medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Healthcare visits of the population 50+ in Europe from 2004 to 2022

Patterns and trends

Van Kinh Nguyen[1,*], Anna Reuter[1,*], Mirna Abd El Aziz[2], and Till Bärnighausen[1]

[1]Heidelberg Institute for Global Health, Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, 69120, Germany
[2]London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK
[*]Equally contributed

July 10, 2024

Background: Guaranteeing access to healthcare among the older population is essential to the planning and preparation of health services. We describe the health care visits among the population 50+ across 27+ European countries, the spatio-temporal trends and determinants, and the changes during and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

Methods: We used individual panel data from 27 European countries across 10 waves of the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe. We analysed the number of healthcare visits (NHV) over time and their correlation with age and chronic conditions using a Bayesian spatio-temporal model.

Results: The nominal rate of healthcare visits varied among countries from two to five visits per year and increased over time, with a slight convergence across countries. The NHV were higher for women and increased approximately linearly with age. Individuals with chronic conditions had a 20%–60% higher NHV, with the largest difference for individuals with cancer. The COVID-19 epidemic severely affected the NHV, with an estimated reduction from 65% to 95%. During COVID-19, older individuals and those with chronic conditions had a more than proportional reduction in the NHV. After COVID-19, the pattern of NHV mostly returned to pre-pandemic levels, with an over-shooting for people with cancer and a lag for people with cardiovascular diseases.

Conclusion: The quick recovery in the NHV for most European countries indicate that access to care stabilised again. Yet, gap in care during COVID-19 was more than proportionate for vulnerable groups, such that these groups require timely action to prevent long-term consequences of missed care.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Access to health care is vital to guarantee early prevention, timely detection and treatment of diseases, as well as retention-in-care. The number of health care visits (NHV) during a period of time can proxy the overall level of health care access, especially in comparison across population groups and over time. This way, reductions in health care utilisation can serve as an early warning sign for the health system, as they can imply postponed prevention and treatment initiation, or a disruption of ongoing treatments. Similarly, different levels of health care visits across population groups can indicate potential inequalities of access, while changes in these differences signal whether inequalities are diminishing or growing. This information on health care access is crucial especially for the older population, as they are affected the most by chronic conditions and multimorbidity, and hence have the highest need of regular health care visits.

Yet, data on health care visits is often available only on aggregated levels, such as the country level. As such, it is neither informative of the general distribution of health care visits within the population, nor of potential differences across population groups. On the other hand, individual data on the NHV is usually based on surveys, which often lack comparability across time or across countries. Yet, both dimensions are needed to differentiate between country-specific and general trends over time in order to analyse country-specific challenges. Especially in the context of global shocks, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, this differentiation can help policymakers to identify their country's strengths and vulnerabilities in comparison to others.

The Survey of Health, Aging and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) poses a unique chance to bring together individual data comparable across time and countries in Europe. Past studies showed that the NHV is positively correlated with frailty [9], the number of health conditions [22], age, being female [24], and, for some countries, the level of education [10]. Individuals who underestimate their health have a higher NHV, individuals which overestimate their health a lower NHV than individuals correctly estimating their health. [33]. Few studies analysed how these determinants changed over time: Palladino et al. showed that the association between the number of health conditions and the NHV decreased over time [22], while Spitzer and Shaikh showed that the role of misperceptions stayed fairly constant [33]. The analysis over time is crucial to fully grasp not only time trends, but also trajectories during and after shocks such as the recent pandemic. During the COVID-19 pandemic, one in eight respondents reported foregoing health care visits, more than a quarter had prescheduled treatments postponed, and one in twenty respondents was denied health care during the first six months of the COVID-19 pandemic [30]. However, these numbers do not stand in comparison to pre-COVID levels, and hence cannot report how the dynamics of health care visits changed over time.

In this study, we make use of the full SHARE panel data, spanning from 2004 to 2022, to describe the determinants of health care visits and estimate the distribution for the population aged 50+ in Europe. This allows us to describe changes over time, disruptions during the COVID-19 pandemic, and pathways to post-COVID levels.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Materials and Methods

Data

Data from 27 European countries were collated from the Survey of Health, Aging and Retirement in Europe (SHARE), waves 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9[11, 14, 20, 21, 23, 28] and the two waves of the COVID-19 survey [31, 32]. The SHARE panel includes health and socioeconomic data of respondents aged 50 or older and their partners. The primary outcome is the number of health care visits an individual reported in the period prior to the interview. The recall period was 12 months for waves 1-9, and varying periods in the COVID-19 waves (wave I: since the outbreak, wave II: since the last interview/past 12 months). For these two waves, we used the exact date of interview to calculate the person-month contributed by each individual. Healthcare visits were considered as any reported outpatient health care visits, excluding visits to dentists. Details can be found in the Appendix .

We excluded respondents who were staying at a nursing facility at the time of interview, those younger than 50 years at the time of the interview, as they were not considered as target sample, and respondents aged 100 or older to preclude selection effects at high ages. To retain the maximum sample size with an observed number of health care visits, we matched individuals across the survey waves and imputed missing values for the covariates (age and gender) by records in the other waves. Health conditions that were collected only in the most recent waves were excluded from the analysis. Ireland participated in only one survey and was not included in this analysis. Overall, data from 147,116 individuals, resulting in 505,607 observations, were included in the analyses.

Model and implementation

We implemented a combined likelihoods approach to estimate the covariate effect without the influence of epidemic and post-epidemic data, as well as providing a concrete reference for the estimation of the epidemic effects. First, the number of healthcare visits during a time period was modelled as a rate per person-month. This allows different periods of recall (further details in **??**) to be modelled and projected. We constructed a Bayesian hierarchical model for the number of healthcare visit y_{ijt} in the corresponding observation period E_{ijt} months for an individual i in country j at interview time t as follows:

$$y_{ijt} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_{ijt}) \tag{1}$$

$$\lambda_{ijt} = \gamma_{ijt} E_{ijt} \exp(\eta_{ijt}) \tag{2}$$

In particular, we modelled the number of healthcare visits as a Poisson count that was extended to allow a larger variation of the NHV via the over-dispersion parameter (γ) with a unit prior mean, and separately for men and women. For the pre-epidemic data period, the linear predictor is modelled as

$$\eta_{ijt} = \beta_0 + \phi_j + \delta_j t + X_{ijt}\beta_x + f(age_{ijt}) + \epsilon_{ijt} \tag{3}$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

where we assumed a country-specific difference, $\phi_j \sim N(0, \sigma_j^2)$, that varied around the global mean β_0. The mean NHV varied according to a set of health conditions with a shared fixed-effect among the countries, $X_{ijt}\beta_x$; a shared effects of the continuous age variable was modelled with a second-order random walk to allow for potential structured nonlinear effects, denoted by $f(age_{ijt})$. Trends over time, represented by the year of interview, were modelled with a random slope term δ_j, which allows for differences in the trends among the countries. We assumed that the trend among the countries might be correlated and modelled the slopes with the spatially correlated model BYM.[1] Individual identification across the waves was modelled with a normally distributed term $\epsilon_{ijt} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$ to take into account within-individual variability. Since the data during and after COVID-19 will affect the coefficient's estimates in the pre-epidemic period, we used only the data before the COVID-19 to inform the model's parameters at this step. We tested for beta convergence by regressing the yearly growth rate of the NHV on the initial NHV.

For the epidemic period, the estimated linear predictor from the pre-epidemic model was carried over to provide the reference point for the case without an epidemic. The data of this period will provide estimates of the changes compared to what would be predicted given the same individual characteristics. The linear predictor for this period of time u read as

$$\eta_{iju} = \hat{\eta_{ijt}} + X_{iju}\rho_{xu}\beta_{xt} + f(age_{iju}) + \epsilon_{iju} + \nu_{ju} \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{\eta_{ijt}}$ denotes the expected level of NHV without epidemic, ρ_{xu} models the relative change of a comorbidity effect compared to pre-epidemic, a separate age pattern during the epidemic was modeled with the RW2 term $f(age_{iju})$, ν_{ju} denotes the country-specific change in the mean of the NHV during the epidemic. Similarly, for the post-epidemic period, we assumed that there might exist a carry-over effect of the pandemic and replaced the coefficients in Equation 4 with those representing for the estimates from latest wave 9 collected in 2022.

Despite three separated data and model's parameters, all the equations were estimated jointly, using augmented data approach and three likelihoods for the three data periods, in which the parameters were copied [8] over to the epidemic and post-epidemic periods, including their uncertainty in the estimates. There were three parts of the data, each of which yields a slightly different data likelihood. For the survey waves 1,2, 4, and 5, SHARE recorded the NHV truncated at the value 98; during wave $6-9$, SHARE recorded the NHV without truncation; during the two waves COVID-19 I & II, SHARE recorded the NHV as a binary response, which we interpreted as a Poisson variable truncated at one. The three parts can be modelled as a censored Poisson at 98, a Poisson, and a censored Poisson at one, respectively. The likelihood reads as

$$L = \prod_{ij} P(Y^{d=0} = y_{ij}) \prod P(Y^{d=1} \geq T_w) \tag{5}$$

where $d = 0, 1$ is an indicator whether the observation was censored; $T_w = \{1, 98\}$ denotes two cases of censored data described above. The model's parameters were estimated with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the R package INLA.[5] We computed posterior medians and 95% credible intervals of the outcomes of interests, including the annual NHV, the differential of the time trend, and the effect of COVID-19, using posterior simulations of 1000 parameter samples. The models were compared using Watanabe Information Criteria (WAIC). Computations were done using the High Performance Computer Cluster at the Center for Scientific Computing (CSC) of the Goethe University Frankfurt with the single model runtime $\tilde{2}$6h on 40-cores 128Gb RAM AlmaLinux.

Results

Health care visits across countries

Fig. 1 shows the expected annual number of health care visits by country and sex estimated for the year 2019, controlling for age, comorbidities, and trends over time. The nominal rate of visits, i.e., for an individual without comorbidites and of average age 75 years, varied from 2 visits to 6 visits per year. The highest rate of visits was observed in the centre of Europe (e.g., Luxembourg, Belgium, Germany, Italy), whereas the lowest rate of visits was observed in Northern Europe (Finland, Sweden) and small islands (Malta, Cyprus). A similar spatial pattern was observed for male and female respondents. In most countries, women had more healthcare visits than men.



Figure 1: Posterior estimate of the rate of health care visits annualised at the year 2019. The estimates are conditioned on the reference group in the regression model: no comorbidity and an average age ($\tilde{75}$)

Health care visits over time

Fig. 2 shows the estimated linear trend by sex and countries without the potential effect of the pandemic. There is a large variation in trends across countries. Overall, there is a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

slight increase in the NHV over time. Also, there is a small convergence, with countries with initially higher rates experiencing a smaller increase in the NHV than countries with initially lower rates (beta convergence men: -1.3%, p-value 0.069, beta convergence women: -2.4%, p-value 0.024). The decreasing and increasing trends converged to an average of four visits per year. Within most countries, trends were relatively similar for women and men. In Italy and Spain, and to a lesser extent in France, Denmark, and Portugal, there was a convergence of women's and men's visits over time. This seems to be the case as well in Slovakia and Bulgaria, although for these countries, the observation period only started with wave 7. For Hungary, Austria, Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania, trends seem to diverge, albeit for the latter three countries, the observation period is very short.

Pandemic shock and recovery

Fig. 3 shows the estimated relative reduction of the healthcare visits rate during and after the COVID-19 pandemic by country. The estimates were derived from the difference between the expected rate if the pandemic had not occurred based on the pre-epidemic data. Individuals in all countries experienced a large drop in the rate of healthcare visits (Fig. 3); the least affected country was Germany with an estimated reduction of 61%. The most affected countries were Italy, Croatia, Estonia, Hungary, where the healthcare visits came nearly to an halt with an estimated reduction of up to 95% in the NHV. Healthcare visits returned back to the pre-pandemic levels for most of the countries. Other countries had not reached, but were relatively close to pre-pandemic levels, with up to 20% below the expected rate. The rate still remained low in Italy, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia. The post-pandemic recovery does not seem to correlate with the severity of the shock during the pandemic.

We grouped the countries by according to the government health expenditure as % of GDP in 2019. Countries with a very high health expenditure tend to have a smaller decline of healthcare visits during COVID-19, but this pattern is not visible among countries with lower levels of health expenditure.

Healthcare visits across age and comorbidities

Fig. 4 shows that for most of the chronic conditions, having either one of them was associated with a higher rate of health care visits. The largest difference in the rate of health care visits was among people with cancer compared to people without cancer. Having chronic lung diseases, diabetes, a history of stroke, or heart attack was associated with an increase in the visit rate by approximately 20%. For most health conditions, the correlation was larger for men than for women. For stroke, stomach and related ulcers and high cholesterol, the correlation was similarly high for both sexes. During the epidemic period, the NHV decreased relatively more for most of the chronic conditions, but remained slightly higher than for respondents without a condition. Post-epidemic data suggests that there was no noticeable carry-over effect of the pandemic, with the correlation of the NHV with a given condition bouncing back close to the pre-epidemic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2: Posterior estimate of the annual rate of health care visits over time from 2004 to 2019. the line and its colour shade are the posterior median and 95% uncertainty interval. The estimates are conditioned on the reference group in the regression model: no comorbidities, an average age ($\tilde{75}$).

level.

During the pre-epidemic period, age was positively linearly correlated with the number of visits, with a steeper trend for men compared to women. This pattern, however, changed during the epidemic. For respondents aged 50-75, the younger the lower the NHV; but for respondents at higher ages, there was a steep negative correlation between age and the NHV. After the pandemic, the positive linear correlation returned for both sexes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: Posterior estimate of the percentage reduction of the healthcare visits rate compared to what is expected by the past trend, the point and number are the posterior median, the lines are the 95% uncertainty interval.

Discussion

Using data from 147,116 individuals aged 50 and older in Europe, we found a large variation in the number of health care visits across Europe, with a tendency of convergence over time. While the COVID-19 pandemic disturbed health care visits differently across countries and age groups, these disturbances were reduced quickly after the end of COVID-19 for most. Our findings contribute to an understanding of how health care visits in Europe evolved over nearly two decades, and the resilience to large systemic shocks such as the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4: Posterior estimate of the relative rate of health care visits by sex. The point/line and line range/shaded colours denote the posterior median and 95% uncertainty interval, respectively. The diseases and health conditions were compared against not being diagnosed with the respective condition. Age was modelled as nonlinear terms for each of the periods (pre, epi, post) separately.

COVID-19 pandemic.

Our findings add to the few studies exploring changes of determinants over time in the SHARE data. The observed convergence in healthcare visits might be partly attributable to an underlying convergence in health, as observed for grip strength across European regions between 2004/5 and 2018 [17]. However, other dimensions of health improved homogeneously over time (cognitive function, health deficit accumulation), or stayed constant (activities of daily life) [17, 19]. Hence, other factors, such as more similar health behaviours or health system functions might contribute to the convergence in healthcare visits, but the evidence on such changes is scarce. One study focussing on the role of perceived health found that while the association between misperceptions of one's own health and healthcare visits stayed homogeneously constant [33], the correlation between the number of diagnosed health conditions with the number of healthcare visits changed differently across countries over time [22].

Our results confirmed a gender gap in healthcare utilization, as found in earlier studies [2, 3, 12, 24], but showed that for some high-income countries, the gender gap is closing over time. Potential drivers of this gap are perceived and actual needs for healthcare, as

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

well as a differential treatment by the care system: Women have worse self-reported health [6], but also report more health deficits than men [16]. Furthermore, misperceptions of one's health seem to have similar effects on healthcare utilization for men and women [33]. The role of differences in objective needs are harder to assess: While we controlled for diagnosed health conditions, this captures differences in objective needs for healthcare only insofar as there are no gender differences in the likelihood to receive a diagnosis when sick. Yet, women are more likely to engage in colorectal screening [27] and preventive health in general [15], and are screened less often for cardiovascular diseases [26]. Also, after diagnoses, follow-up consultations differ across gender [4, 18]. Consequently, the narrowing of the gender gap might be attributable to a more similar (perceived or actual) demand for healthcare services, or a more equitable care continuum.

Similarly, we observed gender gaps in the correlation of diagnoses with healthcare visits, with relatively larger increases of healthcare visits for diagnosed men than women. Again, this might be the consequence of later diagnoses and hence more progressed diseases and higher care needs, or of more follow-ups and referrals to specialists for men. Crucially, the size of the gap differed across conditions.

We focused on the correlation of each diagnosis on healthcare visits separately, rather than the number of diagnoses. Studies using the number of diagnoses of condition, or deficit indices containing diagnosed conditions, find a positive correlation between multimorbidity and healthcare visits [13, 10, 9]. We showed that the difference in healthcare visits among diagnosed and undiagnosed respondents was particularly high for cancer, and comparatively low for stomach and related ulcers, cataracts, and high cholesterol. During COVID-19, these associations decreased, resulting in a relatively larger gap in care for people with chronic conditions. Importantly, the NHV increased more than proportionally for individuals with cancer after COVID-19, indicating that their conditions might have become more severe. At the same time, the NHV increased less than proportionally for less acute conditions such as diabetes, hypertension, or a former heart attack or stroke, such that they still experience a gap in care compared to the time before the pandemic. Without further attention to ensure a full retention in care, these conditions are likely to worsen over time and induce higher healthcare costs in the medium run.

In line with the literature, we find a clear age gradient in healthcare visits for the pre-pandemic period [7, 10]. As people age, health deficits accumulate [16], increasing the need for healthcare. Also, national guidelines and health recommendations might induce more healthcare visits. However, there is also evidence that time to death, rather than age itself, is driving the correlation with healthcare visits [25]. Irrespective of the drivers of the age gradient, its disappearance during COVID-19 for men, and partly reversal for women, indicates sizeable inequities in access to health for the elderly population amid the pandemic. While the age gradient largely recovered after the pandemic, the long-term consequences of the care interruption for elderly might be severe, given that most of the elderly have at least one condition requiring chronic care.

Our study comes with several limitations. The number of healthcare visits measures healthcare access and utilization, but not necessarily whether utilization is adequate. As the number of objectively needed healthcare visits is highly individual and cannot

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

be observed, we cannot distinguish between underutilization, adequate utilization, and overutilization. Hence, a higher rate of healthcare visits does not necessarily reflect better healthcare quality. Still, disparities in the rate of healthcare visits across groups and over time hint at potential deficits for one of the groups, and thus indicate the need for further investigation and potential policy intervention. Another limitation is the changed measurement of healthcare utilization during COVID-19. First, only the extensive margin, i.e., whether a doctor was visited, was assessed. Second, the phrasing of the question differed, as respondents were asked whether they went to a facility other than a hospital, compared to whether they have seen or talked to a doctor or nurse in the previous waves. Third, the recall period in the first COVID survey was changed, from past 12 months to "since the outbreak". We tried to incorporate these differences by modelling different Poisson distributions, but cannot rule out that this led to systematic differences in measurement which cannot be captured by the model. However, given that wave 9 returned to the previous questionnaire, we are confident that the reported post-COVID changes accurately reflect the difference to the pre-COVID period.

Overall, our findings suggest that while access to care largely returned to pre-pandemic levels for the population age 50+ in Europe and across countries, people at higher ages and with chronic conditions require more attention from research and policy making. Both groups were disproportionately affected in their access to care, despite being the groups most in need of regular healthcare visits. In the aftermath of this pandemic, their retention-to-care needs to be ensured, and more monitoring might be required to detect health consequences of the disruption in care early on. For future pandemics, strategies are needed to ensure that disruptions in care are particularly monitored and buffered for those vulnerable groups.

Acknowledgments

This paper uses data from SHARE Waves 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 as well as SHARE Corona Surveys 1 and 2 (DOIs: 10.6103/SHARE.w1.800, 10.6103/SHARE.w2.800, 10.6103/SHARE.w4.800, 10.6103/SHARE.w5.800, 10.6103/SHARE.w6.800, 10.6103/SHARE.w7.800, 10.6103/SHARE.w8.800, 10.6103/SHARE.w8ca.800, 10.6103/SHARE.w9ca.800), see Börsch-Supan et al. (2013) and Scherpenzeel et al. (2020) for methodological details [10, 20]. The SHARE data collection has been funded by the European Commission, DG RTD through FP5 (QLK6-CT-2001-00360), FP6 (SHARE-I3: RII-CT-2006-062193, COMPARE: CIT5-CT-2005-028857, SHARELIFE: CIT4-CT-2006-028812), FP7 (SHARE-PREP: GA N°211909, SHARE-LEAP: GA N°227822, SHARE M4: GA N°261982, DASISH: GA N°283646) and Horizon 2020 (SHARE-DEV3: GA N°676536, SHARE-COHESION: GA N°870628, SERISS: GA N°654221, SSHOC: GA N°823782) and by DG Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion through VS 2015/0195, VS 2016/0135, VS 2018/0285, VS 2019/0332, and VS 2020/0313. Additional funding from the German Ministry of Education and Research, the Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science, the U.S. National Institute on Aging (U01_AG09740-13S2, P01_AG005842, P01_AG08291, P30_AG12815, R21_AG025169, Y1-AG-4553-01, IAG_BSR06-11, OGHA_04–064, HHSN271201300071C,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

RAG052527A) and from various national funding sources is gratefully acknowledged (see https://share-eric.eu/).

Funding

Research in this article is a part of the European Union's H2020 SHARE COVID-19 project (Grant Agreement No. 101015924).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval

The SHARE study was approved by the Ethics Committee at the University of Mannheim (waves 1-4) and by the Ethics Council of the Max-Planck-Society (waves 5-8). Additionally, country-specific ethics committees or institutional review boards approved implementations of SHARE in the participating countries. All study participants provided informed consent.

References

[1] Julian Besag, Jeremy York, and Annie Mollié. "Bayesian Image Restoration, with Two Applications in Spatial Statistics". In: *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 43.1 (Mar. 1, 1991), pp. 1–20. ISSN: 1572-9052. DOI: 10.1007/BF00116466. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00116466 (visited on 11/21/2023).

[2] Karl-Heinz Ladwig et al. "Gender differences of symptom reporting and medical health care utilization in the German population". en. In: *European Journal of Epidemiology* 16.6 (June 2000), pp. 511–518. ISSN: 1573-7284. DOI: 10.1023/A:1007629920752. URL: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007629920752 (visited on 12/06/2023).

[3] Áurea Redondo-Sendino et al. "Gender differences in the utilization of health-care services among the older adult population of Spain". In: *BMC Public Health* 6.1 (June 2006), p. 155. ISSN: 1471-2458. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2458-6-155. URL: https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-6-155 (visited on 12/06/2023).

[4] Nakela L. Cook et al. "Differences in Specialist Consultations for Cardiovascular Disease by Race, Ethnicity, Gender, Insurance Status, and Site of Primary Care". In: *Circulation* 119.18 (May 2009). Publisher: American Heart Association, pp. 2463–2470. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.108.825133. URL: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/full/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.108.825133 (visited on 12/06/2023).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[5] Håvard Rue, Sara Martino, and Nicolas Chopin. "Approximate Bayesian Inference for Latent Gaussian Models by Using Integrated Nested Laplace Approximations". In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 71.2 (2009), pp. 319–392. ISSN: 1467-9868. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00700.x. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00700.x (visited on 11/22/2023).

[6] Ahmad Reza Hosseinpoor et al. "Social Determinants of Self-Reported Health in Women and Men: Understanding the Role of Gender in Population Health". en. In: *PLOS ONE* 7.4 (Apr. 2012). Publisher: Public Library of Science, e34799. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0034799. URL: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0034799 (visited on 01/28/2022).

[7] Florence Jusot, Zeynep Or, and Nicolas Sirven. "Variations in preventive care utilisation in Europe". en. In: *European Journal of Ageing* 9.1 (Mar. 2012), pp. 15–25. ISSN: 1613-9380. DOI: 10.1007/s10433-011-0201-9. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-011-0201-9 (visited on 10/19/2022).

[8] Thiago G. Martins et al. "Bayesian Computing with INLA: New Features". In: *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 67 (Nov. 2013), pp. 68–83. ISSN: 01679473. DOI: 10.1016/j.csda.2013.04.014. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167947313001552%20http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2013.04.014.

[9] Stefania Ilinca and Stefano Calciolari. "The Patterns of Health Care Utilization by Elderly Europeans: Frailty and Its Implications for Health Systems". en. In: *Health Services Research* 50.1 (2015). _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1475-6773.12211, pp. 305–320. ISSN: 1475-6773. DOI: 10.1111/1475-6773.12211. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1475-6773.12211 (visited on 10/19/2022).

[10] Marco Terraneo. "Inequities in health care utilization by people aged 50+: Evidence from 12 European countries". en. In: *Social Science & Medicine* 126 (Feb. 2015), pp. 154–163. ISSN: 0277-9536. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.12.028. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277953614008363 (visited on 10/19/2022).

[11] Axel Börsch-Supan. *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 1*. 2016. DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.W1.500. URL: http://www.share-project.org/data-documentation/waves-overview/wave-1.html (visited on 10/05/2022).

[12] Ingrid Osika Friberg et al. "Sex differences in health care consumption in Sweden: A register-based cross-sectional study". en. In: *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* 44.3 (May 2016). Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd STM, pp. 264–273. ISSN: 1403-4948. DOI: 10.1177/1403494815618843. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494815618843 (visited on 12/06/2023).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[13] Raffaele Palladino et al. "Associations between multimorbidity, healthcare utilisation and health status: evidence from 16 European countries". In: *Age and Ageing* 45.3 (May 2016), pp. 431–435. ISSN: 0002-0729. DOI: 10.1093/ageing/afw044. URL: https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afw044 (visited on 10/19/2022).

[14] Axel Börsch-Supan. *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 4*. 2017. DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.W4.600. URL: http://www.share-project.org/data-documentation/waves-overview/wave-4.html (visited on 10/05/2022).

[15] Julia Hiller, Kathrina Schatz, and Hans Drexler. "Gender influence on health and risk behavior in primary prevention: a systematic review". en. In: *Journal of Public Health* 25.4 (Aug. 2017), pp. 339–349. ISSN: 1613-2238. DOI: 10.1007/s10389-017-0798-z. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-017-0798-z (visited on 12/06/2023).

[16] Ana Lucia Abeliansky and Holger Strulik. "How We Fall Apart: Similarities of Human Aging in 10 European Countries". In: *Demography* 55.1 (Jan. 2018), pp. 341–359. ISSN: 0070-3370. DOI: 10.1007/s13524-017-0641-8. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-017-0641-8 (visited on 04/18/2023).

[17] Linda J Ahrenfeldt et al. "Comparison of cognitive and physical functioning of Europeans in 2004-05 and 2013". In: *International Journal of Epidemiology* 47.5 (Oct. 2018), pp. 1518–1528. ISSN: 0300-5771. DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyy094. URL: https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyy094 (visited on 02/02/2022).

[18] Christelle Clerc Liaudat et al. "Sex/gender bias in the management of chest pain in ambulatory care". en. In: *Women's Health* 14 (Jan. 2018). Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd STM, p. 1745506518805641. ISSN: 1745-5057. DOI: 10.1177/1745506518805641. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/1745506518805641 (visited on 12/06/2023).

[19] Ana Lucia Abeliansky and Holger Strulik. "Long-run improvements in human health: Steady but unequal". en. In: *The Journal of the Economics of Ageing* 14 (Jan. 2019), p. 100189. ISSN: 2212-828X. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeoa.2019.01.003. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212828X18300732 (visited on 09/17/2021).

[20] Axel Börsch-Supan. *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 2*. Version 7.0.0. 2019. DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.W2.700. URL: http://www.share-project.org/data-documentation/waves-overview/wave-2.html (visited on 10/05/2022).

[21] Axel Börsch-Supan. *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 6*. Version 7.0.0. 2019. DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.W6.700. URL: http://www.share-project.org/data-documentation/waves-overview/wave-6.html (visited on 10/05/2022).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[22] Raffaele Palladino et al. "Multimorbidity And Health Outcomes In Older Adults In Ten European Health Systems, 2006–15". In: *Health Affairs* 38.4 (Apr. 2019). Publisher: Health Affairs, pp. 613–623. ISSN: 0278-2715. DOI: 10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05273. URL: https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/full/10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05273 (visited on 09/28/2022).

[23] Axel Börsch-Supan. *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 7*. Version 7.1.0. 2020. DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.W7.710. URL: http://www.share-project.org/data-documentation/waves-overview/wave-7.html (visited on 10/05/2022).

[24] David Cantarero-Prieto, Marta Pascual-Sáez, and Javier Lera. "Healthcare Utilization and Healthy Lifestyles among Elderly People Living in Southern Europe: Recent Evidence from the SHARE". en. In: *Atlantic Economic Journal* 48.1 (Mar. 2020), pp. 53–66. ISSN: 1573-9678. DOI: 10.1007/s11293-020-09657-3. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11293-020-09657-3 (visited on 08/24/2022).

[25] Joan Costa-Font and Cristina Vilaplana-Prieto. "'More than one red herring'? Heterogeneous effects of ageing on health care utilisation". en. In: *Health Economics* 29.S1 (Oct. 2020), pp. 8–29. ISSN: 1057-9230, 1099-1050. DOI: 10.1002/hec.4035. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hec.4035 (visited on 08/24/2022).

[26] Raphaëlle Delpech et al. "Physicians' preventive practices: more frequently performed for male patients and by female physicians". In: *BMC Health Services Research* 20.1 (Apr. 2020), p. 331. ISSN: 1472-6963. DOI: 10.1186/s12913-020-05136-2. URL: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-05136-2 (visited on 12/06/2023).

[27] Isabel Mosquera et al. "Inequalities in participation in colorectal cancer screening programmes: a systematic review". en. In: *European Journal of Public Health* 30.3 (June 2020), pp. 558–567. ISSN: 1101-1262, 1464-360X. DOI: 10.1093/eurpub/ckz236. URL: https://academic.oup.com/eurpub/article/30/3/558/5828321 (visited on 12/06/2023).

[28] Axel Börsch-Supan. *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 8*. Version 1.0.0. 2021. DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.W8.100. URL: http://www.share-project.org/data-documentation/waves-overview/wave-8.html (visited on 10/05/2022).

[29] Thomas Hale et al. "A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker)". In: *Nature Human Behaviour* 5.4 (Apr. 2021). Number: 4 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, pp. 529–538. ISSN: 2397-3374. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-021-01079-8. URL: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-021-01079-8 (visited on 08/24/2022).

[30] Šime Smolić, Ivan Čipin, and Petra Međimurec. "Access to healthcare for people aged 50+ in Europe during the COVID-19 outbreak". en. In: *European Journal of Ageing* (June 2021). ISSN: 1613-9380. DOI: 10.1007/s10433-021-00631-9. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-021-00631-9 (visited on 07/08/2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[31] Axel Börsch-Supan. *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 8. COVID-19 Survey 1*. Version 8.0.0. 2022. DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.W8CA.800. URL: http://www.share-project.org/special-data-sets/share-corona-survey-1.html?L=0 (visited on 07/25/2022).

[32] Axel Börsch-Supan. *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 9. COVID-19 Survey 2*. Version 8.0.0. 2022. DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.W9CA.800. URL: http://www.share-project.org/special-data-sets/share-corona-survey-2.html (visited on 07/25/2022).

[33] Sonja Spitzer and Mujaheed Shaikh. "Health misperception and healthcare utilisation among older Europeans". en. In: *The Journal of the Economics of Ageing* 22 (June 2022), p. 100383. ISSN: 2212-828X. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeoa.2022.100383. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212828X22000160 (visited on 08/24/2022).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Supplemental Information

Survey questions related to the outcome

The following questions were used to collect the number of healthcare visits.

Table 1: Survey questions on number of healthcare visits

Wave	Question	Variable
1,2,4,5	Now please think about the last 12 months. About how many times in total have you seen or talked to a medical doctor or qualified nurse about your health? Please exclude dentist visits and hospital stays, but include emergency room or outpatient clinic visits.	hc002_
6–8	Now please think about the last 12 months. Since {FLLastYearMonth} about how many times in total have you seen or talked to a medical doctor or qualified/registered nurse about your health? Please exclude dentist visits and hospital stays, but include emergency room or outpatient clinic visits.	hc602_
COVID I	Since the outbreak of Corona, did you go to a doctor's office or a medical facility other than a hospital?	caq020_
COVID II	...last year/since last visit	caq120_

Determine recall period with *oxCGRT* timeline

The Oxford Covid-19 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT) data [29] is used to define when was "the start of the epidemic" for each country and individual in the first COVID survey. Since the question asked about "since the outbreak of Corona", we assume that participants are more likely to remember the time the epidemic started as the time when the lockdown measures were put in place which could physically affect the participants or limit the contact with their relatives. The Stringency scores over time are shown in Fig. 5, overlaying by the time when the first wave of COVID was conducted. We choose the date with a score across the C category from 15 and above, meaning at least one of the lockdowns was in effect in the respective country, as the reference time point. Individual date of interview was requested from SHARE and used to calculate the duration from the reference date.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.10.24310226; this version posted July 10, 2024. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5: Filled rectangles are the duration of the interview in the first COVID wave. Lines are the Stringency indices. The vertical dashed line was the time when lockdown measures were enforced in the respective country.