

1 **Sociodemographic and geographic variation in mortality attributable to**
2 **air pollution in the United States**

3 **Authors:**

4 Pascal Geldsetzer^{1,2,3}†*, Daniel Fridljand^{1,4,5}†, Mathew V. Kiang², Eran Bendavid¹, Sam Heft-Neal⁶,
5 Marshall Burke^{6,7}, Alexander H. Thieme^{8,9,10}, Tarik Benmarhnia^{11,12}

6 †These authors contributed equally to this work

7 *Corresponding nauthor. Email: pgeldsetzer@stanford.edu.

8
9 **Affiliations:**

10 ¹ Division of Primary Care and Population Health, Department of Medicine, Stanford
11 University; Stanford, CA 94305, USA.

12 ² Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University; Stanford, CA
13 94305, USA.

14 ³ Chan Zuckerberg Biohub; San Francisco, CA 94158, USA.

15 ⁴ Heidelberg Institute of Global Health (HIGH), Heidelberg University; 69120 Heidelberg,
16 Germany.

17 ⁵ Department of Mathematics, Yale University; New Haven, CT 06511, USA.

18 ⁶ Center on Food Security and the Environment, Stanford University; Stanford, CA 94305,
19 USA.

20 ⁷ Department of Earth System Science, Stanford University; Stanford, CA 94305, USA.

21 ⁸ Stanford Center for Biomedical Informatics Research (BMIR), Department of Medicine,
22 Stanford University; Stanford, CA 94305, USA.

23 ⁹ Department of Radiation Oncology, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin; 10117 Berlin,
24 Germany.

25 ¹⁰ Berlin Institute of Health at Charité — Universitätsmedizin Berlin; 10117 Berlin,
26 Germany.

27 ¹¹ Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego; La Jolla, CA
28 92093, USA.

29 ¹² Univ Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et
30 travail) - UMR_S 1085, Rennes, France.

31

32

33 **Abstract:**

34 There are large differences in premature mortality in the USA by racial/ethnic, education,
35 rurality, and social vulnerability index groups. Using existing concentration-response functions,
36 particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) air pollution, population estimates at the tract level, and county-level
37 mortality data, we estimated the degree to which these mortality discrepancies can be attributed
38 to differences in exposure and susceptibility to PM_{2.5}. We show that differences in mortality
39 attributable to PM_{2.5} were consistently more pronounced between racial/ethnic groups than by
40 education, rurality, or social vulnerability index, with the Black American population having by
41 far the highest proportion of deaths attributable to PM_{2.5} in all years from 1990 to 2016. Over
42 half of the difference in age-adjusted all-cause mortality between the Black American and non-
43 Hispanic White population was attributable to PM_{2.5} in the years 2000 to 2011.

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51 **Main Text**

52 Despite improvements in the overall life expectancy in the USA over the past decades,
53 significant inequalities among different racial/ethnic and socioeconomic groups remain a
54 public health challenge¹. For example, in 2019, the life expectancy at birth was 78.8 years for
55 the non-Hispanic (NH) White population but only 74.8 years for Black Americans².

56
57 Air pollution, particularly exposure to fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), is thought to be a major
58 risk factor for premature death, both worldwide and in the USA³. Although most areas in the
59 USA have seen declines in air pollution over the past decades, the pollution-related health
60 burden remains substantial³. Improvements in air pollution exposure have been unequally
61 distributed across population subgroups⁴⁻⁶. For instance, Tessum et al.⁵ showed an overall
62 decrease in PM_{2.5} exposure in the USA between 2005 and 2015, but that such benefits were
63 less pronounced among Black Americans, communities with lower educational attainment,
64 and rural communities. Several federal environmental policies have been implemented since
65 the 1970 Clean Air Act to address the fact that air pollution exposure differs across USA
66 communities and acknowledge the environmental justice implications of exposure to air
67 pollution. In particular, Executive Order 12898 (focusing on identifying and addressing the
68 disproportionately high adverse human health effects from environmental exposures and on
69 developing strategies for implementing environmental justice), Executive Order 14008
70 (focusing on climate change-related impacts and encouraging mitigations strategies that may
71 also have co-benefits on greenhouse gas emissions and public health) and the National
72 Ambient Air Quality Standard program state that air quality standards must be set at a level
73 that protects the most vulnerable populations. More information on these policies is provided
74 in the Supplementary Text.

75 In addition to being systematically more exposed to higher levels of air pollution, structurally
76 disadvantaged communities are also thought to be more susceptible to adverse health effects
77 from air pollution, which has sometimes been referred to as an environmental justice “double
78 jeopardy”⁷. For example, the concentration-response function (CRF) linking PM_{2.5} exposure
79 to mortality appears to be more pronounced among Black Americans⁸. Such differential
80 susceptibility is thought to be due to differential distributions in pre-existing comorbidities,
81 lack of access to health care, racialized occupational sorting into jobs with more hazardous
82 exposures, and other social and structural determinants of health⁷. Indeed, there is a rich
83 literature documenting how structural racism⁹, related to historical policies such as redlining
84 as well as contemporary inequalities in health care access, can explain such differential
85 susceptibility to air pollutants¹⁰.

86
87 Using existing CRFs, PM_{2.5} air pollution and population estimates at the census tract level,
88 and mortality data at the county level, the aim of this study was to quantify the contribution
89 of PM_{2.5} to racial/ethnic, educational, geographic, and social vulnerability-related inequalities
90 in mortality in the USA to inform appropriate policy interventions. Studies that estimate the
91 number of deaths attributable to air pollution, and PM_{2.5} in particular, usually rely on existing
92 CRFs from the literature to infer such burden¹¹. These studies have used a single CRF for the
93 whole pooled population, assuming no differences in susceptibility to PM_{2.5}, which may
94 drastically underestimate the unequal health burden of air pollution across vulnerable
95 communities. Given the evidence on differences in susceptibility to PM_{2.5} by racial/ethnic
96 groups in the USA⁹⁻¹⁴, we used the CRF from Di et al.¹⁵ for our primary analyses. The CRF
97 from Di et al. is the only existing CRF that provides race-ethnicity-specific estimates for each
98 of the main racial/ethnic categories in the US census and is based on a large sample of the

99 population from all US counties¹⁵. Our analysis relies on the assumption that this CRF
100 accurately depicts a causal effect of PM_{2.5} exposure on mortality. To examine the degree to
101 which the use of CRFs that ignore differences in the concentration-response association by
102 racial/ethnic group underestimates disparities in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality between
103 racial/ethnic groups, we then compare our results to those obtained from two recent and
104 widely used uniform CRFs for the USA population in secondary analyses^{11,16}. In this study,
105 we use the classification of racial/ethnic groups as a proxy for long-established and systemic
106 consequences of political, historical, and economic structures, social constructs as well as
107 environmental racism^{10,12,17}.

108

109 **Results**

110 *Exposure to PM_{2.5} at the national level:*

111 In 2016, 0.8% of all census tracts and 0.9% of the overall population were exposed to an
112 annual mean PM_{2.5} concentration above 12µg/m³, which is the legally required threshold set
113 by the current National Ambient Air Quality Standard¹⁸. In comparison, in 1990, 83.4% of
114 census tracts and 85.9% of the population were exposed to PM_{2.5} levels above 12µg/m³. The
115 decline in PM_{2.5} exposure (as well as all-cause mortality) overall, and separately by
116 subpopulation over time is plotted in figures Fig. S 2 -Fig. S 7. The mean population-
117 weighted PM_{2.5} exposure levels, when averaged over the period from 2000 to 2016, were
118 highest among Black Americans at 9.38 µg/m³, followed by Asians or Pacific Islanders at
119 9.21 µg/m³, Hispanics or Latinos at 9.13 µg/m³, Non-Hispanic Whites at 8.25 µg/m³ and
120 American Indians or Alaska Natives at 7.46 µg/m³ (Fig. S 4). Between 2000 and 2016, the
121 disparity in PM_{2.5} exposure between Black Americans and Non-Hispanic Whites narrowed
122 from 2.17 µg/m³ to 0.94 µg/m³.

123 ***Estimated PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality at the national level:***

124 In the overall population, the estimated PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality declined from 79.2 (95%
125 CI, 77.1 to 81.4) age-adjusted deaths per 100,000 in 1990 to 11.7 (95% CI, 11.4 to 12.0) in
126 2016. We observed this steep downward trend for all studied subpopulations, with absolute
127 differences between these groups narrowing considerably over the study period (**Fig. 1**, Fig.
128 S. 8). However, the lines representing each subpopulation in figure 1 did not intersect at any
129 time between 1990 and 2016. Thus, the most affected groups in 2016 were also the most
130 affected groups in 1990.

131
132 From 1990 to 2016, Black Americans experienced an estimated 86% reduction in the age-
133 adjusted mortality rate attributable to PM_{2.5}, the largest decline observed among all
134 racial/ethnic groups (Fig. 1). However, these larger improvements among Black Americans
135 must be considered in relation to their higher starting point in the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality
136 rate relative to other racial/ethnic groups. In fact, although the *absolute* size of the difference
137 in the PM_{2.5}-attributable age-adjusted mortality rate between Black Americans and other
138 racial/ethnic groups decreased over the study period, the *relative* size of these differences
139 remained similar over time (Fig. S 9). Examining the estimated percent of all-cause mortality
140 that is attributable to PM_{2.5}, rather than the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate, for each
141 population group yielded similar trends (Fig. 1). Of note, the declines in PM_{2.5} exposure over
142 the study period have led to a decrease in the percent of all-cause mortality that is attributable
143 to PM_{2.5} among each of our population subgroups. Unlike the decline in the PM_{2.5}-
144 attributable mortality rate over time, this finding was not self-evident because it indicates that
145 for each population subgroup mortality from PM_{2.5} decreased more rapidly than mortality
146 from other causes.

147

148 More than half of the difference in all-cause mortality between Black Americans and the
149 Non-Hispanic White population was attributable to PM_{2.5} in each year from 2000 to 2011
150 (**Fig. 2**). With a decrease from 53.4% (95% CI, 51.2% to 55.9%) in 2000 to 49.9% (95% CI,
151 47.8% to 52.2%) in 2015, this proportion, however, has declined over time. The percent of
152 the difference in all-cause mortality to Black Americans that can be explained by differences
153 in exposure and susceptibility to PM_{2.5} between racial/ethnic groups was lower for the
154 Hispanic or Latino White, Asian or Pacific Islander, and American Indian or Alaska Native
155 population than for the Non-Hispanic White population. Nonetheless, at a mean for the
156 period 2000 to 2015 of 20.8% (95% CI, 20.7% to 20.9 %), 16.1% (95% CI, 16.1% to
157 16.2%) and 12.8% (95% CI, 12.7% to 12.8%) for the American Indian or Alaska Native,
158 Hispanic or Latino White, Asian or Pacific Islander, and population, respectively, the
159 percentages were still substantial.

160

161 We observed that disparities between racial/ethnic groups in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality
162 exist at all levels of education, rurality, socioeconomic status, household characteristics,
163 housing type and transportation, and social vulnerability index (**Figures 3**, S 10 – S 15). In
164 fact, variation in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality by racial/ethnic group further increased when
165 the analysis was restricted to the population with high educational attainment or those
166 residing in non-metropolitan areas (Fig. S 16). The variation in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality
167 by racial/ethnic group was similar for the different levels of socioeconomic status, social
168 vulnerability index, and housing type and transportation (Fig. S 16). Black Americans and
169 Hispanic or Latino Whites had the highest PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality at all levels of these
170 variables in the year 2016 (Figures 3, S 10 – S 14). Black Americans also had a higher

171 PM2.5-attributable mortality than the respective average for every level of these variables in
172 2016 (Figures 3, Fig. S 10– Fig. S 14). Hispanic or Latino Whites living in socially
173 vulnerable counties experienced double the PM2.5 attributable mortality than Hispanic or
174 Latino Whites living in socially resilient counties in 2016 (Fig. S 10, Fig. S 17).

175

176 Those with low education and Black Americans had a higher PM2.5-attributable mortality
177 than the respective average for every level of rurality, socioeconomic status, housing type
178 and transportation, and social vulnerability index in 2016. Disparities in PM2.5-attributable
179 mortality by educational attainment were more pronounced for high socioeconomic status
180 than for middle and low socioeconomic status (Fig. S 18, Fig. S 19). Those with a high
181 school diploma or a lower level of education experienced a higher PM2.5-attributable
182 mortality than those with a higher educational attainment at all levels of rurality, social
183 vulnerability index, socioeconomic status, household characteristics, minority status, and
184 housing type and transportation (Fig. S 19 - Fig. S 24). High school graduates or lower living
185 in large metropolitan areas experienced 36.9% (95% CI, 34.5% to 39.3%) higher PM_{2.5}
186 attributable mortality than those with the same level of education living in non metro areas in
187 2016 (Fig. S 25).

188

189 Disparities in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality by education or rurality were not as pronounced as
190 for racial/ethnic groups (Fig. 1). This finding was also corroborated when adapting a
191 coefficient of variation approach (15), which found that estimated age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-
192 attributable mortality varied more by racial/ethnic group than by education or rurality in all
193 years of our study period (Fig. S 26). Nonetheless, differences in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality
194 by education and by rurality were still apparent. In the year 2016, those with a high school
195 diploma or lower experienced 16.9 (95% CI, 16.4 to 17.4) PM_{2.5}-attributable age-adjusted

196 deaths per 100,000 (Fig. 1). This rate is nearly double compared to those with some college
197 education but no 4-year degree, who had a rate of 8.8 (95% CI, 8.5 to 9.0), and those with a
198 4-year college degree or higher, who had a rate of 7.7 (95% CI, 7.5 to 7.9) (Fig. 1). Similar
199 patterns are observed in all-cause mortality rates (Fig. S 5). Between 1990 and 2016, there
200 was a significant reduction in the absolute differences in PM_{2.5}-attributable age-adjusted
201 mortality rates per 100,000 between large metro and non-metro areas, declining from 28.7 to
202 5.3. Despite this decrease in absolute disparity, the relative difference remained stable and
203 even showed a slight increase (Fig. 1). Specifically, large metro areas had 1.48 times the
204 PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate of non-metro areas in 1990, and this ratio increased to 1.57
205 times in 2016 (Fig. 1).

206

207 *Variation in estimated PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality across states and counties:*

208 We observed substantial variation across states both in the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable
209 mortality rate (Fig. S 27) as well as the percent of age-adjusted all-cause mortality that can be
210 attributed to PM_{2.5} (Fig. 4). Fig. S 28 depicts the state-level positive association between
211 PM_{2.5} exposure and all-cause mortality. In all states with a PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate
212 above zero, Black Americans had a higher percent of all-cause mortality that can be
213 attributed to PM_{2.5} (Fig. 4), as well as a higher PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate (Fig. S 27), in
214 2016 than the Non-Hispanic White population. Similarly, those with a high school diploma
215 or lower education had a higher PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality in all states compared to groups
216 with a higher level of education (Fig. S 28). In 31 of the 34 states that had both counties
217 designated as “large metro” and “non metro”, “large metro” counties had a higher PM_{2.5}-
218 attributable mortality compared to “non metro” counties (Fig. S 28).

219

220 When examining variation across counties, we found that in virtually all (96.6%) counties for
221 which data were available, Black Americans had a higher age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable
222 mortality rate than the Non-Hispanic White population (**Fig. 5**, Fig. S 29) for the mean value
223 across the period 2000 to 2016. The comparison between the Black American and Hispanic
224 or Latino White population was more varied, with a number of counties in the South-Eastern
225 USA having a lower PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for Black Americans than for Hispanic
226 or Latino Whites. The lowest PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rates for all three racial/ethnic
227 groups for which we had a sufficient sample size at the county level (Black American,
228 Hispanic or Latino White, and Non-Hispanic White) tended to be in counties in the Mountain
229 West. When taking into account spatial autocorrelation, we identified multiple county
230 clusters with significantly higher or lower differences in the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate
231 between racial/ethnic groups than in surrounding areas (Fig. S 30).

232
233 All our analysis results, including differences in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality by racial/ethnic,
234 education, level of rurality, and social vulnerability-related groups, as well as trends over
235 time, remained similar in relative terms when restricting the study population to those aged
236 65 years and older (Figures S 31 – S 45).

237

238 **Discussion**

239 Our study shows that improvements in air quality in the USA have decreased estimated
240 PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality for all subpopulations that we examined. However, our analysis
241 also highlights the remaining inequalities in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality between different
242 subpopulations. These inequalities were most pronounced between racial/ethnic groups. In

243 fact, more than half of the difference in mortality between the Non-Hispanic White
244 population and Black Americans was attributable to PM_{2.5} in each year from 2000 to 2011.

245
246 Our results indicate the strong association of the race and ethnicity group with adverse
247 environmental health outcomes – an association that is even stronger than for education,
248 rurality or social vulnerability-related factors. This finding aligns with a growing body of
249 evidence^{9,10,19} demonstrating that racial/ethnic categories are not simply proxies for
250 socioeconomic differences but are also (imperfect) proxy measures for exposure to historical
251 and contemporary discriminatory practices. Racism and the discrimination of racial/ethnic
252 minorities emerged early in the founding of the USA and evolved into government-sponsored
253 displacement, exclusion, and residential segregation^{9,10,19}. Residential segregation is a
254 substantial consequence of structural racism that still negatively impacts the health of
255 racial/ethnic minorities today through various mechanisms involving both a disproportionate
256 exposure to air pollutants and higher susceptibility to these pollutants^{4,7,9,15,20–22}. Sources of
257 air pollution emissions are often located in marginalized communities, as residents of these
258 areas tend to have less economic opportunity, resources, and social capital, as well as limited
259 political power, to influence the decision-making processes that determine where such
260 sources of pollution are placed^{9,10,20}. In addition to its role in explaining differences in PM_{2.5}
261 exposure between racial/ethnic groups, structural racism is likely also a major driver of the
262 unequal distribution of factors that contribute to the, on average, higher susceptibility to
263 PM_{2.5} exposure among many racial/ethnic minorities¹⁵. These factors include social
264 determinants of health, such as exclusion from job and educational opportunities, inadequate
265 access to healthcare, and maladaptive coping behaviors⁹.

266

267 An additional important finding of our analysis is that inequalities in PM_{2.5}-attributable
268 mortality between racial/ethnic groups were obscured when ignoring differences in the
269 estimated susceptibility to PM_{2.5} across racial/ethnic groups. Using race-ethnicity-specific
270 mortality rates and PM_{2.5} exposure measurements, but assuming that the mortality effects of a
271 given unit of PM_{2.5} are equal across all racial/ethnic groups, will greatly underestimate
272 differences in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality. Similarly, using CRFs that do not take into
273 account differences in susceptibility to PM_{2.5} between racial/ethnic groups will generally
274 underestimate the benefit of reductions in PM_{2.5} on health outcomes among structurally
275 disadvantaged groups. We, thus, advocate for the use of race-ethnicity-specific CRFs in
276 future health impact studies to ensure air quality policies protect subpopulations most at risk.

277
278 We note some caveats of our study. A first set of limitations relates to the CRFs that we used
279 in our analysis. First, although the race-ethnicity-specific CRF by Di et al.¹⁵ used in this
280 analysis was developed in the age group 65+ years, our manuscript presents results for the
281 age group 25+ years. To investigate whether our results would differ substantially if we
282 conducted our study in this older age group only, we have implemented all analyses shown in
283 this manuscript when restricting the study population to the age group 65+. The results
284 (shown in the Supplementary Materials) demonstrate that all relative differences and patterns
285 over time by racial/ethnic, education, and geography group remain similar. Second, we use a
286 uniform CRF to derive the mortality response for all subpopulations not related to
287 racial/ethnic group. There is evidence of differences in susceptibility to PM_{2.5} for the
288 different subpopulations. For example, the composition of air pollution in urban areas has
289 more adverse health effects than in rural areas²³. We may, thus, underestimate the differences
290 in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality between subpopulations not related to racial/ethnic group.

291 Third, because the true underlying PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate is not practically
292 measurable, we cannot estimate the validity of any given CRF. We therefore present results
293 using multiple CRFs, selecting Di et al.'s model as our primary CRF due to its unique
294 provision of race-ethnicity-specific estimates and its foundation in a nationwide
295 sample^{11,16,24}.

296
297 A second set of limitations relates to our PM_{2.5} exposure measurements. We relied on
298 assigning PM_{2.5} exposure based on the current location of residence. This could be
299 problematic for two reasons. First, if people live and work at different locations and pollution
300 levels are systematically different between these locations, our attribution estimates may be
301 biased. However, available evidence for urban areas finds the discrepancies in work and
302 residential PM_{2.5} levels are small in absolute values ($<0.1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)²⁵, suggesting that assigning
303 exposures by residence location may be a reasonable approximation of total exposure. A
304 related concern arises if mortality is driven mainly by long-term cumulative exposure,
305 populations change residence locations during the study period, and there exists a systematic
306 correlation between exposure at previous residence location and exposure at current
307 residence location. However, existing literature finds that both immediate and long-term
308 exposure matter for health outcomes, and again does not find consistent support for patterns
309 of geographic mobility being associated with pollution levels in the USA²⁶. Another potential
310 limitation associated with exposure assignment was due to pollution and population data
311 being available at a geographically more granular level (0.01° by 0.01° and the census tract
312 level, respectively) than our mortality data (available at the county level). As the geographic
313 level at which we conduct our analysis increases, the risk of ecological bias increases.
314 However, it is worth noting that the 'smoothing' effect of using county-level data is more

315 likely to result in underestimation rather than overestimation of disparities between
316 subpopulations. This is because the averaging process could dilute more extreme values that
317 contribute to these disparities, making them appear less pronounced than they actually are.
318 We, however, did not observe a substantial association between the proportion of all-cause
319 mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} with within-county variation in PM_{2.5} (S32, Panels C),
320 implying that aggregation of PM_{2.5} exposure from the census tract to the county level is
321 unlikely to be an important source of bias in our analysis. Another limitation is that our final
322 confidence intervals for PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality do not incorporate uncertainty arising
323 from the PM_{2.5}-exposure estimates, because the PM_{2.5}-exposure estimates on a 0.01° by
324 0.01° grid from Meng et al. only provide mean estimates (without uncertainty estimates).
325 Another limitation is that Di et al.'s CRF is derived from zip-code level data, while our study
326 is based on coarser county-level data. Hence there is a difference in exposure measurement
327 errors between those geographic levels. This could affect the validity of the point estimates
328 and confidence interval of the CRF by Di et al. estimates when applied to our study. For the
329 first point, a previous study²⁷ suggests that the bias for the point estimate introduced by the
330 exposure measurement error is generally small.

331
332 A third set of limitations of our study relates to our measurement of socioeconomic variables.
333 First, we had to rely on racial/ethnic group as a proxy measure for exposure to racism. Richer
334 data on exposure to racism would be a key asset for future research in this area²⁸. Second,
335 there is evidence that educational attainment recorded on death certificates tends to
336 overestimate the decedent's level of education²⁹. Lastly, because information on the social
337 vulnerability-related factors was not available on the death certificates, we assigned the
338 social vulnerability-related factors to all individual deaths within a county. It is important to

339 note that contextual factors such as the social vulnerability index we used may not capture
340 the individual-level socioeconomic status. Yet, contextual socioeconomic vulnerability may
341 be a more relevant indicator to inform/guide targeted policies across the US counties to
342 reduce air pollution related health disparities³⁰. That being said, it would be interesting to
343 explore multi-level socioeconomic disparities in relation to deaths attributable to air pollution
344 in future work as such data becomes available.

345

346 **Methods**

347 We harmonised mortality counts, population counts and PM_{2.5} concentration estimates to
348 estimate PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality across various sociodemographic population subgroups
349 in the United States between 1990 and 2016. The population subgroups used in our analyses
350 were racial/ethnic groups, educational attainment groups, rurality levels, socioeconomic
351 status, household characteristics, racial and ethnic minority status, housing type and
352 transportation, and social vulnerability index. We derived population counts at the census
353 tract level from the U.S. Census Bureau, using linear interpolation to account for missing
354 data in intercensal years. We acquired restricted-use county-level mortality counts from the
355 U.S. National Vital Statistics System. Both data sets were pre-disaggregated by racial/ethnic
356 groups and educational attainment at their respective sources. Additionally, we mapped
357 levels of rurality, socioeconomic status, household characteristics, racial and ethnic minority
358 status, housing type and transportation levels, and the social vulnerability index to the
359 population counts and mortality counts based on county level look-up tables from the
360 National Center for Health Statistics and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

361

362 We mapped PM_{2.5} concentration levels from an established model³¹ and ground-based
363 measurement data³² to census tracts. We assigned population-weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure
364 estimates to each county. To estimate the mortality burden that is attributable to PM_{2.5} at the
365 county (and, subsequently, state and national) level, we combined our annual population-
366 weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure estimate and mortality counts at the county level with a CRF.
367 The main CRF used in this analysis was by Di et al.¹⁵. For state or national-level analyses, we
368 aggregated county-level all-cause and PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality counts to the respective
369 state or national level. We converted these raw mortality counts into age-adjusted mortality
370 rates.

371

372 A detailed description of the data sources and methods can be found in the supplement.

373

374

375

376 **References and Notes**

- 377 1. Heron, M. *et al.* National Vital Statistics Reports, Volume 57, Number 14 (April 17, 2009).
378 135.
- 379 2. Arias, E. United States Life Tables, 2019. 59.
- 380 3. Wu, X., Braun, D., Schwartz, J., Kioumourtzoglou, M. A. & Dominici, F. Evaluating the
381 impact of long-term exposure to fine particulate matter on mortality among the elderly.
382 *Science Advances* **6**, eaba5692 (2020).
- 383 4. Liu, J. *et al.* Disparities in Air Pollution Exposure in the United States by Race/Ethnicity and
384 Income, 1990–2010. *Environmental Health Perspectives* **129**, 127005.
- 385 5. Tessum, C. W. *et al.* Inequity in consumption of goods and services adds to Racial–Ethnic
386 disparities in air pollution exposure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**,
387 6001–6006 (2019).
- 388 6. Colmer, J., Hardman, I., Shimshack, J. & Voorheis, J. Disparities in PM_{2.5} air pollution in the
389 United States. *Science* **369**, 575–578 (2020).
- 390 7. Gardner-Frolick, R., Boyd, D. & Giang, A. Selecting Data Analytic and Modeling Methods to
391 Support Air Pollution and Environmental Justice Investigations: A Critical Review and
392 Guidance Framework. *Environmental Science & Technology* **56**, 2843–2860 (2022).
- 393 8. Benmarhnia, T., Hajat, A. & Kaufman, J. S. Inferential challenges when assessing
394 Racial/Ethnic health disparities in environmental research. *Environmental Health* **20**, 7
395 (2021).
- 396 9. Bailey, Z. D. *et al.* Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: Evidence and
397 interventions. *The Lancet* **389**, 1453–1463 (2017).
- 398 10. Mohai, P. & Bryant, B. Environmental Racism: Reviewing the Evidence. in *Race And The*
399 *Incidence Of Environmental Hazards* (Routledge, 1992).

- 400 11. Burnett, R. *et al.* Global estimates of mortality associated with long-term exposure to
401 outdoor fine particulate matter. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
402 *United States of America* **115**, 9592–9597 (2018).
- 403 12. Krieger, N. Refiguring “Race”: Epidemiology, Racialized Biology, and Biological
404 Expressions of Race Relations. *International Journal of Health Services* **30**, 211–216 (2000).
- 405 13. Ma, Y. *et al.* Racial/ethnic disparities in PM_{2.5}-attributable cardiovascular mortality burden
406 in the United States. *Nat Hum Behav* 1–10 (2023) doi:10.1038/s41562-023-01694-7.
- 407 14. Josey, K. P. *et al.* Air Pollution and Mortality at the Intersection of Race and Social Class.
408 *New England Journal of Medicine* **388**, 1396–1404 (2023).
- 409 15. Di, Q. *et al.* Air Pollution and Mortality in the Medicare Population. *The New England*
410 *Journal of Medicine* **376**, 2513–2522 (2017).
- 411 16. Cohen, A. J. *et al.* Estimates and 25-Year trends of the global burden of disease attributable
412 to ambient air pollution: An analysis of data from the Global Burden of Diseases Study 2015.
413 *The Lancet* **389**, 1907–1918 (2017).
- 414 17. Wang, Y. *et al.* Air quality policy should quantify effects on disparities. *Science* **381**, 272–
415 274 (2023).
- 416 18. Agency, U. E. P. National Ambient Air Quality Standards Table. (2014).
- 417 19. Williams, D. R., Lawrence, J. A. & Davis, B. A. Racism and Health: Evidence and Needed
418 Research. *Annual Review of Public Health* **40**, 105–125 (2019).
- 419 20. Tessum, C. W. *et al.* PM_{2.5} pollutants disproportionately and systemically affect people of
420 color in the United States. *Science Advances* **7**, eabf4491 (2021).
- 421 21. Thind, M. P. S., Tessum, C. W., Azevedo, I. L. & Marshall, J. D. Fine Particulate Air
422 Pollution from Electricity Generation in the US: Health Impacts by Race, Income, and
423 Geography. *Environmental Science & Technology* **53**, 14010–14019 (2019).

- 424 22. Madrigano, J. *et al.* Environmental Racism: The Relationship Between Historical Residential
425 Redlining and Current Environmental Hazards. *ISEE Conference Abstracts* (2021)
426 doi:10.1289/isee.2021.O-LT-061.
- 427 23. Park, M. *et al.* Differential toxicities of fine particulate matters from various sources.
428 *Scientific Reports* **8**, 17007 (2018).
- 429 24. Wang, Y. *et al.* Long-term Exposure to PM_{2.5} and Mortality Among Older Adults in the
430 Southeastern US: *Epidemiology* **28**, 207–214 (2017).
- 431 25. Brazil, N. Environmental inequality in the neighborhood networks of urban mobility in US
432 cities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **119**, e2117776119 (2022).
- 433 26. Banzhaf, H. S., Ma, L. & Timmins, C. Environmental Justice: Establishing Causal
434 Relationships. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* **11**, 377–398 (2019).
- 435 27. Wei, Y. *et al.* The Impact of Exposure Measurement Error on the Estimated Concentration–
436 Response Relationship between Long-Term Exposure to PM_{2.5} and Mortality. *Environmental*
437 *Health Perspectives* **130**, 077006.
- 438 28. Adkins-Jackson, P. B., Chantarat, T., Bailey, Z. D. & Ponce, N. A. Measuring Structural
439 Racism: A Guide for Epidemiologists and Other Health Researchers. *American Journal of*
440 *Epidemiology* **191**, 539–547 (2022).
- 441 29. Sorlie, P. D. & Johnson, N. J. Validity of Education Information on the Death Certificate.
442 *Epidemiology* **7**, 437–439 (1996).
- 443 30. Hajat, A. *et al.* Air Pollution and Individual and Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status:
444 Evidence from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA). *Environmental Health*
445 *Perspectives* **121**, 1325–1333 (2013).
- 446 31. Meng, J. *et al.* Estimated Long-Term (1981–2016) Concentrations of Ambient Fine
447 Particulate Matter across North America from Chemical Transport Modeling, Satellite

- 448 Remote Sensing, and Ground-Based Measurements. *Environmental Science & Technology* **53**,
449 5071–5079 (2019).
- 450 32. US EPA, O. Air Data: Air Quality Data Collected at Outdoor Monitors Across the US.
451 (2014).
- 452 33. Fridljand, D. FridljDa/Pm25_inequality: National_level_data. (2022)
453 doi:10.5281/zenodo.10038691.
- 454 34. Bureau, U. C. Annual tables from the Population Survey’s Annual Social and Economic
455 supplement: Educational Attainment in the United States.
- 456 35. U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates, Table: Table
457 B01001A, B01001B, B01001C, B01001D, B01001E, B01001H, B15001, C15002A,
458 C15002B, C15002C, C15002D, C15002E, C15002H.
- 459 36. Sasson, I. & Hayward, M. D. Association Between Educational Attainment and Causes of
460 Death Among White and Black US Adults, 2010-2017. *JAMA* **322**, 756 (2019).
- 461 37. Rothwell, C. J., Madans, J. H. & Arispe, I. E. National Center for Health Statistics: Series 2,
462 Number 166, 2013 NCHS Urban–Rural Classification Scheme for Counties. 81.
- 463 38. Flanagan, B. E., Hallisey, E. J., Adams, E. & Lavery, A. Measuring Community
464 Vulnerability to Natural and Anthropogenic Hazards: The Centers for Disease Control and
465 Prevention’s Social Vulnerability Index. *J Environ Health* **80**, 34–36 (2018).
- 466 39. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics: Restricted-
467 Use Vital Statistics Data. (2022).
- 468 40. Manson, S., Schroeder, J., Van Riper, D., Kugler, T. & Ruggles, S. IPUMS National
469 Historical Geographic Information System: 1990 Census: STF 1 - 100% Data, Table: NP10.
470 Hispanic Origin by Race.

- 471 41. U.S. Census Bureau. 2000 Decennial Census, Summary File 1, Table: P012A, P012B,
472 P012C, P012D, P012E, P012I.
- 473 42. U.S. Census Bureau. 2010 Decennial Census, Summary File 1, Table: PCT12A, PCT12B,
474 PCT12C, PCT12D, PCT12E, PCT12I.
- 475 43. Logan, J. R., Xu, Z. & Stults, B. J. Interpolating U.S. Decennial Census Tract Data from as
476 Early as 1970 to 2010: A Longitudinal Tract Database. *The Professional Geographer* **66**,
477 412–420 (2014).
- 478 44. Weden, M. M., Peterson, C. E., Miles, J. N. & Shih, R. A. Evaluating Linearly Interpolated
479 Intercensal Estimates of Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics of U.S. Counties
480 and Census Tracts 2001–2009. *Population Research and Policy Review* **34**, 541–559 (2015).
- 481 45. Anderson, R. N. National Vital Statistics Reports. in *Encyclopedia of Human Development*
482 (SAGE Publications, Inc., 2005). doi:10.4135/9781412952484.n432.
- 483 46. Jbaily, A. *et al.* Air pollution exposure disparities across US population and income groups.
484 *Nature* **601**, 228–233 (2022).
- 485 47. Caldas de Castro, M. & Singer, B. H. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A New
486 Application to Account for Multiple and Dependent Tests in Local Statistics of Spatial
487 Association. *Geographical Analysis* **38**, 180–208 (2006).
- 488 48. United States Department of Health and Human Services (US DHHS). Bridged-Race
489 Population Estimates.

490

491

492

493

494

495

496 **Acknowledgments** We thank Gabriel Carrasco-Escobar (University of California San Diego) for
497 his help with the spatial analyses. We thank anonymous reviewers for helpful comments.

498

499 **Funding:**

500 PG is a Chan Zuckerberg Biohub investigator. DF is supported by the Gerhard C. Starck
501 Foundation. MVK is supported by National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant R00DA051534. EB
502 is supported by NIH grants R01AI127250 and R01HD104835. SHN is supported by the Robert
503 Woods Johnson Foundation. TB is supported by NIH grant R01CA228147 and by the California
504 Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (#21-
505 E0018).

506

507 **Author contributions:**

508 Conceptualization: PG

509 Methodology: PG, DF, MVK, EB, SHN, MB, AT, TB

510 Investigation: DF

511 Software/ Formal analysis: DF

512 Visualization: PG, DF, MVK, AT, TB

513 Funding acquisition: PG

514 Project administration: PG, TB

515 Supervision: PG, TB

516 Writing – original draft: PG, DF, TB

517 Writing – review & editing: PG, DF, MVK, EB, SHN, MB, AT, TB

518 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

519 **Data and materials availability:** Data and code are publicly accessible on GitHub
520 (https://github.com/FridljDa/pm25_inequality) and Zenodo³³. Population estimates from the
521 ACS and NCHS are publicly available and shared on the repositories above. Death certificate
522 data was obtained from the National Center for Health Statistics, which mandates that all
523 cells with fewer than 10 deaths and at the subnational level must be suppressed. Data derived
524 from death certificates are, thus, only shared at the national level.


526 **Fig. 1. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate by racial/ethnic group, education**
527 **level, rurality level, and the social vulnerability index.**

528 The first row shows the age-adjusted mortality rate that we estimate is attributable to PM_{2.5}. The second row shows
529 the percentagae of all-cause mortality that we estimate is attributable to PM_{2.5}. The dashed lines depict 95%
530 confidence intervals. 95% confidence intervals for rurality are too narrow to be visible.

531 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, SVI=social vulnerability index.

532

533



534
535


536 **Fig. 2. Extent to which the difference in the age-adjusted mortality rate between each**
537 **racial/ethnic group and Black Americans can be attributed to PM_{2.5}.**

538 Of the racial/ethnic groups considered in this study, Black Americans have both the highest all-cause mortality rate
539 and highest PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate. The first column is the absolute size (in mortality per 100,000) of the
540 difference in mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} between each racial/ethnic group and Black Americans. The second
541 column is the percent of the difference in all-cause mortality between each racial/ethnic group and Black Americans
542 that can be attributed to PM_{2.5} exposure.

543 Dark blue dots denote 2015 and light blue dots denote 2000. Red dots denote the unweighted mean from 2000 to
544 2015. The dot sizes are proportional to the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate that is attributable to PM_{2.5}.

545 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic


546



547
 548 **Fig. 3. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for each**
 549 **racial/ethnic group stratified by educational attainment.**

550 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals. The US Census Bureau has not published data on educational
 551 attainment by age for the racial/ethnic group “American Indian or Alaska Native”³⁴. This racial/ethnic group has,
 552 thus, been omitted from this figure.


553 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



555

556 **Fig. 4. Percentage of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate that was attributable to**
 557 **PM_{2.5} in the year 2016, by state and racial/ethnic group.**

558 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



559

560 **Fig. 5. Differences in the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate between racial/ethnic groups at the county level for the**
 561 **period 2000 to 2016.**

562 These figures show the (unweighted) mean value across the period 2000 to 2016.

563 The first row is the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality per 100,000 for each racial/ethnic group.

564 The second row is the absolute difference in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality per 100,000 between racial/ethnic groups.

565 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Supplementary Materials for

Sociodemographic and geographic variation in mortality attributable to
air pollution in the United States

Pascal Geldsetzer, Daniel Fridljand, Mathew V. Kiang, Eran Bendavid, Sam Heft-Neal, Marshall
Burke, Alexander H. Thieme, Tarik Benmarhnia
Correspondence to: pgeldsetzer@stanford.edu

This PDF file includes:

Materials and Methods
Supplementary Text S1
Figures S1 to S65
Tables S1 to S3

23 **Materials and Methods**

24

25 **Supplementary Text S1**

26

27 **List of Figures**

28 Fig. S 1. Diagram summarizing the analysis steps to estimate age-adjusted PM2.5-
29 attributable mortality rates.

30 Fig. S 2. Time trend in the population-weighted annual mean PM2.5 exposure for the age
31 group 25+ years.

32 Fig. S 3. Time trend in the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate for the age group 25+ years.

33 Fig. S 4. Population-weighted annual mean PM2.5 exposure in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ by sub population for
34 the age group 25+ years.

35 Fig. S 5. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes by subpopulation for the age
36 group 25+ years.

37 Fig. S 6. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes and population-weighted
38 annual mean PM2.5 exposure for the population aged 25+ years in US states and the District of
39 Columbia.

40 Fig. S 7. County level map of population-weighted mean PM2.5 exposure levels by
41 racial/ethnic group in 2016.

42 Fig. S 8 Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 attributable to PM2.5 exposure by
43 subpopulation for the age group 25+ years.

44 Fig. S 9. Percent at which the age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate was lower for
45 each racial/ethnic group relative to Black Americans for the age group 25+ years.

46 Fig. S 10. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
47 each racial/ethnic group stratified by the social vulnerability index.

48 Fig. S 11. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
49 each racial/ethnic group stratified by socioeconomic status.

50 Fig. S 12. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
51 each racial/ethnic group stratified by household characteristics.

52 Fig. S 13. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
53 each racial/ethnic group stratified by minority status.

54 Fig. S 14. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
55 each racial/ethnic group stratified by Housing Type and Transportation.

56 Fig. S 15. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate for the age group 25+ years in the
57 USA.

58 Fig. S 16. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted all-cause mortality attributable to
59 PM2.5 by racial/ethnic group for different sociodemographic groups for the age group 25+ years.

60 Fig. S 17. Relative difference in PM2.5-attributable mortality rate for each racial/ethnic
61 group between different sociodemographic groups.

62 Fig. S 18. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted all-cause mortality attributable to
63 PM2.5 by educational attainment for different sociodemographic groups for the age group 25+
64 years.

65 Fig. S 19. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
66 each education level stratified by socioeconomic status.

67 Fig. S 20. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
68 each education level stratified by rurality.

69 Fig. S 21. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
70 each education level stratified by social vulnerability index.

71 Fig. S 22. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
72 each education level stratified by household characteristic.

73 Fig. S 23. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
74 each education level stratified by minority status.

75 Fig. S 24. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for
76 each education level stratified by housing type and transportation.

77 Fig. S 25. Relative difference in PM2.5-attributable mortality rate for each educational
78 attainment group between different sociodemographic groups.

79 Fig. S 26. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted all-cause mortality attributable to
80 PM2.5 when stratifying by different sociodemographic groups for the age group 25+ years.

81 Fig. S 27. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate for the age group 25+ years in the
82 year 2016, by state and racial/ethnic group.

83 Fig. S 28. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes and attributable to PM2.5
84 (among those aged 25+ years) in US states and the District of Columbia in 2016 for the
85 racial/ethnic groups "Black American" and "NH White", low and high educational attainment,
86 and rurality levels "Non-metro" and "large metro".

87 Fig. S 29. County-level scatter plot of the age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality per
88 100,000 for selected racial/ethnic groups and education levels.

89 Fig. S 30. County-level spatial clusters with high (red colors) and low (blue colors)
90 differences in the age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate between racial/ethnic groups.

91 Fig. S 31. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate by racial/ethnic group, education
92 level, and rurality level for the age group 65+.

93 Fig. S 32. Percentage of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate that was attributable to
94 Fig. S 33. Differences in the age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate between the
95 racial/ethnic groups at the county level for the period 2000 to 2016 for the age group 65+ years.

96 Fig. S 34. Population-weighted annual mean PM2.5 exposure in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ by subpopulation
97 for the age group 65+ years.

98 Fig. S 35. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes by racial/ethnic group,
99 education attainment level, and rurality level for the age-group 65+ years.

100 Fig. S 36. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes and population-weighted
101 average PM2.5 exposure for the population aged 65+ years in US states and District of
102 Columbia.

103 Fig. S 37. Percent at which the PM2.5-attributable mortality rate per 100,000 is lower for
104 each racial/ethnic group relative to Black Americans for the age group 65+ years.

105 Fig. S 38. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate for the age group 65+ years in the
106 USA.

107 Fig. S 39. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted all-cause mortality attributable to
108 PM2.5 when stratifying by different sociodemographic groups for the age group 65+ years.

109 Fig. S 40. Age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate for the age group 65+ years in the
110 year 2016, by state and racial/ethnic group.

111 Fig. S 41. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes and attributable to PM2.5
112 (among those aged 65+ years) in US states in 2016 for the racial/ethnic groups "Black
113 American" and "NH White", low and high educational attainment, and rurality levels "Non-
114 metro" and "large metro"

115 Fig. S 42. County-level scatter plot of the age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 attributable to
116 PM2.5 for selected racial/ethnic groups and education level comparisons for age group 65+
117 years.

118 Fig. S 43. County-level spatial clusters with high (red colors) and low (blue colors)
119 differences in the age-adjusted PM2.5-attributable mortality rate between racial/ethnic groups for
120 the age group 65+ years.

121 Fig. S 44. Analyses to examine the importance of using race-ethnicity specific CRFs for the
122 age group 65+ years.

123 Fig. S 45. Differences in the proportion of all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM2.5
124 for the age group 65+ years between Black Americans and other racial/ethnic groups.

125 Fig. S 46. Exploring the link between PM2.5-attributable mortality at the county level and
126 the variation of the PM2.5 estimates aggregated from the census tract to county level.

127 Fig. S 47. Shape of the CRFs by Di et al. (“Di”), the Global Burden of Disease project
128 (“GBD”), and Burnett et al. (“GEMM”)

129 Fig. S 48. Percent of the difference in the age-adjusted mortality rate between each race-
130 ethnicity and “Black American” that is attributable to PM2.5, using either race-ethnicity-specific
131 CRFs (solid lines) or a uniform CRF (dashed lines).

132 Fig. S 49. Extent to which the difference in the age-adjusted mortality rate between each
133 racial/ethnic group and Black Americans can be attributed to PM2.5.

134 Fig. S 50. Analyses to examine the importance of using race-ethnicity specific CRFs for the
135 age group 25+ years.

136 Fig. S 51. Differences in the proportion of all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM2.5
137 for the age group 25+ years between Black Americans and other racial/ethnic groups.

138 Fig. S 52. Histogram of the number of census tract per county for the period 2000 to 2016.

139 Fig. S 53. Association of the variation in census-tract level PM2.5 measurements with
140 county-level PM2.5-attributable mortality for the period 2000 to 2016 stratified by quantiles of
141 the number of census tracts per county.

142 Fig. S 54. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each racial/ethnic
143 group stratified by rurality.

144 Fig. S 55. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each racial/ethnic
145 group stratified by the social vulnerability index.

146 Fig. S 56. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each racial/ethnic
147 group stratified by socioeconomic status.

148 Fig. S 57. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each racial/ethnic
149 group stratified by household characteristics.

150 Fig. S 58. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each racial/ethnic
151 group stratified by minority status.

152 Fig. S 59. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each racial/ethnic
153 group stratified by housing type & transportation.

154 Fig. S 60. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each educational
155 attainment level stratified by rurality.

156 Fig. S 61. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each educational
157 attainment level stratified by the social vulnerability index.

158 Fig. S 62. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each educational
159 attainment level stratified by Socioeconomic Status.

160 Fig. S 63. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each educational
161 attainment level stratified by Household Characteristic.

162 Fig. S 64. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each educational
163 attainment level stratified by Minority Status.

164 Fig. S 65. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM2.5 for each educational
165 attainment level stratified by Housing Type & Transportation.

166

167 **List of Tables**

168 Table S 1. Data sources for the population counts used in the calculation of age-adjusted
169 mortality rates.

170 Table S 2. Data sources for the population counts used in the estimation of population-
171 weighted mean PM2.5 exposure.

172 Table S 3. ICD-10 codes used in each concentration-response function.


173

174

175

176 **Materials and Methods**

177 This analysis brought together data from several sources. Fig. S 1 summarizes the different
178 input data along with the geographic level at which this data was available, how we aggregated
179 these data to the county level in order to generate a geographically harmonized dataset, and how
180 the data were combined to arrive at age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rates for each
181 population subgroup. In this Materials and Methods section, we provide a detailed description of
182 the following steps of our analysis, with a separate subheading for each step: i) our definition of
183 each racial/ethnic, education, rurality, and social vulnerability-related group; ii) each input
184 variable used to calculate age-standardized mortality rates; iii) each input variable used to
185 calculate population-weighted PM_{2.5} exposure; iv) the steps to geographically harmonize our
186 data; v) the calculations to estimate age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality; vi) the calculations
187 to estimate the degree to which differences in all-cause mortality between racial/ethnic groups
188 can be attributed to PM_{2.5}; vii) a coefficient of variation approach used to compare the degree of
189 disparity in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality across racial/ethnic groups versus education and rurality
190 groups; viii) how we generated each map in our main manuscript and Supplementary Materials;
191 and ix) our analyses to investigate the importance of using race-ethnicity-specific concentration-
192 response functions (CRFs) when studying differences in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality between
193 racial/ethnic groups. The studied time period was 1990-2016. We used R software, version 4.1.1
194 for all analyses (https://github.com/FridlDa/pm25_inequality).



195
196
197
198
199
200
201

Fig. S 1. Diagram summarizing the analysis steps to estimate age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rates.

All “Process” steps in the diagram were conducted separately for each year and subgroup in our study period. For example, we assigned the mean PM_{2.5} exposure level for an entire year to a given census tract.

202
203
204

205 Defining the population subgroups

206 The population subgroups used in our analyses were racial/ethnic groups, education
207 groups, and rurality levels, socioeconomic status, household characteristics, racial and ethnic
208 minority status, housing type and transportation, and the social vulnerability index. We describe
209 below how we defined each of these groups in our data.

210

211 *Racial/ethnic group:*

212 The racial/ethnic groups considered in this study were: “White” (85.9% of study population
213 in 1990), “Black American” (10.7% in 1990, 12.7% in 2016), “Asian or Pacific Islander” (2.8%
214 in 1990, 6.3% in 2016), and “American Indian or Alaska Native” (0.7% in 1990, 1.2% in 2016).
215 From 2000 onwards, the data from the Decennial Census allowed us to additionally disaggregate
216 “White” into the racial/ethnic groups “Non-Hispanic (NH) White” (66.3% in 2016) and
217 “Hispanic White” (13.4% in 2016).

218

219 *Educational attainment level:*

220 We used educational attainment definitions from the US Census Bureau. Educational
221 attainment was recorded into the following three categories: “low”, defined as high school
222 graduate or lower (44.7% of study population in 2009, 40.6% in 2016); “medium”, defined as
223 some college education, but no 4-year college degree (27.7% in 2009, 29.1% in 2016); and
224 “high”, defined as 4-year college graduate or higher (27.5% in 2009, 30.3% in 2016)³⁵. We chose
225 these broad education categories because they minimize potential misclassification bias resulting
226 from minor discrepancies in education reporting across the data sources for population and
227 mortality counts³⁶. The US Census Bureau has not published data on educational attainment for
228 the racial/ethnic group “American Indian or Alaska Native” by age³⁵. The racial/ethnic group
229 “American Indian or Alaska Native” is, thus, not shown in Figure 3 in the main manuscript.

230

231 *Rurality level:*

232 We used the 2013 version of the Urban Rural Classification Scheme from the National
233 Center for Health Statistics to assign a rurality level to each county in our dataset³⁷. To achieve
234 improved clarity of our findings, we aggregated six rurality levels in the scheme into three
235 categories. Specifically, we aggregated “large fringe metro” and “large central metro” into “large
236 metro” (56.6% of study population in 2000, 54.8% in 2016), “small metro” and “medium metro”
237 into “small-medium metro” (29.2% in 2000, 30% in 2016), and “non-core” and “micropolitan”
238 into “non metro” (14.2% in 2000, 15.2% in 2016). We did not assign a rurality level for deaths
239 for which the county of residence and occurrence of death were not available (0% of deaths in
240 1990 and 0.0008% in 2016).

241

242 *Socioeconomic Status:*

243

244 We assigned socioeconomic status (SES) to each county in our dataset using estimates
245 from the CDC's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry³⁸. These estimates integrate
246 metrics such as the population percentage living below 150% of the poverty line, unemployment
247 rates, housing costs, educational levels, and health insurance coverage. The agency ranks
248 counties on a percentile scale for SES. We categorized these rankings into 'Low SES' (0-33rd

249 percentile), 'Middle SES' (34-66th percentile), and 'High SES' (67-100th percentile). In our
250 study, 'High SES' signifies better resource and opportunity access than 'Low SES'.

251

252 *Household Characteristics and Disability:*

253 We classified counties using the CDC's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease
254 Registry's estimates of Household Characteristics³⁸. These estimates consider various
255 demographic factors: population percentages of those over 65 or under 18, civilians with
256 disabilities, single-parent households, and individuals with limited English proficiency. Each
257 county received a percentile rank for Household Characteristics, which we grouped into three
258 categories: 'Low HC' (0-33rd percentile), 'Middle HC' (34-66th percentile), and 'High HC' (67-
259 100th percentile). In our study, a 'High HC' designation signals greater household stability and
260 demographic benefits compared to 'Low HC' counties.

261

262

263 *Racial and Ethnic Minority Status:*

264 We categorized counties using the CDC's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease
265 Registry estimates for Racial and Ethnic Minority Status³⁸. These estimates reflect the
266 composition of various racial and ethnic groups, excluding Hispanic or Latino: Black or African
267 American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific
268 Islander, Two or More Races, and Other Races. Counties received a percentile rank reflecting
269 their Minority Status. We then organized these ranks into three levels: 'Low MS' for counties in
270 the 0-33rd percentile, 'Middle MS' for the 34-66th percentile, and 'High MS' for the 67-100th
271 percentile. In our study, a 'High MS' level suggests a lower prevalence of racial and ethnic
272 minorities, while a 'Low MS' level indicates a higher prevalence.

273

274 *Housing Type and Transportation:*

275 We categorized each county in our dataset using the CDC's Agency for Toxic Substances
276 and Disease Registry estimates for housing and transportation factors³⁸. These factors include the
277 presence of multi-unit structures, mobile homes, crowding (more than one person per room), lack
278 of vehicle access, and group quarters such as dormitories and nursing homes. The agency
279 provides a percentile ranking for each county based on these criteria. We classified these
280 rankings into three levels: 'Low HS' for counties in the 0-33rd percentile, indicating more
281 challenging housing and transportation conditions; 'Middle HS' for those in the 34-66th
282 percentile; and 'High HS' for counties in the 67-100th percentile, which suggests better housing
283 and transportation conditions.

284

285

286 *Social Vulnerability Index:*

287 We applied the CDC's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry's Social
288 Vulnerability Index (SVI) to classify counties in our dataset³⁸. The SVI evaluates a community's
289 resilience by examining socioeconomic status, household composition, minority status, and
290 housing types. Each county was ranked by percentile for SVI. We grouped these rankings into:
291 'Vulnerable SVI' (0-33rd percentile), indicating higher susceptibility; 'Moderate SVI' (34-66th

292 percentile); and 'Resilient SVI' (67-100th percentile), suggesting lower vulnerability to events
293 like natural disasters or epidemics.

294

295 Data sources to calculate age-standardized mortality rates:

296 This study analyzed de-identified, restricted-use mortality counts from the US National
297 Vital Statistics System covering all deaths occurring within the United States³⁹. For both of these
298 datasets, every entry is a record of a deceased person taken from death certificates that were
299 submitted to the vital statistics departments of every US state and the District of Columbia. For
300 the years 1990-1998, the cause of death was coded according to the International Classification
301 of Diseases (ICD) Ninth Revision. For the years 1999-2016, the cause of death was coded
302 according to the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) Tenth Revision. We assigned
303 each death to the county of residence of the deceased individual. When the county of residence
304 was missing but the address where the death occurred was present (which was the case in 0.16%
305 of cases in 1990 and 0% in 2016), we used the county of death instead. We limited our analysis
306 to deaths occurring in the age group 25 years and older, because this is the most common age
307 group analyzed in studies on the health effects of long-term PM_{2.5} exposure^{9,16}, and because
308 some of the population counts (see “Data sources to calculate population-weighted PM_{2.5}
309 exposure”) were only available for this age group³⁵.

310 We ignored deaths for which the age at the time of death was not available. This was the
311 case for 0.005% of deaths in 2016. Furthermore, we ignored deaths for which the decedent’s
312 racial/ethnic group or education was unknown or did not fall in the pre-specified categories. This
313 amounted to 0.027% of deaths in 1990 and 0.004% of deaths in 2016 for the racial/ethnic group,
314 and 4.87% of deaths in 2009 and 1.72% of deaths in 2016 for education. After these exclusions,
315 a total of 63 261 546 deaths between 1990 and 2016 (2 057 450 deaths in 1990 and 2 678 827
316 deaths in 2016) remained in the analysis. The finest geographic resolution available for the
317 mortality counts was county.

318

319 Data sources to calculate population-weighted PM_{2.5} exposure:

320 *PM_{2.5} exposure:*

321 We compiled annual mean estimates of PM_{2.5} concentration on a 0.01° by 0.01° (0.9 km by
322 1.1 km) grid from an established model for the 48 states of the contiguous USA and the District
323 of Columbia³¹. The model combines chemical transport modeling, satellite remote sensing, and
324 ground-based measurements. Meng et al. have reported that the estimated PM_{2.5} level from this
325 model was generally consistent with direct ground-based PM_{2.5} measurements, with a cross-
326 validation R² between 0.6 and 0.85³¹. For Alaska and Hawaii, which were not included in the
327 model by Meng et al.³¹, we collected ground-based measurement data from pre-generated annual
328 summary files provided by the United States Air Quality System Data Mart³². In 2016, the
329 monitors measuring PM_{2.5} in the state of Alaska were located in Anchorage, Fairbanks, the City
330 and Borough of Juneau, and the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, and in the state of Hawaii in
331 Honolulu, Kauai, and Maui. Averaged over the years 1990-2016, the population weighted-
332 median distance between a census tract centroid and a monitoring site in Alaska and Hawaii was
333 14 km and 8 km, respectively.

334

335 *Population counts for estimation of population-weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure:*

336 A detailed list of the data sources used for population counts in the estimation of
337 population-weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure can be found in table S2. To estimate population-
338 weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure for each population subgroup, we used population counts at the

339 lowest geographic level available, which was the census tract. Most census tracts in the USA
340 have a population size between 1200 and 8000 (86.7% of census tracts in 1990; 93.5% in 2016).
341 Population counts by racial/ethnic group and age group at the census tract level are from the US
342 Decennial Census for the years 1990, 2000, and 2010⁴⁰⁻⁴², and from the 5-year estimates in the
343 American Community Survey for the years 2009, and 2011-2016³⁵. The American Community
344 Survey data were provided by the US Census Bureau after imputing missing information.
345 Population estimates for the periods 1991-1999 and 2001-2008 were obtained by linearly
346 interpolating the data from the 1990 and 2000 Decennial Census for the period 1991 to 1999, and
347 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census for the period 2001 to 2008. Because the boundaries of census-
348 defined geographies are adjusted for every Decennial Census in response to changes in
349 population, we first used the Longitudinal Tract Data Base⁴³ to crosswalk all Decennial Census
350 to 2010 vintage census tract boundaries. This method is well validated⁴⁴. The data from the
351 Decennial Census and the interpolations were aggregated by 5-year age groups (with the highest
352 category being age 85+ years).

353 Between 2009 and 2016, the American Community Survey offered population estimates at
354 the census-tract level, categorized by age group and highest educational attainment³⁵. We
355 restricted counts by educational level to ages 25 and above, as persons under age 25 may not
356 have completed their education. For the period 2009-2016, the American Community Survey
357 also provides population estimates for all permutations of racial/ethnic group and education level
358 at the census-tract level for the age group 25 years and above³⁵.

359

360 Geographic harmonization:

361 We aggregated our PM_{2.5} estimates, originally at a 0.01° by 0.01° (0.9 km by 1.1 km) grid
362 resolution, to the county level to match the resolution of our mortality counts. Fig. S 1
363 summarizes this process.

364 We assigned annual PM_{2.5} concentration estimates to each census tract by mapping the
365 nearest PM_{2.5} estimate from a 0.01° by 0.01° (0.9 km by 1.1 km) grid to the centroid of the
366 respective tract. To aggregate PM_{2.5} exposure data from census tracts to counties, we utilized
367 population estimates for each racial/ethnic, educational, rural, and social-vulnerability subgroup
368 at the census tract level (refer to Table S2). This allowed us to calculate the population-weighted
369 mean PM_{2.5} exposure annually for each subgroup at the county level. Figure S3 shows the
370 population-weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure, calculated using this process, at the national level for
371 each population subgroup.

372

373 Estimation of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate

374 To estimate county-level mortality burden attributable to PM_{2.5}, we combined our annual
375 population-weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure estimates at the county level with mortality counts at
376 the county level, using a concentration-response function (CRF) within a health impact
377 assessment framework. A CRF f is a function from a concentration level z taking values in $[0,1]$
378 and, in this analysis, depends on the population subgroup c . It is used to calculate the response,
379 the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality count at the county level, in the following form:

380 $R_c = \sum_d f(z_c | c, d) \cdot T_{d,c}$, where z_c is the population-weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure at the

381 county level, d is a disease outcome (see table S3), $T_{d,c}$ is the mortality count for the
382 subpopulation c and disease d at the county level, and R_c is the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality
383 count for subpopulation c at the county level. For analyses at the state or national level, the
384 county-level all-cause and PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality counts were then summed to the state or

385 national level. We converted these raw mortality counts into an age-adjusted mortality rate using
386 the direct method^{1,45}. The reference population was the 2000 US standard population as used in
387 the National Vital Statistics Reports, Vol. 57, No. 14¹. The age categories in the US standard
388 population were 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, and 85+ years. In data sources that
389 provided population counts for more granular age categories, we thus aggregated the counts to
390 these coarser age categories. Table S1 lists, by geographic level, population subgroup, and year,
391 each data source and age categories that were used for the calculation of age-adjusted mortality
392 rates.

393 As explained in the main text, the CRF used in this analysis was by Di et al.¹⁵. Di et al.
394 provide both a general CRF that does not distinguish by racial/ethnic group as well as CRFs
395 specific to each racial/ethnic group considered in this study. We applied racial/ethnic group-
396 specific CRFs only in analyses where we disaggregated results by these groups. The CRF f from
397 Di et al.¹⁵ is a continuous and stepwise linear function. Specifically, f is zero for all values of
398 annual mean PM_{2.5} between 0 and 5 µg/m³ and has a positive slope m_c (which varies by
399 racial/ethnic group) for all annual mean PM_{2.5} levels greater than 5 µg/m³. Figure Fig. S 47
400 illustrates the shape of the CRF. Di et al.¹⁵ provide the mean estimate along with a 95% CI for
401 each m_c .

402 The CRF by Di et al. was developed among US adults aged 65 years and older¹⁵, whereas
403 our analysis applies this CRF to those aged 25 years and older. To examine whether restricting
404 our study population to those aged 65 years and older would change any of our conclusions, we
405 additionally conducted all analyses shown in the main manuscript when restricting the
406 population to this older age group. The results from these analyses are shown in the
407 Supplementary Materials (Figures Fig Fig. S 31 - Fig. S 45).

408

409 Estimation of the proportion of the all-cause mortality that is attributable to PM_{2.5}:

410 To quantify the role of PM_{2.5} attributable mortality relative to the all-cause mortality, we
411 calculated the ratio between both. Specifically, we calculated the proportion of all-cause
412 mortality that is attributable to PM_{2.5} using the formula:

413

$$414 \frac{PM_{2.5} \text{ attributable mortality rate}}{All \text{ cause mortality rate}}$$

415 The percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} is obtained by multiplying this
416 proportion by 100.

417

418 Estimation of the proportion of the all-cause mortality difference to a given racial/ethnic group 419 that is attributable to PM_{2.5}:

420 To quantify the role of PM_{2.5} in mortality disparities between population subgroups, we
421 calculated the ratio between the difference in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality and the difference in

422 all-cause mortality with respect to a fixed reference group. Specifically, we used the following
423 formula:

424

$$425 \frac{PM_{2.5} \text{ attributable mortality rate}_1 - PM_{2.5} \text{ attributable mortality rate}_2}{All \text{ cause mortality rate}_1 - All \text{ cause mortality rate}_2}$$

426

427 For the racial/ethnic groups, we chose “Black American” as reference group because this
428 racial/ethnic group had both the highest PM_{2.5}-attributable as well as all-cause mortality rate.

429

430 Comparing the degree of disparity in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality:

431 To compare the degree to which the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate varies for
432 different population subgroup, we adopted the coefficient of variation (CoV) approach from
433 Jbailey et al.⁴⁶. To do so, we first computed the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate (a)
434 for each population subgroup. We then calculated:

435

$$436 CoV = \frac{\sqrt{Var(a)}}{mean(a)},$$

437

438 where $Var(a)$ is the empirical variance of a and $mean(a)$ is the empirical mean of a . For
439 example, consider the racial/ethnic groups “Black American”, “NH White”, “White Hispanic or
440 Latino”, “Asian or Pacific Islander”, and “American Indian and Alaska Native”, where the age-
441 adjusted mortality per 100,000 attributable to PM_{2.5} are, respectively, $a =$
442 (600, 400, 500, 400, 400). Then $Var(a) = 8000$, $mean(a) = 460$ and thus $CoV \approx 0.19$.
443 Coefficient of variation, therefore, is a measure of the variability of the data normalized by its
444 magnitude¹⁵.

445

446 Spatial analyses:

447 We first mapped, for each racial/ethnic group, the percentage of the all-cause age-adjusted
448 mortality rate that is attributable to PM_{2.5} by US state and District of Columbia in the year 2016.
449 We then proceeded to map the county-level age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality per
450 100,000 for the three largest racial/ethnic groups (NH White, Hispanic or Latino White, and
451 Black Americans) because county-level sample sizes were insufficient for other racial/ethnic
452 groups. We also mapped county-specific differences in the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable
453 mortality rate between i) Black American and the NH White population, and ii) Black American
454 and the Hispanic or Latino White population. All county-level maps were created for each year
455 of our study period (i.e., from 2000 to 2016) as well as for the (unweighted) mean across the
456 years 2000 to 2016. Lastly, we generated all county-level maps when taking spatial
457 autocorrelation into account. To do so, we calculated the local indicator of spatial association
458 (LISA) using local Getis-Ord Gi statistics with contiguity-based spatial weights at the county
459 level⁴⁷.

460

461 Analyses to assess the effect of using a race-ethnicity-specific CRF:

462 We carried out three sets of analyses to investigate the degree to which the use of CRFs
463 that ignore differences in the concentration-response association by racial/ethnic group
464 underestimate disparities in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality between racial/ethnic groups.

465 First, we compared our findings when using the race-ethnicity-specific CRF by Di et al.¹⁵
466 to those obtained when using the uniform CRFs by Cohen et al.¹⁶ and Burnett et al.¹¹. We

467 selected these two CRFs because they are two recent and widely used CRFs for the US
 468 population. The shape of these CRFs is provided in figure Fig. S 47. Each of the CRFs used in
 469 this analysis are based on hazard ratio models that incorporate risk information from PM_{2.5} and
 470 provide 95% confidence intervals. While Di et al.¹⁵ provide hazard ratios for all-cause mortality,
 471 the CRFs by Cohen et al.¹⁶ and Burnett et al.¹¹ are cause-specific. The ICD-10 codes used for
 472 these cause-specific functions are listed in table S3. Using our notation from the formula
 473 presented under “Estimation of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate” above, we can
 474 represent the CRF by Cohen et al.¹⁶ in the following way. Cohen et al. provide 900 draws
 475 $f_1(z|c, d), \dots, f_{900}(z|c, d)$ for the CRF $f(z|c, d)$ for each age-group c and disease outcome d and
 476 exposure level z . For each draw i , we calculated $R_{c,i} = \sum_d f_i(z_c | c, d) \cdot T_{d,c}$. R_c was then

477 estimated by averaging out $R_{c,i}$, i.e., $R_c = 1/900 \sum_{i=1}^{900} R_{c,i}$. We estimated 95% confidence intervals
 478 for R_c by taking the 2.5th and 97.5th percentile from this distribution of 900 values of R_c .

479 Confidence intervals for the sum of R_c across age groups were then obtained by assuming that
 480 each age group-specific R_c follows an independent Gaussian distribution (thus allowing us to
 481 estimate the standard deviation of each R_c from its confidence intervals). Burnett et al.¹¹ (12)
 482 provide the mean estimate and standard deviation for $f(z|c, d)$. 95% confidence interval bounds
 483 for $f(z|c, d)$ were estimated by assuming a normal distribution around the mean for $f(z|c, d)$
 484 and, thus, using 1.96 times the standard deviation above and below the mean to arrive at the
 485 upper and lower 95% confidence interval bounds, respectively. Burnett et al.¹¹ provide one main
 486 CRF f for all non-communicable diseases. Thus, the formula for R_c reduces to $R_c = f(z_c|c, d) \cdot$
 487 $T_{d,c}$.

488 Second, we compared our findings when using the race-ethnicity-specific CRF from Di et
 489 al.¹⁵ to those obtained when applying the CRF for “NH White” by Di et al. to all racial/ethnic
 490 groups. This comparator, thus, ignores that racial/ethnic groups in the USA have different
 491 susceptibilities to PM_{2.5} by assuming that all racial/ethnic groups have the same susceptibility to
 492 PM_{2.5} as the NH White population. We used the same coefficient of variation approach to
 493 compare the effect of this choice on the magnitude of differences in age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-
 494 attributable mortality between racial/ethnic groups as described in these Supplementary
 495 Materials under “Comparing the degree of disparity in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality”.

496 Third, we used the observed mortality counts from 2016 and race-ethnicity-specific CRFs
 497 (again, from Di et al.¹⁵), but assumed the same PM_{2.5} exposure for all racial/ethnic groups by
 498 applying the population-weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure in the overall USA population to all
 499 racial/ethnic groups. This approach accounts for varying susceptibility to PM_{2.5} among
 500 racial/ethnic groups while presuming uniform PM_{2.5} exposure across these groups.

501
 502 Comparison of CRF with race-ethnicity-specific estimates to CRFs that do not provide race-
 503 ethnicity-specific estimates:

504 When using race-ethnicity-specific CRFs, we estimated that a large proportion of the
 505 differences in all-cause mortality between racial/ethnic groups can be attributed to PM_{2.5}
 506 exposure (Fig. 2, Fig. S 48). While we estimated that more than half of the difference in age-
 507 adjusted mortality between the NH White and Black American population was attributable to
 508 PM_{2.5} in each year from 2000 to 2011, the same proportion ranged only from 2.7% to 16.7% in
 509 each year of this period when using CRFs^{16,18} that do not provide race-ethnicity-specific
 510 estimates (Fig. S 48). To further investigate the importance of using race-ethnicity-specific CRFs
 511 when studying differences in PM_{2.5}-attributable deaths between racial/ethnic groups, we

512 conducted two additional analyses. First, we compared our findings to those obtained when
513 applying the CRF by Di et al.¹⁵ for the NH White population to all racial/ethnic groups, thus
514 assuming that all racial/ethnic groups have the same susceptibility to a given level of PM_{2.5}
515 exposure. Implementing this stylized scenario leads to substantially lower variation by
516 racial/ethnic group (Fig. S 48, Fig. S 49, Fig. S 50, Panel A), with only between 10.5% and 6.5%
517 of the difference in mortality to Black Americans being attributable to PM_{2.5} in each year from
518 2000 to 2015. Second, we used the observed mortality counts from 2016 and race-ethnicity-
519 specific CRFs, but assumed the same PM_{2.5} exposure for all racial/ethnic groups by applying the
520 population-weighted average PM_{2.5} exposure in the overall USA population to all racial/ethnic
521 groups. Underscoring the importance of taking into account differential susceptibility to PM_{2.5}
522 exposure between racial/ethnic groups, this analysis (shown in Fig. S 50, Panel B) still leads to
523 substantial disparities in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality between racial/ethnic groups, with 38.7 age-
524 adjusted deaths per 100,000 for Black Americans, 14.1 for the Hispanic White population, 12.9
525 for American Indians or Alaska Natives, 10.4 for the NH White population, and 8.2 for Asian or
526 Pacific Islanders at the overall population-weighted average PM_{2.5} exposure of 7.2 μg/m³.
527 Similarly, we still observe substantial differences by racial/ethnic groups in PM_{2.5}-attributable
528 mortality when assuming that all counties achieve the PM_{2.5} targets set by the USA
529 Environmental Protection Agency (12 μg/m³) or the World Health Organization (10 μg/m³) (Fig.
530 S 50, Panel C).

531

532

533 Uncertainty estimation:

534 We derived the point estimate and confidence interval for Di et al.'s CRF from the
535 original study¹⁵. In our analysis, we propagated these confidence intervals using the Delta
536 Method and parametric bootstrapping. The Delta Method, under the assumption of Gaussian
537 distributions, approximates the variance of a function of random variables primarily through
538 first-order Taylor expansions. Parametric bootstrapping involves generating new sample datasets
539 by resampling from a fitted model, and then re-estimating the parameter of interest on these new
540 datasets to construct its empirical distribution and confidence intervals. The Delta Method was
541 the preferred approach in cases where parametric bootstrapping was computationally prohibitive.

542

543 **Supplementary Text S1**

544

545 **Selected text passages relevant to environmental justice from Executive Order 12898,**
546 **Executive Order 14008, and the National Ambient Air Quality Standard program**

547

548 Executive Order 12898 of February 11, 1994: (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice
549 in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations)

550 “Section 1–1. Implementation.

551 1–101. Agency Responsibilities. To the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law,
552 and consistent with the principles set forth in the report on the National Performance Review,
553 each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by
554 identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or
555 environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-
556 income populations in the United States and its territories and possessions, the District of
557 Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Mariana Islands.”

558

559 “Sec. 3–3. Research, Data Collection, and Analysis.

560 3–301. Human Health and Environmental Research and Analysis. (a) Environmental human
561 health research, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall include diverse segments of the
562 population in epidemiological and clinical studies, including segments at high risk from
563 environmental hazards, such as minority populations, low-income populations and workers who
564 may be exposed to substantial environmental hazards.”

565

566 “3–302. Human Health and Environmental Data Collection and Analysis. To the extent
567 permitted by existing law, including the Privacy Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. section 552a): (a)
568 each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain, and analyze
569 information assessing and comparing environmental and human health risks borne by
570 populations identified by race, national origin, or income. To the extent practical and
571 appropriate, Federal agencies shall use this information to determine whether their programs,
572 policies, and activities have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental
573 effects on minority populations and low-income populations;”

574

575 Source:

576 Federal Register / Vol. 59, No. 32 / Wednesday, February 16, 1994 / Presidential Documents
577 Clinton, William J.

578 URL: <https://www.archives.gov/files/federal-register/executive-orders/pdf/12898.pdf>

579

580

581

582 Executive Order 14008 of January 27, 2021 (Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad)

583 “Securing Environmental Justice and spurring Economic Opportunity:

584 Sec. 219. Policy. To secure an equitable economic future, the United States must ensure that
585 environmental and economic justice are key considerations in how we govern. That means
586 investing and building a clean energy economy that creates well-paying union jobs, turning
587 disadvantaged communities—historically marginalized and overburdened—into healthy, thriving
588 communities, and undertaking robust actions to mitigate climate change while preparing for the
589 impacts of climate change across rural, urban, and Tribal areas. Agencies shall make achieving
590 environmental justice part of their missions by developing programs, policies, and activities to
591 address the disproportionately high and adverse human health, environmental, climate-related
592 and other cumulative impacts on disadvantaged communities, as well as the accompanying
593 economic challenges of such impacts. It is therefore the policy of my Administration to secure
594 environmental justice and spur economic opportunity for disadvantaged communities that have
595 been historically marginalized and overburdened by pollution and underinvestment in housing,
596 transportation, water and wastewater infrastructure, and health care.” (Biden, J., page 7629).

597

598 Source:

599 Biden, J. "Executive Order 14008 of January 27, 2021: Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and
600 Abroad." Federal Register 86.19 (2021): 7619-7633.

601 URL: <https://www.regulations.gov/document/EPA-HQ-OPPT-2021-0202-0012>

602

603 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter; Final Rule of July 18, 1997

604 “SUMMARY: This document describes EPA’s decision to revise the national ambient air
605 quality standards (NAAQS) for particulate matter (PM) based on its review of the available
606 scientific evidence linking exposures to ambient PM to adverse health and welfare effects at
607 levels allowed by the current PM standards. The current primary PM standards are revised in
608 several respects: Two new PM_{2.5} standards are added, set at 15 µg/m³, based on the 3-year
609 average of annual arithmetic mean PM_{2.5} concentrations from single or multiple community-
610 oriented monitors, and 65 µg/m³, based on the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour
611 PM_{2.5} concentrations at each population-oriented monitor within an area; and the current 24-hour
612 PM₁₀ standard is revised to be based on the 99th percentile of 24-hour PM₁₀ concentrations at
613 each monitor within an area. The new suite of primary standards will provide increased
614 protection against a wide range of PM-related health effects, including premature mortality and
615 increased hospital admissions and emergency room visits, primarily in the elderly and
616 individuals with cardiopulmonary disease; increased respiratory symptoms and disease, in
617 children and individuals with cardiopulmonary disease such as asthma; decreased lung function,
618 particularly in children and individuals with asthma; and alterations in lung tissue and structure
619 and in respiratory tract defense mechanisms. The current secondary standards are revised by
620 making them identical in all respects to the new suite of primary standards. The new secondary
621 standards, in conjunction with a regional haze program, will provide appropriate protection
622 against PM-related public welfare effects including soiling, material damage, and visibility
623 impairment. In conjunction with the new PM_{2.5} standards, a new reference method has been
624 specified for monitoring PM as PM_{2.5}.” (Environmental Protection Agency, page 38652)

625

626 “E. Environmental Justice Executive Order 12848 (58 FR 7629, February 11, 1994) requires that
627 each Federal agency make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and
628 addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental

629 effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minorities and low-income populations. These
630 requirements have been addressed to the extent practicable in the RIA cited in this unit.”
631 (Environmental Protection Agency, page 38708)

632


633 Source:

634 US Environmental Protection Agency. (1997). National ambient air quality standards for
635 particulate matter: Final rule. Fed. Regist., 62(138), 38-651.

636 URL: <https://archive.epa.gov/ttn/pm/web/pdf/pmnaaqs.pdf>

637


638



639
640
641
642


Fig. S 2. Time trend in the population-weighted annual mean PM_{2.5} exposure for the age group 25+ years.

643
644
645



646
647
648

Fig. S 3. Time trend in the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate for the age group 25+ years.




649
 650 **Fig. S 4. Population-weighted annual mean PM_{2.5} exposure in µg/m³ by sub population for**
 651 **the age group 25+ years.**

652 Abbreviations: SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority Status, HTT =
 653 Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index, NH=Non-Hispanic.

654
 655


656



657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664


Fig. S 5. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes by subpopulation for the age group 25+ years.

Abbreviations: SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority Status, HTT = Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index, NH=Non-Hispanic.



665
 666 **Fig. S 6. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes and population-weighted**
 667 **annual mean PM2.5 exposure for the population aged 25+ years in US states and the**
 668 **District of Columbia.**
 669


670 Each dot corresponds to a year-state combination.
 671



672

673 **Fig. S 7. County level map of population-weighted mean PM2.5 exposure levels by**
 674 **racial/ethnic group in 2016.**


675 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



676
677
678
679
680
681
682

Fig. S 8 Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 attributable to PM_{2.5} exposure by subpopulation for the age group 25+ years.

Abbreviations: SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority Status, HTT = Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index, NH=Non-Hispanic.




684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696

Fig. S 9. Percent at which the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate was lower for each racial/ethnic group relative to Black Americans for the age group 25+ years.

This figure is for the age group 25+ years and spans the period 1990 to 2016. On average during the period 1990 to 2016, the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for the “Asian or Pacific Islander” and “American Indian or Alaska Native” population was 81.8% and 85.3% lower, respectively, than for the “Black American” population. The PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for the “White (All Hispanic Origins)” population was 82.0% lower than for the Black American population during the period 1990 to 2000. Lastly, on average during the period 2000 to 2016, the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for the “NH White” and “Hispanic or Latino White” population was 81.4% and 70.1% lower, respectively, than for the “Black American” population.

697
698
699




700
701
702
703
704
705
706

Fig. S 10. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for each racial/ethnic group stratified by the social vulnerability index.

The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




707

708 **Fig. S 11. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for**
 709 **each racial/ethnic group stratified by socioeconomic status.**

710 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

711 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.

712




713
 714 **Fig. S 12. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for**
 715 **each racial/ethnic group stratified by household characteristics.**

716 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

717 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.

718




719

720 **Fig. S 13. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for**
 721 **each racial/ethnic group stratified by minority status.**

722 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

723 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.

724



726


727 **Fig. S 14. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for**
 728 **each racial/ethnic group stratified by housing type and transportation.**

729 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

730 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.


731

732



734
735
736
737
738
739

Fig. S 15. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for the age group 25+ years in the USA.
The left column is by racial/ethnic group and rurality level. The right column is by education and rurality level.
Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




740
 741 **Fig. S 16. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted all-cause mortality attributable to**
 742 **PM_{2.5} by racial/ethnic group for different sociodemographic groups for the age group 25+**
 743 **years.**

744 The line for “High HC” corresponds to the CoV between the racial/ethnic group with the high household
 745 characteristics group. The CoV is the standard deviation of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate divided
 746 by the mean age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate.

747 We excluded the analysis by racial/ethnic group and minority status because those variables are highly correlated.

748
 749 Abbreviations: SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, HTT = Housing Type &
 750 Transportation.
 751



752

753 **Fig. S 17. Relative difference in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for each racial/ethnic**
 754 **group between different sociodemographic groups.**


755 The relative difference in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality is computed using the formula (PM_{2.5} attributable mortality 1
 756 - PM_{2.5} attributable mortality 2)/PM_{2.5} attributable mortality 1. As an illustration, if the mortality rate for High HTT
 757 is 20 and for Low HTT is 36, the calculated relative difference would be (20 - 36)/20 = - 80%.

758

759 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority
 760 Status, HTT = Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index.

761

762




763

764 **Fig. S 18. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted all-cause mortality attributable to**
 765 **PM_{2.5} by educational attainment for different sociodemographic groups for the age group**
 766 **25+ years.**

767 The line for “High HC” corresponds to the CoV between the educational attainment levels with the High Household
 768 Characteristics group. The CoV is the standard deviation of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate
 769 divided by the mean age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate.

770

771 Abbreviations: SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority Status, HTT =
 772 Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index.




773

774 **Fig. S 19. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for**
 775 **each education level stratified by socioeconomic status.**

776 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

777 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, SES = socioeconomic status.




778


779 **Fig. S 20. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for**
 780 **each education level stratified by rurality.**

781 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

782 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




783
 784 **Fig. S 21. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for**
 785 **each education level stratified by social vulnerability index.**
 786 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.
 787 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



788
789
790
791
792

Fig. S 22. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for each education level stratified by household characteristic.



The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.
Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, HC = household characteristic.



793
794
795
796
797

Fig. S 23. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for each education level stratified by minority status.

The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.
Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, MS = minority status.




798

799 **Fig. S 24. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate and all-cause mortality rate for**
 800 **each education level stratified by housing type and transportation.**

801 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

802 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, HTT = housing type and transportation.

803



804

805

806 **Fig. S 25. Relative difference in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for each educational**
 807 **attainment group between different sociodemographic groups.**

808 The relative difference is calculated as $(PM_{2.5} \text{ attributable mortality}_1 - PM_{2.5} \text{ attributable mortality}_2) / PM_{2.5}$
 809 $\text{attributable mortality}_1$. For example, if High HTT = 20 and Low HTT = 36, then the relative difference is $(20 -$
 810 $36) / 20 = -80\%$.


811

812 Abbreviations: SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority Status, HTT =
 813 Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index.

814

815

816




818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827

Fig. S 26. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} when stratifying by different sociodemographic groups for the age group 25+ years.


The line for “Ethnicity*rural_urban_class” corresponds to the CoV between the 15 racial/ethnic and urbanicity group combinations available. The CoV is the standard deviation of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate divided by the mean age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate.

Abbreviations: SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority Status, HTT = Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index.



828
829
830
831
832


Fig. S 27. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for the age group 25+ years in the year 2016, by state and racial/ethnic group.
Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844

Fig. S 28. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes and attributable to PM2.5 (among those aged 25+ years) in US states and the District of Columbia in 2016 for the racial/ethnic groups "Black American" and "NH White", low and high educational attainment, and rurality levels "Non-metro" and "large metro".

The icon area for states is proportional to the state's population size. The most extreme points are labeled. Shaded areas are marginal kernel density estimates. Error bars denote 95% confidence intervals. Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



846

847

Fig. S 29. County-level scatter plot of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality per 100,000 for selected racial/ethnic groups and education levels.

848


849

850 These estimates are for the population aged 25+ years in the USA. Each point represents one county. Points on the
 851 straight line imply that the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate was the same for the group denoted on the
 852 x-axis as for the group denoted on the y-axis. Points below the straight line imply that the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-
 853 attributable mortality rate for the group on the x-axis was higher than for the group on the y-axis.

854

Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.

855




856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863


Fig. S 30. County-level spatial clusters with high (red colors) and low (blue colors) differences in the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate between racial/ethnic groups.

These maps were created for the (unweighted) mean across the period 2000 to 2016. Clusters were estimated with Local Spatial Autocorrelation as Local Getis-Ord Gi*. See 'Spatial analyses' in Materials and Methods for details.

Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




865 **Fig Fig. S 31. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate by racial/ethnic group,**
 866 **education level, and rurality level for the age group 65+.**
 867 The first row shows the age-adjusted mortality rate that we estimate is attributable to PM_{2.5}. The second row shows
 869 the percentage of all-cause mortality that we estimate is attributable to PM_{2.5}. The dashed lines depict 95%
 870 confidence intervals. 95% confidence intervals for rurality are too narrow to be visible.
 871 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.
 872



873
 874
 875
 876
 877

Fig. S 32. Percentage of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate that was attributable to PM_{2.5} in the year 2016, by state and racial/ethnic group for the age group 65+.


Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884

Fig. S 33. Differences in the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate between the racial/ethnic groups at the county level for the period 2000 to 2016 for the age group 65+ years.


The first row is the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality per 100,000 for each racial/ethnic group.
 The second row is the absolute difference in PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality per 100,000 between racial/ethnic groups.
 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic



885
 886 **Fig. S 34. Population-weighted annual mean PM_{2.5} exposure in µg/m³ by subpopulation for**
 887 **the age group 65+ years.**
 888 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority
 889 Status, HTT = Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index.
 890




891
 892 **Fig. S 35. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes by racial/ethnic group,**
 893 **education attainment level, and rurality level for the age-group 65+ years.**
 894 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority
 895 Status, HTT = Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index.
 896




897
898
899
900
901
902

Fig. S 36. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes and population-weighted average PM_{2.5} exposure for the population aged 65+ years in US states and District of Columbia.

Each dot corresponds to a year-state combination.




903
 904 **Fig. S 37. Percent at which the PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate per 100,000 is lower for**
 905 **each racial/ethnic group relative to Black Americans for the age group 65+ years.**
 906 This figure is for the age group 65+ years and spans the period 1990 to 2016.
 907 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.
 908



909 **Fig. S 38. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for the age group 65+ years in the**
 910 **USA.**
 911

912 The left column is by racial/ethnic group and rurality level. The right column is by education and rurality level.
 913 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.
 914




916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925

Fig. S 39. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} when stratifying by different sociodemographic groups for the age group 65+ years.


The line for “race-ethnicity*education” corresponds to the CoV between the 15 racial/ethnic and education group combinations available. The CoV is the standard deviation of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate divided by the mean age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate.

Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority Status, HTT = Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index.




926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931

Fig. S 40. Age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for the age group 65+ years in the year 2016, by state and racial/ethnic group.
 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



932
 933 **Fig. S 41. Age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 from all causes and attributable to PM_{2.5}**
 934 **(among those aged 65+ years) in US states in 2016 for the racial/ethnic groups “Black**
 935 **American” and “NH White”, low and high educational attainment, and rurality levels**
 936 **“Non-metro” and “large metro”**


937 The icon area for states is proportional to the state’s population size. The most extreme points are labeled. Shaded
 938 areas are marginal kernel density estimates. Error bars denote 95% confidence intervals.
 939 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.
 940



941
 942 **Fig. S 42. County-level scatter plot of the age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 attributable to**
 943 **PM_{2.5} for selected racial/ethnic groups and education level comparisons for age group 65+**
 944 **years.**

945 These estimates are for the population aged 65+ years in the USA. Each point represents one county. Points on the
 946 straight line imply that the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate was the same for the group denoted on the
 947 x-axis as for the group denoted on the y-axis. Points below the straight line imply that the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-
 948 attributable mortality rate for the group on the x-axis was higher than for the group on the y-axis.


949 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.
 950



952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957

Fig. S 43. County-level spatial clusters with high (red colors) and low (blue colors) differences in the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate between racial/ethnic groups for the age group 65+ years.

These maps were created for the (unweighted) mean across the period 2000 to 2016. Clusters were estimated with Local Spatial Autocorrelation as Local Getis-Ord Gi* (see “Spatial analyses” in the Materials and Methods section). Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



958
 959 **Fig. S 44. Analyses to examine the importance of using race-ethnicity specific CRFs for the**
 960 **age group 65+ years.**


961 (A) is the Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality per 100,000 across
 962 raceethnicities for different CRFs. The CoV is the standard deviation of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality
 963 rate divided by the mean age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate.

964 (B) is the age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 attributable to PM_{2.5} in the USA by racial/ethnic group using the
 965 raceethnicity-specific CRF by Di et al.¹⁵, but assuming the same exposure (the population-weighted mean across the
 966 US population) to PM_{2.5} for all racial/ethnic groups.

967 (C) is the Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for different stylized
 968 scenarios: the real observed PM_{2.5} exposure (“observed”), as well as a scenario each where all counties are
 969 compliant with the National Ambient Air Quality standards (15) set by the US Environmental Protection Agency
 970 (EPA) at 12µg/ m³ (“NAAQS”), and the guideline set by the World Health Organization (WHO) at 10µg/m³
 971 (“WHO”).

972 Abbreviations: CRF=concentration response function; NH=Non-Hispanic.

973




974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986

Fig. S 45. Differences in the proportion of all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM_{2.5} for the age group 65+ years between Black Americans and other racial/ethnic groups.

The first row is the *absolute difference* (in percentage points) of the proportion of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM_{2.5} between Black Americans and each racial/ethnic group. Positive values indicate that Black Americans had a higher proportion of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5}. The second row is the *ratio* (i.e., a measure of the relative difference) of the proportion of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM_{2.5} for Black Americans divided by the proportion of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM_{2.5} for each racial/ethnic group. The first column assumes the race-ethnicity-specific CRF from Di. et al.¹⁵. The second column assumes a uniform CRF for all racial/ethnic groups by applying the CRF for “NH White” from Di et al. to all racial/ethnic groups.

Abbreviations: CRF=concentration response function; NH=Non-Hispanic.



987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005

Fig. S 46. Exploring the link between PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality at the county level and the variation of the PM_{2.5} estimates aggregated from the census tract to county level.


Panel (A) displays a plot with the x-axis showing the mean population-weighted PM_{2.5} exposure in each county-year combination, and the y-axis depicting the percentage of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate that was attributable to PM_{2.5}.

Panel (B) plots the within-county-year standard deviation in PM_{2.5} exposure at the census-tract level (x-axis) against the county-level percentage of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate that was attributable to PM_{2.5} (y-axis). Outlier points are California and Alaska.

Panel (C) shows the same data as Panel B but categorizes the x-axis values (within-county-year standard deviation in PM_{2.5}) into quintiles.

Panel (D) plots quintiles of the within-county-year standard deviation in PM_{2.5} exposure (x-axis) against the difference (in percentage points) in the percent of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate that was attributable to PM_{2.5} for Black Americans versus the NH White population (y-axis). Positive values on the y-axis indicate that Black Americans had a higher proportion of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} exposure than the NH White population.

Abbreviations: Diff.=difference; NH=Non-Hispanic; std=standard deviation




1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015

Fig. S 47. Shape of the CRFs by Di et al. (“Di”), the Global Burden of Disease project (“GBD”), and Burnett et al. (“GEMM”)

The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals. The baseline mortality rate was taken from the age group 25+ years in the USA in 2016. The y-axis is given in crude (not age-adjusted) mortality per 100,000. GBD¹⁶ uses ischemic heart disease, ischemic stroke, intracerebral hemorrhage, subarachnoid hemorrhage, lung cancer, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, lower respiratory infection, and diabetes mellitus type 2 as baseline mortality. GEMM¹¹ is based on all non-communicable diseases and lower respiratory infections. Di et al.¹⁵ is based on all-cause mortality.


Abbreviations: CRF=concentration-response function.



1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024


Fig. S 48. Percent of the difference in the age-adjusted mortality rate between each race-ethnicity and “Black American” that is attributable to PM_{2.5}, using either race-ethnicity-specific CRFs (solid lines) or a uniform CRF (dashed lines).

The solid lines are the results calculated using race-ethnicity-specific CRFs from Di et al.¹⁵. The dashed lines are the results calculated when applying the CRF in Di et al.¹⁵ for “NH White” to all race-ethnicities.
 Abbreviations: CRF=Concentration-response function; NH=Non-Hispanic.



1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037

Fig. S 49. Extent to which the difference in the age-adjusted mortality rate between each racial/ethnic group and Black Americans can be attributed to PM_{2.5}.
 Of the racial/ethnic groups considered in this study, Black Americans have both the highest all-cause mortality rate and highest PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate. Both columns are the percent of the difference in all-cause mortality between each race-ethnicity and Black Americans that can be attributed to PM_{2.5} exposure. The left column is GBD¹⁶, the right column is GEMM¹¹.
 Dark blue dots denote 2015 and light blue dots denote 2000. Red dots denote the unweighted mean from 2000 to 2015. The dot sizes are proportional to the age-adjusted all-cause mortality rate that is attributable to PM_{2.5}.
 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic



1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052


Fig. S 50. Analyses to examine the importance of using race-ethnicity specific CRFs for the age group 25+ years.

(A) is the Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality per 100,000 across racial/ethnic groups for different CRFs. The CoV is the standard deviation of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate divided by the mean age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate.

(B) is the age-adjusted mortality per 100,000 attributable to PM_{2.5} in the USA by racial/ethnic group using the race-ethnicity-specific CRF by Di et al.¹⁵, but assuming the same exposure (the population-weighted mean across the US population) to PM_{2.5} for all racial/ethnic groups.

(C) is the Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of the age-adjusted PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality rate for different stylized scenarios: the real observed PM_{2.5} exposure (“observed”), as well as a scenario each where all counties are compliant with the National Ambient Air Quality standards¹⁸ set by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) at 12 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (“NAAQS”), and the guideline set by the World Health Organization (WHO) at 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (“WHO”).

Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic, CoV = Coefficient of Variation; CRF=Concentration-response function.



1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067


Fig. S 51. Differences in the proportion of all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM_{2.5} for the age group 25+ years between Black Americans and other racial/ethnic groups.

The first row is the *absolute difference* (in percentage points) of the proportion of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM_{2.5} between Black Americans and each racial/ethnic group. Positive values indicate that Black Americans had a higher proportion of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5}.

The second row is the *ratio* (i.e., a measure of the relative difference) of the proportion of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM_{2.5} for Black Americans divided by the proportion of the age-adjusted all-cause mortality that was attributable to PM_{2.5} for each racial/ethnic group.


The first column assumes the race-ethnicity-specific CRF from Di. et al.¹⁵. The second column assumes a uniform CRF for all racial/ethnic groups by applying the CRF for “NH White” from Di et al. to all racial/ethnic groups.

Abbreviations: CRF = concentration response function, NH=Non-Hispanic.




1068
1069

Fig. S 52. Histogram of the number of census tract per county for the period 2000 to 2016.



1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074


Fig. S 53. Association of the variation in census-tract level PM_{2.5} measurements with county-level PM_{2.5}-attributable mortality for the period 2000 to 2016 stratified by quantiles of the number of census tracts per county.



1077 **Fig. S 54. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each racial/ethnic**
 1078 **group stratified by rurality.**

1079 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

1080 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




1082


1083 **Fig. S 55. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each racial/ethnic**
 1084 **group stratified by the social vulnerability index.**

1085 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

1086 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




1087
 1088 **Fig. S 56. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each racial/ethnic**
 1089 **group stratified by socioeconomic status.**
 1090 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.
 1091 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.
 1092
 1093



1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099

Fig. S 57. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each racial/ethnic group stratified by household characteristics.

The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.
 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




1100

1101 **Fig. S 58. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each racial/ethnic**
 1102 **group stratified by minority status.**

1103 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

1104 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.

1105




1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111

Fig. S 59. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each racial/ethnic group stratified by housing type & transportation.

The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




1112

1113 **Fig. S 60. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each educational**
 1114 **attainment level stratified by rurality.**

1115 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

1116 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.

1117




1118

1119 **Fig. S 61. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each educational**
 1120 **attainment level stratified by the social vulnerability index.**

1121 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

1122 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.




1123

1124 **Fig. S 62. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each educational**
 1125 **attainment level stratified by Socioeconomic Status.**

1126 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

1127 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic




1128 .

1129 **Fig. S 63. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each educational**
 1130 **attainment level stratified by Household Characteristic.**

1131 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

1132 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic

1133




1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139

Fig. S 64. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each educational attainment level stratified by Minority Status.

The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.



1140

1141 **Fig. S 65. Percentage of all-cause mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} for each educational**
 1142 **attainment level stratified by Housing Type & Transportation.**

1143 The dashed lines depict 95% confidence intervals.

1144 Abbreviations: NH=Non-Hispanic.

1145

1146

Geographic level(s)	Population sub-group	Year(s)	Source for population count	Age categories
County	Racial/ethnic group	1990	IPUMS ⁴⁰	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
County	Racial/ethnic group	1991-1999	Interpolation of 1990 and 2000 using Longitudinal Tract Database ⁴³	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
County	Racial/ethnic group	2000	U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census, Summary File 1 ⁴¹	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
County	Racial/ethnic group	2001-2008	Interpolation of 2000 and 2010 using Longitudinal Tract Database ⁴³	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
County	Racial/ethnic group	2009, 2011-2016	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates ³⁵	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
County	Racial/ethnic group	2010	U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Summary File 1 ⁴²	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Racial/ethnic group	1990-2016	Bridged-race resident population estimates ⁴⁸	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State, County	Education	2009-2016	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates ³⁵	25-34, 35-44, 45-64, 65+
National, State	Combinations of racial/ethnic group with rurality, SES,	1990	IPUMS ⁴⁰	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+

	HC, MS, HTT, SVI			
National, State	Combinations of racial/ethnic group with rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	1991-1999	Interpolation of 1990 and 2000 using Longitudinal Tract Database ⁴³	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Combinations of racial/ethnic group with rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	2000	U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census, Summary File 1 ⁴¹	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Combinations of race-ethnicity with rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	2001-2008	Interpolation of 2000 and 2010 using Longitudinal Tract Database ⁴³	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Combinations of racial/ethnic group with rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	2009, 2011-2016	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates ³⁵	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Combinations of racial/ethnic group with rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	2010	U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Summary File 1 ⁴²	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	1990	IPUMS ⁴⁰	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	1991-1999	Interpolation of 1990 and 2000 using Longitudinal Tract Database ⁴³	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	2000	U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census, Summary File 1 ⁴²	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+

National, State	Rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	2001-2008	Interpolation of 2000 and 2010 using Longitudinal Tract Database ⁴³	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National, State	Rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	2009, 2011-2016	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates ³⁵	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, 85+
National	Combinations of education and racial/ethnic group	2009-2016	U.S. Census Bureau, Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement ³⁴	25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75+
National, State	Combinations of education with rurality, SES, HC, MS, HTT, SVI	2009-2016	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates ³⁵	25-34, 35-44, 45-64, 65+

1147 **Table S 1. Data sources for the population counts used in the calculation of age-adjusted**
1148 **mortality rates.**

1149
1150 The US 2000 standard population table, which is also used for the calculation in the National Vital Statistics Report,
1151 has the age categories 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84, and 85+. Population counts that were available in
1152 more granular age categories were aggregated to these coarser categories.

1153
1154 Abbreviations: SES = Socioeconomic Status, HC = Household Characteristics, MS = Minority Status, HTT =
1155 Housing Type & Transportation, SVI = Social Vulnerability Index.

Year(s)	Population subgroup	Data source	Table(s)	Age groups
1990	Racial/ethnic group	IPUMS (35)	NP10	25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+
1991-1999	Racial/ethnic group	Interpolation of 1990 and 2000 using Longitudinal Tract Database (38)	-	25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+
2000	Racial/ethnic group	U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census, Summary File 1 (36)	P012A, P012B, P012C, P012D, P012E, P012I	25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+
2001-2008	Racial/ethnic group	Interpolation of 2000 and 2010 using Longitudinal Tract Database (38)	-	25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+
2009, 2011-2016	Racial/ethnic group	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (30)	B01001A, B01001B, B01001C, B01001D, B01001E, B01001H	25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+
2009-2016	Education	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (30)	B15001	25-34, 35-44, 45-64, 65+
2009-2016	Combinations of education and racial/ethnic group	U.S. Census Bureau, American	C15002A, C15002B, C15002C,	Single age group for 25

		Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (30)	C15002D, C15002E, C15002H	years and above
2010	Racial/ethnic group	U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Summary File 1 (37)	PCT12A, PCT12B, PCT12C, PCT12D, PCT12E, PCT12I	25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+

1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163

Table S 2. Data sources for the population counts used in the estimation of population-weighted mean PM_{2.5} exposure.

All these data sources were at the census-tract level.
Data from the U.S. Census Bureau is available at <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>.
Data from IPUMS is available at <https://data2.nhgis.org/main>.

CRF	Name of condition	ICD-10 code
GBD (14)	Ischemic heart disease	I20-I25.9
	Ischemic stroke	G45-G46.8, I63-I63.9, I65-I66.9, I67.2-I67.3, I67.5-I67.6, I69.3
	Intracerebral hemorrhage	I61-I62, I62.1-I62.9, I68.1-I68.2, I69.1-I69.2
	Subarachnoid hemorrhage	I60-I60.9, I62.0, I67.0-I67.1, I69.0
	Tracheal, bronchus, and lung cancer	C33-C34.9, D02.1-D02.3, D14.2-D14.3, D38.1
	Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	J41-J44.9
	Lower respiratory infection	A48.1, A70, B97.4-B97.6, J09-J15.8, J16-J16.9, J20-J21.9, P23.0-P23.4, U04-U04.9
	Diabetes mellitus type 2	E11-E11.1, E11.3-E11.9
GEMM (12)	Non-communicable diseases	C00-C97, D00–D48, D55-D64, D65–D89, E03-E07, E10-E16, E20-E34, E65-E88, F01-F99, G06-G98, H68-H93, I00-I99, G06-G98, H00-H61, J30-J98, K00-K92, N00-N64, N75-N98, L00-L98, M00-M99, Q00-Q99
Di et al. (13)	All	-

1164
1165
1166

Table S 3. ICD-10 codes used in each concentration-response function.

1167
1168
1169
1170

Abbreviations: CRF=concentration-response function.