Examining Birth Outcomes Hotspots in Maryland

Andrew D. Williams, MPH
Sandra Hofferth, PhD

University of Maryland
School of Public Health
Presenter Disclosures

Andrew Williams, MPH

The following personal financial relationships with commercial interests relevant to this presentation existed during the past 12 months:

No Relationships to Disclose
Purpose of the Study

Geographic Variation of LBW Rates in Maryland

To identify hotspots of poor birth outcomes in Maryland.

Examine population characteristics of identified hotspots.

Discuss how programs and policies can be both geographically targeted and culturally appropriate.
Research Questions

1. Do birth outcomes hotspots exist at the Census tract level in Maryland?

2. How do population characteristics differ between high and low birth outcomes hotspots?

Definitions

• **LBW Rate**: Births <2500 grams as percent of all live births.

• **Hotspot**: Tract in which LBW Rate of the focal tract is statistically similar to the surrounding tracts; clustering of LBW Rates (Queen Specification)
Methods

Linked Dataset

• Global Moran’s I (GMI) and Local Moran’s I (LMI)
• T-tests compared hotspots with High Rates of LBW to hotspots with Low Rates of LBW
• Tracts with <100 total population excluded

Linked Dataset

2010 Census Tract Shapefiles

2010 Census Tract Identifiers

2010-2012 aggregate Maryland Vital Statistics

2008-2012 American Community Survey

Data Analysis

• Global Moran’s I (GMI) and Local Moran’s I (LMI)
• T-tests compared hotspots with High Rates of LBW to hotspots with Low Rates of LBW
• Tracts with <100 total population excluded
Global Moran’s I Results

LBW Quartiles by Tracts in Maryland
(n = 1388)

Does clustering occur?
Yes!
GMI: .291 p < .001
Local Moran’s I Results

LBW Hotspots (n= 127)
LMI > 0; p<.05

Can we identify LBW Hotspots?
Yes!
Results

Frequency of LBW Rates among Hotspots

Do Hotspots with High Rates of LBW Exist?

Yes!

LBW Rate > 11%
 Results

LBW Hotspots (n = 127)

High LBW Hotspots
77.95%
(n = 99)

Low LBW Hotspots
22.04%
(n = 28)

Legend
- Non Hotspots
- Low Hotspots
- High Hotspots

District of Columbia Area Hotspots

Baltimore Area Hotspots
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>High Rate of LBW Mean (sd) (n= 99)</th>
<th>Low Rate of LBW Mean (sd) (n=28)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>F value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>12.66 (21.09)</td>
<td>85.09 (10.63)</td>
<td>24.79***</td>
<td>3.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>81.75 (24.07)</td>
<td>6.06 (7.14)</td>
<td>-27.32***</td>
<td>11.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>1.99 (2.29)</td>
<td>3.78 (4.28)</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
<td>3.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Asian</td>
<td>1.39 (3.13)</td>
<td>3.64 (5.03)</td>
<td>2.25*</td>
<td>2.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# T-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Status</th>
<th>High Rate of LBW Mean (sd) (n= 99)</th>
<th>Low Rate of LBW Mean (sd) (n=28)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>F value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (%)</td>
<td>23.39 (16.27)</td>
<td>3.85 (3.27)</td>
<td>-11.17***</td>
<td>24.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Headed Household (%)</td>
<td>14.97 (8.75)</td>
<td>3.28 (1.77)</td>
<td>-7.01***</td>
<td>24.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ High School Education (%)</td>
<td>79.38 (10.47)</td>
<td>94.50 (3.61)</td>
<td>7.49***</td>
<td>8.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Public Assistance (%)</td>
<td>6.49 (5.91)</td>
<td>.53 (.69)</td>
<td>-5.31***</td>
<td>72.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 16 Years Old Employed (%)</td>
<td>29.27 (14.97)</td>
<td>53.67 (13.96)</td>
<td>7.72***</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

1. Do birth outcomes hotspots exist at the Census tract level in Maryland?
   - GMI suggested global spatial autocorrelation
   - LMI identified hotspot tracts with both High and Low Rates of LBW

2. How do population characteristics differ between high and low birth outcomes hotspots?
   - Hotspots with High Rate of LBW
     - Higher concentration of Black NH residents
     - Low SES across multiple indicators

Aligns with previous work in Maryland and across the United States
Implications

• Geographically targeted programs and policies
  • E.g. Maryland Health Enterprise Zones

• Racial/Ethnic concentration of area matters
  • Community based, culturally appropriate actions

• Low SES may indicate lack of access to resources
  • Data and community input to target resources

• Potential to improve birth outcomes and overall health of populations