

## Tables Supporting Discussion of Hetemaa et al.

Tables A and B below present information underlying the discussion in Scanlan JP. Identifying meaningful differences in inequalities in revascularization rates in different settings. *Journal Review* May \_\_, 2008: \_\_\_\_\_

Responding to:

Hetemaa T, Keskimäki I, Manderbacka, et al. How did the recent increase in the supply of coronary operations in Finland affect socioeconomic and gender equity in their use? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2003;57:178-185.

The fields in Table A are as follows:

Gender	gender
CatType	type of categorization
Year	year
MAG	most advantaged group, i.e., group with highest rate (determined for both years on basis of 1988 rates)
LAG	least advantaged group, i.e., group with lowest rate (determined for both years on basis of 1988 rates)
MAGY	revascularization rate of most advantaged group <sup>1</sup>
LAGY	revascularization rate of least advantaged group
MAGN	rate of no revascularization for most advantaged group
LAGN	rate of no revascularization for least advantaged group
RelFav	relative difference between revascularization rates $(1-(LAGY/MAGY))$
RelAdv	relative difference between rates of no revascularization $((LAGN/MAGN)-1)$
Ratio1	ratio of MAG revascularization rate to LAG revascularization rate $(MAGY/LAGY)$
Ratio2	ratio of LAG rate of no revascularization to MAG rate of no revascularization $(LAGN/MAGN)$
AD	absolute difference between rates
OR	ratio of MAG odds of revascularization to LAG odds of revascularization
EDM	estimated differences between means of hypothesized normal distributions of factors associated with likelihood of revascularization

---

<sup>1</sup> Rates are derived from figures in Hetemaa Table 1 with hospitalizations for CHD used as the pool.

**Table A: Revascularization rates and rates of no revascularization of groups with highest and lowest revascularization rates for by gender according to social class, education and disposable income in 1988 and 1996, with measures of differences between rates**

Gender	Meaning	Year	MAG	LAG	MAGY	MAGN	LAGY	LAGN	ReIY	ReIN	Ratio1	Ratio2	AD	OR	EDM
M	Social Class	1988	Upper white collar	Other	20.56%	79.44%	9.70%	90.30%	52.85%	13.68%	2.12	1.14	10.87%	2.41	48
M	Social Class	1996	Upper white collar	Other	42.60%	57.40%	31.45%	68.55%	26.18%	19.43%	1.35	1.19	11.15%	1.62	30
M	Education	1988	High	Low	22.22%	77.78%	10.76%	89.24%	51.56%	14.73%	2.06	1.15	11.46%	2.37	48
M	Education	1996	High	Low	45.64%	54.36%	33.01%	66.99%	27.68%	23.24%	1.38	1.23	12.63%	1.70	34
M	Disposable Income	1988	1	5th-lowest	17.91%	82.09%	8.27%	91.73%	53.81%	11.74%	2.16	1.12	9.64%	2.42	48
M	Disposable Income	1996	1	5th-lowest	41.27%	58.73%	25.36%	74.64%	38.56%	27.10%	1.63	1.27	15.92%	2.07	44
F	Social Class	1988	Lower white collar	Farmer	8.27%	91.73%	3.33%	96.67%	59.68%	5.38%	2.48	1.05	4.93%	2.61	46
F	Social Class	1996	Lower white collar	Farmer	25.79%	74.21%	22.47%	77.53%	12.89%	4.48%	1.15	1.04	3.32%	1.20	12
F	Education	1988	High	Low	8.26%	91.74%	5.71%	94.29%	30.88%	2.78%	1.45	1.03	2.55%	1.49	20
F	Education	1996	High	Low	30.08%	69.92%	25.22%	74.78%	16.16%	6.95%	1.19	1.07	4.86%	1.28	15
F	Disposable Income	1988	1	5th-lowest	10.00%	90.00%	3.70%	96.30%	63.02%	7.00%	2.70	1.07	6.30%	2.89	51
F	Disposable Income	1996	1	5th-lowest	30.75%	69.25%	17.06%	82.94%	44.51%	19.76%	1.80	1.20	13.69%	2.16	45

The fields in Table B are as follows:

Gender	Gender
CatType	Type of categorization
Year	year
MY	male revascularization rate
FY	female revascularization rate
MN	male rate of no revascularization
FN	female rate of no revascularization
RelFav	relative difference between revascularization rates $(1-(FY/MY))$
RelAdv	absolute difference between rates of no revascularization $((FN/MN)-1)$
Ratio1	ratio of male revascularization rate to female revascularization rate $(MY/FY)$
Ratio2	ratio of female rate of no revascularization to male rate of no revascularization $(FN/MN)$
AD	absolute difference between rates
OR	ratio of male odds of revascularization to female odds of revascularization
EES	estimated effect size, i.e., difference between means of hypothesized normal distributions
EDM	estimated differences between means of hypothesized normal distributions of factors associated with likelihood of revascularization

**Table B: Revascularization rates and rates of no revascularization of men and women in 1988 and 1996, with measures of differences between rates**

Year	MY	MN	FY	FN	ReIY	ReIN	Ratio1	Ratio2	AD	OR	EDM
1988	12.22%	87.78%	6.01%	93.99%	50.78%	7.07%	2.03	1.07	0.06	2.18	39
1996	34.89%	65.11%	25.05%	74.95%	28.20%	15.12%	1.39	1.15	0.10	1.60	29