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Table 2. Distribution of Children Within Hospital Types by Household Income, Payor, Illness Severity, and Disease Complexitya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Freestanding</th>
<th>Specialty or Within a General Hospital</th>
<th>Non-Children’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Type</td>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Nonteaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>22 (1.0)</td>
<td>53 (2.4)</td>
<td>425 (19.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharges</td>
<td>1,174,540</td>
<td>191,018 (16.3)</td>
<td>209,650 (17.8)</td>
<td>390,158 (33.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household incomeb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>313,649 (26.7)</td>
<td>44,849 (23.5)</td>
<td>56,653 (27.0)</td>
<td>113,195 (29.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>295,479 (25.2)</td>
<td>44,476 (23.3)</td>
<td>49,593 (23.7)</td>
<td>97,990 (25.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>289,035 (24.6)</td>
<td>51,050 (26.7)</td>
<td>50,296 (24.0)</td>
<td>91,611 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>276,377 (23.3)</td>
<td>50,643 (26.5)</td>
<td>53,108 (25.3)</td>
<td>87,362 (22.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>550,027 (46.8)</td>
<td>88,337 (46.2)</td>
<td>97,568 (46.5)</td>
<td>183,832 (47.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninsured</td>
<td>37,927 (3.2)</td>
<td>3187 (1.7)</td>
<td>4687 (2.2)</td>
<td>16,697 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>538,717 (45.9)</td>
<td>87,246 (45.7)</td>
<td>100,496 (47.9)</td>
<td>175,447 (45.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severityc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>404,835 (34.5)</td>
<td>85,159 (44.6)</td>
<td>87,071 (41.5)</td>
<td>138,486 (35.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>404,624 (34.4)</td>
<td>68,183 (35.7)</td>
<td>72,773 (34.7)</td>
<td>131,242 (33.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>321,028 (27.3)</td>
<td>36,671 (19.2)</td>
<td>45,138 (21.5)</td>
<td>104,903 (26.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>41,540 (3.5)</td>
<td>773 (0.4)</td>
<td>4395 (2.1)</td>
<td>14,900 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex chronic condition</td>
<td>289,361 (24.6)</td>
<td>78,408 (41.0)</td>
<td>74,464 (35.5)</td>
<td>89,969 (23.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviation: APR-DRG, All Patient-Refined, Diagnosis-Related Group.

a All percentages are by column. Column percentages presented in this table demonstrate hospital patient mix. P < .001 for all comparisons.
b Median household income was determined by the zip code of the patient’s home address. The quartiles were defined as lowest ($1-$39,999), low ($40,000-$49,999), high ($50,000-$65,999), and highest ($66,000 or higher).
c Severity was determined by the charge weight of the discharge APR-DRG. Individual APR-DRG charge weights are used as proxies for severity by dividing the mean charge weight for an APR-DRG by the mean charge weight of all APR-DRGs to establish relative weights. The quartiles were defined as lowest (0.17-0.22), below average (0.29-0.75), above average (0.76-1.5), and highest (1.5-576).
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COMMENT & RESPONSE

Association Between Child Poverty and Academic Achievement

To the Editor Is poverty the primary determinant of child health and achievement, as the article by Haire et al and the editorial by Luby appear to imply? The article by Haire et al failed to address the myriad of interconnected variables associated with poverty. If the implied axiom were true, our parents and grandparents who endured the oppressive poverty of the Great Depression could never have become “the greatest generation.”

In September 2012, Thomson and McLanahan, prolific Princeton University researchers on children and poverty for...
more than 3 decades, addressed the many variables of at-risk children: “Recent research has demonstrated quite convincingly that family structure is strongly associated with children’s well-being, even in the very generous Nordic welfare states...children living with single mothers had fewer material resources, less parental support, and poorer health than those living with 2 original parents.”

Poverty of relationships may be the strongest predictor of behavioral and academic deficiencies.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-National Health Interview Survey publication, “Family Structure and Children’s Health in the United States,” reports on 249,570 families regarding both medical and behavioral health concerns. Among the findings: “Children in nuclear families were generally less likely than children in their remaining family types to have a learning disability or ADHD [attention-deficit/ hyperactivity disorder] regardless of parent’s education, income, poverty status, place of residence, or region.”

Finally, as noted in the editorial by Luby, child brains grow when loved and nurtured. The research by Bick et al demonstrates that enhanced brain development is consistent with the relationship wealth of a nuclear family.

Findings from Child Trends, the Search Institute, and the National Institutes of Health Add Health demonstrate that relationships are better predictors of development than money. The JAMA Network should avoid the appearance of 2-dimensional analysis that implies causality without addressing all variables. It would be deeply regrettable if the conclusions from the article actually led to more discrimination by associating children with lower socioeconomic status with poor brain development and achievement.

This very important topic should not fuel unbalanced advocacy for the children it intends to serve. These children, like their great-grandfathers, have the capacity to become great through caring, competent, and resilient families. Let us advocate for stable families as well as funds.

Alma L. Golden, MD

Author Affiliation: retired, Department of Pediatrics, Texas A&M Health Science Center, Temple.
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Association Between Child Poverty and Academic Achievement

To the Editor Hair et al1 reported in the September 2015 issue of JAMA Pediatrics on the association between child poverty, brain development, and academic achievement. This study provided evidence that as much as 20% of poverty-associated achievement deficits may be a result of a maturation lag in the frontal lobe, the temporal lobe, and the hippocampus. The authors suggested that the results might underestimate the true effect of poverty on child development because they examined a relatively healthy sample of US children who, for the most part, differ only in terms of family income.

We argue that at least a part of the observed effects might be attributable to exposure to environmental neurotoxicants, rather than poverty as such. Children with a low socioeconomic background have been shown to be more exposed to environmental toxicants. In addition, some neurotoxicants are known to affect both academic achievement and induce structural brain changes similar to those reported in this study,3,4 The authors prudently excluded children with low birth weights or attention problems and 3 children with previous lead poisoning in an attempt to identify the independent effect of poverty. However, neurotoxicants, such as lead and pesticides, may exert detrimental effects on gray matter volume and academic achievement at low exposure levels that may have occurred prenatally or early postnatally.

The authors acknowledged that a third factor may have played a role, such as genetic predisposition. However, pesticide exposure from nonorganic foods and lead exposure from poor housing are likely to confound the relationship between brain development and academic achievement on one hand, while mediating the poverty-achievement relationship on the other.

Data on legally mandated blood-lead screening could be useful to yield unbiased direct and indirect estimates. Adjusting for neurotoxicant exposure is necessary to prevent collider bias introduced by adjustment for the mediator (ie, brain development). On the other hand, such adjustment would likely bias the estimate of the direct effect downward by blocking the effect of poverty on academic achievement acting through the neurotoxicant path. In this scenario, methods based on a counterfactual framework, such as marginal structural models and g-formula estimation, are required to adjust for the confounding effect of neurotoxicant exposure without blocking the corresponding direct path from poverty to achievement.

Youssef Oulhote, PhD
Philippe Grandjean, MD, PhD

Author Affiliations: Department of Environmental Health, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts.
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In Reply We are delighted that our article has continued to increase interest in the ways that growing up in poor families affects children’s health and development. We welcome the Letters to the Editor appearing in this issue of JAMA Pediatrics and concur that the experiences described by the authors are important components of impoverished environments. However, we are not as certain as the authors that any single factor irrefutably explains the results that we found.

Oulhote and Grandjean suggest that the association between childhood poverty, brain structure, and academic achievement could be explained by increased exposure to environmental toxins. Exposure to toxins, including neurotoxicants such as pesticides and lead, is a known and serious risk factor for children in poverty. However, in our article, we note that children were screened out for a history of lead poisoning along with a number of conditions indicative of elevated blood lead levels (eg, behavior and learning problems, hearing problems, low IQ, and growth failure). Still, the authors raise an important point; further examination of this potential pathway is warranted.

Dr. Golden suggests that primary emphasis should be placed on the role of family instability. We agree that impaired caregiver-child relationships impede healthy child development. Indeed, many recent studies point to the deleterious effects of early adversity and stress on children’s learning, behavior, and health.

Both letters touch on the question that we are most often asked: “which aspect of poverty is causing these problems for children?” In addition to limited material resources, children living in poverty are likely to confront elevated levels of life stress, family instability, and violence; have poor nutrition; encounter less complex language and few books in the home; receive less consistent health care; live in crowded, noisy, or dangerous places that interfere with sleep; have more exposure to toxins; and attend underfunded schools. Meanwhile their caregivers are less likely to command the tools necessary to buffer children from the influences of these adverse early experiences.

Next steps should focus on the difficult task of elucidating which individual factor, or combination of factors, contributes to poverty’s influence on health and development and understanding the precise biological mechanisms through which these experiences confer risk. Growing up in poverty entails numerous inequities that are difficult to disentangle. It is worth noting that we studied only the healthiest, most robust of the poor, yet we still found striking effects of poverty. Family income may itself be an important pathway.

Our data do not imply that the abilities and health of low-income children are somehow predetermined or permanent. Rather, by studying areas of the brain that demonstrate plasticity, we can learn which causal factors tied to poverty influence children the most at various stages of development, and then design and test the effectiveness of interventions to improve children’s well-being.

Nicole L. Hair, PhD
Jamie L. Hanson, PhD
Barbara L. Wolfe, PhD
Seth D. Pollak, PhD
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