

1 Differences in Declines in Pediatric ED Utilization During the Covid19 Pandemic by
2 Socioeconomic Disadvantage.

3
4 Bisakha Sen¹, Anne Brisendine, Pallavi Ghosh.

5
6 **Abstract**

7 Background: There is growing evidence that the early months of the COVID19 pandemic saw
8 substantial declines in pediatric Emergency Department (ED) utilization in the U.S. However,
9 less is known about whether utilization changed differentially for children who are socio-
10 economically disadvantaged. We examined how changes pediatric ED visits during the early
11 months of the COVID19 pandemic differed by two markers of socio-economic disadvantage,
12 minoritized race and being publicly insured.

13 Methods: This retrospective observational study used electronic medical records from a large
14 pediatric ED in a Deep South state for January-June 2020. Three time-periods -- pre-COVID19
15 (TP0), COVID19 with restrictions like stay-at-home (TP1), and COVID19 with restrictions
16 relaxed (TP2) in 2020 were compared with the corresponding time-periods in 2019. Changes in
17 overall visits, visits for minoritized race (MR) versus non-Hispanic white (NHW) children, and
18 Medicaid-enrolled versus privately-insured children were considered, and changes in acuity-mix
19 of ED visits and share of visits resulting in inpatient admits were inspected.

20 Results: Compared to 2019, total ED visits declined in TP1 and TP2 of 2020 (54.3%, 48.9%).
21 Declines were larger for MR children (57.3%, 57.8%) compared to NHW children (50.5%,

¹ Corresponding author

1 39.3%), and Medicaid enrollees (56.5%, 52.0%) compared to the privately insured (48.3%,
2 39.0%). Particularly, MR children saw steeper percentage declines in high-acuity visits and visits
3 resulting in inpatient admissions compared to NHW children. The mix of pediatric patients by
4 race and insurance-status, as well as the share of high-acuity visits and visits with inpatient
5 admissions differed between TP1 and TP2 of 2019 and 2020 ($p < 0.05$ for all cases). In contrast,
6 there was little evidence of difference between TP0 of 2019 and 2020.

7 Conclusion: The role of socioeconomic disadvantage and the potential impacts on pediatric ED
8 visits during COVID19 in the Deep South of the United States changes is understudied. We find
9 evidence of steeper declines in visits among MR and Medicaid-enrolled children, including for
10 high-acuity conditions, than their NHW and privately-insured counterparts. Since disadvantaged
11 children sometimes lack access to a usual source of care, this raises concerns about unmet health
12 needs, and worsening health disparities, in a region that already has poor health indicators.

13

14

1 **Introduction:**

2 The COVID19 pandemic has brought about seismic disruptions to societies and to healthcare
3 systems around the world. In the United States, a national emergency was declared on March 13,
4 2020 in response to COVID19. Subsequently, many states instated measures like closing schools
5 and businesses and issuing ‘stay at home’ orders of varying degrees of stringency. Further, the
6 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid
7 Services (CMS) recommended delaying elective care and prioritizing urgent care; nonetheless
8 the early months of the pandemic saw sharp declines in Emergency Department (ED) visits in
9 the U.S. [1-4] including ED visits among the pediatric population [5-7]. The decline was likely
10 driven by fear of COVID19 infection and perhaps exacerbated by access issues due to lockdowns
11 and stay-at-home orders [4, 8, 9].

12
13 Some of the decline in pediatric ED visits could be due to reduced needs – for example,
14 lockdowns and school closures could have resulted in fewer vehicular injuries or fewer
15 infections or injuries incurred at school. However, existing studies show that ED visits for
16 serious health conditions declined for both adults [3] and for children [7], raising concerns about
17 unmet health needs that may lead to subsequent adverse effects. Further, while the decline in
18 pediatric ED visits has been recorded using data from single EDs [8, 10] to multiple EDs across
19 several states [1, 5, 7], one issue that is relatively unexplored is whether declines differed for
20 socioeconomically disadvantaged children, particularly children from communities of color that
21 have been disproportionately impacted both in terms of illness and fatality from the virus and
22 the economic fallout of the pandemic. This is particularly relevant since existing research shows

1 that minoritized race and ethnicity, public insurance and low-income status are predictors of
2 using the ED for healthcare needs in lieu of a usual source of care [11].

3
4 We conducted a retrospective, observational study to investigate the change in pediatric ED
5 volume during the early months of the pandemic in the largest pediatric ED facility in the state of
6 Alabama. Alabama is one of the Deep South states -- characterized by large African-American
7 populations, high poverty rates, and low ranking on health indicators. Alabama and other Deep
8 South states like Mississippi, Georgia and Alabama are among the states that had the highest
9 number of ED visits in 2019 in the U.S. [1]. Yet, to our knowledge, most existing studies on
10 changes in pediatric ED visits during COVID19 have not included data from the Deep South,
11 leaving an important gap in this literature.

12 The primary indicator of socio-economic disadvantage that we considered was minoritized race
13 (MR) as opposed to non-Hispanic white (NHW). We also considered Medicaid enrollment as a
14 proxy measure of low family income. We further considered changes in visits of different acuity
15 levels and visits that resulted in inpatient admissions, and whether the extent of these changes
16 differed by race and by insurance status. Finally, we compared changes in the early months of
17 the pandemic when state-imposed restrictions such as stay-at-home orders were in place, versus
18 the subsequent months when these restrictions were largely relaxed.

19

20

21

1 **Methods:**

2 We used Electronic Medical Records (EMR) data for all pediatric patients presenting to the ED
3 from January 1st through June 15th of 2020, and for the same time-period in 2019. We extracted
4 the following information: (i) date of visit; (ii) patient’s race-ethnicity; (iii) the patient’s
5 insurance status; (iv) acuity level of the patient and (v) whether the ED visit resulted in an
6 inpatient admission.

7 For analysis purposes, our main variable of interest were recoded as follows: Race and ethnicity
8 was categorized as the binary indicator NHW versus MR; the latter primarily consisted of
9 African-American patients, but also included Hispanics and other races since they were too small
10 in number to permit a separate category. Subsequently sensitivity analyses that excluded the
11 “other race” category were conducted and found no impact on the results. Insurance status was
12 categorized as private, Medicaid (which covered children up to 141% of the federal poverty
13 level); ALL Kids, -- Alabama Children’s Health Insurance Program (which covered children
14 from above 141% to 312% of federal poverty level); self-insured /not reported; and out-of-state.
15 Acuity-level was originally denoted on a 5-point scale, with level 1 denoting most urgent and
16 resource-intensive to level 5 denoting the least urgent, and two separate categories (T1 and T2)
17 for patients presenting with trauma. It was recoded for analysis purposes into three categories:
18 ‘high-acuity’ which included levels 1 and 2 and the two categories of trauma, ‘mid-acuity’ which
19 included level 3, and ‘low-acuity’ which included levels 4 and 5 of the 5-point scale. Inpatient
20 admission was coded as a binary indicator of whether the ED visit resulted in an inpatient
21 admission or not.

1 We compared patients presenting at the ED in three time periods in 2020 to those presenting
2 during the same periods in 2019. January 1-March 15 is time-period ‘0’ (TP0). In 2020 this was
3 the time-period when COVID19 cases were essentially undetected in Alabama, and no
4 restrictions had been recommended or required, thus the comparison of TP0 in 2019 with TP0 in
5 2020 serves as a ‘counterfactual’ (or hypothetical, alternative state in which there was no
6 pandemic) because no changes due to COVID19 should be seen in this period of 2020. March
7 16-April 30 is time-period ‘1’ (TP1). In 2020, this was the pandemic period when restrictions
8 were also in place in Alabama. For example, limits on businesses and large gatherings started on
9 March 16, public spaces and beaches closed on March 18, the largest city and county started
10 issuing stay-at-home orders on March 24, and statewide stay at home orders were imposed on
11 April 3.[12]. May 1-June 15 is ‘time-period 2’ (TP2), which, in 2020 was the pandemic period
12 when restrictions relaxed or lifted. Non-emergency medical procedures were permitted starting
13 April 28, and from May 1 onwards businesses, restaurants, salons, parks, and beaches were
14 allowed to start re-opening though a ‘safer at home’ advisory remained. The population was
15 asked to voluntarily adopt safety measures, but ‘mask mandates’ were not introduced at a county
16 or state level until July 2020, which is after our study period.

17 We presented data from the three time periods from 2019 and 2020 to illustrate changes in ED
18 visits for the full sample, by MR status and insurance status, and for acuity and inpatient
19 admission for MR and NHW children. Thereafter, we used chi-square analyses to test whether
20 the distribution of these characteristics changed for pediatric patients presenting to the ED in
21 2020 versus the same time period in 2019. Statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$.

1 All analyses were completed using STATA version 16. The study protocol was approved by the
2 Institutional Review Board of [BLINDED FOR REVIEW – University name and IRB
3 Registration Number] as exempt. No informed consent was obtained for the study as the data
4 were retrospective medical records and were de-identified prior to receipt by the authors. The
5 dataset generated and analysed during the current study are not publicly available due to hospital
6 and IRB policies but may be available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

7 **Results.**

8 There were 56,550 total ED visits in our combined study periods, of which 26,683 were NHW
9 and 29,867 were MR children. Of the latter group, 96.9% were African-American, 0.9% were
10 Hispanic, and 2.2% were other races, bi-racial or unreported. Insurance type differed
11 significantly by race ($p < 0.01$) -- among MR children 76.9% were insured by Medicaid, 4.9% by
12 ALL Kids, 13.1% were privately insured, and 3.0% were uninsured or out of state or unknown;
13 for NHW children, corresponding figures were 49.3%, 6.6%, 41.1%, and 4.1%. Of the overall
14 sample, 52.0% were males and 48.0% females.

15 Table 1 shows total visits to the ED for the three time periods in 2019 and 2020, and
16 distributions by race, acuity level, inpatient admits and insurance-status. In TP0 2020, 15,182
17 pediatric patients presented to the ED compared to 15,725 in TP0 2019 – a decline of 3.4%. In
18 contrast, in TP1 2020, 4,093 patients presented for care, a decline of 54.3% from 8,950 patients
19 in TP1 2019; and in TP2 2020, 4,258 patients presented, a decline of 48.9% from 8,342 patients
20 in TP2 2020. Compared to 2019, MR patient visits declined by 2,690 (57.8%) in TP1 of 2020
21 and 2,570 (57.3%) in TP2 of 2020. In contrast, NHW patient visits declined by 2,167 (50.5%) in
22 TP1 and by 1,513 (39.3%) in TP2. The magnitude of declines differed across acuity-level. In

1 2020 as compared to 2019, low-acuity visits declined from 5,570 to 2,272 (59.2%) in TP1 and
2 from 5,361 to 2,230 (58.4%) in TP2; high-acuity visits declined from 1,397 to 744 (46.7%) in
3 TP1 and 1,185 to 774 (34.7%) in TP2 . Visits resulting in inpatient admissions declined from
4 1285 to 828 (35.6%) in TP1 and from 1,159 to 906 (21.8%) in TP2. Finally, compared to 2019,
5 the number of Medicaid-enrolled patients presenting to the ED declined by 3,204 (56.5%) in TP1
6 and 2,792 (52.9%) in TP2 of 2020, whereas number of privately-insured patients declined by
7 1,148 (48.3%) in TP1 and by 869 (39.0%) in the same periods. Unsurprisingly, while the number
8 of out-of-state patients was small in 2019, the percentage decline for this group was especially
9 high in TP1 and TP2 of 2020.

10 The uneven decline by race, acuity and insurance status contributed to a change in the
11 distribution of patient characteristics between 2019 and 2020. From TP1 2019 to 2020, the share
12 of NHW patients increased from 48.0% to 52.0% ($p<0.05$); the share of privately insured
13 patients increased from 26.6% to 30.0% while the share of Medicaid patients fell from 63.4% to
14 60.3% ($p<0.05$); the share of low-acuity visits fell from 62.3% to 55.6% and the share of visits
15 resulting in an inpatient admit increased from 14.4% to 20.2% ($p<0.05$). Similarly, between TP2
16 2019 and 2020, the share of NHW patients increased ($p<0.05$), the share of privately-insured
17 patients increased while the share of Medicaid patients declined ($p<0.05$), the share of low-acuity
18 visits fell ($p<0.05$) while the share of visits resulting in an inpatient admit increased ($p<0.05$). In
19 contrast, there were no statistically significant changes in the distribution of patient race-
20 ethnicity, insurance status or inpatient admits in the pre-COVID19 period of TP0 of 2020 as
21 compared to TP0 of 2019; the one exception being acuity-level where a significant difference
22 were seen due to increases in the share of mid-acuity cases from 19.0% to 20.4% respectively.

Table 1. Distributions of Sample Characteristics in 2019 and 2020

	Total											
	T0 (Jan 1-March 15)				T1 (March 16-April 30)				T2 (May 1-June 15)			
	2019		2020		2019		2020		2019		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	15,725		15,182		8,950		4,093		8,342		4,258	
Race												
Non-Hisp. white	7,090	(45.1)	6,974	(45.9)	4,295	(48.0)	2,128	(51.9)	3,855	(46.2)	2,341	(55.0)
Minoritized race ¹	8,635	(54.9)	8,208	(54.1)	4,655	(52.0)	1,965	(48.1)	4,487	(53.8)	1,917	(45.0)
	p = 0.13				p < 0.001				p < 0.001			
Acuity²												
High-acuity	2,397	(15.3)	2,337	(15.4)	1,397	(15.6)	744	(18.2)	1,185	(14.2)	774	(18.2)
Mid-acuity	2,991	(19.0)	3,088	(20.4)	1,975	(22.1)	1,074	(26.3)	1,790	(21.5)	1,252	(29.4)
Low-acuity	10,329	(65.7)	9,749	(64.3)	5,570	(62.3)	2,272	(55.6)	5,361	(64.3)	2,230	(52.4)
	p < 0.01				p < 0.001				p < 0.001			
Inpatient Admit												
Admission	2,103	(13.4)	2,122	(13.4)	1,285	(14.4)	828	(20.2)	1,159	(13.9)	906	(21.3)
No Admission	13,622	(86.6)	13,060	(86.0)	7,665	(85.6)	3,265	(79.8)	7,183	(86.1)	3,352	(78.7)
	p = 0.12				p < 0.001				p < 0.001			
Insurance												
Medicaid	10,295	(65.5)	9,947	(65.5)	5,673	(63.4)	2,469	(60.3)	5,271	(63.2)	2,479	(58.2)
ALL Kids ³	871	(5.5)	874	(5.8)	510	(5.7)	221	(5.4)	505	(6.1)	238	(5.6)
Out of State	47	(0.3)	44	(0.3)	37	(0.4)	7	(0.2)	37	(0.4)	5	(0.1)
Private	3,904	(24.8)	3,776	(24.9)	2,377	(26.6)	1,229	(30.0)	2,227	(26.7)	1,358	(31.9)
Self-Pay/Unknown	608	(3.9)	541	(3.6)	353	(3.9)	167	(4.1)	302	(3.6)	178	(4.2)
	p = 0.62				p < 0.001				p < 0.001			

1 Note: The strictest limitations on gatherings, businesses, and travel including a statewide stay-at-home order were in place in Alabama between
2 March 16 – April 30, 2020 (T1, 2020). T0, 2020 had no restrictions and T2, 2020 represents the “safer-at-home” period, during which
3 restrictions were relaxed. No statewide mask mandate existed during any of these periods.

4 ¹ This category includes all patients not categorized as non-Hispanic white.

5 ² High-acuity includes those categorized as 1 or 2 on the EMR acuity score. Mid-acuity includes category 3. Low-acuity includes categories 4
6 and 5 on the scale.

7 ³ Alabama’s Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP)

8 Table 2 shows changes in ED visits overall, by acuity level and inpatient admits for NHW and
9 MR children. Compared to 2019, NHW children presenting to the ED declined from 4,295 to
10 2,128 (50.5%) in TP1 of 2020, and from 3,855 to 2,341 (39.2%) in TP2 of 2020. High-acuity
11 visits declined by 48.0% in TP1, but by just 29.7% in TP2; and visits resulting in inpatient
12 admits declined by 34.5% in TP1 and by just 15.8% in TP2. For MR children, the overall
13 number presenting to the ED declined by 57.8% in TP1 and 57.2% in TP2; high-acuity visits

1 declined by 45.0% in TP1 and 40.3% in TP2, and visits resulting in inpatient admits declined by
 2 37.4% in TP1 and 30.8% in TP2. For both groups, the share of high-acuity cases and the share of
 3 cases resulting in inpatient admissions were higher in TP1 and TP2 of 2020 compared to 2019.
 4 There were no statistically significant differences in these shares between TP0 2019 and TP0
 5 2020 except for the distribution of acuity level for MR children where mid-acuity visits increased
 6 from 11.8% to 13.1%.

Table 2. Distributions of Sample Characteristics in 2019 and 2020 by Race-ethnicity

	Non-Hispanic white											
	T0 (Jan 1-March 15)				T1 (March 16-April 30)				T2 (May 1-June 15)			
	2019		2020		2019		2020		2019		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	7,090		6,974		4,295		2,128		3,855		2,341	
Acuity¹												
High-acuity	1,392	(19.7)	1,377	(19.8)	819	(19.1)	426	(20.0)	627	(16.3)	441	(18.8)
Mid-acuity	1,969	(27.8)	2,011	(28.9)	1,256	(29.3)	701	(33.0)	1,130	(29.3)	844	(36.1)
Low-acuity	3,724	(52.6)	3,582	(51.4)	2,217	(51.7)	999	(47.0)	2,095	(54.4)	1,056	(45.1)
	p < 0.31				p < 0.001				p < 0.001			
Inpatient Admit												
Admission	1,336	(18.8)	1,343	(19.3)	812	(18.9)	532	(25.0)	691	(17.9)	582	(24.9)
No Admit	5,754	(81.2)	5,631	(80.7)	3,483	(81.1)	1,596	(75.0)	3,164	(82.1)	1,759	(75.1)
	p = 0.52				p < 0.001				p < 0.001			
	Minoritized race ²											
	T0 (Jan 1-March 15)				T1 (March 16-April 30)				T2 (May 1-June 15)			
	2019		2020		2019		2020		2019		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	8,635		8,208		4,655		1,965		4,487		1,917	
Acuity												
High-acuity	1,005	(11.6)	960	(11.7)	578	(12.4)	318	(16.2)	558	(12.4)	333	(17.4)
Mid-acuity	1,022	(11.8)	1,077	(13.1)	719	(15.5)	373	(19.0)	660	(14.7)	408	(21.3)
Low-acuity	6,605	(76.5)	6,167	(75.2)	3,353	(72.1)	1,273	(64.8)	3,266	(72.8)	1,174	(61.3)
	p < 0.05				p < 0.001				p < 0.001			
Inpatient Admit												
Admission	767	(8.9)	779	(9.5)	473	(10.2)	296	(15.1)	468	(10.4)	324	(16.9)
No Admit	7,868	(91.1)	7,429	(90.5)	4,182	(89.8)	1,669	(84.9)	4,019	(89.6)	1,593	(83.1)
	p = 0.17				p < 0.001				p < 0.001			

7 Note: The strictest limitations on gatherings, businesses, and travel including a statewide stay-at-home order were in place in Alabama between
 8 March 16 – April 30, 2020 (T1, 2020). T0, 2020 had no restrictions and T2, 2020 represents the “safer-at-home” period, during which

1 restrictions were relaxed. No statewide mask mandate existed during any of these periods.

2 ¹ High-acuity includes those categorized as 1 or 2 on the EMR acuity score. Mid-acuity includes category 3. Low-acuity includes categories 4
3 and 5 on the scale.

4 ² This category includes all patients not categorized as non-Hispanic white.

5

6 **Discussion:**

7 A growing body of literature has documented substantial declines in pediatric ED visits during
8 the COVID19 pandemic in several countries [13-15]. In the US, such declines have been
9 confirmed with data from single EDs as well as multiple EDs from several states, and overall
10 declines as well as declines for specific health conditions have been documented [1, 5, 7, 8].

11 We added to this literature in several ways. First, we considered changes in pediatric ED visits
12 by socio-economic disadvantage. The primary measure of socio-economic disadvantage was
13 minoritized race and ethnicity, which can serve as a proxy measure for systemic and policy-
14 based impacts on access to care and other social determinants of health. A second indicator was
15 public insurance coverage. Communities of color and low-income communities have
16 disproportionately borne the adverse health effects and economic effects of the pandemic [16,
17 17], and extant literature shows that children from these communities tend to be high users of ED
18 for healthcare needs [11], hence exploring how their ED use was impacted in the pandemic has
19 strong public health relevance. Second, we considered ED visits when state-level restrictions
20 were in place versus when they were lifted. It has been speculated that restrictions like stay-at-
21 home exacerbated the decline in pediatric ED visits, and in the Netherlands, ED visits declined
22 by 18% in the pre-restriction period of the pandemic and by 29% after restrictions were imposed
23 [13]. In the U.S., to our knowledge one study from Pennsylvania considered the impact of stay-
24 at-home orders but did not include a comparison period during the pandemic when stay-at-home

1 orders were lifted [8]. Another multi-state study indicated a ‘gradual rebound’ in visits from
2 April but did not comment on whether this was correlated to any changes in state restrictions [7].
3 To be clear, we did not establish ‘causal’ links between the restrictions and visits per se – and it
4 could be speculated that perhaps these results happened because apprehension about the virus
5 changed over time, with NHW and relatively affluent privately-insured communities becoming
6 less concerned. Third, we considered data from an ED in a Deep South state. The Deep South is
7 characterized by high poverty, high shares of African-American population, lower public health
8 rankings and higher rates of ED usage compared to the rest of US, yet few studies have
9 considered the impact of the pandemic on pediatric ED visits in this vulnerable region.

10 Consistent with other studies we found that ED visits declined substantially in TP1 and TP2 of
11 2020 compared to 2019 – respectively 54.3% and 48.9%. However, we found substantially larger
12 declines for MR children compared to NHW children. Furthermore, MR children did not see a
13 rebound after state restrictions were lifted, whereas NHW children did see a partial rebound. The
14 number of MR children presenting to the ED declined by approximately 57-58% in TP1 as well
15 as TP2 of 2020 compared to 2019, whereas the number of NHW children declined by 50.5% in
16 TP1, but only by 39.3% in TP2. As a result, whereas MR patients consisted of 52-55% of all ED
17 patients in 2019 and TP0 2020, their share fell well below 50% of all patients in the pandemic
18 period. Similar patterns are seen for publicly insured versus privately insured patients. Visits by
19 Medicaid-enrolled patients declined by 56.5% in TP1 and 52.9% in TP2 in 2020 compared to
20 2019, while privately insured patients saw a decline of 48.3% in TP1 and a then a partial rebound
21 in TP2 when the decline was just 39.0%. Also, while MR children were overall more likely to
22 have lower acuity visits and visits that did not result in inpatient admissions than NHW children,
23 we found evidence suggesting that MR children avoided ED visits even for more serious health

1 conditions during the pandemic, and this continued after state restrictions were lifted. For NHW
2 children, high-acuity visits declined by 48.0% in TP1 of 2020 compared to TP1 2019, but
3 partially rebounded so that the decline was just 29.7% in TP2, whereas for MR children high-
4 visits declined by 45% in TP1 and 40.3% in TP2. Similarly, visits resulting in inpatient
5 admissions declined by 34.5% in TP1 and by just 15.8% in TP2 for NHW children but declined
6 by 37.4% in TP1 and 30.8% in TP2 for MR children. The distributional mix of acuity and
7 inpatient admissions was statistically different in TP1 and TP2 of 2020 compared to 2019,
8 whereas there was no statistical difference in TP0 of 2020 versus 2019.

9 Prior combined data from multi-state pediatric EDs have found a decline of approximately 22%
10 in visits for ‘serious conditions’ and a decline of approximately 43% in visits resulting in
11 inpatient admissions. While there is a paucity of studies that stratify pediatric ED visit declines
12 by race-ethnicity, findings from one Connecticut ED found Black children bore a
13 disproportionate share of the decline in ED visits for mental health diagnoses as compared to
14 white children [10]. We note that our findings regarding the racial mix of ED patients in the post-
15 pandemic period are different from a recent study that pooled data from 27 EDs from unspecified
16 states, and reported that the shares of NH-White, African American, Hispanic and ‘other’
17 patients were respectively 35.9%, 21.4%, 30.0% and 12.8% in the pandemic period, compared to
18 respectively 32.3%, 22.3%, 33.4% and 12.0% in pre-pandemic times [5]. In contrast, we found
19 the share of NHW patients increased to 52-55% in the pandemic period compared 46-48% in the
20 pre-pandemic period. This further emphasizes the importance of looking at this trend of decline
21 in pediatric ED visits by region with attention to socio-economically disadvantaged states, since
22 otherwise critical differences may be obscured when looking at aggregated data.

23

1 Our results suggest that trends in pediatric ED visits is yet another way the COVID19 pandemic
2 may be exacerbating health disparities. It is well documented that communities of color and low-
3 income communities have disproportionately borne the burden of detected cases,
4 hospitalizations, mortality and economic pain during the pandemic. Though children overall
5 have not been as adversely impacted as older adults, there is evidence that children of color and
6 low-income children are at higher risk of testing positive for the virus [16]. The relatively larger
7 and persistent declines in ED visits among MR and Medicaid-enrolled children, including
8 relatively larger declines for high-acuity visits, is likely to be directly linked to the greater
9 disruption and greater apprehension of disease suffered by these communities. While MR and
10 low-income are predictors of high ED usage in ‘normal’ times, often for low-acuity conditions,
11 this is frequently because such families lack access to a usual source of care due to issues of
12 distance, appointment availability, inability to miss work during regular hours for a medical visit,
13 or availability of physicians willing to accept publicly insured patients. Further, ED use is often
14 initiated because parents in disadvantaged families may have lower health literacy and are
15 therefore less able to discern the seriousness of their child’s health conditions and are seeking
16 reassurance [11]. Finally, EDs play a crucial role in diagnosing and treating conditions that have
17 the potential to become severe, potentially disabling or life-threatening. There are indications
18 that delaying ED care may have increased deaths among US adults [3, 4, 17], and that delaying
19 pediatric resulted in ICU admissions and fatalities in Italy [6]. Further, the findings are also
20 consistent with other indicators of delay in pediatric healthcare like vaccinations, particularly for
21 publicly insured children.[18, 19].

22 We acknowledge several limitations. First, we derived our information from patient EMR data
23 provided by the ED, hence we did not have information on reasons why patients decided to not

1 come to the ED, whether urgent care was delayed, and whether there were subsequent adverse
2 health consequences of the delay. Nor did we know whether and to what extent patients were
3 able to access alternate sources of care – such as in-person or telehealth visits with healthcare
4 providers for low acuity conditions, or direct inpatient admission arranged by healthcare
5 providers for higher acuity conditions. Second, the Hispanic population in the state and in our
6 sample was small, which precluded us from examining Hispanic patients as a separate category
7 in our analyses. Third, we did not go beyond acuity-level and categorize exactly what health
8 conditions patients were presenting with, since that has been exhaustively categorized in the
9 multi-state studies. Fourth, while we separated our time period into the time when various state-
10 level restrictions were in place versus not, we cannot ascribe causal impacts of the restrictions –
11 for example, it could be speculated that the partial rebound that we saw among NHW patients
12 was because NHW populations became less apprehensive about the virus within a few months
13 than MR populations. Finally, while our study makes the important contribution of presenting
14 information from a Deep South state ED, results may not be generalizable to the entire country.

15 In conclusion, our findings indicated that the substantial decline seen pediatric ED visits in early
16 months of the COVID19 pandemic in the U.S. were disproportionately driven declines among
17 racial MR and publicly insured children. Nor did these children did not see the ‘partial rebound’
18 in visits that their NHW and privately insured counterparts did in the latter part of this time
19 period, that corresponded with state restrictions being relaxed. MR children also saw relatively
20 large and persistent declines in high-acuity visits as well as visits resulting in inpatient
21 admissions. Since MR and low-income children often lack access to a usual source of care, and
22 ED visits may be an essential component of timely detection of health problems, this raises
23 serious concerns about subsequent poor health outcomes and exacerbation of health disparities.

1 Since it is uncertain when the pandemic will abate, even after rollout of vaccines, we emphasize
2 the need for clear communication from public health officials that is targeted to disadvantaged
3 populations to assure the public that EDs have in place protocols to ensure the safety of their
4 patients, and that emergency visits should not be delayed. We also emphasize the importance of
5 continued research to understand reasons for avoiding or delaying pediatric healthcare
6 utilization, and subsequent health consequences of that delay.

7

References

- 1
2
3 1. Hartnett KP, Kite-Powell A, DeVies J, Coletta MA, Boehmer TK, Adjemian J,
4 Gundlapalli AV, National Syndromic Surveillance Program Community of P: **Impact of**
5 **the COVID-19 Pandemic on Emergency Department Visits - United States, January**
6 **1, 2019-May 30, 2020.** *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020, **69**(23):699-704.
- 7 2. Jeffery MM, D’Onofrio G, Paek H, Platts-Mills TF, Soares WE, Hoppe JA, Genes N,
8 Nath B, Melnick ER: **Trends in Emergency Department Visits and Hospital**
9 **Admissions in Health Care Systems in 5 States in the First Months of the COVID-19**
10 **Pandemic in the US.** *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2020, **180**(10):1328.
- 11 3. Lange SJ, Ritchey MD, Goodman AB, Dias T, Twentyman E, Fuld J, Schieve LA,
12 Imperatore G, Benoit SR, Kite-Powell A *et al*: **Potential indirect effects of the COVID-**
13 **19 pandemic on use of emergency departments for acute life-threatening conditions**
14 **- United States, January-May 2020.** *Am J Transplant* 2020, **20**(9):2612-2617.
- 15 4. Wong LE, Hawkins JE, Murrell KL: **Where are all the patients? Addressing Covid-19**
16 **fear to encourage sick patients to seek emergency care.** *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in*
17 *Care Delivery* 2020.
- 18 5. Delaroche AM, Rodean J, Aronson PL, Fleegler EW, Florin TA, Goyal M, Hirsch AW,
19 Jain S, Kornblith AE, Sills MR *et al*: **Pediatric Emergency Department Visits at US**
20 **Children’s Hospitals During the COVID-19 Pandemic.** *Pediatrics* 2020:e2020039628.
- 21 6. Lazzarini M, Barbi E, Apicella A, Marchetti F, Cardinale F, Trobia G: **Delayed access or**
22 **provision of care in Italy resulting from fear of COVID-19.** *Lancet Child Adolesc*
23 *Health* 2020, **4**(5):e10-e11.

- 1 7. Pines JM, Zocchi MS, Black BS, Carlson JN, Celedon P, Moghtaderi A, Venkat A:
2 **Characterizing pediatric emergency department visits during the COVID-19**
3 **pandemic.** *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine* 2020.
- 4 8. Chaiyachati BH, Agawu A, Zorc JJ, Balamuth F: **Trends in Pediatric Emergency**
5 **Department Utilization after Institution of Coronavirus Disease-19 Mandatory**
6 **Social Distancing.** *The Journal of pediatrics* 2020, **226**:274-277.e271.
- 7 9. Man CY, Yeung RS, Chung JY, Cameron PA: **Impact of SARS on an emergency**
8 **department in Hong Kong.** *Emerg Med (Fremantle)* 2003, **15**(5-6):418-422.
- 9 10. Leff RA, Setzer E, Cicero MX, Auerbach M: **Changes in pediatric emergency**
10 **department visits for mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-**
11 **sectional study.** *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 2021, **26**(1):33-38.
- 12 11. Nicholson E, McDonnell T, De Brún A, Barrett M, Bury G, Collins C, Hensey C,
13 McAuliffe E: **Factors that influence family and parental preferences and decision**
14 **making for unscheduled paediatric healthcare – systematic review.** *BMC Health*
15 *Services Research* 2020, **20**(1).
- 16 12. Fiscus K: **Alabama & coronavirus timeline: How COVID-19 spread and how the**
17 **state reacted.** In: *Montgomery Advertiser.* 2020.
- 18 13. Barten DG, Latten GHP, van Osch FHM: **Reduced Emergency Department Utilization**
19 **During the Early Phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Viral Fear or Lockdown**
20 **Effect?** *Disaster medicine and public health preparedness* 2020:1-4.
- 21 14. Sun H, Liu K, Li M, Tang S, Monte AA, Wang J, Nie S, Rui Q, Liu W, Qin H *et al*: **The**
22 **influence of coronavirus disease 2019 on emergency department visits in Nanjing,**
23 **China: A multicentre cross-sectional study.** *Am J Emerg Med* 2020, **38**(10):2101-2109.

- 1 15. Valitutti F, Zenzeri L, Mauro A, Pacifico R, Borrelli M, Muzzica S, Boccia G, Tipo V,
2 Vajro P: **Effect of Population Lockdown on Pediatric Emergency Room Demands in**
3 **the Era of COVID-19.** *Frontiers in Pediatrics* 2020, **8**.
- 4 16. Goyal MK, Simpson JN, Boyle MD, Badolato GM, Delaney M, McCarter R, Cora-
5 Bramble D: **Racial and/or ethnic and socioeconomic disparities of SARS-CoV-2**
6 **infection among children.** *Pediatrics* 2020, **146**(4).
- 7 17. Woolf SH, Chapman DA, Sabo RT, Weinberger DM, Hill L, Taylor DDH: **Excess**
8 **Deaths From COVID-19 and Other Causes, March-July 2020.** *JAMA* 2020,
9 **324**(15):1562-1564.
- 10 18. Bramer CA, Kimmins LM, Swanson R, Kuo J, Vranesich P, Jacques-Carroll LA, Shen
11 AK: **Decline in child vaccination coverage during the COVID-19 pandemic—**
12 **Michigan Care Improvement Registry, May 2016–May 2020.** 2020.
- 13 19. Santoli JM, Lindley MC, DeSilva MB, Kharbanda EO, Daley MF, Galloway L, Gee J,
14 Glover M, Herring B, Kang Y *et al*: **Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Routine**
15 **Pediatric Vaccine Ordering and Administration - United States, 2020.** *MMWR Morb*
16 *Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020, **69**(19):591-593.
- 17