medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The implications of using maternity care deserts to measure progress in access to obstetric care: A mixed-integer optimization analysis.

Meghan E. Meredith, BS
H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia, USA

Lauren N. Steimle, PhD*
H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia, USA

Stephanie M. Radke, MD, MPH
Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology
University of Iowa Hospitals & Clinics
Iowa City, Iowa, USA

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Background: Among the factors contributing to the maternal mortality crisis in the United States is a lack of risk-appropriate access to obstetric care. There are several existing measures of access to obstetric care in the literature and popular media. In this study, we explored how current measures of obstetric access inform the number and location of additional obstetric care facilities required to improve access.

Methods: We formulated two facility location optimization models to determine the number of new facilities required to minimize the number of reproductive-aged women living in obstetric care deserts. We define deserts as either “maternity care deserts”, designated by the March of Dimes to be counties with no obstetric care hospital or obstetric providers, or regions further than 50 miles from critical care obstetric (CCO) services. We gathered information on hospitals with obstetric services from Georgia Department of Public Health public reports and estimated the female reproductive-age population by census block group using the American Community Survey.

Results: Out of the 1,910,308 reproductive-aged women who live in Georgia, 104,158 (5.5%) live in maternity care deserts, 150,563 (7.9%) reproductive-aged women live further than 50 miles from CCO services, and 38,202 (2.0%) live in both “maternity care desert” and further than 50 miles from CCO services. Our optimization analysis suggests that 16 new obstetric facilities (a 19% increase from the current 83 facilities) are required to reduce the number of reproductive-aged women living in “maternity care deserts” by 50% (from 104,158 to 51,477). At least 56 new obstetric care facilities (a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

67% increase) would be required to eliminate maternity care deserts in Georgia. Meanwhile, expansion of 2 obstetric care facilities to offer CCO services would reduce the number of reproductive-aged women living further than 50 miles from CCO services by 50% (from 150,563 to 57,338), and 8 facilities would ensure all women in Georgia live within 50 miles of CCO services.

Conclusions: Current measures of access to obstetric care may not be sufficient for evaluating access and tracking progress toward improvements. In a state like Georgia with a large number of small counties, eliminating maternity care deserts would require a prohibitively large number of new obstetric care facilities. This work suggests that additional measures and tools are needed to estimate the number and type of obstetric care facilities that best match practical resources to obstetric care needs.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1. Background

The maternal mortality rate in the United States, 32.9 deaths per 100,000 live births as of 2021, is the highest among developed countries and has increased by 89% since 2018.[1,2] There is evidence that upwards of 80% of maternal deaths in the US are preventable.[3] Among the factors contributing to the maternal mortality crisis in the United States is a lack of access to risk-appropriate care and an undersupply of maternal healthcare providers.[2]

The lack of spatial access has been worsening in recent years. Over half of rural counties did not have a hospital offering obstetric services in 2014, and this number grew by 2.7% from 2014 to 2018.[4] Administrators cite financial concerns, shortages of obstetric professionals, and low volume as reasons for closing their obstetric units.[5,6] Lack of access to obstetric services is associated with adverse maternal outcomes, adverse neonatal outcomes, and prenatal stress.[7–11] Recent findings suggest a lack of access and disparities in spatial access will persist unless facility-level infrastructure is expanded.[12] However, spatial access to obstetric care is measured in several ways, which causes uncertainty about how to optimally invest in infrastructure to expand access. One common measure of access in the academic literature and news media is the “maternity care desert”.[13,14] The March of Dimes categorizes counties with a lack of access to care (no hospital or birth center offering obstetric care and no obstetric providers) as “maternity care deserts”. As of 2022, more than 2.2 million reproductive-aged women in the U.S. live in “maternity care deserts”.[15] Studies have shown that pregnant women who live in “maternity care deserts” have higher rates of infant and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

maternal mortality.[16,17] Other studies have measured spatial access as driving time to the nearest hospital offering obstetric services at different levels of care[12,18] and distance to the nearest hospital offering critical care obstetric (CCO) services[19,20] as key measures for quantifying potential access.

In contrast to these existing studies that measure current levels of access, we consider the implications of using these metrics as key performance indicators for tracking improvements in access to obstetric care. In particular, we ask: (1) What is required for states to reduce the number of women living in obstetric care deserts? (2) Is reducing obstetric care deserts in line with the broader goals of promoting optimal maternal outcomes? To answer these questions, we consider the implications of expanding access to care through facility expansions by drawing upon *mathematical optimization*. Optimization is a mathematical science that is widely used to identify the ideal solution while considering the complex interactions and constraints within a system.[21] The specific type of optimization modeling framework, facility location modeling, has often been used to evaluate the ideal placement of healthcare facilities to ensure proper coverage of a patient population.[22–24] A comprehensive review of healthcare facility location modeling is provided by Admadi-Javid et al.[25]

In this article, we characterize access to obstetric care using existing access measures and evaluate these existing measures by determining how many facilities are needed to provide a sufficient level of access according to these measures. We focus on the State of Georgia because Georgia has one of the highest rates of maternal mortality in the US

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

– almost twice as high as the national rate.[26] As of 2019 more than 75% of Georgia's 159 counties had no hospital or birth center offering obstetric care.[15] Georgia does have a set of Regional Perinatal Centers whose mission is to coordinate access to optimal and risk-appropriate maternal and infant care.[27] Georgia is taking multiple initiatives to improve obstetric outcomes, including extending Medicaid coverage, introducing quality improvement initiatives, verifying levels of maternal care in Georgia hospitals, and expanding home visiting in rural counties.[28]

First, we characterize regions as "obstetric care deserts" using two commonly used measures in the literature: (1) the March of Dimes "maternity care desert" measure[15] and (2) regions that are further than 50 miles from the closest hospital that provides CCO services. Upon defining a region as a desert or not, we report the total number of reproductive-aged women that live within an obstetric care desert under both measures. Finally, we analyze how many facilities would be needed in the state of Georgia to reduce the number of reproductive-aged women living in these obstetric deserts by 50% and 100%.

The goal of this paper is to evaluate the responsiveness of two existing access to obstetric care measures to obstetric facility expansion. We hypothesize that obstetric facility expansion policies focused on reducing maternity care deserts are impractical and could have negative consequences. We analyze current measures of obstetric access, but do not recommend new access to care measures or recommend an obstetric facility expansion policy.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2. Methods

2.1 Data Sources

First, we collect data to infer the spatial distribution of obstetric healthcare facilities and providers, as well as the spatial distribution of subpopulations and communities that would demand obstetric services. The data sources used are described below.

2.1.1 Location of Hospitals Providing Obstetric Care

We include obstetric hospitals in Georgia that are classified as birth centers, or Perinatal Care Level 1, 2, or 3 hospitals according to the public records from Georgia's Department of Public Health from 2017.[27] The address of each obstetric hospital was verified by the study team by cross-referencing with Google Maps, and the latitude and longitude of each obstetric hospital were located using Python's geopy package.[29]

2.1.3 Location of Demand for Obstetric Care

To estimate the demand for obstetric care access, we used data from the American Community Survey (ACS) which provides population estimates for age and sex groups. We used the 2017 ACS 5-year estimates of the population of reproductive-aged women (18-44) in each census block group, which we assume is proportional to the demand for obstetric care in each block group. We used 5-year estimates because they are the most reliable and they are collected for all small geographies including census block groups. To estimate the location of this demand, we used the latitude and longitude of center of population of each census block group as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2010.[30]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2.1.2 Distance to Obstetric Care

We calculated the distance between each obstetric hospital and each obstetric care demand point by calculating the great-circle distance in miles between the coordinates of each hospital and each census block group center of population.

2.2 Measures of Obstetric Access

We then determine which census block groups are defined to be obstetric deserts based on the measures outlined below.

2.2.1 "Maternity Care Desert"

We consider the March of Dimes definition of a "maternity care desert" which is defined to be a county that has zero hospitals or birth centers offering obstetric services and zero obstetric providers.[15] Because "maternity care deserts" are defined at the county level and the distance measure is defined at the census block group level, we deem any census block group in a "maternity care desert" county to be a "maternity care desert" census block group. We then use the following evaluation measures to compare these definitions.

2.2.2 Distance to Critical Care Obstetric (CCO) Hospital

We evaluate the distance from the center of population of each census block group to its nearest hospital offering CCO services. In line with previous studies,[20] we characterize hospitals as offering CCO services if they are designated as Level 3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

obstetric hospitals. We refer to public reporting from Georgia's Department of Public Health to characterize each hospital's level of care.[27] We then use Great Circle distance[29] to evaluate whether the census block group population center is within the pre-specified distance threshold of 50 miles. A 50-mile threshold is commonly used because it estimates the widely accepted "Golden Hour". The "Golden Hour" stems from trauma care, where it is thought that critically injured patients have better outcomes if they receive definitive care within an hour of their injuries,[31] although this threshold has not been validated for obstetric care.[32,33]

2.3 Evaluation Metrics

Using the measures above, we characterize each census block group as either having access to obstetric care or existing in an obstetric care desert.

2.3.1 Characterization of obstetric deserts

First, we characterize the number of census block groups that are deemed to be obstetric care deserts based on the definitions ("maternity care desert", > 50 miles from CCO services, and both a "maternity care desert" and > 50 miles from CCO services). We characterize the differences between the definitions of the populations that live in obstetric deserts in terms of demographics, including race, insurance, poverty, age, and marital status.

2.3.2 Other access measures for obstetric care deserts

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We characterize the distribution of distance to the closest obstetric hospital for different obstetric care desert definitions. We further characterize distance to care by Level of obstetric facility, calculating the driving time to the closest hospital offering Level 1, 2, and 3 care. We also determine the proportion of the population of obstetric care deserts that live in counties with an obstetric care facility (i.e., not a “maternity care desert”).

2.3.3 Evaluating the need for facility expansion to improve access

We consider how many new facilities would hypothetically be needed to reduce the number of reproductive-aged women living in deserts by 50% and 100%. To do so, we use a *mathematical optimization* model drawing from the facility location literature (see Appendix). This optimization model determines the optimal placement of new obstetric facilities to minimize the number of reproductive-aged women living in deserts. This model unrealistically assumes that we can readily build obstetric facilities anywhere we want. We revisit this assumption in the discussion.

We consider both definitions of obstetric deserts in our optimization models. First, we investigate the number of new obstetric facilities that would hypothetically be required to reduce the number of women in “maternity care deserts” by a given percentage. To do so, we formulated a mathematical optimization model that minimized the total number of reproductive-aged women who live in obstetric deserts by introducing at most X new obstetric hospitals. This model returns the optimal location of these X new facilities. Here, X is a parameter than was varied to analyze the change in the number of reproductive-aged women living in obstetric deserts as more facilities are introduced.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We also investigate the number of lower-level obstetric facilities that would need to be upgraded to CCO to reduce the number of women living further than 50 miles from a CCO facility by a given percentage. We formulated a second mathematical optimization model that minimized the total number of reproductive-aged women living further than 50 miles from CCO services by optimally choosing at most X existing obstetric hospitals to upgrade to CCO.

3. Results

3.1. Characterization of obstetric deserts

Figure 1 shows the regions that are designated as obstetric care deserts under the two definitions. In Georgia, there are 83 hospitals offering obstetric services. 56 counties that are deemed to be “maternity care deserts”, which contain a combined 524 census blocks. In comparison, 650 census block groups from 53 counties are deemed to be deserts using a 50-mile threshold.

Table 1 shows that out of the 1,910,308 reproductive-aged women who live in Georgia, 104,158 (5.5%) live in “maternity care deserts”, 150,563 reproductive-aged women (7.9%) live more than (>) 50 miles from CCO services, and 38,202 (2.0%) live in both “maternity care desert” and > 50 miles from CCO services.

In Georgia, 14.8% of people do not have insurance and 14.9% of people have Medicaid. These proportions are higher for people who live in regions characterized as “maternity care deserts” (16.9%, 21.1%), > 50 miles from CCO services (17.2%,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

20.4%), and regions designated as both (18.4%, 22.8%). Also, in Georgia, 16.9% of people have an income below the federal poverty line. This proportion is higher in regions characterized as “maternity care deserts” (23.7%), > 50 miles from CCO services (23.4%), and regions designated as both (25.1%).

3.2 Other access measures for obstetric care deserts

Table 2 shows the number of reproductive-aged women who live within the specified distance from obstetric services for each level of care. Of the 104,158 reproductive-aged women who live in “maternity care deserts”, 63% are within 50 miles of CCO services, 97% are within 50 miles of Level 2 care, and 100% are within 50 miles of any obstetric care facility. Of the 150,563 reproductive-aged women who live > 50 miles from CCO services, 98% are within 50 miles of Level 2 care, 100% are within 50 miles of any obstetric care facility, and 75% do not live in a maternity care desert. Of the 1,806,150 reproductive-aged women who do not live in maternity care deserts, 93% are within 50 miles of CCO services. Similarly, of the 1,759,745 women who are within 50 miles of CCO services, 96% live in a county with an obstetric care facility.

3.3 Responsiveness to interventions

Figure 2 shows the results of our optimization analysis. To hypothetically reduce the number of reproductive-aged women living in maternity care deserts by at least 50%, 16 new obstetric hospitals would be required in counties that are currently maternity care deserts. This would be an increase of 19% over the 83 current number of facilities offering obstetric services and would reduce the number of reproductive-aged women living in maternity care deserts from 104,158 to 51,477. To eliminate maternity care

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

deserts in Georgia, 56 new obstetric hospitals would be required (a 67% increase in obstetric facilities; one facility for each county that is currently a maternity care desert).

Our optimization analysis shows that to reduce the number of reproductive-aged women living 50 miles from CCO services by at least 50% (from 150,563 to 57,338 reproductive-aged women) it would require upgrading 2 obstetric facilities to offer CCO services. To eliminate all census block groups that are > 50 miles from CCO services, a minimum of 8 facilities would need to be upgraded to offer CCO services.

Figure 3 shows how many facilities are needed to reduce the number of reproductive-aged women to a specified level. The number of reproductive-aged women living in maternity care deserts does not decrease significantly with each expanded obstetric unit. In contrast, a small number of expanded CCO services dramatically reduces the number of reproductive-aged women living further than 50 miles from CCO services.

4. Discussion

Access to care is an important dimension to consider in the context of the maternal health crisis in the United States. Our study analyzed the implications of using existing measures of access to obstetric care as key performance indicators to evaluate and track improvements in access.

In this paper, we analyzed two current measures of obstetric access, including the popular maternity care deserts measure. Maternity care deserts are counties in which

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

there are no obstetric providers or obstetric care facilities. This measure has been widely used in both academic literature and popular media, and it has drawn widespread attention to the lack of access to obstetric care in the US. Consistent with the March of Dimes report, we found that 5.5% of reproductive-aged women in Georgia live in the 56 counties designated as maternity care deserts (more than the national average, 3.5%).[15] We found that 7.9% of reproductive-aged women live further than 50 miles from CCO services, which is less than a study using 2015 data which found that 10.2% of reproductive-aged women live further than 50 miles from CCO services.[20] This difference may be due to a difference in distance metrics or the procedures for identifying the locations and levels of obstetric hospitals. We additionally found that 2.0% of reproductive-aged women live in regions that are both maternity care deserts and further than 50 miles from CCO services.

In our analysis, we considered the hypothetical implications of using current access measures to inform facility expansions, with the goal of evaluating these measures without concern for costs or workforce barriers. Our optimization model showed that eliminating maternity care deserts in Georgia would require at least 56 new obstetric hospitals. Doing so would increase the number of obstetric hospitals by 67%, from 83 to 139. In contrast, ensuring all reproductive-age women in Georgia live within 50 miles of CCO services would require upgrading at least 8 lower-level hospitals to provide CCO services. Thus, these different measures of access imply very different strategies to expand access and imply very different estimates of how many obstetric facilities of different levels are needed in a geographic region.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Our findings suggest that additional tools are needed to provide estimates of how many facilities of each level of care are needed and can be sustained in a geographic region. Ideally, the number of facilities, their level of care designations, and coordination should promote optimal pregnancy outcomes. Access is indeed an important dimension to this problem, as rural regions have been associated with greater probability of severe maternal morbidity and mortality,[10] and “maternity care deserts” associated with higher rates of preterm birth, infant mortality, low birth weight, and maternal mortality.[16,17,34]

However, the maternity care desert measure is highly dependent on the number of counties in a state. Counties were determined by territories and states without standardization, resulting in high variability in the number and size of counties across states.[35] For example, Georgia has the second most counties of any state (159), only behind Texas (254), although Georgia is the 8th most populated state in the US and 24th largest by area. Thus, this measure may encourage a large number of obstetric units in Georgia simply because Georgia has a large number of counties, despite the fact that 82% of reproductive-aged women who live in maternity care deserts in Georgia live within 25 miles of an obstetric hospital.

Considering these measures of access alone could lead to unintended negative consequences. We showed that it would require a 67% increase in the number of obstetric hospitals to ensure no reproductive-aged women live in maternity care deserts in Georgia. Even if the economic forces would allow for so many obstetric facilities, a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

maternal healthcare system with that many obstetric facilities could have unintended negative consequences due to the dilution of volume across many low-volume rural hospitals, which are known to be associated with poor pregnancy outcomes.[36–39] Moreover, staffing this many units would likely be very expensive and challenging given that there are already obstetric workforce shortages in Georgia.[40]

While distance to CCO services could be a useful measure of access, this measure alone neither considers whether there are other nearby facilities that offer potentially sufficient lower-levels of obstetric care nor coordination between lower-level and CCO facilities. Thus, there are a variety of limitations in using measures of access alone to inform the number of facilities that are needed in a geographic region. These results motivate the need for access to maternity care measures that are capable of evaluating and tracking progress toward the reduction of lack of access. Additionally, these results motivate the need for additional methods and tools to estimate the number of facilities of different levels of care that are necessary and sustainable within a geographic region.

Our study is not without limitations. We did not account for geographical barriers or traffic when calculating distance from the centroid of a census block group when computing whether the group is further than 50 miles from CCO services, and we did not account for measurement errors in the ACS. We did not account for other important barriers to access, such as transportation disadvantage and insurance coverage. We also did not account for out-of-state hospitals that offer obstetric services that could provide care to pregnant people in Georgia. Finally, our analysis only considered

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

potential access. Future work may investigate the impact of facility expansion on realized access to care, especially considering some patients prefer to bypass local hospitals to receive care elsewhere.[41,42]

5. Conclusion

Our findings suggest that the current measures of obstetric access, while useful for capturing certain dimensions of the maternal healthcare system, may not be useful for estimating the optimal number, designations, and coordination of obstetric care within a geographic region. Specifically, the maternity care desert measure is not a practical performance indicator of improvements to access to obstetric care. Thus, there is a need for tools that can track improvements and inform the appropriate number of obstetric care facilities that are needed in a geographic region. In addition, future work may examine how to optimally balance the cost and outcomes of expanding care, considering the trade-offs between increased access and loss of quality due to dilution and staffing issues, and incorporating alternate access expansion strategies such as home visits, telemedicine, and transportation programs.

Declarations

Data Availability

Georgia hospital data is available in public records from Georgia's Department of Public Health from 2017.[27] All Georgia block group population counts data are publicly available from the U.S. Census Bureau. Link:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

https://data.census.gov/all?q=acs&g=040XX00US13$1500000&y=2017. Georgia block group population centroids are publicly available from the U.S. Census Bureau. Link: https://www.census.gov/geographies/reference-files/time-series/geo/centers-population.2010.html#list-tab-ZWAU50627XERV1TT2V. March of Dimes maternity care desert data is available in the March of Dimes report[15] and the March of Dimes maternity care deserts dashboard. Link: https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/life-sciences-and-health-care/articles/march-of-dimes-maternity-care-deserts-dashboard.html.

Funding

Research reported in this publication was supported in part by Imagine, Innovate and Impact (I3) from the Emory School of Medicine, Georgia Tech, by the Georgia CTSA NIH award (UL1-TR002378; Steimle) and by the National Science Foundation under grant number DGE-2039655 (Meredith); any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Hengyi Hu and Abel Sapirstein for their assistance with the data collection and Dr. Debra Kane for her thoughtful comments throughout the analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Hoyert DL. Maternal Mortality Rates in the United States, 2021. Published online 2023.

2. Maternal Mortality and Maternity Care in the United States Compared to 10 Other Developed Countries. doi:10.26099/411v-9255

3. Trost S, Beauregard J, Chandra G, et al. Pregnancy-Related Deaths: Data from Maternal Mortality Review Committees in 36 US States, 2017-2019.

4. Kozhimannil KB, Interrante JD, Tuttle MKS, Henning-Smith C. Changes in Hospital-Based Obstetric Services in Rural US Counties, 2014-2018. *JAMA*. 2020;324(2):197-199. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5662

5. Kozhimannil KB, Interrante JD, Admon LK, Basile Ibrahim BL. Rural Hospital Administrators' Beliefs About Safety, Financial Viability, and Community Need for Offering Obstetric Care. *JAMA Health Forum*. 2022;3(3):e220204. doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2022.0204

6. Daymude AEC, Daymude JJ, Rochat R. Labor and Delivery Unit Closures in Rural Georgia from 2012 to 2016 and the Impact on Black Women: A Mixed-Methods Investigation. *Matern Child Health J*. 2022;26(4):796-805. doi:10.1007/s10995-022-03380-y

7. Aubrey-Bassler FK, Cullen RM, Simms A, et al. Population-based cohort study of hospital delivery volume, geographic accessibility, and obstetric outcomes. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet Off Organ Int Fed Gynaecol Obstet*. 2019;146(1):95-102. doi:10.1002/ijgo.12832

8. Minion SC, Krans EE, Brooks MM, Mendez DD, Haggerty CL. Association of Driving Distance to Maternity Hospitals and Maternal and Perinatal Outcomes. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;140(5):812-819. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004960

9. Ondusko DS, Liu J, Hatch B, Profit J, Carter EH. Associations between maternal residential rurality and maternal health, access to care, and very low birthweight infant outcomes. *J Perinatol*. 2022;42(12):1592-1599.

10. Kozhimannil KB, Interrante JD, Henning-Smith C, Admon LK. Rural-Urban Differences In Severe Maternal Morbidity And Mortality In The US, 2007–15. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2019;38(12):2077-2085. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2019.00805

11. Woodward R, Mazure ES, Belden CM, et al. Association of prenatal stress with distance to delivery for pregnant women in Western North Carolina. *Midwifery*. 2023;118:103573. doi:10.1016/j.midw.2022.103573

12. Thorsen ML, Harris S, McGarvey R, Palacios J, Thorsen A. Evaluating disparities in access to obstetric services for American Indian women across Montana. *J Rural Health*. Published online 2021:1-10. doi:10.1111/jrh.12572

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

13. Tanne JH. Nearly six million women in the US live in maternity care deserts. *BMJ*. 2023;382:1878. doi:10.1136/bmj.p1878

14. National Academies of Sciences E and Medicine. *Advancing Maternal Health Equity and Reducing Maternal Morbidity and Mortality: Proceedings of a Workshop*. The National Academies Press; 2021. doi:10.17226/26307

15. *Nowhere to Go: Maternity Care Deserts across the US (Report No 3)*. March of Dimes; 2022. https://www.marchofdimes.org/maternity-care-deserts-report

16. Wallace M, Dyer L, Felker-Kantor E, et al. Maternity Care Deserts and Pregnancy-Associated Mortality in Louisiana. *Womens Health Issues Off Publ Jacobs Inst Womens Health*. 2021;31(2):122-129. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2020.09.004

17. Waits JB, Smith L, Hurst D. Effect of Access to Obstetrical Care in Rural Alabama on Perinatal, Neonatal, and Infant Outcomes: 2003-2017. *Ann Fam Med*. 2020;18(5):446-451. doi:10.1370/afm.2580

18. Rayburn WF, Richards ME, Elwell EC. Drive times to hospitals with perinatal care in the United States. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2012;119(3):611-616. doi:10.1097/AOG.0b013e318242b4cb

19. Brantley MD, Davis NL, Goodman DA, Callaghan WM, Barfield WD. Perinatal regionalization: a geospatial view of perinatal critical care, United States, 2010–2013. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2017;216(2):185.e1-185.e10. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.10.011

20. Kroelinger CD, Brantley MD, Fuller TR, et al. Geographic access to critical care obstetrics for women of reproductive age by race and ethnicity. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2021;224(3):304.e1-304.e11. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.08.042

21. Chong EKP, Zak SH. An Introduction to Optimization. *IEEE Antennas Propag Mag*. 1996;38(2):60-. doi:10.1109/MAP.1996.500234

22. Daskin MS, Dean LK. Location of Health Care Facilities. In: Brandeau ML, Sainfort F, Pierskalla WP, eds. *Operations Research and Health Care: A Handbook of Methods and Applications*. International Series in Operations Research & Management Science. Springer US; 2004:43-76. doi:10.1007/1-4020-8066-2_3

23. Pu Q, Yoo EH, Rothstein DH, Cairo S, Malemo L. Improving the spatial accessibility of healthcare in North Kivu, Democratic Republic of Congo. *Appl Geogr*. 2020;121:102262. doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2020.102262

24. Griffin PM, Scherrer CR, Swann JL. Optimization of community health center locations and service offerings with statistical need estimation. *IIE Trans*. 2008;40(9):880-892. doi:10.1080/07408170802165864

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

25. Ahmadi-Javid A, Seyedi P, Syam SS. A survey of healthcare facility location. *Comput Oper Res*. 2017;79:223-263. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2016.05.018

26. Hernandez ND, Aina AD, Baker LJ, et al. Maternal health equity in Georgia: a Delphi consensus approach to definition and research priorities. *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23(1):596. doi:10.1186/s12889-023-15395-3

27. Perinatal Health Unit. Core Requirements and Recommended Guidelines for Designated Regional Perinatal Centers Maternal & Child Health Section Office of Family and Community Health Perinatal Health Unit. 2013;(April).

28. *2018-2020 Maternal Mortality Report*. Georgia Department of Public Health

29. GeoPy Documentation.

30. *Centers of Population Computation for the United States. 1950 - 2010.* Geography Division, U.S. Census Bureau

31. Kidher E, Krasopoulos G, Coats T, et al. The effect of prehospital time related variables on mortality following severe thoracic trauma. *Injury*. 2012;43(9):1386-1392. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2011.04.014

32. Lerner EB, Moscati RM. The golden hour: scientific fact or medical “urban legend”? *Acad Emerg Med Off J Soc Acad Emerg Med*. 2001;8(7):758-760. doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2001.tb00201.x

33. Rogers FB, Rittenhouse KJ, Gross BW. The golden hour in trauma: dogma or medical folklore? *Injury*. 2015;46(4):525-527. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2014.08.043

34. Kozhimannil KB, Hung P, Henning-Smith C, Casey MM, Prasad S. Association Between Loss of Hospital-Based Obstetric Services and Birth Outcomes in Rural Counties in the United States. *JAMA*. 2018;319(12):1239-1247. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.1830

35. States, Counties, and Statistical Equivalent Entities. In: *Geographic Areas Reference Manual*. U.S. Census Bureau.

36. Snowden JM, Cheng YW, Emeis CL, Caughey AB. The impact of hospital obstetric volume on maternal outcomes in term, non–low-birthweight pregnancies. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;212(3):380.e1-380.e9. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2014.09.026

37. Janakiraman V, Lazar J, Joynt KE, Jha AK. Hospital Volume, Provider Volume, and Complications After Childbirth in U.S. Hospitals. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2011;118(3):521. doi:10.1097/AOG.0b013e31822a65e4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

38. Kyser KL, Lu X, Santillan DA, et al. The association between hospital obstetrical volume and maternal postpartum complications. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2012;207(1):42.e1-42.e17. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2012.05.010

39. Clapp MA, James KE, Kaimal AJ. The effect of hospital acuity on severe maternal morbidity in high-risk patients. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;219(1):111.e1-111.e7. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2018.04.015

40. Zertuche A, Spelke B. Georgia's General Assembly Joint Study Committee on Medicaid Reform: Georgia's Obstetric Care Shortage.

41. Carrel M, Keino BC, Novak NL, Ryckman KK, Radke S. Bypassing of nearest labor & delivery unit is contingent on rurality, wealth, and race. *Birth*. 2023;50(1):5-10. doi:10.1111/birt.12712

42. Thorsen ML, Harris S, Palacios J, McGarvey R, Thorsen A. American Indians Travel Great Distances for Obstetrical Care: Examining Rural and Racial Disparities. *Soc Sci Med*. (Forthcoming).

Tables and Figures

Figure 1. Current state of obstetric care deserts in Georgia under different definitions (A) Maternity Care Deserts, (B) > 50-miles from CCO services, (C) both Maternity Care Desert and > 50-miles from CCO services



Figure 2. The number of obstetric facilities needed to be expanded to reduce the number of reproductive-aged women in obstetric deserts by 50% and 100%.



Figure 3. The number of obstetric care facilities needed to reduce the number of reproductive-aged (RA) women in obstetric deserts based on two different definitions of obstetric care deserts.



Table 1. The characteristics of all people who live in Georgia by obstetric regions and the ages of reproductive-aged females by obstetric desert region.

Characteristics of Georgia Population by Obstetric Desert Region				
	Georgia Overall	Maternity Care Desert	> 50 miles from CCO Services	Maternity Care Desert & > 50 mi from CCO Services
Total Population	**10,201,635 (100.0%)**	**670,558 (6.6%)**	**890,237 (8.7%)**	**247,074 (2.4%)**
Race				
White	6,061,821 (59.4%)	427,994 (63.8%)	585,792 (65.8%)	164,592 (66.6%)
Black/African American	3,195,268 (31.3%)	210,003 (31.3%)	255,866 (28.7%)	71,646 (29.0%)
American Indian/Alaska Native	30,552 (0.3%)	1,540 (0.2%)	2,583 (0.3%)	712 (0.3%)
Asian	388,946 (3.8%)	4,031 (0.6%)	7,872 (0.9%)	1,180 (0.5%)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	5,237 (0.1%)	569 (0.1%)	264 (0.0%)	54 (0.0%)
Other	282,570 (2.8%)	16,151 (2.4%)	21,521 (2.4%)	5,600 (2.3%)
Multiracial	237,241 (2.3%)	10,270 (1.5%)	16,339 (1.8%)	3,290 (1.3%)
Ethnicity				
Hispanic/Latino	950,380 (9.3%)	37,438 (5.6%)	57,444 (6.5%)	16,797 (6.8%)
Insurance				
No Insurance	1,481,625 (14.8%)	108,443 (16.9%)	146,234 (17.2%)	43,264 (18.4%)
Medicaid	1,491,181 (14.9%)	135,480 (21.1%)	173,232 (20.4%)	53,606 (22.8%)
Poverty	1,679,030 (16.9%)	150,938 (23.7%)	198,171 (23.4%)	58,789 (25.1%)
Total Female Reproductive-aged (18-44)	**1,910,308 (18.7%)**	**104,158 (15.5%)**	**150,563 (16.9%)**	**38,202 (15.5%)**
18-24	492,292 (25.8%)	27,149 (26.1%)	41,512 (27.6%)	9,662 (25.3%)
25-34	709,387 (37.1%)	37,555 (36.1%)	55,886 (37.1%)	13,856 (36.3%)
35-44	708,629 (37.1%)	39,454 (37.9%)	53,165 (35.3%)	14,684 (38.4%)

Table 2. The number and proportion of the reproductive-aged women who live in Georgia overall and in an obstetric desert who live within the specified distance threshold of each level of obstetric care.

Reproductive-Aged Women Who Live Within Distance of Obstetric Care, N (%)						
Distance from Obstetric Care		Georgia Overall	Maternity Care Deserts	Not in Maternity Care Deserts	> 50 miles from CCO services	≤ 50 miles from CCO services
Distance	**Level of Care**	**N = 1,910,308 (100%)**	**N = 104,158 (5.5%)**	**N = 1,806,150 (94.5%)**	**N = 150,563 (7.9%)**	**N = 1,759,745 (92.1%)**
25 miles	1	1,194,235 (62%)	41,860 (40%)	1,152,375 (63%)	80,529 (53%)	1,113,706 (63%)
	2	1,546,787 (80%)	54,577 (52%)	1,492,210 (82%)	86,879 (57%)	1,459,908 (82%)
	3	1,490,107 (78%)	17,789 (17%)	1,472,318 (81%)	0 (0%)	1,490,107 (84%)
	Any	1,883,936 (98%)	85,763 (82%)	1,798,173 (99%)	140,714 (93%)	1,743,222 (99%)
50 miles	1	1,791,838 (93%)	86,719 (83%)	1,705,119 (94%)	132,182 (87%)	1,659,656 (94%)
	2	1,898,528 (99%)	101,364 (97%)	1,797,164 (99%)	148,257 (98%)	1,750,271 (99%)
	3	1,759,745 (92%)	65,956 (63%)	1,693,789 (93%)	0 (0%)	1,759,745 (100%)
	Any	1,910,308 (100%)	104,158 (100%)	1,806,150 (100%)	150,563 (100%)	1,759,745 (100%)
100 miles	1	1,910,308 (100%)	104,158 (100%)	1,806,150 (100%)	150,563 (100%)	1,759,745 (100%)
	2	1,910,308 (100%)	104,158 (100%)	1,806,150 (100%)	150,563 (100%)	1,759,745 (100%)
	3	1,909,715 (99%)	103,630 (99%)	1,806,085 (99%)	149,970 (99%)	1,759,745 (100%)
	Any	1,910,308 (100%)	104,158 (100%)	1,806,150 (100%)	150,563 (100%)	1,759,745 (100%)
Not in Maternity Care Deserts		1,806,150 (95%)	0 (0%)	1,806,150 (100%)	112,361 (75%)	1,693,789 (96%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix: Mathematical optimization models

In this appendix, we present our mathematical optimization models used to compare policy interventions. This decision-analytic approach provides a way to optimally allocate resources (e.g., facility expansions) across a system in a way that considers constraints (e.g., no more than 4 facilities can be expanded) and the objectives of the decision-makers (e.g., minimize the number of reproductive-aged (RA) women living in deserts).

Minimize the number of reproductive-aged women who live in obstetric deserts

We consider a set of counties $\mathcal{C} = \{1,2,\dots,C\}$ and a set of census block groups $\mathcal{B} = \{1,2,\dots,B\}$. The population of reproductive-aged women in census block group *b* is denoted by p_b. We use an indicator β_{bc} which takes on a value of 1 if census block group *b* is within county *c.* We use $q_c = 1$ to indicate if county c has no obstetric providers practicing within the county. We use an indicator x_c^0 which takes on a value of 1 if county *c* has no hospital or birth center providing obstetric care within the county.

For a county to be considered a "maternity care desert", it must have no obstetric providers practicing and no hospital or birth center providing obstetric care within the county.

We consider whether the county is an "maternity care desert" or not using an indicator d_c denoting that county *c* is a desert ($d_c = 1$ indicates that county *c* is a desert while $d_c = 0$ indicates that county c is not a desert). If a county is an "maternity care desert",

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

then all block groups within the county are also obstetric deserts. We indicate if a block group is an obstetric care desert using an indicator d_b ($d_b = 1$ indicates that census block group *b* is a desert while $d_b = 0$ indicates that census block group *b* is not a desert). Thus, the total number of women who currently live in obstetric deserts is given by: $\sum_{i=1}^{B} p_b d_b$.

To consider the impact of policy interventions, we consider the possibility that hospitals can be expanded to provide obstetric services. We designate *decision variables* $x_c \in \{0,1\}$ such that $x_c = 1$ means county *c* has a hospital or birth center providing obstetric care after infrastructure is expanded. We consider a *constraint* that we can expand at most F facilities to provide obstetric care: $\sum_{c=1}^{C}(x_c - x_c^0) \leq F$. We also consider a set of *constraints* that each county is considered a desert if it has no obstetric providers and no hospital or birth centers within the county: $d_c \geq q_c + x_c - 1$. Further, we add another set of *constraints* that each block group is considered a desert only if it is within a county that is a desert: $d_b \geq \sum_{c=1}^{C} d_c \beta_{bc}$. Finally, we add a set of *constraints* $x_c \geq x_c^0$ which enforce that no county can be downgraded such that they no longer have a hospital or birth center providing obstetric services.

Our optimization model will select the values of the decision variables that satisfy the constraints in order to minimize our objective function. To minimize the total number of reproductive-aged women in obstetric deserts, we will minimize the following objective function:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

$$minimize_x \sum_{b=1}^{B} p_b d_b$$

Thus, our final optimization model is:

$$minimize_x \sum_{b=1}^{B} p_b d_b$$

Subject to:

$$\sum_{c=1}^{C} (x_c - x_c^0) \leq F$$

$$d_b \geq (q_c + x_c) - 1, \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}$$

$$d_b \geq \sum_{c=1}^{C} d_c \beta_{bc}, \qquad \forall b \in \mathcal{B}$$

$$x_c \geq x_c^0 , \qquad \forall\, h \in \mathcal{H}$$

$$x_c \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}$$

$$d_c \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}$$

$$d_b \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall b \in \mathcal{B}$$

We can solve this problem quickly by ranking the counties in terms of p_c and selecting the B largest values. We solve this problem for a range of F values (F = 1,2,3,…) to evaluate how the number of maternity care deserts changes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Minimize the number of women of who live more than 50 miles from CCO services

We consider a set of census block groups $\mathcal{B} = \{1,2,\ldots,B\}$, and the population of reproductive-aged women in census block group *b* is denoted by p_b. We also consider a set of obstetric hospitals $\mathcal{H} = \{1,2,\ldots,H\}$. We use an indicator x_h^0 which takes on a value of 1 if hospital *h* provides CCO services. We use an indicator α_{bh} which takes on a value of 1 if census block group *b* is within 50 miles of hospital *h.*

To consider the impact of policy interventions, we allow hospitals that do not provide CCO services to be upgraded to provide CCO services. We consider *decision variables* $x_h \in \{0,1\}$ such that $x_h = 1$ indicates that hospital *h* provides CCO services after upgrades. Then, we add *constraints* to enforce that a census block group is deemed a desert if it is > 50 miles from CCO services ($d_b = 1$ indicates that census block group *b* is a desert while $d_b = 0$ indicates that census block group *b* is not a desert). Thus, the total number of women who currently live in obstetric deserts is given by: $\sum_{i=1}^{B} p_b d_b$. We consider a *constraint* that we can upgrade at most F facilities to provide critical care obstetric services: $\sum_{h=1}^{H}(x_h - x_h^0) \leq F$. Further, we add a set of constraints $d_b \geq 1 - \sum_{h=1}^{H} \alpha_{ch} x_h$ which enforce that a census block group is considered a desert if it is > 50 miles from its nearest obstetric hospital offering CCO services. Finally, we add a set of constraints $x_h \geq x_h^0$ which enforce that no hospitals can be downgraded such that they no longer provide CCO services.

Our optimization model will select the values of the decision variables that satisfy the constraints in order to minimize our objective function. To minimize the total number of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297779; this version posted November 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

reproductive-aged women in obstetric deserts, we will minimize the following objective function:

$$minimize_{\ x,d} \sum_{b=1}^{B} p_b d_b$$

Thus, our final optimization model is:

$$minimize_{\ x,d} \sum_{b=1}^{B} p_b d_b$$

Subject to:

$$\sum_{h=1}^{H} (x_h - x_h^0) \leq F$$

$$d_b \geq 1 - \sum_{h=1}^{H} \alpha_{ch} x_h, \quad \forall b \in \mathcal{B}$$

$$x_h \geq x_h^0, \qquad \forall\, h \in \mathcal{H}$$

$$x_h \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}$$

$$d_b \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall b \in \mathcal{B}$$

We solve this problem for a range of *F* values.