

James P. Scanlan
Attorney at Law
1529 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 338-9224
jps@jpscanlan.com

March 29, 2016

ELECTRONICALLY TRANSMITTED

Judith Seltzer, President
Danielle Staudt
Officers and Members of the Board
Population Association of America

Lisa Berkman, President
Officers and Members of the Board
Association of Population Centers

Wendy Baldwin, Chair
Mary Jo Hoeksema, Director
Members of the Committee
PAA/APC Government and Public Affairs Committee
PAA/APC Office of Government and Public Affairs
1430 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Re: Recommendation That PAA and APC (a) Form a Committee to Address the Unsoundness of Statistical Analyses of Demographic Differences That Fail to Consider Ways That Measures Tend to Be Systematically Affected by the Frequency of an Outcome and (b) Advise Arms of the U.S. Government That Reducing the Frequency of an Outcome Tends to Increase Relative Differences in Outcome Rates and the Proportions More Susceptible Groups Make Up of Persons Experiencing the Outcome

Dear President Seltzer, President Berkman, and Other Members of the Leadership of the Population Association of America, the Association of Population Centers, and the PAA/APC Government and Public Affairs Committee:

This letter has two purposes. One purpose, which involves what could be a long-term undertaking by the Populations Association of America (PAA) and the Association of Population Centers (APC), is to urge the organizations to form a committee to examine the ways analyses by demographers and others of differences between outcome rates and related matters are undermined as a result of the failure to recognize patterns by which standard measures of

differences between outcome rates tend to be systematically affected by the frequency of an outcome. A second purpose of the letter, which involves a matter the organizations can address immediately, is to urge the organizations to formally advise arms of the United States Government that a statistical belief underlying important civil rights law enforcement policies – specifically, that reducing the frequency of an adverse outcome will tend to reduce relative differences in rates of experiencing the outcome and reduce the proportions groups most susceptible to the outcome make up of persons experiencing the outcome – is incorrect. As explained below, reducing the frequency of an outcome in fact tends to increase relative differences in rates of experiencing it and the proportions the most susceptible groups make up of persons experiencing the outcome.

The letter is similar in purpose to an October 8, 2015 letter to the [American Statistical Association](#) (ASA)¹ that addresses the issues more comprehensively. The ASA letter is currently being considered by a subcommittee of ASA’s Science and Public Affairs Advisory Committee.

Section A summarizes the measurement issues most pertinent to the recommendations in this letter. Section B describes materials discussing the pertinent issues in detail. Section C describes recent developments that reflect on the urgency of the recommended PAA/APC actions. Section D illustrates the pertinent issues in somewhat greater detail than Section A.

A. Summary

By way of summary regarding this letter’s first purpose, all standard measures of differences between outcome rates tend to be systematically affected by the frequency of outcome. Most pertinent to the activities of PAA and APC and their members is the pattern, inherent in other than highly irregular risk distributions, whereby the rarer an outcome, the greater tend to be relative differences between rates of experiencing the outcome and the smaller tend to be relative differences between rates of avoiding the outcome.²

¹ To facilitate consideration of issues raised in letters such as this I include links to referenced materials in electronic copies of the letters. I do not include links with every mention of an item, but attempt to include them often enough to make online items readily available without the reader’s having to search for an earlier link. Electronic copies of letters such as this are available by means of the [Institutional Correspondence](#) subpage of the [Measuring Health Disparities](#) page of [jpscanlan.com](#). In this case, electronic copies of the letter are being emailed to the addressee and certain other members PAA/APC leadership and links to the letter will be posted on the ASA Connect section of the American Statistical Association website. Since the online copy of this letter may be corrected, I include here a [link](#) to the most recent version (which, if containing corrections, will indicate on the first page when it was last corrected).

² A more precise description of the pattern would state, rather than “the rarer an outcome,” “the more the outcome is restricted toward either tail of the overall distribution.” But I have characterized the pattern in the manner done in the text above for some time and those discussing it have not been confused by the usage. Thus, I am not at this time inclined to depart from the usage in the text. Similar considerations apply to my use of the term “frequency” used here or the term “prevalence” that I have used in other places. See Section A.8 of the [Scanlan’s Rule](#) page of [jpscanlan.com](#).

A simple illustration of this pattern is set out in Table 1 below. The table is based on a situation where the means of normal test score distributions of an advantaged group (AG) and a disadvantaged group (DG) differ by half a standard deviation and both distributions have the same standard deviation. The table presents pass and fail rates for each group at two cutoff points, along with the ratio of AG's pass rate to DG's pass rate and the ratio of DG's fail rate to AG's fail rate at each cutoff. The table shows that when the cutoff is lowered from the higher point to the lower point, the ratio of DG's failure rate to AG's failure rate increases from 1.85 to 2.60, while the ratio of AG's pass rate to DG's pass rate decreases from 1.27 to 1.09.³ The table thus illustrates how generally decreasing failure rates and generally increasing pass rates, tends to increase relative differences in rates of test failure (the decreasing outcome), while reducing relative differences in rates of test passage (the increasing outcome).

Table 1. Illustration of effects on relative differences in pass and fail rates of lowering a cutoff from a point where 80% of AG passes to a point where 95% of AG passes (when mean scores differ by approximately half a standard deviation)

Cutoff	AG Pass	DG Pass	AG Fail	DG Fail	AG/DG Pass Ratio	DG/AG Fail Ratio
High	80%	63%	20%	37%	1.27	1.85
Low	95%	87%	5%	13%	1.09	2.60

The pattern whereby the rarer an outcome the greater tend to be relative differences in experiencing it and the smaller tend to be relative differences in avoiding it can be found in virtually any data showing points on a continuum of factors associated with likelihood of experiencing an outcome (and its opposite) as well as in countless situations of differing overall frequencies for an outcome. Examples of the pattern with respect to issues examined by demographers and other social or medical scientists include: (a) reductions in mortality, morbidity, and poverty tend to be accompanied by increasing relative differences in mortality, morbidity, and poverty but decreasing relative differences in rates of avoiding those outcomes; (b) improvements in healthcare tend to be accompanied by increasing relative differences in rates of failure to receive appropriate care but decreasing relative differences in rates of receipt of appropriate care; (c) relaxing mortgage lending and school discipline standards tends to increase relative differences in adverse borrower and discipline outcomes but reduce relative differences in rates of avoiding those outcomes; (d) relative differences in survival tend to increase with age

³ While I commonly refer to patterns of relative differences in this letter, the tables I use actually present rate ratios. The relative difference is the rate ratio minus 1 where the rate ratio is above 1 (in which case the larger the rate ratio the larger the relative difference) and 1 minus the rate ratio where the rate ratio is below 1 (in which case the smaller the rate ratio the larger the relative difference). One should be careful not to mistakenly refer to the rate ratio (which can also be termed "risk ratio" or "relative risk") as the relative difference. But the distinction between the rate ratio and the relative difference is not pertinent to the discussion here of patterns by which relative differences tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome, save with respect to the fact that one may not make the same points about patterns of changes in rate ratios that one may make about patterns of changes in relative differences. In recent years I commonly present the rate ratios for both outcomes with the larger figure in the numerator. Thus, as to both outcomes, the larger the rate ratio, the larger the relative difference. Choice of numerator in the ratio, however, has no bearing on the described patterns by which the two relative differences tend to be affected by the frequency of the outcome.

while relative difference in mortality tend to decrease with age; (e) relative differences in adverse outcomes tend to be larger, while relative differences in the corresponding favorable outcomes tend to be smaller, within populations/subpopulations and geographic areas where the adverse outcomes are less common (*e.g.*, the young, whites, persons with high income or high education, British civil servants,⁴ the countries of Norway and Sweden, and the states of Minnesota and Massachusetts), than within populations/subpopulations and geographic areas where the adverse outcomes are more common.

A corollary to the above-described pattern of relative differences is a pattern whereby a factor that affects the likelihood of experiencing an outcome rate will tend to cause larger proportionate changes for the group with the lower baseline rates for the outcome while causing larger proportionate changes in the opposite outcome rates for the other group (which is the group with the lower baseline rate for that outcome). In the situation reflected in Table 1, lowering the cutoff caused the failure rate to decrease by 75% for AG but only 65% for DG, while causing the pass rate to increase by 38% for DG but only 19% for AG. Thus, for example, having high income or education will tend to cause larger proportionate reductions in mortality and self-rated health of less-than-good for advantaged groups while causing larger proportionate increases in survival and self-rated health of good-or-better for disadvantaged groups; having a chronic condition will tend to cause larger proportionate increases in rates of self-rated health of less-than-good for advantaged groups while causing larger proportionate decreases in self-rated health of good-or-better for disadvantaged groups; having fair or poor health (or aging or experiencing chronic conditions) will tend to cause a larger proportionate increases in mortality for advantaged groups while causing larger proportionate decreases in survival for disadvantaged groups.

A second corollary to the above-described pattern of relative differences is a pattern whereby reducing the frequency of an outcome will tend to increase the proportions groups most susceptible to the outcome make up of (a) persons experiencing the outcome and (b) persons avoiding the outcome. According to the illustration in Table 1, assuming DG make up 50% of test takers, lowering the cutoff would cause the proportion DG makes up of persons failing the test to increase from 65% to 72% and the proportion DG makes up of persons passing the test to increase from 44% to 48%. See Table 1 (at 11) of the ASA letter. Thus, for example, reductions in poverty tend to cause disadvantaged groups like racial minorities and female-headed families to make up higher proportions of the poor, and higher proportions of the non-poor, than they previously did. Increases in poverty will tend to have the opposite effect, that is, to cause

⁴ Readers unfamiliar with the Whitehall Studies or their findings may be puzzled by mention of British civil servants. Thus, I note that the Whitehall Studies of health disparities among British civil servants play an important role in the history of health disparities research, and interpretations of implications of the studies' findings that relative socioeconomic/occupational differences in adverse outcomes are greater among British civil servants than in the United Kingdom population at large exemplify the impossibility of soundly interpreting data on demographic differences without understanding the patterns described in this letter. See my "[Race and Mortality Revisited](#)," *Society* (July/Aug. 2014) (at 340) and 2006 British Society for Populations Studies paper "[The Misinterpretation of Health Inequalities in the United Kingdom](#)." See also the [Whitehall Studies](#) subpage of the [Measuring Health Disparities](#) page of [jpscanlan.com](#).

disadvantaged groups to make up smaller proportions of the poor, and smaller proportions of the non-poor, than they previously did.

Failure to understand the above-described and related patterns (including the patterns by which absolute differences and odds ratios tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome, discussed in Section D *infra*) has undermined virtually all efforts by demographers and other social and medical scientists (and courts and administrative agencies) to determine whether differences in the circumstances of advantaged and disadvantaged groups are increasing or decreasing over time, to draw inferences about underlying processes based on perceptions about the comparative size of demographic differences or the comparative size of effects of a factor on different groups, or even to determine whether a particular difference should be deemed large or small. In fact, with the exception of the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), none of government entities that PAA and APC have lately supported in letters or testimony to Congress has shown any understanding of these patterns, and even NCHS has failed to understand the implications of the pattern it has recognized (a matter given further attention in Sections C and D). Thus, none of these entities has yet produced sound analyses of demographic differences in outcome rates or effectively overseen government-funded research regarding such differences.

PAA and APC should therefore form a committee to examine the patterns by which measures commonly employed in analyses of demographic differences tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome, determine the extent to which standard demographic analyses are undermined by failure to understand these patterns, and explore methods for appraising the differences in the circumstances of two groups reflected by their outcome rates that are not affected by the frequency of an outcome.

By way of summary regarding the letter's second purpose, many federal civil rights enforcement policies are based on the belief that reducing the frequency of adverse outcomes will tend to reduce relative differences between rates at which advantaged and disadvantaged groups experience those outcomes and reduce the proportions disadvantaged groups make up of persons experiencing those outcomes. For example, for more than twenty years the federal government has encouraged lenders to relax lending standards and otherwise reduce the frequency of adverse borrower outcomes in order to reduce relative racial/ethnic differences in rates of experiencing those outcomes. For at least several years, the federal government has encouraged public schools to relax discipline standards and otherwise reduce the frequency of adverse school discipline outcomes in order to reduce relative racial and other demographic differences in rates of experiencing those outcomes and the proportions disadvantaged groups make up of persons experiencing the outcomes. In March 2015, in a report on the police and court practices of the City of Ferguson, Missouri, the Department of Justice (DOJ) attributed the high black representation among persons experiencing adverse interactions with the City's police and courts to over policing and unduly harsh court procedures. On February 10, 2016, DOJ brought a civil rights suit against the City of Ferguson based on the same theory.

As explained above, however, reducing the frequency of an outcome tends to increase, not decrease, relative differences between rates of experiencing the outcome and the proportions groups most susceptible to the outcome make up of persons experiencing the outcome. Unaware

of this pattern, the government continues to monitor the fairness of practices on the basis of relative differences in adverse outcomes and the proportion disadvantaged groups make up of persons experiencing the outcomes. Thus, by complying with government encouragements to reduce the frequency of adverse outcomes entities covered by federal civil rights laws tend to increase the chances that the government will accuse them of discrimination.

For a PAA/APC committee to fully examine the problems with standard analyses of demographic differences arising from the failure to understand the patterns discussed in this letter, and to provide a sound foundation for analyses of demographic differences in outcome rates, may take some time. But even without forming a special committee, PAA/APC leadership should recognize that that the government is mistaken in its beliefs regarding the consequences of reducing the frequency of adverse outcomes. PAA and APC leadership should also recognize the urgency of making the government understand that actions it is currently taking and encouraging others to take are based on beliefs regarding the effects of those actions that are the opposite of reality.

I note, however, that larger undertaking has a similar urgency. In the regard, consider how many of the various types of presentations given at the 2016 Population Association of America Conference are based on studies (including ongoing studies) that are undermined by failure to recognize patterns by which the measures employed tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome. Consider also how many presentations at the 2017 Population Association of America Conference are likely to involve studies that are similarly undermined, unless PAA takes some action to alert its members to the implications, or even potential implications, of the matters addressed in this letter. Similar issues exist regarding activities of all members of APC. Thus, unless PAA and APC conclude that one can effectively analyze demographic differences without consideration of the extent to which observed patterns are functions of the frequency of the outcome – and that analyses of demographic differences cannot even be improved by an understanding of the patterns by which measures tend to be affected by frequency of an outcome – they should take immediate action to alert their members to the potential implications of the matters addressed in this letter.

B. Materials Addressing the Pertinent Issues in Detail

The statistical patterns underlying the recommendations in letter are addressed at much greater length in the above-mentioned letter to ASA. Other recent extended treatments of the issues may be found in my [“Race and Mortality Revisited,”](#) *Society* (July/Aug. 2014); [“The Perverse Enforcement of Fair Lending Laws,”](#) *Mortgage Banking* (May 2014); [“Measuring Health and Healthcare Disparities,”](#) Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology 2013 Research Conference (March 2014) (FCSM paper); [“The Mismeasure of Discrimination,”](#) Faculty Workshop, University of Kansas School of Law (Sept. 2013) (Kansas Law paper); *amicus curiae* [brief](#) in *Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs et al. v. The Inclusive Communities Project, Inc.*, Sup. Ct. No. 13-1371 (Nov. 2014) (TDHCA brief). My forthcoming [“The Mismeasure of Health Disparities,”](#) *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* (2016), addresses certain recent developments regarding health and healthcare disparities research that are discussed in Section C *infra*. The above items, and most other

materials I have created since December 2007, include descriptions of a method for appraising the differences in the circumstances of two groups reflected by their rates of experiencing some outcome or its opposite (which may also be characterized as the strength of the forces causing the outcome rates to differ) that is unaffected by the frequency of an outcome (also discussed in Section D *infra*).

Earlier extended treatments of the problems with standard measure of differences between outcome rates (with many examples of fundamentally unsound analyses in the law and the social and medical sciences), but without suggesting a solution to those problems beyond understanding the implications of the effects of the frequency of an outcome with respect to various measures, may be found in [“Can We Actually Measure Health Disparities?”](#), *Chance* (Spring 2006); [“The Misinterpretation of Health Inequalities in the United Kingdom,”](#) British Society for Populations Studies Conference 2006; [“Race and Mortality,”](#) *Society* (Jan./Feb. 2000); [“Divining Difference,”](#) *Chance* (Fall 1994); [“Comment on ‘McLanahan, Sorensen, and Watson’s ‘Sex Differences in Poverty, 1950-1980,’”](#) *Signs* (Winter 1991); [“The Perils of Provocative Statistics,”](#) *Public Interest* (Winter 1991); and [“The ‘Feminization of Poverty’ is Misunderstood,”](#) *Plain Dealer* (Nov 11, 1987).

Extensive graphical and tabular illustrations of the pertinent patterns may be found in recent methods workshops given at arms of American universities,⁵ as well as in more than a score of presentations given at statistics, epidemiology, public health, and demography conferences in North America and Europe between 2001 and 2011 (available [here](#)). Treatments of particular subjects to which the pertinent patterns pertain, usually with tabular illustrations, may also be found on the pages and subpages of [jpscanlan.com](#) devoted to measurement issues.⁶ Over 140 online comments (available [here](#)) address the problems in particular studies in medical, epidemiological, and health policy journals that attempted to measure aspects of health and healthcare disparities or to provide guidance on the interpretation of subgroup effects without

⁵ See [“The Mismeasure of Health Disparities in Massachusetts and Less Affluent Places,”](#) Department of Quantitative Health Sciences, University of Massachusetts Medical School (Nov. 18, 2015) [“The Mismeasure of Discrimination,”](#) Center for Demographic and Social Analysis, University of California, Irvine (Jan. 20, 2015); [“The Mismeasure of Demographic Differences in Outcome Rates,”](#) Public Sociology Association of George Mason University (Oct. 18, 2014); [“Rethinking the Measurement of Demographic Differences in Outcome Rates,”](#) Maryland Population Research Center of the University of Maryland (Oct. 10, 2014); [“The Mismeasure of Association: The Unsoundness of the Rate Ratio and Other Measures That Are Affected by the Prevalence of an Outcome,”](#) Minnesota Population Center and Division of Epidemiology and Community Health of the School of Public Health of the University of Minnesota (Sept. 5, 2014); [“The Mismeasure of Group Differences in the Law and the Social and Medical Sciences,”](#) Institute for Quantitative Social Science at Harvard University (Oct. 17, 2012); [“The Mismeasure of Group Differences in the Law and the Social and Medical Sciences,”](#) Department of Mathematics and Statistics of American University (Sept. 25, 2012).

⁶ The principal measurement pages are: [Measuring Health Disparities](#), [Scanlan’s Rule](#), [Mortality and Survival](#), [Statistical Reasoning](#), [Immunization Disparities](#), [Immunization Disparities](#), [Educational Disparities](#), [Disparate Impact](#), [Discipline Disparities](#), [Lending Disparities](#), [Employment Discrimination](#), [Feminization of Poverty](#). The pages have close to 100 subpages.

consideration of the patterns by which measures tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome.⁷

More succinct treatments of the key points in the context of the government's encouraging lenders and public schools to relax lending and discipline standards under the mistaken belief that doing so will tend to reduce relative racial differences in adverse borrower and discipline outcomes, as well as the DOJ actions regarding Ferguson, Missouri, may found in my "[Things DoJ doesn't know about racial disparities in Ferguson](#)," *The Hill* (Feb. 22, 2016); "[Things government doesn't know about racial disparities](#)," *The Hill* (Jan. 28, 2014); "[The Paradox of Lowering Standards](#)," *Baltimore Sun* (Aug. 5, 2013); and "[Misunderstanding of Statistics Leads to Misguided Law Enforcement Policies](#)," *Amstat News* (Dec. 2012). Older, somewhat longer treatments of the misunderstanding of the effects of relaxing standards on measures of disproportionality, which involve a variety of settings and illustrate both how longstanding and how universal is that misunderstanding, may be found in my "[Mired in Numbers](#)," *Legal Times* (Oct. 12, 1996); "[When Statistics Lie](#)," *Legal Times* (Jan. 1, 1996); "[Getting it Straight When Statistics Can Lie](#)," *Legal Times* (June 23, 1993); "[Bias Data Can Make the Good Look Bad](#)," *American Banker* (Apr. 27, 1992); and "[An Issue of Numbers](#)," *National Law Journal* (Mar. 5, 1990).

Like this letter and the letter to ASA, available online are letters of varying length advising governmental and nongovernmental entities of the ways analyses of demographic or other differences in outcome rates that the entities conduct, fund, or provide guidance on – or that in some manner pertain to the entities' activities – are undermined by the failure to recognize patterns by which measures of differences between outcome rates tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome.⁸ The March 8, 2016 letter to the [Stanford Center on Poverty and](#)

⁷ With respect to interpretations of subgroup effects, there also exist issues regarding the fact that, irrespective of the issues I raise about the ways measures tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome, it is illogical to expect that in the usual course a factor affecting an outcome rate will cause equal proportionate changes in different baseline rates, given that it is not possible for a factor to cause equal proportionate changes in different rates of experiencing an outcome while causing equal proportionate changes in the opposite outcome rates (or that it is similarly illogical to regard the rate ratio as a sound measure of association, given that anytime the rate ratio is the same for two different pairs of outcome rates the rate ratio will necessarily will be different for the corresponding two pairs of rates for the opposite outcome). See "Race and Mortality Revisited" at 339-41 and the ASA letter at 12-13. See also the [Illogical Premises](#), [Illogical Premises II](#), [Subgroup Effects](#), [Subgroup Effects – Nonclinical](#), and [Inevitability of Interaction](#) subpages of the [Scanlan's Rule](#) page of [jpscanlan.com](#) and the [Comment on Hingorani BMJ 2013](#). I do not address these issues at length here, though PAA and APC should consider them carefully.

⁸ See letters to [Council of Economic Advisers](#) (Mar. 16, 2016), [City of Madison, Wisconsin](#) (Mar. 12, 2016), [Stanford Center on Poverty and Inequality](#) (Mar. 8, 2016), [City of Boulder, Colorado](#) (Mar. 5, 2016), [Houston Independent School District](#) (Jan. 5, 2016), [Boston Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Economic Justice](#) (Nov. 12, 2015), [House Judiciary Committee](#) (Oct. 19, 2015), [Chief Data Scientist of White House OSTP](#) (Sept. 8, 2015), [McKinney, Texas Independent School District](#) (Aug. 31, 2015), [Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Education](#) (Aug. 24, 2015), [Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality](#) (July 1, 2015), [City of Minneapolis, Minnesota](#) (June 8, 2015), [Texas Appleseed](#) (Apr. 7, 2015), [Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions](#) (Mar. 20, 2015), [United States Department of Justice and City of Ferguson, Missouri](#) (Mar. 9, 2015), [Vermont Senate Committee on Education](#) (Feb. 26, 2015), [Portland, Oregon Board of Education](#) (Feb. 25, 2015), [Wisconsin Council on Families and Children's Race to Equity Project](#) (Dec. 23, 2014), [Financial Markets and Community Investment Program, Government Accountability Office](#) (Sept. 9, 2014), [Education Law Center](#)

[Inequality](#) (at 3-4) discusses recent work by others that independently reaches conclusions about the measurement of group differences in outcome rates that, in my view, are similar to those in the materials discussed above with respect to both the problem and potential solutions.

Warranting your particular attention, given the nature of PAA/APC support of and interactions with the recipients, are the July 1, 2015 letter to the [Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality](#) (AHRQ) and the August 24, 2015 letter to the [Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Education](#) (HHS & DOE). The AHRQ letter explains that the health and healthcare disparities research the agency conducts or funds has been substantially undermined by the failure, on the parts of both AHRQ and recipients of AHRQ funding, to recognize the ways measures employed in such research tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome. The letter also explains that, apparently as a result of the agency's failure to understand certain measurement issues, AHRQ has failed to measure health and healthcare disparities in the manner it believed it was doing. The failure resulted in an anomaly whereby the 2010 *National Healthcare Disparities Report* highlighted as some of the largest reductions in healthcare disparities over a certain period situations where AHRQ would nevertheless find the disparities to be substantially larger at the end of the period that they were at the beginning of the period. The HHS/DOE letter discusses the fact that, even though a decade earlier NCHS recognized that reducing the frequency of an outcome will tend to increase relative differences between rates of experiencing the outcome, in December 2014, HHS joined DOE in a policy statement reflecting the view that reducing the frequency of an outcome will tend to reduce those differences. The letter also touches on the matter I discuss in the next section regarding recent NCHS actions effectively repudiating the *National Healthcare Disparities Reports* and other healthcare research that relied on earlier NCHS recommendations.

C. Recent Developments

This letter suggests that the reader should rely on the longer treatments of the subject in places like the October 2015 ASA letter and the July/August 2014 "Race and Mortality Revisited." For that reason, I set out below two recent developments that bear on the urgency of the recommended action of PAA and APC.

The first recent development involves a relatively simple matter that is touched upon in Sections A and B. On February 10, 2016, the DOJ filed a suit against Ferguson, Missouri, that, like the underlying March 2015 DOJ report, is based on a belief about the relationship between the frequency of an outcome and measures of disproportionality that is the opposite of reality. The suit also raises issues about the perception of the magnitude of disparities that DOJ has so

(Aug. 14, 2014), [IDEA Data Center](#) (Aug. 11, 2014), [Institute of Medicine II](#) (May 28, 2014), [Annie E. Casey Foundation](#) (May 13, 2014), [Education Trust](#) (April 30, 2014), [Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee of House Finance Committee](#) (Dec. 4, 2013), [Mailman School of Public Health of Columbia University](#) (May 24, 2013), [Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions](#) (Apr. 1, 2013), [Federal Reserve Board](#) (March 4, 2013), [Harvard University et al.](#) (Oct. 26, 2012), [Harvard University](#) (Oct. 9, 2012), [United States Department of Justice](#) (Apr. 23, 2012), [United States Department of Education](#) (Apr. 18, 2012), [The Commonwealth Fund](#) (June 1, 2010), [Institute of Medicine](#) (June 1, 2010), [National Quality Forum](#) (Oct. 22, 2009), [Robert Wood Johnson Foundation](#) (Apr. 8, 2009)

far failed to understand. See my "[Things DoJ doesn't know about racial disparities in Ferguson](#)," *The Hill* (Feb. 22, 2016). Meanwhile, all across the country, jurisdictions are examining racial disproportionality in arrests with the same mistaken understanding of the relationship between the frequency of an outcome and measures of disproportionality in experiencing the outcome that underlies the DOJ's actions against Ferguson and that has underlain a wide range of federal law enforcement practices for more than two decades. See my letters to [City of Madison, Wisconsin](#) (Mar. 12, 2016) and [City of Boulder, Colorado](#) (Mar. 5, 2016). There exist similar pressing issues with regard to racial disproportionality in school discipline. See, e.g., the letters to [Houston Independent School District](#) (Jan. 5, 2016) and [Boston Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Economic Justice](#) (Nov. 12, 2015) with respect to the fact that neither the entities whose practices are challenged or appraised, nor the entities purporting to provide sound analyses of the issues, understand the relationship between the frequency of an outcome and measures of disproportionality.⁹

The second recent development involves actions of NCHS and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) regarding health and healthcare disparities research.¹⁰ Most of my extended discussions of health and healthcare disparities research issues since 2006 address the fact that in 2004-05 NCHS statisticians recognized that determinations of whether health and healthcare disparities were increasing or decreasing would commonly turn on whether one examined relative differences in favorable outcomes or relative differences in the corresponding favorable outcomes. That is, they recognized that reductions in mortality tend to be associated with increased relative differences in mortality but reduced relative differences in survival and that improvements in healthcare tend to be associated with increased relative differences in failure to receive appropriate care but reduced relative differences in receipt of appropriate care.¹¹ See especially "Race and Mortality Revisited" at 331-335.

The forces that cause adverse outcome rates of advantaged and disadvantaged groups to differ are exactly the same forces that cause the corresponding favorable outcome rates to differ. Thus, NCHS should have regarded the fact that the two relative differences commonly (or ever)

⁹ See the following web pages regarding situations where recent reductions in discipline rates were accompanied by increased relative racial/ethnic differences in discipline rates in the jurisdictions indicated in the title of the page: [California Disparities](#), [Colorado Disparities](#), [Connecticut Disparities](#), [Maryland Disparities](#), [Minnesota Disparities](#), [Beaverton, OR Disparities](#), [Denver Disparities](#), [Henrico County, VA Disparities](#), [Los Angeles SWPBS](#), [Minneapolis Disparities](#), [Montgomery County, MD Disparities](#), [Portland, OR Disparities](#), [St. Paul Disparities](#). The pages principally address the patterns of increasing relative racial differences in jurisdictions. But, like many of the letters listed in note 7, many of the pages also reflect the failure of officials of the various jurisdictions, and of entities examining discipline disparities in those jurisdictions, to understand that relaxing standards tend to increase relative differences in adverse outcomes.

¹⁰ These developments are the subject of my forthcoming "The Mismeasure of Health Disparities," *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* (2016).

¹¹ See (a) Keppel KR, Percy JN, Klein RJ. [Measuring progress in Healthy People 2010](#). Healthy People Statistical Notes. No. 25. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2004; (b) Keppel, KP, Percy JN, Measuring relative disparities in terms of adverse events. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2005;11:479-483; (c) Keppel K, Pamuk E, Lynch J, et al. [Methodological issues in measuring health disparities](#). *Vital Health Stat*. 2005;2(141):1-16.

yield opposite conclusions regarding whether those forces are increasing or decreasing as calling into question the value of either relative difference for quantifying the differences in the circumstances of advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Instead, however, the agency simply determined that in appraising progress on the disparities reduction goals in Health People 2010, both health and healthcare disparities would be measured in terms of relative differences in adverse outcomes (that is, in the case of healthcare, non-receipt rather than receipt of appropriate care).

Prior to the NCHS recommendation disparities in health outcomes usually (or almost invariably) were measured in terms of relative differences in adverse outcomes (and thus improvements in health tended to be associated with increasing disparities),¹² while disparities in healthcare outcomes usually were measured in terms of relative differences in favorable outcomes (and thus improvements in healthcare tended to be associated with reduced disparities). The NCHS recommendation to measure healthcare disparities in terms of relative differences in adverse outcomes, which was adopted by AHRQ for the *National Healthcare Disparities Reports*, reversed the situation as to healthcare disparities. But NCHS left entirely unaddressed the fundamental unsoundness of the relative difference as a measure of either health or healthcare disparities.

The NCHS belief that it could arbitrarily choose which relative difference to rely on reflected a fundamental misunderstanding of the purpose of studying health disparities. The unsoundness of its position is especially evident when observers attempt to draw inferences about processes on the basis of the comparative size of the relative differences in experiencing some outcome without consideration that the comparative size of relative differences for the opposite outcome would commonly support a very different inference. See "Race and Mortality Revisited" at 339-341.

NCHS usually made it clear enough that it was examining healthcare disparities in terms of relative differences in adverse outcomes even when the subject was cast in terms of the favorable outcome. But subsequent to 2004-05 the agency did little to inform the public or researchers of the substantial implications of measuring healthcare disparities in terms of relative differences in adverse, rather than favorable, outcomes.¹³ Thus, so far as the published record

¹² See the [Mortality and Survival](#) page of [jpscanlan.com](#) regarding the fact that what titles of articles describe as analyses of demographic disparities in cancer survival are usually analyses of relative differences in cancer mortality, without the authors' recognizing such things as (a) that general improvements in survival tend to increase relative differences in mortality while reducing relative differences in survival or (b) that more survivable cancers tend to show larger relative differences in mortality, but smaller relative differences in survival, than less survivable cancers. On occasion, however, what are described as analyses of cancer survival disparities are analyses of relative differences in survival. See also the FCSM paper at 21-22.

¹³ See (1) Keppel KG, Bilheimer L, Gurley G. Improving population health and reducing health care disparities. *Health Affairs*. 2007;26(5):1281-1292; (2) Keppel KG. Ten largest racial and ethnic health disparities in the United States based on Health People 2010 objectives. *Am J Epidemiology*. 2007;166(1):97-103. See page 32 of the [presentation](#) associated with the FCSM paper regarding the way the Healthy People 2010 Technical Appendix advises that favorable healthcare outcomes are re-expressed in terms of the adverse outcome for purposes of

reveals (including the *National Healthcare Disparities Reports* of AHRQ and the 2011 and 2013 *Health Disparities and Inequalities Reports* of the CDC) no arm of HHS other than NCHS has ever indicated an awareness that is even possible for relative differences in favorable health and healthcare outcomes, and relative differences in the corresponding adverse health and healthcare outcomes, to change in opposite directions as the frequency of an outcome changes, much less that NCHS statisticians found that this tends to occur systematically.

As discussed in the HHS/DOE letter (at 24) some time prior to August 2015, NCHS published online a “[Health Disparities Tool: A User’s Guide](#)” (and associated materials) indicating that for purposes of appraising progress in Healthy People 2020 health and healthcare disparities reduction goals, healthcare disparities will be measured in terms of relative differences in favorable outcomes. In February 2016, NCHS confirmed this approach in a Statistical Note titled “[Measuring Progress Toward Target Attainment and the Elimination of Health Disparities in Healthy People 2020](#).”¹⁴ In indicating that measurement of relative differences in healthcare outcomes will now be calculated on the basis of the favorable outcome, the Note explains that the approach differs from the methodology of Health People 2010. But few readers would understand the implications of the change. And fewer still would understand that the change of approach effectively repudiates more than a decade of healthcare disparities research, including that in the *National Healthcare Disparities Reports*, that, in reliance on NCHS guidance, measured healthcare disparities in terms of relative differences in adverse outcomes.

In the 2011 and 2013 *Health Disparities and Inequalities Reports* the CDC evidenced little awareness that it different measures might yield different conclusions about directions of changes in disparities over time and, as noted, no awareness that relative differences in favorable outcomes and relative differences in the corresponding adverse outcomes could yield different conclusions. While CDC (apart from its arm NCHS) had previously not offered guidance on the measurement of health and healthcare disparities save as reflected in the approaches of its own analyses, CDC scientists/statisticians in conjunction NCHS statisticians, recently published a substantial guide on the measurement of health disparities.¹⁵

Nothing in the document (save, possibly, for a reference to discussion of “other issues” in the NCHS monograph listed as item (c) in note 11 of this letter) suggests any awareness of the NCHS recognition that the two relative differences would commonly change in opposite directions. The article gives significant attention to choosing between the absolute difference and a relative difference when the two yield opposite conclusions about such things as the

calculating the relative difference, without providing any indication of the implications of doing so save by references to the 2004-05 papers of NCHS statisticians.

¹⁴ Talih M, Huang DT. Measuring progress toward target attainment and the elimination of health disparities in Healthy People 2020. *Healthy People Statistical Notes*, no 27. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2016.

¹⁵ Penman-Aguilar A, Talih M, Huang D, et al. Measurement of health disparities, health inequities, and social determinants of health to support the advancement of health equity. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2016;22(1 Supp):S33–S42.

direction of changes in disparities over time. But its discussion of such issue contains nothing to suggest that the unmentioned relative difference might offer a different perspective, even though (as discussed in "Race and Mortality Revisited" and the ASA letter and addressed somewhat in Section D below), anytime it is mentioned that a relative differences and the absolute difference yield opposite conclusion about the directions of changes over time, the unmentioned relative difference will necessarily have changed in the opposite direction of the mentioned relative differences and the same direction as the absolute difference. Most important, however, the document shows no awareness of the patterns whereby the measures it discusses tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome or the implications of such patterns with respect to the utility of the measures for appraising differences in the circumstances of advantaged and disadvantaged groups.

In sum, recent developments heighten the urgency of both the broader and narrower recommendations in this letter and the October 2015 letter to ASA.

D. Illustrations of Patterns by Which Standard Measures of Differences Between Outcome Rates Tend to be Affected by the Frequency of an Outcome

There are four principal measures by which demographers and others appraise differences in rates at which advantaged and disadvantaged groups experience favorable or adverse outcomes: (1) relative (percentage) differences between rates of experiencing the outcome; (2) relative differences between rates of avoiding the outcome (*i.e.*, experiencing the opposite outcome); (3) absolute (percentage point) differences between outcome rates; and (4) odds ratios. None of these measures provides a sound basis for quantifying differences in the circumstances of advantaged and disadvantaged groups reflected by their outcome rates (or, otherwise put, the strength of the forces causing the groups' outcome rates to differ) because each measure tends to be systematically affected by the frequency of an outcome.

The pattern by which the two relative differences tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome – specifically, the rarer an outcome the greater tend to be relative differences in experiencing it and the smaller tend to be relative differences in avoiding it – was discussed in Section A.

Appraisals of differences in the circumstances of advantaged and disadvantaged groups reflected by their outcome rates in terms of absolute (percentage point) differences between rates and differences measured by odds ratios are unaffected by whether one examines the favorable or adverse outcome. But in order for a measure to effectively quantify the strength of the forces causing outcome rates to differ, it must remain unchanged as there occurs a general change in the frequency of an outcome akin to that effected by the lowering of a test cutoff. And, like the two relative differences, absolute differences and odds ratios also tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome, though in a more complicated way than the two relative differences.

Roughly, as uncommon outcomes (below 50% for both groups) become somewhat more common, absolute differences between rates tend to increase; as common outcomes (above 50% for both groups) become even more common, absolute differences tend to

decrease. The frequency- driven direction of change of the absolute difference is harder to predict when the outcome is neither common nor uncommon or changes from being uncommon to common during a period examined.

The absolute difference and both relative differences may all change in the same direction as the frequency of an outcome changes (in which case the difference measured by the odds ratio will also change in the same direction as the other measures). In such circumstances, one may infer that there has been a change in the strength of the forces causing the outcome rates to differ even if the standard measures do not effectively quantify that change.¹⁶

But in the common situation where all measures do not change in the same direction as the frequency of an outcome changes, the absolute difference will tend to change in the same direction as the smaller relative difference. Since observers who rely on relative differences to appraise the difference in the circumstances of two groups reflected by their differing outcome rates usually rely on the larger of the two relative differences, there exists a tendency for observers relying on the absolute difference to reach opposite conclusions about directions of changes in the size of demographic differences, or about the comparative size of the differences in different settings, from observers relying on relative differences.

Further, anytime an observer notes that the absolute difference has changed in a different direction from the relative difference the observer happens to be examining, the unmentioned relative difference will necessarily have changed in the opposite direction of the mentioned relative difference and the same direction as the absolute difference. Thus, observers maintaining that one must make a value judgment in choosing between the relative difference and the absolute difference with respect to the appraisal of a particular change in some demographic disparity over time have already made a choice (usually without thought) to rely on the relative difference that yields an opposite conclusion from the absolute difference rather than the relative difference that yields the same conclusion as the absolute difference.

As the frequency of an outcome changes, and all measures do not change in the same direction, the difference measured by the odds ratio tends to change in the opposite direction of the absolute difference and in the same direction as the larger relative difference.

Graphical depictions of the relationship of the two relative differences, the absolute difference, and the odds ratio according to the same specifications underlying Table 1 of this letter may be found in Figures 2 and 3 of the ASA letter (at 21-22). Table 5 below, which is based on the same specifications as Table 1 of this letter, presents favorable outcome rates for an

¹⁶ For simplicity I cast the matter in terms of an outcome that is increasing in frequency and without reference to the opposite outcome. But it should be obvious that when the outcome is decreasing the absolute difference tends to change in the opposite direction of that described. Further, in the case of an uncommon outcome that is increasing while remaining uncommon (with corresponding increase in the absolute difference), the opposite outcome is necessarily a common outcome that is decreasing while remaining common (also with corresponding increase in the absolute difference).

advantaged and disadvantaged group (with corresponding adverse outcome rates implied) at four frequency levels benchmarked by the advantaged group's favorable outcome rate. The table also presents rate ratios for the favorable and adverse outcomes and the absolute differences and odds ratios (with the larger odds in the numerator). The parenthetical numbers indicate the ways one would rank the size of the disparity between the situation of the advantaged and disadvantaged groups according to each of the four measures. Those numbers show that rankings according to relative differences in favorable outcomes are the opposite of rankings according to relative differences in adverse outcomes. They also show that rankings according to absolute differences and odds ratios, while different from the rankings according to either relative difference, are the opposite of each other.

Table 2. Favorable outcome rates of advantaged group (AG) and disadvantage group (DG) at four settings with different favorable outcome frequencies, with measures of difference

Setting	AG Fav Rate	DG Fav Rate	AG/DG Fav Ratio	DG/AG Adv Ratio	Abs Df (Perc Pnts)	Odds Ratio
A	20.0%	9.0%	2.22 (1)	1.14 (4)	11.0 (4)	2.53 (1)
B	40.0%	22.6%	1.77 (2)	1.29 (3)	17.4 (2)	2.28 (3)
C	70.0%	51.0%	1.37 (3)	1.63 (2)	19.0 (1)	2.24 (4)
D	80.0%	63.4%	1.26 (4)	1.83 (1)	16.6 (3)	2.31 (2)

A version of this table appears as Table 5 (at 335) of "Race and Mortality Revisited," where, as in many other places, it is used to refute the notion that choice of a measure in analyses of demographic differences in health or healthcare outcomes involves a value judgment. In the main, I will rest here on the treatment of that issue in "Race and Mortality Revisited" (at 335-336) and other places. The table, however, usefully illustrates a number of other points pertinent to the subject of this letter.

To being with, the key point of the table is that there is no rational basis for asserting that the strength of the forces causing the outcome rates to differ varies among the rows and that any measure that suggests that that they do vary is an unsound measure. The table thus implies a means of appraising the strength of those forces reflected by any pair of AG and DG rates. Just as knowledge of the difference between the means of the underlying distributions enables one to derive the rate for DG associated with any favorable or adverse outcome rate of AG (and vice versa), knowledge of the properties of normal distributions enables one to derive from any pair of rates an estimate of the difference between the means of underlying normal distributions, in terms of percentage of a standard deviation. I illustrate that method in the tables discussed below.

Table 2 also illustrates how inferences based on the comparative size of some relative difference will tend to be countered by an inference based on the relative difference in the opposite outcome. For example, assuming that Rows A and B reflect the situation of job applicants with low qualifications while Rows C and D reflect the situation of job applicants with high qualifications, any inference based on the smaller relative differences in favorable outcome among the latter than among the former would be no more valid than a contrasting

inference based on the smaller relative difference in the adverse outcome among the former than among the latter. The same point applies to any appraisal of heterogeneity of effects involving groups with different baseline rates. That is, for example, in the case of the employment setting just posited, the table shows that improvements in qualifications tends to increase favorable outcome rates proportionately more for DG (the group with the lower baseline favorable outcomes rate) than AG, while reducing adverse outcomes rates proportionately more for AG than DG. As discussed with regard to the first corollary to the pattern whereby the two relative differences tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome, in any situation where the two relative differences yield opposite conclusions about the comparative size of a disparity, a factor that affects the outcome rates is necessarily causing a larger proportionate change in one outcome rate for one group while causing a larger proportionate change in the opposite outcome rate for the other group. See "Race and Mortality Revisited" at 339-341. See also the [Interactions by Age](#) subpage of the [Scanlan's Rule](#) page of [jpscanlan.com](#).¹⁷

Further with respect to the interpretation of data on employment outcomes, the table illustrates that in an employment tester context, choice of the level of qualifications to fabricate for tester job applicants, and choice of labor market in which to have them apply, will have a substantial effect on the various measures one might employ to appraise the results of the studies. And, in the prevailing environment where either relative difference is regarded as a legitimate measure, there may even be situations where favorable outcome rates reach a point where observers decide to examine relative differences in adverse outcomes rather than relative differences in favorable outcome rates, thus reversing the effects of further enhancement of fabricated qualifications. See "Race and Mortality Revisited" at 341, [University of Massachusetts Medical School Seminar](#) at 143-150. See also the [Four-Fifths Rule](#) subpage of the [Disparate Impact](#) page of [jpscanlan.com](#) (discussing that the Uniform Guidelines for Employee Selection Procedures recommend that users measure disparate impact in terms of the relative difference in the favorable outcome until the point where favorable outcome rates are so high that the disadvantaged group's rate cannot be less than 80% of the advantaged group's rate, in which case users should rely on the relative difference in the adverse outcome).

¹⁷ Given the importance of Professor Mindel Sheps in the history of demography, I note that Professor Sheps almost recognized the pattern of relative differences described here in her 1958 Special Article in the *New England Journal of Medicine* styled "Shall We Count the Living or the Dead" (*N Engl J Med* 1958; 259:1210-14). Professor Sheps stated with regard to relative gender differences in mortality and survival examined at different age cutoffs:

Such ratios have another feature: there is no predictable relation between relative mortality and relative survival. For example, among the three age groups in Table 2, the oldest group shows the greatest relative discrepancy by far in survival rates, but the smallest relative discrepancy in mortality rates.

The lack of complete consistency in the data Professor Sheps examined caused her not to recognize that the example she described was an indication that there was a relationship between the two relative differences rather than an indication of a lack of relationship. See the October 9, 2012 letter to [Harvard University](#) at 11-12; [University of Massachusetts Medical School Seminar](#) at 52-55. And the Sheps analysis can be regarded as finding that after age 40, aging increased mortality proportionately more for women than men while reducing survival proportionately more for men than for women.

Table 2 also illustrates that observers relying on absolute differences to appraise healthcare disparities regarding uncommon outcomes will find that (a) improvements in care tend to increase disparities and (b) disparities tend to be greater at higher-performing institutions than lower-performance institutions (as reflected by comparison of Row A with Row B). It similarly illustrates that observers relying on absolute differences to appraise disparities regarding common outcomes will find that (a) improvements in care tend to decrease disparities and (b) disparities tend to be smaller at higher-performing institutions than lower-performance institutions (as reflected by comparison of Row C with Row D). See "Race and Mortality Revisited" at 337-339 regarding the substantial implications of the failure to understand these patterns with respect to pay-for-performance issues.

Tables 3 to 6 illustrate various points made above, while including the measure described above (termed EES for estimated effect size) that is theoretically unaffected by the frequency of an outcome. Each is a version of a table from "[Race and Mortality Revisited](#)" or the 2013 [FCSM paper](#). I urge the reader to examine all of the tables for the perspectives they offer regarding the problems in standard measures of differences between outcome rates and the plausibility of the measure I suggest or one similar to it.

Two things should be borne in mind in appraising the points I make with these tables as well as many of the points made above. First, while patterns in the table that follow are in most respects generally consistent with the frequency-related patterns described, one will of course find many situations where observed patterns do not accord with those patterns. Observed patterns are functions of (a) the described frequency-related patterns and (b) the strength of the forces causing the outcome rates to differ in the settings being compared. The strength of those forces can vary greatly from setting to setting and can change substantially over time (especially longer periods of time) particularly during periods of dramatic changes in the frequency of an outcome. That can cause the frequency-related patterns not to be observed even though they are having a substantial effect. The crucial consideration, however, is that so long as measures tend to be affected by the frequency of an outcome in any manner, one cannot rely on the measures to appraise the strength of the forces causing rates to differ without consideration of the role of the frequency of the outcome. I stress that point further with regard to Table 3.

Second, in "Race and Mortality Revisited"(at 337) and many other places, I describe the imperfections of the measure I suggest. The [Kansas Law paper](#) discusses some complexities of the matter that are particularly pertinent to the analyses of discrimination issues.¹⁸ But the measure at least provides a rational basis for appraising the strength of the forces causing the

¹⁸ Section C (at 23-26) of the Kansas Law paper also treats the impossibility of appraising the size of a disparity based solely on information regarding the proportion a group makes up of persons potentially experiencing an outcome and the proportion it makes up of persons actually experiencing the outcome. While I do not otherwise discuss the matter here, it is an important issue. See also the [TDHCA brief](#) (at 32-27), the [IDEA Data Center Disproportionality Guide](#) subpage of the Discipline Disparities page, and [slides 97 to 108](#) of the [University of Maryland Workshop](#).

outcome rates to differ, while the standard methods do not.¹⁹ An important role of the committee that I suggests PAA/APC form will be to appraise the utility of that measure and to determine whether there may be a superior measure that is also unaffected by the frequency of an outcome but that better quantifies the strength of the forces causing the outcome rates to differ.

Table 3 is a portion of Table 1 of "[Can We Actually Measure Health Disparities?](#)," *Chance* (Spring 2006), with EES added. It show the effects on various measures of differences in the circumstances of blacks and whites vis a vis poverty, or its avoidance, of (a) a reduction in poverty such as to enable everyone with incomes above 75% of the poverty line to escape poverty (as reflected by comparison of the bottom row with the middle row) and (b) an increase in poverty such as to pull into poverty everyone with incomes below 125% of the poverty line (as reflected by comparison of the top row with the middle row). Most pertinent to the way poverty issues are commonly analyzed (*i.e.*, relative differences in adverse outcomes) the decrease in poverty would increase the disparity while the increase in poverty would decrease the disparity. The relative difference in the favorable outcome and the absolute difference yield results that are the opposite of results yielded by the relative difference in the adverse outcome. The EES reflects the fact that all that has occurred in either situation is a change in the frequency of the outcome (though, if it did so perfectly, the EES value would not change at all).

Table 3. Rates at which white and blacks fall above and below 125%, 100%, and 75% of the poverty line (2004), with measures of differences between rates

Perc of Poverty Line	White Perc Below	Black Perc Below	White Perc Above	Black Perc Above	B/W Below Ratio	W/B Above Ratio	Abs Df (Perc Pnts)	Odds Ratio	EES
125%	14.9%	31.0%	85.1%	69.0%	2.08	1.23	16	2.56	.54
100%	10.8%	24.7%	89.2%	75.3%	2.29	1.18	14	2.70	.55
75%	7.2%	17.8%	92.8%	82.2%	2.48	1.13	11	2.82	.54

In "Race and Mortality Revisited" (at 329-330, 343), with reference to a version of this table, I argue that it is not possible to justify the expenditure of any resources to examine changes in demographic difference in poverty rates (which is the same thing as examining the comparative changes in the poverty rates of different groups) without consideration of the patterns reflected in the table. I am not aware of any basis for debating the point. Yet, to my knowledge, no study of changing demographic differences in poverty has ever considered the implications of these patterns. The same holds as to studies of changing demographic differences in other outcomes.

Table 4 presents results of a study I have used in many places to show how researcher unaware of the NCHS recommendation that healthcare disparities be measured in terms of

¹⁹ A qualification to this point is that the odds ratio (more usefully represented in terms of the standardized mean difference) could be a superior measure to the one I suggest depending on actual shapes of the underlying distributions. For middle ranges of frequency of an outcome, the standardized mean difference differs little from the EES.

relative differences in adverse outcomes would tend to reach opposite conclusions from NCHS.²⁰ Relying on relative differences in vaccination rates as a measure of disparity (and evidencing no awareness that NCHS would do otherwise), the authors found that a school-entry Hepatitis B vaccination requirement, which dramatically increased vaccination rates, dramatically reduced racial disparities for both fifth and ninth graders. NCHS, relying on relative differences in rates of failure to be vaccinated, would have found substantially increased disparities for both grades. CDC, which commonly measures vaccination disparities in terms of absolute differences between rates, would have found substantially increased disparities for fifth graders (where initial rates were quite low) and substantially decreased disparities for ninth graders (where initial rates were much higher).

The column denominated EES, for estimated effect size, indicates that, to the extent that the disparities can be effectively measured, there occurred notable reductions in both grades. That, it warrants note, is the type of change one would expect in the case of a formal requirement, which, if rigidly enforced, ought to eliminate any disparity.

Table 4. White and black Hepatitis B vaccination rates in grades 5 and 9 before and after imposition of school-entry vaccination requirement, with measures of difference

Grade	Year	Requirement Situation	White Vac Rt	Black Vac Rt	W/B Ratio Vac	B/W Ratio No Vac	Abs Df (Perc Pnts)	Odds Ratio	EES
5	1996	Pre	8%	3%	2.67	1.05	5	2.81	.47
5	1997	Post	46%	33%	1.39	1.24	13	1.73	.34
9	1996	Pre	46%	32%	1.44	1.26	14	1.81	.37
9	1997	Post	89%	84%	1.06	1.45	5	1.54	.24

As mentioned above, under the healthcare disparities measurement approach of Healthy People 2020, NCHS would now agree with the authors that there occurred a substantial decrease in disparities in both grades.

Table 5 is based on a study that relied on NCHS guidance for measuring healthcare disparities in terms of relative differences in adverse outcome.²¹ The study's abstract highlighted as a very large increase in relative area-socioeconomic differences in mammography what was in fact a very large increase in relative area-socioeconomic differences in failure to receive mammography. As shown in the table, there was actually a very substantial decline in the relative difference in mammography rates. The EES indicates that, to the extent the disparity can be measured, it increased negligibly.²²

²⁰ Morita JY, Ramirez E, Trick WE. Effect of school-entry vaccination requirements on racial and ethnic disparities in Hepatitis B immunization coverage among public high school students. *Pediatrics*. 2008;121:e547.

²¹ Harper S, Lynch J, Meersman SC, et al. Trends in area-socioeconomic disparities in breast cancer screening, mortality, and survival among women ages 50 years and over (1987-2005). *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2009;18(1):121-131.

²² See the FCSM paper (at 16) regarding my inability to replicate exactly what the study described as a 161 percent increase in relative area-socioeconomic differences in mammography (meaning failure to receive mammography)

Table 5. Mammography rates of highest and lowest socioeconomic groups in 1987 and 2004, with measures of difference

Year	High Mamm Rt	Low Mamm Rt	H/L Ratio Mamm	L/H Ratio No Mamm	Abs Df Perc Pnts	Odd Ratio	EES
1987	36.3%	17.2%	2.11	1.30	19	2.74	0.60
2004	77.4%	55.2%	1.40	1.98	22	2.78	0.62

Though the authors of the study relied on NCHS guidance, in this case NCHS would now reach an opposite conclusion from that of the authors.

Table 6 is based on data from a World Health Organization (WHO) [Handbook on Health Inequality Monitoring](#) (2013) that, while citing NCHS guidance that recommended measuring healthcare disparities in terms of relative differences in adverse outcomes (item (c) of note 10), measured income disparities in skilled attendance at birth and other healthcare outcomes in terms of relative difference in favorable outcomes. The document did not reflect awareness that NCHS would analyze the matter differently or that it could make a difference whether one examined the favorable or the adverse outcome. The table shows the starkly contrasting interpretations of the income-related disparities for skilled attendance at birth for Columbia and Bangladesh according to the WHO approach and the NCHS approach. These countries, which WHO found to have the smallest and largest disparities of the countries it studied, would have the largest and smallest disparities according to the NCHS approach. See FCSM paper at 18-19. The NCHS Healthy People 2020 approach would now agree with the WHO interpretation.

Table 6. Rates of births attended by skilled measures for highest and lowest income quintiles in Columbia and Bangladesh, from WHO Handbook on Health Inequality Monitoring, with measures of difference

Country	Highest Q Attend Rt	Lowest Q Attend Rt	H/L Ratio Attend	L/H Ratio No Attend	Abs Df Perc Pnts	Odds Ratio	EES
Columbia	99.4%	83.7%	1.2	27.2	15.7	32.3	1.34
Bangladesh	50.6%	4.9%	10.3	1.9	45.7	19.9	1.67

The FCSM paper and "Race and Mortality Revisited" present a number of examples like this, with reference to the then-current NCHS approach when pertinent, and with some attention to the disarray among federal agencies and other entities regarding the measurement of health and healthcare disparities. The recent reversal of the NCHS approach adds to the confusion in this area, and it remains to be seen whether and how recognition of that reversal will be reflected in the next *National Healthcare Disparities Report*.

and regarding the authors explanation for examining relative differences in rates of failure to received mammography rather rates if receipt of mammography.

Judith Seltzer, PAA President, *et al.*

March 29, 2016

Page 21

The fundamental problem, however, is that none of the measures currently employed is sound and neither the government agencies involved with health and healthcare research, nor the nongovernmental entities and persons conducting such research, understand that the measures are unsound. And, as noted, the same problem exists with regard to all research into demographic differences in outcome rates.

Given the missions of PAA and APC, as well as the roles the organizations have played in promoting sound research and influencing government funding of research into demographic differences, the organizations have a responsibility to take an active role in addressing the problems discussed above. Untold numbers of studies of demographic differences are ongoing or about to be undertaken without an understanding of the issues discussed above and in the material listed in Section B. Similarly, countless entities are basing actions on the results of such studies and on the mistaken beliefs of federal civil rights law enforcement agencies regarding the implications of generally reducing adverse outcomes. Thus, consideration of the issues raised in the list letter should be a priority of both PAA and APC.

Please contact me if you have questions about any matter discussed in this letter.

Sincerely

/s/ **James P. Scanlan**

James P. Scanlan