Trajectories in county-level Low Birthweight Rates and Associated Contextual Factors in the United States, 2016-2021

AUTHORS: Pallavi Dwivedi, MS, MPH[a], Thu T. Nguyen, ScD MSPH[a], Xin He, PhD[a], Quynh C. Nguyen, PhD[a]

AFFILIATIONS: [a] Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Maryland School of Public Health, College Park, Maryland, United States

CORRESPONDENCE TO: Pallavi Dwivedi, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Maryland School of Public Health, College Park, Maryland

Email: pdwived1@umd.edu

Manuscript word count: 3082 Abstract word count: 237

Tables: 4 Figures: 1

eTables: 1 eFigures: 1

Conflict of Interest statement: The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Infants with low birthweight (less than 2500 grams) have greater risk of mortality, long-term neurologic disability and chronic diseases such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease as compared to infants with normal birthweight. This study examined the trajectories of low birthweight rate in the U.S. across the metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties over the time period of 2016-2021 and the associated contextual factors.

Methods

This longitudinal study utilized data on 21,759,834 singleton births across 3,108 counties. Data on birthweight and maternal sociodemographic and behavioral characteristics was obtained from the National Center for Health Statistics. A generalized estimating equations model was used to examine the association of county-level contextual variables with low birthweight rates.

Results

A significant increase in low birthweight rates was observed across the counties over the duration of the study. Large metro and small metro counties had significantly higher low birthweight rates as compared to non-metro counties. High percentage of Black women, underweight women, age more than 35 years, lack of prenatal care, uninsured population, and

high violent crime rate was associated with an increase in low-birth-weight rates. Other contextual characteristics (percentage of married women, American Indian/Alaskan Native women, and unemployed population) differed in their associations with low birthweight rates depending on county metropolitan status.

Conclusions

Our study findings emphasize the importance of developing interventions to address geographical heterogeneity in low birthweight burden, particularly for metropolitan areas and communities with vulnerable racial/ethnic and socioeconomic groups.

Keywords

Low Birthweight, contextual factors, heterogeneity, maternal factors

INTRODUCTION

In comparison with normal birthweight infants, neonates with low birthweight (< 2500 grams at birth) have higher risk of mortality, and chronic diseases such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes.[1,2,3,4] The determinants of low birthweight include multiple gestation or carrying more than one fetus, obstetric complications, infections, smoking, drinking alcohol, drug abuse, stress, undernutrition and chronic maternal conditions such as hypertension.[2,4,5,6] Prenatal exposure to air pollution has also been shown to be associated with low birthweight.[2] Previous studies have also suggested that racial discrimination is associated with increased risk of preterm and low birthweight.[7,8] The low birthweight rate for Black people has been more than twice that for White people from 2006-2016.[9]

The prevalence of low birthweight in the U.S. was estimated to be 8.3% in 2018 by National Center for Health Statistics.[10] The Healthy People 2020 goal was to reduce the rate of low birthweight to 7.8%.[11] While several previous studies have examined the maternal factors, which are associated with low birthweight of infants, none of these studies examined the patterns of low birthweight rates based on the metropolitan status of counties across the U.S.. In this study, we examined whether there is any variation in the rates of low birthweight rates based on the metropolitan status of U.S. counties. In addition, we examined whether the effect of certain county-level contextual factors such as socioeconomic disadvantage, and maternal factors such as marital status and race or ethnicity on low birthweight rates vary based on the metropolitan status of counties. We also examined the distribution of low birthweight risk across the counties. Examination of geographical variation in low birthweight rates and

associated contextual factors can help to inform interventions and policies and reduce cases of low birthweight.

Study aims and hypotheses.

The aim of this study was to examine the trajectories of low birthweight rate at the county scale based on the metropolitan status of counties and the association of county-level contextual factors with low birthweight rates over the time period of 2016-2021. We hypothesized that there is variation in low birthweight rates based on the metropolitan status of counties and certain county-level contextual factors such as socioeconomic disadvantage, violent crime rate, and maternal factors such as marital status and race or ethnicity might influence the disparities in low birthweight rate across the counties.

METHODS

County-level health data

This longitudinal study utilized data on 21,759,834 singleton births across 3,108 counties for the time period of 2016-2021. Data on birthweight and maternal characteristics (e.g., live birth order, race or ethnicity, age, marital status, prenatal care, body mass index, cigarette smoking status during first, second or third trimester of pregnancy, maternal education) were obtained from the restricted natality files with geographical identifiers from the National Center for Health Statistics.[12] Data on county-level time-varying contextual variables, such as percentage of unemployed population, percentage of uninsured population, violent crime rate per 100,000 population, and primary care provider rate per 100,000 population were obtained from the County Health Rankings data.[13]

43

44 *Measures*

45 Counts of low birthweight cases were aggregated by county in two-year study periods (2016-
46 2017, 2018-2019 and 2020-2021) to enable stabilization of low birthweight rates. Similarly, data
47 on county-level time-varying contextual variables, such as percentage of unemployed
48 population, percentage of uninsured population, violent crime rate per 100,000 population,
49 primary care provider rate per 100, 000 population were aggregated for the two-year study
50 periods. Data on maternal characteristics (live birth order, race or ethnicity, age, marital status,
51 prenatal care, body mass index, cigarette smoking status during first, second or third trimester
52 of pregnancy, maternal education) was also aggregated for the two-year study periods. The
53 National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) Urban–Rural Classification Scheme for counties was
54 used to classify counties.[14] The NCHS scheme is a 6-category classification scheme based on
55 county population. The six categories were combined into 3 categories, and the counties were
56 classified as large metropolitan counties (metro areas of 250,000 population or more), small
57 metropolitan counties (metro areas of fewer than 250,000 population) and non-metropolitan
58 counties.

59

60 *Statistical Analysis*

61 The geographic distribution of low birthweight rates for each two-year study period was
62 examined by calculating the Standardized Incidence Ratios (SIRs). The SIRs can be calculated as
63 the ratio of observed to expected count of low birthweight cases for each county. The state-

level low birthweight rates were used to calculate county-level expected count of low birthweight cases by multiplying state-level low birthweight rates with total number of births per county. The county level observed, or raw rates of low birthweight can be misleading, particularly if the data are sparse due to small population size. Therefore, a Bayesian hierarchical model was used to compute smoothed SIRs and exceedance probability of SIR being greater than 1 for each county during each study period.[15,16] The Bayesian model comprised of a spatial random effect term, which incorporates the influence of neighboring counties, and a non-spatial or unstructured variability term. The spatial random effect term can be defined as a conditional autoregressive Gaussian process with mean equal to the mean of the spatial effects of the neighboring geographic units and precision (τ_v). The non-spatial random effect term was normally distributed with mean equal to zero and precision (τ_u). Gamma (0.5, 0.0005) priors were assigned to the precision terms in the model. The R-INLA package in R was utilized to conduct Bayesian inference by using the integrated nested Laplace approximation (INLA) method.[17,18.]

A generalized estimating equations (GEE) model with a log link function was used to examine the association of county-level contextual variables with low birthweight rates from 2016-2021. The variances of low birthweight cases within each type of county classification (non-metro/small-metro/large-metro) was higher than the mean low birthweight cases, which suggested the presence of overdispersion in the data (eTable 1). Therefore, negative binomial regression was utilized, and the log of the total number of births per county was used as an offset variable to allow for the interpretation as low birthweight rates. A random effect term was included to adjust for the within-county correlations among repeated measures during

86 three measurement periods (2016-2017, 2018-2019 and 2020-2021). We hypothesized that
87 metropolitan status of counties moderates or modifies the effect of socioeconomic status of
88 women on low birthweight rates. Therefore, interaction between metropolitan status and
89 county-level percentage of uninsured population and percentage of unemployed population
90 were examined. We also examined the interaction between metropolitan status and
91 measurement period, maternal race and ethnicity, and marital status of women. The variables
92 such as the county-level percentage of women with live birth order more than one, women
93 within age range of 35-54 years, women who did not receive any prenatal care, underweight
94 women based on their Body Mass Index (BMI), women who smoked cigarette during
95 pregnancy, women with education more than high school, county-level primary care provider
96 rate (per 100,000 population) and violent crime rate per 100,000 population were included as
97 control variables in the model. This study was determined exempt by the University of
98 Maryland College Park Institutional Review Board (1797788-1).

99 **RESULTS**

100 There were a total of 1,444,384 low birthweight cases, out of 21,759,834 singleton births, over
101 the duration of 2016-2021. The percentage of low birthweight cases was similar over the three
102 study periods (486,893 [6.49%] in 2016-2017; 481,152 [6.63%] in 2018-2019; 476,339 [6.8%] in
103 2020-2021). The median low birthweight rate was similar over the three study periods (~ 4 per
104 100 births). Large metropolitan counties accounted for the greatest number of low birthweight
105 cases (1,201,200 [83.16%]), followed by small metropolitan counties (142,938 [9.90%]) and
106 non-metropolitan counties (100,246 [6.94%]).

Geographic distribution of low-birth-weight rates

Figure 1 presents the smoothed Standardized Incidence Ratio (SIRs) of low birthweight and Bayesian exceedance probability for SIR greater than 1 for the three study periods. The county-level SIRs ranged from 0.23 to 13.68, 0.24 to 9.89 and 0.18 to 12.45 in 2016-2017, 2018-2019 and 2020-2021, respectively. The median (interquartile range) for SIR for the study periods of 2016-2017, 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 were 0.76 [0.57-0.98], 0.74 [0.56-0.98] and 0.68 [0.50-1.01] respectively. SIRs greater than 1 indicate higher than expected risk of low birthweight, and SIRs less than 1 represent lower than expected risk of low birthweight. We observed an elevated risk of low birthweight in several counties in California, Arizona, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas and in southern, midwestern and northeastern states over the three study periods (Figure 1).

Contextual variables associated with low birthweight rates.

GEE model was used to examine the association of county-level contextual variables with low birthweight rates (Table 1). We examined whether metropolitan status of counties moderates the effect of socioeconomic status, marital status and racial group of women on low birthweight rates. Therefore, we examined interactions between contextual variables such as percentage of uninsured population, unemployed population, maternal racial group, marital status and county type (large metropolitan, small metropolitan and non-metropolitan). We also examined interaction between county type and study period. The interactions between county type and county-level percentage of American Indian/Alaskan native women, percentage of married women and unemployed population were significant. Stratified models based on the

128 county type or metropolitan status were used to examine the effect of county-level percentage
129 of married women, American Indian/Alaskan Native women and unemployed population on
130 low-birth-weight rates after adjusting for all the covariates (Tables 2 - 4). County-level
131 percentage of women with live birth order of more than one, women within age range of 35-54
132 years, underweight women based on BMI, women with education more than high school,
133 women who smoked cigarette during pregnancy, women who did not receive any prenatal care
134 and county-level violent crime rate per 100,000 population and primary care provider rate (per
135 100,000 population) were included as control variables in the model.

136 Table 1 presents the incidence rate ratios (IRR) for low birthweight for each predictor variable
137 after adjusting for all the other covariates. All predictor variables were standardized to have a
138 mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1. After adjusting for all the covariates, one standard
139 deviation increase in the county-level percentage of Black women (incidence rate ratio, IRR =
140 1.22, 95% CI = 1.20, 1.24) was associated with higher low birthweight rates. One standard
141 deviation increase in the percentage of women who did not obtain any prenatal care, women
142 who were underweight based on their BMI and women who smoked cigarette during
143 pregnancy was associated with increased low birthweight rates (IRR for no prenatal care =1.27,
144 95% CI = 1.23, 1.32; IRR for underweight based on BMI = 1.08, 95% CI = 1.03, 1.13; IRR for
145 smoking during pregnancy= 1.24 , 95% CI = 1.21, 1.28 respectively). An increase in the
146 percentage of women of age 35-54 years was associated with an increase in low birthweight
147 rates (IRR = 1.06, 95% CI = 1.01, 1.11). One standard deviation increase in the percentage of
148 women with live birth order more than one was associated with reduced low birthweight rates
149 (IRR = 0.89, 95% CI = 0.85, 0.93). One standard deviation increase in the county-level

150 percentage of uninsured women was associated with a significant increase in low birthweight
151 rates (IRR = 1.10, 95% CI = 1.09, 1.12). An increase in the county-scale violent crime rate was
152 associated with higher low birthweight rate (IRR =1.07, 95% CI = 1.06, 1.09). One standard
153 deviation increase in the county-level primary care provider rate was associated with a
154 significant increase in low birthweight rates (IRR = 1.09, 95% CI = 1.07, 1.11).

155 We did not observe any significant interaction between metropolitan status or county type and
156 study periods. Compared to the baseline study period of 2016-2017, there was a significant
157 increase in low birthweight rates in the study periods of 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 in all the
158 counties after adjusting for all the covariates (2018-2019: IRR = 1.11, 95% CI = 1.09, 1.13; 2020-
159 2021: IRR = 1.15, 95% CI = 1.13, 1.18). Large metropolitan counties and small metropolitan
160 counties had higher low birthweight rates as compared to non-metropolitan counties over the
161 study duration after adjusting for all the covariates (Large metro: IRR = 1.24, 95% CI = 1.20,
162 1.29; Small metro: IRR = 1.21, 95 % CI =1.16, 1.27). eFigure 1 presents the trajectory of low
163 birthweight rate for large metropolitan, small metropolitan and non-metro counties over the
164 duration of the study.

165 An increase in the county-level percentage of married women was associated with reduced low
166 birthweight rates in non-metropolitan and large metropolitan counties after adjusting for all
167 the covariates (Table 2: Non-metro: IRR = 0.90, 95% CI =0.86, 0.94; Large metro: IRR = 0.98, 95%
168 CI = 0.96, 0.99). One standard deviation increase in the county scale percentage of unemployed
169 population was associated with higher low birthweight rate in non-metropolitan counties
170 (Table 3: IRR = 1.04, 95% CI = 1.02, 1.06). Table 4 presents the incidence rate ratio of low
171 birthweight for one standard deviation increase in county scale percentage of American

172 Indian/Alaskan Native women based on the metropolitan status of counties. An increase in the
173 percentage of American Indian/Alaskan native women was associated with higher low
174 birthweight rates in small metropolitan counties (IRR = 1.08, 95% CI = 1.02, 1.15) and reduced
175 low birthweight rates in non-metro counties (IRR = 0.97, 95% CI = 0.95, 0.98).

176 **DISCUSSION**

177 This study examined county-level low birthweight rate trajectories in the U.S. during the 6-year
178 period from 2016 to 2021 across the metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties.

179 There was a significant increase in low birthweight rates in all the counties over the duration of
180 the study. Large metropolitan and small metropolitan counties had significantly higher low
181 birthweight rates as compared to non-metropolitan counties over the duration of the study.
182 These differences in low birthweight rates based on the metropolitan status of counties might
183 be attributed to demographic or racial and socioeconomic disparities across these
184 counties.[19,20,21] Black race was associated with high low birthweight rates. We also observed a
185 significant increase in low birthweight rates with an increase in county level violent crime rate
186 (per 100,000 population). A study conducted by Messer et al. [22] reported that Black women are
187 more likely to live in disadvantaged neighborhoods, or neighborhoods with high poverty,
188 unemployment, and violent crime rate as compared to White women. Additionally, the authors
189 suggested that Black women living in racially heterogenous areas with high crime rates might
190 be exposed to stress resulting from racial discrimination. Several other studies have suggested a
191 positive association between stress and adverse birth outcomes.[23,24.]

192 An increase in the county-level percentage of married women was significantly associated with
193 reduced low birthweight rates in non-metro and large metropolitan counties. Several studies
194 have suggested that unmarried women are more likely to have poor socioeconomic
195 conditions.[25,26] A study conducted by Taffel[27] found that unmarried Black women are more
196 likely to give birth to a low birthweight infant as compared to unmarried White women. Studies
197 conducted by Rubin[28] and Alhusen et al. [29] found that maternal sociodemographic
198 characteristics, health behavior and prenatal care do not adequately account for disparities in
199 birth outcomes among Black and White women. An increase in the county-level percentage of
200 the unemployed population was significantly associated with higher low birthweight rates in
201 non-metropolitan counties. As study conducted by Hargraves[30] suggested that women living in
202 rural or non-metropolitan counties are affected by inequalities and biases based on gender,
203 reduced transportation and employment with lower salaries and inadequate health insurance.
204 The women of racial and ethnic minority groups are more likely to experience these limitations
205 in rural counties as compared to White women.

206 An increase in the county-level percentage of women who did not receive any prenatal care
207 and the uninsured population was significantly associated with high low birthweight rates. A
208 previous study, conducted by Taylor et al., [31] suggested that women with Medicaid or no
209 insurance are less likely to seek preventive care and have adverse birth outcomes such as
210 preterm birth, preeclampsia and low birthweight as compared to women with commercial
211 insurance. High percentage of underweight women based on their BMI and women who
212 smoked cigarette during first, second or third trimester of pregnancy was associated with high
213 low birthweight rates. These findings are consistent with the findings from the study conducted

214 by Gunther et al., [32] which reported that exposure to nicotine or cigarette smoking during
215 pregnancy are associated with adverse birth outcomes. While maternal age within the range of
216 35-54 years was associated with higher low birthweight rate, an increase in the percentage of
217 women with previous live births (live birth order >1) was associated with reduced low
218 birthweight rate. Few previous studies have reported similar effect of maternal age and live
219 birth order on birth weight of infants.[33,34.]

220 An increase in the county-level percentage of American Indian/Alaskan Native women was
221 significantly associated with an increase in low birthweight rate in small metropolitan counties
222 and a decrease in low birthweight rate in non-metropolitan counties. American Indian/Alaskan
223 Native racial group has been reported to be at increasing rates of socioeconomic disadvantage
224 as compared to White women. Several other studies have also reported disparities in birth
225 outcomes between the American Indian/Alaskan Native women and White women and other
226 racial groups.[35,36] A study conducted by Call et al. [37] reported that American Indian/Alaskan
227 Native racial group experiences barriers to healthcare due to racial discrimination and biases
228 based on their religious beliefs by health care providers. Though access to healthcare has
229 improved among this subpopulation due to Indian Health Service (IHS), disparities in birth
230 outcomes exist in this racial group due to reduced availability of IHS in urban areas.[38,39]

231

232 **CONCLUSIONS**

233 Low birthweight infants have a higher risk of mortality and chronic disorders as compared to
234 infants with normal birthweight. This study identified potential risk factors associated with low

235 birthweight and the variation in the low birthweight rates based on the metropolitan status of
236 counties. Based on our study findings, maternal factors such as racial or ethnic group, BMI, age,
237 cigarette smoking during pregnancy, socioeconomic status, marital status, prenatal care, health
238 insurance and county-scale violent crime rate are significant predictors of low birthweight rate
239 at the county level. We also observed a significant increase in low birthweight rates over the
240 duration of the study. Large metropolitan and small metropolitan counties had high rates of
241 low birthweight as compared to non-metropolitan counties over the duration of the study. Our
242 study findings emphasize the importance of developing interventions tailored specifically for
243 high risk or vulnerable racial or ethnic and socioeconomic groups to reduce low birthweight
244 rates. In addition, we examined geographical distribution of low birthweight risk across the
245 counties and find heterogeneity which suggests additional resources might be warranted to
246 further support areas at higher risk of adverse birth outcomes.

247

248

249

250

Funding

Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities [R00MD012615 (TTN), R01MD015716 (TTN), R01MD016037 (QCN], the National Library of Medicine [R01LM012849 (QCN)]. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

REFERENCES

1. Wardlaw, T. M. (2004). *Low Birthweight: Country, Regional and Global Estimates*. UNICEF.
2. Cutland, C. L., Lackritz, E. M., Mallett-Moore, T., Bardají, A., Chandrasekaran, R., Lahariya, C., Nisar, M. I., Tapia, M. D., Pathirana, J., Kochhar, S., Muñoz, F. M., & Brighton Collaboration Low Birth Weight Working Group. (2017). Low birth weight: Case definition & guidelines for data collection, analysis, and presentation of maternal immunization safety data. *Vaccine*, *35*(48 Pt A), 6492–6500.
3. Malin, G. L., Morris, R. K., Riley, R., Teune, M. J., & Khan, K. S. (2014). When is birthweight at term abnormally low? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the association and predictive ability of current birthweight standards for neonatal outcomes. In *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* (Vol. 121, Issue 5, pp. 515–526). https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.12517
4. Blencowe, H., Krasevec, J., de Onis, M., Black, R. E., An, X., Stevens, G. A., Borghi, E., Hayashi, C., Estevez, D., Cegolon, L., Shiekh, S., Ponce Hardy, V., Lawn, J. E., & Cousens, S. (2019). National, regional, and worldwide estimates of low birthweight in 2015, with trends from 2000: a systematic analysis. *The Lancet. Global Health*, *7*(7), e849–e860.
5. Ratnasiri, A. W. G., Parry, S. S., Arief, V. N., DeLacy, I. H., Halliday, L. A., DiLibero, R. J., & Basford, K. E. (2018). Recent trends, risk factors, and disparities in low

291 birth weight in California, 2005–2014: a retrospective study. *Maternal Health,*
292 *Neonatology and Perinatology*, *4*(1), 15.
293 6. Ashdown-Lambert, J. R. (2005). A review of low birth weight: predictors, precursors and
294 morbidity outcomes. *The Journal of the Royal Society for the Promotion of*
295 *Health*, *125*(2), 76–83.
296 7. Mustillo, S., Krieger, N., Gunderson, E. P., Sidney, S., McCreath, H., & Kiefe, C. I. (2004).
297 Self-Reported Experiences of Racial Discrimination and Black–White Differences in
298 Preterm and Low-Birthweight Deliveries: The CARDIA Study. *American Journal of Public*
299 *Health*, *94*(12), 2125–2131.
300 8. Collins, J. W., Jr, David, R. J., Handler, A., Wall, S., & Andes, S. (2004). Very
301 low birthweight in African American infants: the role of maternal exposure
302 to interpersonal racial discrimination. *American Journal of Public Health*, *94*(12),
303 2132–2138.
304 9. Womack, L. S., Rossen, L. M., & Martin, J. A. (2018). *Singleton Low birthweight rates,*
305 *by race and hispanic origin: United States, 2006--2016*.
306 https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/52611
307 10. Martin, J. A., Hamilton, B. E., Osterman, M. J., & Driscoll, A. K. (2019). Births: Final
308 data for 2018.
309 11. US Department of Health and Human Services. (2012). Maternal, infant, and child
310 health. Healthy People 2020.
311 12. National Center for Health Statistics. Restricted-Use Vital Statistics Data. (2021).

13. County Health Rankings data. (2016-2021). https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/rankings-data-documentation

14. National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) Urban-Rural Classification Scheme for counties. (2013). https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data_access/urban_rural.htm

15. Besag, J., York, J., & Mollié, A. (1991). Bayesian image restoration, with two applications in spatial statistics. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, *43*(1), 1–20.

16. Richardson, S., Thomson, A., Best, N., & Elliott, P. (2004). Interpreting Posterior Relative Risk Estimates in Disease-Mapping Studies. *Environmental Health Perspectives* (Vol. 112, Issue 9, pp. 1016–1025). https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.6740

17. Rue, H., Martino, S., Lindgren, F., Simpson, D., Riebler, A., & Krainski, E. T. (2014). INLA: Functions which allow to perform full Bayesian analysis of latent Gaussian models using Integrated Nested Laplace Approximaxion. *R Package Version 0. 0-1404466487, http://www. R-INLA.org*.

18. Blangiardo, M., Cameletti, M., Baio, G., & Rue, H. (2013). Spatial and spatio-temporal models with R-INLA. *Spatial and Spatio-temporal Epidemiology* (Vol. 4, pp. 33–49). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sste.2012.12.001

333 19. Wartko, P. D., Wong, E. Y., & Enquobahrie, D. A. (2017). Maternal birthplace is associated
334 with low birth weight within racial/ethnic groups. *Maternal and child health journal*, *21*(6),
335 1358-1366.
336 20. Clay, S. L., Woodson, M. J., & Kersh, R. (2021). An Exploration of Socio-
337 demographic, Economic, and Environmental Factors in Black/White Disparities in
338 Low Birth Weight Outcomes: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of Research in*
339 *Health Sciences*, *21*(2), e00511.
340 21. Zeng, N., Erwin, E., Wen, W., Corsi, D. J., Wen, S. W., & Guo, Y. (2021). Comparison
341 of adverse perinatal outcomes between Asians and Caucasians: a population-
342 based retrospective cohort study in Ontario. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 21(1), 1-9
343 22. Messer, L. C., Kaufman, J. S., Dole, N., Herring, A., & Laraia, B. A. (2006). Violent
344 crime exposure classification and adverse birth outcomes: a geographically-
345 defined cohort study. International journal of health geographics, 5(1), 1-12.
346 23. Lobel, M., Dunkel-Schetter, C., & Scrimshaw, S. C. (1992). Prenatal maternal stress
347 and prematurity: a prospective study of socioeconomically disadvantaged women.
348 Health psychology, 11(1), 32.
349 24. Dole, N., Savitz, D. A., Hertz-Picciotto, I., Siega-Riz, A. M., McMahon, M. J.,
350 & Buekens, P. (2003). Maternal stress and preterm birth. American journal
351 of epidemiology, 157(1), 14-24.
352 25. Masho, S. W., Chapman, D., & Ashby, M. (2010). The Impact of Paternity and
353 Marital Status on Low Birth Weight and Preterm Births. *Marriage & Family Review* (Vol.
354 46, Issue 4, pp. 243–256). https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2010.499319

355 26. Wood, C. (1997). The Association of Marital Status with Low Birthweight:
356 North Carolina, 1994-1995. State Center for Health Statistics.
357 27. National Center for Health Statistics (US). (1989). Trends in low birth weight:
358 United States, 1975-85 (No. 48). US Department of Health and Human Services,
359 Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Health Statistics.
360 28. Rubin, L. P. (2016). Maternal and pediatric health and disease: integrating biopsychosocial
361 models and epigenetics. *Pediatric Research* (Vol. 79, Issues 1-2, pp. 127–135).
362 https://doi.org/10.1038/pr.2015.203
363 29. Alhusen, J. L., Bower, K. M., Epstein, E., & Sharps, P. (2016). Racial discrimination and
364 adverse birth outcomes: an integrative review. *Journal of midwifery & women's*
365 *health*, *61*(6), 707-720.
366 30. Hargraves, M. (2002). Elevating the voices of rural minority women. American Journal of
367 Public Health, 92(4), 514-515.
368 31. Taylor J.Y., Liu, T., Howell, E. (2020). Insurance Differences in Preventive Care Use
369 and Adverse Birth Outcomes Among Pregnant Women in a Medicaid Nonexpansion State:
370 A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Journal of Women's Health,* 29(1).
371 32. Günther, V., Alkatout, I., Vollmer, C., Maass, N., Strauss, A., & Voigt, M. (2021). Impact
372 of nicotine and maternal BMI on fetal birth weight. BMC pregnancy and childbirth,
373 21, 1-6.
374 33. Bohn, C., Vogel, M., Poulain, T., Spielau, U., Hilbert, C., Kiess, W., & Körner, A. (2021).
375 Birth weight increases with birth order despite decreasing maternal pregnancy
376 weight gain. Acta Paediatrica, 110(4), 1218-1224.

377 34. Gantt, A., Metz, T. D., Kuller, J. A., Louis, J. M., Cahill, A. G., & Turrentine, M. A.
378 (2022). Pregnancy at Age 35 Years or Older ACOG Obstetric Care Consensus No.
379 11. OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY, 140(2), 348-366.
380 35. Grossman, D. C., Baldwin, L. M., Casey, S., Nixon, B., Hollow, W., & Hart, L. G.
381 (2002). Disparities in infant health among American Indians and Alaska Natives in
382 US metropolitan areas. Pediatrics, 109(4), 627-633.
383 36. Morisaki, N., Kawachi, I., Oken, E., & Fujiwara, T. (2017). Social and anthropometric
384 factors explaining racial/ethnical differences in birth weight in the United States. *Scientific*
385 *Reports*, *7*, 46657.
386 37. Call, K. T., McAlpine, D. D., Johnson, P. J., Beebe, T. J., McRae, J. A., &
387 Song, Y. (2006). Barriers to care among American Indians in public health
388 care programs. Medical care, 595-600.
389 38. Gwin, K. M., Schrader, R., Peters, K., Moreno, A., Thiel, K. W., & Leslie, K. K. (2012).
390 An exploratory study of the variables impacting preterm birth rates in New Mexico.
391 BMC pregnancy and childbirth, 12, 1-8.
392 39. Raglan, G. B., Lannon, S. M., Jones, K. M., & Schulkin, J. (2016). Racial and ethnic
393 disparities in preterm birth among American Indian and Alaska Native women.
394 Maternal and child health journal, 20, 16-24.
395
396
397

398

399

400

401 **TABLES**

Table 1: Association of county-level contextual variables with low birthweight rates during the study period (2016-2021).

County-level contextual variables[a]	Incidence rate ratio of low birthweight (95% CI)	p-value
County type (Reference = Non-metro; N = 1836)		
Small metro (N = 347)	1.21 (1.16, 1.27)	< 0.0001
Large metro (N = 804)	1.24 (1.20, 1.29)	< 0.0001
Time period (Reference = 2016-2017)		
2018-2019	1.11 (1.09, 1.13)	< 0.0001
2020-2021	1.15 (1.13, 1.18)	< 0.0001
% Black	1.22 (1.20, 1.24)	< 0.0001
% Asian	1.01 (0.99, 1.03)	0.22
% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.99 (0.97, 1.01)	0.27
% BMI underweight	1.08 (1.03, 1.13)	< 0.001
% Cigarette smoking during pregnancy	1.24 (1.21, 1.28)	< 0.0001
% Live Birth order > 1	0.89 (0.85, 0.93)	< 0.0001
% Mother's age 35-54 years	1.06 (1.01, 1.11)	0.02
% No prenatal visits	1.27 (1.23, 1.32)	< 0.0001
% Maternal education more than high school	1.02 (0.98, 1.05)	0.34
% Uninsured population	1.10 (1.09, 1.12)	< 0.0001
Violent crime rate (per 100,000)	1.07 (1.06, 1.09)	< 0.0001
Primary care provider rate (per 100,000)	1.09 (1.07, 1.11)	< 0.0001

N= 3,108 counties

[a]All predictor variables were standardized to have a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1.

402

403

Table 2: Incidence rate ratios (IRR*) of low birthweight for 1-SD increase in the county-level percentage of married women.

County type	Incidence rate ratio of low birthweight (95% CI)	p-value
Non metro	0.90 (0.86, 0.94)	< 0.0001
Small metro	0.97 (0.94, 1.01)	0.16
Large metro	0.98 (0.96, 0.99)	0.01

N= 3,108 counties

*IRR estimates were generated after adjusting for all the county-level contextual variables

Table 3: Incidence rate ratios (IRR*) of low birthweight for 1-SD increase in the county-level percentage of unemployed population.

County type	Incidence rate ratio of low birthweight (95% CI)	p-value
Non metro	1.04 (1.02, 1.06)	< 0.001
Small metro	0.99 (0.97, 1.01)	0.16
Large metro	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	0.99

N= 3,108 counties

*IRR estimates were generated after adjusting for all the county-level contextual variables

Table 4: Incidence rate ratios (IRR*) of low birthweight for 1-SD increase in the county-level percentage of American Indian/Alaskan Native women.

County type	Incidence rate ratio of low birthweight (95% CI)	p-value
Non metro	0.97 (0.95, 0.98)	< 0.001
Small metro	1.08 (1.02, 1.15)	0.01
Large metro	1.03 (0.94, 1.13)	0.56

N = 3,108 counties

*IRR estimates were generated after adjusting for all the county-level contextual variables

Figure 1: Smoothed Standardized Incidence Ratios (SIRs) of low birthweight and exceedance probability of low birthweight SIR > 1 for counties across the U.S. for 3 study periods (2016-2017, 2018-2019 and 2020-2021)







475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485