Journal of Clinical and Translational Science

www.cambridge.org/cts

Basic and Preclinical Research Letter

Cite this article: Anderson JB, Laughter MR, Nguyen A, and Erlandson KM. Comorbidities and health care systems differences among states as it relates to COVID-19. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science* **5**: e35, 1–3. doi: 10.1017/cts.2020.528

Received: 1 July 2020 Revised: 17 August 2020 Accepted: 17 August 2020

Keywords:

Health care systems; COVID-19; comorbidities; nursing home; coronavirus

Address for correspondence:

K. M. Erlandson, MD, MS, Medicine and Epidemiology, Divisions Infectious Diseases & Geriatric Medicine, University of Colorado Denver-Anschutz Medical Campus, 12700 E. 19th Ave, Mail Stop B168, Aurora, CO 80045, USA. Email: kristine.erlandson@cuanschutz.edu

© The Association for Clinical and Translational Science 2020. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/),

which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is unaltered and is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained for commercial re-use or in order to create a derivative work.





Comorbidities and health care systems differences among states as it relates to COVID-19

Jaclyn B. Anderson¹, Melissa R. Laughter¹, Alexander Nguyen¹ and Kristine M. Erlandson^{1,2}

¹University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO, USA and ²Department of Medicine, University of Colorado, Aurora, CO, USA

Introduction

Comorbidities, such as cardiovascular disease (CVD), congestive obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), diabetes mellitus (DM), hypertension (HTN), and obesity, have been associated with poorer COVID-19-related prognoses [1]. However, little is known about how these comorbidities and socioeconomic factors (e.g., minority percentage, uninsured status, nursing homes/1000, number of hospital beds/1000) collectively preclude worse COVID-19 outcomes. We compared characteristics of each state with their corresponding COVID-19 case fatality rate to develop a deeper understanding of state-by-state COVID-19 risk and inform allocation of resources, prevention strategies, and policy.

Methods

Data on demographics, comorbidities, hospital systems, and COVID-19 case fatality rates across 50 states and the District of Columbia (DC) were analyzed and stratified by the United States average. Comorbidities data were obtained from the Centers for Disease Control and Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [2,3]. Data regarding demographics and hospital systems in State Health Facts were used with permission from the Kaiser Family Foundation [4–9].

We compared case fatality rates for all regions (51 values per predictor) above and below the national average for that predictor using independent-samples *t*-test, assuming unequal variances, with significance at a *p*-value of <0.05. A multiple linear regression analysis was performed on 12 independent variable predictors to determine the possible case fatality rates at the state level.

Results

Maine, West Virginia, and Vermont had the highest rates of asthma (123, 123, and 120 cases/ 1000 persons), while Texas, South Dakota, and Iowa had the lowest rates (74, 79, and 79 cases/ 1000 persons). Maine, Vermont, and Florida had the oldest mean age of the total population (37, 36, and 35 years), while Utah, DC, and Texas had the youngest (21, 22, and 24 years). Alaska, North Dakota, and Wyoming had the highest male to female (M:F) gender ratio (1.04), while DC, Virginia, and Tennessee had the lowest ratio (0.89, 0.92, and 0.92). Case fatality rates were significantly greater in states above vs. below the national averages for asthma (*p*-value 0.013), age (*p*-value 0.040), and M:F (*p*-value 0.0014). All other variables investigated were not significantly different between states (all *p*-value \leq 0.15) (Table 1).

A multiple linear regression analysis indicated coefficients and *p*-values for each independent variable as follows: Age >55 (coefficient: 0.16, *p*-value: 0.23), Minority Population (0.05, 0.21), M:F (-14.32, 0.26), Uninsured (-0.20, 0.45), Asthma (0.02, 0.56), COPD (0.04, 0.41), CVD (0.01, 0.86), DM (-0.03, 0.52), HTN (-0.07, 0.70), Obesity (-0.01, 0.60), Nursing Homes (13.99, 0.5), and Hospital Beds (-0.53, 0.37). The coefficient of determination *R*2 is 0.27.

Discussion

Understanding the risk and potential impact of the COVID-19 pandemic at the state level is vital for outbreak preparedness and community management. This review is consistent with current literature indicating increased rates of preexisting disease are associated with worse health outcomes [10,11]. Asthma and increased age were significantly greater among states with higher case fatality. In contrast to reportedly higher COVID-19-related deaths among men, lower case fatalities were observed in states with higher M:F ratios.

This study expands upon individual hospital-level data to identify state-wide risk factors for COVID-19. Social factors such as accessibility to healthcare, uninsured rates, urban vs. rural

Table 1. Demographics	, comorbidities,	and hospi	ital data during	g the COVID-19	pandemic	per state
-----------------------	------------------	-----------	------------------	----------------	----------	-----------

_

	Demographics ⁸			Comorbidities (per 1000) ^{2#}					Hospital System ⁸		COVID-19 (current as of 6/09/20) ^{3~}				
State	Age over $55(\%)^4$	Minority Population (%) ⁵	M:F (2017) ⁶	Uninsured (%) ⁷	Asthma	COPD	CVD	DM	HTN	Obesity (BMI > 30)	Nursing Homes Per 1000 (2017) ⁸	Hospital Beds per 1000 ⁹	Cases per 1000	Mortalities per 1000	Case Fatality Rate (%)
United States	29	31	0.96	9	95	66	43	109	323	309	0.049	2.4	6.1	0.35	5.67
Alabama	31	31	0.92	10	105	103	61	145	419	362	0.048	3.1	4.5	0.15	3.4
Alaska	25	27	1.04	12	92	59	31	88	318	295	0.025	2.2	0.8	0.01	1.81
Arizona	30	40	0.96	9	100	71	43	108	307	295	0.021	1.9	4	0.11	2.85
Arkansas	30	24	0.96	10	98	98	64	139	414	371	0.079	3.2	3.3	0.05	1.59
California	26	45	0.96	12	85	46	32	104	284	258	0.031	1.8	3.4	0.12	3.54
Colorado	27	26	1	9	91	44	27	70	259	230	0.04	1.9	5.1	0.28	5.47
Connecticut	32	27	0.96	10	103	53	37	97	305	274	0.064	2	12.7	1.18	9.26
Delaware	33	31	0.92	12	101	70	43	119	349	335	0.048	2.2	10.7	0.44	4.09
District of Columbia	22	56	0.89	9	116	53	25	84	264	247	0.027	4.4	14.1	0.74	5.23
Florida	35	42	0.94	10	87	83	52	126	346	307	0.033	2.6	3	0.13	4.28
Georgia	26	41	0.92	12	89	73	46	126	331	325	0.035	2.4	5.1	0.22	4.21
Hawaii	32	22	0.96	9	93	41	31	115	306	249	0.031	1.9	0.5	0.01	2.67
Idaho	28	14	1	10	87	57	37	102	298	284	0.041	1.9	1.9	0.05	2.6
Illinois	28	31	0.96	12	87	66	34	100	323	318	0.059	2.5	10.4	0.49	4.73
Indiana	29	16	0.96	9	100	90	50	125	352	341	0.085	2.7	5.8	0.36	6.16
Iowa	30	10	0.96	10	79	58	44	100	315	353	0.143	3	7.2	0.2	2.79
Kansas	29	18	0.98	12	98	67	44	116	328	344	0.098	3.3	3.8	0.08	2.22
Kentucky	30	11	0.96	9	115	121	63	137	394	366	0.066	3.2	2.7	0.11	4.11
Louisiana	28	37	0.92	10	89	99	60	141	390	368	0.061	3.3	9.5	0.65	6.84
Maine	37	3	0.96	12	123	81	52	106	348	304	0.077	2.5	2	0.08	3.83
Maryland	29	40	0.92	9	93	57	41	120	324	309	0.038	1.9	10	0.48	4.//
Massachusetts	31	20	0.96	10	102	21	50	117	280	257	0.06	2.5	15.0	0.61	7.1
Minnesoto	31	19	0.90	12	112	00	24	20	247	201	0.045	2.5	5.2	0.01	9.14
Mississippi	20	41	0.92	10	03 97	07	52	144	408	205	0.008	2.5	5.2	0.22	4.51
Missouri	25	41	0.92	10	94	97	51	144	320	350	0.087	31	2.5	0.14	5.56
Montana	34	10	0.90	9	100	60	42	04	200	269	0.007	3.3	0.5	0.02	3.28
Nebraska	29	16		10	89	63	38	97	306	341	0.115	3.6	8.4	0.02	1 19
Nevada	29	30	1	12	80	73	43	108	327	295	0.02	21	3.3	0.15	47
New Hampshire	34	5	1	9	118	80	38	103	300	296	0.056	2.1	3.9	0.22	5.63
New Jersey	30	33	0.96	10	84	56	37	108	330	257	0.042	2.4	18.8	1.4	7.43
New Mexico	31	60	0.96	12	99	63	34	125	305	323	0.036	1.8	4.4	0.2	4.41
New York	30	34	0.92	9	101	58	38	110	294	276	0.032	2.7	20	1.59	7.95
North Carolina	29	32	0.92	10	94	81	57	125	348	330	0.043	2.1	3.6	0.1	2.76
North Dakota	28	12	1.04	12	82	51	43	94	295	351	0.109	4.3	3.9	0.1	2.5
Ohio	31	16	0.96	9	95	85	50	122	347	340	0.085	2.8	3.4	0.21	6.19
Oklahoma	29	25	0.96	10	103	85	58	125	377	348	0.079	2.8	1.9	0.09	5.08
Oregon	31	16	0.96	12	116	69	50	110	301	299	0.033	1.6	1.2	0.04	3.33
Pennsylvania	32	18	0.96	9	100	71	49	113	326	309	0.056	2.9	6.2	0.49	7.99
Rhode Island	32	22	0.94	10	119	69	39	109	331	277	0.082	2.1	15.4	0.79	5.11
South Carolina	32	32	0.92	12	91	82	49	133	381	343	0.039	2.4	3	0.11	3.76
South Dakota	30	15	1	9	79	46	44	93	308	301	0.127	4.8	6.4	0.08	1.19
Tennessee	29	22	0.92	10	98	106	57	138	387	344	0.048	2.9	4.1	0.07	1.61
Texas	24	52	0.96	12	74	62	38	126	325	348	0.044	2.3	2.7	0.07	2.43
Utah	21	17	1	9	93	42	24	84	245	278	0.032	1.8	4	0.04	1.01
Vermont	36	3	0.96	10	120	62	36	92	304	275	0.06	2.1	1.8	0.09	5.12
Virginia	29	28	0.92	12	85	64	38	105	324	304	0.035	2.1	6.3	0.18	2.89
Washington	29	18	1	9	96	51	38	99	295	287	0.029	1.7	3.3	0.16	4.83
West Virginia	35	5	0.96	10	123	153	83	162	435	395	0.07	3.8	1.2	0.05	3.89
Wisconsin	31	14	0.98	12	90	53	38	87	308	320	0.066	2.1	3.7	0.11	3.07
Wyoming	31	13	1.04	9	87	64	37	88	308	290	0.068	3.5	1.7	0.03	1.77

Note: Color gradation is provided to aid the reader. Red indicates the higher value in the corresponding column, and green indicates a lower value in the corresponding column. Significant independent variables columns are bolded and were calculated relative to the predicators United States national average. Abbreviations: M.F. male to female ratio; COPD, congestive obstructive pulmonary disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; DM, diabetes mellitus; HTN, hypertension; BMI, body mass index.

*No Hawaiian or Pacific Islander minority groups reported.

[®]No Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, or Native American minority groups reported.

^No Native American minority group reported.

[#]Data from Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System.

^{\$}Data from the Kaiser Family Foundation.

~Data from the CDC COVID Tracker.

populations, and unemployment status affect the care patients receive. Structural inequalities such as poverty rates, healthcare racial bias, and increased preexisting conditions impact minority groups differently.

To address some of the limitations in an ecological study design, we further evaluated associations in multiple linear regression. While no single variable was significantly associated with mortality, in combination, our multiple linear regression suggested \sim 27% of the case fatality rate can be predicted by the comorbidity and hospital system variables discussed in this study. There may be other factors not addressed in this study that may impact the case fatality rate thus stressing the need for additional research.

Data regarding deaths can be confounded when a patient has multiple comorbidities. Additionally, the available data are limited and partially self-reported, leading to less accurate measurement of predictors (i.e., comorbidities). Deaths can be difficult to compare when each state records deaths at different frequencies and older patients were disproportionately affected early during the pandemic, diverting states' initial infectious trajectory (e.g., New York).

Other limitations are the exclusion of Hawaiian and Pacific Islander populations and Native Americans along with the inability to separate risk factors between minority groups.

Conclusion

Despite the initial decline in cases, with reopening, some states may be at higher risk for COVID-19 outbreaks, due in part to older populations and high asthma rates. Preparing at the state level is imperative to combating COVID-19 outbreaks, limiting spread, and guiding resource allocation. A state-specific COVID-19-Readiness Score may help identify the highest risk states for COVID-19 outbreaks, ensure adequate prevention mechanisms, and help direct further resources.

Disclosures. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

 Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting characteristics, comorbidities, and outcomes among 5700 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 in the New York city area. *JAMA*. 2020; 323(20): 2052–2059. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.6775

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Division of Population Health. BRFSS Prevalence & Trends Data [Internet], 2015 [accessed Jun 09, 2020]. (https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/brfssprevalence/)
- CDC COVID Data Tracker. United States COVID-19 Cases and Deaths by State [Internet], 2020 [cited Jun 9, 2020]. (https://www.cdc.gov/covid-datatracker/)
- Population distribution by age, The Kaiser Family Foundation State Health Facts, Data Source: Census Bureau's American Community Survey, 2008– 2018 [Internet], 2018 [cited May 7, 2020]. (https://www.kff.org/other/stateindicator/distribution-by-age/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B% 22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D)
- Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity, The Kaiser Family Foundation State Health Facts. Data Source: Census Bureau's American Community Survey, 2008–2018. [Internet], 2018 [cited May 7, 2020]. (https://www. kff.org/other/state-indicator/distribution-by-raceethnicity/?currentTime frame=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22: %22asc%22%7D)
- Population Distribution by Gender, The Kaiser Family Foundation State Health Facts, Census Bureau's American Community Survey, 2008–2017 [Internet], 2018 [cited May 7, 2020]. (https://www.kff.org/other/stateindicator/distribution-by-gender/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=% 7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D)
- Health Insurance Coverage of the Total Population, The Kaiser Family Foundation State Health Facts. Data Source: Census Bureau's American Community Survey, 2008–2017. [Internet], 2018 [cited May 7, 2020]. (https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/total-population/?currentTime frame=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22: %22asc%22%7D)
- Total Number of Certified Nursing Facilities, The Kaiser Family Foundation State Health Facts. DataSource: Certification and Survey Provider Enhanced Reports (CASPER) data. [Internet], 2018 [cited May 7, 2020]. (https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/number-of-nursingfacilities/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location %22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D)
- Hospital Beds per 1,000 Population by Ownership Type, The Kaiser Family Foundation State Health Facts, 1999–2018 AHA Annual Survey, [Internet], 2018 [cited May 7, 2020]. (https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/bedsby-ownership/?currentTimeframe=0&selectedDistributions=total&sort Model=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D)
- Guan WJ, Liang WH, Zhao Y, et al. Comorbidity and its impact on 1590 patients with COVID-19 in China: a nationwide analysis. European Respiratory Journal 2020; 55(5): 2000547. doi: 10.1183/13993003.00547-2020
- Onder G, Rezza G, Brusaferro S. Case-fatality rate and characteristics of patients dying in relation to COVID-19 in Italy. *JAMA*. 2020; 323(18): 1775–1776.