

1 **Title:** Evaluating the Relationship between Neighborhood-Level Social Vulnerability and  
2 Patient Adherence to Ophthalmology Appointments

3 **Running Title:** Neighborhood-Level Social Vulnerability and Appointment Adherence

4 **Authors:** Angelica C. Scanzera, OD, MPH<sup>1</sup>, Sasha Kravets, MA<sup>1,2</sup>, Joelle A. Hallak, PhD<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Hugh Musick, MBA<sup>3</sup>, Jerry A. Krishnan, MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>, R.V. Paul Chan, MD, MSc<sup>1</sup>, Sage J. Kim,  
6 PhD<sup>4</sup>

7 **Author affiliations:**

8 <sup>1</sup> Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary  
9 University of Illinois Chicago  
10 1855 W. Taylor Street  
11 Chicago, IL 60612, United States

12  
13 <sup>2</sup> Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health  
14 University of Illinois Chicago  
15 1603 W. Taylor Street  
16 Chicago, IL 60612, United States

17  
18 <sup>3</sup> Institute for Healthcare Delivery Design, Population Health Sciences Program  
19 University of Illinois Chicago  
20 1220 S. Wood Street  
21 Chicago, IL 60657, United States

22  
23 <sup>4</sup> Division of Health Policy & Administration, School of Public Health  
24 University of Illinois Chicago

25 1603 W. Taylor Street  
26 Chicago, IL 60612, United States

27

28 **Corresponding author contact information:**

29 Angelica C. Scanzera  
30 Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences  
31 Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary, University of Illinois at Chicago  
32 1855 W. Taylor Street  
33 Chicago, IL 60612  
34 Email: [ascanz@uic.edu](mailto:ascanz@uic.edu)  
35 Phone: 312-996-5411  
36 Fax: 312-996-4255

37

38 **Meeting presentation:** Early findings from this work were presented during the Implementation  
39 Science poster session at the Midwest Clinical and Translational Research Meeting in Chicago,  
40 IL on March 4, 2022.

41

42 **Acknowledgments:**

43 The authors thank the Center for Health Equity Research (CHER) Chicago for their invaluable  
44 collaboration.

45

46 **Funding/support:** This work was supported by funding by NIH/NEI K12 EY021475 (Scanzera),  
47 NIH/NEI EY001792, NIH/NIMHD U54MD012523 (Kim, Scanzera), and an unrestricted grant to  
48 the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences from Research to Prevent Blindness.

49 The funding organizations had no role in the design or conduct of this research

50

51 **Conflict of Interest:** Dr. R.V. Paul Chan discloses the following 1) Alcon; 2) Novartis; 3)  
52 Phoenix (Unpaid SAB). Dr. Krishnan reports research funding from Regeneron, and consulting  
53 fees from GlaxoSmithKline and Bdata, Inc. Dr. Hallak discloses the following: Abbvie  
54 (Employment). The following authors have no financial disclosures: Dr. Angelica C. Scanzera,  
55 Sasha Kravets, Hugh Musick. Dr. Sage Kim. All authors attest that they meet the current  
56 ICMJE criteria for authorship.

57

58 **Disclaimer statement**

59 The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily  
60 represent the views of the National Eye Institute; the National Institute on Minority Health and  
61 Health Disparities; the National Institutes of Health.

62

63 **Address for Reprints:** Angelica Scanzera, OD, MPH  
64 Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary, University of Illinois at Chicago  
65 1855 W. Taylor Street  
66 Chicago, IL 60612

67

68 **Acronyms:**

69 SVI Social Vulnerability Index

70 SD Standard Deviation

71 IQR Inter-Quartile Range

72

73 **Key Words:** Social vulnerability index, adherence, health equity

74

75

76 **Abstract**

77 **Objective:** Little is known about the association between neighborhood characteristics and non-  
78 adherence to attending scheduled ophthalmology appointments. The purpose of this study was  
79 to examine the association between neighborhood-level social vulnerability and adherence to  
80 scheduled ophthalmology appointments.

81 **Design:** Retrospective cohort study.

82 **Participants:** Adults aged 18 years and older with scheduled ophthalmology appointments  
83 between September 12, 2020, and February 8, 2021.

84 **Methods:** A single-center study was conducted at the University of Illinois Chicago Illinois Eye  
85 and Ear Infirmary, an urban tertiary care referral center in Chicago, Illinois. Primary exposure is  
86 neighborhood-level Social Vulnerability Index (SVI), based on the patient's address of  
87 residence. The SVI ranks (possible range 0 to 1) each census tract on 15 social factors into four  
88 related themes (socioeconomic status, household composition & disability, minority status &  
89 language, and housing type & transportation). Higher SVI rankings indicate higher levels of  
90 social vulnerability. The overall SVI ranking and rankings for each of the four themes were  
91 analyzed separately as the primary exposure of interest in multivariable logistic regression  
92 models that controlled for age, sex, status (new or established appointment), race, and distance  
93 from clinic.

94 **Main Outcome Measure:** Non-adherence to attending scheduled ophthalmology  
95 appointments, defined as missing more than 25% of scheduled appointments.

96 **Results:** A total of 8,322 unique patients (41% non-Hispanic Black, 24% Hispanic, 22% non-  
97 Hispanic White) had scheduled appointments during the five-month study period (range 1 to 23  
98 appointments). Of those, 28% of patients were non-adherent to appointments. In multivariable  
99 logistic regression models, non-adherence to appointments was associated with living in higher

100 SVI ranking neighborhoods (socioeconomic status: (adjusted odds ratio [95% confidence  
101 interval]) 2.38 [1.94, 2.91]; household composition/disability: 1.51 [1.26, 1.81]; minority  
102 status/language: 2.03 [1.55, 2.68]; housing type/transportation: 1.41 [1.16, 1.73]; and overall  
103 SVI: 2.46 [1.99, 3.06]).

104 **Conclusions:** Neighborhood-level measures of social vulnerability are associated with greater  
105 risk of non-adherence to scheduled ophthalmology appointments. Studies to better understand  
106 these neighborhood-level vulnerabilities are needed to inform the design and evaluation of  
107 multi-level (individual and neighborhood) strategies to reduce disparities in access to  
108 ophthalmology care.

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125 The Healthy People 2030 Initiative has maintained a goal to increase the proportion of adults  
126 who have had a comprehensive eye exam in the last 2 years.<sup>1</sup> Despite strong evidence  
127 supporting this initiative, disparities continue to exist. The prevalence of glaucoma, diabetic  
128 retinopathy, and overall visual impairment is greater in Blacks and Hispanics compared to non-  
129 Hispanic Whites.<sup>2,3</sup> In addition to biologic factors, these findings are the result of social  
130 determinants of health,<sup>3-5</sup> and recognizing the social context contributing to these disparities is  
131 critical.

132  
133 Vision loss is a public health issue disproportionately affecting marginalized communities,<sup>6-11</sup> It  
134 can limit every aspect of an individual's daily life, including communication, education,  
135 independence, mobility, and career goals,<sup>12</sup> and is one of the most feared disabilities in the  
136 United States.<sup>13</sup> Screening for refractive error and early eye disease could prevent a high  
137 proportion of unnecessary vision loss or blindness.<sup>10</sup> For example, one study found that 50% of  
138 subjects receiving an ophthalmologic screening examination had an improvement in vision after  
139 refractive correction alone.<sup>14</sup> However, minorities and people of low socioeconomic status  
140 underutilize eye care, are disproportionately affected by barriers to care, and are at the greatest  
141 risk of vision loss.<sup>6,7</sup>

142  
143 It is widely accepted that an individual's health is determined primarily by factors outside of the  
144 healthcare system, such as poverty, unemployment, or lack of access to care.<sup>15,16</sup> In a previous  
145 study at our institution early in the COVID-19 pandemic, we found that individuals scheduled for  
146 recommended urgent eye appointments who did not adhere more often came from  
147 neighborhoods with a greater proportion of Blacks, greater unemployment rates, and a greater  
148 number of COVID-19 related deaths.<sup>17</sup> A higher neighborhood unemployment rate continued to

149 be significantly associated with non-adherence after controlling for race and cumulative deaths  
150 from COVID-19, showing the importance of understanding neighborhood context.

151  
152 Little is understood about the modifiable and non-modifiable neighborhood-level determinants  
153 contributing to issues in eye care access. One potential tool to consider in better understanding  
154 these neighborhood-level determinants is the Social Vulnerability Index (SVI). Social  
155 vulnerability is defined as the potential negative effects on communities caused by external  
156 stressors on human health.<sup>18</sup> Such stressors include natural disasters or health crises such as  
157 the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which disproportionately affect resource poor communities  
158 and contribute to human suffering.<sup>19</sup> In particular, the Centers for Disease Control and  
159 Prevention (CDC) SVI is a composite measure that represents neighborhood relative  
160 vulnerability compared to all other communities nationally by census tract. U.S. Census data is  
161 used to create a percentile rank for each census tract using 15 social factors organized into 4  
162 themes: socioeconomic status, household composition & disability, minority status & language,  
163 and housing type & transportation (**Figure 1**). Though SVI is typically used in response to  
164 emergency events or disasters,<sup>20</sup> it has recently been studied in healthcare to better understand  
165 access and outcomes.<sup>21, 22</sup>

166  
167 In the interest of improving eye health equity, we utilized SVI as a potentially applicable  
168 measure to assess disparities in adherence and target interventions. The objective of this study  
169 was to examine the association between neighborhood-level social vulnerability and adherence  
170 to scheduled ophthalmology office appointments at an urban tertiary referral center.

171

172

173

174 **METHODS**

175 ***Design, Setting, & Participants***

176 In this retrospective cohort study, we assessed the association between patient individual-level  
177 variables and neighborhood-level social vulnerability on adherence to scheduled ophthalmology  
178 appointments at an urban tertiary care referral center. All individuals 18 years and older  
179 scheduled for an ophthalmology appointment between September 12, 2020, and February 8,  
180 2021, at the Department of Ophthalmology at the University of Illinois Chicago were included in  
181 this study. This study was approved by the University of Illinois at Chicago Institutional Review  
182 Board (protocol 2021-0177). This research adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki.

183

184 ***Exposure***

185 The primary exposure of interest is neighborhood-level social vulnerability index (SVI) based on  
186 the patient's address of residence. The 2018 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention SVI  
187 was used for this study.<sup>18</sup> Percentile ranking values range from 0 to 1, with higher values  
188 indicating greater vulnerability. Each census tract receives a separate percentile ranking for  
189 individual themes as well as an overall composite score. Residential addresses were geocoded  
190 using ArcGIS, a geographic information systems software, to append U.S. Census community  
191 characteristics including overall SVI, SVI of each theme, and each of the 15 social factors by  
192 census tract.

193

194 Secondary exposures included individual-level variables, which were provided through a  
195 medical record review. Variables included age, gender, race/ethnicity, insurance status,  
196 distance from the clinic (miles), new patient status, number of appointments scheduled during  
197 the study period, and appointment status (reported as completed or no-show in the record). A  
198 patient was considered new if they had not previously been evaluated in the service they were  
199 scheduled in.



200 **Outcome**

201 The main outcome of interest was non-adherence to attending scheduled ophthalmology  
202 appointments. Patients had varying numbers of scheduled appointments (between 1 and 23).  
203 We looked at those who missed 20%, 25%, and 30% of their scheduled appointments, and the  
204 proportion of individuals who would be defined as non-adherent was similar (29.6%, 28%,  
205 27.9%). For the purposes of this study, a patient was considered non-adherent if they missed  
206 more than 25% of scheduled appointments.

207

208 **Statistical Analysis**

209 Mean  $\pm$  Standard Deviation (SD) or median  $\pm$  inter-quartile range (IQR) and proportions were  
210 reported for continuous and categorical variables, respectively. A t-test or Wilcoxon rank-sum  
211 test was conducted to assess a difference in continuous variables by adherence status, and a  
212 Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test was used to assess a difference in categorical variables  
213 and adherence status. SVI rankings for each of the four themes, as well as an overall composite  
214 ranking, were analyzed separately as the primary exposure of interest in multivariable logistic  
215 regression models that controlled for age, sex, status (new or established appointment),  
216 race/ethnicity, and distance from clinic. An interaction between race and SVI was initially  
217 examined but was found to be insignificant. Using the logistic regression model, the predicted  
218 probability of non-adherence was determined for each patient. A p-value of  $\leq 0.05$  was  
219 considered statistically significant. Data were analyzed using R (R Core Team (2019). R: URL  
220 <https://www.R-project.org/>).

221

222 **RESULTS**

223 A total of 8,322 unique patients were scheduled for an ophthalmology appointment during the  
224 study period. The number of scheduled appointments ranged from 1 to 23 per patient. Just

225 over 1 in 4 (28%) patients were non-adherent. Mean age was 57 ±17 years. Most patients were  
226 women (59.2%), and non-Hispanic Black (41.2%), Hispanic (24.1%), or non-Hispanic White  
227 (21.9%). Over two-thirds of patients had public insurance (37.2% Medicare, 34.5% Medicaid),  
228 and 29.7% were new patients. Median (IQR) distance to the clinic that patients traveled was 7.0  
229 (±10) miles (**Table 1**). Patients scheduled for an ophthalmology appointment come from  
230 communities where the mean percentage of persons living below poverty is 20.3%,  
231 unemployment rate is at 10.6%, minorities accounted for 68.3%, and per capita income median  
232 (IQR) estimate is \$24,541 (\$18,557) (ranging from \$2,530 to \$130,543).

233

### 234 ***Individual-level Determinants***

235 Table 1 summarizes individual characteristics by adherence. There was no significant  
236 difference by sex; however, non-adherent patients were slightly younger (54.2 vs. 57.8 years;  
237  $P<0.01$ ) and living closer (6.92 vs. 7.37 miles;  $P<0.01$ ). Non-adherence was greatest among  
238 Blacks (36.1%), followed by Hispanics (30.3%), other (26.6%), Asian (18.0%), and White  
239 (13.0%;  $P<0.01$ ). New patients were more likely to be non-adherent (32.2%) compared to  
240 established patients (26.3%;  $P<0.01$ ). Non-adherence was also greatest among uninsured  
241 patients (45.5%) followed by those with Medicaid (35.9%).

242

### 243 ***Neighborhood-level Determinants***

244 Median overall SVI in this population was 0.70. Median SVI was higher in non-adherent (0.78)  
245 compared to adherent patients (0.66;  $P<0.01$ ). In multivariable logistic regression models, non-  
246 adherence to appointments was more likely with higher SVI rankings (socioeconomic status:  
247 (adjusted odds ratio [95% confidence interval]) 2.38 [1.94, 2.91]; household  
248 composition/disability: 1.51 [1.26, 1.81]; minority status/language: 2.03 [1.55, 2.68]; housing  
249 type/transportation: 1.41 [1.16, 1.73]; and overall SVI: 2.46 [1.99, 3.06]). **Table 2** provides the  
250 multivariable regression model using overall SVI as the primary exposure. Median SVI was

251 greater in non-adherent compared to adherent patients for each of the four individual themes  
252 (P<0.01). The greatest difference was noted for socioeconomic status, in which non-adherent  
253 patients had a median SVI of 0.82 compared to 0.67 in adherent patients. **Figure 2** further  
254 illustrates themed median SVI by adherence.

255

256 Median neighborhood SVI was highest among Blacks (0.79) followed by Hispanics (0.77), other  
257 (0.57), Asians (0.45), and Whites (0.30). When controlling for age, sex, patient status, distance  
258 from clinic and overall SVI, the odds of non-adherence (95% CI) were 2.8 (2.39, 3.37) and 2.1  
259 (1.78, 2.55) for non-Hispanic Blacks and Hispanics, respectively, when compared to non-  
260 Hispanic Whites. Using the multivariable model, we computed the predicted probability of non-  
261 adherence for a range of SVI from 0-1 for each racial or ethnic group. **Figure 3** illustrates that  
262 as neighborhood SVI increases, the probability of non-adherence increases, regardless of a  
263 racial category. Additionally, we see that the probability of non-adherence is highest for Blacks,  
264 regardless of neighborhood SVI, and increases at a somewhat faster rate, compared to all other  
265 races. Specifically, the mean predicted probability of non-adherence for non-Hispanic Blacks is  
266 0.32, compared to 0.14 for non-Hispanic Whites.

267

## 268 **DISCUSSION**

269 We evaluated the effects of individual and neighborhood-level factors on adherence to  
270 scheduled ophthalmology appointments at an urban tertiary referral center. The key findings of  
271 this study are: 1) greater neighborhood-level social vulnerability is associated with a greater  
272 likelihood of non-adherence to ophthalmology appointments, and 2) after adjusting for  
273 neighborhood-level vulnerability and other relevant factors, race/ethnicity continued to be  
274 significantly associated with non-adherence to appointments.

275

276 We demonstrated that CDC SVI is a useful tool to examine disparities in adherence and  
277 outcomes within ophthalmology. Though CDC SVI was established to assist with understanding  
278 vulnerability to disasters, this study demonstrates the use of SVI to examine health disparities,  
279 particularly in ophthalmology appointment adherence. To the authors' knowledge, this is the  
280 first study that assesses the use of the CDC's SVI in ophthalmology. However, SVI has been  
281 widely used in health science research. For example, higher neighborhood SVI has been  
282 associated with an increased number of chronic conditions,<sup>23</sup> worse surgical outcomes,<sup>21</sup> and  
283 increased risk of mortality.<sup>24</sup> The use of SVI to understand the patient's neighborhood context  
284 expands social determinants of health outcomes in ophthalmic research.

285  
286 Overall, greater neighborhood-level SVI is associated with a greater likelihood of non-adherence  
287 to ophthalmology appointments, and the largest difference in adherence was observed with the  
288 socioeconomic status SVI theme. Low socioeconomic status is associated with a higher  
289 incidence of open globe injury,<sup>25</sup> presenting at a more advanced stage of age-related macular  
290 degeneration,<sup>26</sup> a greater risk of developing glaucoma,<sup>27</sup> and higher rates of blindness.<sup>28</sup>  
291 Residency in more disadvantaged neighborhoods is associated with poor adherence to both  
292 diabetic retinopathy screening<sup>29, 30</sup> and physician recommended urgent ophthalmology  
293 appointments.<sup>17</sup> These findings indicate the importance of understanding the communities our  
294 patients reside in. Moving forward, SVI is being integrated into many electronic health records,  
295 which opens the opportunity for incorporating social context into the standard of care and  
296 clinical interventions.

297  
298 While non-adherence was higher in racial/ethnic minorities, there was also a stark difference in  
299 neighborhood-level vulnerability by race/ethnicity in our patient population. Median  
300 neighborhood-level SVI in Blacks and Hispanics were significantly higher than in Whites (0.79,  
301 0.77, and 0.30, respectively). Neighborhood level inequities are well recognized and

302 exacerbated by residential segregation. Chicago is a highly segregated city, with a dissimilarity  
303 index over 56, meaning that 56% of Chicago's population would have to move to another  
304 neighborhood to balance the composition of individual neighborhoods to the region's general  
305 demographic composition.<sup>31</sup> Racial residential segregation affects how neighborhood  
306 investment decisions are made which has resulted in uneven access to health care<sup>32, 33</sup> and  
307 consequently, shorter life expectancies in highly segregated Black communities.<sup>34, 35</sup> Racial  
308 minorities are more likely to live in underserved areas with lower levels of health and social  
309 service opportunities, further perpetuating poor health outcomes.<sup>36-39</sup> The National Institute on  
310 Minority Health and Health Disparities (NIMHD) Research Framework describes a  
311 multidimensional model that depicts a comprehensive set of health determinants which includes  
312 domains of influence over the life course (biological, behavioral, physical/built environment,  
313 sociocultural environment, and the health care system) and levels of influence (individual,  
314 interpersonal, community, and societal).<sup>40</sup> The intersections of the domains with each level of  
315 influence have distinct effects on health outcomes. Community and societal investment could  
316 improve individual behavior, in our case, adherence to appointments, and health outcomes.  
317  
318 Interestingly, after adjusting for neighborhood-level SVI and other relevant factors, Blacks and  
319 Hispanics continued to have greater odds of non-adherence to scheduled ophthalmology  
320 appointments compared to Whites, indicating that other neighborhood and individual-level  
321 factors are at work, beyond SVI. This is consistent with a study of almost 80,000 Medicare  
322 beneficiaries with glaucoma which found that eye care utilization disparities were greatest  
323 among Blacks and Hispanics, even after stratifying by socioeconomic status.<sup>41</sup> One hypothesis  
324 for this difference focuses on concentrated affluence rather than disadvantage. Brooks-Gunn et  
325 al argued that concentrated socioeconomic resources or affluence, not captured by SVI, can  
326 have a positive influence even after controlling for individual family resources.<sup>42</sup> While  
327 individual-level social capital has the greatest influence on health,<sup>43, 44</sup> increased neighborhood-

328 level social capital is also positively related to better health.<sup>43-46</sup> in our patient population,  
329 minorities live in more disadvantaged areas while Whites live in less disadvantaged areas. This  
330 spatial inequality results in social, economic, and political isolation,<sup>47</sup> which could explain the  
331 differences in eye care utilization in racial and ethnic minorities found in our study not captured  
332 with SVI.

333

334 Another possibility is that racial discrimination could be a deterrent to medical care. Racial  
335 discrimination is a risk factor for disease and a contributor to structural racism in health care.<sup>48</sup>  
336 Findings from a large meta-analysis found that individuals who reported experiences of racial  
337 discrimination were two to three times as likely to be less trusting of health care workers and  
338 systems, perceive lower quality of and satisfaction with care, and express less satisfaction with  
339 patient-provider communication and relationships. Experiencing racism was also associated  
340 with delays in seeking health care and reduced adherence to medical recommendations.<sup>49</sup>  
341 Within eye care, lack of trust, empathy, or patient-doctor communication have each been  
342 emphasized as barriers to utilization in populations at high risk of vision loss,<sup>6</sup> and minorities  
343 have reported feeling less respected by health care professionals compared to non-Hispanic  
344 Whites.<sup>50</sup> There have been several calls to diversify the workforce to improve patient care and  
345 focus on improving health equity through research<sup>51, 52</sup> as both ophthalmology and the field of  
346 medicine currently lack diversity.<sup>53</sup> Given these findings, it is imperative for providers to  
347 acknowledge that structural racism exists in healthcare, recognize and work toward ways to  
348 address implicit bias, and diversify the workforce.

349

350 Our study has several limitations that should be considered. 1) Most notably, this study  
351 investigated data at a single center. Given that our patient population is more diverse than the  
352 make-up of the city of Chicago, this may limit the generalizability of our study; however, these  
353 findings are most relevant to more vulnerable populations. Future multi center studies are

354 needed to confirm these findings. 2) We also focused on demographic factors and did not  
355 leverage all variables available within the medical record. The patient's ocular diagnosis and  
356 comorbidities should be considered in future studies to consider interaction or confounding  
357 variables. 3) This study used 2018 CDC SVI, the latest available SVI, which was data reported  
358 prior to the pandemic. Neighborhood factors have likely changed since the onset of the  
359 pandemic. We imagine disparities may be even greater than what is reported. 4) Lastly, an  
360 important consideration is that neighborhood-level SVI helps us to understand the community  
361 our patients are coming from but cannot be easily applied to the individual. This data suggests  
362 the use of SVI to identify patients at higher risk of non-adherence; however, interventions should  
363 be considered at the patient, health-system, community, and policy levels.

364

365 Previous reports of ambulatory care no-show risk prediction models have focused primarily on  
366 hospital components and individual behavior, such as appointment lead time, appointment  
367 rescheduled by the provider, or history of previous no-show;<sup>54, 55</sup> These fail to take social  
368 context into account. Further, interventions focus on clinical productivity, suggesting options  
369 such as added reminder calls or text messages to improve adherence,<sup>56</sup> or creating overbook  
370 slots, which fail to address factors driving no-shows and likely intensify health inequities.  
371 Findings from this study help us understand who is less likely to show for an appointment.  
372 Utilizing variables that account for social context, there is potential to identify patients at higher  
373 risk of no-show and provide them with targeted interventions.

374

375 This study serves as a step in preintervention planning.<sup>57</sup> Participatory science elevates patient  
376 and community voices and is essential to gain insight into how our patients interact with the  
377 healthcare system.<sup>58</sup> In order to generate changes in healthcare delivery to promote health  
378 equity, a critical next step is to engage stakeholders, including patients and providers, to identify

379 the barriers and facilitators that exist after scheduling an eye appointment that prevent a patient  
380 from adhering to this appointment.

381

382 In this study, we examined the association between neighborhood-level social vulnerability and  
383 adherence to scheduled ophthalmology appointments at an urban tertiary care referral center.

384 We found that higher neighborhood-level social vulnerability is associated with an increased risk  
385 of non-adherence to ophthalmology appointments. Poor adherence to appointments is not  
386 entirely attributed to SVI in minorities, as race/ethnicity continued to be significantly associated  
387 with non-adherence to scheduled appointments after controlling for other relevant factors.

388 These findings suggest the potential effects of individual and neighborhood-level determinants  
389 on non-adherence to scheduled ophthalmology appointments. Studies to inform the design and  
390 evaluation of multi-level (individual and neighborhood) strategies to reduce disparities in access  
391 to ophthalmology care are needed.

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404



405 **References**

- 406 1. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. Healthy People 2030. U.S.  
407 Department of Health and Human Services. Accessed September 8, 2021.
- 408 2. Klein R, Klein BE. The prevalence of age-related eye diseases and visual impairment in  
409 aging: current estimates. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. Dec 13 2013;54(14):ORSF5-ORSF13.  
410 doi:10.1167/iovs.13-12789
- 411 3. Peek ME, Cargill A, Huang ES. Diabetes health disparities: a systematic review of health  
412 care interventions. *Med Care Res Rev*. Oct 2007;64(5 Suppl):101S-56S.  
413 doi:10.1177/1077558707305409
- 414 4. CDC. *The State of Vision, Aging, and Public Health in America*. 2011.  
415 <http://www.aafp.org/afp/2013/0815/p241.html>
- 416 5. Thornton RL, Glover CM, Cene CW, Glik DC, Henderson JA, Williams DR. Evaluating  
417 Strategies For Reducing Health Disparities By Addressing The Social Determinants Of Health.  
418 *Health Aff (Millwood)*. Aug 1 2016;35(8):1416-23. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2015.1357
- 419 6. Elam AR, Lee PP. High-risk populations for vision loss and eye care underutilization: a  
420 review of the literature and ideas on moving forward. *Survey of ophthalmology*. Jul-Aug  
421 2013;58(4):348-58. doi:10.1016/j.survophthal.2012.07.005
- 422 7. Rasendran C, Tye G, Knusel K, Singh RP. Demographic and Socioeconomic Differences  
423 in Outpatient Ophthalmology Utilization in the United States. *American journal of*  
424 *ophthalmology*. Oct 2020;218:156-163. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2020.05.022
- 425 8. Lee DJ, Lam BL, Arora S, et al. Reported eye care utilization and health insurance status  
426 among US adults. *Arch Ophthalmol*. Mar 2009;127(3):303-10.  
427 doi:10.1001/archophthalmol.2008.567
- 428 9. Lee YH, Chen AX, Varadaraj V, et al. Comparison of Access to Eye Care Appointments  
429 Between Patients With Medicaid and Those With Private Health Care Insurance. *JAMA*  
430 *ophthalmology*. 2018;136(6):622-629. doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2018.0813
- 431 10. Varma R, Vajaranant TS, Burkemper B, et al. Visual Impairment and Blindness in Adults  
432 in the United States: Demographic and Geographic Variations From 2015 to 2050. *JAMA*  
433 *ophthalmology*. Jul 1 2016;134(7):802-9. doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2016.1284
- 434 11. National Academies of Sciences E, Medicine, Health, et al. The National Academies  
435 Collection: Reports funded by National Institutes of Health. In: Welp A, Woodbury RB, McCoy  
436 MA, Teutsch SM, eds. *Making Eye Health a Population Health Imperative: Vision for*  
437 *Tomorrow*. National Academies Press (US)  
438 Copyright 2016 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.; 2016.
- 439 12. Christ SL, Zheng DD, Swenor BK, et al. Longitudinal relationships among visual acuity,  
440 daily functional status, and mortality: the Salisbury Eye Evaluation Study. *JAMA ophthalmology*.  
441 Dec 2014;132(12):1400-6. doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2014.2847
- 442 13. CDC. Basics of Vision and Eye Health- Fast Facts. Updated 2016. 2017.  
443 <https://www.cdc.gov/visionhealth/basics/ced/fastfacts.htm>
- 444 14. Tielsch JM, Sommer A, Witt K, Katz J, Royall RM. Blindness and visual impairment in  
445 an American urban population. The Baltimore Eye Survey. *Arch Ophthalmol*. Feb  
446 1990;108(2):286-90. doi:10.1001/archopht.1990.01070040138048
- 447 15. County Health Rankings Model. County Health Rankings & Roadmaps.  
448 [https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/measures-data-sources/county-](https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/measures-data-sources/county-health-rankings-model)  
449 [health-rankings-model](https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/measures-data-sources/county-health-rankings-model)

- 450 16. Hood CM, Gennuso KP, Swain GR, Catlin BB. County Health Rankings: Relationships  
451 Between Determinant Factors and Health Outcomes. *Am J Prev Med.* Feb 2016;50(2):129-35.  
452 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.08.024
- 453 17. Scanzera AC, Thermoziar S, Chang AY, Kim SJ, Chan RVP. Adherence to Urgent Eye  
454 Visits during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Population Characteristics Study. *Ophthalmic*  
455 *Epidemiol.* Dec 13 2021:1-8. doi:10.1080/09286586.2021.2015785
- 456 18. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability  
457 Index. CDC. Accessed July 28, 2021.
- 458 19. Geospatial Research Analysis and Services Program. *CDC Social Vulnerability Index*  
459 *(CDC SVI)*. 2021.
- 460 20. Thomas DSK, Phillips BD, Lovekamp WE, Fothergill A. *Social Vulnerability to*  
461 *Disasters*. 2013.
- 462 21. Diaz A, Hyer JM, Barmash E, Azap R, Paredes AZ, Pawlik TM. County-level Social  
463 Vulnerability is Associated With Worse Surgical Outcomes Especially Among Minority  
464 Patients. *Ann Surg.* Dec 1 2021;274(6):881-891. doi:10.1097/sla.0000000000004691
- 465 22. Givens M, Teal EN, Patel V, Manuck TA. Preterm birth among pregnant women living in  
466 areas with high social vulnerability. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM.* Sep 2021;3(5):100414.  
467 doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2021.100414
- 468 23. Nguyen TN, Ngangue P, Bouhali T, Ryan BL, Stewart M, Fortin M. Social Vulnerability  
469 in Patients with Multimorbidity: A Cross-Sectional Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*  
470 Apr 8 2019;16(7)doi:10.3390/ijerph16071244
- 471 24. Ouvrard C, Avila-Funes JA, Dartigues JF, Amieva H, Tabue-Teguo M. The Social  
472 Vulnerability Index: Assessing Replicability in Predicting Mortality Over 27 Years. *J Am*  
473 *Geriatr Soc.* Jun 2019;67(6):1305-1306. doi:10.1111/jgs.15812
- 474 25. Kousiouris P, Klavdianou O, Douglas KAA, et al. Role of Socioeconomic Status (SES)  
475 in Globe Injuries: A Review. *Clin Ophthalmol.* 2022;16:25-31. doi:10.2147/opth.S317017
- 476 26. Levinger N, Beykin G, Grunin M, et al. Socioeconomic status and visual outcome in  
477 patients with neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *Eur J Ophthalmol.* May  
478 2021;31(3):1094-1100. doi:10.1177/1120672120920783
- 479 27. Shaikh Y, Yu F, Coleman AL. Burden of undetected and untreated glaucoma in the  
480 United States. *American journal of ophthalmology.* Dec 2014;158(6):1121-1129.e1.  
481 doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2014.08.023
- 482 28. Dandona R, Dandona L. Socioeconomic status and blindness. *Br J Ophthalmol.* Dec  
483 2001;85(12):1484-8. doi:10.1136/bjo.85.12.1484
- 484 29. Yusuf R, Chen EM, Nwanyanwu K, Richards B. Neighborhood Deprivation and  
485 Adherence to Initial Diabetic Retinopathy Screening. *Ophthalmol Retina.* May 2020;4(5):550-  
486 552. doi:10.1016/j.oret.2020.01.016
- 487 30. Liu Y, Zupan NJ, Shiyanbola OO, et al. Factors influencing patient adherence with  
488 diabetic eye screening in rural communities: A qualitative study. *PLoS One.*  
489 2018;13(11):e0206742. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0206742
- 490 31. America's least (and most) segregated cities. City Observatory; August 17, 2020, 2020.
- 491 32. Kim SJ, Ramirez-Valles J, Watson K, et al. Fostering health equity research:  
492 Development and implementation of the Center for Health Equity Research (CHER) Chicago. *J*  
493 *Clin Transl Sci.* Feb 2020;4(1):53-60. doi:10.1017/cts.2019.415

- 494 33. Alvidrez J, Castille D, Laude-Sharp M, Rosario A, Tabor D. The National Institute on  
495 Minority Health and Health Disparities Research Framework. *American journal of public health*.  
496 Jan 2019;109(S1):S16-s20. doi:10.2105/ajph.2018.304883
- 497 34. Gary-Webb TL, Egnot NS, Nugroho A, Dubowitz T, Troxel WM. Changes in  
498 perceptions of neighborhood environment and Cardiometabolic outcomes in two predominantly  
499 African American neighborhoods. *BMC Public Health*. 2020/01/14 2020;20(1):52.  
500 doi:10.1186/s12889-019-8119-9
- 501 35. Xiao YK, Graham G. Where we live: The impact of neighborhoods and community  
502 factors on cardiovascular health in the United States. *Clin Cardiol*. Jan 2019;42(1):184-189.  
503 doi:10.1002/clc.23107
- 504 36. Kim SJ, Peterson CE, Warnecke R, Barrett R, Glassgow AE. The Uneven Distribution of  
505 Medically Underserved Areas in Chicago. *Health Equity*. 2020;4(1):556-564.  
506 doi:10.1089/heq.2020.0023
- 507 37. Krieger N. Discrimination and health inequities. *Int J Health Serv*. 2014;44(4):643-710.  
508 doi:10.2190/HS.44.4.b
- 509 38. Institute of Medicine Committee on U, Eliminating R, Ethnic Disparities in Health C. In:  
510 Smedley BD, Stith AY, Nelson AR, eds. *Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic*  
511 *Disparities in Health Care*. National Academies Press (US)  
512 Copyright 2002 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.; 2003.
- 513 39. Shavers VL, Fagan P, Jones D, et al. The state of research on racial/ethnic discrimination  
514 in the receipt of health care. *American journal of public health*. May 2012;102(5):953-66.  
515 doi:10.2105/ajph.2012.300773
- 516 40. Disparities NIOMHaH. NIMHD Research Framework. 2017.
- 517 41. Halawa OA, Kolli A, Oh G, et al. Racial and Socioeconomic Differences in Eye Care  
518 Utilization among Medicare Beneficiaries with Glaucoma. *Ophthalmology*. Oct 6  
519 2021;doi:10.1016/j.optha.2021.09.022
- 520 42. J B-G, GJ D, PK K, N S. Do Neighborhoods Influence Child and Adolescent  
521 Development? *American Journal of Sociology*. 1993;99(2):353-395.
- 522 43. Giordano GN, Ohlsson H, Lindström M. Social capital and health--purely a question of  
523 context? *Health Place*. Jul 2011;17(4):946-53. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.04.004
- 524 44. Waverijn G, Wolfe MK, Mohnen S, Rijken M, Spreeuwenberg P, Groenewegen P. A  
525 prospective analysis of the effect of neighbourhood and individual social capital on changes in  
526 self-rated health of people with chronic illness. *BMC Public Health*. 2014/07/03 2014;14(1):675.  
527 doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-675
- 528 45. Mohnen SM, Groenewegen PP, Völker B, Flap H. Neighborhood social capital and  
529 individual health. *Soc Sci Med*. Mar 2011;72(5):660-7. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.12.004
- 530 46. Lindén-Boström M, Persson C, Eriksson C. Neighbourhood characteristics, social capital  
531 and self-rated health--a population-based survey in Sweden. *BMC Public Health*. Oct 21  
532 2010;10:628. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-10-628
- 533 47. Wilson WJ. *The truly disadvantaged: the inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. 2  
534 ed. 2012.
- 535 48. Williams DR, Lawrence JA, Davis BA, Vu C. Understanding how discrimination can  
536 affect health. *Health Serv Res*. Dec 2019;54 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):1374-1388. doi:10.1111/1475-  
537 6773.13222

- 538 49. Gaston GB, Alleyne-Green B. The impact of African Americans' beliefs about HIV  
539 medical care on treatment adherence: a systematic review and recommendations for  
540 interventions. *AIDS Behav.* Jan 2013;17(1):31-40. doi:10.1007/s10461-012-0323-x
- 541 50. Hicks PM, Elam AR, Woodward MA, et al. Perceptions of Respect From Clinicians by  
542 Patients in Racial and Ethnic Minority Groups With Eye Disease. *JAMA ophthalmology.* Feb 1  
543 2022;140(2):125-131. doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2021.5371
- 544 51. Scott AW, Elam AR, Nwanyanwu K. Addressing Disparities in Eye Care-The Time Is  
545 Now. *JAMA ophthalmology.* Sep 1 2021;139(9):935-936.  
546 doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2021.2053
- 547 52. Nwanyanwu K, Scott AW, Elam AR. Addressing Disparities in Ophthalmic Research:  
548 The Time Is Now. *JAMA ophthalmology.* Dec 1 2021;139(12):1261-1262.  
549 doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2021.4203
- 550 53. Xierali IM, Nivet MA, Wilson MR. Current and Future Status of Diversity in  
551 Ophthalmologist Workforce. *JAMA ophthalmology.* 2016;134(9):1016-1023.  
552 doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2016.2257
- 553 54. Ding X, Gellad ZF, Mather C, 3rd, et al. Designing risk prediction models for ambulatory  
554 no-shows across different specialties and clinics. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* Aug 1  
555 2018;25(8):924-930. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocy002
- 556 55. McMullen MJ, Netland PA. Lead time for appointment and the no-show rate in an  
557 ophthalmology clinic. *Clin Ophthalmol.* 2015;9:513-6. doi:10.2147/opth.S82151
- 558 56. Lin H, Wu X. Intervention strategies for improving patient adherence to follow-up in the  
559 era of mobile information technology: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One.*  
560 2014;9(8):e104266. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0104266
- 561 57. Handley MA, Gorukanti A, Cattamanchi A. Strategies for implementing implementation  
562 science: a methodological overview. *Emerg Med J.* Sep 2016;33(9):660-4.  
563 doi:10.1136/emered-2015-205461
- 564 58. Nwanyanwu K. Participatory Science-The Path Toward Health Equity. *JAMA*  
565 *ophthalmology.* Feb 1 2022;140(2):132-133. doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2021.5368  
566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

**TABLE 1: INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS IN PATIENTS SCHEDULED FOR OPHTHALMOLOGY APPOINTMENT BY ADHERENCE**

	<b>Overall</b> n=8,322	<b>Adherent</b> n=5,988	<b>Non-adherent</b> n=2,334	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Individual Characteristics</b>				
Mean Age (years ± SD)	56.7 ±17.1	57.7 ±16.9	54.2 ±17.3	<0.01
Median Distance to Clinic (miles ± IQR)	7.0±10	7.5 ±11.8	6.9 ± 9.3	<0.001
	n (%)			
Gender				
Female	4,924 (59.2)	3552 (72.1)	1372 (27.9)	0.67
Male	3,397 (40.8)	2435 (71.7)	962 (28.3)	
New Patient				
Yes	2,470 (29.7)	1675 (67.8)	795 (32.2)	<0.01
No	5,852 (70.3)	4313 (73.7)	1539 (26.3)	
Race				
Asian	362 (4.40)	297 (82.0)	65 (18.0)	<0.01
Black	3,429 (41.2)	2191 (63.9)	1238 (36.1)	
Hispanic	2,006 (24.1)	1398 (69.7)	608 (30.3)	
White	1,822 (21.9)	1586 (87.1)	236 (13.0)	
Other	703 (8.5)	516 (73.4)	187 (26.6)	
Insurance Type				
Medicaid	2,871 (34.5)	1840 (64.1)	1031 (35.9)	<0.01
Medicare	3,094 (37.2)	2334 (75.4)	760 (24.6)	
Private	1,957 (23.5)	1551 (79.3)	406 (20.8)	
Self-Pay	264 (3.2)	144 (54.5)	120 (45.5)	
Other Public	114 (1.4)	98 (86.0)	16 (14.0)	
Worker's Comp	22 (0.3)	21 (95.5)	1 (4.5)	

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

<b>TABLE 2: MULTIVARIABLE MODEL OF SOCIAL VULNERABILITY INDEX (SVI) WITH NON-ADHERENCE ADJUSTING FOR INDIVIDUAL LEVEL COVARIATES</b>			
<b>Covariate</b>	<b>Odds Ratio</b>	<b>95% Confidence Interval</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Overall SVI</b>	2.46	(1.99, 3.06)	<0.01
<b>Age at encounter</b>	0.99	(0.99, 0.99)	<0.01
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	Ref	Ref	Ref
Male	1.13	(1.02, 1.25)	0.025
<b>New Patient</b>			
No	Ref	Ref	Ref
Yes	1.19	(1.07, 1.33)	<0.01
<b>Race</b>			
White	Ref	Ref	Ref
Asian	1.27	(0.93, 1.94)	0.101
Black	2.84	(2.39, 3.37)	<0.01
Hispanic	2.13	(1.78, 2.55)	<0.01
Other	2.04	(1.63, 2.55)	<0.01
<b>Distance to clinic</b>	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	0.404

605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618

619 **Figure Legends**

620 **FIGURE 1: SOCIAL VULNERABILITY INDEX (SVI).** Social factors are categorized into 4  
621 themes which make up the overall SVI.

622 **FIGURE 2: THEMED MEDIAN SOCIAL VULNERABILITY INDEX (SVI) BY APPOINTMENT**  
623 **STATUS.**

624 **FIGURE 3: PROBABILITY OF NON-ADHERENCE USING SOCIAL VULNERABILITY INDEX**  
625 **(SVI).** Looking at each race individually, as SVI increases, the probability of non-adherence  
626 increases, adjusting for all other variables.

## Socioeconomic Status

- Below Poverty
- Unemployed
- Income
- No High School Diploma

## Household Composition & Disability

- Aged 65 or Older
- Aged 17 or Younger
- Older than Age 5 with a Disability
- Single-Parent Households

## Minority Status & Language

- Minority
- Speaks English "Less than Well"

## Housing Type & Transportation

- Multi-Unit Structures
- Mobile Homes
- Crowding
- No Vehicle
- Group Quarters



■ Non-Adherent ■ Adherent

**Overall CDC SVI**

0.78

0.66

**Socioeconomic Status**

0.82

0.67

**Household Composition & Disability**

0.59

0.45

**Minority Status & Language**

0.75

0.70


**Housing Type & Transportation**

0.57


0.53

0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9

**SVI (Percentile)**



Probability of Non-adherence



Race

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- White
- Other