

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery Faculty Papers

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery

2-23-2024

In-Hospital Mortality Trends After Surgery for Traumatic Thoracolumbar Injury: A National Inpatient Sample Database Study

Michael McCurdy Thomas Jefferson University

Rajkishen Narayanan Thomas Jefferson University

Omar Tarawneh Thomas Jefferson University

Yunsoo Lee *Thomas Jefferson University* Follow this and additional works at: https://jdc.jefferson.edu/orthofp

CHARWARE COMMONS, and the Surgery Commons Thomas Jefferson University Let US KNOW NOW ACCESS to this document benefits you

See next page for additional authors Recommended Citation

McCurdy, Michael; Narayanan, Rajkishen; Tarawneh, Omar; Lee, Yunsoo; Sherman, Matthew; Ezeonu, Teeto; Carter, Michael; Canseco, Jose A.; Hilibrand, Alan S.; Vaccaro, Alex R.; Kepler, Christopher K.; and Schroeder, Gregory D., "In-Hospital Mortality Trends After Surgery for Traumatic Thoracolumbar Injury: A National Inpatient Sample Database Study" (2024). *Department of Orthopaedic Surgery Faculty Papers*. Paper 216.

https://jdc.jefferson.edu/orthofp/216

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jefferson Digital Commons. The Jefferson Digital Commons is a service of Thomas Jefferson University's Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The Commons is a showcase for Jefferson books and journals, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, unique historical collections from the University archives, and teaching tools. The Jefferson Digital Commons allows researchers and interested readers anywhere in the world to learn about and keep up to date with Jefferson scholarship. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Orthopaedic Surgery Faculty Papers by an authorized administrator of the Jefferson Digital Commons. For more information, please contact: JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu.

Authors

Michael McCurdy, Rajkishen Narayanan, Omar Tarawneh, Yunsoo Lee, Matthew Sherman, Teeto Ezeonu, Michael Carter, Jose A. Canseco, Alan S. Hilibrand, Alex R. Vaccaro, Christopher K. Kepler, and Gregory D. Schroeder

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Brain and Spine

journal homepage: www.journals.elsevier.com/brain-and-spine

In-hospital mortality trends after surgery for traumatic thoracolumbar injury: A national inpatient sample database study

Michael McCurdy, Rajkishen Narayanan^{*}, Omar Tarawneh, Yunsoo Lee, Matthew Sherman, Teeto Ezeonu, Michael Carter, Jose A. Canseco, Alan S. Hilibrand, Alexander R. Vaccaro, Christopher K. Kepler, Gregory D. Schroeder

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Rothman Orthopaedic Institute at Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, USA

ARTICLE INFO ABSTRACT Handling Editor: Prof F Kandziora Introduction: Given the increasing incidence of traumatic thoracolumbar injuries in recent years, studies have sought to investigate potential risk factors for outcomes in these patients. Keywords: Research question: The aim of this study was to investigate trends and risk factors for in-hospital mortality after Thoracolumbar trauma fusion for traumatic thoracolumbar injury. Mortality Materials and methods: Patients undergoing thoracolumbar fusion after traumatic injury were queried from the Socioeconomic National Inpatient Sample (NIS) from 2012 to 2017. Analysis was performed to identify risk factors for inpatient **Risk** factors mortality after surgery. Spine surgery Results: Patients in 2017 were on average older (51.0 vs. 48.5, P = 0.004), had more admitting diagnoses (15.5 vs. 10.7, p < 0.001), were less likely to be White (75.8% vs. 81.2%, p = 0.006), were from a ZIP code with a higher median income quartile (Quartile 1: 31.4% vs. 28.6%, p = 0.011), and were more likely to have Medicare as a primary payer (22.9% vs. 30.1%, p < 0.001). Bivariate analysis of demographics and surgical characteristics demonstrated that patients in the in-hospital mortality group (n = 90) were older (70.2 vs. 49.6, p < 0.001), more likely to be male (74.4% vs. 62.8%, p = 0.031), had a great number of admitted diagnoses (21.3 vs. 12.7, p < 0.001), and were more likely to be insured by Medicare (70.0% vs. 27.0%, p < 0.001). Multivariate regression analysis found age (OR 1.06, p < 0.001) and Black race (OR 3.71, p = 0.007) were independently associated with in-hospital mortality. Conclusion: Our study of nationwide, traumatic thoracolumbar fusion procedures from 2012 to 2017 in the NIS database found older, black patients were at increased risk for in-hospital mortality after surgery.

1. Introduction

Traumatic thoracolumbar injuries have been increasing in developed countries, including the United States (Doud et al., 2015; Beschloss et al., 2022). These injuries disproportionately affect elderly patients—a trend reflective of the aging population and an increase in low-energy traumatic fractures of the thoracolumbar spine (Zileli et al., 2021; Jansson et al., 2010; Jain et al., 2015). Though these injuries may often be treated with nonoperative management, thoracolumbar fusion procedures have become increasingly common in this patient population and are necessary when instability or progressive neurological deficits are present (Kha et al., 2018). Although surgical techniques and outcomes continue to improve for patients who suffer these injuries,

performing surgery in an aging population still poses significant risk. A recent study of patients that underwent surgery after thoracolumbar trauma found a 30-day readmission rate of 5.1%, with half of these patients being readmitted for a complication related to their surgery (Camacho et al., 2023). Another recent study by Beschloss et al. found inpatient mortality had increased from 1.9% to 2.5% in a national database cohort of patients with vertebral fracture from 1993 to 2015, further highlighting challenges that surround successful management of traumatic spine injuries (Beschloss et al., 2022).

Given the increasing incidence of these injuries and persistent surgical risk, recent studies have sought to investigate potential risk factors for outcomes such as complications, readmissions, resource utilization and mortality in these patients. Multiple studies have identified medical

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bas.2024.102777

Received 27 December 2023; Received in revised form 13 February 2024; Accepted 22 February 2024 Available online 23 February 2024

2772-5294/© 2024 Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of EUROSPINE, the Spine Society of Europe, EANS, the European Association of Neurosurgical Societies. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).







^{*} Corresponding author.Rothman Orthopaedic Institute at Thomas Jefferson University 925 Chestnut St, 5th Floor Philadelphia, PA, 19107, USA *E-mail address:* rajkishen.narayanan@gmail.com (R. Narayanan).

risk factors associated with mortality after spine surgery such as kidney disease, age, and male sex (Kim et al., 2022; Kobayashi et al., 2023; Kushioka et al., 2020; ElNemer et al., 2023). With respect to demographic risk factors, Corso et al. observed higher reoperation risk in Black patients with Medicare compared to White, commercially-insured patients after surgical treatment for cauda equina syndrome (Corso et al., 2023). The authors also found higher risk of mortality in patients with Medicaid compared to commercially-insured patients. Disadvantaged patients as measured by the Area Deprivation Index (ADI), a neighborhood-level socioeconomic measure, have been associated with prolonged length of stay and 90-day resource utilization following lumbar surgery (Hagan et al., 2022; Gordon et al., 2023). A recent database study of patients undergoing anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (ACDF) from 2005 to 2014 found patients from ZIP codes with the lowest median incomes experienced more complications after surgery, even after controlling for comorbidities (Lieber et al., 2020).

Though socioeconomic risk factors for complications, readmissions, and resource utilization have been well-studied in the literature, few studies have identified socioeconomic factors that may be associated with mortality in the traumatic spine population. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate trends in in-hospital mortality after fusion for traumatic thoracolumbar injury and to identify potential risk factors that may exist in this population.

2. Methods

2.1. Patient identification

Data was obtained from the National Inpatient Sample (NIS) (HCU-P-US NIS Overview), a Healthcare and Utilization Project (HCUP) nationwide database that contains a 20% sample of inpatient admissions data from a subset of participating hospitals in the United States, from 2012 to 2017. From 2012 to 2015 Q3, patients undergoing primary, non-elective, thoracolumbar fusion were identified using the ICD-9 procedure codes 81.04, 81.05, 81.06, 81.07, and 81.08. From 2015 Q4 -2017, patients undergoing primary, non-elective, thoracolumbar fusion were identified using over 300 ICD-10 procedure codes (Appendix A). To identify suspected traumatic injury, patients were also screened for thoracolumbar fracture diagnoses codes. From 2012 to 2015 Q3, patients with ICD 9 codes 805.2, 805.3, 805.4, 805.5, 806.2, 806.3, 806.4, and 806.5 were selected. From 2015 Q4-2017, patients with ICD 10 codes S22.0, S24.0, S32.0, and S34.0 were included.

2.2. Database data

The NIS database provided numerous patient descriptors that were used for final analysis (NIS Description of Data Elements). Factors that were included for this study included: age, sex, race, surgical approach, surgery location, hospital region, Severity All Patients Refined Diagnosis Related Groups (APR DRG), Mortality APR DRG, # of admitted diagnoses, days from admission to surgery, length of stay (LOS), discharge destination, in-hospital mortality, ZIP code median income quartile, total charges, and expected payer (Medicare, Medicaid, Private Insurance, Uninsured, Other and Missing). Medicare is federal health insurance for people 65 or older and Medicaid is a joint state and federal program that insures low-income and resource restricted individuals (Division (DCD)). Severity APR-DRG is stratified by 3M Health Information Systems based on the base APR-DRG as follows: 1 = minor loss of function, 2 = moderate loss of function, 3 = major loss of function, 4 =extreme loss of function. Mortality APR-DRG is stratified in a similar manner where 1 = minor likelihood of dying, 2 = moderate likelihood ofdying, 3 = major likelihood of dying, 4 = extreme likelihood of dying. Total charges were adjusted for inflation, using 2017 as the year of reference. Opioid use was collected using ICD-9 (304.0, 304.7, 305.5) and ICD-10 (F11.1-9) codes. Marijuana use/abuse was found using ICD-9 (304.3, 305.2) and ICD-10 (F12.1-9) codes.

2.3. Statistical analysis

Descriptive patient statistics were reported for demographics, surgical characteristics, and inpatient measures. Differences in categorical patient factors were compared using Fisher's exact or Pearson Chisquare tests. Differences in continuous data were compared using Mann-Whitney U and independent T-tests. Multivariate regression analysis was performed to identify patient factors that were independently associated with in-patient mortality. All analyses were performed in RStudio (Version 4.0.2, RStudio Inc., Boston, MA, USA).

3. Results

Query of the NIS database from 2012 to 2017 identified 8188 patients that underwent thoracolumbar fusion for traumatic vertebral fracture. Bivariate analysis of subjects by year found that patients in 2017 were on average older (51.0 vs. 48.5, P = 0.004), had more admitting diagnoses (15.5 vs. 10.7, p < 0.001), were less likely to be White (75.8% vs. 81.2%, p = 0.006), were from a ZIP code with a higher median income quartile (Quartile 1: 31.4% vs. 28.6%, p = 0.011), and were more likely to have Medicare as a primary payer (22.9% vs. 30.1%, p < 0.001). Patients in 2017 also were less likely to have a mortality APR-DRG classification of minor likelihood of dying (50.2% vs. 39.8%, p < 0.001) when compared to patients from 2012. There were no significant changes in proportion of patients that were male (63.2% vs. 62.3%, p = 0.330), had a history of opioid use/abuse (1.40% vs. 2.64%, p = 0.131) (Table 1).

Bivariate analysis of surgical characteristics by year demonstrated that patients in 2017 received surgery sooner (2.29 vs. 2.67 days after admission, p = 0.009) and had a shorter length of stay (LOS) (9.76 vs. 11.2 days, p < 0.001) on average than patients treated in 2012. In 2017, a posterior approach was more commonly utilized (94.9% vs. 90.2%, p < 0.001). Additionally, patients were not routinely discharged home as frequently as they were in 2012 (41.2% vs. 34.7%, p < 0.001). Total charges per patient were greater in 2017 compared to 2012 (\$227,415 vs. \$204,071, p < 0.001). In-hospital mortality rates were not significantly different from 2012 to 2017 (0.93% vs. 1.55%, p = 0.186) (Table 2).

90 patients (1.10%) expired in the hospital during their surgical admission. Bivariate analysis of demographics and surgical characteristics demonstrated that patients in the in-hospital mortality group were older (70.2 vs. 49.6, p < 0.001), more likely to be male (74.4% vs. 62.8%, p = 0.031), had more admission diagnoses (21.3 vs. 12.7, p < 0.001), and were more likely to be on Medicare (70.0% vs. 27.0%, p < 0.001). Patients in the mortality group were also associated with the "extreme loss of function" Severity APR-DRG (85.6% vs. 16.9%, p < 0.001) and the "extreme likelihood of dying" Mortality APR-DRG (76.7% vs. 8.40%, p < 0.001). Total hospital charges were also significantly group (\$216,308 vs. \$290,562, p < 0.001). There were no significant differences in race, hospital region, opioid or marijuana use/abuse, median ZIP income quartile, days from admission to surgery, or length of stay between the two groups (Table 3).

Multivariate regression analysis was also performed to identify independent predictors of in-hospital mortality. Increasing age (OR 1.06, p < 0.001), increasing Mortality APR-DRG (OR 3.47, p < 0.001), Severity APR-DRG (OR 5.48, p < 0.001), and Black race (OR 3.86, p = 0.006) were all statistically significant predictors of in-hospital mortality. Year of operation and ZIP code median income quartile were not found to have a statistically significant association with in-hospital mortality (Table 4).

4. Discussion

As the incidence of traumatic thoracolumbar injuries continues to

Table 1

Patient demographics by year.

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	P Value
Age	48.5 (19.3)	48.9 (20.4)	49.4 (19.9)	50.9 (19.8)	50.1 (20.5)	51.0 (20.7)	0.004*
Sex:							0.330
Male	811 (63.2%)	799 (61.7%)	874 (61.8%)	504 (65.7%)	1081 (64.3%)	1087 (62.3%)	
Female	473 (36.8%)	496 (38.3%)	540 (38.2%)	263 (34.3%)	601 (35.7%)	658 (37.7%)	
Race:							0.006*
White	978 (81.2%)	914 (77.6%)	1050 (79.9%)	555 (80.1%)	1219 (77.2%)	1250 (75.8%)	
Black	56 (4.65%)	60 (5.09%)	80 (6.09%)	41 (5.92%)	97 (6.14%)	93 (5.64%)	
Hispanic	112 (9.29%)	121 (10.3%)	105 (7.99%)	59 (8.51%)	145 (9.18%)	190 (11.5%)	
API	16 (1.33%)	22 (1.87%)	27 (2.05%)	13 (1.88%)	47 (2.98%)	54 (3.28%)	
Native American	5 (0.41%)	15 (1.27%)	11 (0.84%)	6 (0.87%)	13 (0.82%)	17 (1.03%)	
Other	38 (3.15%)	46 (3.90%)	41 (3.12%)	19 (2.74%)	58 (3.67%)	44 (2.67%)	
Hospital Region:							<0.001*
New England	44 (3.43%)	44 (3.40%)	36 (2.55%)	55 (7.17%)	43 (2.55%)	61 (3.50%)	
Mid-Atlantic	144 (11.2%)	123 (9.50%)	175 (12.4%)	151 (19.7%)	181 (10.8%)	179 (10.3%)	
East North Central	192 (15.0%)	201 (15.5%)	199 (14.1%)	229 (29.9%)	230 (13.7%)	249 (14.3%)	
West North Central	109 (8.49%)	119 (9.19%)	134 (9.48%)	85 (11.1%)	131 (7.78%)	158 (9.05%)	
South Atlantic	268 (20.9%)	284 (21.9%)	299 (21.1%)	68 (8.87%)	373 (22.2%)	365 (20.9%)	
East South Central	155 (12.1%)	117 (9.03%)	141 (9.97%)	45 (5.87%)	143 (8.50%)	134 (7.68%)	
West South Central	170 (13.2%)	194 (15.0%)	178 (12.6%)	46 (6.00%)	212 (12.6%)	202 (11.6%)	
Mountain	125 (9.74%)	110 (8.49%)	137 (9.69%)	32 (4.17%)	141 (8.38%)	158 (9.05%)	
Pacific	77 (6.00%)	103 (7.95%)	115 (8.13%)	56 (7.30%)	229 (13.6%)	239 (13.7%)	
Severity APRDRG:							0.098
1 (Minor Loss of Function)	13 (1.01%)	6 (0.46%)	7 (0.50%)	6 (0.78%)	21 (1.25%)	22 (1.26%)	
2 (Moderate Loss of Function)	63 (4.91%)	59 (4.56%)	55 (3.89%)	20 (2.61%)	54 (3.21%)	64 (3.67%)	
3 (Major Loss of Function)	974 (75.9%)	999 (77.1%)	1109 (78.4%)	600 (78.2%)	1319 (78.4%)	1350 (77.4%)	
4 (Extreme Loss of Function)	234 (18.2%)	231 (17.8%)	243 (17.2%)	141 (18.4%)	289 (17.2%)	309 (17.7%)	
Mortality APRDRG:							<0.001*
1 (Minor Likelihood of Dving)	645 (50.2%)	608 (46.9%)	663 (46.9%)	322 (42.0%)	665 (39.5%)	695 (39.8%)	
2 (Moderate Likelihood of Dving)	336 (26.2%)	339 (26.2%)	362 (25.6%)	213 (27.8%)	472 (28.0%)	497 (28.5%)	
3 (Major Likelihood of Dving)	209 (16.3%)	248 (19.2%)	284 (20.1%)	161 (21.0%)	364 (21.6%)	356 (20.4%)	
4 (Extreme Likelihood of Dving)	94 (7.32%)	100 (7.72%)	105 (7.43%)	71 (9.26%)	182 (10.8%)	197 (11.3%)	
Number of Admitted Diagnoses	10.7 (6.37)	11.4 (6.17)	11.6 (6.58)	13.1 (7.20)	13.6 (6.97)	15.5 (7.07)	<0.001*
ZIP Median Income Quartile:							0.011*
1 (Lowest)	388 (31.4%)	362 (28.5%)	391 (28.6%)	174 (23.2%)	460 (28.1%)	490 (28.6%)	
2	343 (27.8%)	376 (29.7%)	398 (29 1%)	203 (27.0%)	439 (26.9%)	479 (28.0%)	
3	269 (21.8%)	302 (23.8%)	310 (22.7%)	215 (28.6%)	411 (25.1%)	389 (22.7%)	
4 (Highest)	234 (19.0%)	228 (18.0%)	267 (19.5%)	159 (21.2%)	325 (19.9%)	353 (20.6%)	
Opioid Use Abuse	18 (1.40%)	23 (1.78%)	22 (1.56%)	13 (1.69%)	32 (1.90%)	46 (2.64%)	0.155
Marijuana Use Abuse	35 (2.73%)	41 (3 17%)	33 (2 33%)	27 (3 52%)	66 (3.92%)	64 (3.67%)	0.131
Expected Paver	00 (2.7070)	11 (0.17 /0)	00 (2.0070)	27 (0.0270)	00 (0.9270)	01 (0.07 /0)	<0.001*
Medicare	292 (22 9%)	356 (27.6%)	373 (26.4%)	219 (28.6%)	477 (28.4%)	524 (30.1%)	(01001
Medicaid	139 (10.9%)	132 (10.2%)	189 (13 4%)	112 (14.6%)	261 (15 5%)	269 (15 5%)	
Private	582 (45.6%)	516 (39.9%)	598 (42.3%)	317 (41.4%)	639 (38.1%)	685 (39.4%)	
Self-Pav	136 (10.7%)	129 (9.98%)	104 (7.36%)	38 (4.97%)	128 (7.62%)	104 (5 98%)	
No Charge	6 (0 47%)	13 (1.01%)	7 (0 50%)	5 (0 65%)	3 (0 18%)	7 (0 40%)	
Other	121 (9 48%)	146 (11 3%)	142 (10.0%)	74 (9 67%)	171 (10.2%)	151 (8 68%)	
0 11111	121 (). 10/0)	110 (11.070)	- 12 (10.070)	, , ().07 /07	1/1 (10·2/0)	101 (0.0070)	

*denotes statistical significance with p < 0.05; Abbreviations: API – Asian/Pacific Islander, APRDRG – All Patient Refined Diagnosis Related Groups.

Table 2

Surgical characteristics by year.

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	P Value
Days from Admission to	2.67 (3.33)	2.55 (3.65)	2.51 (3.75)	2.42 (2.84)	2.30 (2.76)	2.29 (2.69)	0.009*
Surgery							
Approach:							<0.001*
Anterior	126 (9.81%)	100 (7.72%)	91 (6.44%)	46 (6.00%)	103 (6.12%)	89 (5.10%)	
Posterior	1158 (90.2%)	1195 (92.3%)	1323 (93.6%)	721 (94.0%)	1580 (93.9%)	1655 (94.9%)	
Length of Stay	11.2 (12.2)	10.9 (9.71)	10.5 (8.43)	9.93 (6.86)	10.4 (10.3)	9.76 (8.08)	<0.001*
Discharge Destination:							<0.001*
Routine	529 (41.2%)	488 (37.7%)	484 (34.2%)	222 (28.9%)	561 (33.4%)	606 (34.7%)	
Transfer to Short Term	31 (2.41%)	17 (1.31%)	27 (1.91%)	13 (1.69%)	35 (2.08%)	17 (0.97%)	
Hospital							
SNF	582 (45.3%)	660 (51.0%)	743 (52.5%)	441 (57.5%)	875 (52.1%)	887 (50.9%)	
Home Health	126 (9.81%)	113 (8.73%)	150 (10.6%)	79 (10.3%)	190 (11.3%)	204 (11.7%)	
AMA	3 (0.23%)	2 (0.15%)	1 (0.07%)	1 (0.13%)	4 (0.24%)	3 (0.17%)	
In Hospital Mortality:	12 (0.93%)	15 (1.16%)	9 (0.64%)	11 (1.43%)	16 (0.95%)	27 (1.55%)	0.186
Total Charges	\$204,071	\$210,004	\$209,902	\$206,478	\$232,716	\$227,415	<0.001*
	(\$171,745)	(\$165,528)	(\$165,468)	(\$156,875)	(\$181,124)	(\$162,001)	

 * denotes statistical significance with p < 0.05; *Abbreviations*: SNF – Skilled Nursing Facility, AMA – against medical advice.

Table 3

Bivariate analysis of demographics and in-hospital mortality.

N = 8095 N = 90 Age 49.6 (20.1) 70.2 (15.2) <0.001* Male 5086 (62.8%) 67 (74.4%) Female 3008 (37.2%) 23 (25.6%) Race: 0.151 White 5893 (78.3%) 72 (85.7%) Black 420 (5.58%) 72 (83.3%) Hispanic 730 (9.69%) 2 (2.38%) Attive American 67 (0.89%) 0 (0.00%) Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (1.57%) Hispanic 735 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 725 (8.96%) 10 (11.1%) West South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Moutatin 698 (8.2%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) S Severity APRDRG: (20.001* Youderate Loss of 1314 (3.88%) <		No Mortality	Mortality	P Value
Age Sex: 49.6 (20.1) 70.2 (15.2) c0.001* c0.001* Male 5086 (62.8%) 67 (74.4%)		N = 8095	N = 90	
Ser: 0.031* Male 5086 (62.8%) 67 (74.4%) Female 3008 (37.2%) 23 (25.6%) Rac: 0.151 White 5893 (78.3%) 7(8.33%) Black 420 (5.58%) 7 (8.33%) Hispanic 730 (9.6%) 2 (2.38%) API 11.19%) 11.19%) Native American 67 (0.89%) 0 (0.00%) Other 244 (3.24%) 15 (16.7%) Hospital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 10 (1.1%) West North Central 1285 (15.9%) 15 (16.7%) West North Central 726 (8.97%) 10 (1.1%) West North Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: - - 1 (Minor Loss of 75 (0.93%) 0 (0.00%) Function) - - 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) <trd< td=""><td>Age</td><td>49.6 (20.1)</td><td>70.2 (15.2)</td><td><0.001*</td></trd<>	Age	49.6 (20.1)	70.2 (15.2)	<0.001*
Male 5086 (62.8%) 67 (74.4%) Fernale 3008 (37.2%) 23 (25.6%) Race: 0.151 White 5893 (78.3%) 72 (85.7%) Black 420 (5.5%) 7 (8.3%) Hispanic 730 (9.69%) 2 (2.38%) API 176 (2.34%) 1 (1.19%) Native American 67 (0.3%) 0 (0.09%) Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (2.38%) Hospital Region: 0.098 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 1285 (15.5%) 15 (16.7%) East Noth Central 726 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APEDRG: (304.4%) 3 (3.33%) Purction) 12 (13.3%) Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) <t< td=""><td>Sex:</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.031*</td></t<>	Sex:			0.031*
Fenale 3008 (37.2%) 23 (25.6%) Race: 0.151 White 5893 (78.3%) 72 (85.7%) Black 420 (5.58%) 7 (8.33%) Hispanic 730 (9.69%) 2 (2.38%) API 176 (2.34%) 1 (1.19%) Native American 67 (0.89%) 0 (0.00%) Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (2.38%) Hospital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 726 (8.97%) 10 (0.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.33%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: - <0.001*	Male	5086 (62.8%)	67 (74.4%)	
Race: 0.151 White 5893 (78.3%) 72 (85.7%) Black 420 (5.58%) 7 (8.33%) Hispanic 730 (9.69%) 2 (2.38%) API 176 (2.34%) 1 (1.19%) Native American 67 (0.89%) 0 (0.00%) Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (2.38%) Hospital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 948 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 228 (15.9%) 15 (16.7%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 10 (11.1%) West South Central 726 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Central 926 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: - - 2 (Moderate Loss of 314 (3.88%) 1 (1.11%) Function) - - 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) - <td>Female</td> <td>3008 (37.2%)</td> <td>23 (25.6%)</td> <td></td>	Female	3008 (37.2%)	23 (25.6%)	
White 593 (78.3%) 72 (85.7%) Black 420 (5.58%) 7 (8.33%) Hispanic 730 (9.69%) 2 (2.38%) API 176 (2.34%) 1 (1.19%) Native American 67 (0.89%) 0 (0.00%) Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (2.38%) Hospital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 126 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1445 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: <0.001*	Race:			0.151
Biack 420 (5.58%) 7 (8.3%) Hispanic 730 (9.69%) 2 (2.38%) API 176 (2.34%) 1 (1.19%) Native American 67 (0.89%) 0 (0.00%) Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (2.38%) Hespital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 1285 (15.9%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 10 (11.1%) West South Central 996 (12.2%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 0 (0.00%) Function) - - 2 (Moderate Loss of 314 (3.88%) 1 (1.11%) Function) - - 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 503 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) Dying) - - 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 1604 (19.8%) 1 (1.11%) 1 (Minor Likelihood of 1604 (19.8%) 1 (3.52%)	White	5893 (78.3%)	72 (85.7%)	
API 7.3 (9.3.9%) 2 (2.38%) API 176 (2.34%) 1 (1.19%) Native American 67 (0.89%) 0 (0.00%) Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (2.38%) Hospital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 726 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (2.03%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 725 (8.96%) 10 (11.1%) West South Central 966 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: - <0.001*	Black	420 (5.58%)	7 (8.33%)	
Init 10 (L.S.M.) 1 (L.1.M.) Native American 67 (0.89%) 0 (0.00%) Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (2.38%) Hospital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 1265 (15.9%) 15 (16.7%) West North Central 726 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.55%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: 2 (Moderate Loss of 314 (3.88%) 1 (1.11%) Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) 3 (Major Likelihood of 1604 (19.8%) 18 (20.0%) Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 2018 (27.4%) 1 (1.11%) 1.000 Mariusal Use Abuse: 1		730 (9.09%) 176 (2.34%)	2 (2.38%)	
Other 244 (3.24%) 2 (2.38%) Hospital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 1285 (15.9%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 725 (8.96%) 10 (11.1%) West South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 0 (0.00%) Severity APRDRG: 2 (Moderate Loss of 75 (0.93%) 0 (0.00%) Function 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 3593 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 680 (8.40%)	Native American	67 (0.89%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hospital Region: 0.098 New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 1285 (15.9%) 15 (16.7%) West North Central 726 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 725 (8.96%) 10 (11.1%) West South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (6.2%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: - <0.001*	Other	244 (3.24%)	2 (2.38%)	
New England 275 (3.40%) 7 (7.78%) Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.6%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 1285 (15.9%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: 1 (Minor Loss of 75 (0.93%) 0 (0.00%) Function) 2 (Moderate Loss of 314 (3.88%) 1 (1.11%) Function) 3 (Major Loss of 6336 (78.3%) 12 (13.3%) Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Punction) 3 (Major Likelihood of 1604 (19.8%) 18 (20.0%) Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying)	Hospital Region:			0.098
Mid-Atlantic 938 (11.69%) 15 (16.7%) East North Central 1285 (15.9%) 15 (16.7%) West North Central 726 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: (0.00%) 1 (Minor Loss of 75 (0.93%) 0 (0.00%) Function) - 2 (Moderate Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 12 (13.3%) Function) - 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Punction) - - 3 (Major Likelihood of 3593 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) Dying) - - 3 (Major Likelihood of 1604 (19.8%) 18 (20.0%) Dying) - - . . 4 (Extreme Likelihood of 680 (8	New England	275 (3.40%)	7 (7.78%)	
Fast North Central 1285 (15.9%) 15 (16.7%) West North Central 726 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 10 (11.1%) East South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (6.29%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: <0.001*	Mid-Atlantic	938 (11.6%)	15 (16.7%)	
West North Central 726 (8.97%) 9 (10.0%) South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: 1 (Minor Loss of 75 (0.93%) 0 (0.00%) Function) 2 (Moderate Loss of 314 (3.88%) 1 (1.11%) Function 3 (Major Loss of 636 (78.3%) 12 (13.3%) Function - - - - 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) - - Punction - - - - - Mortality APRDRG: - - - - - 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 3593 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) - - - Dying) - - (0.00%) - - - - - - -	East North Central	1285 (15.9%)	15 (16.7%)	
South Atlantic 1645 (20.3%) 12 (13.3%) East South Central 725 (8.96%) 10 (11.1%) West South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: $< 0.001^*$ 1 (Minor Loss of 75 (0.93%) 0 (0.00%) Function < 3 (Major Loss of 6336 (78.3%) 12 (13.3%) Function < 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) < 4 (Extreme Loss of 218 (27.4%) 0 (0.00%) Dying) < 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 3293 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) Dying) < 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 2218 (27.4%) 0 (0.00%) Dying) < 4 (Extreme Likelihood of 660 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying) $< 2216 (28.1%)$ 1 (1.11%) 1.000 Marijuana Use Abuse: 265 (3.27%) 1 (1.11%) 0.372 ZIP Median Income 0.4411 0.4411 Quartle: $< 2123 (28.4%)$ 31 (35.2%) $< 4.001^*$ J 104 (19.7%)	West North Central	726 (8.97%)	9 (10.0%)	
East South Central 725 (8.96%) 10 (11.1%) West South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (6.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APDRG:	South Atlantic	1645 (20.3%)	12 (13.3%)	
West South Central 996 (12.3%) 6 (0.67%) Mountain 698 (8.62%) 5 (5.56%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: - <0.001*	East South Central	725 (8.96%)	10 (11.1%)	
Mountain 698 (8.6.2%) 5 (3.50%) Pacific 807 (9.97%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: - <0.001*	West South Central	996 (12.3%)	6 (6.67%)	
rath 507 (9.37%) 11 (12.2%) Severity APRDRG: -<0.001*	Decific	098 (8.02%) 807 (0.07%)	5 (5.50%) 11 (12 204)	
1 (Minor Loss of 75 (0.93%) 0 (0.00%) Function) 2 (Moderate Loss of 314 (3.88%) 1 (1.11%) Punction) 3 (Major Loss of 6336 (78.3%) 12 (13.3%) Function) 3 (Major Loss of 6336 (78.3%) 12 (13.3%) Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) Mortality APRDRG: <0.001*	Severity APRDRC	807 (9.97%)	11 (12.2%)	<0 001*
Function) 10 (0100) 2 (Moderate Loss of 314 (3.88%) 1 (1.11%) Function) 3 (Major Loss of 6336 (78.3%) 12 (13.3%) Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) 77 (85.6%) Function) Mortality APRDRG: <0.001*	1 (Minor Loss of	75 (0.93%)	0 (0.00%)	<0.001
2 (Moderate Loss of 314 (3.88%) 1 (1.11%) Function) 3 (Major Loss of 6336 (78.3%) 12 (13.3%) Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 3593 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 3593 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 2218 (27.4%) 0 (0.00%) Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 1604 (19.8%) 18 (20.0%) Dying) 4 (Extreme Likelihood of 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying) 4 (Extreme Likelihood of 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying) 0.372 ZIP Median Income 0.441 Quartile: 1 1.11%) 1.000 Marijuana Use Abuse: 265 (3.27%) 1 (1.11%) 0.372 21P Median Income 0.441 0.441 Quartile: 1 1 (Lowest) 2234 (28.4%) 31 (35.2%)	Function)		- ()	
Function) 3 (Major Loss of 6336 (78.3%) 12 (13.3%) Function) - 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) - <	2 (Moderate Loss of	314 (3.88%)	1 (1.11%)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Function)			
Function) 4 (Extreme Loss of 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function)	3 (Major Loss of	6336 (78.3%)	12 (13.3%)	
4 (Extreme Loss of Function) 1370 (16.9%) 77 (85.6%) Function) $< 0.001^*$ Mortality APRDRG: $< 0.001^*$ 1 (Minor Likelihood of Dying) 3593 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of Dying) 2218 (27.4%) 0 (0.00%) $= 2$ (Moderate Likelihood of Dying) 1604 (19.8%) 18 (20.0%) $= 3$ (Major Likelihood of Dying) 1604 (19.8%) 18 (20.0%) $= 4$ (Extreme Likelihood of A (Extreme Likelihood of Bying) 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) $= 0$ (Minor Marijuana Use Abuse: 153 (1.89%) 1 (1.11%) 1.000 Marijuana Use Abuse: 265 (3.27%) 1 (1.11%) 0.372 Quartile: 0.441 0.441 Quartile: 0.441 0.441 Quartile: 1 (Lowest) 2234 (28.4%) 31 (35.2%) 2 2 2216 (28.1%) 21 (23.9%) 3 1873 (23.8%) 22 (25.0%) 4 (Highest) 1551 (19.7%) 14 (15.9%) Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) <0.001*	Function)			
Function)<0.001*Mortality APRDRG: $< 0.001^*$ 1 (Minor Likelihood of $3593 (44.4\%)$ $3 (3.33\%)$ Dying) $2 (Moderate Likelihood of$ $2218 (27.4\%)$ $0 (0.00\%)$ Dying) $3 (Major Likelihood of$ $1604 (19.8\%)$ $18 (20.0\%)$ Dying) $3 (Major Likelihood of$ $680 (8.40\%)$ $69 (76.7\%)$ Dying) 4 (Extreme Likelihood of $680 (8.40\%)$ $69 (76.7\%)$ Dying) 0 $1 (1.11\%)$ 1.000 Marijuana Use Abuse: $265 (3.27\%)$ $1 (1.11\%)$ 0.372 ZIP Median Income 0.441 0 0.441 Quartile: 0.441 0.372 $2216 (28.1\%)$ $21 (23.9\%)$ 2 $2216 (28.1\%)$ $21 (23.9\%)$ 3 $1873 (23.8\%)$ $22 (25.0\%)$ 4 (Highest) $1551 (19.7\%)$ $14 (15.9\%)$ 0.001^* Number of Admitted $12.7 (6.91)$ $21.3 (5.72)$ $<0.001^*$ Diagnoses $< 0.001^*$ $63 (70.0\%)$ $4 (4.4\%)$ $- 638 (7.90\%)$ $1 (1.11\%)$ Number of Admitted $1097 (13.6\%)$ $5 (5.56\%)$ $- 754 (9.2\%)$ $3 (3.33\%)$ Private $3317 (41.1\%)$ $18 (20.0\%)$ $- 550 (6.80\%)$ $- 5.50 (6.80\%)$ Approach: 0.502 $- 550 (6.80\%)$ $4 (4.44\%)$ Posterior $7544 (93.2\%)$ $86 (95.6\%)$ $- 5.022$ Anterior $550 (6.80\%)$ $4 (4.44\%)$ $- 550 (6.80\%)$ $4 (4.44\%)$ Posterior $7544 (93.2\%)$ $86 (95.6\%)$ $- 5022$ Days fro	4 (Extreme Loss of	1370 (16.9%)	77 (85.6%)	
Mortality APRDRG: <0.001*	Function)			
1 (Minor Likelihood of Dying) 3/93 (44.4%) 3 (3.33%) Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of 2218 (27.4%) 0 (0.00%) Dying) 1604 (19.8%) 18 (20.0%) Dying) 18 (20.0%) Dying) 4 (Extreme Likelihood of 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying)	Mortality APRDRG:	0500 (44 40/)	0 (0 000)	<0.001*
2 (Moderate Likelihood of 2218 (27.4%) 0 (0.00%) Dying) 3 (Major Likelihood of 1604 (19.8%) 18 (20.0%) Dying) 4 (Extreme Likelihood of 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying) 4 (Extreme Likelihood of 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying) 0ioid Use Abuse: 153 (1.89%) 1 (1.11%) 1.000 Marijuana Use Abuse: 265 (3.27%) 1 (1.11%) 0.372 ZIP Median Income 0.441 0.441 Quartile: 1 1 (Lowest) 2234 (28.4%) 31 (35.2%) 2 2216 (28.1%) 21 (23.9%) 4 (15.9%) 3 1873 (23.8%) 22 (25.0%) 4 (Highest) 1 551 (19.7%) 14 (15.9%) Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) <0.001*	1 (Minor Likelihood of	3593 (44.4%)	3 (3.33%)	
2 (Woter are Likelihood of 2218 (27.4%)) 0 (0.00%) Dying) 3 (Major Likelihood of 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying)	Dying) 2 (Moderate Likelihood of	2218 (27 404)	0 (0 00%)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2 (Moderate Likelihood of Dving)	2218 (27.4%)	0 (0.00%)	
Dying) Horization (1997) Horization (1997) 4 (Extreme Likelihood of ping) 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) Dying) Opioid Use Abuse: 153 (1.89%) 1 (1.11%) 1.000 Marijuana Use Abuse: 265 (3.27%) 1 (1.11%) 0.372 ZIP Median Income 0.441 0.372 Quartile: 1 (Lowest) 2234 (28.4%) 31 (35.2%) 2 2216 (28.1%) 21 (23.9%) 3 3 1873 (23.8%) 22 (25.0%) 4 4 (Highest) 1551 (19.7%) 14 (15.9%) 0.001* Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) <0.001*	3 (Major Likelihood of	1604 (19.8%)	18 (20.0%)	
4 (Extreme Likelihood of Dying) 680 (8.40%) 69 (76.7%) 69 (76.7%)Dying)0pioid Use Abuse: 153 (1.89%) 1 (1.11%) 1.000 Marijuana Use Abuse: 265 (3.27%) 1 (1.11%) 0.372 ZIP Median Income 0.441 0.372 0.441 Quartile: 1 (1.0west) 2234 (28.4%) 31 (35.2%) 2 2216 (28.1%) 21 (23.9%) 3 3 1873 (23.8%) 22 (25.0%) 4 (Highest) 4 (Highest) 1551 (19.7%) 14 (15.9%)Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) $<0.001^*$ Diagnoses $=$ $=$ Expected Payer: $<$ $<0.001^*$ Medicare 2178 (27.0%) 63 (70.0%)Medicare 317 (41.1%) 18 (20.0%)Self-Pay 638 (7.90%) 1 (1.11%)No Charge 41 (0.51%) 0 (0.00%)Other 801 (9.92%) 3 (3.33%)Approach: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%)Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%)Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) <td>Dying)</td> <td></td> <td> (,</td> <td></td>	Dying)		(,	
Dying)	4 (Extreme Likelihood of	680 (8.40%)	69 (76.7%)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Dying)			
Marijuana Use Abuse:265 (3.27%)1 (1.11%)0.372ZIP Median Income0.441Quartile:0.4411 (Lowest)2234 (28.4%)31 (35.2%)22216 (28.1%)21 (23.9%)31873 (23.8%)22 (25.0%)4 (Highest)1551 (19.7%)14 (15.9%)Number of Admitted12.7 (6.91)21.3 (5.72)Jiagnoses $<$ $<$ Expected Payer: $<$ $<$ Medicare2178 (27.0%) $63 (70.0\%)$ Medicaid1097 (13.6%) $5 (5.56\%)$ Private $3317 (41.1\%)$ $18 (20.0\%)$ Self-Pay $638 (7.90\%)$ $1 (1.11\%)$ No Charge41 (0.51%) $0 (0.00\%)$ Other801 (9.92%) $3 (3.33\%)$ Approach: 0.502 Anterior $550 (6.80\%)$ $4 (4.44\%)$ Posterior $7544 (93.2\%)$ $86 (95.6\%)$ Days from Admission to $2.44 (3.18)$ $2.78 (3.35)$ 0.345 Surgery $U.44 (9.53)$ $12.0 (8.74)$ 0.092 Total Charges $$216,308$ $$220,562$ $<$ $<$ (§168,459)(§171,405) $<$ $<$	Opioid Use Abuse:	153 (1.89%)	1 (1.11%)	1.000
ZIP Median Income 0.441 Quartile: 1 1 (Lowest) 2234 (28.4%) 31 (35.2%) 2 2216 (28.1%) 21 (23.9%) 3 1873 (23.8%) 22 (25.0%) 4 (Highest) 1551 (19.7%) 14 (15.9%) Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) <0.001*	Marijuana Use Abuse:	265 (3.27%)	1 (1.11%)	0.372
Quartile:1 (Lowest)2234 (28.4%)31 (35.2%)22216 (28.1%)21 (23.9%)31873 (23.8%)22 (25.0%)4 (Highest)1551 (19.7%)14 (15.9%)Number of Admitted12.7 (6.91)21.3 (5.72)Olagnoses	ZIP Median Income			0.441
1 (Lowest) 2234 (28.4%) 31 (35.2%) 2 2216 (28.1%) 21 (23.9%) 3 1873 (23.8%) 22 (25.0%) 4 (Highest) 1551 (19.7%) 14 (15.9%) Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) <0.001*	Quartile:			
2 2216 (28.1%) 21 (23.9%) 3 1873 (23.8%) 22 (25.0%) 4 (Highest) 1551 (19.7%) 14 (15.9%) Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) <0.001*	1 (Lowest)	2234 (28.4%)	31 (35.2%)	
3 1673 (23.8%) 22 (25.0%) 4 (Highest) 1551 (19.7%) 14 (15.9%) Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) <0.001*	2	2216 (28.1%)	21 (23.9%)	
A (Inglest) 1531 (13, 76) 14 (13, 976) Number of Admitted 12.7 (6.91) 21.3 (5.72) <0.001*	3 A (Highest)	1873 (23.8%)	22 (25.0%)	
Initiate of FLF (0.51) 21.0 (0.72) C0.001 Diagnoses Expected Payer: <0.001*	Number of Admitted	127 (6 91)	213(572)	<0.001*
Expected Payer: <0.001* Medicare 2178 (27.0%) 63 (70.0%) Medicaid 1097 (13.6%) 5 (5.56%) Private 3317 (41.1%) 18 (20.0%) Self-Pay 638 (7.90%) 1 (1.11%) No Charge 41 (0.51%) 0 (0.00%) Other 801 (9.92%) 3 (3.33%) Approach: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery U Length of Stay 10.4 (9.53) 12.0 (8.74) 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Diagnoses	12.7 (0.91)	21.0 (0.72)	\$0.001
Medicare 2178 (27.0%) 63 (70.0%) Medicaid 1097 (13.6%) 5 (5.56%) Private 3317 (41.1%) 18 (20.0%) Self-Pay 638 (7.90%) 1 (1.11%) No Charge 41 (0.51%) 0 (0.00%) Other 801 (9.92%) 3 (3.33%) Approach: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery Uength of Stay 10.4 (9.53) 12.0 (8.74) 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Expected Payer:			<0.001*
Medicaid 1097 (13.6%) 5 (5.56%) Private 3317 (41.1%) 18 (20.0%) Self-Pay 638 (7.90%) 1 (1.11%) No Charge 41 (0.51%) 0 (0.00%) Other 801 (9.92%) 3 (3.33%) Approach: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery U U.04 (9.53) 12.0 (8.74) 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Medicare	2178 (27.0%)	63 (70.0%)	
Private 3317 (41.1%) 18 (20.0%) Self-Pay 638 (7.90%) 1 (1.11%) No Charge 41 (0.51%) 0 (0.00%) Other 801 (9.92%) 3 (3.33%) Approach: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery U U 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Medicaid	1097 (13.6%)	5 (5.56%)	
Self-Pay 638 (7.90%) 1 (1.11%) No Charge 41 (0.51%) 0 (0.00%) Other 801 (9.92%) 3 (3.33%) Approach: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery U U 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Private	3317 (41.1%)	18 (20.0%)	
No Charge 41 (0.51%) 0 (0.00%) Other 801 (9.92%) 3 (3.33%) Approach: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery 10.4 (9.53) 12.0 (8.74) 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Self-Pay	638 (7.90%)	1 (1.11%)	
Other 801 (9.92%) 3 (3.33%) Approach: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery	No Charge	41 (0.51%)	0 (0.00%)	
Approacn: 0.502 Anterior 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery	Other	801 (9.92%)	3 (3.33%)	0 500
Anternor 550 (6.80%) 4 (4.44%) Posterior 7544 (93.2%) 86 (95.6%) Days from Admission to 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Surgery Length of Stay 10.4 (9.53) 12.0 (8.74) 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Approach:	FF0 ((000())	4 (4 4 40/)	0.502
Posterior 7944 (95.2%) 80 (95.6%) Days from Admission to Surgery 2.44 (3.18) 2.78 (3.35) 0.345 Length of Stay 10.4 (9.53) 12.0 (8.74) 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Anterior	550 (6.80%)	4 (4.44%)	
Days from runnession to 2.74 (5.16) 2.76 (5.35) 0.345 Surgery Length of Stay 10.4 (9.53) 12.0 (8.74) 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001*	Posterior Days from Admission to	7 344 (93.2%) 2 44 (3 19)	00 (93.0%) 2 78 (3 35)	0 345
Length of Stay 10.4 (9.53) 12.0 (8.74) 0.092 Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001* (\$168,459) (\$171,405)	Surgery	2.17 (3.10)	2.70 (0.00)	0.545
Total Charges \$216,308 \$290,562 <0.001* (\$168,459) (\$171,405)	Length of Stav	10.4 (9.53)	12.0 (8.74)	0.092
(\$168,459) (\$171,405)	Total Charges	\$216,308	\$290,562	< 0.001*
	-	(\$168,459)	(\$171,405)	

*denotes statistical significance with p < 0.05; *Abbreviations*: API – Asian Pacific Islander, APRDRG – All Patient Refined Diagnosis Related Group.

rise, identifying risk factors for poor outcomes in these patients has become a major priority. Short-term outcomes after surgery such as complications, readmissions, and revisions are commonly viewed as important metrics in determining the overall success of patients who undergo surgery after these injuries. Awareness and consideration of social determinants of health, and their impact on these outcomes, has been brought to the forefront of academic medicine in recent years, with various indices incorporating factors such as average socioeconomic status, housing and transportation, education status, and employment status to create community-level socioeconomic stratifications (Kind et al., 2014; Glance; Kesler). These factors are especially important when considering our finding of significantly increased total charges in patients that expire in the hospital, a finding likely representative of these patients' medical complexities (Tanenbaum et al., 2016). After investigation of individual and community-level socioeconomic factors utilizing the NIS database from 2012 to 2017, our study observed no significant increase in mortality over that time, but did find an association between in-hospital mortality and patient's age and race after thoracolumbar fusion.

Trends in mortality among admitted spine patients vary between injury mechanisms and management. Jain et al. conducted a comprehensive assessment of in-hospital mortality after acute spinal cord injury from 1993 to 2012 and found an increase in mortality from 6.6% to 7.5% (Jain et al., 2015). This increase may, in part, be associated with an increase in surgical cases, particularly in the elderly population. Another study of the NIS database from 2005 to 2014 observed increased in-hospital mortality in patients >65 years of age that suffered a spinal cord injury, regardless of lesion site in the spine (Gao et al., 2020). Our study aligns with the recent literature, observing an increase in the average age of patient undergoing thoracolumbar fusion after traumatic injury from 2012 to 2017, and identifying age as an independent predictor of in-hospital mortality after surgery. Notably, there was no significant increase in mortality from 2012 to 2017, even with an increasingly aging patient cohort. Improvement in days from admission to surgery across the same time period may be one factor that has helped mitigate the risks of surgery in these patients, as multiple studies have observed fewer in-hospital complications and lower rates of in-hospital mortality with quicker time to surgery (Ruddell et al., 2021; Bellabarba et al., 2010; Barkay et al., 2023).

Recent literature presents mixed evidence regarding associations between patient demographic and socioeconomic factors and mortality after spine surgery. In a recent database study, Engler et al. found Black patients experienced more readmissions and complications, even when controlling for the patient's social vulnerability index (SVI)-a community-level socioeconomic index (Engler et al., 2023). However, 90-day mortality rates were fully explained by controlling for demographic factors, such as age, sex, and Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI). Another study in the metastatic spine disease population similarly found no associations between race, SVI, insurance status, or modified Bauer Score (a validated prognostication model for metastatic spine disease) and survival after spine surgery (De la Garza Ramos et al., 2023). Conversely, Schoenfeld et al. observed increased odds (2.1 OR) of in-hospital mortality in black patients after spine trauma, even when controlling for other mortality risk factors such as Glasgow Coma Scale (GSC), injury severity score (ISS), and length of stay (Schoenfeld et al., 2013). Multiple studies have also found increased risk of mortality in Black patients after spine surgery, with one meta-analysis calculating a 55% higher risk of mortality after spine surgery compared to White patients (Khan et al., 2022; Akosman et al., 2023; Alosh et al., 2009). Our findings align with these studies, as Black patients were independently associated with increased in-hospital mortality rates when compared to White patients. Increased mortality rates in Black patients after trauma has been shown repeatedly in the literature, with previous studies citing implicit bias as a potential contributor to these inequities (Henry et al., 2023; Bailey et al., 2017; Scott et al., 2013). Although race has a unique significance in America, multiple studies have highlighted race as a risk factor for poor outcomes globally, both in the medical and surgical fields (Siddig et al., 2023; Bakhtiari, 2022; Vitalis et al., 2021). Future research is necessary to further identify and investigate these healthcare disparities in spinal trauma, both in North America and globally.

Table 4

Regression analysis of in-hospital mortality.

	In Hospital Mortality			In Hospital Mortality		
Predictors	Odds Ratios	CI	p-value	Odds Ratios	CI	p-value
Age	1.06	1.04-1.08	<0.001	1.06	1.04-1.08	< 0.001
Mortality APRDRG	3.47	2.10-6.00	<0.001	3.47	2.10-6.00	< 0.001
Black	3.71	1.31-9.13	0.007	3.86	1.35-9.55	0.006
Hispanic	0.41	0.07-1.40	0.230	0.40	0.06-1.38	0.219
API	0.48	0.03-2.54	0.488	0.51	0.03-2.72	0.526
ZIP MI Quartile 1	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
ZIP MI Quartile 2	0.60	0.31-1.12	0.114	0.59	0.31-1.11	0.105
ZIP MI Quartile 3	0.95	0.50-1.78	0.880	0.97	0.51-1.82	0.922
ZIP MI Quartile 4	0.67	0.32-1.34	0.267	0.67	0.32-1.35	0.271
Number of Admission Diagnoses	1.02	0.98-1.07	0.305	1.02	0.98-1.07	0.323
Severity APRDRG	5.46	2.46-13.02	<0.001	5.48	2.47-13.12	< 0.001
2012	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
2013				1.11	0.47-2.61	0.818
2014				0.68	0.26-1.75	0.434
2015				1.31	0.51-3.28	0.562
2016				0.71	0.31-1.66	0.424
2017				0.99	0.46–2.24	0.988

*denotes statistical significance with p < 0.05; *Abbreviations*: API – Asian Pacific Islander, APRDRG – All Patient Refined Diagnosis Related Group, ZIP MI – ZIP code median income.

The lack of a significant association of ZIP code median income quartile also suggests that community-level socioeconomic metrics may not provide prognostic utility in risk assessment of in-patient mortality after thoracolumbar fusion. Though ZIP code median income does not fully capture a person's community-level socioeconomic and psychosocial health, it can serve as a reasonable corollary in a nationwide database study. A recent study of mortality after surgery for metastatic spine disease found that mortality was not associated with two different community-level indices-social deprivation index (SDI) and area deprivation index (ADI) (Piña et al., 2023). Instead, insurance status and palliative care consultation were found to be associated with mortality in these patients. Community-level indices like SDI and ADI have also been investigated in relation to other outcomes after surgery, including readmissions, reoperations, and patient-reported outcome measures. Lambrechts et al. observed no association between distressed community index (DCI) quintile and PROMs after anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (ACDF) (Lambrechts et al., 2022). Another study found a similar lack of association between DCI and PROMs after elective lumbar fusion (Siegel et al., 2023). Though this study cannot assess PROMs due to the nature of the NIS database, these findings suggest that community-level indices such as DCI, ADI, and SVI may not adequately capture the disparities that exist in these communities.

This study is not without its limitations. The NIS database generates a sample of 20% of annual admissions from participating national hospitals; however, any outcome or complication encountered outside of the hospital admission is not reported. Therefore, it is not possible to draw conclusions about short-term outcomes such as readmissions, complications, and reoperations. Additionally, any inaccuracies in reported diagnoses codes or procedure codes associated with the admission cannot be validated. Changes in the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) from ICD-9 to ICD-10 during 2015 also posed challenges in querying the database; however, an extensive search of both classification systems was conducted to identify the appropriate codes to include in our query. Finally, ZIP code median income quartile is not as comprehensive as other validated community-level socioeconomic indices that include additional factors such as housing status, education

status, and employment rates. It has been used in this study as an approximation to a patient's community-level health as other indices are not able to be calculated from the provided NIS data.

5. Conclusions

Our study of nationwide, traumatic thoracolumbar fusion procedures from 2012 to 2017 in the NIS database found older, black patients were at increased risk for in-hospital mortality; however, it is important to note that only 90 in-hospital mortalities were reported during this time and seven of these patients were black. We additionally observed no association between ZIP code median income and in-hospital mortality, highlighting a potential lack of prognostic utility in community-level socioeconomic measures in relation to mortality. As the awareness of healthcare disparities grows, future research focusing on racial and socioeconomic inequities should continue to critically evaluate their impact on spinal trauma surgical outcomes. Improving the prognostic value of current socioeconomic indices may help enhance care delivery to this patient population and beyond.

Conflicts of interest and source of funding

The authors, their immediate family, and any research foundation with which they are affiliated did not receive any financial payments or other benefits from any commercial entity related to the subject of this article. There are no relevant disclosures.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

The authors have no acknowledgements to declare.

Appendix A. ICD 10 Codes for Primary Thoracolumbar Fusion

ICD 10	0RG1070, 0RG1071, 0RG107J, 0RG10A0, 0RG10AJ, 0RG10J0, 0RG10J1, 0RG10JJ, 0RG10JJ, 0RG10K0, 0RG10K1, 0RG10KJ, 0RG1370, 0RG1371, 0RG137J, 0RG13A0, 0RG13AJ,
	0RG13J0, 0RG13J1, 0RG13JJ, 0RG13JJ, 0RG13K0, 0RG13K1, 0RG13KJ, 0RG1470, 0RG1471, 0RG147J, 0RG14A0, 0RG14AJ, 0RG14J0, 0RG14J1, 0RG14JJ, 0RG14JJ, 0RG14K0, 0RG14K1,
	0RG14KJ, 0RG2070, 0RG2071, 0RG207J, 0RG20A0, 0RG20AJ, 0RG20J0, 0RG20J1, 0RG20JJ, 0RG20K0, 0RG20K1, 0RG20KJ, 0RG2370, 0RG2371, 0RG237J, 0RG23A0,
	0RG23AJ, 0RG23J0, 0RG23J1, 0RG23JJ, 0RG23JJ, 0RG23K0, 0RG23K1, 0RG23KJ, 0RG2470, 0RG2471, 0RG247J, 0RG24AJ, 0RG24AJ, 0RG24JJ, 0RG
	0RG24K1, 0RG24KJ, 0RG4070, 0RG4071, 0RG407J, 0RG40A0, 0RG40AJ, 0RG40J0, 0RG40J1, 0RG40JJ, 0RG40KJ, 0RG40KJ, 0RG40KJ, 0RG4370, 0RG4371, 0RG437J,
	0RG43A0, 0RG43AJ, 0RG43J0, 0RG43J1, 0RG43JJ, 0RG43JJ, 0RG43K0, 0RG43K1, 0RG43KJ, 0RG4470, 0RG4471, 0RG447J, 0RG44A0, 0RG44AJ, 0RG44J0, 0RG44J1, 0RG44JJ,
	0RG44K0, 0RG44K1, 0RG44KJ, 0RG6070, 0RG6071, 0RG607J, 0RG60A0, 0RG60A0, 0RG60AJ, 0RG60J0, 0RG60J1, 0RG60JJ, 0RG60K1, 0RG60K1, 0RG60KJ, 0RG6370, 0RG6371,
	0RG637J, 0RG63A0, 0RG63AJ, 0RG63J0, 0RG63J1, 0RG63JJ, 0RG63JJ, 0RG63K0, 0RG63K1, 0RG63KJ, 0RG6470, 0RG6471, 0RG647J, 0RG64A0, 0RG64AJ, 0RG64J0, 0RG64J0, 0RG64J1,
	0RG64JJ, 0RG64K0, 0RG64K1, 0RG64KJ, 0RG7070, 0RG7071, 0RG707J, 0RG70A0, 0RG70AJ, 0RG70JJ, 0RG70JJ, 0RG70JJ, 0RG70K1, 0RG70KJ, 0RG
	0RG7371, 0RG737J, 0RG73A0, 0RG73AJ, 0RG73J0, 0RG73J1, 0RG73JJ, 0RG73JJ, 0RG73K0, 0RG73K1, 0RG73KJ, 0RG7470, 0RG7471, 0RG747J, 0RG74A0, 0RG74AJ, 0RG74J0,
	0RG74J1, 0RG74JJ, 0RG74K0, 0RG74K1, 0RG74KJ, 0RG8070, 0RG8071, 0RG807J, 0RG80A0, 0RG80AJ, 0RG80JJ, 0RG80JJ, 0RG80JJ, 0RG80K0, 0RG80K1, 0RG80KJ,
	0RG8370, 0RG8371, 0RG837J, 0RG83A0, 0RG83AJ, 0RG83J0, 0RG83J1, 0RG83JJ, 0RG83JJ, 0RG83K1, 0RG83K1, 0RG8470, 0RG8471, 0RG8470, 0RG84A0, 0RG84AJ,
	0RG84J0, 0RG84J1, 0RG84JJ, 0RG84K0, 0RG84K1, 0RG84KJ, 0RGA070, 0RGA071, 0RGA07J, 0RGA0A0, 0RGA0AJ, 0RGA0J1, 0RGA0J1, 0RGA0JJ, 0RGA0K0, 0RGA0K1,
	0RGA0KJ, 0RGA370, 0RGA371, 0RGA37J, 0RGA3A0, 0RGA3AJ, 0RGA3J0, 0RGA3J1, 0RGA3JJ, 0RGA3K0, 0RGA3K1, 0RGA3KJ, 0RGA470, 0RGA471, 0RGA47J,
	0RGA4A0, 0RGA4AJ, 0RGA4J0, 0RGA4J1, 0RGA4JJ, 0RGA4K0, 0RGA4K1, 0RGA4KJ, 0SG0070, 0SG0071, 0SG007J, 0SG00A0, 0SG00AJ, 0SG00J1, 0SG00J1, 0SG00JJ,
	0SG00K0, 0SG00K1, 0SG00KJ, 0SG0370, 0SG0371, 0SG037J, 0SG03A0, 0SG03AJ, 0SG03J0, 0SG03J1, 0SG03JJ, 0SG03K0, 0SG03K1, 0SG03KJ, 0SG0470, 0SG0471,
	0SG047J, 0SG04A0, 0SG04AJ, 0SG04J0, 0SG04J1, 0SG04JJ, 0SG04K0, 0SG04K1, 0SG04K1, 0SG04KJ, 0SG1070, 0SG1071, 0SG107J, 0SG10A0, 0SG10AJ, 0SG10J0, 0SG10J1,
	0SG10JJ, 0SG10K0, 0SG10K1, 0SG10KJ, 0SG1370, 0SG1371, 0SG137J, 0SG13A0, 0SG13AJ, 0SG13J0, 0SG13J1, 0SG13JJ, 0SG13K0, 0SG13K1, 0SG13KJ, 0SG1470,
	0SG1471, 0SG147J, 0SG14A0, 0SG14AJ, 0SG14J0, 0SG14J1, 0SG14JJ, 0SG14K0, 0SG14K1, 0SG14KJ, 0SG3070, 0SG3071, 0SG307J, 0SG30A0, 0SG30AJ, 0SG30AJ
	0SG30J1, 0SG30JJ, 0SG30K0, 0SG30K1, 0SG30KJ, 0SG3370, 0SG3371, 0SG337J, 0SG33A0, 0SG33AJ, 0SG33J0, 0SG33J1, 0SG33JJ, 0SG33K0, 0SG33K1, 0SG33K1, 0SG33K1, 0SG33K1, 0SG33K0, 0SG3XK1, 0SG3XK1, 0SG3
	0SG3470, 0SG3471, 0SG347J, 0SG34A0, 0SG34AJ, 0SG34J0, 0SG34J1, 0SG34JJ, 0SG34K0, 0SG34K1, 0SG34KJ

References

- Akosman, I., Kumar, N., Mortenson, R., et al., 2023. Racial differences in perioperative complications, readmissions, and mortalities after elective spine surgery in the United States: a systematic review using AI-assisted bibliometric analysis. Global Spine J. Published online June 26, 21925682231186759. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 21925682231186759.
- Alosh, H., Riley, L.H., Skolasky, R.L., 2009. Insurance status, geography, race, and ethnicity as predictors of anterior cervical spine surgery rates and in-hospital mortality: an examination of United States trends from 1992 to 2005. Spine 34 (18), 1956–1962. https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181ab930e.
- Bailey, Z.D., Krieger, N., Agénor, M., Graves, J., Linos, N., Bassett, M.T., 2017. Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: evidence and interventions. Lancet 389 (10077), 1453–1463. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30569-X.
- Bakhtiari, E., 2022. Diminished returns in Europe: socioeconomic status and ethno-racial health disparities across 30 countries in the European social survey. J Racial Ethn Health Disparities 9 (6), 2412–2426. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-021-01178-2.
- Barkay, G., Apterman, S., Ackshota, N., Shtewe, A.H., Sissman, E., Friedlander, A., 2023. Early surgery for thoracolumbar extension-type fractures in geriatric patients with ankylosing disorders reduces patient complications and mortality. Spine J. 23 (1), 157–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2022.08.016.
- Bellabarba, C., Fisher, C., Chapman, J.R., Dettori, J.R., Norvell, D.C., 2010. Does early fracture fixation of thoracolumbar spine fractures decrease morbidity or mortality? Spine (Phila Pa 1976 35 (9 Suppl. 1), S138–S145. https://doi.org/10.1097/ BRS.0b013e3181d830c1.
- Beschloss, A.M., Taghlabi, K.M., Rodriguez, D.A., et al., 2022. Demographic and economic trends in vertebral fracture surgeries throughout the United States. N Am Spine Soc J 12, 100175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xnsj.2022.100175.
- Camacho, J.E., Kung, J.E., Thomson, A.E., et al., 2023. Retrospective analysis of causes and risk factors of 30-day readmission after spine surgery for thoracolumbar trauma. Global Spine J. 13 (6), 1558–1565. https://doi.org/10.1177/21925682211041045.
- Corso, K.A., Joo, P., Ruppenkamp, J., Holy, C.E., Coplan, P.M., Mesfin, A., 2023. Racial and health insurance differences in patient outcomes after surgical treatment for cauda equina syndrome: a United States retrospective hospital claims database analysis. Spine 48 (19), 1373–1387. https://doi.org/10.1097/ BRS.000000000004727.
- De la Garza Ramos, R., Javed, K., Ryvlin, J., Gelfand, Y., Murthy, S., Yassari, R., 2023. Are there racial or socioeconomic disparities in ambulatory outcome or survival after oncologic spine surgery for metastatic cancer? Results from a medically underserved center. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 481 (2), 301–307. https://doi.org/10.1097/ CORR.00000000002445.
- Division (DCD) DC. What's the difference between Medicare and Medicaid? Published February 9, 12AD. Accessed February 8, 2024. https://www.hhs.gov/answers/medi care-and-medicaid/what-is-the-difference-between-medicare-medicaid/index.html.
- Doud, A.N., Weaver, A.A., Talton, J.W., et al., 2015. Has the incidence of thoracolumbar spine injuries increased in the United States from 1998 to 2011? Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 473 (1), 297–304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-014-3870-9.
- ElNemer, W., Solomon, E., Raad, M., Jain, A., Lee, S.H., 2023. Predicting mortality following odontoid fracture fixation in elderly patients: CAADS-16 score. Global Spine J. Published online December 1, 21925682231220019. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/21925682231220019.
- Engler, I.D., Vasavada, K.D., Vanneman, M.E., Schoenfeld, A.J., Martin, B.I., 2023. Do community-level disadvantages account for racial disparities in the safety of spine surgery? A large database study based on Medicare claims. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 481 (2), 268–278. https://doi.org/10.1097/CORR.00000000002323.
- Gao, F., Chu, H., Chen, L., et al., 2020. Factors associated with in-hospital outcomes of traumatic spinal cord injury: 10-year analysis of the US national inpatient sample.

J. Am. Acad. Orthop. Surg. 28 (17), 707–716. https://doi.org/10.5435/JAAOS-D-18-00728.

- At A Glance: CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability Index | Place and Health | ATSDR. Published October 26, 2022. Accessed December 20, 2023. https://www.atsdr.cdc. gov/placeandhealth/svi/at-a-glance_svi.html.
- Gordon, A.M., Elali, F.R., Ng, M.K., Saleh, A., Ahn, N.U., 2023. Lower neighborhood socioeconomic status may influence medical complications, emergency department utilization, and costs of care after 1- to 2-level lumbar fusion. Spine (Phila Pa 1976 48 (24), 1749–1755. https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.00000000004588.
- Hagan, M.J., Sastry, R.A., Feler, J., et al., 2022. Neighborhood-level socioeconomic status, extended length of stay, and discharge disposition following elective lumbar spine surgery. N Am Spine Soc J 12, 100187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. xnsj.2022.100187.
- Henry, R., Liasidis, P.K., Olson, B., et al., 2023. Disparities in care among gunshot victims: a nationwide analysis. J. Surg. Res. 283, 59–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jss.2022.10.009.
- Jain, N.B., Ayers, G.D., Peterson, E.N., et al., 2015. Traumatic spinal cord injury in the United States, 1993-2012. JAMA 313 (22), 2236–2243. https://doi.org/10.1001/ jama.2015.6250.
- Jansson, K.A., Blomqvist, P., Svedmark, P., et al., 2010. Thoracolumbar vertebral fractures in Sweden: an analysis of 13,496 patients admitted to hospital. Eur. J. Epidemiol. 25 (6), 431–437. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-010-9461-5.
- Kesler P. Distressed Communities. Economic Innovation Group. Accessed June 7, 2023. https://eig.org/distressed-communities/.
- Kha, S.T., Ilyas, H., Tanenbaum, J.E., Benzel, E.C., Steinmetz, M.P., Mroz, T.E., 2018. Trends in lumbar fusion surgery among octogenarians: a nationwide inpatient sample study from 2004 to 2013. Global Spine J. 8 (6), 593–599. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/2192568218756878.
- Khan, I.S., Huang, E., Maeder-York, W., et al., 2022. Racial disparities in outcomes after spine surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. World Neurosurg 157, e232–e244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2021.09.140.
- Kim, H.J., Zuckerman, S.L., Cerpa, M., Yeom, J.S., Lehman, R.A., Lenke, L.G., 2022. Incidence and risk factors for complications and mortality after vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty in the osteoporotic vertebral compression fracture-analysis of 1,932 cases from the American college of surgeons national surgical quality improvement. Global Spine J. 12 (6), 1125–1134. https://doi.org/10.1177/2192568220976355.
- Kind, A.J.H., Jencks, S., Brock, J., et al., 2014. Neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and 30-day rehospitalization: a retrospective cohort study. Ann. Intern. Med. 161 (11), 765–774. https://doi.org/10.7326/M13-2946.
- Kobayashi, M., Yokogawa, N., Kato, S., et al., 2023. Risk factors for early mortality in older patients with traumatic cervical spine injuries-A multicenter retrospective study of 1512 cases. J. Clin. Med. 12 (2), 708. https://doi.org/10.3390/ jcm12020708.
- Kushioka, J., Takenaka, S., Makino, T., et al., 2020. Risk factors for in-hospital mortality after spine surgery: a matched case-control study using a multicenter database. Spine J. 20 (3), 321–328. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2019.10.008.
- Lambrechts, M.J., Toci, G.R., Issa, T.Z., et al., 2022. Patients from socioeconomically distressed communities experience similar clinical improvements following anterior cervical discectomy and fusion. Spine (Phila Pa 1976 47 (24), 1701–1709. https:// doi.org/10.1097/BRS.00000000004455.
- Lieber, A.M., Boniello, A.J., Kerbel, Y.E., et al., 2020. Low socioeconomic status is associated with increased complication rates: are risk adjustment models necessary in cervical spine surgery? Global Spine J. 10 (6), 748–753. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 2192568219874763.
- NIS Description of Data Elements. Accessed December 19, 2023. https://hcup-us.ahrq.gov/db/nation/nis/nisdde.jsp.
- HCUP-US NIS Overview. Accessed December 20, 2023. https://hcup-us.ahrq.gov/nisove rview.jsp.

- Piña, D., Kalistratova, V., Boozé, Z., et al., 2023. Sociodemographic characteristics of patients undergoing surgery for metastatic disease of the spine. J. Am. Acad. Orthop. Surg. 31 (17), e675–e684. https://doi.org/10.5435/JAAOS-D-22-01147.
- Ruddell, J.H., DePasse, J.M., Tang, O.Y., Daniels, A.H., 2021. Timing of surgery for thoracolumbar spine trauma: patients with neurological injury. Clin Spine Surg 34 (4), E229–E236. https://doi.org/10.1097/BSD.00000000001078.
- Schoenfeld, A.J., Belmont, P.J., See, A.A., Bader, J.O., Bono, C.M., 2013. Patient demographics, insurance status, race, and ethnicity as predictors of morbidity and mortality after spine trauma: a study using the National Trauma Data Bank. Spine J. 13 (12), 1766–1773. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2013.03.024.
- Scott, V.K., Hashmi, Z.G., Schneider, E.B., et al., 2013. Counting the lives lost: how many black trauma deaths are attributable to disparities? J. Surg. Res. 184 (1), 480–487. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2013.04.080.
- Siddiq, S., Ahmed, S., Akram, I., 2023. Clinical outcomes following COVID-19 infection in ethnic minority groups in the UK: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Publ. Health 222, 205–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2022.05.019.
- Siegel, N., Lambrechts, M.J., Karamian, B.A., et al., 2023. Readmission and resource utilization in patients from socioeconomically distressed communities following lumbar fusion. Clin Spine Surg 36 (4), E123–E130. https://doi.org/10.1097/ BSD.00000000001386.
- Tanenbaum, J.E., Lubelski, D., Rosenbaum, B.P., Thompson, N.R., Benzel, E.C., Mroz, T. E., 2016. Predictors of outcomes and hospital charges following atlantoaxial fusion. Spine J. 16 (5), 608–618. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2015.12.090.
- Vitalis, A., Shantsila, A., Kay, M., Vohra, R.K., Lip, G.Y.H., 2021. Outcome of femoralpopliteal bypass procedures in different ethnic groups in England: a retrospective analysis of hospital episode statistics. Ann. Vasc. Surg. 76, 351–356. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.avsg.2021.04.018.
- Zileli, M., Sharif, S., Fornari, M., 2021. Incidence and epidemiology of thoracolumbar spine fractures: WFNS spine committee recommendations. Neurospine 18 (4), 704–712. https://doi.org/10.14245/ns.2142418.209.