Rural-Urban Variations in the Association Between Substance Use and Pre-Hospital Crash Injury Severity Among Older Adults: A Single Year National Cross-sectional Study

Authors:

Oluwaseun Adeyemi, MBCh.B, Ph.D. [1], Charles DiMaggio, Ph.D. [2,3], Corita Grudzen, MD, MSHS [1,3], Sanjit Konda, MD,[4,5] Adenikinju Abidemi, MD,[4] Bouillon Minois, Jean-Baptiste, MD, Ph.D.,[6] Omotola Akinsola, MSW, Ph.D.,[7] Alison Moore, MD, MPH,[8,] Ryan McCormack, MD,[1] Joshua Chodosh, MD, MSHS [3,9,10]

Affiliations

1. Ronald O Perelman Department of Emergency Medicine, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, USA
2. Department of Surgery, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, USA
3. Department of Population Health, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, USA
4. Department of Orthopedic Surgery, New York University Langone Orthopedic Hospital, New York, NY, USA.
5. Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Jamaica Hospital Medical Center, Jamaica, New York, USA.
6. Emergency Department, CHU Clermont-Ferrand, Clermont-Ferrand, France
7. College of Allied Health and Nursing, Minnesota State University, Minnesota, USA
8. Department of Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA
9. Division of Geriatric Medicine and Palliative Care, Department of Medicine, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY, United States.
10. Medicine Service, Veterans Affairs New York Harbor Healthcare System, New York, NY, United States

Corresponding Author

Oluwaseun J. Adeyemi, MBCh.B, MWACS, MS, Ph.D
Ronald O Perelman Department of Emergency Medicine,
New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York
Email: oluwaseun.adeyemi@nyulangone.org
Phone: 980-939-9764

Funding: This study was not funded.

Acknowledgment: The authors appreciate the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's Office of Emergency Medical Service and the Technical Assistance Center at the University of Utah for providing the data.

Disclosures: The authors declare no competing interests.

Keywords: Substance Use, Crash Injury, Older Adults, Rurality/Urbanicity, Emergent, Critical and Fatal Injuries

Rural-Urban Variations in the Association Between Substance Use and Pre-Hospital Crash Injury Severity Among Older Adults: A Single Year National Cross-sectional Study

Abstract

Background: This study aims to assess the rural-urban differences between substance use and crash injury severity among older adults.

Methods: This single-year cross-sectional analysis pooled the 2019 data from the National Emergency Medical Service Information System. We measured injury severity (low acuity, emergent, critical, and fatal) as predicted by substance use, defined as self-reported or officer-reported alcohol and/or drug use. We controlled for age, sex, road user type, anatomical injured region, revised trauma score, location (scene) of the injury, and the time of the day. We stratified by rurality/urbanicity and performed a partial proportional ordinal logistic regression. We reported the odds of worse injury outcomes (emergent, critical, and fatal injuries) compared to low acuity injuries and the predicted probabilities of each injury category by rurality/urbanicity.

Results: Our sample consisted of 58,238 older adults, who sustained crash injuries. Approximately 69%, 25%, 5%, and 1% sustained low acuity, emergent, critical, and fatal injuries, respectively. Substance use was reported in approximately 4% of the sample population, and this proportion did not significantly differ across rural-urban areas. After controlling for patient and injury characteristics, substance use was associated with 45% increased odds of emergent, critical, and fatal injuries compared to low acuity injuries across all areas. The predicted probabilities of critical and emergent injuries increase from urban to suburban and rural areas.

Conclusion: Substance use is associated with worse geriatric crash injury severity and the predicted probabilities of substance use-related emergent and critical crash injuries increase from urban to rural areas.

Keywords: Substance Use, Crash Injury, Older Adults, Rurality/Urbanicity, Emergent, and Critical Injuries

Introduction

Every day in the U.S., approximately 720 older adults sustain crash injuries with varying degrees of severity of whom 20 die.[1] While motor vehicular crashes account for about 55% of crash injuries among older adults,[2,3] pedestrian crash rates have been on the rise increasing from 40.7 to 45.0 per 100,000 population between 2009 and 2019.[4] Unique among older adult drivers is an increased incidence of worsened visual acuity and peripheral vision, other eye diseases, hearing loss, and decline in motor skills, all of which increase the risk of crash involvement.[5] It is estimated that there are over 40 million licensed older adult drivers in the U.S., a 60% increase compared to a decade ago.[1] Furthermore, approximately 38,000 older adults receive opioid prescriptions every day, one out of every eight older adults takes alcohol daily, and a smaller proportion report daily use of marijuana and cocaine.[6,7]

Substance use is a major risk factor for fatal and non-fatal crash injuries.[8-11] When viewed as a single heterogeneous group comprising alcohol and drug use, substance use is associated with 45% increased odds of adverse crash outcomes and increased risk of pre-admission Emergency Department fatality.[12,13] Alcohol is associated with a two to seven folds increased odds of crash involvement in a crash,[14-16] and a 15-fold increased odds of severe injury.[15] Marijuana, opioids, narcotics, stimulants, and depressants are associated with two to six folds increased crash risks and odds of fatal crash injuries.[17-22]

Substance use and crash characteristics differ across rural and urban areas in the U.S. While urban areas have a higher incidence of hallucinogens, cocaine, marijuana, and other illicit drug use, rural areas have a higher incidence of alcohol and opioid misuse.[23] Also, while fatal injuries occur more in rural areas, minor and serious injuries occur more in urban areas. [13,24,25] Furthermore, the crash response times in rural areas are longer,[26,27] and the proportions of deaths at the crash scenes in rural areas are higher.[28] The rural-urban disparity in crash characteristics, and the presence of background co-morbid illnesses may predispose older adults in rural areas to experience worse crash injury severity and increased mortality risk.

It is unknown to what extent substance use is associated with injury severity among older adults. Additionally, it is not known how the relationship between substance use and crash injury severity among older adults differs across rural and urban areas. Identifying these regional differences may inform policies on safe driving, road infrastructural design, and targeted behavioral interventions for older adults. Assessing the risk of crash injury severity among older adults is important due to the increasing older US adult population,[29,30] and older licensed drivers.[1] This study aims to assess the relationship between substance use and crash injury severity among older adults and the rural-urban differences that further define this problem.

Methods

Study Design

We conducted a cross-sectional analysis using the 2019 data from the National Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Information System (NEMSIS). The NEMSIS is the national database of all EMS cases across U.S. States and territories.[31] The 2019 NEMSIS represents data from 46 states and the District of Columbia, excluding Idaho, Missouri, Massachusetts, and Ohio.[32]

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

In 2019, 34,203,087 persons were managed following an EMS activation (Figure 1). We identified crash injuries using the International Classification of Disease version 10 (ICD-10) codes V00 to V89. Of this population, 1,200,018 (3.5%) persons were involved in crash events. Of this crash population, 831,999 persons (69.3%) had documentation stating whether substance use was or was not detected. After excluding respondents without a substance use status, 502,866 persons (60.4%) had a reported injury status. We restricted the data to participants 65 years and older, excluding 444,628 persons (88.4%). The final dataset included 58,238 older adults who sustained crash injuries and whose substance use status at the time of the EMS review was known.

Injury Severity

Injury severity status, our outcome, was measured on a four-point categorical variable: low acuity, emergent, critical, and fatal injury. A patient with low acuity injury is one whose injury has a low probability of worsening or developing serious complications in the absence of intervention. A patient with an emergent injury represents one with injuries that have the potential of worsening if intervention is not initiated quickly. A patient with critical injury represents one with a life-threatening injury who is at high mortality risk if intervention is not initiated immediately. A patient with a fatal injury either died at the crash scene or while in transit to the hospital. These categorizations were made by EMS providers at the crash scene using a standard matrix.[33,34]

Substance Use

The main predictor variable was the presence or absence of substance use. We defined substance use using the variable eHistory.17, representing alcohol/drug use indicators.[35] The NEMSIS defined substance use in 11 categories: 1) alcohol containers/paraphernalia at the scene, 2) drug paraphernalia at the scene, 3) patient admits to alcohol use, 4) patient admits to drug use, 5) positive level (of alcohol or drugs) known from law enforcement or hospital record, 6) smell of alcohol on breath, 7) none reported 8) patient refused 9) unable to complete 10) not applicable, 11) not recorded. We had earlier excluded cases whose substance use status was unknown (defined as cases in the 8th to 11th categories). We defined the presence of substance use at the time of the crash event as cases in the first to sixth categories while the absence of substance use at the time of the crash was defined with cases coded in the seventh category.[35]

Patient and Injury Characteristics

We controlled for age, sex, road user type, anatomical injured region, revised trauma score, environmental location of the crash, and the time of the day of the crash. We selected these patient and injury characteristics a priori from the literature.[13,26,28] Road user type was measured in four categories using the ICD-10 codes: car occupants (V40 – V49), pedestrians (V00 – V09), two/three-wheel vehicle occupants (V10 – V39), and occupants of trucks, buses, industrial vehicles (V50 – V89). We defined the injured anatomic region in five categories: injury to the head and neck, abdomen and genitals, chest and back, upper and lower limbs (extremities), and general body injuries. Also, we computed the revised trauma score (RTS) using three neuro-vital sign measures - the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) score, respiratory rate (RR), and systolic blood pressure (SBP). We generated the RTS using the formula (0.9368*GCS category) + (0.7326 * SBP category) + (0.2908 * RR category), consistent with its definition.[36] The GCS, RR, and SBP values were re-coded into five-point categories from 0 to 4. The

categorizations of the three neuro-vital signs and the calculation of the RTS are summarized in Table 1. Lower RTS corresponds with better outcomes.

We defined the time of the crash injury in four categories: morning rush hour period, afternoon rush hour period, nighttime, and other hours. We defined the morning and afternoon rush hour periods as crash injuries sustained between 6 to 9 am and 3 to 7 pm, respectively. A recently published meta-analysis identified these time range as the average rush-hour periods across the U.S.[37] Nighttime was defined as crash injuries occurring between 9 pm and 5 am. Following the recommended NEMSIS incident location categorization,[38] we defined the environmental location of the crash in three categories, using the ICD-10 codes: parking lots/sidewalks (Y92.48, including Y92.480 - Y.92.489), streets/highways/paved roads (Y92.41, including Y92.410 – Y92.419, and Y.92.4), and other locations. The other crash locations include places of residence, business, stores, recreational areas, schools, and places not otherwise specified.

Stratification

The geographical location where the crash injury occurred was used as a stratification variable. NEMSIS reports the geographical location as a four-point categorical variable: wilderness, rural, suburban, and urban. The NEMSIS defines the rurality/urbanicity of the crash location using the United States Department of Agriculture Urban influence codes.[32] We recoded this variable into three categories: rural/wilderness (hereafter referred to as rural), suburban, and urban. We performed separate analyses for cases in these three geographical locations.

Analysis

Across the selected variables, the missing values ranged from 0.3% to 28.7%. We performed multiple imputations for missing data, using the multivariate normal regression after justifying that missingness was not completely at random.[39] Since NEMSIS had advised researchers not to assume that missingness in the NEMSIS data is "Not Missing at Random",[40] we imputed missing data on the assumption that the missingness was at random.

We computed the frequency distribution of demographic, injury, crash, and substance use characteristics. We assessed differences across injury severity status and rural, suburban, and urban areas using chi-square statistics. The RTS was measured as a continuous variable, and we reported the mean (including the standard deviation) and median (including the first (Q1) and third (Q3) quartiles) values across the injury and geographical categories. The mean and median differences were assessed using one-way ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests, respectively.

We performed a partially proportional ordinal logistic regression to assess the odds of critical, emergent, and fatal injuries as compared to low acuity injuries.[41] The decision to use a partially proportional ordinal logistic regression, as opposed to a proportionally ordinal regression was based on the violation of the parallel lines assumption evidenced by a significant Brant test. We reported the predicted probabilities of low acuity, emergent, critical, and fatal injuries across all geographical areas and rural, suburban, and urban areas. Data were analyzed using STATA version 16.[42]

Results

A total of 58,238 older adults met our inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 2). The majority of the population was aged 65 and 74 years (62%), female (53%), and car occupants (72%). The sample population mostly sustained general body injuries (24%), with a mean (SD) RTS of 7.7 (0.7). The crash injuries occurred mostly in urban areas (81%) with 20% of the injuries occurring at parking lots/sidewalks, and 28% occurring during the afternoon rush hour period. Substance use was identified in approximately 4% of the sample population. Approximately 69% of the sample population had low acuity injury, 25%, and 5% sustained emergent and critical injuries and 1% died. Age, sex, road user type, the anatomical injured region, RTS, geographical location, environmental location of the crash, time of the day, and substance use were associated with significant pre-hospital crash injury severity($p<0.001$).

There were significant differences in the age and sex of older adults who sustained crash injuries in rural, suburban, and urban areas (Table 3). Comparing urban to rural areas, the proportion of older adults involved in car crash injuries significantly decreases from 73.2% (urban) to 69.0% (suburban), to 65.6% (rural) ($p<0.001$). Also, the proportions of head and neck and extremity injuries in urban, suburban, and rural increased from 17.1% to 17.2%, and 18.3% (head and neck) and 16.7%, to 19.1% and 20.0% (extremity), respectively. The proportion of crash injuries that occurred at parking lots/sidewalks increased from 18.9% to 23.8 % and 26.2% from urban to suburban and rural areas, respectively. There were no significant differences in the rural-urban proportions of substance use among older adults with crash injuries. However, as the proportion of low acuity injuries decreased, the proportion of critical, and emergent injuries increased. The proportion of pre-hospital deaths in urban areas was 0.9% and it significantly increased to 1.7% and 2.4% in suburban and rural areas, respectively.

Compared to low acuity injury, the unadjusted odds of emergent, critical, and fatal injuries were higher with increasing age, among males, and lower with a unit increase in the RTS (Table 4). Injuries that occur in rural and suburban areas, at parking lots/sidewalks and streets or highways, and at nighttime were associated with higher odds of critical, emergent, and fatal injuries. Compared to low acuity injury, the adjusted odds of emergent, critical, and fatal injuries were higher with increasing age (adjusted odds ratio (AOR): (75-84 years) 1.10; 95% CI: 1.05 - 1.14); (85 years and older) 1.14 (1.07 - 1.22)), among males (AOR: 1.29; 95% CI: 1.24 - 1.34), among pedestrians (AOR: 1.57; 95% CI: 1.46 – 1.68), two/three-wheel vehicle occupants (AOR: 1.73; 95% CI: 1.61 – 1.86), and truck/buses/industrial vehicle occupants (AOR: 1.33; 95% CI: 1.26 – 1.41).

Substance use was associated with 99% (OR: 1.99: 95% CI: 1.82 - 2.18) increased odds of critical, emergent, and fatal injuries when compared to low acuity injuries (Table 5). The observed odds ratio was attenuated to 45% (AOR: 1.45; 95% CI: 1.31 – 1.59) after adjusting for other demographic, injury, and crash characteristics. In suburban and urban areas, the adjusted odds of critical, emergent, and fatal injuries were 1.98 (95% CI: 1.36 – 2.87) and 1.48 (1.33 – 1.65), respectively. The predicted probability of low acuity injuries was highest in urban areas (64%) and lowest in rural areas (51%) (Figure 2). On the contrary, the predicted probabilities of emergent and critical injuries were highest in rural areas (emergent: 39%; critical: 10%) and lowest in urban areas (emergent: 30%; critical: 6%).

Discussion

We report that among older adults who sustained crash injuries, about 30% had emergent or critical injuries while 1% had fatal injuries. The proportion of critical, emergent, and fatal injuries in rural areas was significantly higher when compared to suburban and urban areas. Substance use did not differ significantly across rurality/urbanicity. Additionally, substance use was associated with increased odds of

emergent, critical, and fatal injuries across all geographical locations. The predicted probabilities of emergent and critical injuries increased step wisely from urban to suburban and rural areas.

This study reports that, among adults 65 years and older, substance use was associated with 45% increased odds of emergent, critical, and fatal crash injuries. This observed relationship may be explained by the effect of acute and chronic use of alcohol or drugs on injury response in older adults. Acute and chronic alcohol use is associated with orthostatic hypotension and hypertension,[43-45] respectively, and drugs such as opioids and benzodiazepines may depress the central nervous system.[46,47] Alcohol and drugs may further impair an age-related weakened physiologic response to acute trauma, hence increasing injury morbidity among older adults.

While the proportion of substance use-related crash injuries did not significantly differ across rural, suburban, and urban areas, the crash injury severity differ significantly. Earlier studies have reported that there are no rural-urban differences in alcohol and drug consumption among all age groups.[48,49] Despite the approximately equal incidence of substance use in rural, suburban, and urban regions, the proportion of fatal injuries increased from urban to rural areas. This trend may partly be explained by crash response differences in rural and urban areas. An unmitigated acute blood loss, the commonest crash injury symptom, may propel an emergent case to a critical and/or a fatal case within minutes.

We report that as the predicted probabilities of low acuity injury decreased from urban to rural, the predicted probabilities of critical and emergent injuries increased. Additionally, suburban and rural areas had higher fatal injury probabilities compared to urban areas. The observed rural-urban stepwise increase in the predicted probabilities of critical and emergent crash injuries among older adults is similar to earlier studies that have reported similar stepwise increases in crash injury patterns across all age groups,[26] at the county level,[27] in EMS response times, [27,28] in the pattern of deaths at the scene of the crash,[28] and among substance use-related non-fatal crash injuries across all age groups.[13]

In this study, substance use among older adults in rural areas was associated with worse injury outcomes in the unadjusted model but the odds were attenuated and no longer significant in the adjusted model. The significant association in suburban and urban areas persisted after controlling for patient and injury characteristics. Despite this observed finding, earlier studies have reported that rural areas have significantly prolonged response times,[26,28] increased deaths at the crash scene,[28] and increased proportions of crash fatalities.[50-52] These metrics would affect all injured rural patients and may blur the difference between the injury severity categories of crash victims in rural areas.

This study has its limitations. The study is of a cross-sectional design and causal inferences cannot be made. Also, we used a large dataset and statistical significance may not suggest clinical significance. The study did not report the racial/ethnic characteristics of the study population due to the large proportion of missing variables. Race/ethnicity is a potential confounding variable since earlier studies have reported significant racial/ethnic differences in substance use[53,54] and crash injury outcomes.[55] Additionally, we did not control for other risky driving behaviors such as non-use of seatbelts, distracted driving, and speeding because these variables were not captured in the NEMSIS. The 2019 NEMSIS data captured data from 44 out of the 48 U.S. states and the results of this study can only be generalized to these states. Substance use, a heterogeneous term for alcohol, marijuana, narcotics, stimulants, depressants, benzodiazepines, and other illicit drugs is inconsistently screened across U.S. states. The spectrum and protocol of screening for substance use differ across states and there is substantial under-reporting of drug use while driving.[56] The gold standard for a diagnosis of substance use remains a

serological assessment.[57] However, with some cases of substance use identified by self-reported measures and the presence of paraphernalia of alcohol and drugs, the possibility of misclassification bias is likely. Misclassification of the outcome measure is less likely since injury severity classification was based on a complex matrix and applied by a trained EMS staff. Despite these limitations, the generalizability of this study to older adults across the representative US states is a strength. Also, this is one of the few studies that assess the association between substance use and non-fatal crash injuries among older adults and the associated geographic distribution.

Conclusion

Substance use is associated with worse crash injury severity among older adults. Also, worse injury severity increases from urban to rural areas despite no significant difference in rural-urban proportions of substance use among older adults. Addressing factors associated with early initiation of care may improve health outcomes of older adults in rural and suburban areas.

References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Older Adult Drivers. Transportation Safety Web site. https://www.cdc.gov/transportationsafety/older_adult_drivers/index.html. Published 2021. Accessed 12/13/2021.
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Overall All Transport Nonfatal Emergency Department Visits and Rates per 100,000: 2019, United States, All Races, Both Sexes, Ages 65 to 85+, Disposition: All Cases. CDC. Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS) Web site. https://wisqars.cdc.gov/nonfatal-reports. Published 2022. Accessed 04/15/2022.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Overall MV-Occupant Nonfatal Emergency Department Visits and Rates per 100,000: 2019, United States, All Races, Both Sexes, Ages 65 to 85+, Disposition: All Cases. CDC. Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS) Web site. https://wisqars.cdc.gov/nonfatal-reports. Published 2022. Accessed 04/15/2022.
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Overall Pedestrian Nonfatal Emergency Department Visits and Rates per 100,000, 2009 - 2020, United States: All Races, Both Sexes, Ages 65 to 85+, Disposition: All Cases. CDC. Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS) Web site. https://wisqars.cdc.gov/nonfatal-reports. Published 2022. Accessed 04/15/2022.
5. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. Older Drivers in the Workplace: How Employers and Workers Can Prevent Crashes. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/2016-116/pdfs/2016-116.pdf. Published 2016. Accessed 04/15/2022.
6. Hoots BE, Xu L, Kariisa M, et al. 2018 Annual surveillance report of drug-related risks and outcomes--United States. 2018.
7. Mattson M, Lipari RN, Hays C, Van Horn SL. A day in the life of older adults: Substance use facts. *The CBHSQ report*. 2017. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK436750/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK436750.pdf. Accessed 04/15/2022.
8. Alcañiz M, Santolino M, Ramon L. Drinking patterns and drunk-driving behaviour in Catalonia, Spain: A comparative study. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour.* 2016;42:522-531.

9. Bondallaz P, Favrat B, Chtioui H, Fornari E, Maeder P, Giroud C. Cannabis and its effects on driving skills. *Forensic Sci Int.* 2016;268:92-102.
10. Kumar S, Bansal YS, Singh D, Medhi B. Alcohol and Drug Use in Injured Drivers - An Emergency Room Study in a Regional Tertiary Care Centre of North West India. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research.* 2015;9(7):Hc01-04.
11. Freeman DG. Drunk driving legislation and traffic fatalities: New evidence on BAC 08 laws. *Contemporary Economy Policy.* 2007;25(3):293-308.
12. DiMaggio CJ, Avraham JB, Frangos SG, Keyes K. The role of alcohol and other drugs on emergency department traumatic injury mortality in the United States. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2021;225:108763.
13. Adeyemi OJ, Paul R, DiMaggio CJ, Delmelle EM, Arif AA. An assessment of the non-fatal crash risks associated with substance use during rush and non-rush hour periods in the United States. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2022:109386.
14. Asefa NG, Ingale L, Shumey A, Yang H. Prevalence and factors associated with road traffic crash among taxi drivers in Mekelle town, northern Ethiopia, 2014: a cross sectional study. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(3):e0118675.
15. Compton RP, Berning A. Drug and Alcohol Crash Risk. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Traffic Safety Facts: Research Note Web site. http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/nti/pdf/812117-Drug_and_Alcohol_Crash_Risk.pdf. Published 2015. Accessed 02/24/2022.
16. Penmetsa P, Pulugurtha SS. Risk drivers pose to themselves and other drivers by violating traffic rules. *Traffic Injury Prevention.* 2017;18(1):63-69.
17. Blows S, Ivers RQ, Connor J, Ameratunga S, Woodward M, Norton R. Marijuana use and car crash injury. *Addiction.* 2005;100(5):605-611.
18. Preuss UW, Huestis MA, Schneider M, et al. Cannabis Use and Car Crashes: A Review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry.* 2021;12.
19. Brubacher JR, Chan H, Erdelyi S, et al. Cannabis use as a risk factor for causing motor vehicle crashes: a prospective study. *Addiction.* 2019;114(9):1616-1626.
20. Drummer OH, Gerostamoulos D, Di Rago M, et al. Odds of culpability associated with use of impairing drugs in injured drivers in Victoria, Australia. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2020;135:105389.
21. Drummer OH, Gerostamoulos J, Batziris H, et al. The involvement of drugs in drivers of motor vehicles killed in Australian road traffic crashes. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2004;36(2):239-248.
22. Laumon B, Gadegbeku B, Martin JL, Biecheler MB. Cannabis intoxication and fatal road crashes in France: population based case-control study. *BMJ.* 2005;331(7529):1371.
23. Rural Health Information Hub. Substance Use and Misuse in Rural Areas. https://www.ruralhealthinfo.org/topics/substance-use. Published 2020. Accessed 04/15/2022.
24. Cabrera-Arnau C, Prieto Curiel R, Bishop SR. Uncovering the behaviour of road accidents in urban areas. *R Soc Open Sci.* 2020;7(4):191739.
25. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. Fatality Facts 2019: Urban/rural comparison. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Highway Loss Data Institute. https://www.iihs.org/topics/fatality-statistics/detail/urban-rural-comparison. Published 2022. Accessed 04/15/2022.
26. Byrne JP, Mann NC, Dai M, et al. Association Between Emergency Medical Service Response Time and Motor Vehicle Crash Mortality in the United States. *JAMA surgery.* 2019;154(4):286-293.
27. Adeyemi OJ, Paul R, Arif A. An assessment of the rural-urban differences in the crash response time and county-level crash fatalities in the United States. *The Journal of Rural Health.* 2021.

28. Adeyemi OJ, Paul R, DiMaggio C, Delmelle E, Arif A. The association of crash response times and deaths at the crash scene: A cross-sectional analysis using the 2019 National Emergency Medical Service Information System. *The Journal of Rural Health.* 2022.
29. Vespa J. The U.S. Joins Other Countries With Large Aging Populations. United States Census Bureau. The Graying of America: More Older Adults Than Kids by 2035 Web site. https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2018/03/graying-america.html. Published 2021. Accessed 04/15/2022.
30. Pallin DJ, Espinola JA, Camargo CA, Jr. US population aging and demand for inpatient services. *J Hosp Med.* 2014;9(3):193-196.
31. National Emergency Medical Services Information System. How NEMSIS Works. https://nemsis.org/what-is-nemsis/how-nemsis-works/. Published 2019. Accessed 11/27/2020.
32. Emergency Medical Services. NEMSIS Data Dictionary. 2020;version 3.4.0. https://nemsis.org/media/nemsis_v3/release-3.4.0/DataDictionary/PDFHTML/DEMEMS/index.html. Accessed 03/22/2021.
33. Beeson MS, Ankel F, Bhat R, et al. The 2019 Model of the Clinical Practice of Emergency Medicine. *J Emerg Med.* 2020;59(1):96-120.
34. Counselman FL, Babu K, Edens MA, et al. The 2016 Model of the Clinical Practice of Emergency Medicine. *J Emerg Med.* 2017;52(6):846-849.
35. National Emergency Medical Services Information System. eHistory.17 - Alcohol/Drug Use Indicators. National Emergency Medical Services Information System. https://nemsis.org/media/nemsis_v3/release-3.4.0/DataDictionary/PDFHTML/DEMEMS/sections/elements/eHistory.17.xml. Published 2021. Accessed 04/14/2022.
36. Champion HR, Sacco WJ, Copes WS, Gann DS, Gennarelli TA, Flanagan ME. A revision of the Trauma Score. *J Trauma.* 1989;29(5):623-629.
37. Adeyemi OJ, Arif AA, Paul R. Exploring the relationship of rush hour period and fatal and non-fatal crash injuries in the U.S.: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2021;163:106462.
38. National Emergency Medical Services Information System. Defined Lists and Other Resources. Suggested and Defined Lists Web site. https://nemsis.org/technical-resources/version-3/version-3-resources/. Published 2021. Accessed 05/10/2022.
39. Lee KJ, Carlin JB. Multiple imputation for missing data: fully conditional specification versus multivariate normal imputation. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2010;171(5):624-632.
40. NEMSIS Technical Assistance Center. National EMS Database NEMSIS Public Release Research Data Set: 2020 User Manual 2021(v3.4.0). https://nemsis.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/2020-NEMSIS-RDS-340-User-Manual_v3-FINAL.pdf. Accessed 05/11/2022.
41. Williams R. Gologit2: A program for generalized logistic regression/partial proportional odds models for ordinal variables. *STATA Journal.* 2005;12:2005.
42. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 16* [computer program]. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2020.
43. Narkiewicz K, Cooley RL, Somers VK. Alcohol Potentiates Orthostatic Hypotension. *Circulation.* 2000;101(4):398-402.
44. Husain K, Ansari RA, Ferder L. Alcohol-induced hypertension: Mechanism and prevention. *World J Cardiol.* 2014;6(5):245-252.
45. Klatsky AL, Gunderson E. Alcohol and hypertension: a review. *J Am Soc Hypertens.* 2008;2(5):307-317.

46. Smink BE, Egberts ACG, Lusthof KJ, Uges DRA, de Gier JJ. The relationship between benzodiazepine use and traffic accidents: A systematic literature review. *CNS Drugs.* 2010;24(8):639-653.
47. Li G, Chihuri S. Prescription opioids, alcohol and fatal motor vehicle crashes: a population-based case-control study. *Injury epidemiology.* 2019;6:11-11.
48. Dixon MA, Chartier KG. Alcohol Use Patterns Among Urban and Rural Residents: Demographic and Social Influences. *Alcohol Res.* 2016;38(1):69-77.
49. Derefinko KJ, Bursac Z, Mejia MG, Milich R, Lynam DR. Rural and urban substance use differences: Effects of the transition to college. *The American journal of drug and alcohol abuse.* 2018;44(2):224-234.
50. Adeyemi OJ, Paul R, DiMaggio C, Delmelle E, Arif A. *Rush Hour-Related Road Crashes: Assessing the Social and Environmental Determinants of Fatal and Non-Fatal Road Crash Events* [Ph.D.]. Ann Arbor: Public Health Sciences, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte; 2021.
51. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. Fatality Facts 2018: Urban/rural comparison. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety/Highway Loss Data Institute. Fatality Statistics Web site. https://www.iihs.org/topics/fatality-statistics/detail/urban-rural-comparison. Published 2019. Accessed 12/5/2020.
52. National Center for Statistics and Analysis. Rural/Urban Comparison of Traffic Fatalities. *Traffic Safety Fact: 2017 Data.* 2019. https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/812741. Accessed 06/12/2022.
53. Wu LT, Woody GE, Yang C, Pan JJ, Blazer DG. Racial/ethnic variations in substance-related disorders among adolescents in the United States. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2011;68(11):1176-1185.
54. Grigsby TJ, Howard K, Howard JT. Comparison of Past Year Substance Use Estimates by Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity Between Two Representative Samples of the U.S. Adult Population. *Popul Res Policy Rev.* 2021:1-16.
55. National Center for Statistics and Analysis. Race and Ethnicity. *Traffic Safety Fact: 2006 Data.* 2009. https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/810995.
56. Berning A, Smither DD. *Understanding the limitations of drug test information, reporting, and testing practices in fatal crashes: traffic safety facts: research note.* United States. Department of Transportation. National Highway Traffic Safety …;2014.
57. DiMaggio C, Wheeler-Martin K, Oliver J. Alcohol-Impaired Driving in the United States: Review of Data Sources and Analyses. The National Academies Press. Getting to Zero Alcohol-Impaired Driving Fatalities: A Comprehensive Approach to a Persistent Problem Web site. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK500064/. Published 2018. Accessed 08/06/2021.

Table 1: Summary of the calculation of the Revised Trauma Scale (RTS) Score from the neuro-vital signs

Category	Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS)	Respiratory Rate (RR)	Systolic Blood Pressure (SBP)
0	13 – 15	10 – 29/minute	>89 mmHg
1	9 – 12	>29/minute	76 – 89 mmHg
2	6 – 8	6 – 9/minute	50 – 75 mmHg
3	4 – 5	1 – 5/minute	1 – 49 mmHg
4	3	0	0
RTS = (0.9368*GCS category) + (0.7326 * SBP category) + (0.2908 * RR category)			

Table 2: Frequency distribution and summary statistics of the demographic, crash, injury, and substance use characteristics of the study population (N=38,717)

Variables	Frequency (%) (N=58,238)	Low Acuity n=40,219 (69.1%)	Emergent n=14,336 (24.6%)	Critical n=3,035 (5.2%)	Fatal n=648 (1.1%)	p-value*
Age Categories						
65 – 74 years	36,189 (62.1)	25,238 (62.7)	8,783 (61.3)	1,793 (59.1)	375 (57.9)	<0.001
75 – 84 years	16,522 (28.4)	11,326 (28.2)	4,152 (29.0)	858 (28.3)	186 (28.7)	
85 years and older	5,527 (9.5)	3,655 (9.1)	1,401 (9.8)	384 (12.6)	87 (13.4)	
Sex						
Male	27,450 (47.1)	17,616 (43.8)	7,530 (52.5)	1,865 (61.4)	439 (67.7)	<0.001
Female	30,788 (52.9)	22,603 (56.2)	6,806 (47.5)	1,170 (38.6)	209 (32.3)	
Road User Type						
Pedestrian	4,626 (7.9)	2,724 (6.8)	1,339 (9.3)	458 (15.1)	105 (16.2)	<0.001
Two/Three Wheel Vehicles	3,848 (6.6)	2,162 (5.4)	1,241 (8.7)	384 (12.7)	61 (9.4)	
Truck/Buses/Industrial Vehicle	7,813 (13.4)	4,983 (12.4)	2,217 (15.5)	496 (16.3)	117 (18.1)	
Cars	41,951 (72.0)	30,350 (75.4)	9,539 (66.5)	1,697 (55.9)	365 (56.3)	
Anatomical Injured Region						
Head and Neck	10,026 (17.2)	6,165 (15.3)	2,817 (19.6)	830 (27.4)	214 (33.0)	<0.001
Abdomen and Genitals	12,823 (22.0)	10,037 (25.0)	2,486 (17.3)	291 (9.6)	9 (1.4)	
Chest and Back	11,660 (20.0)	8,222 (20.4)	3,007 (21.0)	406 (13.4)	25 (3.9)	
Extremities	10,045 (17.3)	7,397 (18.4)	2,290 (16.0)	347 (11.4)	11 (1.7)	
General Body	13,684 (23.5)	8,398 (20.9)	3,736 (26.1)	1,161 (38.2)	389 (60.0)	
Revised Trauma Score**						
Mean (SD)	7.71 (0.68)	7.83 (0.17)	7.70 (0.50)	6.58 (1.91)	2.31 (3.10)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	7.84 (7.84, 7.84)	7.84 (7.84, 7.84)	7.84 (7.84, 7.84)	7.84 (5.97, 7.84)	0.29 (0.00, 3.92)	<0.001
Geographical Location						
Rural	6,705 (11.5)	3,725 (9.3)	2,226 (15.5)	592 (19.5)	162 (25.0)	<0.001
Suburban	4,354 (7.5)	2,900 (7.2)	1,077 (7.5)	304 (10.0)	73 (11.3)	
Urban	47,179 (81.0)	33,594 (83.5)	11,033 (77.0)	2,139 (70.5)	413 (63.7)	
Environmental Location of Crash						
Parking lots/Sidewalks	11,721 (20.1)	7,430 (18.5)	3,323 (23.2)	878 (28.9)	90 (13.9)	<0.001
Street or Highways	1,895 (3.3)	1,250 (3.1)	491 (3.4)	122 (4.0)	32 (4.9)	

Other locations	44,622 (76.6)	31,539 (78.4)	10,522 (73.4)	2,035 (67.0)	526 (81.2)	
Time of the Day						
Morning Rush Hour	5,536 (9.5)	3,955 (9.8)	1,223 (8.5)	276 (9.1)	82 (12.7)	<0.001
Afternoon Rush Hour	16,406 (28.2)	11,275 (28.0)	4,084 (28.5)	875 (28.8)	172 (26.5)	
Nighttime Driving	3,703 (6.4)	2,403 (6.0)	981 (6.8)	250 (8.2)	69 (10.7)	
Other Hours	32,593 (56.0)	22,586 (56.2)	8,048 (56.1)	1,634 (53.8)	325 (50.1)	
Substance Use						
Yes	2,099 (3.6)	1,123 (2.8)	720 (5.0)	224 (7.4)	32 (4.9)	<0.001
No	56,139 (96.4)	39,096 (97.2)	13,616 (95.0)	2,811 (92.6)	616 (95.1)	

*Statistical differences in low acuity, emergent, and critical categories across all variables except Revised Trauma Score assessed using chi-square; **Mean differences in Revised Trauma Score were assessed using the one-way ANOVA, median differences assessed using the Kruskal-Wallis test

Table 3: Rural-urban differences in the frequency distribution and summary statistics of the demographic, crash, injury and substance use characteristics of the study population (N=38,717)

Variables	Rural (n=6,705)	Suburban (n=4,354)	Urban (n=47,179)	p-value*
Age Categories				
65 – 74 years	4,059 (60.5)	2,635 (60.5)	29,495 (62.5)	<0.001
75 – 84 years	2,022 (30.2)	1,305 (30.0)	13,195 (28.0)	
85 years and older	624 (9.3)	414 (9.5)	4,489 (9.5)	
Sex				
Male	3,587 (53.5)	2,190 (50.3)	25,506 (54.1)	<0.001
Female	3,118 (46.5)	2,164 (49.7)	21,673 (45.9)	
Road User Type				
Pedestrian	492 (7.3)	351 (8.1)	3,783 (8.0)	<0.001
Two/Three Wheel Vehicles	545 (8.1)	294 (6.7)	3,009 (6.4)	
Truck/Buses/Industrial Vehicle	1,273 (19.0)	706 (16.2)	5,834 (12.4)	
Cars	4,395 (65.6)	3,003 (69.0)	34,553 (73.2)	
Injured Region				
Head and Neck	1,229 (18.3)	751 (17.2)	8,046 (17.1)	<0.001
Abdomen and Genitals	1,031 (15.4)	811 (18.6)	10,981 (23.3)	
Chest and Back	1,407 (21.0)	852 (19.6)	9,401 (19.9)	
Extremities	1,338 (20.0)	832 (19.1)	7,875 (16.7)	
General Body	1,700 (25.3)	1,108 (25.5)	10,876 (23.0)	
Revised Trauma Score**				
Mean (SD)	7.65 (0.84)	7.70 (0.67)	7.72 (0.65)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	7.84 (7.84, 7.84)	7.84 (7.84, 7.84)	7.84 (7.84, 7.84)	<0.001
Environmental Location of Crash				
Parking lots/Sidewalks	1,754 (26.2)	1,037 (23.8)	8,930 (18.9)	<0.001
Street or Highways	245 (3.6)	137 (3.2)	1,513 (3.2)	
Other locations	4,706 (70.2)	3,180 (73.0)	36,736 (77.9)	
Time of the Day				
Morning Rush Hour	538 (8.0)	297 (6.8)	4,701 (10.0)	<0.001
Afternoon Rush Hour	1,806 (26.9)	1,154 (26.5)	13,446 (28.5)	
Nighttime Driving	381 (5.7)	300 (6.9)	3,022 (6.4)	
Other Hours	3,980 (59.4)	2,603 (59.8)	26,010 (55.1)	
Substance Use				
Yes	237 (3.5)	147 (3.4)	1,715 (3.6)	0.646
No	6,468 (96.5)	4,207 (96.6)	45,464 (96.4)	
Injury status				
Lower acuity	3,725 (55.6)	2,900 (66.6)	33,594 (71.2)	<0.001
Emergent	2,226 (33.2)	1,077 (24.7)	11,033 (23.4)	
Critical	592 (8.8)	304 (7.0)	2,139 (4.5)	
Fatal	162 (2.4)	73 (1.7)	413 (0.9)	

*Statistical differences in rural, suburban, and urban categories across all variables except Revised Trauma Score assessed using chi-square; **Mean differences in Revised Trauma Score were assessed using the one-way ANOVA, median differences assessed using the Kruskal-Wallis test

Table 4: Unadjusted and adjusted odds ratio of worse injury severity (critical, emergent, death vs. low acuity) associated with the demographic, crash, injury, and substance use characteristics among older adults

Variables	Critical/Emergent/Fatal vs Low Acuity**	
	Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)***
Age Categories		
65 – 74 years	Ref	Ref
75 – 84 years	**1.06 (1.02 – 1.10)**	**1.10 (1.05 – 1.14)**
85 years and older	**1.18 (1.11 – 1.25)**	**1.14 (1.07 – 1.22)**
Sex		
Male	**1.54 (1.49 – 1.60)**	**1.29 (1.24 – 1.34)**
Female	Ref	Ref
Road User Type		
Pedestrian	**1.83 (1.72 – 1.94)**	**1.57 (1.46 – 1.68)**
Two/Three Wheel Vehicles	**2.04 (1.91 – 2.18)**	**1.73 (1.61 – 1.86)**
Truck/Buses/Industrial Vehicle	**1.49 (1.41 – 1.56)**	**1.33 (1.26 – 1.41)**
Cars	Ref	Ref
Anatomical Injured Region		
Head and Neck	0.99 (0.94 – 1.05)	1.04 (0.98 – 1.10)
Abdomen and Genitals	**0.44 (0.42 – 0.47)**	**0.57 (0.54 – 0.61)**
Chest and Back	**0.66 (0.63 – 0.70)**	**0.86 (0.82 – 0.91)**
Extremities	**0.57 (0.54 – 0.60)**	**0.65 (0.61 – 0.69)**
General Body	Ref	Ref
Revised Trauma Score	**0.13 (0.12 – 0.15)**	**0.15 (0.13 – 0.16)**
Geographical Location		
Rural	**1.24 (1.16 – 1.32)**	**1.12 (1.05 – 1.21)**
Suburban	**1.98 (1.88 – 2.08)**	**1.77 (1.68 – 1.88)**
Urban	Ref	Ref
Environmental Location of Crash		
Parking lots/Sidewalks	**1.39 (1.33 – 1.45)**	**1.20 (1.14 – 1.25)**
Street or Highways	**1.24 (1.13 – 1.37)**	1.07 (0.96 – 1.18)
Other locations	Ref	Ref
Time of the Day		
Morning Rush Hour	**0.90 (0.85 – 0.96)**	**0.89 (0.83 – 0.95)**
Afternoon Rush Hour	1.03 (0.99 – 1.07)	1.00 (0.95 – 1.04)
Nighttime Driving	**1.22 (1.14 – 1.31)**	1.06 (0.98 – 1.14)
Other Hours	Ref	Ref
Substance Use		
Yes	**1.99 (1.82 – 2.18)**	**1.45 (1.31 – 1.59)**
No	Ref	Ref

*Univariate logistic regression used to perform the analysis; **Partially proportional ordinal logistic regression used to perform the analysis; ***Adjusted model consist of all listed variables.

Table 5: Unadjusted and adjusted odds of worse injury severity (critical, emergent, death vs. low acuity) associated with substance use across rural, suburban, and urban areas

Models	Variable	Critical/Emergent/Fatal vs Low Acuity	
		Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Rural Areas	Substance Use		
	Yes	**1.31 (1.02 – 1.71)**	0.98 (0.74 – 1.31)
	No	Ref	Ref
Suburban	Substance Use		
	Yes	**2.68 (1.92 – 3.73)**	**1.98 (1.36 – 2.87)**
	No	Ref	Ref
Urban	Substance Use		
	Yes	**2.09 (1.89 – 2.30)**	**1.48 (1.33 – 1.65)**
	No	Ref	Ref

Each model adjusted for age, sex, anatomical injured region, revised trauma score, environmental location of the injury, time of the day, and road user type.

Figure 1: Data selection steps



Figure 2: Predicted probabilities of substance used-associated injury outcomes across rural, suburban, and urban areas



Each model adjusted for age, sex, injured region, revised trauma score, location of the injury, and the time of the day; Vertical bars report the 95% confidence intervals.