

This is a repository copy of *Socioeconomic inequalities in health care in England*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/135817/>

Version: Published Version

Monograph:

Cookson, Richard Andrew orcid.org/0000-0003-0052-996X, Propper, Carol, Asaria, Miqdad orcid.org/0000-0002-3538-4417 et al. (1 more author) (2016) Socioeconomic inequalities in health care in England. Discussion Paper. CHE Research Paper . Centre for Health Economics, University of York , York, UK.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.


Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Centre For Health Economics

UNIVERSITY *of* York



Socioeconomic Inequalities in Health Care in England

Richard Cookson, Carol Propper,
Miqdad Asaria, Rosalind Raine

CHE Research Paper 129

Socioeconomic inequalities in health care in England

¹Richard Cookson

²Carol Propper

¹Miqdad Asaria

³Rosalind Raine

¹Centre for Health Economics, University of York, York, UK

²Business School, Imperial College London and Centre for Market and Public Organisation, University of Bristol and CEPR

³Department of Applied Health Research, University College London

April 2016

Background to series

CHE Discussion Papers (DPs) began publication in 1983 as a means of making current research material more widely available to health economists and other potential users. So as to speed up the dissemination process, papers were originally published by CHE and distributed by post to a worldwide readership.

The CHE Research Paper series takes over that function and provides access to current research output via web-based publication, although hard copy will continue to be available (but subject to charge).

Acknowledgements

We thank Antonio Rojas-Garcia for his help with the literature searching, and Josie Dixon, Julian Le Grand and an anonymous referee for helpful comments, though the authors take full responsibility for all remaining errors and omissions. Financial support is from an ESRC Professorial Fellowship to Propper (ES/J023108/1) and a NIHR Senior Research Fellowship to Cookson (SRF-2013-06-015). The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health.

Further copies

Copies of this paper are freely available to download from the CHE website www.york.ac.uk/che/publications/. Access to downloaded material is provided on the understanding that it is intended for personal use. Copies of downloaded papers may be distributed to third-parties subject to the proviso that the CHE publication source is properly acknowledged and that such distribution is not subject to any payment.

Printed copies are available on request at a charge of £5.00 per copy. Please contact the CHE Publications Office, email che-pub@york.ac.uk, telephone 01904 321405 for further details.

Centre for Health Economics
Alcuin College
University of York
York, UK
www.york.ac.uk/che

Abstract

This paper reviews what is known about socioeconomic inequalities in health care in England, with particular attention to inequalities relative to need that may be considered unfair ('inequities'). We call inequalities of 5% or less between most and least deprived socioeconomic quintile groups 'slight'; inequalities of 6-15% 'moderate', and inequalities of > 15% 'substantial'. Overall public health care expenditure is substantially concentrated on poorer people. At any given age, poorer people are more likely to see their family doctor, have a public outpatient appointment, visit accident and emergency, and stay in hospital for publicly funded inpatient treatment. After allowing for current self-assessed health and morbidity, there is slight pro-rich inequity in combined public and private medical specialist visits but not family doctor visits. There are also slight pro-rich inequities in overall indicators of clinical process quality and patient experience from public health care, substantial pro-rich inequalities in bereaved people's experiences of health and social care for recently deceased relatives, and mostly slight but occasionally substantial pro-rich inequities in the use of preventive care (e.g. dental checkups, eye tests, screening and vaccination) and a few specific treatments (e.g. hip and knee replacement). Studies of population health care outcomes (e.g. avoidable emergency hospitalisation) find substantial pro-rich inequality after adjusting for age and sex only. These findings are all consistent with a broad economic framework that sees health care as just one input into the production of health, alongside many other socioeconomically patterned inputs including environmental factors (e.g. living and working conditions), consumption (e.g. diet, smoking), self care (e.g. seeking medical information) and informal care (e.g. support from family and friends).

JEL classification: I18

Keywords: health care, inequalities, socioeconomic factors

1. Introduction

This paper reviews evidence on socioeconomic inequalities in health care in England, a country which consistently comes near the top of international league tables of equity in health care financing (Davis et al. 2014; Schoen & Osborn 2010; World Health Organization 2000; Van Doorslaer et al. 1999). Benefit incidence studies show that public health care expenditure in England and other high income countries disproportionately benefits poorer people (Kelly et al. 2016). However, this does not necessarily mean that health care is distributed fairly in relation to need, since poorer people tend to be sicker and so have greater need for health care. So our review pays close attention to empirical studies that have attempted to allow for need in order to assess how far socioeconomic differences in health care may be considered unfair or inequitable.

England's tax-funded National Health Service (NHS) provides a relatively generous package of health care, free at the point of use, which makes up nearly 85% of national health care expenditure. Whilst the level of public funding is high, however, England is not an outlier. All high income countries offer their citizens a substantial package of publicly funded health care, including countries with relatively low shares of public expenditure on health such as the US and Chile, who spend just under 50% compared with the OECD average of 72% in 2012 (OECD 2014). While all health care systems in wealthy countries have equity goals relating to access to, and/or delivery of, health care as well as its financing (Van Doorslaer et al. 1999; Wagstaff & Van Doorslaer 2000), the English NHS is unusual in also having explicit policy objectives relating to reducing inequalities in health care outcomes. These objectives were first articulated in 2000 (Department of Health 2000) and formalised in the 2012 Health and Social Care Act.¹

Associated with these policy goals is a large literature on the distribution of health care and of health in the UK and England. In this review we confine our attention primarily to the literature on inequalities which takes an economics perspective. Under this umbrella we focus mainly on health care and present studies of departures from equality in health care supply, utilisation, expenditure and quality. We also devote some space to recent literature on patient health outcomes. We do not review evidence of inequality in health care financing since the NHS is largely funded through general taxation and few people in England report financial difficulties in paying health care bills or face catastrophic medical expenditures (Schoen & Osborn 2010; Davis et al. 2014).

We focus on variations in health care associated with socioeconomic characteristics related to ability to pay, such as income, education, deprivation and social class, although there is also evidence of social inequality by other individual characteristics such as ethnicity (Szczepura 2005), geographical location (Hacking et al. 2011), age (Raine et al. 2009), gender (Raine et al. 2010), veteran status (Bedard & Deschenes 2006), type of illness (Emerson & Baines, 2011; Lawrence & Kisely, 2010), and other aspects of disadvantage or vulnerability (Parry et al. 2007; Dixon-Woods et al. 2006). As shorthand we use the term 'poor' in a broad sense to mean 'socioeconomically disadvantaged'.

We update previous reviews of studies of health care inequalities in England published in the 1990s and early 2000s (Goddard & Smith 2001; Dixon et al. 2007; Dixon-Woods et al. 2006) by identifying major national studies conducted subsequently. We also draw on major cross-country studies and reviews of evidence in the US (Fiscella et al. 2000; Starfield 2006; Macinko & Starfield 2002; Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality 2014). However, our aim is to identify stylised facts about

¹ This legislation placed a duty upon NHS health care payers in England to 'have regard to the need to (a) reduce inequalities between patients with respect to their ability to access health services; and (b) reduce inequalities between patients with respect to the outcomes achieved for them by the provision of health services' (Department of Health 2012).

health care inequalities rather than to conduct a systematic review of this large, diverse and multi-disciplinary empirical literature.

We start by reviewing general population studies that aim to provide a comprehensive picture of inequality in the health care sector as a whole, across a broad range of different clinical conditions. We then include a selection of recent national studies of inequalities in services for specific clinical conditions, which are reasonably representative of the literature. We focus on three common and high profile conditions: cancer, circulatory disease and osteoarthritis. Cancer and circulatory disease are policy priorities due to their high mortality rates and cost, and osteoarthritis due to long hospital waiting times for hip and knee joint replacement. We also present selected studies of preventative services such as screening for cervical cancer, which are particularly prone to pro-rich inequality for reasons to do with health production that are explained in the next section. We do not review studies of inequality in long-term care, such as home care and residential nursing home services for the elderly. In England, public funding for long-term care is means tested and services are organised separately from the NHS as part of local government social care services.

Almost all the evidence we cite focuses on publicly funded NHS health care, since data on privately funded health care are generally not available from routine administrative data and only sometimes included in survey data. This is a limitation, since privately funded care makes up a substantial proportion of elective hospital care for low-risk procedures and some forms of preventive care such as diagnostic tests and dentistry. Furthermore, as elaborated below, important non-medical forms of prevention are privately funded such as housing quality, food quality, gym memberships and so on.

Wherever possible we seek to cite simple measures of relative inequality that are easy to compare across studies of different kinds of health care, such as relative gaps between the most and least socioeconomically disadvantaged quintile groups of people in England. We call inequalities of 5% or less between most and least deprived socioeconomic quintile groups 'slight'; inequalities of 6-15% 'moderate', and inequalities of > 15% 'substantial'. These criteria are arbitrary, but at least they are explicit and help us to achieve a degree of consistency in our conclusions about the size of different inequalities. Even this simple classification is not always possible, however, since there is substantial reporting diversity in the literature. For example, much of the health economics literature only reports concentration indices, which are hard to interpret, and much of the health services research literature only reports odds ratios from logistic regression, which unlike rate ratios and relative risks can be misleading without knowing baseline risks. There is also reporting diversity due to different units of analysis (e.g. individual, household, small area, large area), different data sources (e.g. whole-population administrative data versus sample survey data) and different methods of adjusting for need (e.g. direct versus indirect standardisation and different sets of need variables). Another key limitation is that the vast majority of studies continue to be snapshots of a particular population at a particular point in time rather than comparative studies. Few studies compare health care equity in England at different points in time, few compare England with other countries, and so far none have performed detailed comparisons of socioeconomic equity in health care between different local areas of England. This makes it hard to draw conclusions about how far inequities are changing over time, how well England is performing on equity in health care compared with other countries, and whether some areas of England are succeeding better than others at tackling health care inequities.

Finally, almost all the empirical research focuses on health care received during a particular period rather than over the course of individual lifetimes. This absence of a lifetime perspective means that issues such as poor health leading to low incomes, or low incomes leading to later poor health, are

not addressed by studies which focus on whether care currently is allocated according to current need, or whether this allocation favours the currently poor or the currently rich.

2. Equity studies and the health production approach

We begin by outlining how socioeconomic inequalities in health care fit into the broader economic approach that treats health care as one of many inputs into the production of individual health. The approach was introduced by Grossman (Grossman 1972) and focuses on adult health, taking income as given.² The basic insight was that health care is an input into a production process rather than a final good. Medical treatment itself is often time-consuming and unpleasant – i.e. more like a ‘bad’ than a ‘good’. What an individual values as a final good is health. Health demand consists of two elements. The first is a consumption effect: health yields direct utility i.e. individuals feel better when they are healthier. The second is an investment effect (and the novel part of the model): that health increases the number of days available to participate in market and non-market activities.

In a simple production function approach, focusing on adult health under conditions of certainty, individuals get utility from a composite consumption good, Z and their health stock, H , which depreciates over time at a rate δ :

$$(1) \quad U_t = u(H_t, Z_t; s)$$

$$(2) \quad H_{t+1} - H_t = I_t - \delta H_t$$

The household production function for health is:

$$(3) \quad I_t = f(M_t, T_H; E_t)$$

and for consumption goods is:

$$(4) \quad Z_t = f(X_t, T_C; E_t)$$

where I = investment in health, M = market inputs including medical care, T_H = time spent on improving health, X = market produced goods, T_C = time spent on composite consumption good, E = a vector of factors that affect the production function including education and environment, s = vector of tastes and t = time.³

While the basic model is not primarily focused on the issue of socio-economic inequalities in health (and ignores any causal link between health and future income) its components make clear that departures from the allocation of current health care according to current need may arise for (at least) two different types of reason.

First, individuals will vary in their taste for health and consumption. Variation in taste means individuals will choose different levels of investment in health (including medical care) depending on their tastes as well as their resource constraints. This is not necessarily inequitable.

² The model has been developed to accommodate the growing body of evidence about the importance of physiological and skills development in early life (Galama & Kippersluis 2013; Almond & Currie 2011).

³ This basic model has been extended to incorporate uncertainty (Dardanoni & Wagstaff 1990), which is central to certain forms of health care such as screening and diagnosis that are essentially about reducing uncertainty; and to incorporate pre-adulthood stages of life. Current models of health and human capital development during the early years of life emphasise (1) the role of ‘in utero’ nutrition and physiological development on outcomes in later life, and (2) the role of families and childhood environments in shaping skills and character traits that influence both income and health in later life (Heckman 2012; Heckman & Mosso 2014; Almond et al. 2014; Fogel 2003; Galama & Kippersluis 2013)

Second, health involves many inputs. Other inputs into health production include health-related consumption such as diet, physical activity, smoking, drinking, narcotic use, etc. The ability to produce health from a given set of inputs will depend on the individual's knowledge (education) and the environment they face, including health-related factors such as living and working conditions, stressful aspects of the social and economic environment, air pollution, noise pollution, water pollution, transport safety, violent crime etc. Thus even if health care prices are set to zero, there are many other factors that may lead to socioeconomic inequality in health and in the receipt of health care. First, poorer (socioeconomically disadvantaged) individuals will have fewer resources (wealth, human and social capital) to invest in the production of health. Thus a unit of medical care will be less beneficial than for a richer individual who will have more resources to utilise alongside that medical care. Second, the nature of a low income individual's employment and lives may also mean they are heavily time constrained. If so, this will raise the relative prices of time inputs for them and they may therefore value the opportunity costs from using health care (e.g. time away from domestic and work duties, travel costs) more highly than the potential health gains, particularly when considering investments in health such as preventative care. Thus poorer individuals may tend to use less preventive health care when facing no immediate pain or disability, and present to health care providers at a later stage of illness. This will mean that when they finally access health care they will be in greater need and require more health care inputs. Third, the quality of care received may depend in part upon the intensity and effectiveness of care seeking behaviour, for example in navigating through a complex health care system and lobbying providers for the best quality care. Again, individuals with fewer resources will be less equipped to undertake such activity. All these reasons mean that we would expect, even in a system with zero monetary prices, to see poorer individuals having a greater need for care, and to require more health care relative to that need. To the extent that measures of inequities do not take into account the resources required by the individual to use health care inputs, they will present an overly positive picture of inequities in the receipt of care.

3. Measuring inequities in health care

The empirical literature on social inequality in health care usually adopts a normative perspective that seeks to distinguish ‘appropriate’ or ‘fair’ inequalities in health care from ‘inappropriate’ or ‘unfair’ inequalities. To mark this distinction, it is common in the literature to use the word ‘inequities’ (in Europe) or ‘disparities’ (in the US) to mean ‘unfair’ social inequalities in health care; though there is considerable variation in usage (O’Donnell & Doorslaer 2008; Fleurbaey & Schokkaert 2009; Gravelle et al. 2006). The basic idea is to measure departures from ‘horizontal equity’ – the appropriately equal treatment of people who are alike in relevant respects. Most authors in this literature define horizontal equity in health care in terms of the principle of ‘equal access for equal need’ – that citizens with equal need for health care should have equal access to high quality care (Goddard & Smith 2001; Fiscella et al. 2000). Some authors argue that the appropriate objective should be the more demanding one of equal utilisation for equal need (O’Donnell & Doorslaer 2008; Sen 2002b). However, other authors argue that it is important to respect individual preferences about how far to seek, accept and adhere to needed health care (Fleurbaey & Schokkaert 2011). In practice, the empirical literature has focused on equality of utilisation, and interpreted this either as the relevant equity objective or as a proxy for equality of access.⁴

To measure departures from horizontal equity, the basic research strategy is to measure cross sectional associations between a socioeconomic variable (e.g. income) and a health care variable (e.g. doctor visits) after adjusting for ‘appropriate’ or ‘fair’ differences due to differences in individual needs and, in some cases, preferences (Fleurbaey & Schokkaert 2011). This is methodologically challenging for several reasons.

The appropriate magnitude of adjustment for ‘fair’ differences requires a potentially contestable normative assumption about how far people with different needs and preferences should be treated differently (Sutton 2002; Morris et al. 2005). This is an assumption about ‘vertical equity’ – the appropriately different treatment of people who differ in relevant respects. Except in rare cases where it is reasonable to assume that all individuals have identical needs and preferences for health care, it is not possible to measure horizontal equity in health care without making a normative assumption about vertical equity. The simplest and most common vertical equity assumption is that the current population average relationship between need and utilisation is appropriate (i.e. ‘on average, the system gets it right’). This assumption implies that need adjustment should be performed by estimating needed health care using population average reference values of non-need characteristics. An alternative assumption is that the need-utilisation relationship among socioeconomically advantaged individuals is appropriate (i.e. ‘the system gets it right for socioeconomically advantaged patients’). Different vertical equity assumptions involving different reference values are also possible, as are assumptions based on expert opinion about what the need-utilisation relationship should ideally be, rather than data on what it currently is (Fleurbaey & Schokkaert 2011).

Another problem is that data on health care needs are often limited and may under-estimate the additional needs of socioeconomically disadvantaged individuals (Cookson et al. 2012). Data for the empirical studies of departures from equity in health care tend to be drawn either from household

⁴ Going the further step of measuring access by explicitly modelling individual choice behaviour is considerably more demanding in terms of data requirements. However, it can potentially yield useful information about how far departures from the equity goal arise because of behaviour on the part of individuals or the behaviour of suppliers. For example, a recent study found that only a small proportion of pro-rich inequalities in waiting times for heart procedures in England can be explained by patient choice of hospital and treatment (Moscelli et al. 2015).

survey data or administrative data (primarily routine hospital data, but also care in primary settings and specialised clinical registry data for particular conditions). One common limitation in both kinds of data is lack of detailed information on either stage of illness or multi-morbidity (the combination of multiple diseases in the same individual), both of which may tend to be more severe in deprived individuals (Shadmi 2013; Charlton et al. 2013; McLean et al. 2014). A particular limitation in survey data is reporting bias in measures of self-reported health, whereby disadvantaged individuals tend to self-report better subjective health despite having worse 'objective' disease status from an external clinical perspective. This applies both to general measures of health and to reports of specific health conditions (e.g. Bago d'Uva et al. 2009; Bago D'Uva et al. 2008; Sen 2002a; Johnston et al 2009; Johnston et al. 2010).

Another limitation of general household survey data is that sample size limitations preclude studies of inequalities in the use of specific health care technologies for specific conditions (Cookson et al. 2012). Although administrative data have larger sample sizes they have limited measures of ability to pay. For example, UK administrative data on health do not include measures of patient or household ability to pay and have not been matched to other administrative data that provide such measures such as tax records. The approach taken in all administrative data studies in England is to proxy ability to pay by measures of the socio-economic status of the population of the area in which the patient lives. Most studies in England since 2001 have used variants of the 'Index of Multiple Deprivation' based on just over 32,000 English small area neighbourhoods of approximately 1,500 people (minimum 1,000 and maximum 3,000) that were introduced in the 2001 census. Area deprivation is correlated with individual socioeconomic status, due to house price differentials and wealth-related housing segregation. However, the correlation is imperfect – rich individuals may live in deprived areas and poor individuals may live in non-deprived areas. Furthermore, there are potential biases due to migration and consequent change in the individual level composition of areas over time.

Another challenge is heterogeneity in needs and preferences between individuals. This can mean, for example, that the degree of horizontal inequity may vary between groups of individuals (Raine 2002).⁵ So an overall estimate of horizontal inequity that aggregates across different types of patient without explicitly modelling the interactions between need, preferences and socioeconomic status may suffer from a composition effect. Finally, almost all analyses to date take current income and need (however defined) as given and have examined departures from equity at one point in time. If there is pro-rich inequality at all ages then a cross-sectional snapshot will underestimate the extent to which health care is pro-rich. More broadly, they do not take into account the dynamic relationship between health and ability to pay.

As a result of these methodological challenges, it is often hard to draw clear normative conclusions about 'horizontal inequity' as opposed to positive conclusions about inequality.

⁵ For example, there might be substantial horizontal inequity between rich and poor patients with mildly elevated blood pressure (a 'low' level of need) but no horizontal inequity among patients with severe heart disease (a 'high' level of need).

4. Findings

4.1 General population studies of the whole health care sector

Most economic studies focus on the general population, and seek to provide a comprehensive picture of health care inequality across the health care sector as a whole. We review general population studies under three categories: (i) health care quantity (including supply, utilisation and expenditure), (ii) health care quality (including process quality and patient experience), and (iii) health care outcomes.

4.1.1 Health care quantity

Table 1 summarises selected recent national studies of socioeconomic inequality in overall health care supply, utilisation and expenditure in England.

Data on overall health care supply – e.g. funding allocations, workforce, hospital beds, high-tech hospital equipment – are typically collected at the level of large administrative areas or hospitals. This data can be used to analyse inequality in large area supply relative to need, by using large area level measures of need based on variables such as mortality, self-assessed morbidity, disease prevalence, and proxies for morbidity such as emergency hospital admissions and pharmaceutical utilisation. For example, studies have looked at inequality between large areas in GP supply relative to need, finding persistent inequalities from 1974 to 1995 (Gravelle & Sutton, 2001) and from 2002 to 2006 (Goddard et al. 2010). Large area studies cannot accurately pinpoint socioeconomic inequality, however, much of which lies within the large and socioeconomically diverse populations of administrative areas. To address this issue, a recent study has exploited the availability of data on family doctor or ‘general practitioner’ (GP) supply at neighbourhood level, by linking clinic level workforce data with data on the neighbourhood of residence of each registered patient from 2004/5 to 2011/12 (Asaria, Cookson, et al. 2016). This study adjusted for need based on age, sex and neighbourhood ill-health, using the ‘Carr-Hill’ workload adjustment derived from estimates of the impact of these variables on GP workload. It found that adjusted supply of GPs per 1,000 population exhibited slight pro-rich inequality in 2004/5, but that this had reversed by 2011/12 to slight pro-poor inequality. The authors concluded that equity in GP supply had improved during this period, but that the Carr-Hill approach to need adjustment is insufficiently accurate to draw firm conclusions about levels of inequity.

Data on health care utilisation in England are available from both household sample surveys and whole-population hospital administrative datasets. Studies using survey data have examined family doctor visits, medical specialist visits and hospital visits, with the latter often split into outpatient visits, day case and inpatient hospital admissions. These studies typically find pro-poor variation in family doctor visits, though this typically disappears after adjusting for need. One study with detailed need adjustment uses data from 1998, 1999 and 2000 from the Health Survey for England, and adjusts for age, sex, self-reported health, self-reported diagnoses of longstanding illnesses and small area (ward) level indicators of mortality and illness (Morris et al., 2005). It finds that richer and more highly educated individuals are less likely to visit their GP, but that after need adjustment the association with income becomes non-significant though not the association with education. This cannot be interpreted as inequity favouring less educated individuals, however, since need for doctor visits in socioeconomically disadvantaged individuals is likely under-estimated as explained above in Section 2. Furthermore, these data do not allow for the length and quality of family doctor

Table 1: Inequality in overall healthcare supply, utilisation and expenditure in England – selected recent national studies

Healthcare Variable (and Data Type)	Data Years	Need Adjustment Variables (and Data Type)	Findings	Publication
Supply				
NHS family doctors (GPs) per general population (admin data)	2004/5 to 2011/12	Age, sex, small area health (admin data)	Slight pro-rich inequality in 2004/5 switching slightly pro-poor from 2010/11	Asaria, Ali et al. 2016
Utilisation				
NHS family doctor (GP) visits (HSE survey data)	1998-2000	Age, sex, self-assessed health and morbidity, small area health (survey data)	No significant rich-poor inequality but slight anti-educated inequality	Morris et al. 2005
Medical specialist consultations, inc. private (BHPS survey data)	2009	Age, sex, self-assessed health	Slight pro-rich inequality	Devaux 2015
NHS outpatient hospital utilisation (admin data)	2000/1 to 2008/9	Small area age, sex and chronic condition prevalence (admin data)	Moderate pro-poor inequality	Cookson et al. 2012
NHS non-emergency inpatient hospital utilisation (admin data)	2000/1 to 2008/9	Small area age, sex and chronic condition prevalence (admin data)	Moderate pro-poor inequality	Cookson et al. 2012
Expenditure				
NHS inpatient hospital costs (including emergency) (admin data)	2010/11 to 2014/15	No need adjustment (admin data)	Substantial pro-poor inequality e.g. relative gap of 22% between most and least deprived fifths of patients aged over 65 (£4,146 vs. £5,605)	Kelly et al. 2016 (in this special issue)
NHS inpatient hospital costs (including emergency) (admin data)	2011/12	No need adjustment (admin data)	Substantial pro-poor inequality e.g. relative gap of 31% between most and least deprived fifths of all-age population (£597 vs. £455)	Asaria, Doran and Cookson (forthcoming)

consultations.⁶ Finally, these studies may mask differential patterns of socioeconomic inequality between different types of GP consultation. For example, there is evidence from studies in the 1990s that people from non-manual social classes were more likely to visit the GP for preventive health checkups (Goddard & Smith 2001; Dixon et al. 2007).

Survey based studies do, however, find clear evidence of slight pro-rich inequity in overall use of medical specialist visits including both NHS funded and (where they have been examined) privately funded visits, after controlling for need. These survey based findings are consistent over time for the 1970s onwards. Findings for the pre-2000 period include (O'Donnell & Propper 1991; Propper & Upward 1992), and the first study of socioeconomic inequality in health care we are aware of that attempted to allow for need (Le Grand 1978). They are also consistent with findings in other high income countries (van Doorslaer et al. 2004; Van Doorslaer et al. 2006; Bago d'Uva et al. 2009; van Doorslaer et al. 2000; Devaux 2015; Devaux & Looper 2012) which typically show slight to moderate pro-rich inequities in specialist visits – usually larger than in the UK – and in preventive care such as dental visits, mammography and cervical screening, but no pro-rich inequity in GP visits.

One survey study found no significant income-related or education-related inequality in day case and inpatient hospital utilisation after allowing for need during the short window 1998-2000 (Morris et al., 2005). However, a study using administrative data at small area level from 2000-2008 found significant 'pro-poor' inequality in both outpatient and non-emergency inpatient hospital care in each year of the period, after allowing for available small area measures of need such as population size, age-sex structure and disease prevalence from primary care pay for performance disease registries (Cookson et al. 2012).

Analysis of health care expenditure in England requires administrative data, since survey respondents are not billed for their NHS care and do not know how much it costs. Two recent studies have examined the socioeconomic distribution of hospital expenditure using whole-population hospital administrative data. Both find that hospital expenditure is substantially concentrated on poorer people. Kelly and colleagues (Kelly et al. 2016) find a relative gap of 22% between most and least deprived fifths of patients aged over 65 (£4,146 vs. £5,605). Asaria and colleagues (Asaria, Doran and Cookson (forthcoming)) find a relative gap of 31% between most and least deprived fifths of all-age population (£597 vs. £455).

4.1.2 Health care quality

Table 2 summarises recent national studies of socioeconomic inequality in both the quality and outcomes of health care.

In the UK, in contrast with the USA (Fiscella et al. 2000; Institute of Medicine 2001; Nelson 2002), the study of inequalities in health care *quality* is relatively recent. Arguably, as quality is measured for patients who are already receiving care, it is less necessary to standardise for need in such studies.

There has been an increase in the availability of measures of quality of care in the UK since the early 2000s. The UK primary care pay for performance scheme introduced in 2004/5 includes data on practice level primary care clinical process quality for a number of different conditions. One study examined an average of these scores and found a gap of 4% between the most deprived and least deprived fifth of practices in 2004/05 which fell to 0.8% in 2006/07 (Doran et al. 2008). A more

⁶ There is evidence from a small-scale study published in 2001 of 1,075 GP-patient consultations by 21 GPs in the West of Scotland that consultation length tends to be shorter in socioeconomically deprived patients (Stirling et al. 2001) though a study published in 2002 of 190 general practitioners and 3,674 patients in six European countries found no education-related inequality after allowing for other factors including GP workload, the number of conditions discussed and the presence of psychosocial rather than purely biomedical problems (Deveugele et al. 2002)

recent study updated this analysis to 2011/12 and found ongoing inequality reductions (Asaria, Ali, et al. 2016).

The UK Department of Health recently reported a series of estimates of the difference in health care patient experience at small area level, based on data from the annual national GP Patient Survey (<https://gp-patient.co.uk>). Characterising small areas by deprivation, they found pro-rich differences between the top and bottom deprivation quintile groups in the proportion of people feeling supported to manage their condition, in patient rated experience of: GP services and NHS dental services and in patient rated access to GP and dental services (Department of Health 2015).

Finally, a recent study of equity in palliative care used data from the 2013 National Survey of Bereaved People and found substantial pro-rich inequalities in bereaved people's experiences of care for a recently deceased close relative, for example in the probability of rating the overall quality of care as 'outstanding' or 'excellent', the probability of receiving as much support as needed from health and social services, and the probability of dying at home (Dixon et al. 2015).

4.1.3 Health care outcomes

To date, most studies of socioeconomic inequality in overall health care outcomes have been conducted at population level, and have adjusted for age and sex but not for morbidity and other risk factors beyond the immediate control of health care providers. In a study of administrative data from 2004/5 to 2011/12, for example, Asaria and colleagues found substantial pro-rich inequality in both avoidable emergency hospitalisation and mortality amenable to health care, which reduced slightly during the period (Asaria, Ali, et al. 2016). However, we cannot draw conclusions about how far these pro-rich inequalities are 'unfair' inequalities attributable to inadequate health care, as opposed to worse health among poorer populations attributable to wider health production processes.

Patient level studies of health care outcomes can control more accurately for morbidity and other individual level risks of poor health care outcomes that are beyond the immediate control of health care providers. A limitation, however, is that patient level studies focus on patients who have succeeded in getting access to health care and so may give a selective picture of inequalities in the general population – including outcomes for people who do not receive appropriate care. Furthermore, morbidity at the point of treatment may partly be due to inadequate health care in past years. A longitudinal perspective on fairness in health care would therefore need to allow for the dynamic relationship between health care and morbidity and not merely treat current morbidity as an exogenous risk factor.

Table 2: Inequality in overall healthcare quality and outcomes in England – selected recent national studies

Healthcare Variable (and Data type)	Data Years	Risk Adjustment Variables	Findings	Publication
Process Quality and Patient Experience				
Primary care process quality (QOF admin data)	2004/5 to 2011/12	Not applicable	Moderate pro-rich inequity reducing to slight over time	Asaria, Ali et al. 2016
Proportion of people feeling supported to manage their condition (GP Patient Survey)	2012-2014	None	Moderate pro-rich inequity e.g. most deprived fifth 10 percentage points lower than least deprived fifth	Department of Health 2015
Patient rated experience of NHS services (GP Patient Survey)	2012-2014	None	Slight pro-rich inequity e.g. percentage point gaps between most and least deprived fifth of: 4.7 (GP services), 3 (out of hours GP services) and 4 (dental services)	Department of Health 2015
Patient rated access to NHS services (GP Patient Survey)	2012-2014	None	Slight pro-rich inequity e.g. percentage point gaps between most and least deprived fifth of: 5 (GP services) and 3 (dental services)	Department of Health 2015
Family rated quality of care for deceased close relative	2013	Age, sex, cause of death	Substantial pro-rich inequity e.g. odds ratio of 0.81 between most and least deprived fifths for rating overall quality of care as 'outstanding' or 'excellent'	Dixon et al. 2015
Outcomes				
Emergency hospitalisation for chronic ambulatory care sensitive conditions (Hospital admin data)	2004/5 to 2011/12	Age and sex only	Substantial pro-rich inequality e.g. in 2011/12 the most deprived fifth nearly 2.5 times more likely to suffer avoidable hospitalisation than the least deprived	Asaria, Ali et al. 2016
Mortality amenable to healthcare (ONS admin data)	2004/5 to 2011/12	Age and sex only	Substantial pro-rich inequality	Asaria, Ali et al. 2016
Dying at home (National Survey of Bereaved People)	2013	Age, sex, cause of death	Substantial pro-rich inequality (odds ratio of 0.67 between most and least deprived fifths)	Dixon et al. 2015

Notes: The quality and outcomes (QOF) framework is the UK primary care pay-for-performance programme; this study used a composite of indicators from multiple different clinical domains, importance weighted by expected mortality impact.

4.2 Condition-specific studies of specific sub-populations

In this section we review a selection of recent national studies of inequalities in services for specific clinical conditions. One of the advantages of the condition-specific approach is that there is less heterogeneity in need within rather than across conditions. However, there is no reason to expect no heterogeneity nor that this heterogeneity is not socially graded.

Table 3 summarises selected national studies of socioeconomic inequality in care for cancer, circulatory disease and osteoarthritis. Our selection is reasonably representative of the selection of topics in the published literature, which tends to reflect the priorities of policy makers and researchers rather than a more systematic assessment of importance in terms of expenditure, disease burden or potential health gain. The five disorders with highest burden of disease in the UK in 2010 were low back pain, falls, major depressive disorder, neck pain and other musculoskeletal disorders (Murray et al. 2013). These five disorders receive substantially less attention in the health care inequality literature than cancer (no form of which is in the top 26 disorders by burden of disease), circulatory disease (ischaemic heart disease is number 19 and stroke number 23) and osteoarthritis (number 11).⁷ As with the general population studies, most of the condition-specific studies are cross sectional in nature and do not report trends in health care inequities over time.⁸

4.2.1 Cancer

It is well established that even in England, where the monetary price of care is zero, poorer patients tend to present at a later stage of cancer. For example, using data from 1998-2000 one study found that patients in the least deprived fifth of neighbourhoods are more likely to be diagnosed with breast cancer at early stage I (39.2% vs 36.3%) and less likely to be diagnosed at advanced stage IV (5% vs 7%) (Downing et al. 2007). Poorer patients are also more likely to be admitted as emergencies. A study using data from 1999 to 2006 found that cancer patients from the most deprived fifth of neighbourhoods in England are more likely to be admitted to hospital as emergencies than those from the least deprived fifth (colorectal cancer 37.9% vs 28.9%, breast cancer 17% vs 10.7% and lung cancer 55.2% vs 48.3%) (Raine et al. 2010). The same study also found that deprived patients are also less likely to receive the preferred surgical procedures for these cancers. It is not known how far these patterns reflect differences in care seeking behaviour and late presentation, as opposed to poorer quality care for patients of lower SES.

Poorer patients also have worse outcomes from cancer treatment in England, a finding echoed in other high income countries (Palmer & Schneider 2005). For example, even after allowing for observable co-morbidity, patients living in more deprived neighbourhoods of England are more likely to experience re-operation or mortality following bowel cancer surgery (Burns et al. 2011). Socioeconomic inequalities in cancer survival following diagnosis are also well documented (Rachet et al. 2010; Coleman et al. 2004; Lyratzopoulos et al. 2011).

⁷ We found only find one national study of socioeconomic inequality in any of these areas: a 'twin-condition' study that looked at cardiovascular screening for patients with severe mental illness (Osborn et al. 2011), plus one national study of ethnic-related inequalities in GP visits and antidepressant use for patients with common mental disorder (Cooper et al. 2013).

⁸ A few studies report trends in socioeconomic inequality in mortality over time. These studies typically find a mixed pattern of decreasing absolute inequality together with increasing relative inequality as a proportion of the average (Bajekal et al. 2013).

Table 3: Inequality in condition-specific healthcare in England – selected recent national studies

Healthcare Variable (and Data Type)	Data Years	Risk Adjustment Variables	Findings	Publication
Cancers				
Late stage diagnosis (admin data)	1998-2000	Not applicable	More deprived fifth less likely diagnosed with breast cancer at early stage I (36.3% vs. 39.2%)	Downing et al. 2007
Proportion of inpatients admitted as emergencies (admin data)	1999-2006	Not applicable	Most deprived fifth more likely admitted as emergencies (colorectal 37.9% vs 28.9%, breast 17% vs 10.7% and lung 55.2% vs 48.3%)	Raine et al. 2010
Re-operation rates (admin data)	2000-2008	Age, sex, co-morbidity	More deprived patients more likely to require re-operation following bowel cancer surgery	Burns et al. 2011
Survival rates (admin data)	1974-2004	Age and sex	Pro-rich inequality for rectal and breast cancer	Lyratzopoulos et al. 2011
Circulatory diseases				
Various utilisation measures (Health Survey for England data)	2003-6	Age, sex, morbidity	Pro-rich inequalities in outpatient visits, electrocardiography tests and heart surgery	Vallejo-Torres & Morris 2013
Secondary prevention after stroke (admin data)	1995-2005	Age, sex	No deprivation related inequality	Raine et al. 2009
Medication for coronary disease (admin data)	2003, 2007	Age, sex	No deprivation related inequality for patients after heart attack or with chronic angina	Hawkins et al. 2013
Waiting times for bypass surgery and angioplasty (admin data)	2002-2010	Age, sex, co-morbidity	Gap between most and least deprived fifth fell to 10% (surgery) and 15% (angioplasty) by 2010	Moscelli et al. 2015 (working paper)
Osteoarthritis				
Non-emergency hip and knee replacement (admin data)	2002	Age, sex and modelled need	Adjusted rate ratios of 0.31 (hip) and 0.33 (knee) between most and least deprived fifths	Judge et al. 2010
Specialist referral for hip pain (survey data)	2001-7	Not applicable	Most deprived fifth less likely to be referred for hip pain than least deprived fifth (14% vs 20%)	McBride et al. 2010
Waiting times (admin data)	1997-2007	Age and sex	Most deprived fifth initially had longer waits, but these gaps disappeared by the mid 2000s	Cooper et al. 2009
Patient reported outcome gains (admin data)	2009-2011	Age, sex, ethnicity, and a detailed set of health variables	Gap between top and bottom deprivation fifth of 2.8 (hip) and 2.4 (knee) on a scale of 0 to 48	Neuburger et al. 2013

4.2.2 *Circulatory disease*

In contrast to cancer treatment, several recent studies of circulatory disease have found fewer differences across SES groups. One study using Health Survey for England data from 2003 and 2006 found pro-rich inequalities in outpatient visits, electrocardiography tests and heart surgery (Vallejo-Torres & Morris 2013). Another study using practice level administrative data from 2006/7 found that practices serving more deprived populations were less likely to prescribe statins (a cholesterol-lowering medication) for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease in low-risk patients (Fleetcroft et al. 2014). However, a patient level study using follow up data for 2005-7 from the Whitehall study of civil servants found no socioeconomic difference in use of cholesterol-lowering medication related to employment grade (Forde et al. 2011).⁹ Furthermore, studies looking at secondary prevention following cardiovascular events or diagnosis in higher-risk patients have found no pro-rich inequities. Using patient level clinical registry data from 1995-2005, one study found no deprivation related difference in secondary prevention after stroke (Raine et al. 2009). Another study using patient level clinical registry data found no deprivation related inequities in medical treatments for patients following heart attack, or with chronic angina or requiring secondary prevention (Hawkins et al. 2013). After controlling for available measures of need, a study using data from 1985-1999 found no association between social position and the use of cardiac procedures or secondary prevention drugs (Britton et al. 2004). Finally, a small area study using data from 2001-8 also found no clear evidence of inequality in coronary revascularisation procedures favouring people living in less deprived neighbourhoods (Cookson et al. 2012).¹⁰

Waiting times are used to ration demand in a system in which prices are zero. They are therefore particularly important in the English NHS context, although there have been substantial falls in NHS hospital waiting times since the early 2000s (Propper et al. 2008). Interestingly, as waiting times have fallen for heart procedures, so have differences in waiting times across groups. (Moscelli et al. 2015) found a 35% difference in waiting time - within the same NHS hospital - for patients undergoing non-emergency heart revascularisation procedures in 2002 between the most deprived and least deprived groups. This fell to 10% by 2010. There was a corresponding fall for angioplasty from 50% in 2002 to 15% in 2010.¹¹

4.2.3 *Hip and knee joint replacement for osteoarthritis*

Two national studies using small area level administrative data found evidence of substantial deprivation related inequality in total hip replacement in the early 2000s, both before and after allowing for small area level need (Judge et al. 2010; Cookson et al. 2007). The second study estimated a considerably larger magnitude of inequality, due to use of a modelled estimate of small area need rather than age and sex adjustment alone. This study found need adjusted rate ratios of 0.31 and 0.33 respectively for hip and knee replacement in the over 50s in 2002, suggesting that people living in the least deprived fifths of neighbourhoods in England are three times more likely to receive a needed hip or knee replacement than those in the most deprived fifth. These are surprisingly large inequalities, especially given that these data focus only on publicly funded hip replacements and a substantial proportion of hip and knee replacements are performed privately

⁹ There was a substantial ethnic gap: a substantial differential among high risk individuals favouring white over South Asian people.

¹⁰ These studies contradict findings from earlier studies in the 1990s (Goddard & Smith 2001), for example a study using data from 1993-7 that found that GP practices serving areas of high deprivation had lower need-adjusted utilisation of coronary angiography and revascularisation (Hippisley-Cox & Pringle 2000). However, these earlier studies tended to have less detailed controls for need, so we cannot tell whether there has been change over time.

¹¹ These inequalities in waiting times may partly be caused by differential health care seeking behaviour, such as non-attendance at appointments and less effective self-advocacy in persuading NHS clinicians and administrators of the need for a shorter waiting time. They may also reflect provider behaviour during clinician-patient interactions such as 'unconscious bias' in how clinicians frame consultations with different social groups (Haider et al. 2011; Willems et al. 2005; van Ryn & Burke 2000; Balsa et al. 2005).

(around a quarter at the time these studies were conducted, though this share fell during the 2000s as NHS waiting times fell). Further, the findings for hip and knee replacement is somewhat unusual as many other elective hospital procedures (including cataract surgery, heart revascularisation and overall elective services) do not exhibit pro-rich inequalities of this kind (Cookson et al. 2012). One study using data from 2001-7 found substantial differences between the most and least deprived fifth of neighbourhoods in England in rates of primary care referral for hip pain (14% vs 20%) and dyspepsia (12% vs 15%) (McBride et al. 2010). Socioeconomic inequality in the utilisation of joint replacement may partly be explained by the fact that there is substantial clinical uncertainty about the appropriate timing of surgery, and patients often have to navigate their way through a lengthy series of outpatient consultations over many months before being admitted for surgery (Marques et al. 2014).

Studies using administrative data in the late 1990s and early 2000s have also found find 'pro-rich' inequalities in waiting times for hip and knee joint replacement (and other 'high profile' types of low-risk elective surgery, including cataract surgery). One study found a 7% longer waiting time for hip replacement for patients living in the most deprived areas as compared to those living in the most affluent areas in the year 2001/2 (Laudicella et al. 2012). However, inequalities in waiting times for hip and knee replacement reduced from the late 1990s to 2000s as average waiting times fell (Cooper et al. 2009). Indeed, inequalities in waiting times for hip and knee inequality had disappeared by the mid 2000s while inequalities in waiting time for heart treatment persisted. Furthermore, from both the joint replacement and the heart treatment studies, there is some indication that inequalities in waiting times for elective hospital based treatment have fallen whilst inequalities in the use of these treatments have not fallen (Cookson et al. 2012). This may be due to the difference in the absolute changes in these two variables: the fall in waiting times during the 2000s was larger than the growth in utilisation.¹² So as waiting times have become very low, it may no longer be worth richer individuals investing in actions to reduce them, meaning that the benefits of falling waiting times have been disproportionately felt by poorer individuals.

Finally, a recent study using patient level administrative data found evidence of deprivation-related inequalities in patient-reported outcome measures after hip and knee replacement surgery from 2009-2011 (Neuburger et al. 2013). These inequalities were attenuated but not eliminated by adjusting for risk in the form of pre-operative health and disease severity. However, the adjusted differences were small: absolute differences between top and bottom deprivation fifth of 2.8 and 2.4 on a scale of 0 to 48, respectively for hip replacement (Oxford Hip Score) and knee replacement (Oxford Knee Score).

4.2.4 Preventive care

Table 4 summarises selected recent national studies of socioeconomic inequality in preventive care, including dental checkups, eye tests and condition-specific studies of adult screening and childhood vaccination.

Preventive care inequalities are pervasive and can be substantial, as one would expect from a health production perspective insofar as poorer individuals are less able and willing to invest in health (Goddard & Smith 2001; Dixon et al. 2007). In addition, neither dental checkups nor eye tests are universally funded by the NHS, though there are various age- and means-related subsidies. (Labeit et al. 2013).

Most condition-specific studies of equity in preventive care focus on screening and vaccination programmes that target particular 'at risk' sub-populations. The measurement of need is relatively

¹² The overall growth in inpatient utilisation of heart surgery (CABG) was around 35% whereas waiting times for CABG were 300 percent smaller. Wait times for CABG fell from around 160 days to around 50 days.

straightforward in studies of this kind, insofar as everyone in a particular age-sex group is considered to need the service in question. For example, the national bowel cancer screening programme in England currently recommends and offers colonoscopy and stool examination screening for colon cancer to all men and women between the ages of 60 and 75 years.¹³

In general, poorer and less educated patients are less likely to participate in adult screening programmes. For example, in the early stages of the NHS Bowel Cancer Screening Programme from 2006-2009 there were substantial differences in uptake between people living in the most and least deprived fifth of neighbourhoods in England of 35% vs. 61% (von Wagner et al. 2011). Even following positive screening results, people living in the most deprived fifth of neighbourhoods were still a little less likely to attend appointments for further diagnostics and treatment.¹⁴ Children from poor families are also less likely to participate in childhood vaccination programmes. For example, coverage of the measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccine during the 1990s was lower in the most deprived fifth of neighbourhoods of England compared with the last deprived fifth (86% vs 92% in 1992, and 85% vs 87% in 2001) (Middleton & Baker 2003). Interestingly, this inequality subsequently reversed in the mid-2000s following adverse press coverage of the MMR vaccination, as parents from more affluent neighbourhoods responded more negatively to this media coverage. Socioeconomic inequality was also found in uptake of human papillomavirus (HPV) cervical cancer vaccine during pilots in the financial year 2007/8 (Roberts et al. 2011). This was found to disappear in the subsequent national rollout, though ethnic inequalities remained from 2008/09 to 2010/11 (Fisher et al. 2014).

These findings are mirrored in other high income countries. A recent study of 13 European countries excluding England found pro-rich and pro-educated inequities in breast and colon cancer screening, blood tests and flu-vaccination using data from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe pooled across three survey waves around 2004, 2007 and 2009 (Carrieri & Wuebker 2013). Data from the British Household Panel Survey suggest that participation in courses leading to qualifications increases the probability of having a smear test between 4.3 and 4.4 percentage points (Sabates & Feinstein 2006). The WHO World Health Survey of 70 countries in 2002/3 found slight to moderate pro-rich inequity in cervical cancer screening for women aged 25 to 64 in 50 out of the 67 countries with screening data (McKinnon et al. 2011) and pro-educated inequity pooling across all 22 of the participating European countries including the UK (Palència et al. 2010). While the latter finding was not statistically significant within the UK alone the sample was small (521 women). A larger study of 3,185 women age 40-74 in 2005-7 did find statistically significant educational and ethnic inequities in cervical screening (Moser et al. 2009).

¹³ Data on individual health could in principle provide further useful information about need within such groups. For example, a person age 60 with particular risk factors such as a family history of colon cancer may be considered to need screening more than another person of the same age without those risk factors.

¹⁴ Rates of colonoscopy following positive FOBT in the least and most deprived fifth of neighbourhoods in England were 85.2% vs 89.1 respectively (Morris et al. 2012)

Table 4: Inequality in preventive care in England – selected recent national studies

Healthcare Variable (and Data Type)	Data Years	Findings	Publication
Dental checkups (BHPS survey data)	2009	Substantial pro-rich inequity (19% relative gap between 58% for the poorest and 69% for the richest household income quintile groups)	Devaux and de Looper 2012
Eye tests (BHPS survey data)	1992-2008	Substantial pro-rich inequity	Labeit et al. 2013
Bowel cancer screening participation (admin data)	2006-2009	Substantial pro-rich inequity: the least deprived fifth were 74% more likely to participate than the most deprived fifth (levels of 61% vs. 35%)	von Wagner et al. 2011
Bowel cancer follow-up testing after initial screening shows there may be cancer (admin data)	2006-2009	Slight pro-rich inequity: least deprived fifth 3.5% more likely to attend follow-up colonoscopy than most deprived fifth (levels of 89.5% and 86.4%)	Morris et al. 2012
Measles, mumps and rubella vaccination (admin data)	2001	Slight pro-rich inequity: vaccine uptake slightly higher in less deprived areas (85% vs 87%)	Middleton & Baker 2003
Human papillomavirus (HPV) cervical cancer vaccine (admin data)	2008/9 to 2010/11	No pro-rich inequity: deprivation-related differences in 2007/8 pilot disappeared by 2008/9, but ethnic related inequities remained	Fisher et al. 2014
Cervical cancer screening for women aged 25 to 64 (World Health Survey)	2002/3	Pro-rich inequities	McKinnon et al. 2011
Cervical cancer screening for women aged 40 to 74 (National Statistics Omnibus Survey)	2005-7	Pro-educated and ethnic differences	Moser et al. 2009
Preventive checkups with the family doctor (GP) (survey data)	1990s	Non-manual occupational classes more likely to have a preventive checkup with their GP	Dixon et al. 2007

Note: Need adjustment is arguably not necessary for these studies, other than selecting an appropriate age group to study, as in principle everyone in a particular age-gender group is in need of particular kinds of screening, vaccination and health checkups

5. Discussion

Our review suggests the following stylised facts about the socioeconomic distribution of health care, after some kind of adjustment for need, in England.

- 1) Poorer individuals consume a greater quantity of publicly funded NHS health care in terms of overall expenditure and utilisation (Kelly et al. 2016; Asaria, Doran and Cookson, 2016; Cookson et al. 2012).
- 2) Richer patients tend to achieve better health care outcomes (e.g. surgical mortality, preventable hospitalisation) even after adjusting for observable risk factors
- 3) Richer individuals tend to present to health care providers at an earlier stage of disease progression; consume more medical specialist visits including privately funded visits; consume more preventative NHS care such as screening and vaccination services; are more likely to receive a needed NHS hip or knee replacement operation and to be referred by their doctor for specialist investigation of hip pain; have shorter waiting times for heart bypass surgery and angioplasty; may receive slightly better NHS quality of care for some conditions as measured by clinical process quality indicators; and report slightly better patient experiences.

The picture is thus one of an overall pro-poor distribution of quantity but a pro-rich distribution of quality, experience and access to services including waits for treatment. However, in terms of magnitude, the pro-rich inequity gaps are generally small. It is unusual to find a need- or risk-adjusted gap of greater than 10 percent between the richest and poorest fifth. Furthermore, studies rarely provide detailed information about how far these pro-rich inequities are attributable to the behaviour of NHS health care providers as opposed to socioeconomic differences in health care seeking and self-care behaviour.

These stylised facts make sense in the context of a health production approach where health care is only one input into health and the costs of other inputs differ systematically with income. Individuals who have fewer resources will tend to have worse health at all stages of life. This helps to explain fact (1), since people with worse health need more health care and generally demand more health care in a universal health system like the English NHS which sets prices at or close to zero. It also helps to explain fact (2), since people with worse health are at risk of worse health care outcomes. It also helps rationalise the set of facts under point (3). Poorer individuals invest less time and money in improving their health because they have fewer resources to invest, face higher opportunity costs in terms of lost income and household production relative to their limited resources, and may value future health benefits less if they have a higher rate of time preference.¹⁵

Finally, important gaps in knowledge remain. There are few studies that compare change over time, or that compare performance on equity in health care between different sub-national areas to help managers learn lessons about effective ways of reducing health care inequalities. The selection of condition-specific study topics is skewed by political priorities and researcher interest and convenience. A more systematic approach would place greater emphasis on conditions involving high disease burden, high expenditure, and high potential health gains through more vigorous implementation of cost-effective health care. Research is needed to tell us how far inequalities are due to the behaviour of providers and how far to individual choices about health care (Moscelli et al. 2015). Studies of inequalities in health care could usefully be integrated with studies of wider inequalities in health – such as a recent study of trends in inequality in cardiovascular mortality which examines the contributions of trends in treatment uptake and risk factors (Bajekal et al. 2012). Another future research direction is to exploit internationally comparable administrative datasets to

¹⁵ For a discussion of this with respect to obesity see for example Propper (2005).

make more detailed condition-specific comparisons between health care equity in different countries (Cookson et al. 2015).

Finally, as is clear from this review, most of the research on whether health care is allocated according to need has focused on appropriate adjustment for need, taking resources as given. But to the extent that ill health drives both health and socio-economic factors, particularly employment, earnings and income, it is no surprise that the poor use more health care. A life cycle perspective, in which attention is given to the relationship between income and need, will allow a fuller assessment of the extent to which this is inequitable.

References

- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2014. *2014 National Healthcare Quality and Disparities Report*.
- Almond, D. & Currie, J., 2011. *Human capital development before age five*, Elsevier B.V. Available at: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218\(11\)02413-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218(11)02413-0).
- Almond, D., Currie, J.M. & Meckel, K., 2014. *Encyclopedia of Health Economics*, Elsevier. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B978012375678700417X> [Accessed March 6, 2016].
- Asaria, M., Ali, S., et al., 2016. How a universal health system reduces inequalities: lessons from England. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, pp.1–7.
- Asaria, M., Cookson, R., et al., 2016. Unequal socioeconomic distribution of the primary care workforce: whole-population small area longitudinal study. *BMJ Open*, 6(1), p.e008783.
- Asaria, M., Doran, T. & Cookson, R., 2016. *The costs of inequality: whole-population study of lifetime hospital costs in the English NHS*. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, (forthcoming)
- Bago D’Uva, T. et al., 2008. Does reporting heterogeneity bias the measurement of health disparities? *Health Economics*, 17(3), pp.351–375.
- Bago d’Uva, T., Jones, A.M. & van Doorslaer, E., 2009. Measurement of horizontal inequity in health care utilisation using European panel data. *Journal of Health Economics*, 28(2), pp.280–289.
- Bajekal, M. et al., 2012. Analysing recent socioeconomic trends in coronary heart disease mortality in England, 2000–2007: A population modelling study. *PLoS Medicine*, 9(6), p.12.
- Bajekal, M. et al., 2013. Unequal Trends in Coronary Heart Disease Mortality by Socioeconomic Circumstances, England 1982–2006: An Analytical Study. *PLoS ONE*, 8(3).
- Balsa, A.I., McGuire, T.G. & Meredith, L.S., 2005. Testing for statistical discrimination in health care. *Health Services Research*, 40(1), pp.227–252.
- Bedard, K. & Deschenes, P., 2006. The long-term impact of military service on health: evidence from World War II and Korean War Veterans. *American Economic Review*, 96(1), pp.176–194.
- Britton, A. et al., 2004. Does access to cardiac investigation and treatment contribute to social and ethnic differences in coronary heart disease? Whitehall II prospective cohort study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 329(7461), p.318.
- Burns, E.M. et al., 2011. Variation in reoperation after colorectal surgery in England as an indicator of surgical performance: retrospective analysis of Hospital Episode Statistics. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 343, p.d4836.
- Carrieri, V. & Wuebker, A., 2013. Assessing inequalities in preventive care use in Europe. *Health Policy*, 113(3), pp.247–257.
- Charlton, J. et al., 2013. Impact of deprivation on occurrence, outcomes and health care costs of people with multiple morbidity. *Journal of health services research & policy*, 18(4), pp.215–23. Available at:

<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3808175&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>.

Coleman, M.P. et al., 2004. Trends and socioeconomic inequalities in cancer survival in England and Wales up to 2001. *British journal of cancer*, 90(7), pp.1367–1373.

Cookson, R. et al., 2015. Socioeconomic inequality in hip replacement in four European countries from 2002 to 2009—area-level analysis of hospital data. *The European Journal of Public Health*, 25(suppl 1), pp.21–27. Available at: http://eurpub.oxfordjournals.org/content/25/suppl_1/21.abstract.

Cookson, R., Dusheiko, M. & Hardman, G., 2007. Socioeconomic inequality in small area use of elective total hip replacement in the English National Health Service in 1991 and 2001. *Journal of health services research & policy*, 12 Suppl 1(April), pp.S1–S10–7.

Cookson, R., Laudicella, M. & Donni, P.L., 2012. Measuring change in health care equity using small-area administrative data - Evidence from the English NHS 2001-2008. *Social Science and Medicine*, 75(8), pp.1514–1522. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.05.033>.

Cooper, C. et al., 2013. Ethnic inequalities in the use of health services for common mental disorders in England. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 48(5), pp.685–692.

Cooper, Z.N. et al., 2009. Equity, waiting times, and NHS reforms: retrospective study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 339, p.b3264.

Dardanoni, V. & Wagstaff, A., 1990. Uncertainty and the demand for medical care. *Journal of Health Economics*, 9(1), pp.23–38.

Davis, K. et al., 2014. Mirror, Mirror on the Wall: How the Performance of the U.S. Health Care System Compares Internationally. , (June), pp.1–32.

Department of Health, 2012. Health and Social Care Act (2012). *Health and Social Care Act explained*. Available at: <http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/2012/06/act-explained/>.

Department of Health, 2015. NHS Outcomes Framework Indicators for health inequalities assessment. , (March).

Department of Health, 2000. *The NHS Plan: a plan for investment, a plan for reform*, Available at: http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/@dh/@en/documents/digitalasset/dh_4055783.pdf.

Devaux, M., 2015. Income-related inequalities and inequities in health care services utilisation in 18 selected OECD countries. *The European Journal of Health Economics*, 16(1), pp.21–33.

Devaux, M. & Looper, M. de, 2012. *Income-Related Inequalities in Health Service Utilisation in 19 OECD Countries, 2008-2009*, Available at: </content/workingpaper/5k95xd6stnxt-en>.

Deveugele, M. et al., 2002. Consultation length in general practice: cross sectional study in six European countries. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 325(7362), p.472.

Dixon, A. et al., 2007. Is the British National Health Service equitable? The evidence on socioeconomic differences in utilization. *Journal of health services research & policy*, 12(2), pp.104–109.

Dixon-Woods, M. et al., 2006. Conducting a critical interpretive synthesis of the literature on access to healthcare by vulnerable groups. *BMC medical research methodology*, 6, p.35.

Doran, T. et al., 2008. Effect of financial incentives on inequalities in the delivery of primary clinical care in England: analysis of clinical activity indicators for the quality and outcomes framework. *The Lancet*, 372(9640), pp.728–736.

Downing, a et al., 2007. Socioeconomic background in relation to stage at diagnosis, treatment and survival in women with breast cancer. *British journal of cancer*, 96(5), pp.836–840.

Emerson, E. & Baines, S., 2011. Health inequalities and people with learning disabilities in the UK. *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, 16(1), pp.42–48. Available at: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.5042/tldr.2011.0008>.

Fiscella, K. et al., 2000. Inequality in quality: addressing socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic disparities in health care. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association*.

Fisher, H. et al., 2014. Examining inequalities in the uptake of the school-based HPV vaccination programme in England: A retrospective cohort study. *Journal of Public Health (United Kingdom)*, 36(1), pp.36–45.

Fleetcroft, R., Schofield, P. & Ashworth, M., 2014. Variations in statin prescribing for primary cardiovascular disease prevention: cross-sectional analysis. *BMC health services research*, 14(1), p.414.

Fleurbaey, M. & Schokkaert, E., 2011. Chapter Sixteen – Equity in Health and Health Care. In *Handbook of Health Economics*. pp. 1003–1092. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780444535924000165>.

Fleurbaey, M. & Schokkaert, E., 2009. Unfair inequalities in health and health care. *Journal of health economics*, 28(1), pp.73–90. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18829124> [Accessed November 15, 2010].

Fogel, R.W., 2003. Secular trends in physiological capital: implications for equity in health care. *Perspectives in biology and medicine*, 46(3), pp.S24–S38.

Forde, I. et al., 2011. Socioeconomic and ethnic differences in use of lipid-lowering drugs after deregulation of simvastatin in the UK: The Whitehall II prospective cohort study. *Atherosclerosis*, 215(1), pp.223–228.

Galama, T.J. & Kippersluis, H. van, 2013. Health Inequalities through the Lens of Health-Capital Theory: Issues, Solutions, and Future Directions. In *Health and Inequality*. Research on Economic Inequality. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 10–263. Available at: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1049-2585\(2013\)0000021013](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1049-2585(2013)0000021013).

Goddard, M. et al., 2010. Where did all the GPs go? Increasing supply and geographical equity in England and Scotland. *Journal of health services research & policy*, 15(1), pp.28–35.

Goddard, M. & Smith, P., 2001. Equity of access to health care services: theory and evidence from the UK. *Social Science and Medicine*, 53(9), pp.1149–62. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11556606>.

Gravelle, H., Morris, S. & Sutton, M., 2006. Economic studies of equity in the consumption of health

care. In *The Elgar companion to health economics*. Edward Elgar Publishing, p. 193. Available at: <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/68687/>.

Gravelle, H. & Sutton, M., 2001. Inequality in the geographical distribution of GPs in England and Wales 1974-1995. , 6(1), pp.6–13. Available at: <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/51798/>.

Grossman, M., 1972. On the Concept of Health Capital and the Demand for Health. *Journal of Political Economy*, 80(2), p.223.

Hacking, J.M., Muller, S. & Buchan, I.E., 2011. Trends in mortality from 1965 to 2008 across the English north-south divide: comparative observational study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 342, p.d508.

Haider, A.H. et al., 2011. Association of unconscious race and social class bias with vignette-based clinical assessments by medical students. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association*, 306(9), pp.942–951.

Hawkins, N.M. et al., 2013. The UK National Health Service: Delivering Equitable Treatment Across the Spectrum of Coronary Disease . *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes* , 6 (2), pp.208–216. Available at: <http://circoutcomes.ahajournals.org/content/6/2/208.abstract>.

Heckman, J.J., 2012. The developmental origins of health. *Health Economics*, 21(1), pp.24–29.

Heckman, J.J. & Mosso, S., 2014. The Economics of Human Development and Social Mobility. *Annual review of economics*, 6, pp.689–733. Available at: </pmc/articles/PMC4204337/?report=abstract>.

Hippisley-Cox, J. & Pringle, M., 2000. Inequalities in access to coronary angiography and revascularisation: The association of deprivation and location of primary care services. *British Journal of General Practice*, 50(455), pp.449–454.

Institute of Medicine, 2001. *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*, Washington D.C.: National Academy Press. Available at: http://www.nap.edu/download.php?record_id=10027.

Johnston, D.W. et al., 2010. *Is There an Income Gradient in Child Health? It Depends Whom You Ask*.

Johnston, D.W., Propper, C. & Shields, M.A., 2009. Comparing subjective and objective measures of health: Evidence from hypertension for the income/health gradient. *Journal of Health Economics*, 28(3), pp.540–552.

Judge, A. et al., 2010. Equity in access to total joint replacement of the hip and knee in England: cross sectional study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 341, p.c4092.

Kelly, E., Stoye, G. & Vera-Hernández, M., 2016. Public hospital spending in England: evidence from National Health Service administrative records. *Fiscal Studies*.

Labeit, A., Peinemann, F. & Baker, R., 2013. Utilisation of preventative health check-ups in the UK: findings from individual-level repeated cross-sectional data from 1992 to 2008. *BMJ open*, 3(12), p.e003387. Available at: <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/3/12/e003387.full>.

Laudicella, M., Siciliani, L. & Cookson, R., 2012. Waiting times and socioeconomic status: Evidence from England. *Social Science and Medicine*, 74(9), pp.1331–1341. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.049>.

Lawrence, D. & Kisely, S., 2010. Inequalities in healthcare provision for people with severe mental illness. *Journal of psychopharmacology (Oxford, England)*, 24(4 Suppl), pp.61–68.

Le Grand, J., 1978. The Distribution of Public Expenditure: The Case of Health Care. *Economica*, 45(178), p.125. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2553499>.

Lyratzopoulos, G. et al., 2011. Changes over time in socioeconomic inequalities in breast and rectal cancer survival in England and Wales during a 32-year period (1973-2004): The potential role of health care. *Annals of Oncology*, 22(7), pp.1661–1666.

Macinko, J. a & Starfield, B., 2002. Annotated Bibliography on Equity in Health, 1980-2001. *International journal for equity in health*, 1, p.1.

Marques, E. et al., 2014. DISCLOSING TOTAL WAITING TIMES FOR JOINT REPLACEMENT: EVIDENCE FROM THE ENGLISH NHS USING LINKED HES DATA. *Health Economics*, 23(7), pp.806–820. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hec.2954>.

McBride, D. et al., 2010. Explaining variation in referral from primary to secondary care: cohort study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 341, p.c6267.

McKinnon, B., Harper, S. & Moore, S., 2011. Decomposing income-related inequality in cervical screening in 67 countries. *International Journal of Public Health*, 56(2), pp.139–152.

McLean, G. et al., 2014. The influence of socioeconomic deprivation on multimorbidity at different ages: a cross-sectional study. *The British journal of general practice : the journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners*, 64(624), pp.e440–7. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24982497>.

Middleton, E. & Baker, D., 2003. Comparison of social distribution of immunisation with measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine, England, 1991-2001. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 326(7394), p.854.

Morris, S. et al., 2012. Socioeconomic variation in uptake of colonoscopy following a positive faecal occult blood test result: a retrospective analysis of the NHS Bowel Cancer Screening Programme. *British journal of cancer*, 107(5), pp.765–71. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22864455> [Accessed September 12, 2012].

Morris, S., Sutton, M. & Gravelle, H., 2005. Inequity and inequality in the use of health care in England: An empirical investigation. *Social Science and Medicine*, 60(6), pp.1251–1266.

Moscelli, G. et al., 2015. Socioeconomic inequality of access to healthcare: Does patients' choice explain the gradient? *CHE Research Paper 112*.

Moser, K., Patnick, J. & Beral, V., 2009. Inequalities in reported use of breast and cervical screening in Great Britain: analysis of cross sectional survey data. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 338, p.b2025.

Murray, C.J.L. et al., 2013. UK health performance: findings of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet*, 381(9871), pp.997–1020.

Nelson, A., 2002. Unequal treatment: confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 94(8), pp.666–668.

Neuburger, J. et al., 2013. Socioeconomic differences in patient-reported outcomes after a hip or knee replacement in the English National Health Service. *Journal of public health (Oxford, England)*,

35(1), pp.115–24. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22729275>.

O'Donnell, O. & Doorslaer, E. Van, 2008. *Analyzing Health Equity Using Household Survey Data*, Washington, Available at: <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Analyzing+Health+Equity+Using+Household+Survey+Data#5>.

O'Donnell, O. & Propper, C., 1991. Equity and the distribution of UK National Health Service resources. *Journal of Health Economics*, 10(1), pp.1–19.

OECD, 2014. OECD Health Data 2014. *OECD Health Data*. Available at: http://stats.oecd.org/index.aspx?DataSetCode=HEALTH_STAT.

Osborn, D.P.J. et al., 2011. Inequalities in the provision of cardiovascular screening to people with severe mental illnesses in primary care. Cohort study in the United Kingdom THIN Primary Care Database 2000-2007. *Schizophrenia Research*, 129(2-3), pp.104–110.

Palència, L. et al., 2010. Socio-economic inequalities in breast and cervical cancer screening practices in Europe: Influence of the type of screening program. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 39(3), pp.757–765.

Palmer, R.C. & Schneider, E.C., 2005. Social disparities across the continuum of colorectal cancer: A systematic review. In *Cancer Causes and Control*. pp. 55–61.

Parry, G. et al., 2007. Health status of Gypsies and Travellers in England. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, 61(3), pp.198–204.

Propper, C. et al., 2008. Did 'Targets and Terror' Reduce Waiting Times in England for Hospital Care? *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 8(2).

Propper, C. & Upward, R., 1992. Need, Equity and the NHS: The Distribution of Health Care Expenditure 1974-87. *Fiscal Studies*, 13(2), pp.1–21.

Rachet, B. et al., 2010. Socioeconomic inequalities in cancer survival in England after the NHS cancer plan. *British journal of cancer*, 103(4), pp.446–453. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6605752>.

Raine, R., 2002. Bias measuring bias. *Journal of health services research & policy*, 7(1), pp.65–67.

Raine, R. et al., 2010. Social variations in access to hospital care for patients with colorectal, breast, and lung cancer between 1999 and 2006: retrospective analysis of hospital episode statistics. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 340, p.b5479.

Raine, R. et al., 2009. Sociodemographic variations in the contribution of secondary drug prevention to stroke survival at middle and older ages: cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 338, p.b1279.

Roberts, S. a et al., 2011. Human papillomavirus vaccination and social inequality: results from a prospective cohort study. *Epidemiology and infection*, 139(3), pp.400–405.

Sabates, R. & Feinstein, L., 2006. The role of education in the uptake of preventative health care: The case of cervical screening in Britain. *Social Science and Medicine*, 62(12), pp.2998–3010.

Schoen, C. & Osborn, R., 2010. *The commonwealth fund 2010 international health policy survey in*

- eleven countries*, Available at: [http://63.131.142.217/~media/Files/Publications/In the Literature/2010/Nov/Int Survey/PDF_2010_IHP_Survey_Chartpack_FINAL_white_bkgd_111610_ds.pdf](http://63.131.142.217/~media/Files/Publications/In%20the%20Literature/2010/Nov/Int%20Survey/PDF_2010_IHP_Survey_Chartpack_FINAL_white_bkgd_111610_ds.pdf).
- Sen, A., 2002a. Health: perception versus observation. Self reported morbidity has severe limitations and can be extremely misleading. *BMJ*, 324, pp.860–861. Available at: <http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/324/7342/860>.
- Sen, A., 2002b. Why health equity? *Health Economics*, 11(8), pp.659–666.
- Shadmi, E., 2013. Multimorbidity and equity in health. *International journal for equity in health*, 12(1), p.59. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23961952>.
- Starfield, B., 2006. State of the art in research on equity in health. *Journal of health politics, policy and law*, 31(1), pp.11–32.
- Stirling, A.M., Wilson, P. & McConnachie, A., 2001. Deprivation, psychological distress, and consultation length in general practice. *British Journal of General Practice*, 51(467), pp.456–460.
- Sutton, M., 2002. Vertical and horizontal aspects of socio-economic inequity in general practitioner contacts in Scotland. *Health Economics*, 11(6), pp.537–549.
- Szczepura, a, 2005. Access to health care for ethnic minority populations. *Postgraduate medical journal*, 81(953), pp.141–147.
- Vallejo-Torres, L. & Morris, S., 2013. Income-related inequity in healthcare utilisation among individuals with cardiovascular disease in England - Accounting for vertical inequity. *Health Economics (United Kingdom)*, 22(5), pp.533–553.
- van Doorslaer, E. et al., 2000. Equity in the delivery of health care in Europe and the US. *Journal of health economics*, 19(5), pp.553–583.
- Van Doorslaer, E. et al., 1999. The redistributive effect of health care finance in twelve OECD countries. *Journal of Health Economics*, 18(3), pp.291–313.
- van Doorslaer, E., Koolman, X. & Jones, A.M., 2004. Explaining income-related inequalities in doctor utilisation in Europe. *Health Economics*, 13(7), pp.629–647.
- Van Doorslaer, E., Masseria, C. & Koolman, X., 2006. Inequalities in access to medical care by income in developed countries. *Canadian Medical Journal*, 174(2), pp.177–183.
- van Ryn, M. & Burke, J., 2000. The effect of patient race and socio-economic status on physicians' perceptions of patients. *Soc Sci Med*, 50(6), pp.813–28. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/htbin-post/Entrez/query?db=m&form=6&dopt=r&uid=10695979\nor:\nhttp://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MIimg&_imagekey=B6VBF-3YXJF6K-6-2&_cdi=5925&_orig=search&_coverDate=03/31/2000&_qd=1&_sk=999499993&wchp=dGLStV-ISzBV&_acct=C0.
- von Wagner, C. et al., 2011. Inequalities in participation in an organized national colorectal cancer screening programme: Results from the first 2.6 million invitations in England. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 40(3), pp.712–718.

Wagstaff, A. & Van Doorslaer, E., 2000. Equity in health care finance and delivery. *Handbook of health economics*, 1, pp.1803–1862. Available at: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1574006400800475> [Accessed April 12, 2011].

Willems, S. et al., 2005. Socio-economic status of the patient and doctor-patient communication: Does it make a difference? *Patient Education and Counseling*, 56(2), pp.139–146.

World Health Organization, 2000. *The world health report 2000: health systems: improving performance*, World Health Organization.