

## Introduction

- Most of this class we will examine markets for medical care
- How they operate
- What are economic issues
- Medical care is however only interesting in that it is an intermediate product - used to produce what people care about - health
- This section - discuss what inputs can be transformed into health outputs
- How is health measured?
- Some predictors of outcomes?
- Extended discussion about the role of socioeconomic status and health



## Aggregate measures of health

- Mortality rates
- death per period among a define population
- Infant mortality rate
- deaths $1^{\text {st }}$ year of life/births
- Neonatal mortality: deaths $1^{\text {st }} 28$ days
- Life expectancy
- At birth
- Conditional on a particular age


## Self-reported health status

- Benefits
- Easy/low cost variable to collect
- Predicts other measures of health that are difficult to collect
- Shortcomings
- No way to compare people
- No way to compare aggregate data across countries
- May be difficult to compare groups over time
- Rise in disability
- "Harvesting"

| \% Reporting Health Status, Males |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Health | Age 30-44 | Age 45-64 | Age 65-74 |
| Excellent | 43.7\% | 30.6\% | 18.1\% |
| Very good | $30.3 \%$ | $26.9 \%$ | 22.5\% |
| Good | 19.8\% | 26.1\% | 31.6\% |
| Fair | 4.7\% | 10.6\% | 18.5\% |
| Poor | 1.5\% | 5.8\% | 9.3\% |
|  |  |  | 6 |


| 5-Year Mortality Rate, Males |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Health | Age 30-44 | Age 45-64 |
| Excellent | $0.7 \%$ | Age 65-74 |
| Very good | $0.9 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| Good | $1.6 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Fair | $2.9 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |
| Poor | $10.4 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ |


| 5-Year Mortality Rate, Females |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Health Age 45-64 | Age 65-74 |  |
| Excellent | Age $30-44$ | Age |
| Very good | $0.3 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Good | $0.4 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| Fair | $1.8 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Poor | $7.1 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ |

## Biomarkers

- Mortality limited for some populations
- SRHS difficult to compare across people
- Objective way to measure health status across people?
- Biomarkers
- Clinical markers of physiology
- Predictive of future health outcomes
- Measurable across people
- Easily collect


## Examples

- Blood pressure
- High BP can lead to stroke, AMI, heart failure, kidney failure
- Cholesterol
- HDL, LDL and total
- High chol. can lead to heart attack
- Resting heart rate
- Glycated hemoglobin
- Predictor of diabetes,
- Body mass index (kg's/cm²)
- Increased risk of diabetes
- High BMI correlated w/ increased mortality
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Mortality rates in the $20^{\text {th }}$ century
Figure 3
Mortality From Infectious Disease and Cardiovascular Disease, United States, 1900-2000

- Tremendous changes in aggregate statistics
- Two halves
- Decline in infant deaths ( $1 / 2$ half) and infections
- Conquering cardiac disease


Sourre: Data are from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, and are age adjusted.


## What causes big changes in life expectancy?

- Most deaths are to the elderly
- But, when an infant dies, you add a small number to the numerator in a life expectancy calculation
- Big changes will be generated by
- Changes in the infant mortality rate
- Changes in mortality for the elderly which are a large fraction of deaths


## Distribution of Deaths by Age

| - Age <br> of | Fraction <br> deaths | • Age | Fraction <br> deaths |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $<1$ | $1.0 \%$ | $55-64$ | $12.9 \%$ |
| $1-14$ | $0.3 \%$ | $65-74$ | $16.5 \%$ |
| $15-24$ | $1.1 \%$ | $75-84$ | $24.9 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | $1.7 \%$ | $85+$ | $31.3 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | $2.8 \%$ |  | $72.7 \%$ of deaths are to people <br> $45-54$ |
|  | $7.3 \%$ |  |  |

## Numeric Example

- Population with 100 people
- $10 \%$ die at age 1
- ~ the 1900 infant mortality rate)
- If they survive, they live to age 75
- Life expectancy $=(.1)(1)+(.9)(75)=67.6$
- Suppose infant mortality rates drops to $1 \%$ - ~ the 1980 Infant mortality rate
- Life expectancy $=(0.01)(1)+(.99)(75)=74.3$


Vital Statistics, 2016

- 323 million people
- ~3.9 millions births
- $\sim 2.7$ million deaths


| Leading Causes of Death, 2016 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| - Heart disease | 633,842 |  |
| - Cancer | 595,930 |  |
| - Accidents | 146,571 |  |
| - Chronic lower resp. disease | 155,041 |  |
| - Stroke | 140,323 |  |
| - Alzheimer's | 110,561 |  |
| - Diabetes | 79,535 |  |
| - Influenza/Pneumonia | 57,062 |  |
| - Nephritis | 49,959 |  |
| - Suicide | 44,193 |  |
|  |  | 19 |



| Actual Causes of Death |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# (\% of deaths) | \# (\% of deaths) |  |
| Cause of death | 1990 | 2000 |  |
| Tobacco | 400,000 (19\%) | 435,000 (18\%) |  |
| Diet/inactivity | 300,000 (15\%) | 400,000 (17\%) |  |
| Alcohol | 100,000 (5\%) | 85,000 (5\%) |  |
| Micorbial agents | 90,000 (4\%) | 75,000 (4\%) |  |
| Toxic agents | 60,000 (3\%) | 66,000 (3\%) |  |
| Motor Vehicles | 25,000 (1\%) | 43,000 (2\%) |  |
| Firearms | 35,000 (2\%) | 29,000 (1\%) |  |
| Sexual Behavior | 30,000 (1\%) | 20,000 ( $<1 \%$ ) |  |
| Illegal drugs | 20,000 ( $<1 \%$ ) | 17,000 (<1\%) |  |
| Total | 1,060,000 (50\%) | 1,060,000 (48\%) | 21 |



## Gompertz Equation

- 1825 British actuary Benjamin Gompertz
- "the number of living corresponding to ages increasing in arithmetical progression, decreased in geometrical progression."
- geometrical decrease in survival with age existed because of a geometric increase in the "force of mortality"
- $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{a}}=c e^{\mathrm{ba}}$
- $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{a}}=$ mortality rate at age a
- $\mathrm{a}=$ age
- $\mathrm{c}=$ initial mortality rate
- $\mathrm{b}=$ Gompertz parameter - exponential rate of change in mortality with age
- Note that if $y=e^{b t}$
- Then $\ln (\mathrm{y})=\mathrm{bt}$
- And then $\ln \left(\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)=\ln (\mathrm{c})+\mathrm{ba}$
- Log mortality rates are linear in age





- $\mathrm{dln}(\mathrm{M}) / \mathrm{da}=\mathrm{b}$
- $\operatorname{dln}(M)=d M / M=$ percentage change in $M$
- $d \ln (\mathrm{M}) / \mathrm{da}=\%$ change in M for a one year increase in age
- In the model above
$-\ln (\mathrm{c})=-7.75$
- b=0.0816
- Mortality increases by $8.2 \%$ per year of age

| - $\mathrm{b}=(\mathrm{dM} / \mathrm{M}) / \mathrm{da}$, <br> - $\mathrm{b}(\mathrm{da})=\mathrm{dM} / \mathrm{M}$ <br> - If a=10 years, mortality is predicted to increase $82 \%$ over 10 year period (same regardless of the starting age) <br> $-\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{ce}^{\mathrm{ba}}$ <br> $-\mathrm{C}=\exp (-7.75)=0.000495$ <br> - $\mathrm{M}=0.00043 \mathrm{e}^{0.081 a}$ <br> - Given a, one can predict the mortality rate for this group |
| :---: |
| ${ }^{31}$ |

## SES/Health Relationship

- Health (H) improves with Socioeconomic status (I)
- But at a decreasing rate
$-\mathrm{dH} / \mathrm{dI}>0$
$-\mathrm{d}^{2} \mathrm{H} / \mathrm{dI}^{2}<0$
- Relationship is true for
- Nearly all measures of health
- Nearly all measures of SES (income, wealth, education, status)
- For all subgroups (by sex, race, age, etc)
- For nearly all populations
- For nearly all time period
- For nearly all countries
- Focus on one measure of SES -- Income



## Chetty et al., JAMA 2014

- Match taxpayers (income) aged 40-76 from 1999-2014 to SS death records (mortality)
- 1.4 billion person records
- Income - pre-tax household earnings
- If file taxes, get from 1040
- If don't file taxes, get from W2/1099-G (Unemp. comp.)
- If neither - assume income is zero


## Matching income to mortality

- Most people start to collect SS at age 63
- Earnings after this age not a good reflection of their SES status
- If under 63 , earnings are the 2 years prior
- If 63 or over, earnings are at age 61
- Data starts at age 40, years 1999-2014
- Can follow a 61 year old for an additional 15 years - follow until people are 76


## Life expectancy

- Mortality is hard to think about as an outcome
- Expected life expectancy
- If die before age 76 - have actual outcome
- Use Gompertz curves to estimate expected mortality after age 76
- Translate expected mortality into expected lifespan



\% Died in 6 Years, NLMS 6c

| \% Died in 6 Years, NLMS Gc |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income | Age groups |  |  |
|  | 30-49 | 50-64 | 65-79 |
| < High school | 1.78 | 6.77 | 19.37 |
| HS graduate | 1.46 | 4.96 | 15.48 |
| Some college | 1.18 | 3.95 | 14.65 |
| College | 0.66 | 2.46 | 12.47 |



| Percent Died within 5 years of Survey, Females NLMS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Education Group | $35-54$ years of age | 55-64 years of age | 65-74 years of age |
| Less than high school | 2.0 | 6.0 | 11.7 |
| High school graduate | 1.3 | 4.3 | 9.7 |
| College graduate | 0.9 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
| 45 |  |  |  |


| 18-64 year olds, BRFSS 2005-2009 (\% answering yes) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Educ <br> Level | Fair or <br> poor health | No exer. in past 30 days | Current smoker | Obese | Any bad mental hlth past 30 days |
| <12 Years | 40.9 | 45.8 | 37.8 | 43.6 | 43.7 |
| 12-15 years | 17.8 | 27.3 | 26.5 | 34.7 | 38.4 |
| 16+ Years | 7.2 | 13.5 | 10.8 | 24.8 | 34.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 46 |



## Questions for class

- What are the possible mechanisms through which income (or education) can improve health?
- What data supports or refutes each of these hypotheses?
- List possible explanations
- Give some evidence for and against
- Decide whether the pathway is a causal mechanism


## What do we mean by causal pathway?

- If causal, we assume that health is determined by income
- For example, $\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{f}$ (Income)
- Therefore, $\mathrm{dH} / \mathrm{dI}>0$
- An exogenous change in income will alter health
- Example: Suppose we change social security benefits if income is causal, this should alter mortality of the elderly

Why is it hard to determine whether the income/health relationship is causal

- Many factors that determine high income
- Drive/ambition/intelligence/risk taking/luck/background
- Many of these same factors can also impact health
- Therefore, we do not know whether income is causing better health, or some third factor that is unmeasured

Died $_{i}=\alpha+x_{i} \delta+$ income $_{i} \beta+\varepsilon_{i}$

Died $_{i}=1$ if died within 5 years, $=0$ otherwise $x_{i}=$ controls
income $_{i}=$ annual family income
$\hat{\beta}$ unbiased is $\left[\varepsilon_{i} \mid x_{i}\right.$, income $\left._{i}\right]=0$

## Problem:

- Realization of $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{i}}$ conveys information about income
- If $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{i}}>0$, more likely to die early
- Could mean you had lower income because you were sick and could not work as much (reverse causality)
- Could mean you have a hiogh discount rate - don't invest in human capital for the job market (which means lower income) and it means you maybe did not invest in health (which means higher $\varepsilon_{i}$ )




## Clark and Royer

- Examines education/health link using shock to education in England
- 1944 law
- Raised age of comp. schooling from 14-15
- Went into effect April 1, 1947
- Raised comp years of schooling to 9
- Gave Minister of Ed power to increase to 16 under certain conditions
- Did so in Sept 1, 1972
- Raised comp. years of schooling to 10
- Produce large changes in education across birth cohorts
- Changes in education and health are "smooth" over birth cohorts
- If education alters health, should see a structural change in outcomes across cohorts as well
- What assumptions have to be true for this to generate an unbiased estimate of the impact of schooling on health?






## Sullivan and von Wachter

- Consider the opposite of Gardner and Oswald - what happens when someone loses income
- Lost income due to job loss
- Focus on displacement?
- What is displacement?
- Why displacement and not job loss?


## Data

- 5\% random sample of unemployment records in PA 1974-1991
- Have quarterly earnings
- Select sample of workers with the same employer 19741979 (firms > 50 workers)
- Identify people who have been "displaced"
- Lose job 1980-1986
- And when firm size falls by $30 \%$ or more

Impact of displacement on earnings
$y_{i t}=\alpha_{i}+\lambda_{t}+x_{i t} \beta+\sum_{k=-20}^{36} D_{i t}^{k} \delta_{k}+\varepsilon_{i t}$
$i=$ person, $\quad t=$ quarter
$y_{i t}=\ln ($ quarterly earnings $)$
$\alpha_{i}=$ person effect
$\lambda_{t}=$ quarter (time) effect
$x_{i t}=$ time - var ying characteristics
$D_{i t}^{k}=1$ if person $i$ was displaced $k$ quarters ago(after)
$\delta_{k}=$ effect of displacement


Estimate of the Decline in Annual Earnings due to Job Displacement (Sample Men in Stable Employment 1974-1979, Firm 1979 Employment $\geq 50$ Born 1930-1959, Work in PA Labor Force Every Year 1980-1986)
,
Solid line represents coefficient estimates of the interaction of year effects and
displacement dummies in a regression model of log quarterly earnings including
displacement dummies in a regression model of log quarterly earnings including
vear fixed effects, person fixed effects, and a quartic for age. Two standard error year fixed effects, person fixed effects, and a quartic for age. Two standard error
bands are drawn around main effects.

Impact of displacement on mortality
$y_{i t}=\alpha_{i}+\lambda_{t}+x_{i t} \beta+D_{i t} \delta+\varepsilon_{i t}$
$i=$ person, $t=y$ year
Sample: people alive 1/1/1980
$y_{i t}=1$ if person dies in period $t,=0$ otherwise
$D_{i t}=1$ if person $i$ was displaced in the year
$\delta_{k}=$ effect of displacement

| Work restriction in Pennsylvania labor market during 1980-1986 | $\underset{\text { (continued) }}{\text { TABLE I }}$ |  |  | Work every year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No work restriction |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\underset{\substack{\text { workers } \\ \text { (1) }}}{\text { All }}$ | Displaced workers <br> (2) | Nondisplaced workers <br> (3) | $\begin{gathered} \text { workers } \\ \text { (4) } \end{gathered}$ | Displaced workers (5) | Nondisplaced workers <br> (6) |
| Log(average quarterly earnings in 1987-1991) | $\begin{gathered} 8.606 \\ (1.069) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.184 \\ & (1.310) \\ & ( \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.791 \\ (0.883) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.728 \\ (0.891) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.421 \\ (1.064) \\ (1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.838 \\ (0.792) \end{gathered}$ |
| Log(std. dev. of log quarterly earnings in 1987-1991) | $\begin{gathered} -1.144 \\ (0.764) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.119 \\ (0.793) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.440 \\ (0.730) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.393 \\ (0.736) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.197 \\ (0.757) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.142 \\ (0.716) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of quarters in nonemployment in 1987-1991 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.31 \\ & (7.070) \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{2} .66$ (8.207) | 3.11 $(6.079)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.20 \\ & (4.736) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.32 \\ & (5.900) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.79 \\ & (4.145) \end{aligned}$ |
| Deaths per 1,000 per year 1987-2006 | $\begin{aligned} & 6.764 \\ & (0.143) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.639 \\ & (0.263) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.325 \\ & (0.170) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} (4.156) \\ 6.343 \\ (0.152) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.913 \\ (0.306) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.132 \\ (0.175) \end{gathered}$ |
| Deaths per 1,000 per year 1987-1993 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.167 \\ & (0.181) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.151 \\ (0.347) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.670 \\ & (0.208) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.745 \\ & (0.189) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.400 \\ (0.393) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.502 \\ (0.214) \end{gathered}$ |
| Deaths per 1,000 per year 1994-1999 | $\begin{gathered} 7.407 \\ (0.227) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.114 \\ (0.411) \end{gathered}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c} 0.2007 \\ 7.053 \\ 0.272 \end{array}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.994 \\ (0.242) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.451 \\ (0.481) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.826 \\ 0.280) \end{gathered}$ |
| Deaths per 1,000 per year 2000-2006 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.815 \\ & (0.427) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.909 \\ & (0.777) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.270 \\ & (0.510) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 10.347 \\ (0.458) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.033 \\ & (0.911) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.094 \\ & (0.529) \end{aligned}$ |


| TABLE II <br> Effect of Job Displacement on Log-Odns of Death for Various Samples, Follow-Up Periods, and Specifications (Workers in Stable Employment 1974-1979, Firm 1979 Employment $\geq 50$, Born 1930-1959) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | th follow-up period | No work restriction 1980-2006 | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { No work } \\ \text { restriction } \\ \text { (2) } \end{array} \\ 1987-2006 \end{gathered}$ | Work at least three years 1987-2006 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Work every } \\ \text { year } \\ \text { (4) } \\ 1987-2006 \end{gathered}$ | Work every year, exclude non-MLF separators JLS sample) (5) 1987-2006 |
| (1) | Baseline model with average and std. dev. of earnings in 1974-1979 | $\begin{gathered} 0.170 \\ 0.136 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.147 \\ (0.137) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.148 \\ (0.038) \end{gathered}$ | $0.088$ $(0.044)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.104 \\ (0.046) \end{gathered}$ |
| (2) | Model in row (1) with one-digit industry fixed effects | $\begin{gathered} 0.170 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.137$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0139 \\ (0.039) \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $0.077$ $(0.045)$ | $0.098$ $(0.047)$ |
| (3) | Model in row (1) with one-digit industry effects and | 0.163 | 0.129 | 0.128 | 0.069 | 0.088 |
|  | added career variables | (0.038) | (0.039) | (0.040) | (0.047) | (0.048) |
|  | Model in row (1) with industry effects and career variables*age interactions | $\begin{aligned} & 0.169 \\ & -0.058 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.136 \\ (0.038) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.138 \\ (0.039) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.077 \\ & (0.045) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.098 \\ (0.047) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Linear probability model (specification row (2)) | 0.0012 | 0.0011 | 0.0.012 (000031) (0) | 0.0006 | 0.0008 |
| (6) | Linear probability model (specification row (1)) with firm effects | $\underbrace{(0.00026)}_{(0.00038)}$ | $(0.00032)$ 0.0008 <br> (0.00050) | (0.00031 (0.00048) | 0.0006 <br> (0.00054) | 0.0009 (0.00051) |
| $0.0012 / 0.007=0.17=17 \%$ increase in mortality risk |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 |




## Stress as an explanation for the SES/Health Gradient

- Usual suspects don't explain gradient
- Leading candidate is Stress
- Low SES face more persistent stress
- Body reacts to stress in a good way in the short run
- Persistent stress can cause more permanent damage


## HPA Axis

- Hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis
- Put into work when the body faces stress
- Regulates many body functions including digestion, immune, mood, emotions, energy storage
- Concern: activation of system is "good" under stress, but it does come at a cost. Therefore, persistent stress generates more permanent damage to the body's systems


## Cortisol

- Circadian rhythm. Rises when awake, in late afternoon
- Regulates many activites
- Under stress, more cortisol is produced
- Increases availability of glucose
- Suppresses energy available to other systems like immune
- Cortisol reduces after the stress subsides
- Problems
- constant stress leads to dysregulation of HPA
- Stress in early life can generate dysfunction of HPA


## Cortisol

- Stress increases cortisol
- Higher among residents
- Higher among accountants near April 15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$
- Poor have elevated cortisol at all times
- They are more exposed to stress
- Elevated cortisol thought to
_ "burn out" major organs - they just work harder
- Increases susceptibility of immune system


## Primate research

- Observational studies show worse health among subordinate male baboons
-Elevated stress hormone (glucocorticoid) levels, worse cholesterol profile
- Experimental manipulation of status provides more compelling evidence
- Causal effects of subordination and harmful effects of "status competition"


## Baseball Hall of Fame

- Baseball Writers Association of America
- Annual voting held since 1936
- Eligibility: >10 seasons in MLB, retired 5+ years, max of 15 ballot appearances
- Voting: $\sim 450$ voters, mail-in ballot, can name up to 10 players
- Induction: Must be named on $75 \%$ of total ballots cast
- Compete voting results are reported to public (newspapers)
- Committee on Baseball Veterans (Veterans)
- Select former MLB players not chosen by BBWAA
- Historically voting was held annually
- Much smaller committee ( $\sim 15$ ), but similar $75 \%$ required for induction
- Voting results not publicly disclosed and accusations of cronyism
- Major reforms in 2001 (expanded voting pool, public disclosure)


## Sample

- All players alive while appearing on at least one ballot between 1945-2006
- Restrict analysis to pre-1946 births to reduce censoring ( $\mathrm{N}=597$ )
- Key derived variables:
- Indicators of induction status (BBWAA and veterans)
- Maximum vote share ever received (categorical: $<1,1-2, \ldots$, 51-74, 75-78...)
- Number of "close losses" (defined as vote share $\geq 50$ but $<75$ )

Adjusted life duration by maximum vote


Cause of death by maximum vote share


