Published in final edited form as:

Pediatr Emerg Care. 2018 November ; 34(11): 802–809. doi:10.1097/PEC.0000000000001289.

Emergency Department Utilization by Native American Children

Heather G. Zook, MA¹, Anupam B. Kharbanda, MD, MSc², Susan E. Puumala, PhD^{3,4}, Katherine A. Burgess, MPH³, Wyatt Pickner, BA, BS³, and Nathaniel R. Payne, MD, MHSA^{1,5}

¹Department of Research and Sponsored Programs, Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota, 2525 Chicago Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55404

²Department of Pediatric Emergency Medicine, Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota, 2525 Chicago Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55404

³Center for Health Outcomes and Prevention Research, Sanford Research, 2301 East 60th Street North, Sioux Falls, SD 57104

⁴Department of Pediatrics, Sanford School of Medicine at the University of South Dakota, 1400 West 22nd Street, Sioux Falls, SD 57105

⁵Department of Quality and Safety, Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota, 2525 Chicago Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55404

Abstract

Objectives—Determine differences in Emergency Department (ED) use by Native American (NA) children in rural and urban settings, and identify factors associated with frequent ED visits.

Methods—This cross-sectional, cohort study examined visits to six EDs: two rural, two mid-size urban, and two large urban from June 2011 to May 2012. Univariate and multiple regression analyses were conducted. Frequent ED visitors had 4 visits in the study period.

Results—We studied 8294 NA visits (5275 patients) and 44 503 White visits (33 945 patients). Rural EDs' had a higher proportion of NA patients, those below 200% of the income poverty level, and those who traveled > 10 miles from their residence to attend the ED (all $p < .05$) compared to mid-size and urban EDs. NA patients had a high proportion of mental health diagnoses compared to Whites (4.9% vs. 1.9%, $p < 0.001$). Frequent ED visitors had greater odds of NA race, age < 1 year, public insurance, female sex, residence < 5 miles from the ED, and chronic disease.

Conclusions—NA children appear to have greater challenges than Whites obtaining care in rural areas. NA children were more likely to be frequent ED visitors, despite having to travel farther from their residence to the ED. NA children visiting rural and mid-size urban EDs had a much higher prevalence of mental health problems than Whites. Additional efforts to provide both medical and mental health services to rural NA are urgently needed.

Keywords

Race; Emergency Department; Native American

Introduction

Many children receive treatment in the Emergency Department (ED) for non-emergent conditions that could likely be appropriately treated in a primary care clinic.^{1–17} Many factors have been associated with frequent ED visits in adults^{3,10,12,14,16,18–21} and pediatric patients,^{6,11,13,22–25} in both urban^{8,14} and rural settings.^{7,11} Children with socioeconomic disadvantage, such as those on public insurance, some racial groups, and perhaps urban location, appear to be frequent ED users when compared to non-Hispanic White (White) children on private insurance.^{6,11,13,15,17,22–24} Lack of primary care access, residence in close proximity to the ED, visits to the ED in the afternoon or early evening, urban location, younger age, mental health issues, chronic medical conditions, and minority race/ethnicity have all been associated with frequent ED visits.^{4,7,11,14,16,24,26}

Despite these many reports, ED utilization by Native American (NA) children has not been well characterized. As a racial group, NA patients are often underrepresented or combined with other racial groups, presumably because NA patients often constitute too small a fraction of the study sample to facilitate reliable analyses.^{10–12,15,19,23} NA children appear to have higher ED utilization rates, poorer health status, higher infant/pediatric mortality, and live in a greater degree of poverty than White children and even other minorities.^{27,28} Although modest progress has been made in reducing some disparities, NA children are still less likely to receive necessary preventive care, to have a physician visit in the last 12 months, and to have routine preventive dental care in the last 12 months compared to White children.²⁹ Since many NA children live in rural areas, it also is not clear how the size of their community might influence ED utilization.

The purpose of our study was to better understand ED utilization by NA children. We hypothesized that 1) NA children would be more likely to visit the ED frequently in rural settings compared to urban and semi-urban areas, presumably because of low primary care access. We also hypothesized that 2) other demographic and clinical factors associated with frequent ED visits by NA children would vary in rural vs. semi-urban or urban areas.

Materials and Methods

Study design and sample

This cross-sectional study examined all pediatric patients (< 18 years old) who visited six different EDs in Minnesota and South Dakota from June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2012. Researchers electronically extracted data from each of the six participating hospital's medical records and sent them to a central site where research staff cleaned, de-identified, and merged the data into a single database. Patients that died or were discharged to a correctional facility were excluded (Figure 1). Institutional Review Boards of all participating hospitals approved this study.

There were two large urban EDs, which are located in metropolitan centers (population 250,000). One of the urban sites is located in the neighborhood with the largest concentration of NA in an urban area in the upper Midwest. Multiple primary care clinics are available to NA patients of all ages in these areas, some of which require no insurance

and provide free transportation. The two urban EDs are not close to reservations and primarily care for urban NA patients. The two mid-size urban centers (population 70 000 and 170 000) serve primarily NA patients living in those cities, although both have reservations approximately 40 miles from the ED. The two rural sites (population < 20,000) are about 30 miles from NA reservations.

Outcome measures and clinical definitions

The primary outcome was the number and characteristics of frequent ED visitors. We defined frequent ED visitors as those with ≥ 4 ED visits in the study period.^{1,15,19} Secondly, we examined the characteristics of NA ED visits by rural, mid-size urban, and large urban ED location. Patients were dichotomized into those with 1–3 vs. ≥ 4 total visits. Previously identified, clinical and demographic factors were assessed to evaluate their association with ED visit and frequent ED utilization.

Other clinical variables were defined using standard definitions were available. We defined chronic disease using the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Chronic Condition Indicator (CCI) software.^{15,30,31} Patients were considered to have a chronic condition if they had a chronic condition at any ED visit. Patients were assigned the median income for the zip code in which they resided using Truven Health Analytics (Ann Arbor, MI) data. Median income as a percentage of the national poverty level was used as an estimate of socioeconomic status³² and grouped as ≤ 200% of poverty level, > 200% but < 300% of poverty level, and ≥ 300% of poverty level for a family of two adults and two children. The threshold poverty income level for a family of two adults and two children in 2012 was \$23 283.³³ Race was self/parent-reported at registration, as was sex. Triage level was recorded differently at the participating EDs and could not be compared. For example, while most EDs used the 5-level Emergency Services Severity Index, version 4,³⁴ some used another method, including one that used a 3-level triage system. Insurance type was categorized as private, public, or other. Prepaid Medical Assistance (MA) plans were included in the public insurance category.

We calculated the distance between the patient's residence and the ED from the center of the patient's zip code to the treating ED using SAS (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). The amount of time between each visit was calculated in hours for patients with multiple visits.

Statistical analysis

Independent variables were selected based on our hypothesized association with ED visits, which was based on previously published studies^{2,6,7,9,11,13,15,35} and available study data. For multiple logistic regression, we included all variables with a significant association with frequent ED attendance using a $p < 0.1$ in univariate analysis. For the final regression model, we included all variables with a $p < 0.05$. We examined all variables for an interaction with race and also for an interaction between distance from the ED and rural vs. mid-size urban vs. urban location. Statistical analyses were performed using Stata version 14.1 (Stata Corp, College Station, TX).

To assess the sensitivity of the original model, we redefined our primary outcome variable to include only visits occurring > 48 hours after a previous visit¹⁵ and repeated our analysis.

We also attempted to account for the influence of hospital-level characteristics, using a hierarchical model and logistic regression (Stata routine “xtmelogit”), grouping patients by hospital. Finally, racial classification was missing from 21.5% (1327/6182) of the visits at one ED. Multiple imputations were used for the missing race values on the basis of the following variables: age, language, insurance, distance from the ED, hospital, and the presence of a chronic condition. We used 20 imputations, repeating our logistic regression analysis for each imputed data set and then combined the results using Stata’s *Multiple Imputation* suite of commands. A p -value < 0.05 indicated statistical significance, and we did not adjust for multiple comparisons in the univariate analyses.

Results

Demographic characteristics visits

Our total study sample included 112 746 visits of which NA and White patients constituted 52 797 ED visits and 39 220 patients (Figure 1). The 5275 NA patients contributed 8294 visits and the 33 945 White patients contributed 44 503 visits. There were notable differences among the six EDs. The rural EDs and the mid-size urban EDs had a much higher proportion of NA pediatric visits than the urban EDs (Table 1). Compared to mid-size and large urban EDs, rural location was positively associated with public insurance, income $< 200\%$ of the poverty level (based on median zip code income) and travel > 10 miles from the patients’ residence to the ED (Table 1). Rural EDs had lower rates of hospital admission/transfer and lower rates of most chronic diseases than the urban EDs (Tables 1). Other demographic features of ED visits appear in Table 1.

Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients

Some patients had multiple visits overweighting their impact on the findings so subsequent analysis was restricted to patients, instead of visits (Table 2). NA patients, especially rural NA patients, differed in several respects from White patients. Rural NA and White patients had lower estimated income than patients seen at mid-size or large urban EDs, but in each location NA patients had a lower estimated income than White patients (Table 2). Rural NA patients had a higher percentage of patients traveling > 10 miles to the ED than White patients (69.4% vs. 43.2%, $p < 0.001$, Table 2). Compared to urban patients, rural and mid-size urban NA ED patients were more likely than White patients to have asthma and other chronic diseases (Table 2). NA patients had a particularly high prevalence of mental health diagnoses (4.9% vs. 1.9%, $p < 0.001$).

Frequent ED visits

Multiple visits accounted for 25.7% of all NA and Whites’ visits ($n = 13\,577/52\,797$). There were 6030 visits (11.4%, 6030/52 797) by patients who were frequent users (≥ 4 ED visits in study period). Characteristics associated with frequent ED visitors varied by geographic site and racial group. By univariate analysis, all three settings (rural, mid-size urban and large urban) were associated with a higher prevalence of frequent ED visitors among NA compared to White patients ($p = .029$ to $.001$, Table 2). Urban NA patients were more likely than either rural or mid-size urban patients to be frequent visitors. We did not have sufficient patients to determine if rural and mid-size urban NA patients differed in the prevalence of

frequent ED visits. A chronic health condition, public insurance, median zip code income < 200% of the poverty level, rural location, female sex, living < 5 miles from the ED and age < 1 year were all associated with frequent ED visits by univariate regression (Table 3).

Multiple regression analysis largely confirmed the univariate analysis, however there were site differences (Table 3) and two significant interactions (Figure 2a & 2b). By multiple regression analysis, frequent visitor status was associated with NA race, age < 1 year, public insurance, female sex, and residence < 5 miles from the ED (Table 3). Estimated income was not a significant predictor of frequent visits when insurance status was included. After adjusting for covariates and interactions, NA race was associated with a higher predicted probability of being a frequent ED visitor at urban and rural locations, but not at the two mid-size urban EDs (Figure 2a). Chronic conditions increased the odds of being a frequent visitor, among both White and NA patients, but had a smaller effect in the case of NA patients (Figure 2b).

Sensitivity analyses

We performed three sensitivity analyses to assess our findings with regard to frequent ED visitors. First, patients were re-categorized as frequent visitors after excluding repeat visits to the ED that occurred at < 48 hours from the initial visit. This reduced the number of frequent visitors from 1,179 to 1,006. There were no differences in significant associations, including the interactions. Second, we repeated our model analysis using each site as a hierarchical variable. There were no changes in significant associations or interactions. Finally, there was one site that had 21.5% of racial classifications missing. We performed multiple (20) imputations of the missing race values and then repeated the original analysis. Again, there were no changes in significant findings or interactions.

Discussion

Our findings on ED utilization by NA patients emphasize the challenges facing NA children seeking care at an ED, especially those that live in rural areas. Over 90% of rural NA patients lived in households with incomes < 200% of the poverty level and almost 70% traveled > 10 miles to reach the ED (Table 2). Despite their longer travel distance to rural EDs, rural NA patients were more likely to be frequent ED visitors compared to rural White patients (Table 3). This suggested limited primary care access for NA children and/or the parent/guardian's belief that the patient needed urgent care. Between 1 in 14 and 1 in 40 NA patients presented to a rural ED with a mental health diagnosis (Table 2). Interestingly, rural NA patients had a lower prevalence of asthma and any chronic disease than NA patients presenting to an urban ED (Table 2). This could represent underdiagnosis or relocation to seek care for a child with chronic illness. Rural NA ED patients were hospitalized less often than urban NA ED patients. This may be partially explained by a higher prevalence of chronic disease in urban than in rural NA patients or a greater tendency to treat rural patients on an outpatient basis. All of these findings highlight the very significant health and care challenges that NA patients face in rural, mid-size urban, and urban areas.

Previous work has shown that rural NA patients carry a high burden of injuries and illness compared to those living in urban areas.^{28,36,37} Our findings confirm and help to

characterize that burden. NA children living in rural areas may also be served by the Indian Health Service (IHS) facilities.^{38,39} It has been reported that some IHS emergency medical services may lack the resources to treat pediatric patients.^{38,39} This might force NA children to visit emergency rooms of non-IHS facilities and travel long distances to obtain needed emergency care. Although regionalization might improve the availability of services,⁴⁰ travel distances might not improve. Our finding of a high proportion of ED visits associated with mental health conditions in all NA patients compared to Whites was similar to the observations of others.³⁵

Higher proportions of NA patients were frequent ED visitors compared to White patients at rural, mid-size urban and urban EDs (Table 2). Urban location had the highest prevalence of NA frequent ED visitors (Table 3). However, in multiple regression analysis, there was a significant interaction of race and location such that at mid-size urban EDs, NA race was not associated statistically with a higher predicted probability of being a frequent ED visitor (Figure 2a). We also found an interaction between race and chronic disease indicating that chronic disease was less likely to predict frequent ED visits in NA than in White patients (Figure 2b). Taken together, these data suggested availability of primary care access, chronic disease, distance of residence from the ED and other factors influence the frequency of ED visits by NA patients.

Common characteristics among frequent ED users at all locations suggest opportunities for intervention, primarily through better access to consistent primary care. The highest odds for being a frequent ED visitor were associated with public insurance, age < 1 year, proximity to the ED, NA race, and chronic disease. Perhaps, interventions directed at first-time mothers, whose neonates and infants have increased ED utilization,¹³ would provide reassurance and guidance for their children's first-year illnesses without attending the ED. The weaker association of chronic disease and frequent ED visits in NA compared to White patients (Figure 2b) is concerning and might mean that NA patients are not receiving sufficient care. Previous reports have shown that primary care access has not improved over recent years for most NA.⁴¹ Taken together, our findings suggested that NA patients might not be receiving needed care, despite frequenting the ED.

However, simply providing more primary care access may not reduce frequent ED visits.^{8,14} Many NA patients harbor a deep distrust of health care institutions, more so than White patients.⁴² Therefore there may be emotional barriers to establishing a consistent source of care. Further, some parents may not distinguish between their child's serious and less urgent conditions, perceiving an illness as severe that ED personnel would assess as minor.^{1,2,6,9,19,43,44} This further suggests that assessing health literacy, providing care navigation, and improving healthcare education might lead to more appropriate ED use.^{21,45} To address many of the inconsistencies of care will require a thoughtful, culturally sensitive approach to care.

Strengths

This multi-center study had several unique features. First, our study reports one of the largest number of NA pediatric ED patients (5275 children & 8294 ED visits) that we have found. We accrued sufficient NA patients to assess their ED utilization apart from other

racial groups. Second, we included patients treated at rural, mid-size and large urban hospital EDs, which we believe provides a more complete picture of NA ED utilization and makes our results potentially generalizable to a large number of EDs. We also examined both clinical and demographic factors associated with ED attendance, such as income, distance of residence from the ED, and the presence of chronic disease.

Limitations

Our data come only from EDs in the Upper Midwest, and results from other regions might differ. We were limited to the potential covariates that were present in our electronically extracted data. Our data only include ED returns to the same institution. Other authors have documented that frequent ED utilizers may visit more than one ED.⁴ Without data from all EDs in our region, it is likely that we have underestimated the number of frequent ED visitors. Race classification was missing from 21.5% of ED visits from one hospital, but were able to use multiple imputation to partially compensate for the missing data.

Conclusions

Our study suggests that NA children have greater challenges than Whites obtaining care in rural areas. NA children were more likely to be frequent ED visitors, despite having to travel farther from their residence to the ED and greater poverty. NA children visiting rural and mid-size urban EDs had a much higher prevalence of mental health problems than Whites. Additional efforts to provide both medical and mental health services to rural NA are urgently needed.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number U54MD008164. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

References

1. Alpern ER, Clark AE, Alessandrini EA, et al. Recurrent and high-frequency use of the emergency department by pediatric patients. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2014 Apr; 21(4):365–73. [PubMed: 24730398]
2. Berry A, Brousseau D, Brotanek JM, et al. Why do parents bring children to the emergency department for nonurgent conditions? A qualitative study. *Ambul Pediatr*. 2008 Nov-Dec;8(6):360–7. [PubMed: 19084785]
3. Blank FS, Li H, Henneman PL, et al. A descriptive study of heavy emergency department users at an academic emergency department reveals heavy ED users have better access to care than average users. *J Emerg Nurs*. 2005 Apr; 31(2):139–44. [PubMed: 15834378]
4. Cook LJ, Knight S, Junkins EP, et al. Repeat patients to the emergency department in a statewide database. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2004 Mar; 11(3):256–63. [PubMed: 15001405]
5. Davis JW, Fujimoto RY, Chan H, et al. Identifying characteristics of patients with low urgency emergency department visits in a managed care setting. *Manag Care*. 2010 Oct; 19(10):38–44. [PubMed: 21049788]
6. Fieldston ES, Alpern ER, Nadel FM, et al. A qualitative assessment of reasons for nonurgent visits to the emergency department: parent and health professional opinions. *Pediatr Emerg Care*. 2012 Mar; 28(3):220–5. [PubMed: 22344210]
7. Hardie TL, Polek C, Wheeler E, et al. Characterising emergency department high-frequency users in a rural hospital. *Emerg Med J*. 2015 Jan; 32(1):21–5. [PubMed: 24351523]

8. Hoffmann C, Broyles RS, Tyson JE. Emergency room visits despite the availability of primary care: a study of high risk inner city infants. *Am J Med Sci.* 1997 Feb; 313(2):99–103. [PubMed: 9030675]
9. Kubicek K, Liu D, Beaudin C, et al. A profile of nonurgent emergency department use in an urban pediatric hospital. *Pediatr Emerg Care.* 2012 Oct; 28(10):977–84. [PubMed: 23023463]
10. Lasser KE, Kronman AC, Cabral H, et al. Emergency department use by primary care patients at a safety-net hospital. *Arch Intern Med.* 2012 Feb 13; 172(3):278–80. [PubMed: 22332165]
11. LeDuc K, Rosebrook H, Rannie M, et al. Pediatric emergency department recidivism: demographic characteristics and diagnostic predictors. *J Emerg Nurs.* 2006 Apr; 32(2):131–8. [PubMed: 16580475]
12. Milbrett P, Halm M. Characteristics and predictors of frequent utilization of emergency services. *J Emerg Nurs.* 2009 Jun; 35(3):191, 8. [PubMed: 19446122]
13. Millar KR, Gloor JE, Wellington N, et al. Early neonatal presentations to the pediatric emergency department. *Pediatr Emerg Care.* 2000 Jun; 16(3):145–50. [PubMed: 10888448]
14. Sandoval E, Smith S, Walter J, et al. A comparison of frequent and infrequent visitors to an urban emergency department. *J Emerg Med.* 2010 Feb; 38(2):115–21. [PubMed: 18462906]
15. Neuman MI, Alpern ER, Hall M, et al. Characteristics of recurrent utilization in pediatric emergency departments. *Pediatrics.* 2014 Oct; 134(4):e1025–31. [PubMed: 25225134]
16. Ruger JP, Richter CJ, Spitznagel EL, et al. Analysis of costs, length of stay, and utilization of emergency department services by frequent users: implications for health policy. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2004 Dec; 11(12):1311–7. [PubMed: 15576522]
17. Yamamoto LG, Zimmerman KR, Butts RJ, et al. Characteristics of frequent pediatric emergency department users. *Pediatr Emerg Care.* 1995 Dec; 11(6):340–6. [PubMed: 8751167]
18. LaCalle E, Rabin E. Frequent users of emergency departments: the myths, the data, and the policy implications. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2010 Jul; 56(1):42–8. [PubMed: 20346540]
19. Sun BC, Burstin HR, Brennan TA. Predictors and outcomes of frequent emergency department users. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2003 Apr; 10(4):320–8. [PubMed: 12670845]
20. Hong R, Baumann BM, Boudreaux ED. The emergency department for routine healthcare: race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and perceptual factors. *J Emerg Med.* 2007 Feb; 32(2):149–58. [PubMed: 17307624]
21. Pillow MT, Doctor S, Brown S, et al. An Emergency Department-initiated, web-based, multidisciplinary approach to decreasing emergency department visits by the top frequent visitors using patient care plans. *J Emerg Med.* 2013 Apr; 44(4):853–60. [PubMed: 23102594]
22. Angoulvant F, Jumel S, Prot-Labarthe S, et al. Multiple health care visits related to a pediatric emergency visit for young children with common illnesses. *Eur J Pediatr.* 2013 Jun; 172(6):797–802. [PubMed: 23404734]
23. Kroner EL, Hoffmann RG, Brousseau DC. Emergency department reliance: a discriminatory measure of frequent emergency department users. *Pediatrics.* 2010 Jan; 125(1):133–8. [PubMed: 20008418]
24. Woodward CA, Boyle MH, Offord DR, et al. Ontario Child Health Study: patterns of ambulatory medical care utilization and their correlates. *Pediatrics.* 1988 Sep; 82(3 Pt 2):425–34. [PubMed: 3405678]
25. Chen CL, Fitzpatrick L, Kamel H. Who uses the emergency department for dermatologic care? A statewide analysis. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2014 Aug; 71(2):308–13. [PubMed: 24780175]
26. Hargraves JL, Hadley J. The contribution of insurance coverage and community resources to reducing racial/ethnic disparities in access to care. *Health Serv Res.* 2003 Jun; 38(3):809–29. [PubMed: 12822914]
27. Flores G, Tomany-Korman SC. Racial and ethnic disparities in medical and dental health, access to care, and use of services in US children. *Pediatrics.* 2008 Feb; 121(2):e286–98. [PubMed: 18195000]
28. Wong CA, Gachupin FC, Holman RC, et al. American Indian and Alaska Native infant and pediatric mortality, United States, 1999–2009. *Am J Public Health.* 2014 Jun; 104(Suppl 3):S320–8. [PubMed: 24754619]

29. Flores G, Lin H. Trends in racial/ethnic disparities in medical and oral health, access to care, and use of services in US children: has anything changed over the years? *Int J Equity Health*. 2013 Jan 22;12:10,9276-12-10. [PubMed: 23339566]
30. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Chronic Condition Indicator (CCI) for ICD-9. Downloadable software for Stata. <http://www.hcup-usahrqgov/toolssoftware/chronic/chronicjsp>
31. Feudtner C, Christakis DA, Connell FA. Pediatric deaths attributable to complex chronic conditions: a population-based study of Washington State, 1980–1997. *Pediatrics*. 2000 Jul; 106(1 Pt 2):205–9. [PubMed: 10888693]
32. Berkowitz SA, Traore CY, Singer DE, et al. Evaluating area-based socioeconomic status indicators for monitoring disparities within health care systems: results from a primary care network. *Health Serv Res*. 2015 Apr; 50(2):398–417. [PubMed: 25219917]
33. Poverty Data - Poverty thresholds [Internet]. U.S. Census Bureau; 2015. [updated January 26,2015; cited May 29, 2015]. Available from: <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html>
34. Gilboy N, Tanabe T, Travers D. , et al. Emergency Severity Index (ESI). Implementation Handbook 2012 Edition. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2011 Nov. A Triage Tool for Emergency Department Care, Version 4. AHRQ Publication No. 12-0014
35. Newton AS, Rosychuk RJ, Dong K, et al. Emergency health care use and follow-up among sociodemographic groups of children who visit emergency departments for mental health crises. *CMAJ*. 2012 Sep 4; 184(12):E665–74. [PubMed: 22690003]
36. Murphy T, Pokhrel P, Worthington A, et al. Unintentional injury mortality among American Indians and Alaska Natives in the United States, 1990–2009. *Am J Public Health*. 2014 Jun; 104(Suppl 3):S470–80. [PubMed: 24754624]
37. Valet RS, Gebretsadik T, Carroll KN, et al. High asthma prevalence and increased morbidity among rural children in a Medicaid cohort. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. 2011 Jun; 106(6):467–73. [PubMed: 21624745]
38. Sequist TD, Cullen T, Bernard K, et al. Trends in quality of care and barriers to improvement in the Indian Health Service. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2011 May; 26(5):480–6. [PubMed: 21132462]
39. Genovesi AL, Hastings B, Edgerton EA, et al. Pediatric emergency care capabilities of Indian Health Service emergency medical service agencies serving American Indians/Alaska Natives in rural and frontier areas. *Rural Remote Health*. 2014; 14(2):2688. [PubMed: 24852933]
40. Horeczko T, Marcin JP, Kahn JM, et al. Consortium Of Regionalization Efforts in Emergency Medical Services for Children (CORE-EMSC). Urban and rural patterns in emergent pediatric transfer: a call for regionalization. *J Rural Health*. 2014 Summer;30(3):252–8. [PubMed: 24164349]
41. 2014 National Healthcare Quality and Disparities Report. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2015 May. AHRQ Publication No. 15-0007
42. Call KT, McAlpine DD, Johnson PJ, et al. Barriers to care among American Indians in public health care programs. *Med Care*. 2006 Jun; 44(6):595–600. [PubMed: 16708009]
43. Olsson M, Hansagi H. Repeated use of the emergency department: qualitative study of the patient's perspective. *Emerg Med J*. 2001 Nov; 18(6):430–4. [PubMed: 11696488]
44. Raven MC, Lowe RA, Maselli J, et al. Comparison of presenting complaint vs discharge diagnosis for identifying " nonemergency" emergency department visits. *JAMA*. 2013 Mar 20; 309(11): 1145–53. [PubMed: 23512061]
45. Schumacher JR, Hall AG, Davis TC, et al. Potentially preventable use of emergency services: the role of low health literacy. *Med Care*. 2013 Aug; 51(8):654–8. [PubMed: 23703649]

Figure 1. Flow Diagram of Study Sample

Percentages are out of the original sample of 59,719 ED encounters.

Figure 2. Graphic Presentation of Interactions from Regression Analysis

Predicted probability graphs illustrating the interaction between race and chronic disease, Figure 2a, and race and ED location, Figure 2b. Along the y-axis is the predicted probability of being a frequent ED visitor (≥ 4 ED visits in the study period). Along the x-axis are the categorical values of chronic disease (yes/no, Figure 2a) and ED location (Rural/Mid-size urban/Urban, Figure 2b).

* Along the y-axis of both panels represents probability of ≥ 4 ED visits in the study period. The graphs show the change in the influence of the size of the city in which the ED resides (Panel A) and the presence of a chronic condition (Panel B) on race as a predictor of being a frequent ED visitor.

Table 1

Demographics of Emergency Department (ED) Visits by Site

	Rural^a		Mid-Size Urban^a		Large Urban^a		Total
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Visit Characteristics	6.3% (7147)	^b	16.6% (18 677)		77.1% (86 922)		100% (112 746)
Racial/Ethnic Group^c							
Whites	41.2% (2943)		65.4% (12 211)		33.8% (29 349)		39.5% (44 503)
Native American	37.8% (2703)		22.3% (4158)		1.7% (1433)		7.4% (8294)
African American	0.9% (64)		4.8% (888)		30.2% (26 281)		24.2% (27 233)
Asian	0.3% (22)		1.2% (222)		4.4% (3799)		3.6% (4043)
Hispanic	0.4% (31)		1.9% (354)		15.8% (13 740)		12.5% (14 125)
Other	0.8% (54)		2.9% (550)		10.4% (8994)		8.5% (9598)
Missing	18.6% (1330)		1.6% (294)		3.8% (3326)		4.4% (4950)
Language^c							
English	13.5% (964)		99.1% (18 500)		75.1% (65 257)		75.1% (84 721)
Spanish	0% (0)		0.4% (83)		12.0% (10 410)		9.3% (10 493)
Other	0.01% (1)		0.4% (77)		12.6% (10 965)		9.8% (11 043)
Missing	86.5% (6182)		0.1% (17)		0.3% (290)		5.8% (6489)
Age^c							
< 1 Year	16.2% (1157)		10.4% (1940)		18.0% (15 672)		16.7% (18 769)
1–4 Years	32.6% (2333)		36.4% (6799)		40.7% (35 332)		39.4% (44 464)
5–10 Years	23.5% (1682)		24.1% (4505)		25.1% (21 785)		24.8% (27 972)
11–17 Years	27.6% (1975)		29.1% (5433)		16.3% (14 133)		19.1% (21 541)
Sex							
Female	47.9% (3425)		48.0% (8965)		46.5% (40 456)		46.9% (52 846)
Male	52.1% (3722)		52.0% (9712)		53.5% (46 466)		53.1% (59 900)

	Rural ^a	Mid-Size Urban ^a	Large Urban ^a	Total
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Insurance Type^c				
Public	71.7% (5124)	62.0% (11 581)	62.3% (54 125)	62.9% (70 830)
Private	26.5% (1895)	26.7% (4978)	37.7% (32 748)	35.2% (39 621)
Other	1.8% (128)	11.3% (2116)	0% (0)	2.0% (2244)
Income Level^{c,d}				
<2 X Poverty level	84.2% (6018)	51.4% (9604)	49.9% (43 382)	52.3% (59 004)
2–3 X Poverty level	10.1% (718)	38.1% (7106)	30.0% (26 109)	30.1% (33 933)
>3 X Poverty level	1.0% (77)	4.3% (795)	19.3% (16 754)	15.6% (17 619)
Missing	4.8% (341)	6.3% (1172)	0.8% (677)	1.9% (2190)
Distance from ED^c				
< 5 Miles	47.4% (3388)	58.0% (10 823)	47.1% (40 954)	48.9% (55 165)
5–10 Miles	1.3% (90)	16.5% (3083)	27.7% (24 085)	24.2% (27 258)
> 10 Miles	51.3% (3669)	25.5% (4771)	25.2% (21 883)	26.9% (30 323)
Chronic Condition^c				
None	90.7% (6480)	89.8% (16 769)	82.2% (71 484)	84.0% (94 733)
Chronic	9.3% (667)	10.2% (1908)	17.8% (15 438)	16.0% (18 013)

^aRural location was defined as population < 50 000, mid-size urban as 50 000 to 250 000 population, urban as population > 250 000.

^bNumbers represent % (n) of ED visits with the row characteristic within the column group.

^cSignificant difference ($p < 0.001$) between sites using Chi-square tests.

^dPatients were assigned the median income for the zip code in which they resided. The poverty threshold for a family of two adults and two children was \$23 283 in 2012.

Table 2

Characteristics of Emergency Department (ED) Patients by Race and City Size

	Rural (N=3805)		Mid-Size Urban (N=12 160)		Large Urban (N = 23 255)		Total (N = 39 220)	
Characteristics	NA ^a	Whites ^b	NA	Whites	NA	Whites	NA	Whites
	N = 1680	N = 2125	N = 2779	N = 9381	N = 816	N = 22 439	N = 5275	N = 33 945
	(44.2%) ^b	(55.9%)	(22.9%)	(77.2%)	(3.5%)	(96.5%)	(13.5%)	(86.6%)
Median income < 200% of Poverty level	1510	1630	2129	3593	589	4214	4228	9437
	(91.7%)	(82.6%)	(82.1%)	(41.4%)	(72.7%)	(19.0%)	(83.8%)	(28.8%) ^c
Distance from the ED > 10 miles	1166	918	958	2705	125	11 440	2249	15 063
	(69.4%)	(43.2%)	(34.5%)	(28.8%)	(15.3%)	(51.0%)	(42.6%)	(44.4%) ^d
Any chronic condition	118	137	345	591	87	2706	550	3434
	(7.0%)	(6.5%)	(12.4%)	(6.3%)	(10.7%)	(12.1%)	(10.4%)	(10.1%)
Asthma	46	28	62	150	54	779	162	957
	(2.7%)	(1.3%)	(2.2%)	(1.6%)	(6.6%)	(3.5%)	(3.1%)	(2.8%)
Mental health diagnosis	38	54	214	243	4	349	256	646
	(2.3%)	(2.5%)	(7.7%)	(2.6%)	(0.5%)	(1.6%)	(4.9%)	(1.9%) ^c
4 ED visits in year	99	49	113	201	72	472	284	722
	(5.9%)	(2.3%)	(4.1%)	(2.1%)	(8.8%)	(2.1%)	(5.4%)	(2.1%) ^c
Left without being seen	71	52	35	90	43	373	149	515
	(4.2%)	(2.5%)	(1.3%)	(1.0%)	(5.3%)	(1.7%)	(2.8%)	(1.5%) ^c
Admit or transfer to hospital	76	52	78	642	97	4607	251	5301
	(4.5%)	(2.5%)	(2.8%)	(6.8%)	(11.9%)	(20.5%)	(4.8%)	(15.6%) ^c
ED return at < 49 hrs	42	45	45	147	16	493	103	685
	(2.5%)	(2.1%)	(1.6%)	(1.6%)	(2.0%)	(2.2%)	(2.0%)	(2.0%)

^aNA = Native American; Whites = Non-Hispanic white

^bNumbers represent number of patients % (n) of patients with the row characteristic within the column group.

^c $p < 0.001$ by Chi-square analysis

^d $p = 0.018$

Table 3

Unadjusted and Adjusted Odds Ratios for Frequent Emergency Department (ED) Attendees

Patient Characteristics	OR ^a (95% CI)	aOR ^a (95% CI)
Age		
11–17 Years	1.0	1.0
< 1 Year	2.855 (2.408 – 3.384) ^b	3.356 (2.803 – 4.019) ^b
1–4 Years	1.370 (1.163 – 1.615) ^b	1.643 (1.384 – 1.950) ^b
5–10 Years	0.772 (0.634 – 0.940) ^d	0.854 (0.697 – 1.046) ^c
Insurance type		
Private	1.0	1.0
Public	3.687 (3.246 – 4.187) ^b	3.175 (2.745 – 3.672) ^b
Other	1.017 (0.671 – 1.544) ^c	1.467 (0.942 – 2.284) ^c
Sex		
Male	1.0	1.0
Female	1.171 (1.043 – 1.315) ^d	1.202 (1.067, 1.355) ^d
Distance to EDⁱ		
> 10 miles	1.0	1.0
5–10 miles	1.354 (1.140 – 1.607) ^d	1.648 (1.375 – 1.976) ^b
< 5 miles	2.086 (1.827 – 2.381) ^b	2.317 (2.006 – 2.676) ^b
Chronic condition^g		
No chronic condition	1.0	1.0
Any chronic condition	4.375 (3.851 – 4.971) ^b	6.494 (5.573 – 7.568) ^b
Urban location^f		
Large urban (>100 000)	1.0	1.0
Mid-size urban (50 000 – 100 000)	1.063 (0.933 – 1.211) ^c	0.782 (0.659 – 0.933) ^d
Rural (<50 000)	1.629 (1.371 – 1.936) ^b	0.828 (0.618 – 1.109) ^c
Race		
Whites	1.0	1.0
Native American (NA) ^g	2.432 (2.130 – 2.778) ^b	2.122 (1.598 – 2.817) ^b
Interaction of NA & chronic disease		
Whites* Chronic condition		1.0
NA* Chronic condition		0.461 (0.328 – 0.649) ^b

Patient Characteristics	OR ^a (95% CI)	aOR ^a (95% CI)
Interaction of race & urban location		
Whites* Urban Location		1.0
NA* Rural		1.163 (0.753 – 1.795) ^c
NA* Mid-size Urban		0.631 (0.445 – 0.895) ^d

^aOdds ratio (OR) and adjusted odds ratio (aOR) of ≥ 4 ED visits in the 12-month study period. Adjustors chosen on the basis of their presumed association with frequent ED visits.

^b
p = 0.001

^c
p = 0.05 (Not Significant)

^d
p = 0.001 – 0.01

^fNumbers in parentheses refer to population of the city in which the ED was located (based on 2010 census estimates, see methods).

^gDetermined using definitions found in reference

^h
p = 0.008

^eDistance from center of patient's zip code to the ED attended (see methods).