

Disaster preparedness among women with a recent live birth in Hawaii, a cross-sectional study, results from the Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS), 2016

Penelope Strid, MPH^{1,2}; Carlotta Ching Ting Fok, PhD, MA³; Marianne Zotti, DrPH, MS^{1,4}; Holly B. Shulman, MA¹; Jane Awakuni, BS³; L. Duane House, PhD¹; Brian Morrow, MA¹; Judy Kern⁵; Matthew Shim, PhD, MPH³; Sascha Ellington, PhD, MSPH¹

Affiliations

¹Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Division of Reproductive Health (Atlanta, GA, USA); ²Oak Ridge Institute of Science and Education (Oak Ridge, TN, USA); ³Hawaii State Department of Health-Family Health Services Division (Honolulu, HI, USA); ⁴Zotti Consulting (Bella Vista, AR, USA); ⁵Hawaii State Department of Health-Office of Public Health Preparedness (Honolulu, HI, USA)

Corresponding author

Penelope Strid; U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 4770 Buford Highway NE, Mailstop S 107-2, Atlanta, GA 30341, pstrid@cdc.gov, 404.718.7986

Declarations

Funding CDC provides annual funding to participating PRAMS sites through a cooperative agreement.

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests The authors have no conflicts of interest to report. The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Ethics approval PRAMS protocol has been reviewed and approved by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Institutional Review Board and approved as human subjects research (HSR #2233)

Consent to participate All survey respondents provided verbal consent via phone or implied consent by returning a completed questionnaire.

Consent for publication All authors have consented for publication.

Availability of data and material Data are available through request at

<https://www.cdc.gov/prams/prams-data/researchers.htm>

Code availability SAS-callable SUDAAN code available upon request.

Authors' contributions All authors have reviewed, contributed significantly to, and approve the paper.

Abstract

Objectives - This study examines emergency preparedness behaviors among women with a recent live birth in Hawaii.

Methods- Using the 2016 Hawaii Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring Survey we estimated weighted prevalence of eight preparedness behaviors.

Results- Among 1010 respondents (weighted response rate=56.3%), 79.3% reported at least one preparedness behavior and 11.2% performed all eight behaviors. The prevalence of women with a recent live birth in Hawaii reporting preparedness behaviors includes: 63.0% (95% CI: 58.7-67.1%) having enough supplies at home for at least seven days, 41.3% (95% CI: 37.1-45.6%) having an evacuation plan for their child(ren), 38.7% (95% CI: 34.5, 43.0) having methods to keep in touch, 37.8% (95% CI: 33.7, 42.1) having an emergency meeting place, 36.6% (95% CI: 32.6, 40.9) having an evacuation plan to leave home, 34.9% (95% CI: 30.9, 39.2) having emergencies supplies to take with if they have to leave quickly, 31.8% (95% CI: 27.9, 36.0) having copies of important documents, 31.6% (95% CI: 27.7, 35.8) having practiced what to do.

Conclusion- One in ten women practiced all eight behaviors indicating more awareness efforts are needed among this at-risk population in Hawaii. Hawaii can measure the effect of interventions to increase preparedness by tracking this question over time.

Significance

“What is already known on this subject?”

Preparedness is associated with reduced vulnerability, and postpartum women are considered an at-risk population in the post-disaster period with special clinical needs. One prior study has assessed disaster preparedness among postpartum women.

“What this study adds?”

This is the first study to describe a methodology to analyze the eight-part PRAMS emergency preparedness question. Among recently postpartum women in Hawaii, about 80% practiced at least one of eight emergency preparedness measures assessed and about 10% practiced all behaviors.

Keywords

disaster, preparedness, maternal health, PRAMS

Introduction

From 2000 to 2016, the United States (US) averaged 58 Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defined major disaster declarations annually (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2020). During this same period, Hawaii (HI) experienced 11 FEMA major disaster declarations (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2020). In the past 20 years, major disasters have occurred more frequently in the US; reinforcing the need for disaster preparation to mitigate damage and harm (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2020; Yahmed and Koob 1996; World Health Organization 2007).

Disasters can compound and exacerbate social vulnerabilities (Morrow 1999; Nour 2011). According to the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act (2019), pregnant and postpartum women and infants are considered an at-risk population with special clinical needs. Basic resources such as clean water, nutritious foods, diapers, and safe sleeping areas may not be readily available but are especially important for pregnant and breastfeeding women and their infants (Callaghan et al. 2007; Ewing, Buchholtz, and Rotanz 2008; Larrance, Anastario, and Lawry 2007). Public health and medical services may be interrupted due to damaged infrastructure, power outages, and lack of trained personnel (Harville, Xiong, and Buekens 2009).

Vulnerable populations such as pregnant and postpartum women may have a slow recovery after a disaster further amplified as a result of socioeconomic disadvantages, limited financial resources, and poor social support (Morrow 1999; Nour 2011; Zahran, Peek, Snodgrass, Weiler, and Hempel 2011; Callaghan et al. 2007; Giarratano, Barcelona, Savage, and Harville 2019). Preparedness is associated with reduced vulnerability (Yahmed and Koob 1996; World Health Organization 2007). Baseline measures of preparedness can inform public health education campaigns to increase preparedness and help in planning to meet the population's needs during a disaster. Limited information is available on the prevalence of preparedness among pregnant and postpartum women (Zilversmit, Sappenfield, Zotti, and

McGehee 2014; Maher 2019; National Institutes of Health 2019; Hapsari, Jayanti, Nugraheni, and Panuntun 2020). It may be difficult to estimate baseline measures of preparedness among pregnant and postpartum women through traditional population-based sampling since they are a small percentage of the general population (Horney, Zotti, Williams, and Hsia 2012). The Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS) is an annual survey conducted by states and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) which can be used to estimate baseline preparedness among women who recently had a live birth. An analysis of one 2009 Arkansas PRAMS emergency preparedness question provided the first prevalence estimate of postpartum women who responded that they had an emergency preparedness plan (Zilversmit, Sappenfield, Zotti, and McGehee 2014). In 2016, PRAMS introduced an eight-part supplemental question to assess disaster preparedness (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2016). Using the 2016 Hawaii PRAMS data, we assessed the prevalence of emergency preparedness behaviors among women that recently had a live birth. To look at characteristics associated with preparedness, we used factor analysis to distill the eight preparedness behaviors into correlated preparedness factors.

METHODS

Data Collection

PRAMS is a state, population-based sample of women who recently had a live birth. State birth certificate files are used to select approximately 200 women each month in Hawaii. The surveys are self-reported and follow the systematic PRAMS methodology; previously described by Shulman et al. (2018). Women receive the survey approximately two months after delivery. Contact is made initially by mail and then by phone. In Hawaii, PRAMS is only offered in English. Those who participate receive a \$10 gift card to a local food market. Consent by mail is implied by returning a completed questionnaire; verbal consent is provided by phone. The protocol is IRB reviewed and approved by the CDC and the Hawaii State Department of Health.

Variables

The eight pre-tested, standardized PRAMS emergency preparedness questions are listed in Table 1 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2016). Data from the Hawaii birth certificate included maternal age, maternal education, marital status, urban or rural residence, maternal race, and participation in Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women Infants and Children (WIC) during pregnancy. Age was collapsed into five categories: 19 years or less, 20 to 24 years, 25 to 29 years, 30 to 34 years, and 35 years or greater. Education was categorized as less than high school diploma, high school diploma or equivalent, some college, and baccalaureate degree or higher. The urban or rural residence variable was established by county, and Maui was classified as rural according to the 2012 Census classification. Race was categorized by the racial categories specific to Hawaiian birth certificates: White, Native Hawaiian, Filipino, Japanese, Other Pacific Islander, and other. Anyone selecting Native Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian was grouped into the Native Hawaiian race. Other Pacific Islanders included those selecting the category, and Samoans and Guamanians. All other races were categorized as “other”, consistent with methods described by Sorenson et al. (2003).

Information obtained from PRAMS included current health insurance at time of survey, total income, and family size. Insurance status was categorized into three options: private, public, or none. Individuals that indicated having both private and public insurance were categorized as having private insurance. Military insurance was captured as a separate option on the survey and categorized as private for the analysis. Total income captured the reported household income 12 months prior to the birth, and family size was defined as number of individuals living on the total income in the 12 months prior to the live birth. Family sizes of five or greater were collapsed into a single category. A variable categorizing income as a percent of the federal poverty level (FPL) was developed from total income and family size, compared to the January 2016 poverty guidelines for Hawaii issued by the Federal Register of the Department of Health and Human Services (Department of Health and Human Services 2016).

Four FPL groups are reported as less than or equal to 100%, 101-185%, 186-300%, and greater than 300% FPL, consistent with federal programing eligibility and Hawaii PRAMS trend report (Hawaii 2019; Department of Health and Human Services 2016).

Statistical Analysis

The sample is weighted to be representative of the state by accounting for sampling stratification, nonresponse, and noncoverage. The sample is stratified initially by county (Honolulu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai) and within Honolulu county, by birthweight.

Factor analysis was performed to assess underlying factors among the eight emergency preparedness behaviors. The dataset was converted to a tetrachoric correlation matrix, and factor analysis was performed using the maximum likelihood estimate and varimax rotation. The overall measure of sampling adequacy was 0.91 suggesting factor analysis could be used for these data (Kaiser 1974).

Data analysis was performed in SAS-callable SUDAAN 11.0 (SAS v9.4) to account for weighted data and complex survey methods. Multivariable logistic regression models were used to estimate predicted marginal prevalence ratios to assess characteristics of women associated with emergency preparedness behaviors. White was the referent category for race, otherwise the subcategory with the greatest proportion of women was used as the referent category. Variables included in the model were established *a priori* from existing literature and included age, education, marital status, urban or rural residence, race, insurance status, family size, FPL, and use of WIC during pregnancy.

RESULTS

Study Characteristics

In 2016, 1,999 women were contacted for PRAMS in Hawaii and 1,076 responded (weighted response rate 56.3%). The final sample for this analysis included 1,010 women; 66 were excluded for not

answering any of the emergency preparedness questions. Table 2 presents the demographic characteristics of the 1,010 women included in this analysis.

The largest proportion of respondents for each demographic characteristic were aged 30-34 (31.2%), had completed a baccalaureate degree or higher (34.7%), were married (63.4%), lived in an urban area (72.3%), were Native Hawaiian race (30.3%), had private insurance at the time of the survey (69.1%), had a family size of two (30.4%), had an income greater than 300% FPL (26.5%), and did not use WIC (65.0%).

Preparedness Behaviors

Among all women, 79.3% (n=826) reported at least one preparedness behavior, and 11.2% (n=96) reported all eight. Having emergency supplies was most commonly reported with 63.0% (95% CI: 58.7-67.1%) of women having enough supplies at home for at least seven days, followed by 41.3% (95% CI: 37.1-45.6%) having an evacuation plan for their child(ren). Less than 40% of women reported other preparedness behaviors: having an emergency meeting place (37.8%, 95% CI: 33.7-42.1%); practicing what to do in case of a disaster (31.6%, 95% CI: 27.7-35.8%); having a plan to keep in touch with family if separated (38.7%, 95% CI: 34.5-43.0%); having an evacuation plan to leave home (36.6%, 95% CI: 32.6-40.9%); having copies of important documents (31.8%, 95% CI: 27.9-36.0%); and having emergency supplies to take during an evacuation (34.9%, 95% CI: 30.9-39.2%). (Table 3)

Among 20.7% (n=184) of women reporting zero preparedness behaviors, significant differences were observed in urban or rural residence and race. Twenty-three percent of women living in an urban area and 16% of women living in a rural area reported zero preparedness behaviors ($p=0.019$). Of the six races reported, Japanese women had the highest proportion reporting zero preparedness behaviors, while Other Pacific Islanders had the lowest proportion reporting zero preparedness behaviors. Reporting of zero preparedness behaviors did not vary by education, marital status, insurance, family size, income, or WIC participation. (Table 4)

We assessed factor loading plots and determined the eight preparedness behaviors could be described by three factors (Online Resources 1-3). The first factor, having emergency plans, captured women that responded yes to at least one of the behaviors: emergency meeting place, practiced what to do, plan to keep in touch, plan for themselves to evacuate, or an evacuation plan for their child(ren). The second factor included women who responded yes to having copies of important documents, and the third factor, included women that had emergency supplies for at least seven days and/or had emergency supplies prepared if they had to leave quickly.

Within the sample, 59.8% (95% CI: 55.5-64.0%) of women had emergency plans; 31.8% (95% CI: 27.9-36.0%) had copies of important documents; and 66.8% (95% CI: 62.5-70.8%) had emergency supplies (Table 3). Having emergency plans varied by race; among Other Pacific Islanders, 79% reported an emergency planning behavior compared to 50% of Japanese women. Emergency planning also varied by family size and percent of the FPL. More than 70% of women with a family size of four or greater reported having emergency plans, while 53.5% (95% CI: 45.5, 61.3) of women with a family size of two reported these behaviors. Among women with an income of 186-300% FPL, 70.7% (95% CI: 60.6, 79.1) reported having emergency plans, whereas 50.3% (95% CI: 40.6, 59.9) of women with an income more than 300% FPL reported emergency planning behaviors. Demographic characteristics among women reporting having copies of important documents varied significantly by race and FPL. Having copies of important documents was most commonly reported among Native Hawaiians (44.5%, 95% CI: 36.9, 52.4). In contrast, 11.9% (95% CI: 6.0, 22.4) of Japanese women reported having copies of important documents. A greater percent of women living at 101-185% FPL (38.5%, 95% CI: 30.3, 47.4) had copies of important documents compared to 22.5% (95% CI: 16.5, 29.8) of women living at more than 300% FPL. Reporting of emergency supplies varied by urban or rural residence. Sixteen percent of women living in a rural residence (15.8%, 95% CI: 13.1, 18.9) and 23.6% (95% CI: 18.1, 27.9) of women living in an urban residence had emergency supplies. (Table 4)

Models

The results of the multivariable analysis are presented in Table 5. Results from women 19-years-old and younger, Other Pacific Islanders, and those with no insurance at the time of survey, should be interpreted with caution as their sample size was small (30-59 respondents). Education and marital status were not associated with any preparedness factors. The prevalence of completing at least one planning emergency preparedness behavior differed significantly by race, family size, and poverty level. Other Pacific Islanders were 45% more likely to report having emergency plans compared to White women (aPR 1.45, 95% CI: 1.09-1.93). Women with a family size of one were 33% (aPR 0.67, 95% CI: 0.46-0.96) less likely to report having emergency plans compared to women with a family size of two. In contrast, having emergency supplies is more common among women with a family size of four (aPR 1.31, 95% CI: 1.06, 1.61) and five or more (aPR 1.33, 95% CI: 1.04- 1.70) compared to those with a family size of two. Compared to women with an income above 300% FPL, those with an income between 186 and 300% FPL were 28% (aPR 1.28, 95% CI: 1.03- 1.60) more likely to have emergency plans.

Having copies of important documents significantly differed in the adjusted models by residence, race, insurance status, family size, and WIC participation. This behavior was less common among women living in a rural residence compared to women living in an urban residence (aPR 0.75, 95% CI: 0.60, 0.95), and among women that used WIC during pregnancy compared to those that did not (aPR 0.72, 95% CI: 0.53, 0.98). Native Hawaiian (aPR 2.16, 95% CI: 1.45-3.24), Filipino (aPR 1.69, 95% CI: 1.06-2.69), and Other Pacific Islanders (aPR 2.02, 95% CI: 1.10-3.71) were more likely than White women to have copies of important documents. Additionally, having copies of important documents was more common among women with public insurance compared to women with private insurance (aPR 1.42, 95% CI: 1.04, 1.93), and among women with a family size of four compared to women with a family size of two (aPR 1.50, 95% CI: 1.02, 2.20).

Significant differences were noted by age, race, family size, and FPL in the adjusted model for emergency supplies. Women 19-years-old and younger were 33% more likely to have emergency supplies compared women 30-34 years old (aPR 1.33, 95% CI: 1.14-1.55). Having emergency supplies was also more likely among Other Pacific Islanders compared to White women (aPR 1.44, 95% CI: 1.18-1.76), and women with a family size of five or more, compared to those with a family size of two. Women with an income at or less than 100% FPL were 26% (aPR 0.74, 95% CI: 0.57-0.97) less likely to have emergency supplies compared to women with an income more than 300% FPL.

DISCUSSION

Analysis of the 2016 Hawaii PRAMS data shows the eight preparedness behaviors can be generalized into three factors - having emergency plans, having copies of important documents, and having emergency supplies. About 80% of women participated in at least one preparedness behavior, and each behavior displayed at least 30% participation.

Race and ethnicity have previously been shown to be important predictors of preparedness, although no consensus exists between the direction of association of race and preparedness in current literature (Zilversmit, Sappenfield, Zotti, and McGehee 2014; DeBastiani, Strine, Vagi, Barnett, and Kahn 2015; Baker 2011; Murphy, Cody, Frank, Glik, and Ang 2009; Diekman, Kearney, O'Neil, and Mack 2007; Bethel, Burke, and Britt 2013). An assessment of the 2006 - 2010 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System general preparedness module found Black and Hispanic respondents were more likely to have a three-day supply of water, and an evacuation plan prepared compared to White respondents; however White respondents were more likely to have a three-day supply of food, battery operated radio, and medication (Bethel, Burke, and Britt 2013). Among a nationally representative sample of US households completing an online survey to assess predictors of disaster preparedness and compliance, the authors found that non-White individuals were more likely to have emergency plans (Murphy, Cody, Frank, Glik, and Ang 2009). In our analysis, Other Pacific Islanders reported higher participation in all three factors

than White women. Although the sample size of Other Pacific Islanders was small, PRAMS methodology is designed to be representative of the state. Other Pacific Islanders are a minority group in the US, however many reside within Hawaii, making Hawaii the ideal state to assess behaviors among Other Pacific Islander women with a recent live birth (Office of Minority Health 2020).

Family size was significantly associated with each factor in multivariable analyses. A family size of one was associated with a lower likelihood of having emergency plans compared to a family size of two. Compared to women with a family size of two, family sizes of four or more were associated with increased likelihood of having emergency plans, a family size of four was associated with a higher likelihood of having copies of important documents, and a family size of five or more was associated with a higher likelihood of having emergency supplies. A study by Zilversmit et al. (2014) observed families with five or more members were 30% more likely to have an emergency plan compared to families of one to four members when assessing the presence of an emergency plan among postpartum women in Arkansas. A focus group discussing household emergency preparedness among homeowners found children in the home promote preparedness for two reasons: it is a way for parents to protect their children, and preparedness is a result of increased involvement in community activities that prompt preparedness behaviors (Diekman, Kearney, O'Neil, and Mack 2007).

In this study, income categorized by percent of the FPL was significant in the emergency plans and emergency supplies adjusted models. Women with an income at or below 100% FPL were less likely to have emergency supplies compared to women with an income greater than 300% FPL, but there were no differences between these groups for emergency plans. Women with an income 186%-300 FPL were more likely to have emergency plans than women with an income greater than 300% FPL. Data from the 2016 Styles survey suggests among US adults, cost is a barrier to emergency preparedness, while discounts to buy preparedness supplies are a motivator for emergency preparedness (Kruger et al. 2020). Buying surplus supplies in case of an emergency may be economically burdensome.

The second factor, having copies of important documents, was associated with residence, current insurance status, and participation in WIC. Women living in rural areas of Hawaii were less likely to report having copies of important documents in a safe location outside of the home compared to women with an urban residence. A rural area may have fewer options for safe storage of important documents outside of the home. Having copies of important documents was 42% more likely among women with public insurance, compared to women with private insurance. Use of WIC was associated with a lower prevalence of having copies of important documents, compared to those not using WIC. Participation in WIC during pregnancy requires a woman to be classified as having a nutritional risk by a health professional, and have an income at or below 185% FPL (USDA Food and Nutrition Service). Although percent FPL was not a significant predictor of having copies of important documents in this study, the income thresholds for WIC eligibility may be related to its association with lower prevalence of having copies of important documents.

In this analysis, younger age was significantly associated with having emergency supplies. In contrast, a study among Florida residents identified those aged 40-70 were more prepared than other respondents (Baker 2011).

Our study identified minimal demographic differences with preparedness behaviors among women with a recent live birth in Hawaii, suggesting disaster preparedness interventions should target all pregnant and postpartum women. Among mailed surveys, shorter questionnaires are associated with higher response rates (Edwards et al. 2009; Yammarino, Skinner, and Childers 1991). Therefore, reducing this eight-part preparedness question to three-parts identified through factor analysis may be preferable. This study is limited by self-reported data so misclassification and reporting bias may be present. Furthermore, dichotomous answer options do not capture levels of preparedness, nor specify a timeframe to consider when responding. This analysis is limited as Hawaii PRAMS does not collect information on social support and nontangible resources; however, these have been described as a

strong predictor of preparedness (Diekman, Kearney, O'Neil, and Mack 2007; Kim, Pant, and Yamashita 2018; Levac, Toal-Sullivan, and O`Sullivan 2012; Giarratano, Barcelona, Savage, and Harville 2019; Ehrlich et al. 2010).

CONCLUSION

This study provides a measure of emergency preparedness among women with a recent live birth in Hawaii and is the first to describe a methodology to analyze the eight-part PRAMS emergency preparedness question. If other states observe similar factor analysis results of these eight preparedness behaviors, this PRAMS question could be reformatted to three parts. Fewer questions may increase the use of this question by jurisdictions and participant response rates may improve. Additionally, these results can inform Hawaii's efforts to increasing disaster preparedness among postpartum women and families in Hawaii. The effect of interventions to increase preparedness can be measured by tracking this question over time.

REFERENCES

- Baker, E. J. (2011). Household preparedness for the Aftermath of Hurricanes in Florida. *Applied Geography*, 31(1), 46-52, doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2010.05.002.
- Bethel, J. W., Burke, S. C., & Britt, A. F. (2013). Disparity in disaster preparedness between racial/ethnic groups. *Disaster Health*, 1(2), 110-116, doi:10.4161/dish.27085.
- Callaghan, W. M., Rasmussen, S. A., Jamieson, D. J., Ventura, S. J., Farr, S. L., Sutton, P. D., et al. (2007). Health concerns of women and infants in times of natural disasters: lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina. [journal article]. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 11(4), 307-311, doi:10.1007/s10995-007-0177-4.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2016). PRAMS Phase 8 Topic Reference Document. https://www.cdc.gov/prams/pdf/questionnaire/Phase-8-Topics-Reference_508tagged.pdf. Accessed March 1 2020.
- DeBastiani, S. D., Strine, T. W., Vagi, S. J., Barnett, D. J., & Kahn, E. B. (2015). Preparedness Perceptions, Sociodemographic Characteristics, and Level of Household Preparedness for Public Health Emergencies: Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2006-2010. *Health Security*, 13(5), 317-326, doi:10.1089/hs.2014.0093.
- Department of Health and Human Services (2016). Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines. *Federal Register*, 81(15), 4036-4037.
- Diekman, S. T., Kearney, S. P., O'Neil, M. E., & Mack, K. A. (2007). Qualitative Study of Homeowners' Emergency Preparedness: Experiences, Perceptions, and Practices. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 22(6), 494-501, doi:10.1017/S1049023X00005318.
- Edwards, P. J., Roberts, I., Clarke, M. J., DiGuseppi, C., Wentz, R., Kwan, I., et al. (2009). Methods to increase response to postal and electronic questionnaires. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*(3), doi:10.1002/14651858.MR000008.pub4.
- Ehrlich, M., Harville, E., Xiong, X., Buekens, P., Pridjian, G., & Elkind-Hirsch, K. (2010). Loss of resources and hurricane experience as predictors of postpartum depression among women in southern Louisiana. *Journal of Women's Health*, 19(5), 877-884, doi:10.1089/jwh.2009.1693.
- Ewing, B., Buchholtz, S., & Rotanz, R. (2008). Assisting Pregnant Women to Prepare for Disaster. *MCN, The American Journal of Maternal/Child Nursing*, 33(2), 98-103, doi:10.1097/01.NMC.0000313417.66742.ce.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (2020). Disasters. <https://www.fema.gov/disasters>. Accessed March 2, 2020.
- Giarratano, G. P., Barcelona, V., Savage, J., & Harville, E. (2019). Mental health and worries of pregnant women living through disaster recovery. *Health Care Women Int*, 40(3), 259-277, doi:10.1080/07399332.2018.1535600.
- Hapsari, E. D., Jayanti, R. D., Nugraheni, D., & Panuntun, R. A. (2020). Information needs in pregnant women living in disaster prone area. *Enfermeria Clinica*, 30, 80-86.
- Harville, E., Xiong, X., & Buekens, P. (2009). Hurricane Katrina and perinatal health. *Birth*, 36(4), 325-331, doi:10.1111/j.1523-536X.2009.00360.x.
- Hawaii, F. H. S. D. (2019). Hawaii PRAMS 2009-2015 Trend Report. <https://health.hawaii.gov/fhsd/files/2019/07/PRAMS-Trend-Report-ALL-FINAL6-2019-LR.pdf>. Accessed January 29 2020.
- Horney, J., Zotti, M. E., Williams, A., & Hsia, J. (2012). Cluster Sampling with Referral to Improve the Efficiency of Estimating Unmet Needs among Pregnant and Postpartum Women after Disasters. *Women's Health Issues*, 22(3), e253-e257, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2012.01.002>.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36, doi:10.1007/BF02291575.

- Kim, K., Pant, P., & Yamashita, E. (2018). Managing uncertainty: Lessons from volcanic lava disruption of transportation infrastructure in Puna, Hawaii. *Journal of emergency management (Weston, Mass.)*, 16(1), 29-40, doi:10.5055/jem.2018.0351.
- Kruger, J., Chen, B., Heitfeld, S., Witbart, L., Bruce, C., & Pitts, D. L. (2020). Attitudes, Motivators, and Barriers to Emergency Preparedness Using the 2016 Styles Survey. *Health Promotion Practice*, 21(3), 448-456, doi:10.1177/1524839918794940.
- Larrance, R., Anastario, M., & Lawry, L. (2007). Health status among internally displaced persons in Louisiana and Mississippi travel trailer parks. *Ann Emerg Med*, 49(5), 590-601, 601 e591-512, doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2006.12.004.
- Levac, J., Toal-Sullivan, D., & O'Sullivan, T. L. (2012). Household Emergency Preparedness: A Literature Review. *Journal of Community Health*, 37(3), 725-733, doi:10.1007/s10900-011-9488-x.
- Maher, M. J. (2019). Emergency Preparedness in Obstetrics: Meeting Unexpected Key Challenges. *The Journal of perinatal & neonatal nursing*, 33(3), 238-245, doi:10.1097/jpn.0000000000000421.
- Morrow, B. H. (1999). Identifying and Mapping Community Vulnerability. *Disasters*, 23(1), 1-18, doi:10.1111/1467-7717.00102.
- Murphy, S. T., Cody, M., Frank, L. B., Glik, D., & Ang, A. (2009). Predictors of emergency preparedness and compliance. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*, 3(2), 1-10.
- National Institutes of Health (2019). Pregnant Women in Disasters and Emergencies: Health Information Guide. <https://disasterinfo.nlm.nih.gov/pregnant-women>. Accessed May 1 2020.
- Nour, N. N. (2011). Maternal health considerations during disaster relief. *Reviews in obstetrics & gynecology*, 4(1), 22-27.
- Office of Minority Health (2020). Profile: Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders. <https://www.minorityhealth.hhs.gov/omh/browse.aspx?lvl=3&lvlid=65>. Accessed February 29 2020.
- Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act. S. 1379, 116th Cong. (2019).
- Shulman, H. B., D'Angelo, D. V., Harrison, L., Smith, R. A., & Warner, L. (2018). The Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS): Overview of Design and Methodology. *Am J Public Health*, 108(10), 1305-1313, doi:10.2105/AJPH.2018.304563.
- Sorensen, C., Wood, B., & Prince, E. (2003). Race & Ethnicity Data: Developing a Common Language for Public Health Surveillance in Hawaii. *Californian J Health Promot*, 1, doi:10.32398/cjhp.v1iSI.561.
- USDA Food and Nutrition Service WIC Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).
- World Health Organization (2007). Risk reduction and emergency preparedness: WHO six-year strategy for the health sector and community capacity development. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Yahmed, S. B., & Koob, P. (1996). Health sector approach to vulnerability reduction and emergency preparedness. *World Health Stat Q*, 49(3-4), 172-178.
- Yammarino, F. J., Skinner, S. J., & Childers, T. L. (1991). Understanding Mail Survey Response Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 55(4), 613-639.
- Zahran, S., Peek, L., Snodgrass, J. G., Weiler, S., & Hempel, L. (2011). Economics of disaster risk, social vulnerability, and mental health resilience. *Risk Anal*, 31(7), 1107-1119, doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01580.x.
- Zilversmit, L., Sappenfield, O., Zotti, M., & McGehee, M. A. (2014). Preparedness Planning for Emergencies Among Postpartum Women in Arkansas During 2009. *Women's Health Issues*, 24(1), e83-e88, doi:10.1016/j.whi.2013.10.006.

Table 1 Eight standardized emergency preparedness questions from 2016 Hawaii PRAMS

- a. I have an emergency meeting place for family members (other than my home).
- b. My family and I have practiced what to do in case of a disaster.
- c. I have a plan for how my family and I would keep in touch if we were separated.
- d. I have an evacuation plan if I need to leave my home and community.
- e. I have an evacuation plan for my child or children in case of disaster (permission for day care or school to release my child to another adult).
- f. I have copies of important documents like birth certificates and insurance policies in a safe place outside of my home.
- g. I have emergency supplies in my home for my family such as enough extra water, food, and medicine to last for at least seven days.
- h. I have emergency supplies that I keep in my car, at work, or at home to take with me if I have to leave quickly.

Note. Women are asked to “check no if it is not something you have done to prepare for a disaster or yes if it is” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2016).

Table 2 Demographic characteristics of women with a recent live birth in Hawaii, 2016 Hawaii PRAMS (N=1,010)

	N	(%)	95% CI
Age (years)			
≤19	33	(3.0)	(1.9, 4.8)
20-24	156	(14.5)	(11.7, 17.9)
25-29	288	(28.5)	(24.8, 32.6)
30-34	313	(31.2)	(27.3, 35.3)
≥35	220	(22.8)	(19.3, 26.6)
Education^a			
Less than High School	147	(17.1)	(13.8, 20.9)
High School	174	(18.9)	(15.8, 22.5)
Some College	336	(29.3)	(25.6, 33.3)
Baccalaureate or Higher	352	(34.7)	(30.7, 38.9)
Marital status			
Married	604	(63.4)	(59.2, 67.4)
Not Married	406	(36.6)	(32.6, 40.8)
Residence			
Rural	590	(27.7)	(26.9, 28.5)
Urban	420	(72.3)	(71.5, 73.1)
Race^b			
White ^c	227	(21.6)	(18.2, 25.3)
Native Hawaiian ^d	314	(30.3)	(26.5, 34.4)
Filipino	195	(16.9)	(13.9, 20.3)
Japanese	102	(12.1)	(9.5, 15.3)
Other Pacific Islander ^e	50	(5.7)	(4.0, 8.1)
Other ^f	119	(13.5)	(10.7, 16.9)
Insurance^g			
Private ^h	624	(69.1)	(65.1, 72.8)
Public	332	(27.2)	(23.7, 31.1)
None	41	(3.7)	(2.5, 5.7)
Family size^{i,j}			
1	113	(10.2)	(7.9, 13.1)
2	310	(30.4)	(26.5, 34.5)
3	249	(28.5)	(24.6, 32.6)
4	194	(18.6)	(15.5, 22.3)
≥5	120	(12.4)	(9.7, 15.6)
% FPL^k			
≤100%	252	(24.3)	(20.8, 28.3)
101-185%	254	(25.3)	(21.6, 29.3)
186-300%	167	(17.2)	(14.1, 20.8)
>300%	273	(33.2)	(29.1, 37.6)
WIC during pregnancy^l			
Yes	337	(35.0)	(30.9, 39.4)
No	609	(65.0)	(60.6, 69.1)

Note. Reported sample sizes are unweighted and reported percentages are weighted. Abbreviations: Federal Poverty Level (FPL); Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)
^aN=1,009. ^bN=1,008. ^cIncludes Portuguese. ^dIncludes mixed race Native Hawaiians. ^eIncludes Samoan, Guamanian, Other Pacific Islander. ^fIncludes American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian Indian, Black, Chinese, Cuban, Mexican, Mixed Race, other Asian, Puerto Rican, and other. ^gN=997. ^hIncludes military healthcare. ⁱN=986. ^jFamily size describes number of individuals living on total income in the 12 months prior to the birth. ^kPercent FPL determined by reported household income and number of individuals living on that income 12 months prior to birth, compared to the January 2016 poverty guidelines for Hawaii issued by the Federal Register of the Department of Health and Human Services. ^lN=946.

Table 3 Prevalence of disaster preparedness behaviors among women with a recent live birth in Hawaii, 2016 Hawaii PRAMS

	N	(%)	95% CI
Individual Questions			
a. Emergency meeting place	373	(37.8)	(33.7, 42.1)
b. Practiced what to do	304	(31.6)	(27.7, 35.8)
c. Keeping in touch	390	(38.7)	(34.5, 43.0)
d. Evacuation plan to leave home and community	353	(36.6)	(32.6, 40.9)
e. Evacuation plan for child(ren)	407	(41.3)	(37.1, 45.6)
f. Copies of important documents	315	(31.8)	(27.9, 36.0)
g. Emergency supplies in home to last for at least 7 days	666	(63.0)	(58.7, 67.1)
h. Emergency supplies to take with if had to leave quickly	348	(34.9)	(30.9, 39.2)
Factor 1 (Plans) ^a	610	(59.8)	(55.5, 64.0)
Factor 2 (Documents) ^b	315	(31.8)	(27.9, 36.0)
Factor 3 (Supplies) ^c	697	(66.8)	(62.5, 70.8)
No preparedness behaviors	184	(20.7)	(17.3, 24.6)

Note. Reported sample sizes are unweighted and reported percentages are weighted.

^aAnswered yes to at least one behavior among: have an emergency meeting place, have practiced what to do in case of a disaster, have a plan for how family would keep in touch if separated, have an evacuation plan if she needed to leave her home and community, and have an evacuation plan for her child(ren) in case of disaster.

^bAnswered yes to having copies of important documents in a safe place outside of the home.

^cAnswered yes to having emergency supplies in the home for at least seven days and/or have emergency supplies to take with if she had to leave quickly.

Table 4 Emergency preparedness behaviors by demographic category among women with a recent live birth in Hawaii, 2016 Hawaii PRAMS

	Factor 1 ^a (Plans)				Factor 2 ^b (Documents)				Factor 3 ^c (Supplies)				No Preparedness Behaviors			
	Yes	%	95% CI	p-value	Yes	%	95% CI	p-value	Yes	%	95% CI	p-value	Yes ^d	%	95% CI	p-value
Age (years)																
≤19 ^e	22	(60.2)	(36.2, 80.1)	0.8543	9	(38.5)	(18.7, 62.9)	0.9612	27	(80.2)	(54.1, 93.3)	0.1762	5	(18.8)	(6.0, 45.6)	0.3525
20-24	93	(58.3)	(46.7, 69.0)		56	(32.6)	(23.2, 43.6)		108	(63.2)	(51.4, 73.6)		28	(23.3)	(14.6, 35.0)	
25-29	164	(56.6)	(48.4, 64.5)		95	(32.1)	(25.0, 40.2)		195	(62.3)	(53.9, 69.9)		58	(24.8)	(18.1, 32.9)	
30-34	190	(62.8)	(55.2, 69.9)		95	(32.3)	(25.4, 40.1)		218	(72.6)	(65.5, 78.8)		54	(15.7)	(11.0, 22.0)	
≥35	141	(60.7)	(51.3, 69.3)		60	(29.5)	(21.8, 38.6)		149	(64.8)	(55.5, 73.2)		39	(21.2)	(14.4, 30.0)	
Education																
Less than High School	86	(55.7)	(44.0, 66.7)	0.6055	43	(30.8)	(21.2, 42.5)	0.1066	96	(61.2)	(49.4, 71.8)	0.6837	30	(26.4)	(17.3, 38.2)	0.2097
High School	115	(60.5)	(50.3, 69.8)		64	(39.6)	(30.3, 49.7)		122	(66.3)	(56.1, 75.2)		31	(24.1)	(16.1, 34.4)	
Some College	207	(63.8)	(56.2, 70.7)		118	(34.4)	(27.6, 41.9)		241	(69.5)	(61.9, 76.1)		52	(15.6)	(10.9, 22.0)	
Baccalaureate or higher	201	(58.1)	(50.8, 65.1)		89	(25.8)	(19.9, 32.8)		238	(67.6)	(60.4, 74.1)		71	(20.5)	(15.2, 27.1)	
Marital status																
Married	357	(60.0)	(54.5, 65.3)	0.9020	175	(29.1)	(24.3, 34.4)	0.0842	404	(64.7)	(59.2, 69.8)	0.1850	114	(20.8)	(16.5, 25.8)	0.9692
Not Married	253	(59.5)	(52.4, 66.2)		140	(36.6)	(30.1, 43.6)		293	(70.4)	(63.5, 76.4)		70	(20.6)	(15.3, 27.2)	
Residence																
Rural	374	(63.7)	(59.8, 67.5)	0.1259	182	(31.0)	(27.4, 34.8)	0.7218	424	(71.8)	(68.0, 75.2)	0.0415*	92	(15.8)	(13.1, 18.9)	0.0190*
Urban	236	(58.3)	(52.5, 63.9)		133	(32.2)	(27.0, 37.8)		273	(64.9)	(59.1, 70.2)		92	(22.6)	(18.1, 27.9)	
Race																
White ^f	117	(54.8)	(45.6, 63.7)	0.0465*	49	(20.0)	(13.8, 28.1)	<0.001*	147	(62.5)	(53.1, 71.0)	0.1213	57	(27.2)	(19.7, 36.4)	0.0482*
Native Hawaiian ^g	211	(61.7)	(53.7, 69.1)		130	(44.5)	(36.9, 52.4)		230	(73.0)	(65.4, 79.5)		45	(16.9)	(11.5, 24.1)	
Filipino	129	(66.2)	(56.0, 75.2)		70	(36.3)	(27.0, 46.7)		147	(67.8)	(57.1, 76.9)		22	(15.4)	(8.9, 25.3)	
Japanese	54	(49.6)	(37.0, 62.2)		16	(11.9)	(6.0, 22.4)		64	(60.5)	(47.4, 72.2)		24	(28.2)	(17.9, 41.3)	
Other Pacific Islander ^{e,h}	35	(78.7)	(62.8, 89.0)		14	(38.6)	(22.5, 57.7)		35	(79.4)	(62.3, 90.0)		6	(9.6)	(3.5, 23.9)	
Other ⁱ	62	(56.2)	(43.8, 67.8)		35	(32.1)	(21.7, 44.6)		73	(59.9)	(47.4, 71.3)		30	(24.4)	(15.3, 36.6)	
Insurance																
Private ^j	367	(58.8)	(53.4, 64.0)	0.7467	181	(29.0)	(24.4, 34.1)	0.1588	434	(66.2)	(60.9, 71.2)	0.3894	119	(21.3)	(17.1, 26.1)	0.8623
Public	208	(61.0)	(52.9, 68.4)		113	(38.1)	(30.6, 46.1)		227	(69.4)	(61.8, 76.2)		57	(19.4)	(13.7, 26.9)	
None ^e	26	(66.1)	(43.8, 83.0)		14	(32.4)	(16.3, 54.0)		25	(53.2)	(32.4, 73.0)		8	(24.0)	(9.3, 49.3)	

Family size

1	60	(42.9)	(30.9, 55.9)	0.0007*	37	(37.5)	(25.5, 51.3)	0.0729	81	(60.2)	(46.3, 72.6)	0.3813	23	(28.4)	(17.5, 42.7)	0.3197
2	157	(53.5)	(45.5, 61.3)		84	(24.5)	(18.4, 31.9)		211	(61.9)	(53.8, 69.4)		65	(24.3)	(17.9, 32.1)	
3	162	(59.8)	(51.3, 67.8)		76	(31.9)	(24.6, 40.2)		177	(70.6)	(62.3, 77.7)		40	(18.3)	(12.6, 25.9)	
4	129	(71.8)	(62.4, 79.6)		60	(41.6)	(32.0, 51.9)		125	(70.6)	(61.2, 78.5)		37	(16.2)	(10.3, 24.6)	
≥5	89	(72.5)	(56.5, 82.6)		49	(29.5)	(20.2, 40.9)		89	(69.6)	(56.3, 80.2)		12	(16.8)	(8.6, 30.3)	

% FPL

≤100%	162	(62.4)	(53.3, 70.6)	0.0122*	85	(34.2)	(26.3, 43.1)	0.0168*	170	(63.3)	(54.3, 71.5)	0.0821	42	(20.3)	(13.8, 29.0)	0.4031
101-185%	165	(63.1)	(54.3, 71.2)		91	(38.5)	(30.3, 47.4)		172	(62.5)	(53.5, 70.7)		41	(20.2)	(13.8, 28.5)	
186-300%	104	(70.7)	(60.6, 79.1)		51	(34.9)	(25.4, 45.7)		121	(77.2)	(67.4, 84.7)		31	(15.0)	(9.0, 24.1)	
>300%	142	(50.3)	(42.4, 58.3)		65	(22.5)	(16.5, 29.8)		189	(66.9)	(58.9, 74.0)		58	(24.0)	(17.7, 31.7)	

WIC during pregnancy

Yes	222	(63.5)	(55.8, 70.6)	0.2420	111	(32.6)	(25.9, 40.2)	0.9776	230	(64.2)	(56.5, 71.3)	0.3081	58	(21.9)	(15.9, 29.3)	0.6031
No	354	(58.0)	(52.4, 63.4)		185	(32.5)	(27.5, 38.0)		425	(69.0)	(63.6, 73.9)		113	(19.7)	(15.6, 24.6)	

Note. Reported sample sizes are unweighted and reported percentages are weighted. Percentages describe women in category sub-group having preparedness factor. Abbreviations: Federal Poverty Level (FPL); Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

^aAnswered yes to at least one behavior among: have an emergency meeting place, have practiced what to do in case of a disaster, have a plan for how family would keep in touch if separated, have an evacuation plan if she needed to leave her home and community, and have an evacuation plan for her child(ren) in case of disaster. ^bAnswered yes to having copies of important documents in a safe place outside of the home. ^cAnswered yes to having emergency supplies in the home for at least seven days and/or have emergency supplies to take with if she had to leave quickly. ^dWomen reporting no preparedness behaviors. ^eSubgroup contains 30-59 respondents, results should be interpreted with caution. ^fIncludes Portuguese. ^gIncludes mixed race Native Hawaiians. ^hIncludes Samoan, Guamanian, Other Pacific Islander. ⁱIncludes American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian Indian, Black, Chinese, Cuban, Mexican, Mixed Race, other Asian, Puerto Rican, and other. ^jIncludes military healthcare
*p<0.05 for Wald Chi-square test

Table 5 Multivariable logistic regression of the characteristics of women with a recent live birth in Hawaii on the presence of emergency preparedness behavior factors, 2016 Hawaii PRAMS

	Factor 1 ^a (Plans)		Factor 2 ^b (Documents)		Factor 3 ^c (Supplies)	
	Prevalence Ratio	95% CI	Prevalence Ratio	95% CI	Prevalence Ratio	95% CI
Age (years)						
≤19 ^d	1.27	(0.96, 1.69)	1.33	(0.74, 2.42)	1.33	(1.14, 1.55)
20-24	1.06	(0.82, 1.38)	1.21	(0.80, 1.84)	1.00	(0.81, 1.25)
25-29	0.96	(0.79, 1.18)	1.01	(0.71, 1.45)	0.92	(0.77, 1.09)
30-34	Referent		Referent		Referent	
≥35	1.00	(0.82, 1.23)	1.08	(0.75, 1.56)	0.90	(0.75, 1.09)
Education						
Less than High School	0.81	(0.59, 1.11)	0.76	(0.45, 1.30)	0.89	(0.69, 1.14)
High School	0.95	(0.75, 1.21)	1.25	(0.85, 1.84)	0.93	(0.75, 1.16)
Some College	1.02	(0.85, 1.23)	1.06	(0.75, 1.51)	1.01	(0.86, 1.17)
Baccalaureate or higher	Referent		Referent		Referent	
Marital status						
Married	Referent		Referent		Referent	
Not Married	0.98	(0.80, 1.19)	0.89	(0.64, 1.25)	1.14	(0.98, 1.33)
Residence						
Rural	1.08	(0.95, 1.23)	0.75	(0.60, 0.95)	1.10	(0.99, 1.23)
Urban	Referent		Referent		Referent	
Race						
White ^e	Referent		Referent		Referent	
Native Hawaiian ^f	1.16	(0.93, 1.44)	2.16	(1.45, 3.24)	1.18	(0.98, 1.42)
Filipino	1.23	(0.98, 1.55)	1.69	(1.06, 2.69)	1.07	(0.87, 1.32)
Japanese	1.06	(0.78, 1.43)	0.75	(0.34, 1.69)	0.99	(0.76, 1.29)
Other Pacific Islander ^{d,g}	1.45	(1.09, 1.93)	2.02	(1.10, 3.71)	1.44	(1.18, 1.76)
Other ^h	1.03	(0.77, 1.38)	1.50	(0.89, 2.52)	1.02	(0.80, 1.30)
Insurance						
Private ⁱ	Referent		Referent		Referent	
Public	1.02	(0.85, 1.23)	1.42	(1.04, 1.93)	1.06	(0.91, 1.24)
None ^d	0.91	(0.60, 1.38)	0.92	(0.38, 2.27)	0.81	(0.53, 1.25)
Family size						
1	0.67	(0.46, 0.96)	1.26	(0.80, 1.97)	0.86	(0.64, 1.15)
2	Referent		Referent		Referent	
3	1.09	(0.88, 1.35)	1.23	(0.85, 1.78)	1.12	(0.94, 1.34)
4	1.31	(1.06, 1.61)	1.50	(1.02, 2.20)	1.19	(0.99, 1.43)
≥5	1.33	(1.04, 1.70)	1.02	(0.62, 1.67)	1.24	(1.02, 1.52)
% FPL						
≤100%	1.05	(0.77, 1.43)	1.07	(0.65, 1.75)	0.74	(0.57, 0.97)
101-185%	1.01	(0.79, 1.31)	1.47	(0.99, 2.20)	0.84	(0.69, 1.02)
186-300%	1.28	(1.03, 1.60)	1.41	(0.94, 2.10)	1.10	(0.94, 1.28)
>300%	Referent		Referent		Referent	
WIC during pregnancy						
Yes	1.11	(0.94, 1.31)	0.72	(0.53, 0.98)	0.96	(0.82, 1.12)
No	Referent		Referent		Referent	

Note. Reported prevalence ratios are adjusted for all variables included in models. Abbreviations: Federal Poverty Level (FPL); Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

^aAnswered yes to at least one behavior among: have an emergency meeting place, have practiced what to do in case of a disaster, have a plan for how family would keep in touch if separated, have an evacuation plan if she needed to leave her home and community, and have an evacuation plan for her child(ren) in case of disaster. ^bAnswered yes to having copies of important documents in a safe place outside of the home. ^cAnswered yes to having emergency supplies in the home for at least seven days and/or have emergency supplies to take with if she had to leave quickly.

^dSubgroup contains 30-59 respondents, results should be interpreted with caution. ^eIncludes Portuguese. ^fIncludes mixed race Native Hawaiians.

^gIncludes Samoan, Guamanian, Other Pacific Islander. ^hIncludes American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian Indian, Black, Chinese, Cuban, Mexican, Mixed Race, other Asian, Puerto Rican, and other. ⁱIncludes military healthcare.

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7-8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	8-9
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	7
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8-9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	19
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	19
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	20
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	23
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	9-11
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	9-11
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	12-14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	14-15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14-15
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.