

Background

- Individual markers of lower SES (e.g., personal income) are associated with higher HbA1c in adults with type 1 diabetes $(T1D)^{1,2}$
- Markers of lower socioeconomic status (SES) occur in a *broader* community context (e.g., county-level income), which may *also* impact HbA1c, like other health outcomes^{3,4}
- Past research has typically examined SES in isolation or as a single composite score, and distinctions in insurance type (e.g., Medicaid grouped with Medicare) are sometimes lost

We aimed to:

- 1) Understand *concurrent* associations of individual and community markers of SES
- 2) Explore whether insurance type *changes* associations
- between county-level income and HbA1c

Methods

- Participants (*N* = 9027) were adults in the T1D Exchange Registry – an online longitudinal study of people with T1D – who completed Baseline Questionnaire items of demographics, diabetes history, markers of SES, and HbA1c.
- We used hierarchical linear regressions to examine concurrent associations of insurance type, markers of SES, demographics, and diabetes technology with self-reported HbA1c; then, we interactions between county-level income and insurance type on HbA1c.

Demographics

Table 1. Diabetes characteristics and sample demographics.

Diabetes Characteristics	Mean (SD)	Freque
HbA1c	7.33 (1.63)	
Pump Use (Yes)		6393
CGM Use (Yes)		7530
Demographics	Mean (SD)	Frequ
Age	42.3 (14.5)	
Gender (female)		6936
Race (non-white) ¹		697
Ethnicity (Hispanic/Latino)		469
Income (≤ \$50,000)		2748
Education (High School or Less)		752

¹Participants self-identified as Black/African American (n = 178, 2.0%), Asian (n = 72, 0.8%), Native American/Native Alaskan (n = 36, 0.4%), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (n = 9, 0.1%), or mixed race (n = 402, 4.5%) and were collapsed into a single category, as individual group sizes were small.

Nuances of Socioeconomic Status and Health Insurance **Associations with HbAlc in Adults with Type 1 Diabetes**

Caitlin S. Kelly, BA, BSN, MA, PhD; Huyen Nguyen, BA, MA, PhD; Katherine S. Chapman, BA; Megan E. Peter, BA, MA, PhD; Kelsie LaFerriere, BA; Julia Ravelson, BA; & Wendy A. Wolf, BS, PhD

Results

Table 2. Community (zip code) characteristics and insurance type.

Zip Code Characteristics	Mean (SD)	Frequency (%)
Residential Area (Nonmetro) ¹		1309 (14.5%)
County Median Income ²	7.71 (2.85)	
Health Insurance Type	Mean (SD)	Frequency (%)
Medicaid		836 (9.3%)
Medicare		848 (9.4%)
No Health Insurance (HI)		167 (1.9%)
Private ³		7176 (79.5%)

¹Nonmetro was defined as having a population less than 20,000. ²County median income in measurement units of \$10,000; thus, the median is \$77,100. Counties with median income of \$250,000+ was capped at \$250,000.

³Private insurance *included* participants who reported having insurance through the Affordable Care Act Marketplace.

Most variables were significantly associated with HbA1c in hierarchical regression models although magnitude varied. No significant association between HbA1c and: ethnicity (p = .20), Medicare (p = .61), and living in a non-metro area (p = .07).

Lower HbA1c	B (SE)
Pump Use	51 (.04)
CGM Use	65 (.05)
Age	01 (.001)
Income	08 (.01)
Education	16 (.01)
Median County	06 (.02)
Income	

Significant interactions between Medicaid/no HI on association between median county income and HbA1c. People with Medicaid or no HI in lower average or lower income counties also had higher HbA1c.

Figure 1. Plot of interactions of health insurance type.

Predicted HbA1c by County Median Income



Note. Simple slope tests revealed significant slope and moderate estimates for Medicaid (est. = .29, SE = .07, t = -4.30, p < .001) and No Health Insurance (est. = -0.52, SE = .04, t = 3.69, p < .001). Private insurance also had a significant slope, but magnitude was too small to interpret (est. = -.05). Simple slope for Medicare recipients was not significant (est. = .00, SE = .05, t = .08, p = .94). Interactions were significant at below the mean, around the mean, and about +2.25 SD above the mean.

iency (%)

(70.8%) (83.4%)

iency (%)

(76.8%) (7.7%) (5.2%) (30.4%) (8.3%)

Higher HbA1c	B (SE)
Female Gender	.12 (.04)
Non-white Race	.21 (.06)
Medicaid Insurance	.24 (.06)
No Health Insurance	.41 (.12)

- race, Medicaid, and no HI.
- county-level resources.

Limitations & Conclusions

Limitations

- small (e.g., ethnicity).

Conclusions

This research was supported in part by The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust

- https://doi.org/10.1111/pedi.13112

- *Diabetes, 39*(3), 278-283. https://doi.org/10.2337/cd21-0028

Key Findings

While many markers of SES, demographics and diabetes characteristics are related to HbA1c, magnitude of effects are only modest-to-large for technology use,

2. Associations between county-level income and HbA1c are moderated by insurance type (Medicaid; no HI), suggesting these individuals may be more sensitive to

Despite large sample size overall, some group sizes were

• Metro vs. non-metro (population < 20,000) may not have accurately captured rural vs. urban distinctions.

Characteristics of sample (overall, high SES, high tech use, NH-White) may limit generalizability.

• Magnitude of estimate on HbA1c is greater for some diabetes and SES factors and is consistent with research in health inequities where multiple factors (e.g., race, lack of technology use) are often compounded⁵

• Results suggest a multifaceted approach to SES which includes community resources (e.g., median county income) may help to explain inequities in HbA1c and should be explored in future research.

References

Sutherland, M. W., Ma, X., Reboussin, B. A., Mendoza, J. A., Bell, B. A., Kahkoska, A. R., ... & Liese, A. D. (2020). Socioeconomic position is associated with glycemic control in youth and young adults with type 1 diabetes. *Pediatric Diabetes, 21*(8), 1412-1420.

Miller, K. M., Beck, R. W., Foster, N. C., Maahs, D. M., & T1D Exchange. (2020). HbA1c levels in type 1 diabetes from early childhood to older adults: a deeper dive into the influence of technology and socioeconomic status on HbA1c in the T1D exchange clinic registry findings. *Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics, 22*(9), 645-650. https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2019.0393 Stumetz, K. S., Joyce, P., Mitrovich, C., & Early, K. B. (2016). Quality of care in rural youth with type 1 diabetes: a cross-sectional pilot assessment. BMJ Open Diabetes Research and Care, 4(1), e000300. doi: 10.1136/bmjdrc-2016-000300 4. Farahmand, B., Dehghani, M., Vafamand, N., Mirzaee, A., Boostani, R., & Pieper, J. K. (2022). Robust nonlinear control of blood glucose in diabetic patients subject to model uncertainties. ISA transactions. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isatra.2022.07.009

5. Majidi, S., Ebekozien, O., Noor, N., Lyons, S. K., McDonough, R., Gandhi, K., ... & Jones, N. H. Y. (2021). Inequities in health outcomes in children and adults with type 1 diabetes: data from the T1D Exchange Quality Improvement Collaborative. *Clinical*