

The Impact of Socioeconomic Status on Cirrhosis and Hepatocellular Carcinoma in the United States Roselyn Nsenga¹, Sophia Tzavaras¹, Daniel Waldo¹, Amit G Singal², Elliot B Tapper,¹ <u>Neehar D. Parikh¹</u>

1. Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 2. Division of Digestive and Liver Diseases, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX

Background and Aim

- Recent data has shown increases in mortality related to cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) across the US since 2008.
- There are however significant regional disparities, with states such as Kentucky, New Mexico, and Arizona, showing more pronounced rises in mortality than others (i.e. Maryland).
- We aimed to examine the association of socioeconomic factors on the rise in cirrhosis and HCC related mortality in the US.

Methods

- We used death certificate data from the Vital Statistics Cooperative, and population data from the US Census Bureau compiled by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's Wideranging Online Data for Epidemiologic Research (1999-2017).
- We used coding for K74 (cirrhosis of liver); K70.3 (alcoholic cirrhosis); K70 (alcoholic liver disease); and C22 (HCC) in the multiple causes of death file to calculate age-adjusted mortality rates.
- We also compiled county level socioeconomic status (SES) data from 1999-2017 from the Federal Reserve Economic Data and Bureau of Labor Statistics and Census including median household income, unemployment rate, percentage of patients below poverty level and percentage of the population with at least a bachelor degree.
- We tested for associations between SES and 5year county level mortality trends

Wyoming

unemployment edian Household (%, SD) (% Bachelor Degree, income (2018 USD) (%, SD) SD) Alabama 17.0 (1.5) \$48,394 (\$2,506) 23.0 (1.3) 6.3 (2.1) Alaska 10.0 (0.9) 27.8 (1.2) \$72,158 (\$43,93) 7.0 (0.5) Arizona 15.5 (2.1) 26.9 (1.4) \$55,208 (\$2,768) 6.2 (2.0) Arkansas 18.5 (1.5) 20.5 (1.6) \$44,739 (\$2,151) 5.8 (1.4) California 14.3 (1.5) 30.9 (1.5) \$64,757 (\$2,655) 7.2 (2.5) Colorado 11.2 (1.6) 37.3 (2.1) \$67,785 (\$3,577) 5.2 (1.9) Connecticut 9.1 (1.3) 36.6 (1.6) \$73,480 (\$2,049) 5.6 (2.0) Delaware 10.9 (1.6) 29.1 (1.7) \$62,543 (\$4,787) 5.1 (1.7) Florida 14.2 (2.1) 26.8 (1.4) \$51,936 (\$2,144) 5.9 (2.4) Georgia 15.5 (2.4) \$54,750 (\$3,799) 6.2 (2.3) 28.4 (1.4) Hawaii 10.3 (1.0) 30.4 (1.3) \$69,366 (\$4,623) 4.4 (1.5) Idaho 13.4 (1.7) 25.2 (1.3) \$54,596 (\$2,640) 5.4 (1.8) Illinois 12.5 (1.6) 31.5 (1.7) \$60,632 (\$3,562) 6.7 (2.0) Indiana 12.7 (2.5) 23.7 (1.5) \$54,374 (\$3,349) 5.9 (2.2) 10.9 (1.6) lowa 26.1 (1.6) \$58,510 (\$2,686) 4.2 (1.0) 11.9 (1.6) Kansas 30.6 (1.6) 4.9 (1.1) \$55,155 (\$2,875) Kentucky 17.1 (1.8) 21.6 (1.5) \$47,615 (\$2,825) 6.4 (1.9) Louisiana 19.0 (1.0) 21.9 (1.3) \$45,910 (\$2,505) 6.1 (1.1) Maine 12.3 (1.4) 28.2 (2.0) \$53,660 (\$2,288) 5.3 (1.6) Maryland 9.1 (0.9) 37.0 (1.7) \$75,643 (\$2,658) 5.0 (1.4) Massachusetts 10.3 (1.1) 39.8 (2.0) \$68,771 (\$2,447) 5.3 (1.6) Michigan 13.9 (2.7) 26.2 (1.6) \$57,829 (\$4,174) 7.3 (2.7) Minnesota 9.5 (1.6) 32.9 (1.8) \$69,005 (\$4,520) 4.7 (1.4) Mississippi 20.8 (1.9) 20.2 (1.1) \$42,335 (\$3,438) 7.1 (1.7) Missouri 13.6 (1.8) 26.4 (1.6) \$55,925 (\$3,958) 5.8 (1.8) Montana 14.4 (0.8) 29.0 (1.7) \$48,757 (\$4,447) 5.0 (1.1) Nebraska 11.2 (1.3) 28.9 (1.6) \$59,028 (\$1,692) 3.5 (0.6) Nevada 12.5 (2.4) 22.5 (1.1) \$58,715 (\$4,573) 6.9 (3.2) New Hampshire 7.7 (1.2) 34.1 (1.7) \$74,286 (\$2,803) 4.1 (1.1) New Jersey 9.4 (1.2) 36.1 (2.0) \$72,659 (\$3,840) 6.1 (2.0) New Mexico 18.8 (1.4) 25.9 (0.9) 5.9 (1.2) \$48,271 (\$2,332) New York 9.8 (1.2) 33.4 (1.6) \$57,686 (\$2,800) 6.1 (1.5) North Carolina 15.0 (2.0) 27.7 (2.0) \$50,686 (\$2,755) 6.4 (2.3) North Dakota 11.3 (0.6) 27.5 (1.6) \$55,871 (\$4,895) 3.2 (0.4) Ohio 13.4 (2.2) 25.4 (1.6) \$55,204 (\$3,686) 6.3 (1.8) Oklahoma 15.7 (1.1) 23.6 (1.1) \$50,051 (\$2,359) 4.7 (1.0) Oregon 13.8 (2.1) 30.1 (2.0) 7.0 (2.0) \$57,950 (\$3,220) Pennsylvania 12.0 (1.4) 28.0 (2.0) \$58,181 (\$2,612) 5.8 (1.4) Rhode Island 12.5 (1.6) 31.3 (1.5) 6.7 (2.6) \$60,916 (\$3,075) South Carolina 15.8 (1.9) 25.2 (1.7) \$49,942 (\$3,342) 6.8 (2.2) South Dakota 13.1 (0.9) 26.5 (1.4) \$54,393 (\$2,359) 3.5 (0.7) Tennessee 15.7 (1.9) 24.1 (1.8) \$48,712 (\$3,082) 6.1 (2.0) Texas 16.4 (1.2) 26.8 (1.6) \$55,081 (\$2,221) 5.6 (1.3) Utah 10.8 (1.5) 30.5 (1.9) \$66,424 (\$2,816) 4.6 (1.5) Vermont 10.5 (1.3) 34.9 (1.9) \$60,649 (\$3,365) 4.1 (1.0) Virginia 10.4 (1.0) 35.5 (1.9 \$68,604 (\$2,153) 4.4 (1.4) Washington 11.2 (1.5) 32.3 (1.8) \$65,648 (\$4,154) 6.5 (1.4) West Virginia 17.4 (1.0) 18.5 (1.3) \$44,625 (\$2,523) 6.1 (1.2) Wisconsin 11.0 (1.9) 27.2 (1.7) \$60,147 (\$3,354) 5.4 (1.6)

10.7 (0.6)

\$58,836 (\$3,738)

4.4 (1.0)

25.1 (1.6)

Table 1. Socioeconomic factors by state 1999-2017

Results

Figure 1. Trend in age adjusted mortality for fibrosis and cirrhosis of the liver (K74)



Figure 2. Trend in age adjusted mortality for alcoholic liver disease (K70)









- (p<0.001).



Results

Age-adjusted mortality related to cirrhosis, alcoholic liver disease, and HCC increased from 2008-2017

 Socioeconomic indicators remained stable up until the US financial crisis in 2008-09, when all SES indicators, except for percentage of population with a college degree, deteriorated until the economic recovery 2011-2014, with heterogeneity in the rate of recovery across counties

 Cirrhosis-related mortality and higher unemployment (r=0.14; p<0.001) and lower education levels (r=-0.13;p<0.001) were positively correlated.

 Alcoholic cirrhosis mortality was positively correlated with unemployment (r=0.043; p=0.038) and income levels (r=0.044; p=0.036), and negatively correlated with poverty (r=-0.15; p=0.037), although all associations were weak.

• There was no correlation between socioeconomic factors and HCC-related mortality.

Conclusions

• Cirrhosis an HCC related mortality have increased since 2008, which coincides with the financial crisis in the US. Counties that had lower SES indicators, including unemployment and education had faster growth in cirrhosis mortality.

 Higher income and lower poverty were associated with lower alcohol-cirrhosis related mortality, possibly reflecting decreased alcohol access.

 Focused interventions to curb cirrhosis related mortality based on SES community status are warranted







