

Association of Black Race With Physical and Chemical Restraint Use Among Patients  
Undergoing Emergency Psychiatric Evaluation

by

Colin M. Smith

Duke Global Health Institute  
Duke University

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nathan Thielman, Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jane P. Gagliardi

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Egger

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science in the Duke Global Health Institute  
in the Graduate School of Duke University

2022

ABSTRACT

Association of Black Race With Physical and Chemical Restraint Use Among Patients  
Undergoing Emergency Psychiatric Evaluation

by

Colin M. Smith

Duke Global Health Institute  
Duke University

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nathan Thielman, Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jane P. Gagliardi

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Egger

An abstract of a thesis submitted in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
of Master of Science in the Duke Global Health Institute  
in the Graduate School of Duke University

2022

Copyright by  
Colin M. Smith  
2022

## **Abstract**

Objective: Few studies have examined the disproportionate use of restraints for Black adults receiving emergency psychiatric care. This study sought to determine whether the odds of physical and chemical restraint use were higher for Black patients undergoing emergency psychiatric care compared with their white counterparts.

Methods: This single-center retrospective cohort study examined 12,977 unique encounters of adults receiving an emergency psychiatric evaluation between January 1, 2014, and September 18, 2020, at a large academic medical center in Durham, North Carolina. Self-reported race categories were extracted from the electronic medical record. Primary outcomes were the presence of a behavioral physical restraint order or chemical restraint administration during the emergency department encounter. Covariates included age, sex, ethnicity, height, time of arrival, positive urine drug screen results, peak blood-alcohol concentration, and diagnosis of a bipolar or psychotic disorder.

Results: A total of 961 (7.4%) encounters involved physical restraint, and 2,047 (15.8%) involved chemical restraint. Models with and without a race covariate were compared by using quasi-likelihood information criterion (QIC) scores; in each instance, the model

with race performed better than the model without. Black patients were more likely to be physically (adjusted odds ratio [AOR]=1.35; 95% confidence interval [CI]=1.07–1.72) and chemically (AOR=1.33; 95% CI=1.15–1.55) restrained than white patients.

Conclusions: After adjusting for measured confounders, Black patients undergoing psychiatric evaluation were at higher odds of experiencing physical or chemical restraint compared with white patients, which is consistent with the growing body of evidence revealing racial inequities in psychiatric care.

# Contents

Abstract .....	iv
List of Tables.....	vii
Acknowledgements.....	viii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Methods.....	3
2.1 Design, Setting, and Population.....	3
2.2 Data Collection, Measures, and Outcomes.....	3
2.3 Statistical Analysis .....	5
3. Results .....	7
3.1 Sample.....	7
3.2 Outcomes.....	10
4. Discussion .....	13
4.1 Implications for Policy and Practice.....	15
4.2 Implications for Further Fesearch.....	16
4.3 Study Strengths and Limitations .....	16
5. Conclusion .....	19
Appendix A .....	20
References .....	26

## List of Tables

Table 1: Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients.....	8
Table 2: Unadjusted risk of physical restraint and chemical restraint use by race.....	11
Table 3: Crude and adjusted odds of receiving physical restraint by race.....	11
Table 4: Crude and adjusted odds of receiving chemical restraint by race.....	11
Table A.1: Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients stratified by race.....	20
Table A.2: Crude and adjusted odds of receiving physical restraint by variable .....	22
Table A.3: Crude and adjusted odds of receiving chemical restraint by variable.....	23
Table A.4: Sensitivity analysis of physical restraints using multiple imputation.....	24
Table A.5: Sensitivity analysis of chemical restraints by multiple imputation.....	25

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank those people who made this work possible: Jane Gagliardi, who developed the initial idea for this project, and who provided invaluable mentorship with an unyielding focus on social justice. Nathan Thielman, whose mentorship fostered my academic and personal growth during my journey at Duke. Nick Turner, whose unending patience was instrumental in supporting the statistical analysis of this work. Damon Tweedy, who provided sage advice and mentorship throughout this project. Joe Egger, who ensured the rigor of the statistical analysis. Sarah Rivelli and Paul Jung, whose pragmatism gave me the opportunity to pursue Global Health training. The Hubert-Yeargan Center for Global Health, the Duke Global Health Institute, the Global Health Pathway for Residents and Fellows, the Department of Medicine, the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, and the Center for REACH Equity at Duke, which provided the resources to pursue this project. Lori-Ann Daley, Chris Lea, B. Lynette Staplefoote-Boynton, Keith Daniel, and Jenn Headley, who committed to elevating the voices and experiences of patients in our qualitative project. Clinicians, staff, first responders, and administrators, who strive to improve the health of the people they care for. The people represented in this study and ongoing research, who shared their own stories. My wife, Nerissa, as well as my parents, sisters, and brother, who inspire me to be a positive force in the world.



# 1. Introduction

Racial inequities in psychiatric care for Black individuals are widely documented in the United States (1) and include reduced access to psychotropic medication, fewer outpatient mental health appointments (2), and less psychiatric specialty care than for white individuals (3). Decades of evidence point to systemic and structural inequity, along with health care provider bias, contributing to observed inequities in psychiatric care (4, 5) and highlighting the vulnerability of intersecting identities, such as Blackness and mental illness, in the United States (6). Whether because of socioeconomic status or other factors, emergency departments (EDs) are a major point of access to psychiatric care. Compared with whites presenting to the ED, Black patients endure longer wait times, receive lower emergency severity index scores, are less likely to be admitted, are less likely to receive blood tests or other procedures, and are more likely to experience in-hospital death after their ED visit (7). Similarly, compared with white patients in the ED, Black patients receive less analgesic medication for abdominal pain, are less likely to be admitted to the hospital (8), and are less likely to undergo an electrocardiogram or chest radiograph (9). Although mental health–related visits account for an increasing proportion of ED visits (10), a setting in which Black individuals are consistently overrepresented (11), few studies are dedicated to elucidating inequities in emergency psychiatric care.

The use of physical or chemical restraint is common in emergency settings (12,

13). In one analysis of over 43,000 patients presenting to the ED, 84% of patients showing agitation received physical restraint, and 76% received sedation (12). Because restraint use is associated with adverse outcomes, such as aspiration, rhabdomyolysis, thrombosis, and posttraumatic stress symptoms (14–16), studies are needed to examine differential use of restraints in a group made medically and psychiatrically vulnerable, such as among Black individuals. A pair of recent retrospective studies at large EDs found an association between Black race and physical restraint use (17, 18). A separate study using a national sample of ED visits revealed disproportionate chemical restraint use for Black patients, but the analysis was restricted to pediatric patients (19). Moreover, analyses on physical restraint in emergency settings have broadly examined the general ED population instead of focusing on individuals receiving psychiatric consultation (17, 18), a population at high risk of restraint (20). Given that patients with mental illness endure structural racism and bias (21, 22), inequities in restraint use in emergency psychiatric settings must be elucidated to develop clinically and culturally appropriate solutions.

In this study, we aimed to address this gap in the psychiatric literature by assessing whether Black patients receiving emergency psychiatric evaluation at a large academic medical were more likely to undergo physical and chemical restraint compared with their white counterparts.

## **2. Methods**

### ***2.1 Design, Setting, and Population***

In this single-center study, we identified a cohort of adults ( $\geq 18$  years) receiving psychiatry consultation in the Duke University Hospital ED from January 1, 2014, to September 18, 2020. The study protocol was reviewed by the institutional review board at Duke University Hospital and was determined to be exempt; informed consent was waived because the study posed minimal risk to individuals. We followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines.

### ***2.2 Data Collection, Measures, and Outcomes***

Participants were identified, and key variables were collected by querying the electronic health record through the Duke Enterprise Data Unified Content Explorer (23). The exposure was self-reported race, which was categorized as Asian, Black, White, multiracial, other, and unreported. "Multiracial" was used when patients self-selected two or more races; "other" was used when patients self-selected American Indian-Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian-Pacific Islander, or a racial category not mentioned earlier; and "unreported" was used when patients did not report or declined to report race. Primary outcomes were record of violent (behavioral) physical restraint order, record of chemical restraint administration in the electronic medical record during the ED encounter, or both. Orders placed for violent restraints comprising physical holds,

mitts, soft restraints, locking cuffs, or neoprene cuffs (invoked for patient behaviors including violence, severely aggressive behavior, self-injurious behavior, or inability to exhibit safe behaviors) were included. Orders for nonviolent (medical-surgical) restraints comprising siderails, mitts, soft restraints, vests or jackets, wheelchair belt loops, roll belts, and enclosed beds (ordered for patient behaviors including pulling of lines or tubes or behaviors related to toxic, metabolic, infectious syndromes, dementia, or brain injury) were excluded. The provider's selection of physical restraint type (violent or nonviolent) and reason were required in the order. Chemical restraint was defined as documentation in the medication administration record of a non-long-acting parenteral formulation of a first- or second-generation antipsychotic available on the hospital formulary (chlorpromazine, fluphenazine, haloperidol, olanzapine, and ziprasidone). In our institution, physical restraint for violent behavior generally took place in conjunction with chemical restraint in the context of a "behavioral emergency team activation," including nursing staff, psychiatry provider staff, and security.

Additional covariates extracted from the electronic medical record included age in years (18–19, 20–39, 40–59, 60–79, and 80–100), sex (male or female), self-reported ethnicity (Hispanic or non-Hispanic), height (in inches), time of arrival (12:00 a.m.–3:59 a.m., 4:00 a.m.–7:59 a.m., 8:00 a.m.–11:59 a.m., 12:00 p.m.–3:59 p.m., 4:00 p.m.–7:59 p.m., and 8:00 p.m.–11:59 p.m.), urine drug screen results (THC, cocaine, opiates, and amphetamine), and elevated peak blood alcohol concentration during the encounter

( $\geq 80$  mg/dl). Bipolar or psychotic disorder diagnosis was identified through provider diagnosis codes linked to the encounter. Bipolar disorders were identified by using codes 296.0, 296.1, 296.4–296.8 from ICD-9 and F30–F31 from ICD-10. Psychotic disorders were identified by using codes 295, 297–298 from ICD-9 and F20, F22–F25, and F28–F29 from ICD-10 on the basis of expert review and previous literature (24, 25).

### **2.3 Statistical Analysis**

We constructed two separate logistic regression models to evaluate the association between race and the primary outcomes: use of physical restraint and use of chemical restraint. In both models, we accounted for correlation in the response due to repeated ED visits by using a generalized estimating equation with an exchangeable working correlation matrix. We adjusted for potential confounders—age, sex, ethnicity, height, arrival time, urine drug screen results, peak alcohol concentration, and diagnosis—selected on the basis of previous literature and expert opinion. We assessed continuous variables for nonlinear functional relationships with the outcome and discretized age into 20-year categories and blood alcohol content as elevated ( $\geq 80$  mg/dL) or not on the basis of the legal cutoff for intoxication. We evaluated models for multicollinearity by variance inflation factors, with all acceptable at  $< 2$ . We performed the primary analysis with complete cases only. The primary covariate of interest, race, was self-reported within the electronic health record and, in some instances, could appear as “unreported” if the patient had elected not to answer. In those instances, we

treated “unreported” as its own category. Odds ratios (ORs) for the race variable were calculated through exponentiation of logistic model coefficients and were reported with their 95% robust confidence intervals (CIs).

In addressing the potential effects of missing data among other variables, we imputed missing data by using the Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE) package, version 3.13.0, in R. We used predictive mean matching to calculate a set of donor values for each missing value. Predictions were made on the basis of all other available non-missing values for each observation, and five imputations were performed for each missing value. Linear regression was used to predict continuous variables, and logistic regression was used to predict categorical variables. For modeling purposes, pooled estimates were reported from the five imputed data sets.

We assessed whether race was a predictor of restraint by using the quasi-likelihood information criterion (QIC) goodness-of-fit statistic, and we assumed that smaller QIC values indicated better model fit. All data management and statistical analyses were conducted using R, version 3.6.0.

## **3. Results**

### **3.1 Sample**

From January 1, 2014, to September 18, 2020, 12,977 unique emergency psychiatric encounters were identified. The median age of the cohort was 37.0 years (interquartile range [IQR] 27.0–52.0), and a majority of encounters involved male patients (N = 7,159, 55.2%). A total of 6,287 (48.4%) encounters involved Black patients, 5,263 (40.6%) involved white patients, 4,383 (33.8%) encounters resulted in a psychotic disorder diagnosis, and 2,045 (15.8%) resulted in a bipolar disorder diagnosis (Table 1). A psychotic disorder diagnosis was recorded in 43.2% (N = 2,719) of cases involving Black patients and 22.3% (N = 1,174) of cases involving white patients. Table A.1 in Appendix A shows patient characteristics stratified by race. Complete demographic and clinical characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients receiving an emergency psychiatric consultation from January 1, 2014, to September 18, 2020**

Characteristic	Overall (N=12,977)		Physical restraint				Chemical restraint			
			No (N=12,016)		Yes (N=961)		No (N=10,930)		Yes (N=2,047)	
	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	Median	IQR
Age (years)	37.0	27.0–52.0	38.0	27.0–52.0	32.0	26.0–44.0	38.0	27.0–52.0	35.0	27.0–49.0
Height (inches) <sup>a</sup>	67.0	64.0–70.0	67.0	64.0–70.0	67.0	64.5–70.5	67.0	64.0–70.0	67.0	64.0–71.0
	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>
Sex										
Female	5,816	44.8	5,430	45.2	386	40.2	5,013	45.9	803	39.2
Male	7,159	55.2	6,585	54.8	574	59.7	5,916	54.1	1,243	60.7
Missing	2	<.01	1	<.01	1	0.1	1	<.01	1	<.01
Race										
Asian	234	1.8	221	1.8	13	1.4	202	1.8	32	1.6
Black	6,287	48.4	5,739	47.8	548	57.0	5,151	47.1	1,136	55.5
White	5,263	40.6	4,979	41.4	284	29.6	4,616	42.3	647	31.6
Multiracial	682	5.3	609	5.1	73	7.6	542	5.0	140	6.8
Other	326	2.5	302	2.5	24	2.5	278	2.5	48	2.3
Unreported	178	1.4	159	1.3	19	2.0	135	1.2	43	2.1
Missing	7	0.1	7	0.1	0	-	6	0.1	1	0.0
Ethnicity										
Hispanic	566	4.4	531	4.4	35	3.6	499	4.6	67	3.3
Non-Hispanic	12,137	93.5	11,234	93.5	903	94.0	10,207	93.4	1,930	94.3
Unreported	266	2.0	243	2.0	23	2.4	217	2.0	49	2.4
Missing	8	<0.1	8	<0.1	0	-	7	0.1	1	<0.1

∞



Shift											
	12:00 a.m.–3:59 a.m.	1,620	12.5	1,503	12.5	117	12.2	1,357	12.4	263	12.8
	4:00 a.m.–7:59 a.m.	782	6.0	708	5.9	74	7.7	643	5.9	139	6.8
	8:00 a.m.–11:59 a.m.	1,640	12.6	1,491	12.4	149	15.5	1,367	12.5	273	13.3
	12:00 p.m.–3:59 p.m.	2,881	22.2	2,638	22.0	243	25.3	2,371	21.7	510	24.9
	4:00 p.m.–7:59 p.m.	3,143	24.2	2,933	24.4	210	21.9	2,689	24.6	454	22.2
	8:00 p.m.–11:59 p.m.	2,911	22.4	2,743	22.8	168	17.5	2,503	22.9	408	19.9
Diagnosis											
	Bipolar disorder	2,045	15.8	1,801	15.0	244	25.4	1,562	14.3	483	23.6
	Psychotic disorder	4,383	33.8	3,877	32.3	506	52.7	3,275	30.0	1,108	54.1
	Missing	225	1.7	216	1.8	9	0.9	211	1.9	14	0.7
Laboratory test <sup>c</sup>											
	Amphetamine <sup>d</sup>	320	3.8	303	3.9	17	3.0	273	3.9	47	3.3
	THC <sup>e</sup>	2,239	26.8	1,996	25.7	243	42.6	1,725	24.9	514	35.9
	Cocaine <sup>f</sup>	1,646	19.7	1,548	19.9	98	17.1	1,389	20.1	257	17.9
	Opiate <sup>g</sup>	552	6.6	519	6.7	33	5.8	463	6.7	89	6.2
	Alcohol $\geq 80\text{mg/dl}$ <sup>h</sup>	1,063	13.1	1,006	13.3	57	10.1	900	13.4	163	11.6

<sup>a</sup> Height was missing from 2,019 (15.6%) encounters.

<sup>b</sup> Denotes column percentages.

<sup>c</sup> Amphetamine screen was not obtained in 4,619 (35.6%) encounters; THC screen was not obtained in 4,626 (35.6%) encounters; cocaine screen was not obtained in 4,616 (35.6%) encounters; opiate screen was not obtained in 4,618 (35.6%) encounters; blood alcohol level was not obtained in 4,839 (37.3%) encounters.

<sup>d</sup> Total N=8,358; physical restraint: no, N=7,787; yes, N=571; chemical restraint: no, N=6,925; yes, N=1,433.

<sup>e</sup> Total N=8,351; physical restraint: no, N=7,780; yes, N=571; chemical restraint: no, N=6,919; yes, N=1,432.

<sup>f</sup> Total N=8,361; physical restraint: no, N=7,788; yes, N=573; chemical restraint: no, N=6,926; yes, N=1,435.

<sup>g</sup> Total N=8,359; physical restraint: no, N=7,788; yes, N=571; chemical restraint: no, N=6,926; yes, N=1,433.

<sup>h</sup> Total N=8,138; physical restraint: no, N=7,575; yes, N=563; chemical restraint: no, N=6,730; yes, N=1,408.

### **3.2 Outcomes**

Over the study period, 961 (7.4%) encounters involved physical restraint, and 2,047 (15.8%) involved chemical restraint. A total of 797 (83%) encounters involving physical restraint also involved chemical restraint. Of the individuals undergoing physical restraint, 574 (60%) were male, 548 (57%) were Black, 284 (30%) were white, and the median age was 32.0 years (IQR 26.0–44.0). Of those who were chemically restrained, 1,243 (61%) were male, 1,136 (56%) were Black, 647 (32%) were white, and the median age was 35 years (IQR 27.0–49.0). Data were missing for sex (N = 2, <0.01%), race (N = 7, 0.01%), ethnicity (N = 8, <0.01%), height (N = 2,019, 15.6%), complete urine drug screen results (N = 4,626, 35.6%), blood alcohol results (N = 4,839, 37.3%), and psychiatric diagnosis (N = 225, 1.7%).

Black patients underwent physical restraint during 8.7% of encounters and chemical restraint during 18.1% of encounters, whereas white patients underwent physical restraint during 5.4% of encounters and chemical restraint during 12.3% of encounters (Table 2). Compared with white patients, Black patients (OR = 1.67; 95% CI = 1.44–1.94), multiracial patients (OR = 2.09; 95% CI = 1.60–2.75), and patients with unreported race (OR = 2.09; 95% CI = 1.28–3.42) had higher odds of undergoing physical restraint. (Table 3). Compared with white patients, Black patients (OR = 1.57, 95% CI; 1.42–1.75), multiracial patients (OR = 1.84; 95% CI = 1.50–2.26), and patients with

unreported race (OR = 2.27; 95% CI = 1.60–3.23) had higher odds of undergoing chemical restraint (Table 4).

**Table 2. Unadjusted risk of physical restraint and chemical restraint use by race**

Characteristic	Overall (N=12,977)		Black (N=6,287)		White (N=5,263)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Patients receiving physical restraint	961	7.4	548	8.7	284	5.4
Patients receiving chemical restraint	2,047	15.8	1,136	18.1	647	12.3

**Table 3. Crude and Adjusted odds of receiving physical restraint by race<sup>a</sup>**

Characteristic	OR	95% CI	AOR	Robust 95% CI
Asian	1.03	0.58–1.83	0.58	0.21–1.64
Black	1.67	1.44–1.94	1.35	1.07–1.72
Multiracial	2.09	1.60–2.75	1.84	1.20–2.80
Other	1.39	0.90–2.15	1.32	0.65–2.65
Unreported	2.09	1.28–3.42	0.84	0.29–2.43

<sup>a</sup>Reference group: White.

**Table 4. Crude and adjusted odds of receiving chemical restraint by race<sup>a</sup>**

Characteristic	OR	95% CI	AOR	Robust 95% CI
Asian	1.13	0.77–1.66	1.10	0.66–1.84
Black	1.57	1.42–1.75	1.33	1.15–1.55
Multiracial	1.84	1.50–2.26	2.11	1.56–2.84
Other	1.23	0.90–1.69	1.52	0.94–2.46
Unreported	2.27	1.60–3.23	1.30	0.64–2.65

<sup>a</sup>Reference group: White.

After adjusting for potential confounders of age, sex, ethnicity, height, arrival time, urine drug screen results, peak alcohol concentration, and diagnosis, the association between Black race and restraint remained. Black individuals were more likely to be physically restrained than white individuals (adjusted odds ratio [AOR] = 1.35; 95% CI = 1.07–1.72) (Table 3) and more likely to be chemically restrained than white individuals (AOR = 1.33; 95% CI = 1.15–1.55) (Table 4). After adjusting for all variables except for psychotic and bipolar disorder diagnoses, Black individuals remained more likely to be chemically (AOR = 1.60; 95% CI = 1.38–1.84) and physically (AOR = 1.57; 95% CI = 1.25–1.96) restrained than whites. We compared models with and without a race covariate, with QIC scores for both physical restraint (QIC including race = 3,097.12; QIC excluding race = 3,101.43) and chemical restraint (QIC including race = 6,012.51; QIC excluding race = 6,032.44), and both models including race had lower QIC scores.

We used multiple imputation to assess for the potential effect of missing data on our conclusions (see Table A.4 and A.5 in Appendix A). In each instance, Black race remained significantly associated with risk of physical restraint (AOR = 1.28; 95% CI = 1.09–1.52) and chemical restraint (AOR = 1.26; 95% CI = 1.12–1.41).

## 4. Discussion

Using electronic health records for ED psychiatry patient encounters, we examined the association of Black race with use of physical and chemical restraints over a 6-year period. We found that race was a predictor of restraint use, and, after we adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, height, arrival time, positive urine drug screen results, peak blood alcohol concentration, and diagnosis of a bipolar or psychotic disorder, Black patients were more likely to experience physical or chemical restraint than white patients.

Our findings are consistent with two other recent observational studies demonstrating increased risk of physical restraint for Black patients compared with their white counterparts in the emergency setting (17, 18). However, our sample had a greater proportion of Black patients (48.4%) than these studies (10% – 28.2%), and the rate of physical restraint (7.4%) was relatively high in comparison (1% – 1.4%). The high rate of physical restraint in the emergency psychiatric setting is consistent with findings that patients with mental disorders are at increased risk for undergoing physical restraint (17, 18). Our findings align with a smaller observational study evaluating antipsychotic use in a psychiatric emergency setting, where physical restraint occurred in 9% of encounters (26).

Our findings that Black patients are at increased risk for chemical restraint compared with white patients are consistent with the findings of Segal et al. (26). This

observational study, conducted 25 years ago, included 442 independently observed evaluations in the psychiatry emergency setting. Clinicians, most of whom were white, prescribed more oral and parenteral antipsychotic medications to Black patients compared with white patients, even after the study controlled for psychotic disorder, disease severity, and physical restraint (26). Recent studies have documented inequities in the prescription of antipsychotics for Black individuals compared with that for white individuals, including greater duration and higher dosing of antipsychotics and increased likelihood of receiving first-generation medication (27–29). To our knowledge and disappointment, our study is the first in 25 years to demonstrate that such inequities have persisted in the adult emergency psychiatric setting. Our findings are also consistent with recent results among a national sample of pediatric patients demonstrating a higher rate of chemical restraint use during mental health visits for Black patients compared with white patients (19).

In adjusting for height in the analysis, we sought to adjust for physical size as a contributor to perception of risk of violence, and we still found significantly higher rates of physical and chemical restraint for Black patients compared with white patients. More restraint use for Black individuals could reflect contributions from processes of both interpersonal and systemic racism that were not measured in this study. Indeed, a previous meta-analysis indicated that U.S. physicians have implicit preference for white individuals, although how this preference has directly affected clinical decision making,

on a large scale, remains less clear (30). All but one of the studies in the analysis used vignettes instead of live patient encounters, and none of the studies examined the impact of bias on actual physician decision making in the ED (30). Black individuals also are recognized as having less access to outpatient psychiatric appointments, psychotropics (2), and specialty care (3) and, therefore, might present to care with more severe symptoms. Paradoxically, qualitative research describes restraint use itself as a barrier to ED care because patients report experiences of restraint as dehumanizing, leading to poor sense of well-being, distrust, and avoidance of health care (16).

#### ***4.1 Implications for Policy and Practice***

Finding ways to humanize patients' experiences with emergency psychiatric services, especially through decreasing unnecessary restraint use, may improve earlier help-seeking efforts for at-risk patients. There is growing recognition that Black individuals are more likely to access mental health services through law enforcement (31), which might influence clinician perception of dangerousness and heighten patient stress.

Policies should focus on reducing interpersonal bias and eliminating structural racism. While recruiting a more racially diverse health care workforce (32) and implementing bias training and structured checklists (33) may reduce provider and staff bias and improve patient outcomes, these measures are unlikely to eliminate inequities if these outcomes are driven by structural racism. Given notable inequities in access to

outpatient mental health services for people of color (2, 3), health systems should reduce barriers to both outpatient and inpatient mental health services for minoritized groups. Health systems should make an explicit commitment to antiracist policies and consider medical reparations (34), such as implementing a program which proactively identifies minoritized groups meeting criteria for hospital admission.

#### ***4.2 Implications for Further Research***

Our analysis reveals racial inequity in restraint use but was not designed to elucidate the drivers of these outcomes. Further studies should assess the ways in which patients' access to mental health services and interactions impact restraint use. There are also limited data on the experiences and needs of Black people who undergo evaluation in emergency psychiatric settings. To that end, we are conducting a qualitative study guided by semi structured interviews to elevate the voices of Black people who have been evaluated in the psychiatric emergency unit at our institution. We hope the findings from this work support proactive interventions to meet the mental health needs of Black patients.

#### ***4.3 Study Strengths and Limitations***

There were several limitations of our study. The first category of limitations concerns restraint use. We defined chemical restraint as administration of first- or second-generation (non-long-acting) parenteral antipsychotics available on our formulary. We did not measure non-antipsychotic chemical restraint (e.g.,



benzodiazepine or barbiturates) use, given their common use for alcohol withdrawal, and we did not measure use of oral antipsychotic or sedative medications, some of which may be used for restraint. Our definition was also based on the assumption that parenteral antipsychotics were used for restraint in a population receiving psychiatric consultation in the ED. Therefore, we may have underrecognized chemical restraint use overall. Our model may also have underrecognized physical restraint, as we counted physical restraint only when an order was present. We could have missed actual restraint use in certain cases or reason for restraint could have been misclassified. We also were not able to determine the appropriateness of use of physical or chemical restraint, as our electronic medical record did not include an objective measure of appropriateness of physical or chemical restraint use or an objective measure of patient agitation or clinical condition.

The second category of limitations concerns confounders. Given the nature of the electronic medical record and the retrospective cohort study design, there may have been factors contributing to outcomes that we were not able to measure or include in our models. However, treating psychotic disorder diagnosis as a confounder in the study provided a conservative estimate for the relationship between Black race and restraint, given that Black patients are more likely to be over-diagnosed with psychotic disorders compared with white patients (35). Although there was a significant degree of missing data, particularly within drug screen, height, and blood alcohol data, the primary

association observed between race and restraints was stable across both complete-case and multiple imputed analyses.

The final set of limitations concerns causality and generalizability. The retrospective nature of the study limited the capacity to make direct causal claims. Although we were able to analyze data from a large number of encounters, our single-center design may limit generalizability to other regions or hospital settings. In light of increasing evidence regarding social determinants and health inequities, we believe that our findings are of broad relevance to other health care institutions and systems. Finally, analyses of race-based differences are challenging, considering that race is a social construct. Accordingly, observational databases, including electronic health records, are limited in their ability to document patient race accurately and are, at times, incomplete (36). The increased rate of restraint receipt in the “unreported” race category is consistent with previous literature (18) and likely results from patients who were unable to provide information because of acute distress or illness. Despite these limitations, utilizing self-reported race as documented in the electronic medical record, we found race-based inequities in emergency psychiatric treatment. Our large cohort of patients evaluated in the psychiatric emergency setting extends the literature on the role of Black race in restraint use and suggests important areas for further scholarly inquiry. Our findings suggest areas for improvement in the provision of equitable and accessible psychiatric care.

## 5. Conclusion

The finding that Black patients are more likely to undergo physical and chemical restraint in an emergency psychiatry setting adds to a growing body of literature regarding emergency care settings and restraint use and extends these findings to a group made intersectionally vulnerable: Black patients receiving psychiatric consultation. Observed differences remain, even after adjusting for relevant confounders. The observational nature of the study limits our ability to make causal claims, but our findings nonetheless suggest ongoing inequities in psychiatric care for Black patients in the prehospital and emergency settings. These data support the need for further work elucidating where the inequities arise in order to improve equity in and access to care.

## Appendix A

**Table A.1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients receiving an emergency psychiatry consult stratified by race**

Characteristic	Overall (12,977)		Black (N=6,287)		White (N=5,263)	
	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	Median	IQR
Age (years)	37.0	27.0, 52.0	36.0	26.0, 49.0	42.0	29.0, 56.0
Height (inches) <sup>a</sup>	67.0	64.0, 70.0	67.0	64.4, 70.0	67.0	64.0, 70.2
	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>
Sex						
Female	5,816	44.8	2,606	41.5	2,493	47.4
Male	7,159	55.2	3,681	58.5	2,770	52.6
Missing	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	566	4.4	20	0.3	96	1.8
Non-Hispanic	12,137	93.5	6,215	98.9	5,072	96.4
Unreported	266	2.0	51	0.8	95	1.8
Missing	8	0.1	1	0.0	0	0.0
Shift						
12:00 a.m.–3:59 a.m.	1,620	12.5	944	15.0	516	9.8
4:00 a.m.–7:59 a.m.	782	6.0	459	7.3	250	4.8
8:00 a.m.–11:59 a.m.	1,640	12.6	808	12.9	663	12.6
12:00 p.m.–3:59 p.m.	2,881	22.2	1,276	20.3	1,280	24.3
4:00 p.m.–7:59 p.m.	3,141	24.2	1,378	21.9	1,402	26.6
8:00 p.m.–11:59 p.m.	2,911	22.4	1,422	22.6	1,152	21.9

Diagnosis						
Bipolar disorder	2,045	15.8	900	14.3	937	17.8
Psychotic disorder	4,383	33.8	2,719	43.2	1,174	22.3
Missing	225	1.7	102	1.6	93	1.8
Laboratory test <sup>c</sup>						
Amphetamine	320	3.8	53	1.3	232	6.6
THC	2,239	26.8	1,320	33.1	720	20.6
Cocaine	1,646	19.7	1,081	27.1	466	13.3
Opiate	552	6.6	180	4.5	334	9.5
Alcohol $\geq$ 80mg/dl	1,063	13.1	424	10.9	530	15.6

<sup>a</sup> Height was missing from 2,019 (15.6%) encounters.

<sup>b</sup> Denotes column percentages.

<sup>c</sup> Amphetamine screen was not obtained in 4,619 (35.6%) encounters; THC screen was not obtained in 4,626 (35.6%) encounters; cocaine screen was not obtained in 4,616 (35.6%) encounters; opiate screen was not obtained in 4,618 (35.6%) encounters; blood alcohol level was not obtained in 4,839 (37.3%) encounters

**Table A.2. Crude and adjusted odds of receiving physical restraint by variable**

Characteristic	OR	95% CI	AOR	Robust 95% CI
Age (reference: 18-20)				
20-40	2.01	1.44-2.81	1.00	.64-1.57
40-60	.99	.70-1.41	.53	.32-.86
60-80	.90	.60-1.35	.40	.21-.73
80-100	.82	.36-1.87	.95	.31-2.91
Height	1.02	1.00-1.04	1.03	1.00-1.06
Sex (reference: female)				
Male	1.23	1.08-1.41	.96	.74-1.25
Race (reference: white)				
Asian	1.03	.58-1.83	.58	.21-1.64
Black	1.67	1.44-1.94	1.35	1.07-1.72
Multiracial	2.09	1.60-2.75	1.84	1.20-2.80
Other	1.39	.90-2.15	1.32	.65-2.65
Unreported	2.09	1.28-3.42	.84	.29-2.43
Ethnicity (reference: non-Hispanic)				
Hispanic	.89	.61-1.30	.82	.46-1.47
Unreported	1.18	.77-1.82	1.05	.50-2.23
Shift (reference: 12:00a.m. – 3:59a.m.)				
12:00 a.m.–3:59 a.m.	1.34	.99-1.82	2.03	1.30-3.17
4:00 a.m.–7:59 a.m.	1.28	1.00-1.65	1.57	1.05-2.34
8:00 a.m.–11:59 a.m.	1.18	.94-1.49	1.51	1.06-2.17
12:00 p.m.–3:59 p.m.	.92	.73-1.16	.96	.66-1.40
4:00 p.m.–7:59 p.m.	.78	.61-1.00	.79	.54-1.15
Diagnosis				
Psychotic disorder	2.32	2.03-2.64	2.30	1.87-2.84
Bipolar disorder	1.91	1.64-2.23	2.37	1.89-2.97
Urine drug screen				
Amphetamine	.76	.46-1.24	.69	.38-1.27
THC	2.11	1.77-2.52	1.75	1.42-2.17
Cocaine	.88	.69-1.13	.68	.51-.91
Opiates	.85	.59-1.23	1.19	.77-1.85
Alcohol $\geq$ 80mg/dl	.69	.52-.91	1.38	.98-1.95

**Table A.3. Crude and adjusted odds of receiving chemical restraint by variable**

Characteristic	OR	95% CI	AOR	Robust 95% CI
Age (reference: 18-20)				
20-40	2.12	1.64-2.73	1.24	.89-1.71
40-60	1.55	1.19-2.00	1.01	.72-1.42
60-80	1.59	1.19-2.11	.89	.60-1.31
80-100	1.82	1.12-2.96	1.63	.81-3.28
Height	1.02	1.00-1.04	1.01	.99-1.03
Sex (reference: female)				
Male	1.31	1.19-1.44	1.24	1.04-1.49
Race (reference: white)				
Asian	1.13	.77-1.66	1.10	.66-1.84
Black	1.57	1.42-1.75	1.33	1.15-1.55
Multiracial	1.84	1.50-2.26	2.11	1.56-2.84
Other	1.23	.90-1.69	1.52	.94-2.46
Unreported	2.27	1.60-3.23	1.30	.64-2.65
Ethnicity (reference: non-Hispanic)				
Hispanic	.72	.55-0.93	.73	.48-1.10
Unreported	1.19	.87-1.64	.92	.55-1.53
Shift (reference: 12:00a.m. – 3:59a.m.)				
12:00 a.m.–3:59 a.m.	1.11	.89-1.40	1.09	.80-1.50
4:00 a.m.–7:59 a.m.	1.03	.86-1.24	1.04	.80-1.36
8:00 a.m.–11:59 a.m.	1.11	.94-1.31	1.18	.94-1.49
12:00 p.m.–3:59 p.m.	.87	.74-1.03	.85	.67-1.07
4:00 p.m.–7:59 p.m.	.84	.71-.99	.83	.65-1.04
Diagnosis				
Psychotic disorder	2.72	2.47-3.00	2.83	2.47-3.24
Bipolar disorder	1.83	1.63-2.05	2.29	1.95-2.68
Laboratory tests				
Amphetamine	.83	.60-1.13	1.02	.71-1.47
THC	1.68	1.49-1.90	1.53	1.32-1.78
Cocaine	.87	.75-1.01	.80	.67-.96
Opiates	.92	.73-1.17	1.28	.97-1.70
Alcohol $\geq$ 80mg/dl	.96	.81-1.15	1.41	1.14-1.74

**Table A.4. Sensitivity analysis of physical restraints using multiple imputation**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>AOR</b>	<b>Robust 95% CI</b>
Age (reference: 18-20)		
20-40	1.59	1.13-2.24
40-60	.93	.64-1.33
60-80	.86	.56-1.33
80-100	1.08	.46-2.52
Height	1.00	.97-1.02
Sex (reference: female)		
Male	1.14	.95-1.38
Race (reference: white)		
Asian	.90	.50-1.60
Black	1.28	1.09-1.51
Multiracial	1.95	1.45-2.62
Other	1.53	.97-2.42
Unreported	1.58	.90-2.76
Ethnicity (reference: non-Hispanic)		
Hispanic	.63	.42-.95
Unreported	1.00	.61-1.67
Shift (reference: 12:00a.m. – 3:59a.m.)		
12:00 a.m.–3:59 a.m.	1.32	.97-1.80
4:00 a.m.–7:59 a.m.	1.32	1.02-1.72
8:00 a.m.–11:59 a.m.	1.26	1.00-1.60
12:00 p.m.–3:59 p.m.	.95	.74-1.21
4:00 p.m.–7:59 p.m.	.77	.60-.99
Diagnosis		
Psychotic disorder	2.17	1.88-2.50
Bipolar disorder	2.00	1.71-2.35
Laboratory tests		
Amphetamine	.80	.41-1.56
THC	1.77	1.42-2.21
Cocaine	.79	.62-1.01
Opiates	1.08	.74-1.75
Alcohol $\geq$ 80mg/dl	1.06	.80-1.42



**Table A.5. Sensitivity analysis of chemical restraints  
by multiple imputation**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>AOR</b>	<b>Robust 95% CI</b>
Age (reference: 18-20)		
20-40	1.58	1.22-2.05
40-60	1.33	1.01-1.74
60-80	1.42	1.05-1.91
80-100	2.33	1.40-3.89
Height	1.00	.98-1.02
Sex (reference: female)		
Male	1.24	1.08-1.42
Race (reference: white)		
Asian	1.12	.76-1.64
Black	1.26	1.12-1.41
Multiracial	1.92	1.53-2.42
Other	1.57	1.10-2.22
Unreported	2.01	1.33-3.03
Ethnicity (reference: non- Hispanic)		
Hispanic	.56	.41-.76
Unreported	1.00	.70-1.44
Shift (reference: 12:00a.m. – 3:59a.m.)		
12:00 a.m.–3:59 a.m.	1.09	.86-1.39
4:00 a.m.–7:59 a.m.	1.04	.85-1.26
8:00 a.m.–11:59 a.m.	1.16	.98-1.38
12:00 p.m.–3:59 p.m.	.88	.74-1.05
4:00 p.m.–7:59 p.m.	.82	.69-.98
Diagnosis		
Psychotic disorder	2.68	2.42-2.97
Bipolar disorder	2.02	1.79-2.28
Laboratory tests		
Amphetamine	.85	.55-1.31
THC	1.58	1.36-1.83
Cocaine	.80	.67-.96
Opiates	1.22	.92-1.60
Alcohol $\geq$ 80mg/dl	1.43	1.19-1.72

## References

1. Fiscella K, Sanders MR: Racial and ethnic disparities in the quality of health care. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2016; 37:375–394
2. Cook BL, Trinh NH, Li Z, et al: Trends in racial-ethnic disparities in access to mental health care, 2004–2012. *Psychiatr Serv* 2017; 68:9–16
3. Narain K, Xu H, Azocar F, et al: Racial/ethnic disparities in specialty behavioral health care treatment patterns and expenditures among commercially insured patients in managed behavioral health care plans. *Health Serv Res* 2019; 54:575–585
4. Lawson WB, Hepler N, Holladay J, et al: Race as a factor in inpatient and outpatient admissions and diagnosis. *Hosp Community Psychiatry* 1994; 45:72–74
5. Gara MA, Vega WA, Arndt S, et al: Influence of patient race and ethnicity on clinical assessment in patients with affective disorders. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2012; 69:593–600
6. Jordan A, Allsop AS, Collins PY: Decriminalising being Black with mental illness. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2021; 8:8–9
7. Zhang X, Carabello M, Hill T, et al: Trends of racial/ethnic differences in emergency department care outcomes among adults in the United States from 2005 to 2016. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2020; 7:300
8. Shah AA, Zogg CK, Zafar SN, et al: Analgesic access for acute abdominal pain in the emergency department among racial/ethnic minority patients: a nationwide examination. *Med Care* 2015; 53:1000–1009
9. Pezzin LE, Keyl PM, Green GB: Disparities in the emergency department evaluation of chest pain patients. *Acad Emerg Med* 2007; 14:149–156
10. Santillanes G, Axeen S, Lam CN, et al: National trends in mental health-related emergency department visits by children and adults, 2009–2015. *Am J Emerg Med* 2020; 38:2536–2544
11. Snowden LR, Catalano R, Shumway M: Disproportionate use of psychiatric emergency services by African Americans. *Psychiatr Serv* 2009; 60:1664–1671

12. Miner JR, Klein LR, Cole JB, et al: The characteristics and prevalence of agitation in an urban county emergency department. *Ann Emerg Med* 2018; 72:361–370
13. Muir-Cochrane E, Grimmer K, Gerace A, et al: Prevalence of the use of chemical restraint in the management of challenging behaviours associated with adult mental health conditions: a meta-synthesis. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2020; 27:425–445
14. Mohr WK, Petti TA, Mohr BD: Adverse effects associated with physical restraint. *Can J Psychiatry* 2003; 48:330–337
15. Hays H, Jolliff HA, Casavant MJ: The psychopharmacology of agitation: consensus statement of the American Association for Emergency Psychiatry Project BETA Psychopharmacology Workgroup. *West J Emerg Med* 2012; 13:536
16. Wong AH, Ray JM, Rosenberg A, et al: Experiences of individuals who were physically restrained in the emergency department. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020; 3:e1919381
17. Wong AH, Whitfill T, Ohuabunwa EC, et al: Association of race/ ethnicity and other demographic characteristics with use of physical restraints in the emergency department. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021; 4:e2035241
18. Schnitzer K, Merideth F, Macias-Konstantopoulos W, et al: Disparities in care: the role of race on the utilization of physical restraints in the emergency setting. *Acad Emerg Med* 2020; 27: 943–950
19. Foster AA, Porter JJ, Monuteaux MC, et al: Pharmacologic restraint use during mental health visits in pediatric emergency departments. *J Pediatr.* 2021; 236:276–283e2
20. Wong AH, Taylor RA, Ray JM, et al: Physical restraint use in adult patients presenting to a general emergency department. *Ann Emerg Med* 2019; 73:183–192
21. Satcher D: *Mental Health: Culture, Race, and Ethnicity – A Supplement to Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General.* Washington, DC, US Department of Health and Human Services, 2001. <https://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/22834>
22. Bailey ZD, Krieger N, Agenor M, et al: Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: evidence and interventions. *Lancet* 2017; 389:1453–1463

23. Horvath MM, Winfield S, Evans S, et al: The DEDUCE Guided Query tool: providing simplified access to clinical data for research and quality improvement. *J Biomed Inform* 2011; 44: 266–276
24. Wang L, Homyra F, Pearce LA, et al: Identifying mental health and substance use disorders using emergency department and hospital records: a population-based retrospective cohort study of diagnostic concordance and disease attribution. *BMJ Open* 2019; 9:e030530
25. Taquet M, Luciano S, Geddes JR, et al: Bidirectional associations between COVID-19 and psychiatric disorder: retrospective cohort studies of 62354 COVID-19 cases in the USA. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2021; 8:130–140
26. Segal SP, Bola JR, Watson MA: Race, quality of care, and antipsychotic prescribing practices in psychiatric emergency services. *Psychiatr Serv* 1996; 47:282–286
27. Fleck DE, Hendricks WL, DelBello MP, et al: Differential prescription of maintenance antipsychotics to African American and white patients with new-onset bipolar disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2002; 63:658–664
28. Kuno E, Rothbard AB: Racial disparities in antipsychotic prescription patterns for patients with schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry* 2002; 159:567–572
29. Lawson W, Johnston S, Karson C, et al: Racial differences in antipsychotic use: claims database analysis of Medicaid-insured patients with schizophrenia. *Ann Clin Psychiatry* 2015; 27:242–252
30. Dehon E, Weiss N, Jones J, et al: A systematic review of the impact of physician implicit racial bias on clinical decision making. *Acad Emerg Med* 2017; 24:895–904
31. Swartz MS: The urgency of racial justice and reducing law enforcement involvement in involuntary civil commitment. *Psychiatr Serv* 2020; 71:1211
32. Burgess D, van Ryn M, Dovidio J, Saha S. Reducing racial bias among health care providers: lessons from social-cognitive psychology. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2007;22(6):882
33. in RO, Anaebere TC, Haar RJ. Exploring bias in restraint use: Four strategies to mitigate bias in care of the agitated patient in the emergency department. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2021;28(9):1061-1066. doi:10.1111/acem.14277

34. Bassett MT, Galea S. Reparations as a Public Health Priority - A Strategy for Ending Black-White Health Disparities. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(22):2101-2103.  
doi:10.1056/NEJMp2026170
35. Schwartz RC, Blankenship DM: Racial disparities in psychotic disorder diagnosis: a review of empirical literature. *World J Psychiatry* 2014; 4:133–140
36. Polubriaginof FCG, Ryan P, Salmasian H, et al: Challenges with quality of race and ethnicity data in observational databases. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2019; 26:730–736