
SHARE WORKING PAPER SERIES

Social inequalities in access to healthcare among the population aged 50+ years during the COVID-19 pandemic in Europe

Louis Arnault, Florence Jusot, Thomas Renaud

Working Paper Series 58-2021

DOI: [10.17617/2.3289765](https://doi.org/10.17617/2.3289765)

SHARE-ERIC | Amalienstr. 33 | 80799 Munich | Germany | share-eric.eu



mea | MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR
SOCIAL LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY
Munich Center for the Economics of Aging



This project has received funding from the European Union under grant agreements VS/2019/0332, VS/2020/0313 and the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreements No 870628, No 101015924.



SPONSORED BY THE

Federal Ministry
of Education
and Research

Supported by the

NIH National Institute
on Aging

Acknowledgements

Research in this article is a part of the H2020 SHARE-COVID19 project (Grant agreement No. 101015924).

This publication is based on preliminary SHARE wave 8 release 0 data (Börsch-Supan 2020). Therefore, the analyses, conclusions and results are preliminary. Please see Scherpenzeel et al. (2020) for methodological details. In addition, this paper uses data from SHARE Waves 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (DOIs: [10.6103/SHARE.w1.710](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w1.710), [10.6103/SHARE.w2.710](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w2.710), [10.6103/SHARE.w3.710](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w3.710), [10.6103/SHARE.w4.710](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w4.710), [10.6103/SHARE.w5.710](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w5.710), [10.6103/SHARE.w6.710](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w6.710), [10.6103/SHARE.w7.710](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w7.710)), see Börsch-Supan et al. (2013) for methodological details. The SHARE data collection has been funded by the European Commission through FP5 (QLK6-CT-2001-00360), FP6 (SHARE-I3: RII-CT-2006-062193, COMPARE: CIT5-CT-2005-028857, SHARELIFE: CIT4-CT-2006-028812), FP7 (SHARE-PREP: GA N°211909, SHARE-LEAP: GA N°227822, SHARE M4: GA N°261982, DASISH: GA N°283646) and Horizon 2020 (SHARE-DEV3: GA N°676536, SHARE-COHESION: GA N°870628SERISS: GA N°654221, SSHOC: GA N°823782) and by DG Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion. Additional funding from the German Ministry of Education and Research, the Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science, the U.S. National Institute on Aging (U01_AG09740-13S2, P01_AG005842, P01_AG08291, P30_AG12815, R21_AG025169, Y1-AG-4553-01, IAG_BSR06-11, OGHA_04-064, HHSN271201300071C) and from various national funding sources is gratefully acknowledged, (see www.share-project.org).

Social inequalities in access to healthcare among the population aged 50+ years during the COVID-19 pandemic in Europe

Louis ARNAULT*, Florence JUSOT**°, Thomas RENAUD*

* Université Paris Dauphine, PSL, Paris, France

° IRDES (Institut de Recherche et Documentation en Economie de la Santé), Paris, France

Corresponding author: Thomas RENAUD (thomas.renaud@dauphine.psl.eu), ORCID: 0000-0002-4895-6090

Abstract

This study investigated social inequalities in access to healthcare during the first wave of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) epidemic in Europe among adults aged 50 years and older, using data from the regular administration of the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) and the specific telephone survey administered regarding COVID-19 (**SHARE Corona Survey**). It addressed three main research questions: did people who were in difficult economic situations before the epidemic face more barriers to access healthcare than others? If so, to what extent can these discrepancies be attributed to initial differences in health status and the use of care between social groups or to differential effects of the pandemic on these groups? Did social inequalities with regard to unmet needs during the pandemic differ across countries? Unmet healthcare needs are characterised by three types of behaviours likely to be induced by the pandemic: forgoing care for fear of contracting COVID-19, having pre-scheduled care postponed, and being unable to obtain medical appointments or treatments when needed.

Our results substantiate the existence of social inequalities in accessing healthcare during the pandemic and of cumulative effects of economic and medical vulnerabilities: the impact of economic vulnerability is notably stronger among those who were in poor health before the outbreak and thus are potentially the oldest individuals. The cross-country comparison highlighted heterogeneous effects of economic vulnerability on forgoing care and having care postponed among countries, which are not comparable to the initial cross-country differences in social inequalities in access to healthcare.

Keywords: COVID-19; social inequalities; healthcare; unmet needs

1. Introduction

The management of the coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has compelled countries to undertake major reorganisations of their healthcare systems, which led to drastic healthcare rationing. The activities of some health professionals – specialist doctors, dentists and physiotherapists – have been put on hold, and programmed care has been rescheduled (WHO, 2020; Søreide et al., 2020). In the meantime, the demand for care may also have changed. Shortages in the supply of healthcare and travel restrictions may have increased transport and transaction costs incurred by accessing healthcare. Some people may also have forgone care for fear of contracting COVID-19; this fear is potentially stronger in the population at risk for severe COVID-19, such as elderly and chronically ill individuals, and is exacerbated by difficulties in obtaining and processing relevant health information.

A substantial decrease in the amount of emergency and scheduled care provided has been observed in most countries. In the US, Chatterji and Li (2020) reported a 67% reduction in outpatient visits during the third week of April 2020 compared to a baseline pre-epidemic week and a 25% reduction by mid-May. A dramatic decrease in the provision of healthcare has also been observed with regard to primary care visits, visits to emergency departments, and elective surgeries (Hartnett et al., 2020; Mehrotra et al., 2020), which seems to be causally linked to ‘stay-at-home’ and nonessential business closure policies (Ziedan et al., 2020). In France, ambulatory care expenditures decreased by 12% during the lockdown compared to the same period the year before (CNAMTS, 2020). England has seen a sharp decrease of 57% in visits to emergency departments in April-May compared to the year before, followed by a gradual upturn thereafter (NHS, 2020). In Belgium, 75% of the population reported having forgone planned healthcare since the start of the outbreak (Bertier et al., 2020). On average, European countries have suffered a partial or complete disruption in the provision of 40% of essential health services in hospitals, primarily preventive, emergency and oncological care (WHO, 2020). Elective surgery was notably affected: more than 2 million surgical procedures per week were cancelled or postponed worldwide during the peak weeks of disruption (Negopdiev et al., 2020).

It is therefore important to identify which populations have suffered most from these disruptions in healthcare provision, as these are likely to have major long-term effects on the health of these populations. Preliminary studies have established that delays in diagnosis and treatment in the UK could lead to a 5% to 15% increase in the number of deaths from cancer up to 5 years after diagnosis (Maringe et al., 2020). Given the magnitude of pre-existing social inequalities in health and in healthcare utilisation, the impact of the epidemic on these inequalities needs to be addressed. Reducing inequalities in health and access to healthcare between social groups is one of the major public health objectives in Europe (Marmot et al., 2008; Marmot and Bell, 2016). It is therefore crucial to determine to what extent the COVID-19 pandemic stands as a potentially serious obstacle to achieving this goal.

Evidence of social inequalities in healthcare use – i.e., disparities in the utilisation of healthcare for the same health need depending on the socio-economic level – has been extensively described in European countries, particularly regarding visits to specialists and dentists, preventive care, and the risk of forgoing care due to costs, distance or waiting time (OECD, 2019), especially among older adults (Jürges and Stella, 2019; Litwin and Sapir, 2009). The channels through which pandemics and situations involving care rationing can shape these healthcare inequalities are multifaceted. First, the most socially vulnerable people and those most “disconnected” from the healthcare system may have been isolated even more than usual. The pandemic may also have modified people’s demand for healthcare in distinctive manners depending on their social status. We can assume that more educated people were able to better adjust their demand for healthcare to their actual level of need, while less educated

people might have suffered more from barriers to information and care restrictions. Fear of contracting COVID-19 may also differ socially due to differences in exposure to the virus at home or at work, differences in the likelihood of developing severe COVID-19 related to differences in the prevalence of chronic diseases, and heterogeneity in risk perception and risk aversion. Conversely, health systems may have adopted a general policy of healthcare resource prioritisation in favour of people with the highest need, especially older people with comorbidities, irrespective of any other characteristic (Hanna et al., 2020; Pikoulis et al., 2020; Rosenbaum, 2020). The rationing of planned and specialist care may also have had a greater impact on those who usually make more use of these types of care, especially the more socio-economically advantaged. Given the differences in the organisation of healthcare systems, responses to the pandemic and initial levels of social inequalities in healthcare utilisation across countries, it seems also appropriate to assess the between-country variations in the consequences of the epidemic with regard to social inequalities in healthcare use.

To date, only a few studies have analysed social disparities in the likelihood of unmet care needs specific to the COVID-19 pandemic, mainly for the US. Gonzalez et al. (2020) found a clear effect of social deprivation on unmet needs: the probability of avoiding getting care due to concerns about exposure to the virus affected 36% of the people who lost work or work-related income during the pandemic and only 25% of the others. Another study revealed that delaying or avoiding obtaining urgent medical care due to concerns about COVID-19 was more common among the less well-educated and usually underprivileged ethnic groups, although no difference was observed after stratification by income level (Czeisler et al., 2020). Racial and ethnic inequities in access to dental care during the pandemic have also been observed (Kranz et al., 2020).

This study investigated social inequalities in unmet needs —forgoing care due to the fear of contracting COVID-19, postponing scheduled care and finding it impossible to obtain a medical appointment or treatment— during the first wave of the COVID-19 epidemic in 26 European countries participating in SHARE. It addresses the following questions: Did people in difficult economic situations before the epidemic face more barriers to access healthcare than others? If so, to what extent can these discrepancies be attributed to initial differences in health status and use of care between social groups or to differential effects of the pandemic on these groups? Did social inequalities in unmet needs during the pandemic differ across countries?

2. Data and methods

2.1. Sample selection

This research is based on Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) panel data (Börsch-Supan et al., 2013) derived from both the eighth wave of regular data collection and the SHARE Corona Survey, the *ad hoc* telephone survey focused on the impact of the COVID-19 crisis conducted among SHARE panel households in June-July 2020 (Scherpenzeel et al., 2020).

The sample was restricted to participants aged 50 years and over living in private households who participated in both the regular face-to-face wave 8 and SHARE Corona Survey and for whom there no missing values for any of the variables involved in the analyses. In the end, the sample included 31,928 respondents.

2.2. Measuring unmet healthcare needs during the first wave of the epidemic

Inequalities in access to care are here identified by the subjective assessment of unmet needs due to barriers to healthcare, which have been shown to be associated with the subsequent deterioration of health status and thus to provide policy-relevant information for measuring inequity (Allin et al., 2010; Dourgnon et al.; 2012; Ko, 2016). Subjective unmet needs can be defined as the gap between the amount of healthcare received by an individual and the amount of healthcare he/she desires based on his/her needs and preferences with regard to health and healthcare. Consequently, forgoing care may be more common among those with a higher demand for health services for a given healthcare need, particularly among the more affluent.

Dimensions of unmet healthcare needs are captured by the SHARE Corona Survey through the assessment of three different kinds of barriers to accessing health services that have emerged since the start of the epidemic for various reasons: 1) forgoing healthcare due to the fear of contracting COVID-19 (fear): *“Since the outbreak of Corona, did you forgo medical treatment because you were afraid to become infected by the corona virus?”*; 2) having planned healthcare cancelled or rescheduled (postponement): *“Did you have a medical appointment scheduled, which the doctor or medical facility decided to postpone due to Corona?”*; and 3) being unable to obtain a medical appointment (unavailability): *“Did you ask for an appointment for a medical treatment since the outbreak of Corona and did not get one?”*.

It is worth analysing these three indicators separately insofar as they presumably reflect different reasons for not accessing healthcare and different types of unmet needs. The decision to forgo care for fear of contracting COVID-19 can *a priori* apply to any type of care. However, postponement implies that accessing healthcare was originally scheduled – an appointment with a specialist, a planned medical exam, an elective surgery, etc. – and therefore might be more common in people with poor health and chronic conditions. Impossibility of obtaining a medical appointment are instead associated with a request for more immediate medical care, which is usually provided by first-line health professionals in response to acute health problems.

2.3. Measuring economic vulnerability prior to the outbreak

Economic vulnerability before the outbreak is assessed based on the self-reported difficulty of “making ends meet” in SHARE wave 8, which is collected in the following question: *“Thinking of your household’s total monthly income, would you say that your household is able to make ends meet...? With great difficulty/with some difficulty/fairly easily/easily”*. Respondents who express some or great difficulty are said to be economically vulnerable.

This question originates from pioneering works on the poverty line (Goedhart et al., 1977) and has the advantage of providing a synthetic and subjective measure of living conditions, comparable in principle between countries regardless of cultural norms (Fahey, 2007).

2.4. Measuring levels of healthcare needs and utilisation prior to the outbreak

The most disadvantaged socio-economic groups are generally in worse health and tend to have lower levels of healthcare utilisation for identical health needs in most countries (OECD, 2019). Investigating the social inequalities in unmet needs during the pandemic thus requires disentangling the influence of economic vulnerability *per se* from the confounding effects due to initial differences in baseline health status and healthcare utilisation between social groups.

Two different sets of measures were then used.

First, we sought to characterise individuals with serious chronic conditions, differentiating between diseases identified in the medical literature as putting people at higher risk for developing severe COVID-19 (Williamson et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2020), who may have been more likely to have forgone care for fear of contracting COVID-19, and other chronic diseases. In SHARE, lists of chronic conditions and drug treatments taken at least once a week are provided to respondents. Respondents were defined as having a chronic condition that increases the risk of severe COVID-19 when they reported that they had been diagnosed with or were taking medication for any of the following diseases: chronic heart, lung, or kidney disease; cerebro-vascular disease (including stroke); cancer; hypertension; diabetes.

Obesity also increases the risk of developing severe COVID-19. In our analysis, an individual was considered obese when his/her body mass index (BMI) was greater than or equal to 30 kg/m².

In addition, self-reported health was included among the variables assessing baseline health needs, and it was grouped into four categories (“excellent/very good”, “good”, “fair”, “poor”). Despite its inherent subjectivity, this variable has been shown to be a good proxy for global health status, as well as a reliable predictor of all-cause mortality (Idler and Benyamini, 1997) and the level of healthcare use (DeSalvo et al., 2005).

Differences in the use of health services before the outbreak were captured through three additional variables: the number of encounters with a general practitioner or specialist during the previous 12 months and whether they had visited a dentist at least once in the same time frame. The introduction of healthcare utilisation at baseline into the models is particularly needed in the analysis of postponed care because only care that was planned before the pandemic could have been postponed.

2.5. Empirical strategy

The empirical strategy involved a sequence of probit models that were successively estimated for the three types of unmet needs during the first wave of the epidemic.

As a first step, the overall influence of economic vulnerability on outcomes was estimated, after controlling for differences in unmet needs due to age, sex, relationship status (living alone or not), and country of residence. This also enabled us to identify whether older individuals suffered more from unmet needs than others, irrespective of their economic vulnerability status.

In the second step, we investigated how the overall effect of economic vulnerability evolved when baseline differences in healthcare needs and utilisation were accounted for (full model). For all three outcomes, the full model specification was re-estimated separately for each country to explore the heterogeneity of the effects of economic vulnerability on unmet needs across Europe.

Finally, for each type of unmet need, the full model was re-estimated over the entire sample with the addition of an interaction term between economic vulnerability and baseline self-reported health. This interaction model reveals to what extent the social gradient of inequalities in access to healthcare differed between originally healthy and unhealthy individuals.

3. Results

Table 1 provides a description of the sample's average characteristics. Country-specific weights were applied to ensure the country subsamples were representative of the national populations aged 50 years and over with regard to age, sex, and region (De Luca and Rossetti, 2018). The mean age of our sample was 66.3 years, and 48% of the respondents were aged 65 years or older. Women represented 54% of the respondents.

3.1. Descriptive statistics

Unmet healthcare needs during the period are mainly revealed by the postponement of planned care (25%) and, to a lesser extent, by situations in which people forwent care for fear of contracting COVID-19 (12%) and were unable to obtain a medical appointment (5%) (**Table 1**). The proportion of respondents who reported they experienced a postponement of at least one planned medical encounter was notably high in several countries (**Table 2**), such as Luxembourg (54%), the Czech Republic (37%), France (36%) and Belgium (35%). The variability between countries in forgoing care for fear of contracting COVID-19 was lower and only weakly correlated with the intensity of the first wave of the epidemic: the proportions of Germans (17%) and Swedes (15%) who have forgone care for fear of COVID-19 were higher than the proportions observed in countries where the impact of the epidemic has been greater, such as France (10%) and Spain (4%). The proportion of individuals who were unable to obtain a medical appointment differed across countries as well, reaching 10% in France and 12% in Latvia. These heterogeneous proportions across countries justify the adjustment of all models for country fixed effects.

Table 1 provides additional insights. Eighty-three percent of individuals aged 50 years and over reported suffering from a chronic condition or taking regular medical treatments for such a condition in the interview conducted before the pandemic. This proportion was only 59% when the scope was narrowed to only those chronic diseases predisposing patients to severe COVID-19. Regarding healthcare utilisation, respondents reported an average of 4.1 contacts with general practitioners and 2.7 contacts with specialists during the 12 months before the interview. Additionally, an average of 57% of those people consulted a dentist at least once in the same period.

Thirty-six percent of the respondents admitted experiencing difficulties in making ends meet on their household income and were therefore considered economically vulnerable. Older individuals were significantly less economically vulnerable than younger seniors, whereas women were significantly more economically vulnerable than men. Economically vulnerable people had, on average, worse health than others. As a result, without adjustment for age or health status, they made more frequent use of primary care, visiting their general practitioner an average of 4.9 times a year, compared to 3.6 times in the non-vulnerable population. This difference in healthcare utilisation was negligible for specialist doctors and was reversed for dentists, which is reflectively of the unaffordability of dental care for the lowest socio-economic groups.

Without adjustment for differences in other characteristics between the two sub-populations, people who were economically vulnerable at baseline were less likely to have had at least one medical treatment postponed during the first wave of the pandemic (22% versus 26%) and were as likely to have been unable to obtain a medical appointment (6% versus 5%). No difference according to economic vulnerability was observed in the probability of having forgone care for fear of contracting COVID-19.

3.2. Overall impact of economic vulnerability on unmet needs

Table 3 shows the results of the two probit models estimated for each of the three indicators of unmet needs.

After controlling for differences in age, sex, relationship status and country (step 1), relatively more of the most economically vulnerable people reported having forgone medical care because of the fear of COVID-19 (+1.9 percentage points) and not being able to get a medical appointment when needed (+1.3 points). No significant difference between vulnerable and non-vulnerable individuals was observed in the probability of experiencing a postponement of scheduled care. In addition, people aged 65 to 85 years were significantly more likely than others to have had unmet needs during the epidemic, especially with regard to forgoing care due to fear of COVID-19 and experiencing the postponement of care, with an increasing risk with increasing age until the age of 79 years.

As expected, when introduced into the models (step 2), all the variables related to the need for healthcare, except obesity, were positively correlated with each of the three types of unmet needs. A self-reported global health status of “poor” rather than “excellent or very good” increased the probability of having forgone care for fear of contracting COVID-19 by 3.4 percentage points, the risk of postponement of care by 6.0 points, and the probability of having been unable to obtain a medical appointment by 2.1 points.

It also appears that unmet needs have been even more pronounced among individuals suffering from chronic conditions that are not specifically associated with an increased risk of severe forms of COVID-19: patients suffering from non-specific chronic conditions were more likely than people with chronic conditions that predisposed them to severe COVID-19 to have been refraining from healthcare (+4.2 points compared with +1.6 points), to have experienced the postponement of scheduled care (+8.0 versus +6.3) and to have been unable to obtain a medical appointment (+1.8 versus +0.7). The pre-epidemic intensity of healthcare utilisation was also positively correlated with the likelihood of reporting having faced barriers in accessing care during the pandemic. This result suggests that the healthcare demand during the pandemic was correlated with initial healthcare habits, for a given health status, which reflects preferences regarding health and healthcare and initial difficulties in accessing health services.

Notably, the sign of the effect of age on unmet needs changed after controlling for the pre-epidemic differences in care needs and utilisation between respondents: this suggests that healthcare needs and utilisation are strongly and positively correlated with age. In the full model, the probability of having had unmet needs during the first epidemic wave was much lower among the eldest individuals than among those aged between 50 and 64 years for each indicator.

After controlling for baseline differences in health care needs and utilisation between individuals (step 2), the overall effects of economic vulnerability on the three measures of unmet needs slightly decreased but did not significantly change compared to those obtained previously (step 1). This may be explained by two reverse effects: economically vulnerable individuals may have higher pre-epidemic needs than others, on average, but a lower utilisation of care for the same needs. In the end, these two competing effects on unmet needs tend to cancel each other out. Based on the full model, the magnitude of the effect of economic vulnerability was +1.0 points for forgoing care due to fear of COVID-19, +0.9 points for the unavailability of medical appointments, and not significant for the probability of experiencing the postponement of planned care.

3.3. Country-specific impact of economic vulnerability on unmet needs

The full specification model was then re-estimated on a country-by-country basis to determine the heterogeneous influence of economic vulnerability on access to care across Europe (estimates available upon request).

Although the effect of economic vulnerability on having forgone medical treatment for fear of infection was significantly positive in the analysis including all countries, it varied substantially among countries (**Figure 1**). The risk of forgoing care was higher among the most economically vulnerable individuals in Israel (+10.9 percentage points), the Czech Republic (+8.3) and Sweden (+6.5). The same was not the case everywhere: in Spain (-3.3 points), Finland (-3.6), Switzerland (-4.6) and Bulgaria (-6.2), the most economically vulnerable people refrained from accessing medical care for fear of COVID-19 less frequently than others.

A similar pattern was identified in the postponement of medical treatments during the first wave of the epidemic (**Figure 2**). The non-significant impact of economic vulnerability on the probability of having had care postponed in the sample including all countries masked the heterogeneous effects across European countries: this particular risk affected economically vulnerable people more frequently than others in Denmark (+9.4 points), France (+8.2) and Slovakia (+5.1), while it affected them significantly less in a few other countries, particularly Italy (-6.8 points).

The positive effect of economic vulnerability on the unavailability of care was weaker than its effect on forgoing care for fear of COVID-19 in the sample including all countries and was also more uniform across countries (**Figure 3**). The most economically vulnerable faced more difficulties obtaining medical appointments or treatments in Spain (+3.4 points) and Greece (+2.9), while they appeared to experience fewer difficulties in Italy (-2.4).

The interpretation of these country-level differences is not straightforward. Social differences in forgoing care for fear of COVID-19 may be more important in countries in which the most economically vulnerable have been more likely to be exposed to the virus, and the variations in the risk of exposure are themselves potentially correlated with the heterogeneous spread across and within countries between the more and less privileged areas (Northern versus Southern Italy, Catalunya versus other Spanish provinces, Paris versus other French regions). They could also be explained by country-level differences in the type and strictness of social distancing policies and the social distribution of individual preferences towards risk. Social differences in postponement and unavailability of care may be more related to country-level variations in the magnitude of healthcare restrictions and the types of care that have been cancelled (GPs versus specialists, public versus private sector, etc.) .

The international differences observed during the first wave of the epidemic do not seem to overlap with the established evidence regarding the level of social inequalities in healthcare use and unmet needs across European countries. For instance, the impact of economic vulnerability on care postponement and the unavailability of care was significantly negative in Italy, although Italy is well known for its high level of social inequality with regard to visits to GPs and specialists and unmet needs due to cost, waiting time or distance (OECD, 2019). Conversely, highly positive effects were observed in Spain, although the magnitudes of social inequalities in access to care in Spain and Italy are usually alike. The health systems in both countries can also be considered similar in many aspects, and they both had to deal with a particularly deadly first wave of the epidemic.

In France and Slovakia, high levels of social inequalities in the postponement of care during the pandemic were observed, which are consistent with those existing before the pandemic, namely, high social inequalities in unmet needs because of cost in Slovakia and high social inequalities in specialist care, which is more habitually planned, in France. In Greece, the greater effect of economic vulnerability on the unavailability of care is consistent with the higher level of social inequality in access to GPs before the pandemic. This pattern does not hold, however, for the other countries exhibiting high social inequalities in the unavailability of care during the first wave of the epidemic, such as the Netherlands and Spain.

3.4. Cumulative effects of economic vulnerability and baseline health status on unmet needs

The final stage consisted of re-estimating the full model over the entire sample by adding an interaction term between economic vulnerability and self-reported health status at baseline (estimates available upon request).

For each of the three types of unmet needs considered, the effect of economic vulnerability was higher among individuals reporting "poor" health before the epidemic than among those reporting "excellent or very good" health (**Figure 4**). For example, among the former, the most economically vulnerable were much more likely than others to have experienced the postponement of planned care (+3.5 points). Similarly, among individuals reporting a "poor" health before the epidemic, those in situations of economic vulnerability were more likely to forgo care for fear of COVID-19 (+3.3), whereas the reverse was true among those with "excellent or very good" health (-2.4). These results suggest that social inequalities in access to care during the first epidemic wave were greater among the populations with the greatest needs, who were potentially the oldest individuals. As a result, the pandemic may increase social inequalities in health in the long term.

4. Discussion

The aim of this work was to investigate the social inequalities in access to healthcare during the first wave of the COVID-19 epidemic among older European adults.

Postponing planned care (25%) and forgoing healthcare for fear of infection (12%) were greater obstacles to accessing care for people over the age of 50 years than were difficulties in obtaining medical treatments due to the unavailability of health providers (5%). Barriers to accessing care have had greater effects on those who had the highest need and who used healthcare the most before the outbreak, in particular the oldest individuals. After adjusting for age, sex, relationship status, country, and care needs and utilisation before the pandemic, economically vulnerable individuals had an additional 1.0% risk of forgoing care for fear of contracting COVID-19 and an additional 0.9% risk of being unable to obtain a medical appointment when needed but did not have a significantly higher risk of experiencing care postponement.

The increased risk of forgoing care for fear of COVID-19 among the most economically vulnerable may be rooted in initial differences in health literacy – i.e., the capacity to obtain, communicate, process, and understand basic health information and services to make appropriate health decisions – (Sørensen et al., 2015) or the degree of risk aversion between wealthier and poorer individuals (Barsky et al., 1997).

Several factors may explain the higher probability of having tried unsuccessfully to obtain a medical appointment among the most economically vulnerable, even after controlling for their pre-pandemic care needs and utilisation. The poorest individuals may have been more discouraged by the difficulties caused by care rationing and the complexity of the steps that needed to be taken to obtain an appointment. Restrictions and shortages may have been more substantial for certain types of care that are more often used by the poorest population, such as hospital care or care delivered by public sector doctors. On the other hand, the deferral of previously scheduled care seems to have occurred more equally, with no observable difference according to the socio-economic status of the patients.

Social inequalities in access to care during the first wave of the epidemic emerged more distinctly among people initially in poor health for all three types of unmet needs. Among those in poor health at baseline, the economically vulnerable had a 3.5-point greater likelihood of experiencing the postponement of scheduled care, a 3.4-point greater likelihood of forgoing care for fear of COVID-19, and a 2.0-point greater likelihood of being unable to obtain a medical appointment. Thus, the reorganisation of health systems caused by the pandemic did not result in a prioritisation of care based exclusively on need and health status criteria, as social inequalities in access to care over the period could be observed in the sickest population.

The impact of economic vulnerability on unmet needs differed substantially among countries, with a notably low impact of economic vulnerability on the postponement of care and the unavailability of new appointments in Italy. However, the magnitude of social differences in unmet needs does not appear to have been exacerbated during the pandemic in the countries with the highest initial levels of social inequality in access to care or unmet needs. This finding would need to be examined in future research to shed light on the differences in social inequalities in access to care during the pandemic according to the organisation of health systems and the various strategies used to confront the pandemic in each country.

Besides the possible selection bias inherent in data obtained with a telephone survey such as SHARE Corona Survey, the questions used in this survey to measure unmet needs during the pandemic had never been tested before: it is unclear exactly how respondents understood these. The measurement of health also relied on the list of chronic diseases provided by SHARE, which, however broad, does not cover all chronic or acute conditions. Likewise, the use of a single subjective question on “difficulties making ends meet” to characterise economic vulnerability, although parsimonious and, in principle, entirely comparable across countries, could be questioned.

Despite these limitations, this work highlights the risk that these periods of care rationing may ultimately lead to an exacerbation of social inequalities in healthcare and in health. Data from the second wave of the SHARE Corona Survey will be valuable for studying the potential effects of unmet care needs on social inequalities in health in the long term.

References

- Allin S., Grignon M., & Le Grand J. (2010) Subjective unmet need and utilization of healthcare services in Canada: what are the equity implications? *Social Science & Medicine*, 70(3), 465-472.
DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.10.027.
- Barsky, R. B., Juster, F. T., Kimball, M. S., & Shapiro, M. D. (1997). Preference parameters and behavioural heterogeneity: An experimental approach in the health and retirement study. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2), 537-579.
- Bertier, M., Luyten, J., & Tubeuf, S. (2020), Renoncement aux soins médicaux durant le confinement au printemps 2020 en Belgique : effet de l'offre ou de la demande ? Université Catholique de Louvain. Mimeo.
- Börsch-Supan, A., M. Brandt, C. Hunkler, T. Kneip, J. Korbmacher, F. Malter, B. Schaan, S. Stuck, S. Zuber (2013). Data Resource Profile: The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). *International Journal of Epidemiology*. DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyt088
- Börsch-Supan, A. (2020). Survey of Health Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 8. Release version: 0. SHARE-ERIC. Preliminary data set.
- Chatterji P., & Li Y. (2020). Effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on outpatient providers in the US. *National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)*, Working Paper Series, No. 27173.
- CNAMTS (2020). L'actualité en quelques chiffres : les remboursements de soins du régime général à fin avril 2020.
- Czeisler M.E., Marynak, K., Clarke, K.E.N, Salah, Z., Shakya, I., Thierry, J.M, et al. (2020). Delay or Avoidance of Medical Care Because of COVID-19–Related Concerns. US Department of Health and Human Services / Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *MMWR (Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report)*, 69(36).
- De Luca, G. and Rossetti, C. (2018). Stata program to compute calibrated weights from scientific use file and additional database. *SERISS report D2.10*.
- DeSalvo, K. B., Fan, V. S., McDonell, M. B., & Fihn, S. D. (2005). Predicting mortality and healthcare utilization with a single question. *Health services research*, 40(4), 1234-1246.
- Dourgnon P., Jusot F., Fantin R. (2012), Payer nuit gravement à la santé : une étude de l'impact du renoncement financier aux soins sur l'état de santé, *Economie Publique*, 28-29, 123-147.
- Fahey, T. (2007) The case for an EU-wide measure of poverty. *European Sociological Review*, 23 (1): 35-47
- Goedhart, T., Halberstadt, V., Kapteyn, A., & Van Praag, B. (1977). The poverty line: concept and measurement. *Journal of Human Resources*, 503-520.
- Gonzalez, D., Zuckerman, S., Kenney, G.M, & Karpman, M. (2020). Almost Half of Adults in Families Losing Work during the Pandemic Avoided Healthcare Because of Costs or COVID-19 Concerns. *Urban Institute*, Policy brief, July 2020.
- Hanna, T. P., Evans, G. A., & Booth, C. M. (2020). Cancer, COVID-19 and the precautionary principle: prioritizing treatment during a global pandemic. *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology*, 17(5), 268-270.
- Hartnett, K.P., Kite-Powell, A., DeVies, J., Coletta, M.A., Boehmer, T.K., Adjemian, J., Gundlapalli, A.V. (2020). Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Emergency Department Visits — United States, January 1, 2019 – May 30, 2020. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)*, 69(23), 699–704
- Idler, E. L., & Benyamini, Y. (1997). Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 21-37.
- Jürges H., & Stella L. (2019). The social dynamics of unmet need, catastrophic healthcare expenses and satisfaction with health insurance coverage in Börsch-Supan, A., J. Bristle, K. Andersen-Ranberg, A. Brugiavini, F. Jusot, H. Litwin, G. Weber (Eds.) (2019). *Health and Socio-Economic Status over the Life Course. First Results from SHARE Waves 6 and 7*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ko H., (2016). Unmet healthcare needs and health status: Panel evidence from Korea. *Health policy*, 120(6), 646-653.

- Kranz, A.M., Gahlon, G., Dick, A.W., & Stein, B.D. (2021). Characteristics of US Adults Delaying Dental Care Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JDR Clinical & Translational Research*, 6(1), 8-14. DOI: 10.1177/2380084420962778.
- Litwin, H., & Sapir, E. V. (2009). Forgone healthcare due to cost among older adults in European countries and in Israel. *European journal of ageing*; 6(3), 167-176.
- Maringe, C., Spicer, J., Morris, M., Purushotham, A., Nolte, E., Sullivan, R., Aggarwal, A. (2020). The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer deaths due to delays in diagnosis in England, UK: a national, population-based, modelling study. *The Lancet oncology*, 21(8), 1023-1034.
- Marmot, M., Friel, S., Bell, R., Houweling, T., Taylor, S., & the Commission on Social Determinants of Health (2008). Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health. *The Lancet*, 372, 1661-1669.
- Marmot M. and Bell R. (2016). Social inequalities in health: a proper concern of epidemiology. *Ann Epidemiol.*, 26(4), 238-40.
- Mehrotra, A., Chernew, M., Linetsky, D., Hatch, H. & Cutler, D. (2020). The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Outpatient Visits: A Rebound Emerges, *Commonwealth Fund*, To the Point (blog). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26099/ds9e-jm36>
- Negopdiev, D., Collaborative, C., & Hoste, E. (2020). Elective surgery cancellations due to the COVID-19 pandemic: global predictive modelling to inform surgical recovery plans. *British Journal of Surgery*, 107(11), 1440-1449.
- NHS (2020). A&E Attendances and Emergency Admissions 2020-21. NHS data collection. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/ae-waiting-times-and-activity/ae-attendances-and-emergency-admissions-2020-21/>
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2019). Health for Everyone? Social Inequalities in Health and Health Systems. *OECD Health Policy Studies*.
- World Health Organisation (WHO) (2020). Pulse survey on continuity of essential health services during the COVID-19 pandemic: *interim report, 27 August 2020*. World Health Organization. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/334048>.
- Pikoulis, E., Solomos, Z., Riza, E., Puthooppambal, S. J., Pikoulis, A., Karamagioli, E., & Puchner, K. P. (2020). Gathering evidence on the decreased emergency room visits during the coronavirus disease 19 pandemic. *Public Health*, 185, 42.
- Rosenbaum, L. (2020). Facing Covid-19 in Italy—ethics, logistics, and therapeutics on the epidemic's front line. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(20), 1873-1875.
- Scherpenzeel, A., Axt, K., Bergmann, M., Douhou, S., Oepen, A., Sand, G., Schuller, K., Stuck, S., Wagner, M., & Börsch-Supan, A. (2020). Collecting survey data among the 50+ population during the COVID-19 outbreak: The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). *Survey Research Methods*, 14(2), 217-221.
- Sørreide, K., Hallet, J., Matthews, J. B., Schnitzbauer, A. A., Line, P. D., Lai, P. B. S., ... & Teh, C. S. (2020). Immediate and long-term impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on delivery of surgical services. *The British journal of surgery*.
- Sørensen, K., Pelikan, J.M, Röthlin, F., Ganahl, K., Slonska, Z., Doyle, G., et al. on behalf of the HLS-EU Consortium, Health literacy in Europe: comparative results of the European health literacy survey (HLS-EU). *European Journal of Public Health*, 25(6), 1053-58, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckv043>
- Williamson, E. J., Walker, A. J., Bhaskaran, K., Bacon, S., Bates, C., Morton, C. E., ... & Cockburn, J. (2020). Factors associated with COVID-19-related death using OpenSAFELY. *Nature*, 584(7821), 430-436.
- Zheng Z., Peng F., Xu B., Zhao J., Liu H., ..., Tang W., 2020, Risk factors of critical & mortal COVID-19 cases: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Infection*, 81(2): 16-25.
- Zhou F., Yu T., Du R., Fan G., ..., Cao B., 2020, Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study, *The Lancet*, 395(10229): 1054-1062.
- Ziedan, E., Simon, K.I. & Wing, C. (2020) Effects of State COVID-19 Closure Policy on NON-COVID-19 Healthcare Utilization. *National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)*, Working Paper Series, No. 27621.

Tables & Figures

Table 1 – Sample description, baseline healthcare needs and utilisation, and unmet needs during the first wave of the epidemic stratified by economic vulnerability

	All respondents	Not economically vulnerable (individuals WITHOUT difficulties in making ends meet)	Economically vulnerable (individuals WITH difficulties in making ends meet)	Statistical significance of the difference between economically vulnerable and not vulnerable
N	31,928	19,447	12,481	
Weighted N (in million)	171.5	109.8	61.7	
Unmet healthcare needs during the first epidemic wave				
Forgoing medical care because of the fear of contracting COVID-19 (%)	12	12	12	NS
Planned care postponed by the healthcare provider (%)	25	26	22	***
Impossibility of obtaining medical appointment/treatment (%)	5	5	6	**
Main characteristics before outbreak				
Age (mean)	66.3	66.6	65.8	***
Aged 65 years or older (%)	48	50	45	***
Women (%)	54	52	56	**
In a relationship (%)	64	67	60	***
Employed, among those aged 50-64 years (%)	62	71	47	***
Economic vulnerability (%)	36			
Health status and healthcare utilisation before outbreak				
Diagnosed with a chronic condition or regular medication (%)	83	82	85	*
Chronic condition linked with severe COVID-19 (%)	59	56	65	***
Obesity: body mass index (BMI) \geq 30 (%)	23	20	26	***
Self-assessed health: fair or poor (%)	37	30	49	***
Number of contacts with a GP in the last 12 months (%)	4.1	3.6	4.9	***
Number of contacts with a specialist in the last 12 months (%)	2.7	2.6	2.8	NS
Visited a dentist in the last 12 months (%)	57	68	37	***

Data: Preliminary SHARE wave 8 release 0. Conclusions are preliminary. *Sample:* N = 31,928 respondents in 26 countries.

Notes: weighted frequencies; Student's t-tests were performed to test the equality of means for continuous variables, and Pearson's chi2 tests were performed for binary variables; * p-value < 0.1 ** p-value < 0.05 *** p-value < 0.01, NS: no significant difference

Table 2 – Unmet healthcare needs during the first wave of the epidemic by country

	Forgoing medical care because of the fear of COVID-19 (%)	Planned care postponed (%)	Impossibility of obtaining medical appointment / treatment (%)
All countries	12	25	5
DE	17	19	3
SE	16	18	4
NL	5	28	3
ES	4	25	4
IT	17	26	7
FR	10	36	10
DK	10	31	4
GR	16	11	5
CH	14	28	3
BE	12	35	9
IL	27	24	9
CZ	19	37	3
PL	9	28	6
LU	23	54	7
HU	6	22	4
SL	4	33	3
EE	10	24	8
HR	9	23	3
LT	14	28	12
BG	10	1	1
CY	11	15	4
FI	8	19	5
LV	13	14	5
MT	11	36	3
RO	6	8	6
SK	15	20	5

Data: Preliminary SHARE wave 8 release 0. Conclusions are preliminary. Sample: N = 31,928 respondents in 26 countries.

Notes: weighted frequencies.


Table 3 – Effects on the probability of unmet healthcare needs during the first wave of the epidemic

	Forgoing medical care because of the fear of COVID-19		Planned care postponed		Impossibility of obtaining medical appointment / treatment	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
Age: 65-69 (<i>Ref. 50-64</i>)	0.011**	0.003	0.012*	-0.005	0.001	-0.002
Age: 70-74 (<i>Ref. 50-64</i>)	0.017***	0.003	0.016**	-0.014*	-0.002	-0.008**
Age: 75-79 (<i>Ref. 50-64</i>)	0.016***	-0.003	0.025***	-0.014*	-0.002	-0.010**
Age: 80-84 (<i>Ref. 50-64</i>)	0.023***	0.001	-0.008	-0.046***	-0.002	-0.010**
Age: 85+ (<i>Ref. 50-64</i>)	-0.008	-0.025***	-0.057***	-0.080***	-0.014***	-0.020***
Women	0.046***	0.041***	0.029***	0.020***	0.005**	0.003
In a relationship	0.003	0.002	0.004	-0.002	0.001	0.001
Economic vulnerability	0.019***	0.010**	0.006	-0.007	0.013***	0.009***
1+ chronic condition linked with severe COVID-19		0.010**		0.041***		0.002
1+ other chronic condition		0.031***		0.045***		0.012***
BMI ≥ 30		0.004		0.002		0.001
Self-assessed health: Excellent or very good (<i>Ref. good</i>)		-0.018***		-0.011*		-0.006*
Self-assessed health: fair (<i>Ref. good</i>)		0.021***		0.027***		0.007**
Self-assessed health: poor (<i>Ref. good</i>)		0.026***		0.028***		0.014***
Contacts with a GP: 1 or 2 (<i>Ref. 0</i>)		0.006		0.051***		0.008**
Contacts with a GP: 3 to 5 (<i>Ref. 0</i>)		0.013**		0.048***		0.008*
Contacts with a GP: 6+ (<i>Ref. 0</i>)		0.011		0.059***		0.013***
Contacts with a specialist: 1 or 2 (<i>Ref. 0</i>)		0.035***		0.085***		0.013***
Contacts with a specialist: 3 to -5 (<i>Ref. 0</i>)		0.048***		0.146***		0.022***
Contacts with a specialist: 6+ (<i>Ref. 0</i>)		0.054***		0.187***		0.035***
Have seen a dentist		0.023***		0.065***		0.012***
Country fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Data: Preliminary SHARE wave 8 release 0. Conclusions are preliminary. Sample: N = 31,928 respondents in 26 countries.

*Notes: (unweighted) models including all countries; average marginal effects displayed; * p-value < 0.1 ** p-value < 0.05 *** p-value < 0.01*

Figure 1 – Probability of having forgone medical treatment for fear of COVID-19: effect of economic vulnerability by country (full model)




How to read: The results are expressed as average marginal effects, which can be understood as percentage points of increase/decrease in the probability of the outcome.

Data: Preliminary SHARE wave 8 release 0. Conclusions are preliminary. *Sample:* N = 31,928 respondents in 26 countries.

Notes: Full models were estimated country by country; BG was excluded (too few individuals had a medical appointment postponed); the error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 2 – Probability of having had planned medical care postponed: effect of economic vulnerability by country (full model)




How to read: The results are expressed as average marginal effects, which can be understood as percentage points of increase/decrease in the probability of the outcome.

Data: Preliminary SHARE wave 8 release 0. Conclusions are preliminary. *Sample:* N = 31,928 respondents in 26 countries.

Notes: Full models were estimated country by country; BG was excluded (too few individuals had a medical appointment postponed); the error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3 – Probability of having been unable to obtain a medical appointment/treatment: effect of economic vulnerability, by country (full model)




How to read: The results are expressed as average marginal effects, which can be understood as percentage points of increase/decrease in the probability of the outcome.

Data: Preliminary SHARE wave 8 release 0. Conclusions are preliminary. *Sample:* N = 31,928 respondents in 26 countries.

Notes: Full models were estimated country by country; BG was excluded (too few individuals had a medical appointment postponed); the error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 4 –Effects of economic vulnerability on unmet healthcare needs according to baseline self-assessed health (all countries)



How to read: The results are expressed as average marginal effects, which can be understood as percentage points of increase/decrease in the probability of the outcome.

Data: Preliminary SHARE wave 8 release 0. Conclusions are preliminary. *Sample:* N = 31,928 respondents in 26 countries.

Notes: Full models including all countries and adjusted for differences in unmet needs due to age, sex, relationship status (living alone or not), country of residence and for baseline differences in health care needs and utilisation; the error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.