## Table Supporting Discussion of Schneider et al.

Table A below presents information underlying the discussion in:

Scanlan JP. Understanding patterns of absolute differences in vaccination rates in different settings. *Journal Review* Apr. 21, 2008:
http://www.journalreview.org/view_pubmed_article.php?pmid=11572737&specialty_id=22&sdesc=&emsg=

Responding to:

Schneider EC, Cleary PD, Zaslavsky AM, Epstein AM. Racial disparity in influenza vaccination: Does managed care narrow the gap between blacks and whites? *JAMA* 2001;286:1455-1460.

The fields in the table are as follows:

Adjusted      whether adjusted or unadjusted for propensity scores
Type      whether fee-for-service (FFS) or managed care (MMC) plans
WV      white vaccination rate
BV      black vaccination rate
WNV      white rate of no vaccination
BNV      black rate of no vaccination
Ratio1      ratio of white vaccination rate to black vaccination rate
Ratio2      ratio of black rate of no vaccination to black rate of no vaccination
RelFav      relative difference between vaccination rates $(1-(BV/WV))$[1]
RelAdv      absolute difference between rates of no vaccination $((BNV/WNV)-1)$
AD      absolute difference between rates (percentage points)
OR      ratio of white odds of vaccination to black odds of vaccination
ES      estimated difference between means of hypothesized normal distributions (in hundredths of a standard deviation)

## Table A. White and Black Rates of Receiving Vaccination and Failing to Receive Vaccination Managed Care and Fee-for-Service Plans, with Various Measures of Differences between Rates

| Adj | Type | WV | BV | WNV | BNV | Ratio 1 | Ratio2 | RelFav | RelAdv | AD | OR | ES |
|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|----|
| N | FFS | 67.10% | 45.40% | 32.90% | 54.60% | 1.48 | 1.66 | 32.34% | 65.96% | 21.7 | 2.45 | 58 |
| N | MMC | 72.80% | 51.20% | 27.20% | 48.80% | 1.42 | 1.79 | 29.67% | 79.41% | 21.6 | 2.55 | 57 |
| Y | FFS | 67.60% | 42.70% | 32.40% | 57.30% | 1.58 | 1.77 | 36.83% | 76.85% | 24.9 | 2.80 | 65 |
| Y | MMC | 72.70% | 54.10% | 27.30% | 45.90% | 1.34 | 1.68 | 25.58% | 68.13% | 18.6 | 2.26 | 50 |

---

[1] These figures are provided because, as discussed in the Addendum to reference 7 and in reference 11, AHRQ's method of calculating relative differences in favorable and adverse outcomes can yield a different conclusion as to which is larger than that yielded by comparison of Ratios 1 and 2.