Title: Identifying Patient Subpopulations with Significant Race-Sex Differences in Emergency Department Disposition Decisions

Short title: Race-Sex Differences in Emergency Department Disposition Decisions

Authors: Peter Lin[1], Nilay T Argon[1] PhD, Qian Cheng[1] PhD, Christopher S Evans[2,3] MD MPH, Benjamin Linthicum[4] DNP, Yufeng Liu[1,5,6,7,8] PhD, Abhishek Mehrotra[4] MD MBA, Laura Murphy[4] MD, Mehul D Patel[4] PhD, Serhan Ziya[1] PhD

[1]: Department of Statistics and Operations Research, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

[2]: Information Services, ECU Health, Greenville, NC, USA

[3]: Department of Emergency Medicine, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA

[4]: Department of Emergency Medicine, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

[5]: Department of Genetics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

[6]: Department of Biostatistics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

[7]: Carolina Center for Genome Sciences, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

[8]: Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Corresponding author: Nilay T Argon, nilay@unc.edu

Financial support: This work was partially supported by grant R03HS029078 from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Abstract

Background/Objectives: The race-sex differences in emergency department (ED) disposition decisions have been reported widely. Our objective is to identify demographic and clinical subgroups for which this disparity is most pronounced, which will facilitate future targeted research and potential interventions.

Methods: We performed a retrospective analysis of 93,987 Caucasian and African-American adults assigned an Emergency Severity Index of 3 at three large EDs from January 2019 to February 2020. Using random forests, we identified the Elixhauser comorbidity score, age, and insurance status as important variables to divide data into subpopulations. Logistic regression models were then fitted to test race-sex disparities within each subpopulation while controlling for other patient characteristics and ED conditions.

Results: In each subpopulation, African-American women were less likely to be admitted than Caucasian men with odds ratios as low as 0.304 (95% confidence interval (CI): [0.229, 0.404]). African-American men had smaller admission odds compared to Caucasian men in subpopulations of 41+ years of age or with very low/high Elixhauser scores, odds ratios being as low as 0.652 (CI: [0.590, 0.747]). Caucasian women were less likely to be admitted than Caucasian men in subpopulations of 18-40 or 41-64 years of age, with low Elixhauser scores, or with Self-Pay or Medicaid insurance status with odds ratios as low as 0.574 (CI: [0.421, 0.784]).

Conclusions: African-American women faced disparities in all subgroups while disparities were lessened by younger age for African-American men, and by older age, higher

Elixhauser score, and Medicare or Commercial insurance for Caucasian women. In general, patients of age 64 years or younger, with low comorbidity scores, or with Medicaid or no insurance appeared most prone to disparities in admissions.

Keywords: Racial disparity; sex disparity; disposition decision, emergency department, logistic regression, random forests

INTRODUCTION

The disposition decision is an important timepoint during a patient's visit to an emergency department (ED) as it represents a split in the patient's path through the healthcare system. Even though patients may no longer remain within an ED after receiving a disposition, this decision continues to affect their health in the long term[1,2,3]. Consequently, patients facing disparities in disposition decisions may be impacted long after they depart the ED, and hence, it is of interest to study disparities surrounding disposition decisions closely. An American College of Emergency Physicians workgroup convened in 2021 identified the measurement of disparities in ED processes, including disposition decision, as a priority to promote health equity in emergency medicine[4].

Disparities have been shown to affect ED patients in many different decisions and specific situations[5,6,7]. Opioid prescribing practices have been documented to vary by patient race[8,9,10]. Patients, both adult and pediatric, suffering from chest pain, have received different treatments depending on sex, race, and insurance status[11,12]. Those who display potential acute coronary syndrome received different care depending on their sex[13] or if they were Caucasian or African American[14,15]. In addition, disparities have been shown to impact triage score assignment[16,17,18,19] as well as rooming prioritization[20,21], with

African-American and Hispanic patients receiving less acute scores and being less likely to be prioritized for rooming.

Several studies have also investigated disparities surrounding ED disposition decisions. In particular, women, African Americans, and uninsured patients have been found to be less likely to be admitted from the ED compared to men, Caucasians, and privately insured patients[22,23,24,25,26,27,28], respectively. Furthermore, uninsured and Medicaid patients and women are more likely to leave an ED against medical advice[29,30]. To date, much of the literature on disparities in ED disposition has focused on specific conditions or complaints, such as chest pain and injury, or adjusting by broad groupings of clinical factors. There is limited evidence on patient subgroups prone to inequitable ED disposition decisions, which would be invaluable to understanding the causes of these disparities and to tailoring and targeting interventions to address them. Given ED patients' demographic and clinical profiles are highly heterogeneous, machine learning methods, such as random forests, can improve the performance of predictive models[31].

In this retrospective study of adult, intermediate-acuity patients presenting to the ED, we examined the extent of race and sex disparities in ED disposition decisions within important demographic and clinical subgroups identified by random forests. Specifically, we tested the null hypothesis that the disposition decision (admit or discharge) did not vary by patient race-sex combination within important patient subgroups when controlling for patient-level and ED operational characteristics. Our objective was to identify subgroups in which race-sex disparities were most pronounced to facilitate future research that evaluates potential mechanisms and explores tailored interventions.

METHODS

We performed a retrospective analysis of data from three EDs in the Southeastern United States from January 1, 2019 through February 29, 2020. ED A is part of a large academic medical center, containing 59 beds divided among five adult care areas and one pediatric care area. ED B is part of a large community hospital in an urban area, with 48 beds split among four care areas. ED C is part of a large hospital serving a predominantly African-American population in both urban and rural areas. It has 38 beds split between a main care area, a fast-track area for low acuity patients and separate dedicated areas for behavioral health, high intensity, and trauma patients. Notably, the county where ED C is located had a median household income of $55,956 in 2021 compared to respective median household incomes of $79,814 and $91,558 for the counties where ED A and B are located[32].

Patients were included in the analysis if they were adults (at least 18 years old) who were assigned an Emergency Severity Index (ESI) score of 3 (intermediate acuity). These patients have a similar level of severity and hence are expected to receive similar treatment from decision makers. In addition, the majority of patients both within the study EDs and in general[33] receive an ESI 3 score at triage. Additional eligibility criteria included being seen in one of the main ED care areas, having complete event timestamps in the electronic health record data, being Caucasian or African American, and being admitted to the hospital or discharged from the ED. Interfacility transfers were excluded. Patients were also excluded if they had a sex other than male or female or races other than Caucasian or African American due to the low patient counts within those demographics affecting model parameter estimates.

111 **Primary outcome and covariates**

112 The primary outcome in all our models was whether a given patient was admitted versus
113 discharged at the end of an ED visit. Differences in disposition decisions were evaluated
114 between four race-sex groups: African-American female, African-American male,
115 Caucasian female, and Caucasian male (referent).

116 In all our models, we adjusted for covariates that were deemed to correlate with admission
117 decisions: age, ethnicity, chief complaint, insurance status, weighted Elixhauser score,
118 care area where disposition was decided, day of week, hour of day, and average waiting
119 time in the ED (as a proxy for crowding level). Patient age was categorized into three
120 groups: 18-40, 41-64, 65 and older. The chief complaint for each patient was first grouped
121 into one of 17 categories[34], which we further reduced to 13 by combining "General/Minor"
122 and "Environmental" as well as merging the three different "ENT" categories. The
123 weighted Elixhauser comorbidity score[35,36] was calculated using provided ICD-10 codes
124 and the R comorbidity package[37]. All patient-level insurance information was collapsed to
125 reduce the number of required parameters in the models. Specifically, primary and
126 secondary insurance information was used to group patients into a single insurance
127 status variable as follows: patients with "Medicaid" listed for either primary or as the sole
128 secondary insurance were grouped into a "Medicaid" group; Self-Pay patients were
129 grouped together in a separate group. All remaining patients were then placed into
130 "Commercial/Other" or "Medicare," depending on what their primary insurance was listed
131 as. Furthermore, for each patient we noted the hourly block during which they received
132 their disposition decision. We then calculated the mean length of time from the end-of-
133 triage to first-seen-by-provider for all patients who entered the waiting room during that

same hourly block and used this mean as the ED crowding measure at the time of the disposition decision. The time of day for disposition decision was recorded as one of six four-hour blocks (12 am to 4 am, 4 am to 8 am, 8 am to 12 pm, 12 pm to 4 pm, 4 pm to 8 pm, and 8 pm to 12 am).

Statistical analysis

First, using the entire dataset, we fitted a logistic regression model for each ED with all covariates. (Table S1 in the Supplement provides reassuring results of a test that we used to check for potential multicollinearity issues.) In each of these logistic regression models we then computed odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) and tested the significance of patient race-sex to determine whether there was evidence of disparity, considering p-values less than 0.05 to be statistically significant.

To select patient subgroups in which to test race-sex disparities, we first fitted a random forest for each ED[38,39] to obtain variable importance plots that reflect the relative importance of each predictor to model accuracy. (For each random forest, we randomly selected 70% of the corresponding ED's data for training and used the remaining 30% for testing.) Each random forest comprised of 500 decision trees, each of which was fitted using 4 predictors selected randomly from the entire pool of 10 covariates. The importance of each predictor was determined through the mean decrease in accuracy when that particular variable was permuted in the out-of-bag data. The random forests were fitted using the randomForest[40] package in R[41].

Using the variable importance plots, we then selected three of the most important variables for subgroupings: the weighted Elixhauser score, age group, and insurance

status. Although the chief complaint category was found to be important consistently across EDs, we did not use it to split our data because of its large number of categories potentially resulting in small sample sizes. Since the weighted Elixhauser score is a continuous variable, groups were set to be 0 and below, 1 through 6, and 7 and above. Age and insurance status groups were set as defined above. For each level we then fitted a logistic regression model using the data belonging to that level with all the covariates except for the one that was being examined. In each of these logistic regression models we then computed ORs and 95% CIs and tested the significance of patient race-sex within each patient subpopulation. All calculations and analysis were performed using R 3.5.3.

This study was reviewed by the IRB at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and determined to be exempt from IRB review. Upon this IRB exemption, a study dataset was provided to the authors on November 18th, 2022. The authors did not have access to information that could identify individual participants. As a retrospective study of existing data with limited identifiers (i.e., patient age and encounter date-times), informed consent was not required.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows a breakdown of study patient characteristics as well as admission rates for each group (Table S2 shows breakdowns of additional characteristics). In total, there were 28,341, 39,048, and 26,598 study patients from EDs A, B, and C with overall admission rates of 35.5%, 30.3%, and 19.2%, respectively. ED B predominantly served Caucasian patients and had the oldest population as well as the highest proportion of patients with commercial insurance at 53.9% compared to 44.6% and 30.4% at EDs A and C. ED C served predominantly African-American patients and had the lowest

179 admission rates among all study EDs. (The difference in admission rates at the three EDs
180 could be attributable to differences in patient population characteristics, utilization of ED
181 resources, and access to healthcare resources such as urgent care centers in the local
182 area.) We also see that ED C had the highest proportions of patients with Medicaid or
183 Self-Pay insurance status.

184 The logistic regression models fitted on the entire datasets for each ED found that all
185 covariates except for patient ethnicity were statistically significant by means of likelihood
186 ratio tests. (The small number of Hispanic patients may explain why ethnicity was the sole
187 insignificant predictor.) The ORs and 95% CIs are provided in Table 2. Caucasian men
188 were significantly more likely to be admitted than any other Race-Sex combination at all
189 three EDs: Estimated odds ratios of admission for all other Race-Sex combinations
190 ranged between 0.55 and 0.89 when Caucasian men was the reference level, with
191 African-American women having the lowest odds ratios of admission at all three EDs. As
192 expected, the older age groups were more likely to be admitted at EDs A, B, and C with
193 respective odds ratio estimates of 1.68, 2.22, and 2.25 for the 41 through 64 age group
194 and odds ratios of 2.25, 3.88, and 3.25 for the 65 and older group when compared to the
195 18 through 40 year old group. Of the chief complaint categories, ENT, Genitourinary,
196 Neurologic, Obstetrics/Gynecology, Ophthalmology, Orthopedic, and Trauma patients
197 were significantly more likely to be discharged than Cardiovascular patients at all three
198 EDs. Medicaid and Medicare patients were significantly more likely to be admitted than
199 Commercial/Other patients, with odds ratios ranging from 1.13 to 1.46, and Self-Pay
200 patients were significantly less likely to be admitted with odds ratios ranging between 0.72
201 and 0.77. Patients with higher Elixhauser scores were more likely to be admitted at all

three EDs. At all EDs, the crowding metric was significant, with admission likelihood increasing when the mean waiting time is higher.

Using the random forests fitted for each ED, we observed that the Elixhauser score, age group, chief complaint, and insurance status were consistently at the top in terms of predictor importance (see Figure 1). The random forests had test accuracies of 68.9%, 72.1%, and 81.4% for EDs A, B, and C, respectively. As described above, we split the population according to the weighted Elixhauser score, age group, and insurance status.

Figure 2 shows the odds ratio plots from the models formed by splitting the patient population according to weighted Elixhauser score. At all three EDs, African-American women were significantly less likely to be admitted than Caucasian men regardless of the Elixhauser score with odds ratios being as low as 0.45 for low Elixhauser category. African-American men and Caucasian women were also significantly less likely to be admitted if they had a low Elixhauser at all three hospitals. Within the middle Elixhauser group, the disparities seemed to disappear except for African-American women. In the high Elixhauser group, Caucasian women were not disadvantaged against Caucasian men at any of the EDs but both African-American men and women were less likely to be admitted compared to Caucasian men.

The next group of models explored how the presence of disparities changed between age groups. Figure 3 shows the associated odds ratio plots for the different age groups at each ED. Across all age groups, African-American women were less likely to be admitted compared to Caucasian men. When examining only Caucasian patients, the sex effect was reduced for older patients, culminating in Caucasian men and women with 65+ years of age having no significant differences in admission likelihood. We also observed a

diminished racial disparity for younger males in EDs A and B, with Caucasian males and African-American males in the 18 through 40 group having no statistically significant difference in admission likelihood. Race-sex disparities existed in the 41 through 64-year-old group across all three EDs.

The final group of models was formed using patients with the same insurance status. Figure 4 shows the odds ratios for each Race-Sex category for different insurance groups. Regardless of the insurance status, African-American women were less likely to be admitted than Caucasian men at all EDs except for Medicare patients at ED A. Considering all insurance groups, Medicare patients faced the least disparities. Within this group, no disparities were observed for any Race-sex category except for African-American women at EDs B and C and for African-American men at ED C. On the other hand, disparities were prevalent in all other insurance groups except for Caucasian female and African-American male patients with Commercial/Other insurance at ED A, with Medicaid insurance at ED B, and who were in Self-Pay insurance category at ED C.

DISCUSSION

Our retrospective study of adult, intermediate-acuity ED patients found that African-American women were less likely to be admitted than Caucasian men at all three EDs regardless of subgroupings by comorbidity score, age, or insurance status (with the only exception being Medicare patients at ED A). Moreover, African-American women trended toward the lowest likelihood of admission compared to all other race-sex groups. In addition, we observed that African-American men also faced disparities compared to Caucasian men consistently across EDs within certain subpopulations. These findings raise further questions about the general presence of racial disparities within EDs as this

248 pattern held regardless of whether the ED served predominantly Caucasian patients (EDs
249 A and B) or African-American patients (ED C).

250 There have been several studies examining both patient and provider related factors that
251 correlate with the disposition decision. For example, more senior physicians were found
252 to have higher discharge rates[42]. On the patient side, women, African-Americans, and
253 uninsured patients have been found to be less likely to be admitted from the ED compared
254 to men, Caucasians, and privately insured patients, respectively, after accounting for age,
255 acuity, comorbidities, and other factors[22,23,24,25,26]. Among heart failure patients,
256 Caucasians have been found to be more likely to be admitted than African Americans[27].
257 Also, Maori patients in New Zealand were found to be less likely to be admitted than non-
258 Maori patients who presented with similar triage acuities[28]. Our findings add further
259 support to these preceding studies about the presence of disposition disparities and how
260 they affect different types of patients.
261 Our subgroup analyses of highly predictive factors identified by random forests suggest
262 that disparities were less prevalent for patients with the highest rates of admission: high
263 Elixhauser, ages 65 years and older, and Medicare insurance. In particular, we note that
264 the sex disparity was less prevalent within high Elixhauser score patients as there was
265 no significant difference between male and female Caucasian patients; we also observed
266 overlapping confidence intervals for male and female African-American patients for this
267 group. In addition, Medicare patients were the least likely group to face disparities.

268 According to our data, patients with low Elixhauser score, ages less than 65 years, and
269 Self-pay were most prone to race-sex disparities in ED disposition, although these results
270 varied by ED. More specifically, the subpopulations that were most vulnerable to

disparities in disposition decision in this study were (i) African-American women, (ii) African-American men who were 41+ years of age or who had very low/high comorbidity scores, and (iii) Caucasian women who were younger than 65 years of age, who had low comorbidity scores, or whose insurance status was Medicaid or Self-Pay. Our future research will investigate the causes and potential mechanisms of race-sex disparities in ED disposition. Further, we plan to explore potential solutions to these disparities tailored and targeted to patient subgroups with the largest magnitude of race-sex inequities.

LIMITATIONS

This study had several limitations. Patient race and ethnicity were taken directly from what was recorded in the electronic health record system during clinical care instead of being prospectively collected. However, less than 0.1% of all patient encounters had missing demographic information and furthermore, this information was collected by trained personnel. We did not have data on the sex and race of the clinicians making the disposition decisions, both of which could be important explanatory variables for a study on patient race-sex disparities.

We only considered Caucasian and African-American race categories as well as only male and female sex categories in this study, primarily due to insufficient sample sizes for other categories. We would need additional data from other sexes and races to further generalize our conclusions about disparities and how admission decisions are made with respect to other demographic groups.

Our models may not account for several unmeasured covariates that affect the admission decision-making process. For example, there are comorbidities that affect demographic

293 groups differently such as end stage renal disease (ESRD) or sickle cell disease[43]. We
294 do not explicitly account for these specific comorbidities that may impact the likelihood of
295 admission.

296 We did not have data on patient outcomes following ED disposition and were not able to
297 determine the most appropriate disposition decision for each patient. The goal of this
298 study was to examine admission from the ED as a process measure to compare by patient
299 sex and race. However, we acknowledge that discharge from the ED can be the more
300 favorable decision for certain patients.

301 Finally, this study considered three large EDs that are located within the Southeastern
302 US. Therefore, our results should not be generalized to EDs with smaller patient
303 populations and to EDs in other geographic locations with potentially different population
304 demographics.

305 **CONCLUSIONS**

306 We observed varying levels of disparities in admission decisions for African-American
307 men and women as well as Caucasian women when compared with Caucasian men
308 within the adult ESI 3 patient populations from three large EDs in the Southeastern US.
309 After stratifying on three patient characteristics highly predictive of admission in random
310 forests, we identified consistent significant in disposition decisions by patient sex and race.
311 Our findings indicated that certain disparities disappeared or weakened for high
312 Elixhauser score patients, Medicare patients, and older patients. In contrast, Medicaid
313 and Self-Pay patients as well as those who had less severe comorbidities were more
314 likely to face disparities. African-American women were consistently less likely to be

315 admitted when compared to Caucasian men, even after splitting the data according to
316 age, insurance status, or Elixhauser score.

317 **REFERENCES**

318 1. Dhingra K, Laurin E. Emergency medicine clerkship primer: a manual for medical
319 students. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2009; 16: e39-e39. doi: 10.1111/j.1553-2712.2009.00579.x

320 2. Junhasavasdikul D, Theerawit P, Kiatboonsri S. Association between admission delay
321 and adverse outcome of emergency medical patients. *Emerg Med J*. 2013;30(4):320-323.
322 doi:10.1136/emermed-2011-200788

323 3. Fernando SM, Rochwerg B, Reardon PM, et al. Emergency Department disposition
324 decisions and associated mortality and costs in ICU patients with suspected infection. *Crit*
325 *Care*. 2018;22(1):172. Published 2018 Jul 6. doi:10.1186/s13054-018-2096-8

326 4. Khidir H, Salhi R, Sabbatini AK, et al. A Quality Framework to Address Racial and
327 Ethnic Disparities in Emergency Department Care. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2023;81(1):47-56.
328 doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2022.08.010

329 5. Thomas YT, Jarman AF, Faynshtayn NG, Buehler GB, Andrabi S, McGregor AJ.
330 Achieving Equity in Emergency Medicine Quality Measures Requires a Sex and Gender
331 Lens. J Emerg Med. 2023 Jul;65(1):e60-e65. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2023.03.063.
332 Epub 2023 Mar 17. PMID: 37331918; PMCID: PMC10505242.

333 6. Stillman K, Mirocha J, Geiderman J, Torbati S. Characteristics of Patients Restrained
334 in the Emergency Department and Evaluation for Disparities in Care. J Emerg Med. 2023

335 Nov;65(5):e393-e402. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2023.05.008. Epub 2023 Jun 4. PMID:
336 37722949.

337 7. Goldfarb SS, Graves K, Geletko K, Hansen MD, Kinsell H, Harman J. Racial and Ethnic
338 Differences in Emergency Department Wait Times for Patients with Substance Use
339 Disorder. J Emerg Med. 2023 Apr;64(4):481-487. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2023.02.015.
340 Epub 2023 Mar 21. PMID: 36997432.

341 8. Tamayo-Sarver JH, Hinze SW, Cydulka RK, Baker DW. Racial and ethnic disparities
342 in emergency department analgesic prescription. *Am J Public Health*. 2003;93(12):2067-
343 2073. doi:10.2105/ajph.93.12.2067

344 9. Heins JK, Heins A, Grammas M, et al. Disparities in analgesia and opioid prescribing
345 practices for patients with musculoskeletal pain in the emergency department. *J Emerg*
346 *Nurs*. 2006;32(3):219-224. doi:10.1016/j.jen.2006.01.010

347 10. Singhal A, Tien YY, Hsia RY. Racial-Ethnic Disparities in Opioid Prescriptions at
348 Emergency Department Visits for Conditions Commonly Associated with Prescription
349 Drug Abuse. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(8):e0159224. Published 2016 Aug 8.
350 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0159224

351 11. Hambrook JT, Kimball TR, Khoury P, et al. Disparities exist in the emergency
352 department evaluation of pediatric chest pain. *Congenit Heart Dis*. 2010;5(3):285-291.
353 doi:10.1111/j.1747-0803.2010.00414.x

354 12. Humphries KH, Lee MK, Izadnegahdar M, et al. Sex differences in diagnoses,
355 treatment, and outcomes for Emergency Department patients with chest pain and

356 elevated cardiac troponin. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2018;25(4):413-424.
357 doi:10.1111/acem.13371

358 13. Gauthier V, Montaye M, Ferrières J, et al. Sex differences in time trends in acute
359 coronary syndrome management and in 12-month lethality: Data from the French
360 MONICA registries. *Int J Cardiol*. 2022;361:103-108. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2022.05.040

361 14. DeVon HA, Burke LA, Nelson H, Zerwic JJ, Riley B. Disparities in patients presenting
362 to the emergency department with potential acute coronary syndrome: it matters if you
363 are Black or White. *Heart Lung*. 2014;43(4):270-277. doi:10.1016/j.hrtlng.2014.04.019

364 15. Alrwisan A, Eworuke E. Are Discrepancies in Waiting Time for Chest Pain at
365 Emergency Departments between African Americans and Whites Improving Over Time?
366 J Emerg Med. 2016 Feb;50(2):349-55. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2015.07.033. Epub 2015
367 Sep 12. PMID: 26371975.

368 16. Schrader CD, Lewis LM. Racial disparity in emergency department triage. *J Emerg*
369 *Med*. 2013;44(2):511-518. doi:10.1016/j.jemermed.2012.05.010

370 17. Zook HG, Kharbanda AB, Flood A, Harmon B, Puumala SE, Payne NR. Racial
371 Differences in Pediatric Emergency Department Triage Scores. J Emerg Med. 2016
372 May;50(5):720-7. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2015.02.056. Epub 2016 Feb 15. PMID:
373 26899520; PMCID: PMC4851931.

374 18. Joseph JW, Kennedy M, Landry AM, et al. Race and Ethnicity and Primary Language
375 in Emergency Department Triage. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(10):e2337557. Published
376 2023 Oct 2. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.37557

377 19. Patel MD, Lin P, Cheng Q, et al. Patient sex, racial and ethnic disparities in emergency
378 department triage: A multi-site retrospective study. *Am J Emerg Med*. Published online
379 November 10, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2023.11.008

380 20. Lin P, Argon NT, Cheng Q, et al. Disparities in emergency department prioritization
381 and rooming of patients with similar triage acuity score. *Acad Emerg Med*.
382 2022;29(11):1320-1328. doi:10.1111/acem.14598

383 21. Sangal RB, Su H, Khidir H, et al. Sociodemographic disparities in queue jumping for
384 emergency department care. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(7):e2326338. Published 2023
385 Jul 3. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.26338

386 22. Selassie AW, McCarthy ML, Pickelsimer EE. The influence of insurance, race, and
387 gender on emergency department disposition. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2003;10(11):1260-1270.
388 doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2003.tb00611.x

389 23. Selassie AW, Pickelsimer EE, Frazier L Jr, et al. The effect of insurance status, race,
390 and gender on ED disposition of persons with traumatic brain injury. *Am J Emerg Med*.
391 2004;22(6):465-473. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2004.07.024

392 24. Sacks GD, Hill C, Rogers SO Jr. Insurance status and hospital discharge disposition
393 after trauma: inequities in access to postacute care. *J Trauma*. 2011;71(4):1011-1015.
394 doi:10.1097/TA.0b013e3182092c27

395 25. Arroyo AC, Ewen Wang N, Saynina O, et al. The association between insurance
396 status and emergency department disposition of injured California children. *Acad Emerg*
397 *Med*. 2012;19(5):541-551. doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2012.01356.x

398 26. Wilson S, Dev S, Mahan M, et al. Identifying disparity in emergency department length
399 of stay and admission likelihood. *World J Emerg Med*. 2016;7(2):111-116.
400 doi:10.5847/wjem.j.1920-8642.2016.02.005

401 27. Lo AX, Donnelly JP, Durant RW, et al. A national study of U.S. emergency
402 departments: racial disparities in hospitalizations for heart failure. *Am J Prev Med*.
403 2018;55(5 Suppl 1):S31-S39. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2018.05.020

404 28. Ho J, Burbridge H, Raumati I, et al. Disposition disparities in an urban tertiary
405 emergency department. *Emerg Med Australas*. 2022;34(4):626-628. doi:10.1111/1742-
406 6723.13996

407 29. Haines K, Freeman J, Vastaas C, Rust C, Cox C, Kasotakis G, Fuller M,
408 Krishnamoorthy V, Siciliano M, Alger A, Montgomery S, Agarwal S. "I'm Leaving": Factors
409 That Impact Against Medical Advice Disposition Post-Trauma. J Emerg Med. 2020
410 Apr;58(4):691-697. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2019.12.023. Epub 2020 Mar 12. PMID:
411 32171476.

412 30. Keneally RJ, Mazzeffi MA, Estroff JM, Yi JN, Maman SR, Heinz ER, Chow JH. Factors
413 Associated With a Discharge Against Medical Advice From an Emergency Department in
414 Adult Patients With Appendicitis. J Emerg Med. 2023 Jan;64(1):40-46. doi:
415 10.1016/j.jemermed.2022.10.006. Epub 2023 Jan 13. PMID: 36642675.

416 31. Shi Y, Qin Y, Zheng Z, Wang P, Liu J. Risk factor analysis and multiple predictive
417 machine learning models for mortality in COVID-19: a multicenter and multi-ethnic cohort
418 study. J Emerg Med. 2023 Jun 20. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2023.06.012.

419 32. U.S. Census Bureau. Small Area Income and Poverty Estimation. 2021. Accessed
420 August 23, 2023. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe.html

421 33. Chmielewski N, Moretz J. ESI triage distribution in U.S. emergency departments. *Adv*
422 *Emerg Nurs J*. 2022;44(1):46-53. doi:10.1097/TME.0000000000000039034. Grafstein E,
423 Bullard MJ, Warren D, et al; CTAS National Working Group. Revision of the Canadian
424 Emergency Department Information System (CEDIS) Presenting Complaint List version
425 1.1. *CJEM*. 2008;10(2):151-173. doi:10.1017/s1481803500009878

426 35. Elixhauser A, Steiner C, Harris DR, et al. Comorbidity measures for use with
427 administrative data. *Med Care*. 1998;36(1):8-27. doi:10.1097/00005650-199801000-
428 00004

429 36. van Walraven C, Austin PC, Jennings A, et al. A modification of the Elixhauser
430 comorbidity measures into a point system for hospital death using administrative
431 data. *Med Care*. 2009;47(6):626-633. doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e31819432e5

432 37. Gasparini A. Comorbidity: An R package for computing comorbidity scores. *J Open*
433 *Source Softw*. 2018; **3**(23): 648. doi:10.21105/joss.00648

434 38. Breiman, L. (2001). Random Forests. Machine Learning, 45(1), 5-32

435 39. Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J. (2009). Random Forests. In: The Elements of
436 Statistical Learning. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, NY.
437 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-84858-7_15

438 40. A. Liaw and M. Wiener (2002). Classification and Regression by randomForest. R
439 News 2(3), 18-22.

440 41. R Core Team, *R: a Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R*
441 *Foundation for Statistical Computing*, 2022. Accessed September 18,
442 2022. http://www.R-project.org/

443 42. Wu KH, Chen IC, Li CJ, et al. The influence of physician seniority on disparities
444 of admit/discharge decision making for ED patients. *Am J Emerg Med*.
445 2012;30(8):1555-1560. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2012.01.011

446 43. Naik RP, Derebail VK, Grams ME, et al. Association of sickle cell trait with chronic
447 kidney disease and albuminuria in African Americans. *JAMA*. 2014;312(20):2115-2125.
448 doi:10.1001/jama.2014.15063

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460 **TABLES**

461 *Table 1 Breakdown of study patient characteristics at each ED with associated admission rates. Admission rates are*
462 *calculated by dividing the number of patients from each category who were admitted by the total number of patients*
463 *for that category.*

	ED A		ED B		ED C	
	Patient Count (%)	Admission Rate	Patient Count (%)	Admission Rate	Patient Count (%)	Admission Rate
All patients	28,341 (100%)	35.5%	39,048 (100%)	30.3%	26,598 (100%)	19.2%
Age						
18-40	9,128 (32.2%)	22.5%	10,726 (27.5%)	11.7%	9,624 (36.2%)	6.21%
41-64	11,477 (40.5%)	36.9%	12,565 (32.2%)	26.5%	9,353 (35.2%)	19.9%
65 and older	7,736 (27.3%)	48.9%	15,757 (40.3%)	46.0%	7,621 (28.6%)	34.9%
Race-Sex						
Caucasian Male	8,062 (28.4%)	39.8%	10,672 (27.3%)	35.7%	3,414 (12.8%)	27.2%
Caucasian Female	10,207 (36.0%)	35.0%	15,578 (39.9%)	32.7%	5,536 (20.8%)	22.9%
African-American Male	4,011 (14.2%)	36.0%	4,393 (11.3%)	28.2%	6,463 (24.3%)	20.9%
African-American Female	6,061 (21.4%)	30.4%	8,405 (21.5%)	20.2%	11,185 (42.1%)	14.1%
Ethnicity						
Hispanic or Latino	433 (1.5%)	21.7%	277 (0.7%)	20.2%	59 (0.2%)	16.9%
Not Hispanic or Latino	27,791 (98.1%)	35.8%	38,683 (99.1%)	30.4%	26,501 (99.7%)	19.2%
Other	117 (0.4%)	24.8%	88 (0.2%)	25.0%	38 (0.1%)	26.3%
Insurance						
Commercial/Other	12,642 (44.6%)	32.6%	21,032 (53.9%)	27.3%	8,090 (30.4%)	16.9%
Medicare	4,288 (15.1%)	50.4%	8,744 (22.4%)	46.0%	4,201 (15.8%)	34.1%

Medicaid	6,979 (24.6%)	41.2%	5,280 (13.5%)	29.9%	9,196 (34.6%)	20.9%
Self-Pay	4,432 (15.7%)	20.6%	3,992 (10.2%)	12.2%	5,111 (19.2%)	7.79%
Weighted Elixhauser						
0 and below	16,856 (59.5%)	24.9%	22,706 (58.2%)	18.1%	20,057 (75.4%)	12.5%
1-6	5,260 (18.5%)	43.9%	6,648 (17.0%)	39.7%	3,062 (11.5%)	33.9%
7 and above	6,225 (22.0%)	57.4%	9,694 (24.8%)	52.5%	3,479 (13.1%)	45.5%

Table 2 Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for logistic regression models using all data; statistically significant (p<0.05) CIs are bolded.

	ED A	ED B	ED C
Age Group (Ref: 18-40)			
41-64	**1.68 (1.57 - 1.79)**	**2.22 (2.06 - 2.39)**	**2.25 (2.03 - 2.50)**
65+	**2.25 (2.07 - 2.44)**	**3.88 (3.58 - 4.21)**	**3.25 (2.89 - 3.66)**
Race-Sex (Ref: Caucasian Male)			
Caucasian Female	**0.87 (0.81 - 0.93)**	**0.89 (0.84 - 0.94)**	**0.82 (0.74 - 0.92)**
African-American Male	**0.81 (0.75 - 0.89)**	**0.82 (0.75 - 0.89)**	**0.75 (0.67 - 0.83)**
African-American Female	**0.70 (0.64 - 0.75)**	**0.56 (0.52 - 0.60)**	**0.55 (0.49 - 0.61)**
Ethnicity (Ref: Not Hispanic/Latino)			
Hispanic or Latino	**0.71 (0.56 - 0.91)**	0.82 (0.59 - 1.12)	1.07 (0.51 - 2.25)
Other	0.74 (0.47 - 1.14)	1.01 (0.60 - 1.70)	1.69 (0.76 - 3.76)
Complaint Category (Ref: Cardiovascular)			
Ear/Nose/Throat	**0.70 (0.59 - 0.82)**	**0.38 (0.31 - 0.47)**	**0.32 (0.24 - 0.42)**
General/Environmental	**1.81 (1.62 - 2.01)**	**1.46 (1.32 - 1.62)**	0.98 (0.85 - 1.12)
Gastrointestinal	**1.42 (1.31 - 1.55)**	**1.24 (1.16 - 1.33)**	**0.77 (0.69 - 0.85)**
Genitourinary	**0.56 (0.48 - 0.64)**	**0.34 (0.29 - 0.39)**	**0.40 (0.33 - 0.47)**
Mental Health	0.80 (0.58 - 1.10)	**0.43 (0.29 - 0.65)**	**0.40 (0.23 - 0.70)**

Neurologic	**0.61 (0.54 - 0.68)**	**0.82 (0.74 - 0.89)**	**0.59 (0.52 - 0.67)**
Obstetrics/Gynecology	**0.41 (0.32 - 0.52)**	**0.38 (0.29 - 0.50)**	**0.35 (0.25 - 0.49)**
Ophthalmology	**0.47 (0.36 - 0.62)**	**0.44 (0.30 - 0.65)**	**0.50 (0.28 - 0.90)**
Orthopedic	**0.77 (0.69 - 0.86)**	**0.60 (0.55 - 0.66)**	**0.52 (0.45 - 0.60)**
Respiratory	**1.69 (1.51 - 1.89)**	**1.43 (1.30 - 1.56)**	1.10 (0.97 - 1.23)
Skin	**1.56 (1.40 - 1.74)**	1.07 (0.94 - 1.21)	0.96 (0.78 - 1.17)
Substance	1.01 (0.79 - 1.30)	**0.67 (0.49 - 0.94)**	0.72 (0.31 - 1.69)
Trauma	**0.65 (0.58 - 0.74)**	**0.53 (0.48 - 0.59)**	**0.37 (0.32 - 0.44)**
Insurance (Ref: Commercial/Other)			
Medicaid	**1.46 (1.36 - 1.56)**	**1.26 (1.17 - 1.36)**	**1.20 (1.10 - 1.31)**
Medicare	**1.32 (1.22 - 1.44)**	**1.13 (1.06 - 1.20)**	**1.16 (1.05 - 1.29)**
Self-Pay	**0.74 (0.68 - 0.81)**	**0.72 (0.64 - 0.80)**	**0.77 (0.67 - 0.87)**
Elixhauser	**1.05 (1.05 - 1.05)**	**1.05 (1.05 - 1.06)**	**1.06 (1.05 - 1.07)**
Time of Day (Ref: 12 am to 4 am)			
4 am – 8 am	0.94 (0.85 - 1.05)	0.91 (0.82 - 1.02)	0.94 (0.81 - 1.09)
8 am – 12 pm	**0.81 (0.73 - 0.91)**	**0.82 (0.74 - 0.90)**	**1.44 (1.26 - 1.66)**
12 pm – 4 pm	0.95 (0.87 - 1.04)	1.02 (0.94 - 1.11)	**1.80 (1.60 - 2.03)**
4 pm – 8 pm	1.02 (0.93 - 1.11)	1.04 (0.96 - 1.13)	**2.06 (1.82 - 2.33)**
8 pm – 12 am	1.02 (0.94 - 1.12)	1.02 (0.94 - 1.11)	**1.40 (1.24 - 1.59)**
Day of Week (Ref: Friday)			
Monday	0.94 (0.86 - 1.02)	1.04 (0.95 - 1.13)	1.11 (0.98 - 1.25)
Tuesday	0.99 (0.90 - 1.09)	1.05 (0.96 - 1.15)	0.99 (0.88 - 1.13)
Wednesday	1.02 (0.93 - 1.12)	**1.12 (1.03 - 1.23)**	1.07 (0.94 - 1.21)
Thursday	0.99 (0.90 - 1.09)	**1.17 (1.08 - 1.28)**	1.10 (0.97 - 1.24)
Saturday	**0.86 (0.77 - 0.95)**	0.98 (0.89 - 1.07)	0.88 (0.77 - 1.01)
Sunday	0.94 (0.85 - 1.04)	0.93 (0.85 - 1.01)	1.00 (0.88 - 1.13)
Waiting Time	**1.002 (1.001 – 1.003)**	**1.001 (1.001 – 1.002)**	**1.001 (1.001 – 1.002)**

469 **FIGURES**



470

471 *Figure 1 Variable importance plots based off mean decrease in accuracy for the three different random forests*

472 *associated with the three EDs.*

473



474

475 *Figure 2 Odds ratio plots with 95% CIs for the Race-Sex variable for patients split by Elixhauser score at each ED,*

476 *with the reference level being Caucasian men. Each row corresponds to a range of Elixhauser scores, and each*

477 *column is an ED. On the vertical axis labels, AA means African-American, and C means Caucasian.*

478

479



480

481 *Figure 3 Odds ratio plots with 95% CIs for the Race-Sex variable for patients split by age group at each ED, with the*

482 *reference level being Caucasian men. Each row corresponds to a different age group and each column is an ED.*

483

484

485



486

487 *Figure 4 Odds ratio plots with 95% CIs for the Race-Sex variable for patients split by insurance status at each ED,*
488 *with the reference level being Caucasian men. Each row corresponds to a different insurance group and each column*
489 *is an ED.*

490

491

492

493

SUPPLEMENT

To ensure that there are no significant effects of multicollinearity in our logistic regression model for each ED, we calculated generalized variable inflation factors (GVIF), see, e.g., Fox and Monette (1992). For variables with one degree of freedom, the GVIF is equivalent to the variable inflation factor (VIF) whereas for variables with two or more degrees of freedom, calculating $\left[(\mathrm{GVIF})^{\frac{1}{2\eta}}\right]^2$ allows us to use the same VIF thresholds as for continuous variables (i.e., those with one degree of freedom). Table S1 shows that the highest value for this calculation is approximately 1.295, which is below the recommended threshold of 2. Therefore, we conclude that multicollinearity is not a concern for either model.

Table S1 $\left[(GVIF)^{\frac{1}{2\eta}}\right]^2$ *values for logistic regression models, where η is the degrees of freedom associated with each predictor. These are directly comparable to VIF thresholds used for continuous variables.*

Predictor	**ED A**	**ED B**	**ED C**
Age Group	1.237	1.295	1.285
Race-Sex	1.046	1.064	1.051
Ethnicity	1.005	1.003	1.003
Complaint Category	1.028	1.011	1.012
Insurance	1.155	1.184	1.175
Elixhauser	1.124	1.157	1.111
Disposition Care Area	1.111	1.030	1.062
Time of Day	1.056	1.045	1.024
Day of Week	1.014	1.003	1.007
Crowding	1.275	1.180	1.059

507 *Table S2 Additional breakdown of study patient characteristics with the same columns as Table 1.*

	ED A		ED B		ED C	
	Patient Count (%)	Admission Rate	Patient Count (%)	Admission Rate	Patient Count (%)	Admission Rate
Complaint Category						
Cardiovascular	4292 (15.1%)	36.4%	8940 (22.9%)	34.1%	4002 (15.1%)	28.1%
ENT	1063 (3.8%)	24.1%	882 (2.3%)	15.6%	783 (2.9%)	8.05%
General/Environ	2360 (8.3%)	51.6%	2335 (6.0%)	42.3%	1653 (6.2%)	30.2%
Gastrointestinal	6096 (21.5%)	40.5%	8562 (21.9%)	31.9%	6447 (24.2%)	16.6%
Genitourinary	1483 (5.2%)	22.8%	2039 (5.2%)	14.7%	1613 (6.1%)	11.8%
Mental Health	255 (0.9%)	31.0%	222 (0.6%)	14.0%	165 (0.6%)	9.7%
Neurologic	2458 (8.7%)	24.9%	3657 (9.4%)	28.2%	2640 (9.9%)	17.4%
Obstetrics	693 (2.5%)	10.8%	1082 (2.8%)	6.1%	1123 (4.2%)	3.5%
Ophthalmology	388 (1.4%)	17.8%	209 (0.5%)	16.7%	138 (0.5%)	10.1%
Orthopedic	2814 (9.9%)	29.0%	3362 (8.6%)	23.3%	2303 (8.7%)	13.8%
Respiratory	2098 (7.4%)	49.0%	3408 (8.7%)	44.4%	2880 (10.8%)	29.7%
Skin	2190 (7.7%)	42.9%	1485 (3.8%)	30.0%	824 (3.1%)	20.0%
Substance Abuse	363 (1.3%)	27.8%	312 (0.8%)	15.1%	45 (0.2%)	15.6%
Trauma	1788 (6.3%)	28.2%	2553 (6.5%)	26.8%	1982 (7.5%)	14.9%
Time of Day						
12 am to 4 am	4900 (17.3%)	34.4%	5459 (14.0%)	27.7%	3643 (13.7%)	14.9%
4 am to 8 am	2698 (9.5%)	32.7%	3285 (8.4%)	27.6%	2491 (9.4%)	15.1%
8 am to 12 pm	2722 (9.6%)	30.3%	4231 (10.8%)	26.0%	3196 (12.0%)	18.3%

12 pm to 4 pm	5301 (18.7%)	35.9%	8185 (21.0%)	31.9%	6335 (23.8%)	20.9%
4 pm to 8 pm	6321 (22.3%)	37.8%	8976 (23.0%)	32.5%	5554 (20.9%)	23.2%
8 pm to 12 am	6399 (22.6%)	37.3%	8912 (22.8%)	31.3%	5379 (20.2%)	18.7%
Day of Week						
Monday	4039 (14.2%)	35.6%	5559 (14.2%)	31.3%	3872 (14.5%)	20.9%
Tuesday	4251 (15.0%)	36.2%	5676 (14.5%)	30.5%	4120 (15.5%)	19.2%
Wednesday	4249 (15.0%)	36.9%	5581 (14.3%)	31.2%	3827 (14.4%)	19.8%
Thursday	3979 (14.0%)	36.9%	5634 (14.4%)	32.4%	3916 (14.7%)	20.2%
Friday	4074 (14.4%)	36.9%	5691 (14.6%)	29.9%	3753 (14.1%)	19.2%
Saturday	3934 (13.9%)	32.5%	5491 (14.1%)	28.8%	3477 (13.1%)	16.7%
Sunday	3815 (13.5%)	33.6%	5416 (13.9%)	28.0%	3633 (13.7%)	18.5%

References

1. Fox J, Monette G. Generalized collinearity diagnostics. *J Am Stat Assoc*, 1992;87(417):178-183. doi:10.2307/2290467