

Accepted Manuscript

Inequalities in access to health and social care among adults with multiple sclerosis: a scoping review of the literature

Hazel Roddam Reader in Allied Health Practice ,
David Rog Consultant Neurologist ,
Jessie Janssen Research Fellow , Neil Wilson Research Associate ,
Lucy Cross Research Assistant , Olufemi Olajide PhD student ,
Paola Dey Professor of Public Health and Epidemiology



PII: S2211-0348(18)30581-9
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msard.2018.12.043>
Reference: MSARD 1106

To appear in: *Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders*

Received date: 5 July 2018
Revised date: 11 December 2018
Accepted date: 31 December 2018

Please cite this article as: Hazel Roddam Reader in Allied Health Practice , David Rog Consultant Neurologist , Jessie Janssen Research Fellow , Neil Wilson Research Associate , Lucy Cross Research Assistant , Olufemi Olajide PhD student , Paola Dey Professor of Public Health and Epidemiology. Inequalities in access to health and social care among adults with multiple sclerosis: a scoping review of the literature, *Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders* (2019), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msard.2018.12.043>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Highlights

- This comprehensive scoping review benchmarks the international evidence base for access to health and social care for MS patients
- There are inequalities across the prevention, care and support pathway, particularly for men, older age groups, lower SES, and those with MH problems.
- There are clear implications for clinicians, health organisations and national policies.
- There are specific research gaps particularly for vulnerable groups and for patient information.
- These findings will help to inform prioritisation of future research internationally for this population.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Inequalities in access to health and social care among adults with multiple sclerosis: a scoping review of the literature

Conflict of interest statement:

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest in submitting this manuscript.

The project was funded by David Rog, Consultant Neurologist, Salford Royal NHS Hospitals Foundation Trust

Hazel Roddam, Reader in Allied Health Practice, School of Health Sciences, University of Central Lancashire, Adelphi Street, Preston, England, PR1 2HE. HRoddam@uclan.ac.uk

David Rog, Consultant Neurologist, Salford Royal NHS Hospitals Foundation Trust, Stott Lane, Salford, M6 8HD David.Rog@srft.nhs.uk

Jessie Janssen, Research Fellow, School of Health Sciences, University of Central Lancashire, Adelphi Street, Preston, England, PR1 2HE. JJanssen@uclan.ac.uk

Neil Wilson, Research Associate, School of Health Sciences, University of Central Lancashire, Adelphi Street, Preston, England, PR1 2HE. NWilson9@uclan.ac.uk

Lucy Cross, Research Assistant, School of Health Sciences, University of Central Lancashire, Adelphi Street, Preston, England, PR1 2HE. LCross1@uclan.ac.uk

Olufemi Olajide, PhD student, School of Dentistry, University of Central Lancashire, Adelphi Street, Preston, England, PR1 2HE. OOlajide@uclan.ac.uk

Paola Dey, Professor of Public Health and Epidemiology, Edge Hill University, St Helens Road, Ormskirk, Lancashire, England L39 4QP paola.dey@edgehill.ac.uk

Corresponding Author: Hazel Roddam, Reader in Allied Health Practice, School of Health Sciences, University of Central Lancashire, Adelphi Street, Preston, England, PR1 2HE. HRoddam@uclan.ac.uk

ABSTRACT (300 words unstructured)

Variations in access to health care are known to contribute to differences in life expectancy, morbidity and health-related quality-of-life across population subgroups. We undertook a scoping review to identify what is known about in-country variations in access to services for adults with multiple sclerosis and to identify gaps in the literature to inform future research and national policies. We searched MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, PSYCHINFO, SocINDEX and Social Science Abstracts from inception to end of December 2016 for quantitative studies which had investigated differences in access to prevention services, healthcare services, treatments and social care between inequality groups, defined using the PROGRESS-PLUS framework. A total of 4959 unique abstracts yielded 36 papers which met our eligibility criteria. Only 3 studies were cohort studies and only 4 were population-based; most were from the United States (n=27). There were 6 studies on access to MS focused care and 6 on access to Disease Modifying drugs. There were 3 studies on access to prevention/lifestyle programmes and none on access to welfare services or information support. There were no papers examining inequalities in access for 'vulnerable' groups, such as, those with learning disability. In the available studies, there was evidence of inequalities in access to services with a trend for worse access among men, older age groups, those from lower socio-economic groups or the least educated, non-caucasians, those with mental health problems and those from rural areas. In the studies on access to disease modifying treatments, older age and lower socioeconomic status were consistently associated with a lower rate of uptake, while race and gender were not. Inequalities or disparities in access to all levels of services and treatments will need to be addressed through a strategic research agenda with an emphasis on population-based studies and development and evaluation of interventions to reduce inequality.

INTRODUCTION

Variations in access to health care are known to contribute to differences in life expectancy, morbidity and health-related quality-of-life across population subgroups [1-4]. When these variations are avoidable they contribute to inequalities or disparities in health experience [5] and have led to international and national strategies to reduce gaps in service provision, particularly, when there is evidence of lack of access to proven effective interventions or clinical variations in care [6-8].

The Multiple Sclerosis Atlas has demonstrated gross international differences in mortality in multiple sclerosis and access to disease modifying treatments [9]. However, studies also suggest variations within countries, with some evidence that place of residence and sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender and ethnicity) have an influence on patient outcome [10-12]. There is also concern about variations in access to disease modifying treatments for some patient subgroups, which might be, in part, secondary to how health services are organised [13,14]. In chronic conditions like multiple sclerosis (MS), it is also important to consider inequalities in access to services and treatments which reduce morbidity across the care pathway, from secondary prevention to rehabilitation and social care [15]. The complex needs of many patients with MS require the input of many other services, such as physiotherapy, occupational therapy and mental health services, as these treatments/therapies have been shown to reduce morbidity in MS [16-18]. Independence and participation may be maintained through social support, personal support and housing adaptations, and the employment consequences of an MS diagnosis through vocational rehabilitation [19]. More recently, there has been a greater focus on improving well-being through promoting healthy lifestyles among adults with multiple sclerosis, because of evidence that increased physical activity helps to maintain physical functioning and improve mental health in MS patients [20] and because smoking may raise the risk of disease progression [21]. Therefore, variations in access to lifestyle and prevention programmes is also important.

We undertook a scoping review of the literature to identify what is known about in-country variations in access to services for adults with MS and to identify gaps in the literature to inform future research and national policies. A scoping review uses systematic methods to identify the literature but addresses a broader question than a systematic review. As such, it is less concerned with the reporting quality of the papers or meta-analysis. In this scoping review, we identified and reviewed studies which used a quantitative methodology to investigate intra-national (in-country) variations in access across the care pathway and health systems of different inequality groups among populations of adult MS patients.

METHODS

Although this study was not focused on the effectiveness of interventions to reduce inequity, we used the Joanna Briggs Institute guidance on scoping reviews [22] and the Cochrane and Campbell Equity methods group checklist [23] to guide the development of the study protocol, study implementation and presentation of findings. This study was funded by Salford Royal NHS Hospitals Foundation Trust.

Definition of exposures (Inequality groups)

We used the PROGRESS-PLUS framework for determining inequality groups in this review [24]. These were used to guide terms in the search strategy and to stratify studies in the analysis. In this framework the PROGRESS inequality groups (place of residence, race/ethnicity/culture/language, occupation/employment status, gender/sex, religion, education, socio-economic status, and social capital) were supplemented by 'PLUS' inequality groups related to personal characteristics pertinent to MS patients: age, disability (physical +/- or cognitive), disease type, mental health conditions, and other 'vulnerable groups', e.g., learning difficulties, travelers, migrants. The 'PLUS' groups were chosen based on the potential for barriers to access of services and/or treatments following discussion within the review team, which consisted of clinicians and public health professionals. When considering social capital, we took a broad and inclusive approach to its definition and included all aspects of social networks and social cohesion under this umbrella term [25]. We also included a broad range of indicators of socioeconomic status, e.g., deprivation indices, income.

Definition of outcomes (programmes/services/treatments)

À priori, we broadly categorised the programmes/services/treatments and, post-hoc, agreed subcategories for presentation when studies were found. The categories (and subcategories) included: prevention programmes (subcategories: primary and secondary prevention), diagnostic investigations, medical care (subcategories: medication general, disease modifying treatments, general health care, neurology services, MS specific services, health provider systems e.g., health maintenance organisation), mental health services, rehabilitation services, social and welfare services (personal support, housing, assisted devices or assisted living) and information support.

Eligibility criteria

We included studies with a quantitative research design from any country and healthcare setting if they compared inequality MS groups as to uptake of, or access to programmes, services or treatments across the prevention/care/support pathway. Participants could have any type or stage of MS and be at any time following diagnosis. As the focus was on adult MS patients, we excluded any study in which more than 5% of the population was under 16 years of age. We also excluded studies comparing MS patients with the general population or with other patient

groups, studies investigating uptake of alternative or complementary therapies, those that focused on uptake of lifestyles rather than the services which promote lifestyle modification, those investigating DMT adherence rather than prescription and studies where the outcome was perceived or reported need, rather than comparative need.

Search strategy

We searched MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, PSYCHINFO, SocINDEX and Social Science Abstracts from inception to end of December 2016 using the key terms for multiple sclerosis as recommended by the Cochrane Multiple Sclerosis and Rare Diseases Review Group [26] and search terms for inequalities/disparities and the inequality groups, adapted as appropriate for the different databases. The search was limited to English Language articles. The full search strategy for MEDLINE (EBSCO) is included in supplementary materials (supplementary table 1). The titles and abstracts were screened by teams of two authors independently and any conflicts resolved by a third reviewer.


Data retrieval, extraction and analysis

Full text papers for all potentially eligible studies identified by the search, and when there was insufficient detail in the title/abstract to determine eligibility, were retrieved and screened for inclusion by two researchers, with a third reviewer resolving any conflicts. Data was extracted for each of the identified studies using a specially designed proforma. Data was extracted on the study design, country and setting, definition of MS, sample size, population characteristics, setting, data source, exposures (PROGRESS-PLUS categories), outcomes (uptake/access) and key findings for each exposure/outcome relationship reported. Data was extracted by one researcher and all data was checked by a second researcher, with conflicts being resolved by discussion. The dataset was synthesised narratively after discussion with the full review team.

RESULTS

A total of 4959 unique abstracts were identified from the databases following automatic removal of duplicates. This yielded 157 full text papers for eligibility screening and a further paper was identified from other sources [15]. A total of 36 papers were deemed eligible for further analysis [15, 27-61]. Reasons for exclusion for the other 122 papers included: a lack of focus on inequality (n = 23); non-eligible study design (n= 26); non-eligible study population (n=18); exposures inconsistent with the PROGRESS-PLUS framework (n=27) or lack of data on access to a service or treatment (n=28). Figure 1 shows the flow diagram of search results.

Figure 1: Flow chart of search



The full characteristics of the 36 studies is shown in supplementary table 2. Only 3 studies were cohort studies [28, 47, 55] and only 4 were population-based [46, 47, 52, 58]. The data source for 12 of the 36 was in full, or in part, from the members of National Multiple Sclerosis Society [32, 33, 36, 37, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 53, 54, 56] and for 4 studies the North American Research Committee on Multiple Sclerosis (NARCOMS) register [30, 44, 45, 56]. There were also 4 studies which used the Minimum Data Set (MDS) for Medicare/Medicaid certified Nursing Homes (two of which used the same sample) [29, 31, 34, 35] and 3 which drew on a single survey ("Aging With MS: Unmet Needs in the Great Lakes Region" survey) [38, 39, 40]. The

studies were published between 2000 and 2016 with 10 studies published since 2010 [30, 38, 39, 46, 47, 51, 53, 55, 56, 61]. Most of the studies were undertaken in the US (n=27) and all studies were undertaken in North America or Western Europe.

Figure 2 and table 1 show the numbers of studies focusing on the different access outcome categories and subcategories. There were 10 unique studies on access to medical services, of which, six studies were on access to MS focused care. Eight unique studies focused on access to medications, of which, 6 were on access to Disease Modifying drugs. A similar number of papers were on access to mental health services (n=7), rehabilitation (n=8), and social support/care (n=7). There were a few studies on diagnostic services (n=2), access to prevention/lifestyle programmes (n=3) and on housing adaptations or aids (n=4), but no studies on access to welfare services or information support. All three studies about inequalities in access to health provider systems were from the United States.

Figure 2: Number of papers by access subcategory




Table 1 summary of findings here (see separate file)

The effect of gender was examined across all access subcategories for which there were studies, and disability and socioeconomic status across all but one. Gender (n=25), age (n=21) and disability (n=18) were most frequently included as exposure factors. In contrast, mental health status (n=9), occupation, i.e., employment status,

(n=9), and disease type (n=7) were less frequently examined. Given the setting of most of the papers, the 15 studies about race mainly focused on differences between Caucasian, African American and Hispanic populations. Those on place (n= 13) compared urban and rural populations and all the papers categorised under social capital (n= 14) were on marital status or living arrangements. There were no papers examining 'vulnerable' groups or religion as factors affecting access to services/treatments.

The findings for each access category is shown in table 1. There was evidence of inequalities in access to services, but the relationship was not consistent across access subcategories. Broadly, there was a trend for worse access among men, older age groups, those from lower socio-economic groups or the least educated, non-caucasians, those with mental health problems and those from rural areas. But these findings were not universal, for example, women were less likely than men to see an urologist or have a powered wheelchair, and younger patients were less likely to be in receipt of personal assistance. In the studies on access to disease modifying treatments, older age and lower socioeconomic status were consistently associated with a lower rate of uptake, while race and gender were not. The relationship between severity of disability and levels of access across the care pathway was complex; with evidence of worse access to primary prevention and neurology services, no evidence of access issues to MS specific care and better access to rehabilitation, social care and assisted living.

DISCUSSION

In the limited number of studies identified, the findings of this scoping review support the existence of inequality, or disparity, in access to services among MS subpopulations within countries. The subpopulations experiencing inequality are similar to those experiencing access or uptake issues in other conditions. For example, in cancer screening men, minority ethnic groups and those from more deprived areas have lower rates of bowel screening [62]; older adults are less likely to receive proven effective treatments [63]; and rurality has been associated with lower access to specialist services [64]. However, this review also suggests that interpreting variations in access rates as an inequality or disparity is complex. There was some evidence that inequalities may be context specific. For example, women rather than men were less likely to be referred to a urologist. Urinary symptoms are very common in multiple sclerosis, but one study suggested that only two thirds of patients are asked about these symptoms by their clinician [65]. Gender disparity in referral to urologists has also been observed in general populations with haematuria and voiding difficulties, with women less likely to be referred and more likely to be treated for urinary tract infections [66,67]. Depending on the population subgroup, a higher or a lower uptake rate might be interpreted as an inequality for the same service. For example, in the study by Marrie [46], access to ICU was lower among those living in rural areas, which might suggest that because of the distance from specialist services those in rural areas could not obtain necessary management. However, access to intensive care units (ICU) was higher among men and older

patients. This could be interpreted as women and younger patients being less likely to benefit from necessary care; but equally could be interpreted that men and older patients are less likely to receive appropriate care to prevent overwhelming infections. Similarly, a lower rate of access to lifestyle interventions among those who are more disabled may be an inequality if they can benefit from these services; whereas a lower rate of access to home adaptations among those who are less disabled may not be an inequality, if they do not need such aids. These examples highlight the need for research to understand the reasons for differences between population subgroups: whilst some of these are likely to be similar to those experienced by adults with other co-morbidities [68], some are likely to be disease specific. Such research will also facilitate the development of strategies to reduce important variations.

Further difficulties in interpretation were introduced by the study designs. Few studies used a cohort design and therefore in most studies both exposure and outcome were measured at the same time. While this may not affect some exposures (such as gender), the interpretation of the direction of effect can be more problematic for exposures such as mental health or disability. So for example, in the study by Buchanan et al, nursing residents who were depressed were less likely to have occupational therapy (OT) [29]. As this was a cross-sectional study, it was unclear whether they had less OT because they were depressed, or not having OT made them depressed. Furthermore, there were other concerns about the quality of these studies: not all studies undertook a multivariate analysis to assess whether the exposures were independent risk factors. Few studies were population-based and many relied on members of MS societies: these groups might be less likely to include those from lower socio-economic groups, the less educated and minority groups [42, 43]. Finally, the generalisability of the findings may be limited because the majority were undertaken in US and all within western developed countries. Even then, the organisation and funding of health and social care systems in the US and the geography and racial breakdown are substantially different to that of, for example, the United Kingdom, where only 3 studies have been undertaken [15, 51, 52].

There were a relatively high number of studies investigating access to disease modifying treatments. This is perhaps unsurprising, given the controversies around funding of these effective but expensive drugs; particularly when they first came to market [51]. More recent studies suggest that in addition to concerns about socioeconomic disadvantage having an impact on access to first line DMTs, there still remain concern about access of patients from lower socioeconomic groups to second line treatments [69]. There were very few studies about prevention programmes, which might reflect the relative recency of the interest in lifestyle interventions to promote well-being in MS populations. Nevertheless, promotion of physical activity, safe alcohol consumption and smoking cessation are incorporated into some national guidelines for MS care [70], and further work on access to these interventions overall and across inequality groups is warranted. It is perhaps more surprising that there were no studies on access to vocational rehabilitation services, and few on the impact of unemployment on access to services, given the

considerable research on the difficulties encountered by adults with MS within the workplace and the detrimental impact of unemployment on their well-being [71, 72]. We also found no studies about access to informational support. There is increasing interest in developing self-management programmes including digital technology for patients. While such programmes are important to promote well-being and patient engagement [13], there is the potential for introducing further health inequalities, as access to and use of the internet or mobile devices differs across socioeconomic and racial groups [73].

As well as the difficulties in interpretation, there were other limitations to our scoping review. Because of resource limitations, only studies in the English language were included. This may in part account for the observation that there were relatively few countries included among the eligible studies. We specifically excluded studies which focused only on perceived or expressed needs, as these are subjective. Studies reporting objectively measured needs were included, but perceived or expressed needs may under represent genuine inequalities as they may represent wants, although studies have shown that these can vary across inequality group [74]. We did not include qualitative studies as the objective was to compare across inequality groups, but these types of studies would give greater depth of understanding of why inequalities exist. Finally, the concluding step in Arksey and O'Malley's original structure for scoping reviews includes a discussion with stakeholders of the findings [75]. This has not been formally undertaken with external stakeholders, but was addressed internally by the review team which included both researchers and clinicians. A recent scoping review on the conduct and reporting of scoping reviews suggests relatively few published scoping reviews undertake this step [76].

CONCLUSION

This scoping review was essential to benchmark the current evidence base and to demonstrate the paucity of published studies to date for this population. It has identified that inequalities exist throughout the prevention, care and support pathway for adults with MS, but the interpretation of these findings are limited by the lack of consistency between studies and across different types of care or support. In part, this may be because inequality is likely to be context specific and, in part, because of the limitations of the study design. There were also some specific research gaps identified, particularly in relation to prevention, vocational support and patient information and within inequality groups, learning disabilities and other 'vulnerable' groups. Inequalities or disparities in access to all levels of services and treatments will need to be addressed through a strategic research agenda. Further research to explore these areas requires large-scale population-based databases to ensure that participants are representative. Longitudinal studies also need to be responsive to changes in evidence about the management and treatment of MS. Further research is needed into understanding the reasons for differences in access to develop strategies to address any inequality. The findings of this scoping review will help to inform the prioritisation of future research for this population internationally.

REFERENCES

1. Cookson R, Asaria M, Ali S et al. Health Equity Indicators for the English NHS; a longitudinal whole-population study at the small area level. Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library. 2016 (Sept)
2. Judge A, Welton NJ, Sandhu J, Ben Shlomo Y. Equity in access to total joint replacement of the hip and knee in England: cross-sectional study. *BMJ*. 2010;341:c4092
3. Karanikolos M, Ellis L, Coleman MP, McKee M. Health systems performance and cancer outcomes. *J Natl Cancer Institute Monograph*. 2013;46:7-12
4. Li Y, Glace LG, Lyness JM et al. Mental illness, access to hospitals with invasive cardiac procedures by Medicaid acute myocardial infarction patients. *Health Serv Res*. 2013;48(3):1076-95
5. World Health Organisation Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Geneva, CH 2008
6. Asaria M, Shehzad A, Doran T et al. How a universal health system reduces inequality: lessons from England. *J Epid Comm Health*. 2016; 70(7); 637-43.
7. Obama B. United States Health Care Reform: Progress to Date and Next Steps. *JAMA*. 2016;316(5):525-32.
8. World Health Organisation. Taking action to improve health equity. Global Plan of Action on Social Determinants of Health. www.who.int/social_determinants/action_sdh/en/ accessed 24/6/2018
9. Browne P, Chandraratna D Angood C et al. Atlas of Multiple Sclerosis 2013: a growing problem with widespread inequity. *Neurology*. 2014;83(11):1022-4.
10. Amezcua L, Rivas E Joseph S et al. Multiple Sclerosis Mortality by race/ethnicity, age and time-period in the United States 1999-2015. *Neuroepidemiology*. 2018; 50:35-40
11. Cutter CR, Zimmerman J, Salter AR et al. Causes of death among persons with multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scher Relat Disord*. 2015;4(5): 484-90.
12. Landtblom AM, Riise T, Boito A, Soderfeldt B. Distribution of Multiple Sclerosis in Sweden based on mortality and compensation statistics. *Neuroepidemiology*. 2002 Jul-Aug;21(4):167-79
13. Marziniak M, Ghorals K, Kozubski W et al. Variations in multiple sclerosis practice within Europe: is it time for a new treatment guideline? *Multiple Sclerosis and related disorders*. 2016;8:35-44.

14. Souliotis K, Alexopoulou E, Papageorgiou M et al. Access to care for multiple sclerosis in times of economic crisis in Greece; the Hope II study. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2015;5(2). 83-9.
15. Freeman JA and Thompson AJ. Community services in multiple sclerosis: still a matter of chance *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2000;69:728–732
16. Khan F, Amatya B. Rehabilitation in multiple sclerosis: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2017;98(2):353-67.
17. Baker NA, Tickle-Degnen L. The effectiveness of physical, psychological and functional intervention in treating clients with multiple sclerosis: a metaanalysis. *Am J of occupational therapy.* 2001; 55(3);324-31.
18. Fiest KM, Walker JR, Bernstein CN et al. Systematic review and metaanalysis of interventions for depression and anxiety in persons with multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* 2016;5:12-26.
19. Costa DC et al 2012 The effect of social support on the quality of life of patients with multiple sclerosis *Arq Neuropsiquiatr* 2012;70(2):108-113
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22311214>
20. Halabchi G, Alizaden Z, Sahranian MA and Abolhasani M. Exercise prescription for patients with multiple sclerosis; potential benefits and practical recommendations. *BMC Neurology.* 2017;17:185.
21. Degelman ML, Herman KM. Smoking and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and metaanalysis using the Bradford Hill criteria for causation. *Mult Scler Related Disorder.* 2017;17:207-16.
22. The Joanna Briggs Institute. The Joanna Briggs Institute Scoping Review Manual 2015 edition/ supplement. Methodology for JBI Scoping Reviews. The Joanna Briggs Institute. 2015.
23. Cochrane and Campbell Equity methods group
<http://methods.cochrane.org/sites/methods.cochrane.org/equity/files/public/uploads/EquityChecklist2012.pdf> Accessed 14th May 2018
24. Cochrane and Campbell Equity methods group
<http://methods.cochrane.org/equity/projects/evidence-equity/progress-plus> Accessed 25th June 2018
25. Moore S and Kawachi I. Twenty years of social capital and health research: a glossary. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2017 May;71(5):513-517. doi: 10.1136/jech-2016-208313.
26. Cochrane Multiple Sclerosis and Rare Diseases Review Group
(<http://msrdcns.cochrane.org/>) Accessed 1st December 2016
27. Avasarala JR, O'Donovan CA, Roach SE et al. Analysis of NAMCS data for multiple sclerosis, 1998-2004. *BMC Medicine* 2007;5:6

28. Bjorkenstam C, Tinghog P, Brenner P et al. Is disability pension a risk indicator for future need of psychiatric healthcare of suicidal behaviour among MS patients- a nationwide register study in Sweden? *BMC Psychiatry*. 2015;15:286
29. Buchanan RJ, Wang S, Tai-Seale M and Ju H. Analyses of nursing home residents with multiple sclerosis and depression using the Minimum Data Set. *Multiple Sclerosis* 2003;9:171-88.
30. Buchanan RJ, Zuniga MA, Carrillo-Zuniga G et al. Comparisons of Latinos, African Americans and Caucasians with Multiple Sclerosis. *Ethnicity and Disease*. 2010;20:451-57
31. Buchanan RJ, Martin RA, Zuniga M et al. Nursing home residents with multiple sclerosis: comparisons of African American residents to white residents on admission. *Multiple Sclerosis* 2004;10:660-67
32. Buchanan RJ, Wang S, Stuijbergen et al. Urban/rural differences in the use of physician services by people with multiple sclerosis. *NeuroRehabilitation*. 2006;21:177-87.
33. Buchanan RJ, Stuijbergen A, Chakravorty BM et al. Urban/rural differences in access and barriers to health care for people with multiple sclerosis. *J Health Hum Serv Adm*. 2006;29(3):360-75
34. Buchanan RJ, Martin RA, Wang S, Kim M. Racial analyses of longer-stay nursing home residents with multiple sclerosis. *Ethnicity and Disease*. 2006;16:159-65
35. Buchanan RJ, Wang S, Zhu L and Kim M. Rural-Urban Comparisons of Nursing Home Residents with Multiple Sclerosis. *The Journal of Rural Health*. 2004;20:85-91.
36. Buchanan RJ, Zhu L and James W. Urban/rural differences in health insurance coverage among people with multiple sclerosis. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2007;29:1890-98
37. Buchanan RJ, Schiffer R, Wang S et al. Satisfaction with Mental Health Care Among People with Multiple Sclerosis in Urban and Rural Areas. *Psychiatric Services*. 2006;57:1206-9
38. Finlayson M, Plow M and Cho C. Use of Physical Therapy Services among Middle-Aged and Older Adults with Multiple Sclerosis. *Physical Therapy*. 2010;90:1607-18
39. Finlayson ML, Cho CC. A Profile of Support Group Use and Need Among Middle-Aged and Older Adults with Multiple Sclerosis. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*. 2011.54:475-93
40. Garcia J and Finlayson M. Mental health and mental health service use among people ages 45 + with Multiple Sclerosis. *Canadian Journal of Mental Health*. 2005;24:9-22

41. Iezzoni LI, Ngo LH and Kinkel RP. Working –age persons with multiple sclerosis and access to disease-modifying medications. *Multiple Sclerosis*. 2008;14:112-22.
42. Iezzoni LI, Rao SR and Kinkel RP. Patterns of mobility aid use among working-age persons with multiple sclerosis living in the community in the United States. *Disability and Health Journal*. 2009;2:67-76
43. Johnson KL, Bamer AM, Yorkston KM and Amtmann D. Use of cognitive aids and other assistive technology by individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol*. 2009;4:1-8.
44. Marrie RA, Cutter G, Tyry T et al. Disparities in the management of multiple sclerosis-related bladder symptoms. *Neurology* 2007;68:1971-78
45. Marrie RA, Horwitz R, Cutter G et al. The burden of mental comorbidity in multiple sclerosis: frequent, underdiagnosed, and undertreated. *Multiple Sclerosis*. 2009;15:385-92.
46. Marrie RA, Bernstein CN, Peschken CA et al. Health care utilization before and after intensive care unit admission in multiple sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders*. 2015;4:296-303
47. McKay KA, Tremlett H, Zhu F et al. A population-based study comparing multiple sclerosis clinic users and non-users in British Columbia, Canada. *European Journal of Neurology* 2016;23:1093-1100.
48. Minden SL, Frankel D, Hadden L and Hoaglin DC. Access to health care for people with multiple sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis*. 2007;13:547-58
49. Minden SL, Hoaglin DC, Hadden L et al. Access to and utilization of neurologists by people with multiple sclerosis. *Neurology*. 2008;70:1141-49
50. Mosley LJ, Lee GP, Hughes ML and Chatto C. Analysis of symptoms, functional impairments, and participation in occupational therapy for individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*. 2004;17:27-43
51. Owens T, Evangelou N and Whynes DK. Rationing and deprivation: disease-modifying therapies for multiple sclerosis in the United Kingdom. *Eur J Health Econ*. 2013;14:315-21.
52. Peters TJ, Somerset M, Campbell R and Sharp DJ. Variables associated with attendance at, and the perceived helpfulness of, meetings for people with multiple sclerosis. *Health and Social Care in the Community*. 2003;11:19-26
53. Plow M, Cho C and Finlayson M. Utilization of health promotion and wellness services among middle-aged and older adults with multiple sclerosis in the mid-west US. *Health Promotion International*. 2010;25:318-330.
54. Putnam M and Tang F. Multiple sclerosis, aging and support service utilization. *The Journal of Rehabilitation*. 2007; 73(4):3-14
55. Ribes Garcia S, Gomez-Pajares F, Puig CA. Description of the Characteristics of Multiple Sclerosis Patients in the Region of Valencia (Spain) Who Requested

- Treatment with Disease-Modifying Drugs during the 2005-14 Decade. *Eur Neurol.* 2016;75:274-81
56. Roessler RT and Gitchel WD. Severity Employment, and Gender: Factors Influencing Independence for Adults with Multiple Sclerosis. *Journal of Rehabilitation.* 2013;79:33-45
57. Shabas D and Heffner M. Multiple sclerosis management for low-income minorities. *Multiple Sclerosis.* 2005;11:635-40.
58. Sundstrom P, Nstrom L, Svenningsson A, Forsgren L. Sick leave and professional assistance for multiple sclerosis individuals in Vasterbotten County, northern Sweden. *Multiple Sclerosis.* 2003;9:515-20.
59. Vickrey BG, Shatin D, Wolf SM et al. Management of multiple sclerosis across managed care and fee-for-service systems. *Neurology.* 2000;55:1341-45
60. Williams RM, Turner AP, Hatzakis M et al. Prevalence and correlates of depression among veterans with multiple sclerosis. *Neurology* 2005;64:75-80.
61. Windt R, Glaeske G and Hoffmann F. Treatment of multiple sclerosis in Germany: an analysis based on claims data of more than 30,000 patients. *Int J Clin Pharm.* 2013;35:1229-35
62. Wools A, Dapper EA, de Leeuw JR. Colorectal cancer screening participation: a systematic review. *Eur J Public Health.* 2016 Feb;26(1):158-68.
63. Gnani R, Migliardi A, Demaria M, Petrelli A, Caprioglio A, Costa G. Statins prescribing for the secondary prevention of ischaemic heart disease in Torino, Italy. A case of ageism and social inequalities. *Eur J Public Health.* 2007 Oct;17(5):492-6.
64. Dourthit N, Kiv S, Dwolatzky T, Biswas S.. Exposing some important barriers to health care access in the rural USA. Douthit N et al. *Public Health.* 2015; 129(6):611-20.
65. Wang G, Marrie RA, Fox RJ, Tyry T, Cofield SS, Cutter GR, Salter A. Treatment satisfaction and bothersome bladder, bowel, sexual symptoms in multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* 2018 Feb;20:16-21.
66. Henning A, Wehrberger M, Madersbacher S et al. Do differences in clinical symptoms and referral patterns contribute to the gender gap in bladder cancer? *BJU Int.* 2013 Jul;112(1):68-73.
67. Johnson EK, Daignault S, Zhang Y, Lee CT. Patterns of hematuria referral to urologists: does a gender disparity exist? *Urology.* 2008 Sep;72(3):498-502
68. Fradgley EA, Paul CL, Bryant J. A systematic review of barriers to optimal outpatient specialist services for individuals with prevalent chronic diseases: what are the unique and common barriers experienced by patients in high income countries? *Int J Equity Health.* 2015 Jun 9;14:52.

69. Calocer F, Dejardin O, Droulon K et al. Socio-economic status influences access to second-line disease modifying treatment in Relapsing Remitting Multiple Sclerosis patients. *PLoS One*. 2018 Feb 1;13(2):e0191646.
70. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Multiple Sclerosis in adults: management. Clinical guideline 186. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. 2014 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/CG186/chapter/1-Recommendations#ms-symptom-management-and-rehabilitation-2> accessed 26th June 2018
71. Gerhard L, Dorstyn DS, Murphy G, Roberts RM. Neurological, physical and sociodemographic correlates of employment in multiple sclerosis: A meta-analysis. *J Health Psychol*. 2018 Feb 1:1359105318755262
72. Raggi A, Covelli C, Schiavolin S et al. Work-related problems in multiple sclerosis: a literature review on its associates and determinants. *Disability and Rehabilitation*;38:936-44.
73. Nguyen A, Mosadeghi S, Almario CV. Persistent digital divide in access to and use of the Internet as a resource for health information: Results from a California population-based study. *Int J Med Inform*. 2017 Jul;103:49-54.
74. Lonergan R, Kinsella K, Fitzpatrick P et al. Unmet needs of multiple sclerosis patients in the community. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. 2015 Mar;4(2):144-50
75. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: Towards a Methodological Framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol*. 2005;8(1):19–32
76. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W et al. A scoping review on the conduct and reporting of scoping reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2016 Feb 9;16:15

Table 1: Number of studies investigating each access subcategory and summary of findings (number in brackets are the references of the papers; SE = socioeconomic)

Factors investigated	Place	Race	Occupation	Gender	Education	SE status	Social Support	Age	Disability	Disease Type	Mental Health	Summary of findings
Lifestyle N=1	[53][53]		[53]	[53]	[53]	[53]	[53]		[53]		[53]	Males, those from less educated backgrounds and the more disabled were significantly less likely to access lifestyle and wellness services. ^[53]
Secondary Prevention N=2	[33]			[57]								There was a trend towards fewer men taking calcium supplements and having a DEXA scan ^[57] and MS patients in urban areas being less able to access mammography, because of lack of adaptation for physical problems. ^[33]
Diagnostic investigation N=2	[33]	[44]		[44]		[44]			[44]			In a multivariate analysis, women and non-white MS patients were less likely to see a urologist and have urological investigation. ^[44] In Buchanan et al (2005), similar proportions of patients with MS in urban and rural areas could not have a diagnostic procedure because the equipment could not accommodate their impairments.
General hospital care N=6	[32], [33], [35], [46]		[56]	[46], [56]		[46]		[46]	[56]		[60]	Veterans with major depression had more frequent primary care visits. ^[60] The unemployed

												had more difficulty attending medical appointments. ^[56] One study suggested no differences in overall access to general care between rural and urban areas, ^[32] access issues may differ though with those in rural areas citing proximity ^[33] , and in urban areas, physical challenges. ^[32] Nursing home residents in rural areas were less likely to receive domiciliary visits ^[35] . Non-urban residents were also less likely to access ICU, but men and older patients were more likely. ^[46]
Neurologist care N=2	[49]	[30], [49],		[49]		[49]		[49]	[49]			Men, older patients, the more severely disabled, rural dwelling patients, and those with lower income were less likely to see a neurologist. ^[49] There was conflicting evidence about race, one study suggested no racial differences, ^[30] while the other suggested African Americans were less likely to see a neurologist. ^[49]
Factors investigated	Place	Race	Occupation	Gender	Education	SE status	Social Support	Age	Disability	Disease Type	Mental Health	Summary of findings

MS specialty services N=5	[32], [33], [55]	[30]		[47], [55]		[47]		[47], [55]	[55]	[55]	<p>Two studies suggest place may impact access to specialty MS services; Ribes Garcia et al (2016) observed regional differences,[55] and Buchanan et al (2005) showed significantly worse access for patients from rural areas: issues for those in rural areas were cost, greater reliance on others to access and a lack of nearby facilities^{[33]/[32]}. Those with mental health problems^[47] and African Americans^[30] were less likely to access specialist MS services. The evidence for age was conflicting with one of the two studies suggesting worse access among older MS patients.^[47]</p>
Disease modifying treatments N=6	[55]	[27], [30], [41]	[41]	[27], [41], [51], [55], [61]	[41]	[27], [41], [51]	[41]	[27], [41], [51], [55]	[51], [55]	[41], [55]	<p>Only one of three studies suggested racial differences in prescription of newer drugs.^[30] Four studies explored the relationship between gender and DMT use; but of the three which took into account other variables, two did not demonstrate a relationship between gender and uptake.^{[51], [41]} Older age was associated with lower prescription rates in all studies investigating this and most studies suggested</p>

												that lower socioeconomic status or unemployment was associated with lower levels of prescription. ^[51] ^[27] ^[41] In a multivariate analysis, region, male gender, older age and disease type were associated with a lower rate of change from first to second line DMD. ^[55]
Other medication N=5		^{[31], [34], [44]}		^{[44], [61]}		^[44]			^[44]		^[29]	Men and those without private health insurance were less likely to receive prescriptions for bladder symptoms, ^[44] . Men were less likely to receive relapse therapy medication, and symptomatic treatments including antidepressants, NSAIDs and hypnotics; women were less likely to receive anti-fatigue and muscle relaxant medications. ^[61] African American MS patients were consistently less likely to be prescribed anti-anxiety and anti-depressant medication prescriptions in the two studies that investigated these factors. ^{[31], [34]}
Factors investigated	Place	Race	Occupation	Gender	Education	SE status	Social Support	Age	Disability	Disease Type	Mental Health	Summary of findings

Mental health services N=7	[35], [37], [45]	[30], [31], [45]		[28], [40], [45]	[40], [45]	[45]	[28], [40], [45]	[28], [40], [45]	[40]		[28]	<p>Two of three studies suggest that rurality^{[37], [35]} and lower education status^{[45], [40]} was associated with lower access to mental health services. Only one of three studies investigating these factors suggested racial,^[30] age^[28] or social support differences.^[28]</p>
Rehabilitation services N=8	[35], [38], [50]	[30], [31], [34], [50]		[38], [50]	[38], [50]	[38], [50]		[38], [50]	[15], [38], [50]		[29], [50]	<p>Two studies suggested that those living in rural areas had less access to rehabilitation services.^{[38], [35]} One study suggested that Latinos were significantly less likely to receive rehabilitation compared with Caucasians and African Americans,^[30] but other studies showed no racial differences. Studies investigating disability, found that the most disabled were significantly more likely to access therapy services.^{[50], [38], [15]} Residents in nursing homes who were depressed were significantly less like to have OT, physical therapy and respiratory therapy but more likely to have nutritional therapies.^[29]</p>

Health service organization N=3	[36], [48]	[48], [59]	[48], [59]	[48], [59]	[48], [59]	[48]	[48], [59]	[48], [59]	[48], [59]	[48]	[48]	<p>Three studies examined inequalities within the US health system. The unemployed and disabled were significantly less likely to access independent practice association;^[59] whereas African Americans and least educated were more likely to be enrolled in an HMO^[59] but those in rural areas less likely^[36]; older patients and separated and divorced more likely to access fee for service.^[59] Minden et al (2007) found that MS patients were less likely to be insured if less educated, not in full-time employment, had low income, rural residence or progressive disease or were in receipt of mental health care.^[48]</p>
Factors investigated	Place	Race	Occupation	Gender	Education	SE status	Social Support	Age	Disability	Disease Type	Mental Health	Summary of findings

ACC

Community care/social care N=7	[35], [39]	[54]	[52], [54]	[39], [52], [54], [58]	[39], [54]	[48], [54]	[39], [52], [54]	[39], [52], [54], [58]	[15], [39], [52], [54], [58]	[52], [54]	[29], [54]	<p>One study investigating access to respite care in nursing homes showed no difference between MS patients with depression and those without.^[29] Three studies examined access to formal personal assistance, all showed those with worse disability had better access^{[54],[58],[15]}; significantly lower uptake was seen in those with lower educational status, without spousal support and on military insurance in a multivariate analysis^[54]; while Sundstrom et al [58] reported that receipt was lower in younger patients.^[58] Nursing home residents from rural areas were less likely to receive training in community skills^[35] but there was no difference between those with and without depression.^[29] One study showed lower access to community nurses, social workers and day centre care among the less disabled.</p>
Adaptions/aids/supported living N=4		[42], [43], [54], [42]	[42], [43], [54]	[42], [43], [54]	[42], [43], [54]	[42], [54]	[15], [42], [43], [54]	[15], [42], [43], [54]	[15], [43], [54]	[42], [43], [54]		<p>Use of memory aids was lower in older patients and those less educated.^[43] The use of assistive technology was lower in those with spousal or partner</p>

