

1 **The Impact of the “Muslim Ban” Executive Order on Healthcare Utilization in**
2 **Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota**

3
4 Elizabeth A. Samuels, MD, MPH, MHS¹, Lilla Orr, MA², Elizabeth B. White, BA³, Altaf Saadi,
5 MD, MHS⁴, Aasim I. Padela, MD, MSc⁵, Michael Westerhaus, MD, MA⁶, Aarti D. Bhatt, MD⁷,
6 Pooja Agrawal, MD, MPH⁸, Dennis Wang, MD, MPH⁹, Gregg Gonsalves, PhD²

7
8 ¹ Department of Emergency Medicine, Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI

9 ² Department of Political Science, Yale University, New Haven, CT

10 ³ Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT

11 ⁴ Department of Neurology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

12 ⁵ Section of Emergency Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

13 ⁶ HealthPartners Center for International Health, Minneapolis, MN

14 ⁷ Division of General Internal Medicine, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

15 ⁸ Department of Emergency Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT

16 ⁹ Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT

17

18

19 **Abstract**

20

21 **Objective:** Determine whether the 2017 “Muslim Ban” Executive Order impacted healthcare
22 utilization by people born in Order-targeted nations living in the United States.

23

24 **Methods:** We conducted a retrospective cohort study of people living in Minneapolis-St. Paul,
25 MN in 2016-2017 who were: 1) born in Order-targeted nations, 2) born in Muslim-majority
26 nations not listed in the Order, and 3) born in the United States and non-Latinx. Primary
27 outcomes were: 1) primary care visits, 2) missed primary care appointments, 3) primary care
28 diagnoses for stress-responsive conditions, 4) emergency department visits, and 5) emergency
29 department visits for stress-responsive diagnoses. We evaluated visit trends before and after
30 Order issuance using linear regression and differences between study groups using a difference-
31 in-difference analyses.

32

33 **Results:** In early 2016, primary care visits and stress-responsive diagnoses increased among
34 individuals from Muslim majority nations. Following the Order, there was an immediate increase
35 in emergency department visits among individuals from Order-targeted nations.

36

37 **Conclusions:** Increases in healthcare utilization among people born in Muslim majority
38 countries before and after the “Muslim Ban” likely reflect elevated cumulative stress including
39 the impact of the Order.

40

41 INTRODUCTION

42 The 2016 United States (U.S.) presidential election was marked by anti-Muslim and anti-
43 immigrant rhetoric and the subsequent Trump administration has introduced multiple restrictive
44 immigration policies, primarily targeting individuals from Muslim-majority and Latin American
45 countries.¹ On January 27, 2017, one week after taking office, President Trump issued Executive
46 Order 13769, “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States,”²
47 commonly referred to as the “Muslim Ban.” The Order, upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court,³
48 suspended the U.S. Refugee Resettlement Program and prevented citizens from seven Muslim-
49 majority countries (Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen) from traveling or
50 immigrating to the U.S.

51 Policies like the Muslim Ban exacerbate heightened levels of discrimination, hostility, and
52 “othering” that U.S. Muslims experience.⁴ Over the past two decades there has been an increase
53 in hate crimes⁵ and social hostility^{6,7} directed toward U.S. Muslims, experiences which
54 negatively impact health. Following the September 11th attacks, Arab Americans, including
55 Muslim Arab Americans, demonstrated increased rates of anxiety, depression, and low birth
56 weights.^{4,8-11} However, it is unknown how health and healthcare utilization in other Muslim
57 American communities have changed in response to shifting sociopolitical climates.

58 This study examines the impact of the Muslim Ban Order on healthcare utilization among
59 people from Order-targeted nations. We sought to determine whether the policy resulted in
60 avoidance of care due to fear of discrimination, or, as was seen among Arab Americans after
61 September 11th, increased healthcare utilization for stress-responsive medical problems. To
62 evaluate these changes, we examined primary care and emergency department (ED) utilization

63 by people from Order-targeted nations living in the Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota
64 metropolitan area, home to the largest Somali Muslim community in the U.S.¹²

65

66 **METHODS**

67 **Study Design**

68 We conducted a retrospective cohort study comparing changes in primary care and ED
69 utilization, missed scheduled clinic appointments, and visits for stress-responsive conditions
70 among individuals from Order-targeted nations from one year before to one year after Order
71 issuance. We characterized visit trends and, for outcomes with similar group trends prior to
72 Order issuance, used a difference-in-difference analysis to estimate its effects on healthcare
73 utilization. The primary analysis compared people born in one of the Order-targeted nations to
74 non-Latinx U.S.-born citizens. Supplementary analyses compared trends among people born in a
75 Muslim-majority nation not listed in the Order (Table 1, Group 2) to non-Latinx U.S.-born
76 citizens.

77

78 **Study setting and population**

79 The Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area has 3.63 million residents and the largest Somali
80 Muslim population in the U.S. In 2017, three quarters (75.1%) of Minneapolis-St. Paul
81 metropolitan area residents were white, 8.56% Black, and 6.64% Asian.¹³ Approximately 10.2%
82 of residents were born outside of the U.S., with an estimated 37,468 people born in Somalia.¹³

83 We analyzed electronic health record (EHR) data from HealthPartners, one of the area's
84 largest healthcare and insurance organizations, serving over 1.2 million patients at 55 primary
85 care centers, 22 acute care centers, and eight hospitals in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan

86 area. While religion is not recorded in the EHR, patient country of origin recorded in the
87 HealthPartners EHR allowed us to characterize patients receiving care between January 1, 2016
88 and December 31, 2017 into three groups: 1) adults born in one of the seven nations mentioned
89 in the Muslim Ban Order (Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen) (Table 1, Group
90 1), 2) adults born in Muslim-majority nations not listed in the Order (Table 1, Group 2), and 3)
91 U.S.-born non-Latinx adults (Table 1, Group 3). We excluded U.S.-born Latinx patients as they
92 have been subject to distinct anti-immigrant rhetoric and policies which have important impacts
93 on their health and healthcare utilization.^{14,15}

94

95 **Outcomes**

96 We examined changes in primary care and ED utilization in the year before and after Order
97 issuance. Primary outcomes included the number of 1) primary care clinic visits, 2) missed
98 primary care clinic appointments, 3) primary care clinic diagnoses for stress-responsive
99 conditions, 4) ED visits, and 5) ED visits for stress-responsive diagnoses, including ambulatory
100 sensitive conditions. This study was conducted in accordance with STROBE guidelines and
101 approved by the HealthPartners and Yale Institutional Review Boards.¹⁶

102

103 *Primary Care Clinic Utilization.* Primary care visits, missed appointments, and stress-responsive
104 diagnoses were analyzed as counts per person. We identified stress-responsive diagnoses,
105 medical diagnoses that may be related to increased stress, through literature review and expert
106 opinion.^{10,14,17-23} Diagnoses included in the analysis were agreed upon by consensus (Table S1)
107 and included 138 ICD-10 codes grouped into six categories: mental health, sleep disorders,
108 gastrointestinal concerns, neurologic concerns, food-related disorders, and pain syndromes.

109
110 *Emergency Department Utilization.* ED visits, stress-responsive diagnoses, and ambulatory
111 sensitive conditions were also analyzed as counts per person. We identified ED stress-responsive
112 diagnoses through literature review and expert opinion. Diagnoses included were agreed upon by
113 research team consensus and included 27 ICD-10 codes for acute coronary syndrome, assault,
114 suicide attempt, and syncope (Table S2).^{10,14,17-25} Ambulatory sensitive conditions are conditions
115 responsive to social stressors and inequalities for which an ED visit or hospitalization is
116 considered preventable through outpatient interventions.^{24,26} Ambulatory sensitive diagnoses
117 included 21 ICD-10 codes for: angina, asthma, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive
118 pulmonary disease, diabetes complications, and hypertension (Table S2).^{24,26}

119

120 **Data**

121 All patient demographic, visit, and diagnosis data were extracted from the HealthPartners
122 EHR by a HealthPartners Data Analyst. All records were de-identified and assigned a unique
123 Study ID prior to transfer through a secure file transmission system from HealthPartners to the
124 study team.

125

126 **Statistical Analyses**

127 We summarized the trends for each outcome using local linear regression and tested trend
128 similarity across groups prior to Order issuance using linear regression. For the difference-in-
129 difference analyses, we fit the linear regression model described in equation 1.

$$130 \quad Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{OrderTargeted} + \beta_2 \text{OrderTargeted} \times \text{Post Order} + \beta_t \text{Period} + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

131 We compared the 360-days before and after Order issuance, divided into 24 distinct, 30-day
132 time periods. Each outcome “Y” is a count per person per 30-day time period. “Order Targeted”
133 and “Order Targeted x Post Order” represent being from a nation named in the Order and being
134 from one of these nations in a time period after the Order was issued, respectively. For each
135 model, we also estimated the average effect (β_2) over increasing time intervals centered on the
136 Order issuance date, beginning with 30-days pre- and post-Order and increasing by 30-day
137 increments to 360-days pre- and post-Order.

138 To further control for potentially confounding effects of individual characteristics and
139 temporal trends, we estimated the average effects relative to two alternative reference groups.
140 First, we used exact matching on age, sex, race, and insurance to reweight members of Group 3
141 (non-Latinx, U.S. born) and identify a subset of Group 3 with similar demographics as Group 1
142 (Order-targeted). We used the R package MatchIt to identify this reference group, then fit a
143 weighted version of the model described in equation 1 (Table S8).²⁷ Second, we used a
144 generalized synthetical control method to reweight members of Group 3 to produce a reference
145 group with demographics and pre-Order outcomes more similar to those observed in Group 1.
146 Models were fit using the R package gsynth with parametric bootstrap standard errors.²⁸

147 We fit separate models for all outcomes: primary care visits, missed primary care
148 appointments, primary care stress-responsive diagnoses, ED visits, and ED stress-responsive
149 diagnoses. The primary difference-in-difference analyses estimated the change in outcomes
150 between pre- and post-Order periods among individuals from Order-targeted nations above and
151 beyond the change observed among non-Latinx U.S.-born individuals. To determine whether
152 these differences are due to the Order, rather than other time-varying differences, we assumed
153 that the trends would have been equivalent across groups if the order had not been issued. We

154 tested for parallel trends in the pre-intervention period by examining the interaction between
155 study group and time (30-day periods) in linear regression models. Our main results include
156 difference-in-difference estimates of the effect of the Order for outcomes with outcomes that did
157 not violate the parallel trends assumption prior to Order issuance. All estimates and robustness
158 checks are reported in the Supplement.

159

160 **RESULTS**

161 **Characteristics of Study Population**

162 From 2016 to 2017, 252,594 patients were included in this analysis: 5,667 (2.2%) in Group 1,
163 1,254 (0.5%) in Group 2, and 245,673 (97.3%) in Group 3 (Table 1). People in Group 1 (from
164 Order-targeted nations) were predominantly Black (92.3%, 5,233/5,667), female (59.4%,
165 3,367/5,667), 25-44 years of age (62.3%, 3,534/5,667), and had Medicare or Medicaid (78.1%,
166 4,428/5,667). The largest proportion of Group 2 (non-Order-targeted Muslim-majority nations)
167 identified as white (31.2%, 391/1,254) and 22-54 years of age (69%, 865/1,254). Group 3 (U.S.-
168 born, non-Latinx) was predominantly white (82.8%, 203,342/245,673), slightly more than half
169 were female (54.5% 133,883/245,673), and had an older age distribution (Table 1).

170

171 **Trends in healthcare utilization and diagnoses**

172 The Muslim Ban Order was issued during a period of political change and its implementation
173 did not occur on a single day. Characterizing visit and diagnosis trends is critical to
174 understanding the effects of the political environment during 2016 and 2017 and allows us to
175 assess for parallel trends prior to Order issuance. Figure 1 displays weekly average visit counts
176 per person for each group, along with a local linear (loess) approximation of the time trend.

177

178 *Primary Care Clinic Utilization.* Average daily clinic visits and stress-responsive diagnoses
179 trends are similar across all three groups in early 2016 (Figure 1A, 1C). While visits and stress-
180 responsive diagnoses remained fairly constant for U.S.-born non-Latinx individuals (Group 3),
181 beginning in early 2016, they dramatically increased for individuals from Muslim majority
182 nations in both Groups 1 and 2 after the 2016 presidential election and before Order issuance
183 (Figure 1A, 1C). This increase, and therefore the absence of parallel trends in the pre-Order
184 period, means that difference-in-difference analysis cannot be used to identify the effects of the
185 Order on primary care visits and responsive diagnoses (Table S3, S4). Missed scheduled clinic
186 appointments do appear to follow parallel trends prior to Order issuance (Table S3, S4), and
187 difference-in-difference can be conducted.

188

189 *Emergency Department Utilization.* U.S.-born non-Latinx individuals have higher baseline ED
190 utilization and ED visits for stress-responsive diagnoses; however, trends are fairly similar for all
191 three groups prior to Order issuance. The rate of ED visits was mostly flat, while stress-
192 responsive diagnoses slightly increased during the year prior to the Order. Around the 2016
193 election, the rate of ED visits and stress-responsive diagnoses increased for individuals from
194 Order-targeted nations (Group 1) as well as individuals from other Muslim majority nations
195 (Group 2) before leveling off at a higher utilization rate in mid to late 2017.

196

197 *Effect of the Muslim Ban Order on healthcare utilization and diagnoses*

198 For the three outcomes with similar trends between study groups prior to Order issuance, we
199 used difference-in-difference analysis to estimate the effect of the Order (Table 2, Figure 2).

200 Equivalent analysis is presented in the Supplement for all outcomes without parallel trends prior
201 to Order issuance.

202
203 *Primary Care Clinic Utilization.* In the year following issuance of the Muslim Ban Order,
204 Groups 1 and 2 had greater increases in rates of primary care visits than were seen in Group 3 or
205 either alternative reference group drawn from Group 3 (Tables S5, S7, S9). However, the rise in
206 clinic visits and stress-responsive diagnoses occurred before Order issuance. Rates of missed
207 appointments for Group 1 do not appear to have been affected by the Order (Table 2, Figure 2A),
208 although a slight positive effect is estimated for Group 2 (Table S14).

209
210 *Emergency Department Utilization.* In the year following Order issuance, there was an increase
211 in ED visits and ED stress-responsive diagnoses among individuals from Order-targeted nations
212 beyond the increase seen among U.S.-born non-Latinx individuals. (Table 2, Figure 2B). There
213 was an additional increase in ED stress-responsive diagnoses after issuance of the Order for
214 individuals from Order-targeted nations; however, the difference-in-differences estimate was not
215 statistically significant. Compared to the demographically matched reference group, the
216 estimated Order effect on the Order-targeted group was negative, but also not statistically
217 significant (Table 2, S7). Compared to the synthetic control, the estimate was larger and
218 statistically significant, but the confidence intervals overlap. These findings are consistent, but
219 together they do not provide strong evidence of an Order effect on stress-responsive ED
220 diagnoses in the year following the order. (Table 2). The estimated effects of the Muslim Ban
221 Order on ED utilization and stress-responsive diagnoses for individuals from nations not targeted
222 in the Order were also not statistically significant (Table S14).

223 In contrast to the utilization trends in the primary care clinic, Group 1 ED visits and stress-
224 responsive diagnoses may have been more immediately impacted by the Muslim Ban Order.
225 Shortly after the Order is issued, in the first 30- to 60-days, difference-in-difference analysis
226 demonstrates large Order effects on ED visits (Figure 2B) and stress-responsive diagnoses
227 (Figure 2C). Both increase shortly after the Order was issued beyond the increase seen in Group
228 3, but is not statistically significant.

229

230 **DISCUSSION**

231 The Muslim Ban Order was a major U.S. policy change impacting the U.S. Refugee
232 Resettlement Program, designed to drastically reduce travel and immigration from Order-
233 targeted nations. After Order issuance, there was an immediate increase in ED visits and ED
234 visits for stress responsive diagnoses among people from Order-targeted nations. Clinic
235 utilization and stress-responsive diagnoses increased before Order issuance, most notably after
236 the 2016 presidential election. The Muslim Ban Order was not a discrete event, as it underwent
237 multiple court challenges and did not go into effect until June 26, 2018. Our findings, even for
238 outcomes which followed similar trends prior to Order issuance, likely reflect the elevated
239 cumulative stress due to multiple restrictive policies and an increasingly hostile climate toward
240 Muslim Americans and Muslim immigrants and refugees in the U.S.⁵⁻⁷

241 Although the estimated differences in utilization and stress-responsive diagnoses are
242 relatively small, they are average differences per person per 30-day period. In a large population,
243 small per-person averages can result in substantial population health changes. In addition to
244 averaging over time, difference estimates may mask heterogeneity in the effect of the Muslim
245 Ban Order on a study population with diverse sub-groups. Our retrospective design and use of

246 EHR data limited our ability to identify different sub-groups, which may respond differently to
247 political stress. Individual-level factors, such as prior trauma, religion, acculturation, and sense
248 of belonging with one's ethnic group, can influence coping.^{22,29} Factors that may increase
249 susceptibility to stress which are not recorded in EHRs include duration of time in the U.S.,
250 whether time spent in a refugee camp, prior interactions with the U.S. immigration and/or
251 refugee administration, employment status, and whether someone is awaiting family
252 reunification.

253 Estimated effects of the Order may have been attenuated by factors specific to Minneapolis-
254 St. Paul that may not be present in other cities and states. Social capital, ethnic enclaves, and
255 local pro-immigrant policies are important protective factors in Minneapolis-St. Paul that may
256 mitigate the harms from federal policy changes like the Muslim Ban. These local characteristics
257 of Minneapolis-St. Paul have provided social support and promoted civic engagement amongst
258 Somalis living in Minneapolis—paving the way for Minneapolis to elect its first Somali-
259 American City Council member in 2013³⁰ and its first Somali-American state legislator Ilhan
260 Omar in 2018.³¹ Social capital, or the ability to secure benefits through social networks and
261 social structures, like community associations or civic organizations, attenuates the negative
262 mental health impacts of self-perceived discrimination^{22,25} through relationships or resources that
263 people mitigate the consequences of prejudice and discrimination.³² Ethnic enclaves, or
264 ethnically homogenous social groups, may also protect immigrants from discrimination and
265 related negative health effects. In one study assessing birth weight, residence in a Mexican
266 enclave attenuated risk of low birth weight for Mexican-origin mothers following the 2016
267 presidential election.²³ A similar effect was demonstrated when Lauderdale et al's study on
268 birthweights among Arab Americans after September 11th in California was replicated in

269 Detroit.^{8,11} The initial study demonstrated lower birthweights among Arab Americans following
270 September 11th, but this effect was not observed in Detroit, which has a large and strong Arab
271 American community.¹¹

272 Research that aims to understand the impacts of immigration and refugee policy on Muslim
273 immigrants and refugees generally, and Muslim American immigrants and refugees in particular,
274 is limited by the lack of available population-level data. Furthermore, while the increases in
275 healthcare utilization may reflect increased community stress, this study does not directly
276 measure stress nor the relation between healthcare utilization and stress. Further investigations
277 are needed to determine this relation and potential mediators. It is important to consider that
278 healthcare utilization may not be the most sensitive population-level outcome to use as a proxy
279 measure for increased stress in immigrant communities.^{15,23} At baseline, immigrants tend to have
280 lower healthcare utilization compared to people born in the U.S., related to multiple factors
281 including service accessibility, prevalence of chronic illnesses, age, interpreter service
282 availability, cultural health beliefs, and comfort getting care within institutional medical
283 establishments.^{23,25} Furthermore, visiting a medical provider is one of many day-to-day activities,
284 such as school or work attendance, which may be sensitive to acute social stresses and warrant
285 further study.

286 There are several limitations to this study. First, evaluating the population-level health
287 impacts of the Muslim Ban Order on Muslim Americans is challenging, as most EHR and
288 healthcare data sources do not capture religious affiliation. As such, we used country of origin to
289 estimate Muslim American healthcare utilization.^{22,23,29} Other EHR limitations include data
290 about income and education, which are important factors noted to influence immigrant health
291 care utilization.³³ Furthermore, when studying a small population, only relatively large effects

292 are easily measured. This may result in an inability to detect small but important effects and
293 precludes nuanced analyses of utilization trends including direct comparison of individuals from
294 Muslim majority nations that were and were not targeted in the Order.

295 Second, we are limited in our ability to isolate the effects of the Order. Trends for two of our
296 primary outcomes, clinic visits and stress-responsive diagnoses, diverged in the year prior to the
297 Order issuance. Effects which could be estimated through a difference-in-difference analysis
298 may capture the cumulative effect of multiple events taking place around the time of Order
299 issuance and may not reflect its full impact over time. While we are examining changes in
300 utilization around a distinct event, the Order was issued seven days after President Trump's
301 Inauguration, following a campaign characterized by anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim rhetoric,
302 and it did not go into effect until June 2017. Therefore, we cannot distinguish which specific
303 event caused changes in utilization patterns.

304 Third, Muslim Americans living in and around Minneapolis-St. Paul are not a homogenous
305 group. Somali Americans, who are racialized as Black, therefore experiencing both racism and
306 anti-Muslim sentiment differently from Arab Muslim Americans racialized as white. This
307 analysis could not differentiate Order impact between these groups, and qualitative methods are
308 better suited to exploring intersectional identities. These and other important differences that are
309 not systematically captured in the EHR could influence the health impacts observed in this study,
310 including: immigration or refugee status, time since immigration, time spent in refugee camps,
311 and acculturation. This study also does not account for second generation immigrants who may
312 experience social and familial stress due to the Order, but be included in the U.S. born
313 comparison group, thereby reducing detected differences between study groups.

314 Finally, the study group and location are not nationally representative of all groups targeted
315 by the Order, which limits generalizability of our findings. Minneapolis-St. Paul is a large,
316 diverse, urban area with comparatively strong social supports for refugees generally, and Somalis
317 in particular. In other locations with smaller refugee and/or immigration communities and fewer
318 social supports there may be larger negative effects of restrictive immigration and refugee
319 policies.

320

321 **Public Health Implications**

322 Increases in primary care utilization prior to issuance of the Order and in ED visits after
323 Order-issuance likely reflect elevated cumulative stress due to multiple factors rather than one
324 particular policy change. Further investigations are needed to evaluate whether increases in
325 utilization are driven by particular subgroups, identify protective factors that convey individual
326 and population-level resilience to political social stressors, and elucidate specific health effects
327 of restrictive immigration policies and cumulative social stress on Muslim Americans.

328

329

330

331

332

333 References

- 334
- 335 1. Pierce S, Selee A. *Immigration under Trump: A Review of Policy Shifts in the Year Since*
336 *the Election*. Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute;2017.
 - 337 2. Executive Order Protecting The Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into The United
338 States. [https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-](https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states-2/)
339 [nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states-2/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states-2/). Published March 6, 2017. Accessed
340 December 1, 2019.
 - 341 3. *Trump vs Hawaii*, (United States Supreme Court 2018).
 - 342 4. Samari G. Islamophobia and Public Health in the United States. *Am J Public Health*.
343 2016;106(11):1920-1925.
 - 344 5. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Hate Crime Statistics, 2018: Incidents and Offenses.
345 <https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2018/topic-pages/incidents-and-offenses>. Published 2018.
346 Accessed December 15, 2019.
 - 347 6. Council on American-Islamic Relations. *Targeted: 2018 Civil Rights Report*.
348 Washington, D.C.: Council on American-Islamic Relations,;2018.
 - 349 7. Southern Poverty Law Center. Ten Days After: Harassment and Intimidation in the
350 Aftermath of the Election. [https://www.splcenter.org/20161129/ten-days-after-](https://www.splcenter.org/20161129/ten-days-after-harassment-and-intimidation-aftermath-election)
351 [harassment-and-intimidation-aftermath-election](https://www.splcenter.org/20161129/ten-days-after-harassment-and-intimidation-aftermath-election). Published November 29, 2016.
352 Accessed December 29, 2019.
 - 353 8. Lauderdale DS. Birth outcomes for Arabic-named women in California before and after
354 September 11. *Demography*. 2006;43(1):185-201.
 - 355 9. Padela AI, Heisler M. The Association of Perceived Abuse and Discrimination After
356 September 11, 2001, With Psychological Distress, Level of Happiness, and Health Status
357 Among Arab Americans. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100(2):284-291.
 - 358 10. Rousseau C, Hassan G, Moreau N, Thombs BD. Perceived discrimination and its
359 association with psychological distress among newly arrived immigrants before and after
360 September 11, 2001. *Am J Public Health*. 2011;101(5):909-915.
 - 361 11. El-Sayed A, Hadley C, Galea S. Birth outcomes among Arab Americans in Michigan
362 before and after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. *Ethn Dis*. 2009;18(3):348-
363 356.
 - 364 12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Refugee Health Profiles: Somali Refugees.
365 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,.
366 <https://www.cdc.gov/immigrantrefugeehealth/profiles/somali/populationMovements.html>
367 . Published 2018. Accessed December 1, 2019.
 - 368 13. Data USA. DATA USA: Minneapolis-S.Paul-Bloomington,MN-WI.
369 [https://datausa.io/profile/geo/minneapolis-st.-paul-bloomington-mn-wi-metro-](https://datausa.io/profile/geo/minneapolis-st.-paul-bloomington-mn-wi-metro-area#demographics)
370 [area#demographics](https://datausa.io/profile/geo/minneapolis-st.-paul-bloomington-mn-wi-metro-area#demographics). Published August 2020. Accessed August 6, 2020.
 - 371 14. Hatzenbuehler ML, Prins SJ, Flake M, et al. Immigration policies and mental health
372 morbidity among Latinos: A state-level analysis. *Soc Sci Med*. 2017;174:169-178.
 - 373 15. Toomey RB, Umana-Taylor AJ, Williams DR, Harvey-Mendoza E, Jahromi LB,
374 Updegraff KA. Impact of Arizona's SB 1070 immigration law on utilization of health
375 care and public assistance among Mexican-origin adolescent mothers and their mother
376 figures. *Am J Public Health*. 2014;104 Suppl 1:S28-34.

- 377 16. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of
378 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting
379 observational studies. *PLoS Med.* 2007;4(10):e296.
- 380 17. Finnstrom B, Soderhamn O. Conceptions of pain among Somali women. *J Adv Nurs.*
381 2006;54(4):418-425.
- 382 18. Jager KS. Addressing Mental Health with the Somali Population in the Twin Cities Area.
383 *Master of Social Work Clinical Research Papers.* 2014:Paper 333.
- 384 19. Kessler RC, Mickelson KD, Williams DR. The prevalence, distribution, and mental
385 health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *J Health Soc Behav.*
386 1999;40(3):208-230.
- 387 20. Moradi B, Hasan NT. Arab American persons' reported experiences of discrimination
388 and mental health: The mediating role of personal control. *J Couns Psychol.*
389 2004;51(4):418.
- 390 21. Pavlish CL, Noor S, Brandt J. Somali immigrant women and the American health care
391 system: discordant beliefs, divergent expectations, and silent worries. *Soc Sci Med.*
392 2010;71(2):353-361.
- 393 22. Rippey AE, Newman E. Perceived Religious Discrimination and its Relationship to
394 Anxiety and Paranoia Among Muslim Americans. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health.*
395 2006;1(1):5-20.
- 396 23. Williams DR, Medlock MM. Health Effects of Dramatic Societal Events - Ramifications
397 of the Recent Presidential Election. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;376(23):2295-2299.
- 398 24. Sanderson C, Dixon J. Conditions for which onset or hospital admission is potentially
399 preventable by timely and effective ambulatory care. *J Health Serv Res Policy.*
400 2000;5(4):222-230.
- 401 25. Stalnikowicz R, Tsafrir A. Acute psychosocial stress and cardiovascular events. *Am J*
402 *Emerg Med.* 2002;20(5):488-491.
- 403 26. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. *Guide to prevention quality indicators:*
404 *hospital admission for ambulatory care sensitive conditions.* Rockville, MD: Agency for
405 Healthcare Research and Quality;2001.
- 406 27. Ho DE, Imai K, King G, Stuart EA. MatchIt: Nonparametric Preprocessing for
407 Parametric Causal Inference. *Journal of Statistical Software.* 2011;42(8).
- 408 28. Xu Y. Generalized Synthetic Control Method: Causal Inference with Interactive Fixed
409 Effects Models. *Political Analysis.* 2017;25(1):57-76.
- 410 29. Padela AI, Raza A. American Muslim health disparities: the state of the Medline
411 literature. *J Health Disparities Res Pract.* 2015;8(1).
- 412 30. Rao M. First Somali elected to Mpls. City Council. Star Tribune.
413 <https://www.startribune.com/first-somali-elected-to-mpls-city-council/230761041/>.
414 Published November 6, 2013. Accessed August 18, 2020.
- 415 31. Golden E. Ilhan Omar again makes history, becoming 1st Somali-American elected to
416 U.S. House. Star Tribune. <https://www.startribune.com/ilhan-omar-becomes-first-somali-american-elected-u-s-house/499708271/>.
417 Published November 7, 2018. Accessed August
418 18, 2020.
- 419 32. Fazel M, Reed RV, Panter-Brick C, Stein A. Mental health of displaced and refugee
420 children resettled in high-income countries: risk and protective factors. *The Lancet.*
421 2012;379(9812):266-282.

422 33. Sarria-Santamera A, Hijas-Gomez AI, Carmona R, Gimeno-Feliu LA. A systematic
 423 review of the use of health services by immigrants and native populations. *Public Health*
 424 *Rev.* 2016;37:28.

427 **Table 1. Characteristics of HealthPartners patients seeking care in a primary care clinic or**
 428 **emergency department, January 2016 to December 2017**

	Group 1 People born in a Muslim Ban Order targeted nation¹ (n=5,667) No. (%)	Group 2 People born in a Muslim-majority nation not named in the Muslim Ban Order² (n=1,254) No. (%)	Group 3 U.S.-born, non-Latinx (n=245,673) No. (%)
Race			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	10 (0.2)	12 (1)	3207 (1.3)
Asian	45 (0.8)	307 (24.5)	5,567 (2.3)
Black	5,233 (92.3)	272 (21.7)	29,644 (12.1)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	5 (0.1)	11 (0.9)	660 (0.3)
White	155 (2.7)	391 (31.2)	203,342 (82.8)
Sex			
Female	3,367 (59.4)	627 (50)	133,883 (54.5)
Male	2,300 (40.6)	627 (50)	111,786 (45.5)
Age			
18-24	498 (8.8)	105 (8.4)	24,747 (10.1)
25-34	2,076 (36.6)	283 (22.6)	49,897 (20.3)
35-44	1,458 (25.7)	311 (24.8)	40,385 (16.4)
45-54	927 (16.4)	271 (21.6)	44,007 (17.9)
55-64	520 (9.2)	175 (14)	49,107 (20)
≥65	408 (7.2)	172 (13.7)	46,586 (19)
Insurance status			
Commercial	995 (17.6)	622 (49.6)	145,161 (59.1)
Medicare or Medicaid	4,428 (78.1)	574 (45.8)	91,253 (37.1)

429 * Missing or unknown data not included in table; sums may not add to 100%

430 ¹ Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen

431 ² Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bosnia-Herzegovnia,
 432 Brunei, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cocos Islands, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, Guinea, Indonesia,
 433 Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,
 434 Mauritania, Mayotte, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia,
 435 Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tajikistan, The Comoros, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United
 436 Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Western Sahara

437
 438

439 **Table 2: Difference-in-difference estimates of the effect of the Muslim Ban Order on**
 440 **missed primary care clinic appointments, emergency department visits, and emergency**
 441 **department stress-responsive diagnoses among patients from Order-targeted nations**
 442 **(Group 1)**
 443


Outcome (average per person)	Difference in Differences Model			Difference in Differences Estimate (SE)	Matched Difference in Differences Model Estimate (SE)	Generalized Synthetic Control Model Estimate (SE)
	Means	U.S.-born, non-Latinx	Order-Targeted			
Missed primary care appointments N = 152,505	Pre-Order	0.029	0.046	0.002 (0.001)	0.003 (0.002)	0.002 (0.001)
	Post- Order	0.029	0.048			
	First Difference	0.000	0.002			
ED visits per person N = 112,220	Pre- Order	0.032	0.021	0.004 (0.001)	0.005 (0.002)	0.004 (0.003)
	Post- Order	0.033	0.026			
	First Difference	0.001	0.005			
ED ambulatory sensitive and acute stress diagnoses N = 31,861	Pre- Order	0.119	0.064	0.005 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.007)	0.019 (0.006)
	Post- Order	0.133	0.083			
	First Difference	0.014	0.019			

444
 445 *Table 2:* Effect estimates are additional increases in each outcome (per person per 30-day time
 446 period) from the year before to the year after the Muslim Ban Order was issued among
 447 individuals from Order-targeted nations, beyond the increases observed in a reference group.
 448 Each outcome is displayed on a separate row. Robust standard errors are included in parentheses
 449 for difference in difference estimates with and without demographic matching. Parametric
 450 bootstrap standard errors are included in parentheses for generalized synthetic control model
 451 estimates. See Supplement for details.

452
 453


454
455
456
457

Figure 1: Time trends for all primary outcomes among patients from Order-targeted nations, patients from other Muslim-majority nations, and U.S.-born non-Latinx patients, January 2016 to December 2017.



458
459 **Figure 1:** Points indicate weekly average counts per person in each group for A) clinic visits, B)
460 missed clinic appointments, C) clinic stress-responsive diagnoses, D) ED visits, and E) ED
461 stress-responsive diagnoses. A loess regression line summarizing the time trend is included for
462 each group, based on daily average counts per person. For all clinic outcomes, panels A, B, and
463 C, non-business days are excluded from the analysis. The solid line marks the Order issuance
464 and the dotted line marks the 2016 election, for reference.

465 **Figure 2: Difference-in-difference estimates for missed clinic appointments, ED visits, and**
466 **ED stress-responsive diagnoses, January 2016 to December 2017.**



467
468
469
470 **Figure 2:** Each point represents a difference-in-differences estimate of the effect of the Muslim
471 Ban Order on A) missed appointments, B) ED visits, or C) stress-responsive ED diagnoses, with
472 a 95% confidence interval. The left most points compare the difference in each outcome 30 days
473 before to 30 days after the issuance of the Order for Groups 1 and 3. Each additional point
474 compares differences across a larger time period up to 360 days pre-/post-Order.
475