Provider Density and Systemic Contributors to Rural Cardiovascular Disease Mortality in New England

Eashwar Krishna

Department of Sociology, University of Connecticut

Abstract

Introduction: Rural disparities in cardiovascular disease (CVD)-related mortality may be compounded by limited access to primary care and specialist providers. This study sought to quantify the relationship between CVD-related mortality and the availability of providers in rural and non-rural areas of New England, with consideration of systemic socioeconomic factors.

Methods: Thirty-day mortality rates for inpatient heart failure (HF) and heart attacks (HA) at 182 hospitals in the New England region from July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2022, were analyzed using data from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Provider density was derived from the Area Health Resource Database. Differences in mortality rates and provider densities between rural and non-rural areas were assessed using ANOVA models. General linear models were employed to explore the relationships between provider density and mortality outcomes, both with and without adjustments for socioeconomic confounders such as median income, median age, poverty, educational attainment, and racial demographics.

Results: Rural counties had a significantly lower density of cardiologists than non-rural counties ($B = -0.612$, $p < .001$) which persisted when socioeconomic confounders were included in the model ($B = 0.418$, $p = 0.023$). A similar effect was not observed for primary care provider (PCP) density. Rural hospitals also exhibited significantly higher 30-day HF mortality rates compared to non-rural hospitals ($B = 1.671$, $p < .001$), yet this disparity diminished when structural factors were included in the model ($B = 0.161$, $p = .692$). No significant difference in HA mortality rates was observed between rural and non-rural hospitals ($B = -0.52$, $p = .897$). Cardiologist density was significantly associated with HF mortality in unadjusted models ($B = -0.634$, $p < .001$), but its effect weakened after controlling for confounders ($B = -0.298$, $p = .100$). Relationships between PCP density and HA mortality were not significant.

Conclusion: Rural disparities in heart failure mortality in New England persist, likely due in part to insufficient access to cardiologists to provide appropriate long-term care for chronic cardiovascular conditions. There exists a complex intersection between socioeconomic gradients and rurality, underscoring the importance of addressing structural inequities to reduce rural-urban health disparities. Furthermore, greater emphasis needs to be placed on workforce innovations in the recruitment, retention, distribution, and support of rural specialist physicians.

Introduction

Rural communities face substantial challenges in accessing consistent healthcare, contributing to worse outcomes, particularly among patients with chronic diseases. The prevalence of chronic heart disease (CHD) is notably higher in rural populations, affecting 14.2% of residents compared to 11.2% in small metropolitan areas and 9.9% in urban settings (1). These disparities are compounded by limited access to timely follow-up care and low provider density, which are crucial for managing conditions like CHF. For example, early follow-up – within seven days of discharge – has been shown to reduce 30-day readmission rates for CHF patients, a critical factor in improving outcomes (2). Unfortunately, rural areas often lack a sufficient number of specialists and primary care providers (PCPs) alike, making such follow-up difficult.

While most individuals regardless of rural status live within twenty kilometers of a primary care provider, accessing heart failure cardiologists can require rural patients to travel over one hundred kilometers, a burden few can manage without substantial resources (3). For many rural physicians themselves, the challenges don't end with geography. They often face overwhelming patient volumes, itself caused by the low number of physicians sharing the burden, leading to burnout and high turnover rates. Moteirak et al. also found that many new providers leave after one or two years, finding it difficult to sustain their practice amidst such demands (3). This constant cycle of provider shortages and turnover exacerbates the challenges of delivering consistent, high-quality care in rural areas, particularly for chronic conditions requiring specialized follow-up.

Despite extensive research documenting rural-urban disparities in healthcare outcomes, there remains a lack of focused analysis on how provider density directly impacts cardiovascular disease (CVD) outcomes. It has been demonstrated that outpatient resources like disease management clinics (DMCs) staffed by outpatient cardiologists, significantly lower all-cause mortality following hospitalizations for heart failure (4). Furthermore, it has been shown that higher provider density in a particular geographic area is correlated with higher rates of early follow-up (2). However, studies such as that conducted by Harris et. al indicate that in particular regions, socioeconomic factors such as poverty, rather than rurality or provider density, primarily drive hospitalization rates (5). In addition, income level and educational attainment have been demonstrated to be significantly associated with CVD rates in high-income countries such as the

U.S (6). As such, there appears to be a multifaceted influence of rurality and other social determinants of health on cardiovascular disease prevalence, subsequent hospitalization, and thus inpatient mortality rates.

This study seeks to examine how provider density and rural status influence 30-day inpatient mortality rates for cardiovascular disease in New England. By exploring these relationships, the study aims to provide insight into whether increasing provider density could mitigate rural health disparities and improve outcomes for heart failure and other cardiovascular conditions.

Methods

Data Sources

Thirty-day inpatient mortality rates coded as heart failure (MORT_30_HF) or heart attack (MORT_30_AMI) were obtained from the National Complications and Deaths dataset published by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) on January 31st, 2024, which reported these measures from July 1st, 2019, to June 30th, 2022 for hospitals in all U.S states (7). This dataset was filtered to exclude all data points except those located in Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. Of the 182 hospitals included in the study, 28 did not have data for heart failure mortality rates, and 83 did not have data for heart attack mortality; in both cases, this indicated that fewer than twenty-five deaths from either condition had occurred in the three-year timeframe.

Patients discharged alive the same or the day following hospital admission, with inconsistent/unknown demographics or vitals, enrolled in Medicare hospice at any point up to twelve months prior to admission, discharged against medical advice, or diagnosed with COVID-19 upon admission were all excluded from the CMS report for both HF and HA mortality rates; furthermore, patients with LVAD implementation or those who received a heart transplant up to twelve months before admission were excluded from the heart failure dataset.

Hospitals were coded as rural or non-rural using the Rural Health Grants Eligibility tool based on the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy definition, which uses a modified interpretation of Rural-Urban Commuting Area codes to ensure representation of rural tracts that are within a nominally urban county (8). The number of primary care and cardiology care providers by county was drawn from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Area Health Resource files 2022-2023 release, which included data up to 2021 (9). Provider density (practitioners per ten thousand residents) was then calculated using county population data from the 2022 American Community Survey (ACS) release (10).

Systemic variables such as median household income, percentage of residents with a college degree, median age, percentage of nonwhite residents, and percentage of residents below the poverty line, were all measured in 2021 except median age, which was measured in 2022. Values were drawn from the County Health Rankings as published by the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute (11), Federal Reserve Economic Data as released by the St. Louis Federal Reserve (12), the 2022 ACS release (10), the DataUSA portal published by Deloitte (13), and the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates released by the U.S Census Bureau (14), respectively.

Statistical Analysis

A combination of descriptive, comparative, and regression analyses was performed to evaluate the relationship between structural factors, rurality, provider density, and mortality outcomes. The null hypothesis was that there would be no differences in provider densities or cardiovascular mortality rates between rural and non-rural areas, while the alternative hypothesis was that significant differences would exist. Two regression models were constructed for all analyses. Model 1 tested the unadjusted relationship between the independent variable, such as rural or non-rural status, and the dependent variable. Model 2 adjusted for potential systemic confounders to determine whether socioeconomic factors influenced the relationship observed in Model 1; these were: median household income, percentage of residents with a college degree, median age, percentage of nonwhite residents, and percentage of residents below the poverty line, all measured at the county level. The decision to retain both models in the final reporting stemmed from the understanding that rural disparities do not exist in a vacuum but rather in

synergy with social determinants of health; as such Model 1 was intended to demonstrate the disparity "as-is" whereas Model 2 was intended to display the sole effect of rurality, which is by nature a more theoretical measure.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the significance of the predictors in each model, and unstandardized coefficients (B) were reported to describe the strength of the relationships. ANOVA significance levels were reported for each regression model to ensure that the predictors collectively explained a meaningful portion of the variance. For heart failure (HF) and heart attack (HA) mortality, two sets of regression analyses were conducted to compare rural and non-rural hospitals. Both models were tested for multicollinearity, and all predictors were retained in the analysis.

Separate analyses were also conducted to examine differences in provider density. Rural and non-rural counties were compared for primary care provider (PCP) and cardiologist densities (number of practitioners per ten thousand residents) using regression models, where rurality was the independent variable. Descriptive statistics and measures of central tendency were calculated for both rural and non-rural datasets. Furthermore, general linear regressions tested the relationship between provider density and cardiovascular mortality rates separate from rural status. Two sets of analyses were run for each outcome: one with HF mortality as the dependent variable and another with HA mortality as the dependent variable. Provider densities for both PCPs and cardiologists were utilized as independent variables in these regressions. For each analysis, results from both unadjusted (Model 1) and adjusted (Model 2) models were reported.

Multicollinearity diagnostics confirmed that there was no significant overlap between the predictors in any model. All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 29 with a significance threshold of $\alpha = 0.05$.

Results

Regression analyses revealed significant and complex differences in heart failure (HF) mortality rates between rural and non-rural hospitals.

Table 1: Summary of Regression and ANOVA Results

Outcome	Predictor	Model 1 (Unadjusted)	Model 2 (Adjusted)
HF Mortality	Rurality	B = 1.671, **p < .001**	B = 0.161, p = 0.692
HA Mortality	Rurality	B = 0.579, p = 0.055	B = -0.52, p = 0.897
PCP Density	Rurality	B = -0.026, p = 0.960	B = 0.698, p = 0.223
Cardiologist Density	Rurality	B = -0.612, **p < .001**	B = -0.418, **p = 0.023**
HF Mortality	Cardiologist Density	B = -0.634, **p < .001**	B = -0.298, p = 0.100
HF Mortality	PCP Density	B = -0.092, **p = 0.044**	B = -0.074, p = 0.215
HA Mortality	Cardiologist Density	B = -0.255, **p = 0.015**	B = -0.348, p = 0.074
HA Mortality	PCP Density	B = -0.042, p = 0.227	B = -0.096, p = 0.193

Model 1, which examined the unadjusted relationship, showed that rural hospitals had significantly higher 30-day HF mortality rates compared to non-rural hospitals (B = 1.671, p < .001). However, in Model 2, after adjusting for systemic confounders (median household income, percentage of residents with a college degree, median age, percentage of nonwhite residents, and percentage of residents below the poverty line) the rural-urban disparity in HF mortality was no longer significant (B = 0.161, p = 0.692). No single confounder contributed independently to the overall variance, suggesting that the effects were collectively explained by the included variables. For heart attack (HA) mortality, neither Model 1 (B = 0.579, p = 0.055) nor Model 2 (B = -0.52, p = 0.897) demonstrated a significant difference in mortality rates between rural and non-rural hospitals. ANOVA results for both models were not significant.

Provider density analyses revealed differing patterns for primary care providers (PCPs) and cardiologists. For PCP density, Model 1 showed no significant difference between rural and non-rural counties (B = -0.026, p = 0.960). However, in Model 2, which adjusted for systemic confounders, there was a weak yet insignificant effect of rurality on PCP density (B = 0.698, p = 0.223). Median age, percentage of residents with a college degree, and median income were the primary predictors of variance in PCP density. ANOVA indicated that while the adjusted model was significant, the variance in PCP density could largely be explained by these confounders rather than rurality itself. For cardiologist density, Model 1 revealed a significant disparity, with

rural counties having significantly fewer cardiologists per 10,000 residents than non-rural counties (B = -0.612, p < .001). This disparity persisted in Model 2 after adjusting for confounders, though the magnitude of the effect was reduced (B = 0.418, p = 0.023). ANOVA results confirmed the significance of both models. Median age, percentage of residents with a college degree, median income, and percentage of nonwhite residents were all significant contributors to the variance.

Regression analyses examining provider density and mortality outcomes showed that cardiologist density was significantly associated with HF mortality in Model 1, where higher cardiologist density was linked to lower HF mortality rates (B = -0.634, p < .001). In Model 2, after adjusting for systemic variables, this relationship weakened and became borderline insignificant (B = -0.298, p = 0.100). For PCP density and HF mortality, Model 1 demonstrated a significant relationship (B = -0.092, p = 0.044), but this relationship disappeared after adjustment in Model 2 (B = -0.074, p = 0.215). For HA mortality, cardiologist density was significantly associated with lower mortality in Model 1 (B = -0.255, p = 0.015). However, in Model 2, after controlling for confounders, the relationship was no longer significant (B = -0.348, p = 0.074). PCP density did not exhibit a significant relationship with HA mortality in either Model 1 (B = -0.042, p = 0.227) or Model 2 (B = -0.096, p = 0.193).

ANOVA results for the provider density models confirmed that both unadjusted and adjusted models were significant for cardiologist density and HF mortality, as well as for cardiologist density and HA mortality. However, the models for PCP density and mortality outcomes were not significant.

Discussion

The results demonstrate significant differences in healthcare access and outcomes between rural and non-rural areas, particularly in heart failure mortality. Rural hospitals have substantially higher heart failure mortality rates compared to urban hospitals, but this disparity lessens when systemic socioeconomic factors such as income, education, and racial demographics are controlled for. This finding suggests that disparities in social determinants of health (SDOH) play a central role in shaping rural-urban inequities, echoing evidence from other contexts that suggests rural areas perform poorly in multiple SDOH metrics (15). Notably, no

significant difference was observed in heart attack mortality rates between rural and urban hospitals, which may reflect the acute, standardized nature of heart attack treatment protocols that are less dependent on long-term access to specialist care (16). This contrast between conditions requiring ongoing management, such as heart failure, and acute events, like heart attacks, is a lesson in the importance of examining disease-specific drivers of rural-urban disparities.

Rural counties consistently have significantly lower cardiologist density compared to non-rural areas, even after controlling for systemic factors. While confounders such as median income and education partially moderate the rural-urban disparity in cardiologist density, they do not fully explain it. The structural challenges faced by rural hospitals—geographic isolation, limited financial resources, and reduced access to professional development opportunities—are likely significant contributors to these disparities. It may also be the case that there is a financial barrier to placing specialists in community settings parallel to general practitioners (17). Moreover, these findings align with previous research indicating that adults from lower-income households are less likely to have cardiologists involved in their care during hospitalizations for heart failure (18), further highlighting the intersection of socioeconomic inequities and healthcare access. Cardiologist density was significantly associated with heart failure mortality in unadjusted analyses, but this relationship weakened and became statistically insignificant after adjusting for confounders. This suggests that while specialist availability is critical, its impact and perhaps the variable itself are mediated by structural factors. For heart attack mortality, the absence of significant associations with cardiologist density may reflect the effectiveness of the aforementioned standardized treatment protocols, which reduce variability in care delivery across settings and allow non-physician providers and general practitioners to fill the gaps.

In contrast to cardiologist density, primary care provider density showed no significant difference between rural and non-rural areas in the unadjusted model. However, systemic factors such as income, education, and age explain much of the observed variance in PCP density, indicating that these providers are distributed more equitably across regions but remain influenced by broader socioeconomic conditions. Furthermore, the lack of a strong association between PCP density and heart failure or heart attack mortality reinforces the idea that primary care providers, while essential for general health maintenance, may not be as directly impactful

on outcomes for conditions requiring specialist intervention. This highlights a potential gap in the rural healthcare infrastructure: even when primary care access is comparable, the lack of specialists may leave rural populations underserved for complex or chronic conditions like heart failure.

The role of socioeconomic variables in shaping healthcare outcomes is evident across the analyses. Median income, education, and racial demographics consistently influenced provider availability and mortality rates. Lower-income populations, for instance, have been reported to have increased cardiovascular disease hospitalization due to cost-related medication underuse (19), which likely contributes to outcome disparities in rural areas. Additionally, racial minorities remain underrepresented in beneficial clinical trials for HF treatment. Prescription rates of widely-accepted and novel therapies alike also remain disproportionately lower among racial and ethnic minority patients (20); historical mistrust of the medical establishment among certain racial groups, combined with institutional discrimination, likely forms the foundation for these trends. Although these socioeconomic trends account for a non-negligible portion of the variance in provider density and health outcomes, they do not fully explain the structural inequities that persist in rural healthcare systems. Geographic isolation, financial constraints, and the inherent challenges of recruiting and retaining specialists in rural areas all contribute to the persistent disparities in cardiologist availability and heart failure outcomes (21). As one study noted, while differences in SDOH partially explain rural-urban disparities, gaps in access to advanced care and treatment quality remain significant factors (22). Taken together, these results highlight the complex nature of rural-urban disparities in cardiovascular healthcare. Addressing these disparities requires a targeted approach that goes beyond frequently-discussed socioeconomic variables to focus on the specific issues facing rural healthcare systems.

The need for such a targeted approach raises several critical considerations for rural health policy, particularly in addressing the disparities in cardiologist access. These disparities, deeply rooted in systemic inequities, demand targeted and multifaceted interventions to effectively mitigate their impact on rural populations. One promising avenue is the implementation of recruitment and retention programs tailored specifically for rural areas. Programs such as the Physicians for Shortage Area Program (PSAP) at Jefferson Medical College provide a useful model for this approach. PSAP has demonstrated substantial success in

increasing the percentage of rural family physicians in Pennsylvania, accounting for a significant portion of the rural physician workforce despite the program's relatively small size (23).

The introduction of similar programs targeting cardiologists and other specialists, coupled with incentives such as rural residency rotations and preferences for in-state applicants, could play a pivotal role in building a more sustainable rural healthcare workforce. It follows from logic that the providers most likely to practice in rural areas are those who have lived or trained in such (24), and medical education institutions seeking to produce rural physicians will likely see success by creating more rural training opportunities. Numerous initiatives currently aim to attract physicians to underserved regions with a disproportionate emphasis on recruitment, with less attention given to retaining these providers after their initial service commitments are met (25). Furthermore, the vast majority of newly-created rural residency programs have a family/internal medicine focus (26); this may reflect a crippling oversight to train rural specialists. It should also be noted that such incentive programs were the least prevalent in the northeastern U.S, which includes the New England region studied by the present analysis (25).

Most existing programs also fail to address the underlying challenges that lead to high turnover rates among rural physicians. For instance, programs that give preference to applicants who completed their residencies in the state or in rural areas have shown promise in improving retention rates, as these physicians are more likely to remain in rural settings even after their service commitments have ended (25). Expanding these types of initiatives, while also addressing factors such as professional isolation, limited career advancement opportunities, and inadequate support staff, could help build a more stable rural healthcare workforce. It is imperative that new policy initiatives focus on retention as well as retainment of specialist providers in rural areas; such initiatives would not only help ameliorate the observed health disparities, but would also increase the social integration of specialists within rural areas, which may have the additional beneficial effect of increasing trust in the medical establishment among these communities.

Another key policy implication is the need for telemedicine and outreach programs as short-term solutions to bridge the gap in access to specialist care. Rural hospitals and clinics often face significant challenges in recruiting cardiologists due to geographic isolation and

limited financial resources, but telemedicine provides an opportunity to extend the reach of urban-based specialists to underserved areas. By enabling remote consultations and follow-up care, telemedicine can reduce the need for rural patients to travel long distances for specialist appointments, which is a significant barrier to care in these settings (27). This approach is particularly well-suited to managing chronic conditions like heart failure, where regular monitoring and adjustments to treatment plans are critical. Telemedicine has already shown promise in improving cardiovascular care in rural communities (28) and should be prioritized for further expansion.

However, telemedicine alone is not sufficient to address the long-term needs of rural populations. While it offers a mechanism to improve access, it cannot fully substitute for the presence of specialists within these communities. Policies should therefore support innovative care models such as visiting consultant clinics (29), where urban-based cardiologists provide on-site care in rural hospitals and clinics on a rotating basis. These clinics not only bring specialist expertise directly to rural areas but also facilitate collaboration between primary care providers and specialists, which can enhance the overall quality of care. The combination of telemedicine and visiting consultant clinics offers a more comprehensive strategy for addressing the immediate and ongoing needs of rural patients.

This study contributes to this body of research by quantifying the relationships between provider density, mortality outcomes, and socioeconomic factors in the New England region, a geographic area that has received less attention in rural health research compared to other parts of the United States. While these findings are region-specific, they reflect broader trends observed in rural healthcare systems across the country, underscoring the need for nationwide and local policy initiatives to address these disparities.

Limitations

One notable limitation in this analysis is the potential for missing data among hospitals with low mortality counts, particularly for heart attack patients, which could lead to an underrepresentation of smaller facilities in the analysis. Such smaller facilities are more likely to be in rural tracts; the implication for this study is that while HF mortality disparities are likely satisfactorily captured, the same for HA may not have been, leading to insignificant results in

that metric. Post-hoc analysis options of statistical power are themselves limited by the lack of data available at this time. Additionally, unmeasured confounders, such as differences in hospital resources, staffing levels, or patient comorbidities, may have influenced the results. While the inclusion of systemic confounders such as income, education, and racial demographics provides a robust framework for isolating the effect of rurality, it is possible that other variables not accounted for in the models could also play a role in explaining the observed disparities. Future research should aim to address these gaps by incorporating more comprehensive data and exploring the impact of other potential confounders on rural-urban health inequities.

The finding that primary care providers are relatively equitably distributed across New England counties should not be taken out of the context of the metric used; the fact that there are equal rates of providers per ten thousand residents in rural and non-rural counties is not sufficient to demonstrate equitable access. It is also true that certain rural counties, most notably those in the northern regions of Maine, are much larger in terms of land area while simultaneously being sparsely populated. As such, the rate of providers by population may seem sufficient, yet the actual access to regular health care is still inhibited by other, uniquely rural, factors such as geography. Indeed, distance to primary care providers has been isolated as a significant contributor to higher disease burdens (30).

Furthermore, the results of these analyses should not be interpreted as diminishing the irrefutable impact of primary care providers on preventing and managing chronic cardiovascular conditions. This study was limited by its usage of inpatient mortality, which reflects the relative progression of patients into severe statuses and the management of said status at complex stages. As such, there exists the chance that the analysis overemphasized the role of specialist care, considering that inpatient care is the setting in which specialist care is the most critical. Alternatively, outpatient mortality could be utilized, yet further structural factors such as EMS response systems would need to be controlled for.

Despite these limitations, the findings offer valuable insights into the systemic and structural challenges facing rural healthcare systems. They highlight the urgent need for targeted interventions to improve access to specialist care, particularly for conditions like heart failure that require ongoing management and coordination. Policymakers should consider the

implementation of comprehensive strategies that address both the immediate and long-term needs of rural communities, including telemedicine expansion, visiting consultant clinics, and programs to recruit and retain specialists. By addressing the multifaceted nature of rural healthcare inequities, these policies have the potential to significantly improve health outcomes for underserved populations.

Conclusion

Rural hospitals in New England exhibit higher heart failure mortality rates compared to non-rural hospitals, a disparity that diminishes but does not fully resolve when adjusting for socioeconomic factors such as income, education, and racial demographics. The shortage of cardiologists in rural areas stands out as a key contributor, emphasizing the structural challenges these communities face in accessing specialized care. Primary care provider density, which shows no significant urban-rural difference, further suggests that rural health inequities are driven more by specialized care shortages than general healthcare access. This analysis underscores the urgent need for targeted interventions to improve rural health outcomes and promote healthcare equity.

References

1) Schopfer DW. Rural health disparities in chronic heart disease. *Prev Med*. 2021;152(Pt 2):106782. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106782
2) Verdejo HE, Ferreccio C, Castro PF. Heart Failure in Rural Communities. *Heart Fail Clin*. 2015;11(4):515-522. doi:10.1016/j.hfc.2015.07.011
3) Motairek I, Chen Z, Makhlouf MHE, et al. Mapping Geographic Proximity to Cardiologists Across the United States. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2023;16(10):e010133. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.123.010133.
4) Van Spall HGC, Rahman T, Mytton O, et al. Comparative effectiveness of transitional care services in patients discharged from the hospital with heart failure: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2017;19(11):1427-1443. doi:10.1002/ejhf.765
5) Harris DE, Aboueissa AM, Hartley D. Myocardial infarction and heart failure hospitalization rates in Maine, USA - variability along the urban-rural continuum. *Rural Remote Health*. 2008;8(2):980
6) Schultz WM, Kelli HM, Lisko JC, et al. Socioeconomic Status and Cardiovascular Outcomes: Challenges and Interventions. *Circulation*. 2018;137(20):2166-2178. doi:https://doi.org/10.1161/circulationaha.117.029652
7) Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Complications and Deaths - National. Cms.gov. Published 2024.https://data.cms.gov/provider-data/dataset/qqw3-t4ie#data-table
8) Health Resources and Services Administration. Rural Health Grants Eligibility Analyzer. HRSA Data Warehouse. Published 2020. https://data.hrsa.gov/tools/rural-health
9) Health Resources and Services Administration. Area Health Resources Files. HRSA Data Warehouse. Published July 31, 2023. https://data.hrsa.gov/topics/health-workforce/ahrf
10) U.S Census Bureau. American Community Survey 5-year estimates. data.census.gov. Published 2022. https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST1Y2022.S0101
11) University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute. Median Household Income. County Health Rankings & Roadmaps. Published 2022. https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/health-data/health-factors/social-economic-factors/income/

12) St. Louis Federal Reserve. Federal Reserve Economic Data. Stlouisfed.org. Published 2021. https://fred.stlouisfed.org/release/tables?rid=330&eid=391810
13) Deloitte. Data USA County Reports. datausa.io. Published 2022. https://datausa.io/profile/geo
14) US Census Bureau. Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) Program. Census.gov. Published October 5, 2022. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe.html
15) Weeks WB, Chang JE, Pagán JA, et al. Rural-urban disparities in health outcomes, clinical care, health behaviors, and social determinants of health and an action-oriented, dynamic tool for visualizing them. *PLOS Glob Public Health*. 2023;3(10):e0002420. Published 2023 Oct 3. doi:10.1371/journal.pgph.0002420
16) Franklin C, Mathew J. Developing strategies to prevent inhospital cardiac arrest: analyzing responses of physicians and nurses in the hours before the event. *Crit Care Med*. 1994;22(2):244-247.
17) Lovén M, Pitkänen LJ, Paananen M, Torkki P. Evidence on bringing specialised care to the primary level-effects on the Quadruple Aim and cost-effectiveness: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2024;24(1):2. Published 2024 Jan 2. doi:10.1186/s12913-023-10159-6
18) Zhang DT, Onyebeke C, Nahid M, et al. Social Determinants Of Health And Cardiologist Involvement In The Care Of Adults Hospitalized For Heart Failure. *Journal of Cardiac Failure*. 2023;29(4):651. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cardfail.2022.10.254
19) Heisler M, Choi H, Rosen AB, et al. Hospitalizations and deaths among adults with cardiovascular disease who underuse medications because of cost: a longitudinal analysis. *Med Care*. 2010;48(2):87-94. doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e3181c12e53
20) Lewsey SC, Breathett K. Racial and ethnic disparities in heart failure: current state and future directions. *Curr Opin Cardiol*. 2021;36(3):320-328. doi:10.1097/HCO.0000000000000855
21) Collins C. Challenges of Recruitment and Retention in Rural Areas. *N C Med J*. 2016;77(2):99-101. doi:10.18043/ncm.77.2.99

22) Zeitler EP, Joly J, Leggett CG, et al. The role of comorbidities, medications, and social determinants of health in understanding urban-rural outcome differences among patients with heart failure. *J Rural Health*. 2024;40(2):386-393. doi:10.1111/jrh.12803

23) Rabinowitz HK, Diamond JJ, Markham FW, Santana AJ. Increasing the supply of rural family physicians: recent outcomes from Jefferson Medical College's Physician Shortage Area Program (PSAP). *Acad Med*. 2011;86(2):264-269. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31820469d6

24) Palnati SR, Jurado CM, Bhakta SH. Exploring Rural Medicine Residency Programs: A Narrative Review. *Cureus*. 2024;16(10):e72238. Published 2024 Oct 23. doi:10.7759/cureus.72238

25) Arredondo K, Touchett HN, Khan S, Vincenti M, Watts BV. Current Programs and Incentives to Overcome Rural Physician Shortages in the United States: A Narrative Review. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2023;38(Suppl 3):916-922. doi:10.1007/s11606-023-08122-6

26) Payerchin R. CMS creating residencies to focus on primary care, but they have not expanded to rural areas. MedicalEconomics. Published August 14, 2023. Accessed December 26, 2024. https://www.medicaleconomics.com/view/cms-creating-residencies-to-focus-on-primary-care-but-they-have-not-expanded-to-rural-areas

27) Butzner M, Cuffee Y. Telehealth Interventions and Outcomes Across Rural Communities in the United States: Narrative Review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23(8):e29575. Published 2021 Aug 26. doi:10.2196/29575

28) Tolu-Akinnawo O, Ezekwueme F, Awoyemi T. Telemedicine in Cardiology: Enhancing Access to Care and Improving Patient Outcomes. *Cureus*. 2024;16(6):e62852. Published 2024 Jun 21. doi:10.7759/cureus.62852

29) Gruca TS, Pyo TH, Nelson GC. Providing Cardiology Care in Rural Areas Through Visiting Consultant Clinics. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2016;5(7):e002909. Published 2016 Jun 30. doi:10.1161/JAHA.115.002909

30) Billi JE, Pai CW, Spahlinger DA. The effect of distance to primary care physician on health care utilization and disease burden. *Health Care Manage Rev*. 2007;32(1):22-29. doi:10.1097/00004010-200701000-00004