

Toward Equitable Access: Leveraging Crowdsourced Reviews to Investigate Public Perceptions of Health Resource Accessibility

Zhaoqian Xue^{1,*}, Guanhong Liu², Kai Wei³, Chong Zhang⁴, Qingcheng Zeng⁵, Songhua Hu⁶, Wenyue Hua⁷, Lizhou Fan⁸, Yongfeng Zhang⁹, Lingyao Li^{10,†}

¹Georgetown University

²University of Chicago

⁴University of Michigan

³University of Liverpool

⁵Northwestern University

⁶Massachusetts Institute of Technology

⁷University of California, Santa Barbara

⁸Harvard Medical School

⁹Rutgers University, New Brunswick

¹⁰University of South Florida

zx136@georgetown.edu, guanhongliu@uchicago.edu, weikai@umich.edu,
pcczc15@gmail.com, qingchengzeng2027@u.northwestern.edu, hsonghua@mit.edu,
wenyuehua@ucsb.edu, lfan8@bwh.harvard.edu, yongfeng.zhang@rutgers.edu,
lingyaol@usf.edu

Abstract

Access to health resources is a critical determinant of public well-being and societal resilience, particularly during public health crises when demand for medical services and preventive care surges. However, disparities in accessibility persist across demographic and geographic groups, raising concerns about equity. Traditional survey methods often fall short due to limitations in coverage, cost, and timeliness. This study leverages crowdsourced data from Google Maps reviews, applying advanced natural language processing techniques, specifically ModernBERT, to extract insights on public perceptions of health resource accessibility in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, we employ Partial Least Squares regression to examine the relationship between accessibility perceptions and key socioeconomic and demographic factors—including political affiliation, racial composition, educational attainment and so on. Our findings reveal that public perceptions of health resource accessibility varied significantly across the U.S., with disparities peaking during the pandemic and slightly easing post-crisis. Political affiliation, racial demographics, and education levels emerged as key factors shaping these perceptions. These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions and policy measures to address inequities, fostering a more inclusive healthcare infrastructure that can better withstand future public health challenges.

1 Introduction

Access to essential health resources is fundamental to public well-being, particularly during health crises when demand surges for medical services and preventive care [World Health Organization, 2020]. Equitable distribution of critical supplies—such as medications, personal protective equipment (PPE), and testing kits—is vital for controlling disease spread and minimizing mortality [Sodhi *et al.*, 2023; Roozenbeek *et al.*, 2020]. However, disparities in health resource availability persist, exacerbating existing social and economic inequalities [Baum, 2016; Detels *et al.*, 2021].

Traditional methods for assessing health resource accessibility—such as surveys and administrative records—provide valuable insights but are often constrained by time lags, high costs, and limited spatial coverage [Keppel *et al.*, 2005]. These limitations hinder timely interventions, particularly during rapidly evolving health crises. With the rise of digital platforms, crowdsourced data provides an alternative means to assess public perceptions of health resource accessibility [Kim *et al.*, 2017]. Platforms like Google Maps offer granular, real-time insights into how people experience and perceive access to healthcare resources in their local communities [Jia *et al.*, 2021].

This study examines the potential of crowdsourced data in analyzing social inequality by leveraging Google Maps reviews (2018–2021) to investigate how public perceptions of health resource accessibility varied across the U.S. during the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, we aim to answer:

RQ1: Do health resource disparities, as perceived by the public, exist across different regions in the United States?

RQ2: Are these perceived health resource disparities correlated with the socioeconomic or demographic characteristics of local communities?

RQ3: Did the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbate health resource disparities as perceived by the public?

To address these questions, we apply state-of-the-art Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques, typically ModernBERT, for text analysis and Partial Least Squares (PLS) regression to examine the relationship between perceived accessibility and socioeconomic factors. Our findings reveal significant disparities in public perceptions of health resource accessibility, which peaked during the crisis and partially eased afterward. Political affiliation, racial composition, and educational attainment emerged as key drivers of these perceptions. These results underscore the need for targeted policy interventions to promote a more equitable healthcare infrastructure.

2 Related Work

Traditional studies on healthcare access primarily rely on surveys and administrative data, which, while rigorous, often lack the temporal resolution and spatial granularity needed to track evolving public health challenges [Gao *et al.*, 2016]. In contrast, crowdsourced data from digital platforms enable large-scale, passive data collection, offering real-time insights into public experiences [Wazny, 2017]. Plus, advancements in natural language processing and machine learning have significantly enhanced the ability to analyze vast amounts of unstructured text (crowdsourced) data, enabling more precise and systematic analysis of user-generated content [Khan *et al.*, 2023; Devlin, 2018].

Previous research has highlighted the value of user-generated crowdsourced data in health crisis management and even health-related decision-making. For example, large-scale social media data has been leveraged to monitor disease outbreaks [Gui *et al.*, 2017] and track public sentiment on vaccines [Salathé and Khandelwal, 2011; Broniatowski *et al.*, 2018]. However, social media data often lacks the location-specific granularity and structured context, which are needed to assess health resource accessibility at a community level. In contrast, online review platforms, such as Google Maps, provide richer, geo-tagged insights into real-world experiences with pharmacies as well as other healthcare providers. Despite this advantage, the potential of crowdsourced data to capture dynamic changes, spatial and temporal disparities, and evolving public perceptions of health resource accessibility has received little attention—particularly in crises where real-time and precise management is most critical.

This study addresses this gap by leveraging Google Maps reviews to analyze spatial and temporal disparities in perceived health resource accessibility. Unlike traditional survey-based surveillance methods, which often lack real-time responsiveness, and social media data, which may be unstructured and less location-specific, online review platforms like Google Maps provide a unique, geo-tagged perspective on public experiences with healthcare services. Utilizing location-specific, crowdsourced data, our approach serves as

both a scalable, real-time complement to traditional surveillance and an enhancement over existing crowdsourced data sources. These findings offer actionable, data-driven insights for policymakers and public health officials, helping to shape more equitable and responsive health policies.

3 Dataset and Methodology

The research started with data collection and preparation, involving the aggregation of Google Maps reviews related to stores across the United States from 2018 to 2021 (Section 3.1). We then applied a keyword filtering process to identify reviews concerning health resources (Section 3.2). To determine the public perceptions of health resource accessibility, we developed text classification models using natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning techniques (Section 3.3). After classification, we calculated perception scores based on the classification results (Section 3.4). Finally, we employed Partial Least Squares (PLS) regression to explore the relationships between perception scores and both socioeconomic and demographic factors across different time periods (Section A.2).

3.1 Data Collection

Google Maps, a widely used location-based platform enriched with user-generated reviews, serves as a valuable data source for analyzing consumer experiences [Mehta *et al.*, 2019]. To investigate health resource disparities during the COVID-19 pandemic, we compiled a dataset of 4,569 Points of Interest (POIs) across the United States from 2018 to 2021. These POIs include pharmacies, groceries, and other medical resource providers, offering insights into the availability and accessibility of essential medical supplies.

The POI dataset was sourced from Google Local Data [Li *et al.*, 2022; Yan *et al.*, 2023], which is a large-scale repository containing 666,324,103 reviews, 113,643,107 users, and 4,963,111 businesses in JSON format. This extensive database provides real-time, location-specific information on consumer experiences, enabling us to track the availability of critical health supplies such as personal protective equipment (PPE) and over-the-counter medications. By leveraging this dataset, our study captures public perceptions of health resource accessibility with a level of granularity and timeliness not easily attainable through traditional data sources.

To gain deeper insights into public perceptions of health resource accessibility, we segmented the dataset into three distinct time periods.

- **Pre-Pandemic Period:** January 1, 2018 – January 31, 2020
- **Peak-Pandemic Period:** February 1, 2020 – May 31, 2020
- **Post-Peak Period:** June 1, 2020 – May 31, 2021

On February 1, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global health emergency [Cucinotta and Vanelli, 2020], triggering severe shortages of critical health supplies [Trump, 2020]. In

response, on March 18, 2020, President Trump invoked the Defense Production Act (DPA) to accelerate medical supply production [Peters and Lee, 2020], later extending it to protect food supply chains [The White House, 2020]. By early May 2020, supply shortages began stabilizing [United States Government Accountability Office, 2021], marking the end of the Peak-Pandemic period on May 31, 2020. The subsequent Post-Peak phase spanned until May 31, 2021, allowing us to assess the early recovery period. This segmentation provided a nuanced comparison of public perceptions before, during, and after the crisis.

We enhanced our analysis by incorporating three supplementary datasets from the U.S. Census Bureau. First, the Household Pulse Survey [United States Census Bureau, 2021] offered a government-led benchmark to validate user-reported perceptions, comparing experiences of resource scarcity with official self-reported delays. Second, county-level administrative shapefiles [United States Census Bureau, 2023] delineated geographic boundaries for spatial analysis. Third, socioeconomic metrics [United States Census Bureau, 2023] facilitated regression modeling to understand how income, education, and race influenced public perceptions of health resource availability. By merging these sources, we aimed to ensure analytical rigor and robust insight into the pandemic’s varying impacts on health resource access across diverse regions.

3.2 Keywords Ontology and Development

To identify reviews related to health resources, we developed a comprehensive keyword ontology informed by public health literature and consumer behavior research. Our process began with critical items designated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and WHO, such as “sanitizer,” “mask,” and “thermometer” [Liang and others, 2020]. We then expanded the list to include common over-the-counter medications and household supplies (e.g., “Tylenol,” “Advil,” “Lysol spray,” “Vick’s Vaporub”) [Keller, 2020], as well as COVID-19-specific terms, such as “N95,” “test kit,” and “home test” [Andrejko, 2022]. Additionally, we incorporated controversial items (e.g., “hydroxychloroquine”), which sparked significant public debate during the pandemic [Ben-Zvi *et al.*, 2012; Réa-Neto *et al.*, 2021; Self and others, 2020]. The full keyword list is presented in Table 1.

We then conducted iterative adjustments using insights from social media analyses and consumer health research [Awan *et al.*, 2024] to refine our ontology, ensuring that our dataset captured colloquial terms, brand names, and emerging pandemic-related jargon [Amur *et al.*, 2023]. This approach filtered 289,919 relevant reviews from 102,452 businesses, yielding a robust dataset that reflects public perceptions of health resource availability across different regions and time periods.

3.3 Text Classification

We developed classification models to categorize reviews into three classes: Class -1 (shortage of health resources), Class 1 (no shortage), and Class 9 (unrelated). To ensure balance and minimize bias, we

Table 1: Keyword ontology for health resources

Category	Keywords
Essential health supplies	sanitizer, soap, toilet paper, mask, disinfectant, gloves, thermometer, tissues, wipes, face shield, hand wash, respirators, alcohol
Over-the-counter medications	acetaminophen, tylenol, advil, motrin, ibuprofen, dayquil, nyquil, mucinex, robitussin, sudafed, pepto-bismol, tums, vick’s vaporub
Preventive healthcare items	vitamins, zinc, pedialyte, gatorade
Diagnostic tools	test kit, home test, self test
COVID-19 specific items	N95, hydroxychloroquine
Household sanitization products	lysol spray, disinfectant wipes

employed a sequential annotation approach, manually labeling reviews until each class contained approximately 500 instances, yielding a 1,500-review dataset.

To maintain annotation quality, three public health experts labeled the data following detailed guidelines. Each review was independently annotated by two experts, achieving a Cohen’s Kappa of 0.85 [Cohen, 1960], with a third expert resolving any disagreements. The final dataset was split 80% for training and 20% for testing.

We vectorized the text using TF-IDF [Xiang, 2022] and ModernBERT embeddings. Three classifiers—Random Forest [Breiman, 2001], Support Vector Machine (SVM) [Vapnik, 2013], and Logistic Regression [King and Zeng, 2001]—were trained on TF-IDF features, alongside a standalone ModernBERT model. After 5-fold cross-validation and grid search hyperparameter tuning, we compared models based on accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-Score [Krasnodebska *et al.*, 2024].

As shown in Figure 5 in appendix, ModernBERT outperformed TF-IDF-based models, achieving an overall accuracy of 85.2% and superior F1-Scores. Consequently, we selected ModernBERT as the final classifier and applied it to all reviews, retaining only Class -1 and Class 1 reviews while discarding Class 9.

3.4 Measuring Public Perceptions of Health Resource Availability

To assess public perceptions of health resource accessibility over time and across regions, we derived a county-level perception score from our classification results (subsection 3.3). This score serves as a proxy for community experiences, capturing the balance between reported shortages and adequacy. Formally, for each county c and period t :

$$S_{c,t} = \frac{1}{N_{c,t}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{c,t}} L_i \quad (1)$$

where $N_{c,t}$ is the number of reviews labeled as shortage (Class -1) or no shortage (Class 1), and L_i is the label for review i . Scores approaching -1 indicate widespread shortage complaints, values near -1 suggest perceived resource adequacy, and scores around 0 reflect a mix of both perceptions. Thus, $S_{c,t}$ provides a quantitative measure of health resource perceptions at the county level.

To ensure reliability, we restricted analysis to counties with at least 10 relevant reviews per period (Section 3.1). This threshold, widely used in social media analytics, helps reduce noise and improve representativeness [Faber and Fonseca, 2014].

Table 2: Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for features in the model

Feature	VIF
Democratic Rate	41.104
Republican Rate	35.098
Total Population	1.550
Median Income	11.411
GINI	3.548
No Insurance Rate	3.000
Household Below Poverty Rate	8.924
HISPANIC LATINO Rate	5.771
White Rate	24.026
Black Rate	17.701
Indian Rate	1.894
Asian Rate	6.624
Under 18 Rate	<i>inf</i>
Between 18 and 44 Rate	<i>inf</i>
Between 45 and 64 Rate	<i>inf</i>
Over 65 Rate	<i>inf</i>
Male Rate	2.037
Bachelor Rate	17.800
Education Degree Rate	27.328
Population Density	1.374
Unemployed Rate	3.165

3.5 Partial Least Squares (PLS) Regression

After calculating the perception scores, we performed Partial Least Squares (PLS) regression at the county level to explore the relationship between average perception scores and socioeconomic factors. Ultimately, 530 counties were included in the final regression analysis.

PLS regression was selected to address the multicollinearity observed among several independent variables, such as Democratic and Republican Rate, all exhibiting variance inflation factors (VIF) exceeding 5 (Table 2). A common solution to multicollinearity is to remove collinear variables, but this approach risks excluding key predictors. PLS regression, however, addresses this challenge by decomposing both dependent and independent variables into orthogonal scores and loadings during coefficient estimation [de Jong, 1993].

The key equations of PLS regression are presented below:

$$\begin{aligned} X &= TP^T + E \\ Y &= UQ^T + F \\ Y &= XK^T + \Theta \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where T , U , P , and Q are orthogonal scores and loadings, K represents the regression coefficients, and error terms E and F are independently and identically distributed. To address RQ2, we conducted three regressions on the average perception scores (Pre-, Peak-, and Post-Pandemic), and for RQ3, two additional regressions examined score differences between periods. Model fit was assessed using R^2 and RMSE.

Since standard PLS model does not inherently produce p-values, we employed a permutation test [Afthanorhan *et al.*, 2015], comparing observed coefficients with those from permuted samples to derive robust significance estimates.

4 Results

This section presents the results of our analysis, addressing the three key research questions outlined in the introduction. First, we analyzed the geographic distribution of perception scores derived from Google Maps reviews to examine whether public perceptions of health resource accessibility varied across regions in the United States (Section 4.1). We visualized spatial patterns and quantified the degree of spatial clustering using Moran's I statistic. Next, we investigated the relationship between the socioeconomic characteristics of local communities (counties) and perceptions of health resource accessibility, across three time periods: Pre-Pandemic, Peak-Pandemic, and Post-Peak, through PLS regression (Section 4.2). Finally, we evaluated whether the pandemic exacerbated existing health resource disparities by investigating the changes in perception scores between periods (Section 4.3).




Figure 1: Comparison between weighted delayed ratio reported by US Census Bureau and average perception scores by online reviews.

Before addressing the research questions, we validated the public perception of health resource accessibility—calculated using online reviews grouped by each month—by comparing it with data

from the Household Pulse Survey conducted by the US Census Bureau from April 2020 to April 2021 (Figure 1). The survey measured the proportion of respondents reporting delays in securing health resources at the state level. To evaluate the alignment between the two measures, we calculated the correlation between the perceived scores (state-level averages weighted by perception scores) and the proportion of respondents reporting delays. To ensure robust parameter estimates, we employed Cook's Distance [Nurunnabi *et al.*, 2014] to identify and remove observations that were both outliers and high-leverage points, as such data points could significantly distort the true correlation trend [Pennsylvania State University, 2024].

As shown in Figure 1, the red dashed line shows the trend with a negative correlation ($r = -0.255$). This suggests that states with higher public perception scores of health resource accessibility tended to have fewer reported delays in securing health resources. Although the correlation is slight, it implies that online reviews reflect the situation in terms of health resource accessibility.




Figure 2: Health resource availability trends across pandemic periods.

4.1 RQ1: Do health resource disparities, as perceived by the public, exist across different regions in the United States?

To address RQ1, we analyzed county-level perception scores of health resource accessibility across the United States during the Pre-Pandemic, Peak-Pandemic, and Post-Peak periods. These scores range from -1 (indicating extremely negative perceptions) to 1 (indicating extremely positive perceptions). As illustrated in Figure 2, the average perception scores dropped significantly during the Peak-Pandemic period and remained relatively low in the Post-Peak period, underscoring persistent challenges in health resource accessibility. These trends were further visualized using GIS maps (Figure 3), where red denotes negative perceptions and blue represents positive perceptions.

During the Pre-Pandemic period (Figure 3a), negative perceptions were particularly pronounced across parts of the Western states, while the Eastern regions exhibited a more nuanced mix of positive and negative perceptions, especially in densely populated areas.

During the Peak-Pandemic period (Figure 3b), these regional disparities in public perceptions became more pronounced. Western states, notably California and its surrounding areas, experienced a significant surge in negative perceptions, as reflected by larger red clusters. Meanwhile, the Eastern region maintained its heterogeneous pattern but exhibited a noticeable shift toward more negative perceptions. By the Post-Peak period (Figure 3c), a substantial transition toward neutral perceptions was observed nationwide, as indicated by the predominance of light gray tones on the map.




Figure 3: Geographic patterns of the perceived health resource disparities across the United States.

We used Moran's I statistic to perform the spatial autocorrelation analysis and quantify the patterns of public perceptions, as shown in Figure 4. Before the pandemic, perception scores showed virtually no spatial clustering among neighboring counties, as indicated by a low, non-significant Moran's I (0.001, $p = 0.421$). As the pandemic reached its peak, however, we observed the emergence of weak yet statistically significant spatial patterns in public perception (Moran's I = 0.016, $p = 0.048$). In the Post-Peak period, spatial autocorrelation became more pronounced and statistically significant (Moran's I = 0.022, $p = 0.012$), indicating that counties with similar perception scores were increasingly clustered geographically. This trend is also evident in Figure 3, which shows that most investigated counties display similar sentiment values. Such a progression suggests that the pandemic may

have exposed and potentially exacerbated underlying regional inequalities in health resource availability.




Figure 4: Moran's I scatterplots across pandemic periods.

4.2 RQ2: Are these perceived health resource disparities correlated with the socioeconomic and demographic factors?

The PLS regression overall revealed a strong correlation between public perceptions and socioeconomic characteristics (Table 3), with significant influences observed from factors such as race, income inequality, education, and even age.

Before the outbreak of COVID-19, the White Rate (coeff = 0.024, $p = 0.000$) exhibited a positive association with perception scores, indicating better access to health resources in counties with a higher proportion of White residents. Conversely, counties with a larger proportion of Black residents (Black Rate: coeff = -0.045, $p = 0.000$) tended to have less favorable access. Additionally, a higher Republican population rate (Republican Rate: coeff = -0.025, $p = 0.025$) and a higher uninsured population rate (No Insurance Rate: coeff = -0.020, $p = 0.000$) were negatively associated with health resource accessibility, highlighting disparities in Republican-leaning regions and among uninsured populations.

During the peak of the pandemic, new factors emerged as significant. Politically liberal regions (Democratic Rate: coeff = 0.008, $p = 0.005$) exhibited better accessibility to health resources, whereas politically conservative regions (Republican Rate: coeff = -0.017, $p = 0.002$) faced challenges. Surprisingly,

counties with lower median income levels (Median Income: coeff = -0.013, $p = 0.010$) and higher poverty rates (Household Below Poverty Rate: coeff = 0.001, $p = 0.006$) demonstrated resilience in addressing the pandemic's challenges. Conversely, counties with higher unemployment rates (Unemployed Rate: coeff = -0.003, $p = 0.016$) experienced more pronounced resource strain. Racial disparities also became evident, with counties with higher proportions of Hispanic/Latino populations (coeff = -0.018, $p = 0.000$) showing severe resource pressure. While no clear trend emerged for the White population, educational attainment appeared to be a positive factor. Counties with higher educational attainment levels (Bachelor Rate: coeff = 0.012, $p = 0.000$; Education Degree Rate: coeff = 0.011, $p = 0.000$) were associated with better access to health resources.

During the Post-Peak recovery period, although the overall impact diminished, certain factors remained significant. Educational attainment continued to play a significant role, with the Bachelor Rate (coeff = 0.002, $p = 0.000$) and Education Degree Rate (coeff = 0.001, $p = 0.000$) exhibiting positive associations, albeit weaker compared to the pandemic peak. Surprisingly, dissatisfaction with health resource accessibility was observed among both Democrats and Republicans, with Democrats expressing more pronounced negative perceptions. Economic factors also gained prominence during recovery. Counties with higher median income levels (Median Income: coeff = 0.002, $p = 0.005$) and lower uninsured rates (No Insurance Rate: coeff = -0.005, $p = 0.001$) experienced faster recovery. Demographically, counties with higher Asian populations (coeff = 0.001, $p = 0.002$) and middle-aged populations (Between 18 and 44 Rate: coeff = 0.003, $p = 0.013$) recovered more quickly. Conversely, counties with higher proportions of Indian populations (Indian Rate: coeff = -0.006, $p = 0.009$) and younger populations (Under 18 Rate: coefficient = -0.004, $p = 0.011$) experienced slower recovery.

4.3 RQ3: Did the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbate health resource accessibility as perceived by the public?

The results presented in Tables 4 and 5 highlight the significant shifts in health resource accessibility reflected by the online reviews during the peak of the pandemic and subsequent recovery period, offering valuable insights into the evolving disparities over time. Tables 4 demonstrates that the pandemic exacerbated pre-existing inequalities. Predominantly White communities experienced more pronounced declines in perception scores (coeff = -0.026, $p = 0.003$), potentially due to their historically better access to health resources, which created a larger margin for potential deterioration. In contrast, Black communities exhibited greater resilience (coeff = 0.048, $p = 0.004$), potentially reflecting their already limited access to resources before the pandemic, which left leaving less room for further decline.

Table 5 highlights persistent inequalities in recovery are evident. Counties with higher Hispanic/Latino

Table 3: PLS regression results of socioeconomic factors on perception scores across pandemic periods.

Variable	Pre-Pandemic			Peak-Pandemic			Post-Peak		
	Coeffs	P-Value	Std. err.	Coeffs	P-Value	Std. err.	Coeffs	P-Value	Std. err.
Democratic Rate	0.023	0.057	0.044	0.008	0.005**	0.045	-0.003	0.022*	0.044
Republican Rate	-0.025	0.025*	0.045	-0.017	0.002**	0.046	-0.001	0.002**	0.045
Total Population	0.004	0.701	0.044	0.008	0.779	0.044	-0.001	0.595	0.045
Median Income	-0.018	0.599	0.044	-0.013	0.010**	0.044	0.002	0.005**	0.046
GINI	0.016	0.064	0.046	-0.015	0.865	0.046*	0.002	0.116	0.043
No Insurance Rate	-0.020	0.000**	0.046	-0.023	0.000**	0.045	-0.005	0.001**	0.046
Household Below Poverty Rate	-0.007	0.990	0.045	0.001	0.006**	0.044	-0.001	0.099	0.045
HISPANIC LATINO Rate	-0.024	0.056	0.045	-0.018	0.000**	0.045	0.002	0.287	0.044
White Rate	0.024	0.000**	0.044	0.001	0.674	0.044	-0.002	0.632	0.044
Black Rate	-0.045	0.000**	0.045	-0.008	0.240	0.046	-0.003	0.358	0.044
Indian Rate	0.003	0.536	0.043	0.017	0.126	0.047	-0.006	0.009**	0.044
Asian Rate	0.007	0.679	0.045	-0.001	0.055	0.047	0.001	0.002**	0.044
Under 18 Rate	0.002	0.000**	0.046	0.003	0.000**	0.045	-0.004	0.011*	0.045
Between 18 and 44 Rate	0.001	0.849	0.044	-0.009	0.810	0.044	0.003	0.013*	0.044
Over 65 Rate	0.005	0.016*	0.045	0.013	0.072	0.044	0.001	0.548	0.043
Male Rate	-0.019	0.878	0.045	-0.012	0.095	0.043	-0.002	0.941	0.045
Bachelor Rate	0.004	0.185	0.045	0.012	0.000**	0.046	0.002	0.000**	0.045
Education Degree Rate	-0.011	0.147	0.045	0.011	0.000**	0.044	0.001	0.000**	0.045
Population Density	-0.012	0.794	0.044	0.001	0.320	0.047	0.001	0.086	0.045
Unemployed Rate	0.005	0.554	0.046	-0.003	0.016*	0.044	0.002	0.120	0.047
Model Goodness-of-fit	R^2 : 0.135	RMSE: 0.171		R^2 : 0.142	RMSE: 0.125		R^2 : 0.087	RMSE: 0.038	

Note: Significance codes: ** < 0.01, * < 0.05

Rates (coeff = 0.019, $p = 0.000$) experienced significant improvements in health resource accessibility, whereas Indian communities (coeff = -0.022, $p = 0.018$) faced slower recovery, highlighting ongoing challenges for certain demographic groups. The No Insurance Rate (coeff = 0.018, $p = 0.000$) was positively associated with delayed recovery, emphasizing the critical role of insurance coverage in improving access to health resources. Notably, political affiliations also demonstrated influence during the recovery phase. Counties with higher Republican Rates (coeff = 0.017, $p = 0.014$) showed relatively greater improvements, while those with higher Democratic Rates (coeff = -0.010, $p = 0.047$) experienced less favorable outcomes, suggesting nuanced differences in recovery trajectories linked to political demographics. Additionally, educational attainment, reflected in the negative associations of the Bachelor Rate (coeff = -0.010, $p = 0.001$) and Education Degree Rate (coeff = -0.010, $p = 0.000$), indicates that counties with lower education levels faced prolonged barriers to resource accessibility during the recovery phase.

These findings demonstrate that the pandemic not only intensified existing disparities but also resulted in uneven recovery trajectories, shaped by a complex interplay of demographic, socioeconomic, and political factors.

5 Discussion

The study highlights clear disparities in public perceptions of health resource accessibility across various socioeconomic and demographic communities in the United States. Several key observations and practical implications are listed below.

5.1 Implications

Geographic disparities. The geographic disparities of public perception revealed through county-level analysis and Moran's I statistics indicate that health re-

source availability could vary significantly across regions in the United States, with notable shifts during the pandemic. Pre-Pandemic, Western states experienced more pronounced negative perceptions, while the Eastern regions displayed a mix of perceptions. The Peak-Pandemic period amplified these disparities, with Western states, particularly California, facing severe shortages. The post-pandemic period saw a return to more neutral perceptions. These observations underscore the importance of regional strategies in addressing health resource disparities. Policies should prioritize areas with historically negative perceptions, such as certain Western counties, ensuring equitable access during routine healthcare delivery and emergencies.

Table 4: Changes in PLS regression coefficients between Pre-Pandemic and Peak-Pandemic periods (Peak-Pandemic minus Pre-Pandemic).

Variable	Coeffs	P-Value	Std. err.
Democratic Rate	-0.021	0.963	0.045
Republican Rate	0.006	0.937	0.046
Total Population	0.010	0.646	0.046
Median Income	-0.001	0.056	0.045
GINI	-0.048	0.075	0.044
No Insurance Rate	-0.012	0.777	0.047
Household Below Poverty Rate	0.026	0.090	0.045
HISPANIC LATINO Rate	0.020	0.282	0.045
White Rate	-0.026	0.003**	0.045
Black Rate	0.048	0.004**	0.045
Indian Rate	0.007	0.604	0.045
Asian Rate	-0.013	0.383	0.046
Under 18 Rate	-0.001	0.221	0.044
Between 18 and 44 Rate	-0.016	0.754	0.045
Between 45 and 64 Rate	0.001	0.391	0.047
Over 65 Rate	0.016	0.325	0.044
Male Rate	0.012	0.252	0.045
Bachelor Rate	0.010	0.073	0.043
Education Degree Rate	0.040	0.060	0.044
Population Density	0.471	0.390	0.044
Unemployed Rate	-0.014	0.321	0.044
Model Goodness-of-fit:	R^2 : 0.069, RMSE: 0.207		

Socioeconomic and demographic factors. The study’s PLS regression results confirm that socioeconomic and demographic characteristics play a pivotal role in shaping health resource accessibility. Pre-Pandemic advantages observed in predominantly White and insured communities underscore inequities favoring wealthier, better-educated populations. During the pandemic, compounded challenges in communities with higher poverty rates, lower median incomes, and significant Hispanic/Latino or Asian populations reflected a deepening of these inequities. Post-pandemic, the persistence of disparities in uninsured and less-educated communities further underscores the entrenched nature of these challenges.

Policy measures should address these socioeconomic determinants by expanding health resource access for uninsured populations and investing in education to enhance long-term resilience, which aligns well with prior studies’ findings [Khairat *et al.*, 2019]. For instance, enhancing community health education and subsidizing insurance coverage could help alleviate disparities and improve resource distribution during future crises. The disparities observed in Hispanic/Latino and Indian communities also suggest the need for culturally tailored interventions to bridge gaps in accessibility.

Table 5: Changes in PLS regression coefficients between Peak-Pandemic and Post-Peak periods (Post-Peak minus Peak-Pandemic).

Variable	Coeffs	P-Value	Std. err.
Democratic Rate	-0.010	0.047*	0.044
Republican Rate	0.017	0.014*	0.043
Total Population	-0.010	0.904	0.045
Median Income	0.015	0.091	0.044
GINI	0.017	0.517	0.045
No Insurance Rate	0.018	0.000**	0.046
Household Below Poverty Rate	-0.001	0.023*	0.043
HISPANIC LATINO Rate	0.019	0.000**	0.045
White Rate	-0.002	0.584	0.046
Black Rate	0.005	0.351	0.045
Indian Rate	-0.022	0.018*	0.045
Asian Rate	0.001	0.263	0.045
Under 18 Rate	-0.007	0.004**	0.046
Between 18 and 44 Rate	0.013	0.340	0.046
Between 45 and 64 Rate	0.009	0.058	0.044
Over 65 Rate	-0.013	0.062	0.045
Male Rate	0.011	0.129	0.046
Bachelor Rate	-0.010	0.001**	0.044
Education Degree Rate	-0.010	0.000**	0.044
Population Density	-0.001	0.643	0.046
Unemployed Rate	0.005	0.060	0.045
Model Goodness-of-fit: R^2 : 0.119, RMSE: 0.127			

Pandemic’s impact. The analysis of temporal changes in perception scores reveals that the pandemic exacerbated pre-existing health resource disparities. Prior research also shows that public health crises could disproportionately affect different demographic communities [Connor *et al.*, 2020]. In our study, White communities experienced sharper declines in perception scores during the pandemic, potentially due to previously better access that was strained under increased demand. Conversely, the resilience of Black communities suggests a unique dynamic where limited access Pre-Pandemic left less room for perceived deteriora-

tion. The role of income inequality, as evidenced by the GINI coefficient, further illustrates how structural disparities became more pronounced during the pandemic.

Post-pandemic recovery trajectories reflect ongoing inequities, with some communities, such as Hispanic/Latino populations, showing notable improvements, while others, like Indian communities, experienced slower recovery. These findings emphasize the pandemic’s role in exacerbating inequalities and highlighting the need for tailored interventions. Policies aimed at bolstering resource distribution for underserved communities and addressing income inequality could play a transformative role in achieving equitable recovery.

5.2 Opportunities for Future Work

This study highlights several promising directions for future research. The first opportunity lies in improving model classification performance. While the current ModernBERT model has demonstrated satisfactory performance in detecting perceptions, future research could focus on leveraging more advanced models. For instance, using large language models (LLMs) like LLaMA could enable the identification of more fine-grained perceptions from online reviews. Additionally, expanding the datasets for training and testing through a more comprehensive annotation process could enhance the robustness of the model.

A second potential research direction involves data fusion. Social media platforms often represent specific subsets of users, and as noted in prior studies, social media data can overrepresent certain demographics such as educated or urban populations [Wang *et al.*, 2019]. For example, as shown in Figure 3, very few messages have been posted from less-represented areas. To address these limitations, future work could incorporate reviews from other platforms, such as Yelp or TripAdvisor, to explore how web data might complement traditional surveys. Such an approach could yield a broader and more representative understanding of public perceptions.

6 Conclusions

This study demonstrates the value of crowdsourced data from platforms like Google Maps reviews in identifying disparities in public perceptions of health resource accessibility. During the COVID-19 pandemic, these disparities intensified at the peak and showed improvement in the Post-Peak period, shaped primarily by socioeconomic and demographic factors. Geospatial and regression analyses revealed more positive perceptions among White, insured, wealthy, and educated communities, underscoring a persistent equity gap. These findings emphasize the urgency for targeted policies that address structural inequities and ensure equitable access to healthcare resources. By adopting data-driven strategies and collaborative partnerships, stakeholders can foster more inclusive, resilient communities prepared to withstand future public health challenges.

References

- [Afthanorhan *et al.*, 2015] Asyraf Afthanorhan, Aimran Ahmad, and Sabri Ahmad. Permutation test, non-parametric, and confidence set approaches to multi group analysis for comparing 2 groups using partial least square structural equation modeling (pls-sem). *Advances in Research*, 4(5):315–328, 2015.
- [Amur *et al.*, 2023] Zaira Hassan Amur, Yew Kwang Hooi, Gul Muhammad Soomro, Hina Bhanbhro, Said Karyem, and Najamudin Sohu. Unlocking the potential of keyword extraction: The need for access to high-quality datasets. *Applied Sciences*, 13(12):7228, 2023.
- [Andrejko, 2022] Kristin L Andrejko. Effectiveness of face mask or respirator use in indoor public settings for prevention of sars-cov-2 infection—california, february–december 2021. *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report*, 71, 2022.
- [Awan *et al.*, 2024] Asma Tahir Awan, Ana Daniela Gonzalez, and Manoj Sharma. A neoteric approach toward social media in public health informatics: A narrative review of current trends and future directions. *Information*, 15(5):276, 2024.
- [Baum, 2016] Frances E Baum. Health systems: how much difference can they make to health inequities?, 2016.
- [Ben-Zvi *et al.*, 2012] Ilan Ben-Zvi, Shaye Kivity, Pnina Langevitz, and Yehuda Shoenfeld. Hydroxychloroquine: from malaria to autoimmunity. *Clinical reviews in allergy & immunology*, 42:145–153, 2012.
- [Breiman, 2001] Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45:5–32, 2001.
- [Broniatowski *et al.*, 2018] David A. Broniatowski, Amelia M. Jamison, SiHua Qi, Lulwah AlKulaib, Tao Chen, Adrian Benton, Sandra C. Quinn, and Mark Dredze. Weaponized health communication: Twitter bots and russian trolls amplify the vaccine debate. *American Journal of Public Health*, 108(10):1378–1384, 2018. PMID: 30138075.
- [Cohen, 1960] Jacob Cohen. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1):37–46, 1960.
- [Connor *et al.*, 2020] Jade Connor, Sarina Madhavan, Mugdha Mokashi, Hanna Amanuel, Natasha R Johnson, Lydia E Pace, and Deborah Bartz. Health risks and outcomes that disproportionately affect women during the covid-19 pandemic: A review. *Social science & medicine*, 266:113364, 2020.
- [Cucinotta and Vanelli, 2020] D. Cucinotta and M. Vanelli. Who declares covid-19 a pandemic. *Acta Biomed*, 91(1):157–160, Mar 2020.
- [de Jong, 1993] Sijmen de Jong. Simpls: An alternative approach to partial least squares regression. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, 18(3):251–263, 1993.
- [Detels *et al.*, 2021] Roger Detels, Quarraisha Abdool Karim, Fran Baum, Liming Li, Alastair H. Leyland, Frank J. van Lenthe, and Johan P. Mackenbach. Socioeconomic inequalities in health in high-income countries: The facts and the options. In *Oxford Textbook of Global Public Health*. Oxford University Press, 11 2021.
- [Devlin, 2018] Jacob Devlin. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [Faber and Fonseca, 2014] J. Faber and L. M. Fonseca. How sample size influences research outcomes. *Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics*, 19(4):27–29, 2014.
- [Gao *et al.*, 2016] Fei Gao, Wahida Kihal, Nolwenn Le Meur, Marc Souris, and Séverine Deguen. Assessment of the spatial accessibility to health professionals at french census block level. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 15(1):125, 2016.
- [Gui *et al.*, 2017] Xinning Gui, Yubo Kou, Kathleen H. Pine, and Yunan Chen. Managing uncertainty: Using social media for risk assessment during a public health crisis. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 4520–4533. Association for Computing Machinery, 2017.
- [Jia *et al.*, 2021] Xiaoyun Jia, Yan Pang, and Liangni Sally Liu. Online health information seeking behavior: A systematic review. *Healthcare*, 9(12), 2021.
- [Keller, 2020] Kevin Lane Keller. Consumer research insights on brands and branding: a jcr curation. *Journal of Consumer research*, 46(5):995–1001, 2020.
- [Keppel *et al.*, 2005] Kenneth Keppel, Elsie Pamuk, John Lynch, Olivia Carter-Pokras, Insun Kim, Vickie Mays, Jeffrey Percy, Victor Schoenbach, and Joel S Weissman. Methodological issues in measuring health disparities. *Vital and Health Statistics Series 2: Data Evaluation and Methods Research*, (141):1–16, jul 2005.
- [Khairat *et al.*, 2019] Saif Khairat, Timothy Haithcoat, Songzi Liu, Tanzila Zaman, Barbara Edson, Robert Gianforcaro, and Chi-Ren Shyu. Advancing health equity and access using telemedicine: a geospatial assessment. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 26(8-9):796–805, 2019.
- [Khan *et al.*, 2023] Wahab Khan, Ali Daud, Khairullah Khan, Shakoor Muhammad, and Rafiul Haq. Exploring the frontiers of deep learning and natural language processing: A comprehensive overview of key challenges and emerging trends. *Natural Language Processing Journal*, page 100026, 2023.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2017] Minjeong O. Kim, Enrico Coiera, and Farah Magrabi. Problems with health information technology and their effects on care delivery and patient outcomes: a systematic review. *Journal*

- of the American Medical Informatics Association, 24(2):246–250, March 2017.
- [King and Zeng, 2001] Gary King and Langche Zeng. Logistic regression in rare events data. *Political analysis*, 9(2):137–163, 2001.
- [Krasnodębska *et al.*, 2024] Katarzyna Krasnodębska, Wojciech Goch, Judith Anne Versteegen, Johannes H Uhl, and Martino Pesaresi. Advancing precision, recall, f-score, and jaccard index: An approach for continuous gridded data. *Recall, F-Score, and Jaccard Index: An Approach for Continuous Gridded Data*, 2024.
- [Li *et al.*, 2022] Jiacheng Li, Jingbo Shang, and Julian McAuley. Uctopic: Unsupervised contrastive learning for phrase representations and topic mining. In *ACL*, pages 6159–6169, 2022.
- [Liang and others, 2020] Wenhua Liang *et al.* Development and validation of a clinical risk score to predict the occurrence of critical illness in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 180(8):1081–1089, 2020.
- [Mehta *et al.*, 2019] Heeket Mehta, Pratik Kanani, and Priya Lande. Google maps. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 178(8):41–46, 2019.
- [Nurunnabi *et al.*, 2014] Abdul Nurunnabi, Ali Hadi, and A. Imon. Procedures for the identification of multiple influential observations in linear regression. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 41:1315–1331, 01 2014.
- [Pennsylvania State University, 2024] Pennsylvania State University. Lesson 10: More on checking the model assumptions, 2024. Accessed: 2024-12-05.
- [Peters and Lee, 2020] Heidi M. Peters and Erica A. Lee. The defense production act (dpa) and covid-19: Key authorities and policy considerations. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IN/IN11231>, 2020. Congressional Research Service Insight Report, Version 4, Updated March 18, 2020.
- [Réa-Neto *et al.*, 2021] Álvaro Réa-Neto, Rafaella Stradiotto Bernardelli, Bruna Martins Dzivielewski Câmara, Fernanda Baumle Reese, Marcos Vinicius Oliveira Queiroga, and Mirella Cristine Oliveira. An open-label randomized controlled trial evaluating the efficacy of chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine in severe covid-19 patients. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):9023, 2021.
- [Roozenbeek *et al.*, 2020] Jon Roozenbeek, Claudia R Schneider, Sarah Dryhurst, John Kerr, Alexandra LJ Freeman, Gabriel Recchia, Anne Marthe Van Der Bles, and Sander Van Der Linden. Susceptibility to misinformation about covid-19 around the world. *Royal Society open science*, 7(10):201199, 2020.
- [Salathé and Khandelwal, 2011] Marcel Salathé and Shashank Khandelwal. Assessing vaccination sentiments with online social media: Implications for infectious disease dynamics and control. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 7(10):1–7, 10 2011.
- [Self and others, 2020] Wesley H. Self *et al.* Effect of hydroxychloroquine on clinical status at 14 days in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*, 324(21):2165–2176, 2020.
- [Sodhi *et al.*, 2023] ManMohan S Sodhi, Christopher S Tang, and Evan T Willenson. Research opportunities in preparing supply chains of essential goods for future pandemics. *International Journal of Production Research*, 61(8):2416–2431, 2023.
- [The White House, 2020] The White House. Executive order delegating authority under the DPA with respect to food supply chain resources during the national emergency caused by the outbreak of COVID-19, 2020. Accessed: 2024-12-03.
- [Trump, 2020] Donald J. Trump. Proclamation 9994: Declaring a national emergency concerning the novel coronavirus disease (covid-19) outbreak, March 13 2020.
- [United States Census Bureau, 2021] United States Census Bureau. Household pulse survey: 2021 data tables, 2021. Accessed: 2024-12-03.
- [United States Census Bureau, 2023] United States Census Bureau. TIGER/line shapefiles and geographic resources: 2023, 2023. Accessed: 2024-12-03.
- [United States Government Accountability Office, 2021] United States Government Accountability Office. Covid-19: Critical vaccine distribution, supply chain, program integrity, and other challenges require focused federal attention. Technical Report GAO-21-108, U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2021.
- [Vapnik, 2013] Vladimir Vapnik. *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer science & business media, 2013.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2019] Zijian Wang, Scott Hale, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Przemyslaw Grabowicz, Timo Hartman, Fabian Flöck, and David Jurgens. Demographic inference and representative population estimates from multilingual social media data. In *The world wide web conference*, pages 2056–2067, 2019.
- [Wazny, 2017] Kerri Wazny. “crowdsourcing” ten years in: A review. *Journal of global health*, 7(2), 2017.
- [World Health Organization, 2020] World Health Organization. WHO Technical Report 2020. Technical report, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2020.
- [Xiang, 2022] Lin Xiang. Application of an improved tf-idf method in literary text classification. *Advances in Multimedia*, 2022(1):9285324, 2022.
- [Yan *et al.*, 2023] An Yan, Zhankui He, Jiacheng Li, Tianyang Zhang, and Julian McAuley. Personalized showcases: Generating multi-modal explanations for recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2251–2255, 2023.

A Appendix

A.1 Classification performance

Figure 5 shows the classification results by different text classification models.




Figure 5: Classification performance of candidate models: (a) Precision, (b) Recall, (c) F1-score, and (d) Training and testing accuracy.

A.2 Permutation test method in PLS regression

The key equations of Permutation tests are:

Θ^{obs} = Coefficient derived from the original dataset,

$\Theta^{(k)}$ = Coefficient derived from the k -th permutation,

$$p_i = \frac{1}{n_{\text{perm}}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{\text{perm}}} \mathbb{I}(|\Theta_i^{(k)}| \geq |\Theta_i^{\text{obs}}|),$$

$$SE(\Theta_i) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n_{\text{perm}}} (\Theta_i^{(k)} - \bar{\Theta}_i)^2}{n_{\text{perm}} - 1}}. \quad (3)$$

where Θ^{obs} represents the observed regression coefficients calculated from the original dataset using the SIMPLS algorithm, and $\Theta^{(k)}$ denotes the coefficients derived from the k -th permutation of the dependent variable \mathbf{Y} , with n_{perm} representing the total number of permutations (1000 in this study). The p-value (p_i) for each Θ_i is computed by comparing the observed Θ_i^{obs} with the null distribution generated by permuted $\Theta_i^{(k)}$. Specifically, p_i measures the proportion of permuted coefficients that are as extreme as or more extreme than the observed coefficient.

In addition, the standard error $SE(\Theta_i)$ is calculated as the standard deviation of the permuted coefficients $\Theta_i^{(k)}$ around their mean $\bar{\Theta}_i$.

A.3 Cook's Distance method to remove extreme points

For an observation i , Cook's Distance is calculated as:

$$D_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n (\hat{y}_j^{(-i)} - \hat{y}_j)^2}{p \cdot \text{MSE}} \quad (4)$$

where: $\hat{y}_j^{(-i)}$ is the predicted value for observation j when observation i is excluded, \hat{y}_j is the predicted value using the full dataset, p is the number of model parameters (including the intercept), and MSE is the mean squared error of the regression model.

To identify influential observations, we applied a threshold defined as:

$$\text{Threshold} = \frac{4}{n} \quad (5)$$

where n is the total number of observations in the dataset. Observations with $D_i > \text{Threshold}$ were flagged as extreme observations, and they will be removed.

A.4 Representative examples

Table 6 shows the Representative Google Maps reviews for public perception of health resource accessibility.

Table 6: Representative Google Maps reviews for public perception of health resource accessibility

Google Maps review	Targeted text	Attitude
Just absolutely crazy! There there was no hamburger and no toilet paper, and not hardly no potato chips on the shelves. People were grabbing up stuff like this was the end of the world.	There there was no hamburger and no toilet paper...	Shortage
Ran out of a lot of paper goods - toilet paper, paper towels. Ended up buying the more expensive paper towels and toilet paper, which I really could not afford, but I needed it.	Ran out of a lot of paper goods - toilet paper, paper towels.	Shortage
I was able to buy toilet paper there at the height of the shortage, and they sanitized every cart before use.	I was able to buy toilet paper there at the height of the shortage...	No Shortage
I was thankfully able to visit the Dollar General store location off of Donaghey, and they had plenty of paper products, as well as hand soaps.	...and they had plenty of paper products, as well as hand soaps.	No Shortage
The only major store that requires you to wear a mask to shop, but the employees near the entrance having masks hanging below their nose makes it pointless to wear a mask.	The only major store that requires you to wear a mask to shop...having masks hanging below their nose makes it pointless to wear a mask.	Unrelated
Boards are in place between customers and employees at the payment counter to encourage social distancing, but then only 1 out of the 3 staff present seem to know how to wear a mask properly.	...but then only 1 out of the 3 staff present seem to know how to wear a mask properly.	Unrelated