Differential Effects of Race/Ethnicity and Social Vulnerability on COVID-19 Positivity, Hospitalization, and Death in the San Francisco Bay Area

Wendy K. Tam Cho, PhD[1]
David G. Hwang, MD, FACS[2]

Abstract

BACKGROUND: Higher COVID-19 incidence and morbidity have been amply documented for US Black and Hispanic populations but not as clearly for other racial and ethnic groups. Efforts to elucidate the mechanisms underlying racial health disparities can be confounded by the relationship between race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

OBJECTIVE: Examine race/ethnicity and social vulnerability effects on COVID-19 outcomes in the San Francisco Bay Area, an ethnically and socioeconomically diverse region.

DESIGN: Retrospective cohort study.

SETTING: Geocoded patient records from the University of California, San Francisco Health system between January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2020.

PATIENTS: Patients who underwent polymerase chain reaction testing for COVID-19.

EXPOSURES: Race/ethnicity and Social Vulnerability Index (SVI).

MAIN MEASURES: COVID-19 test frequency, positivity, hospitalization rates, and mortality.

KEY RESULTS: Higher social vulnerability, but not race/ethnicity, was associated with less frequent testing yet a higher likelihood of testing positive. Asian hospitalization rates (11.5%) were double that of White patients (5.4%) and exceeded the rates for Black (9.3%) and Hispanic (6.9%) groups. A modest relationship between higher hospitalization rates and increasing social vulnerability was evident only for White individuals. The Hispanic group had the lowest mean age at death and thus highest years of expected life lost due to COVID-19.

CONCLUSIONS: COVID-19 outcomes were not consistently explained by greater socioeconomic vulnerability. Asian individuals showed disproportionately high rates of hospitalization regardless of socioeconomic status. Study of the San Francisco Bay Area population not only provides valuable insights into the differential contributions of race/ethnicity and social determinants of health to COVID-19 outcomes but also emphasizes that all racial groups have experienced the toll of the pandemic, albeit in different ways and to varying degrees.

[1]Department of Ophthalmology, School of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA. Department of Political Science, Department of Statistics, Department of Mathematics, Department of Computer Science, Department of Asian American Studies, the College of Law, and the National Center for Supercomputing Applications, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA. *wendycho@illinois.edu*

[2]Department of Ophthalmology, School of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA. *david.hwang@ucsf.edu*

Introduction

Previous national [1, 2], regional [3], and hospital-based [4] studies in the US have demonstrated a pattern of Black and Hispanic groups testing positive for COVID-19 at higher rates than White individuals across a variety of states and localities. Given the enormous geographic and contextual diversity across the country, each of these studies provides some insight into the complex relationship between race and the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the larger phenomenon of general racial health disparities.

Conducting studies across different geographic contexts is critical, in part, because the correlation between race and socioeconomic status (SES) creates difficulties in untangling the relative effects of race versus SES in contributing to disparities in COVID-19 incidence and morbidity [5]. To gain additional insights in this regard and to contribute to a fuller and more inclusive understanding of these racial disparities, we studied the demographics of COVID-19 positivity, hospitalization, and death in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The population of the San Francisco Bay Area (7.7 million; 2020 US Census) is of particular interest both for its racial and ethnic diversity (36% White, 6% Black, 28% Asian, 24% Hispanic, 6% other; 2020 US Census) as well as its marked income inequality, as evidenced by an 11-fold income difference between households in the 90th and 10th income percentiles and by fully one-third of households characterized as being very low income [6, 7]. Moreover, the Asian group in the Bay Area exhibits wide intra-group ethnolinguisitic diversity and is evenly distributed across an expansive range of the income spectrum, with 25% of the group in the very low income group and 27% in the high income group [7]. Because of the relative dissociation between race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status in the Bay Area Asian population, study of the demographics of COVID-19 outcome in this region may be of particular interest in helping to decipher the complex and confounding interrelationship between race/ethnicity and other social determinants of health on observed outcomes in COVID-19.

Methods

Under an IRB-approved protocol (IRB #20–30545), an analysis was performed of all the electronic health records (EHR) of patients of UCSF Health, a large multi-hospital, multi-clinic academic health care system of the University of California San Francisco (UCSF).

Inclusion criteria were threefold: 1) residence in one of the nine Bay Area counties (to reduce referral effects); 2) patient self-reporting of a single race or ethnicity; and 3) a record of RT-PCR testing for SARS-CoV-2 at least once in 2020 (a period chosen to exclude the influence of vaccinations, first doses of which were available to $< 1\%$ of the study population as early as mid-December 2020 and second doses of which would not have been completed until January 2021 for the earliest vaccinated individuals).

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) Social Vulnerability Index (SVI), which incorporates US Census data to determine the social vulnerability of every census tract in the US, was mapped to each patient record based on address. The SVI summarizes a broad set of data from four different types of measures: socioeconomic factors, household composition and disability factors, minority status and language factors, and housing type and transportation factors [8]. Higher CDC SVI

Table 1: **Racial/Ethnic Distribution of the Study Population in Comparison to the US and San Francisco Bay Area**

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
US population	76.3%	13.4%	18.5%	6.1%
San Francisco Bay Area population	35.9%	5.6%	24.4%	28.3%
Study Population	57.9%	7.4%	19.0%	15.4%

mapped to the county level has been reported to correlate with higher incidence and mortality rates of COVID-19 in the United States [9].

Racial/ethnic identification was made based on patient self-reporting as non-Hispanic Black (hereafter, Black), non-Hispanic White (hereafter, White), non-Hispanic Asian (hereafter Asian), and Hispanic or Latino (hereafter Hispanic). The small number of patients (approximately 1%) self-reporting as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander were included with the Asian group. Patients who self-reported being American Indian ($< 1\%$) were excluded because of small sample sizes.

Results

Racial and Ethnic Demographics. The racial and ethnic composition of the study population, the US population, and the San Francisco Bay Area population is shown in Table 1. The demographics of the Bay Area differ from the general US population in having greater racial diversity, with far fewer White individuals, many more Asian persons, lower proportions of Black individuals, and higher proportions of Hispanic persons. The study population has a racial and ethnic distribution that differs from that of both the US population and the Bay Area population. The proportion of White individuals in the study population (57.9%) is lower than that in the US (76.3%) but notably higher than that in the Bay Area (35.9%). The Asian group, by contrast, constitutes a much higher proportion of the study population (15.4%) than in the US (6.1%) but is significantly underrepresented relative to their proportion in the Bay Area (28.3%).

Table 2: **COVID-19 Testing and Positivity by Race**

	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian	
Testing	55.69%	(73,503)	8.19%	(10,815)	17.54%	(23,155)	18.34%	(24,205)
Positivity Rate	2.54%	(1,866)	5.38%	(582)	11.76%	(2,722)	3.68%	(890)

N shown in parentheses.

COVID-19 Testing Frequency. Table 2 shows the percentage of total tests and the percentage of positive tests ascribed to each race and ethnicity. No significant association between race and the frequency of COVID-19 testing was observed: the distribution of race and ethnicity among the COVID-19 testing group (Table 2) largely mirrored the racial proportions in the overall UCSF patient pool (Table 1). White and Hispanic individuals underwent testing at slightly lower rates than their overall UCSF patient pool proportions, while Black and Asian individuals underwent test-

ing at somewhat higher rates. These differences were small: for all groups, the absolute deviations from the UCSF patient pool percentages were no more than 3%.



(a) (b)

Figure 1: **COVID-19 Testing Frequency and Positivity Rates in Relationship to Social Vulnerability Index. Fig. 1a depicts the distribution of the total population (solid line) and the distribution of the population undergoing COVID-19 testing (dashed line) according to SVI decile (SVI 1 = least vulnerable; SVI 10 = most vulnerable). Fig. 1b shows the total number of tests performed (left y-axis) and with the positivity rate (right y-axis) corresponding to each SVI decile. Individuals with higher social vulnerability test much less frequently than those with lower social vulnerability yet have much higher positivity rates, even when correcting for their lower overall rate of testing.**

By contrast, an inverse relationship was observed between the CDC SVI and the frequency of undergoing COVID-19 testing. Figure 1(a) depicts the percentage of the total UCSF population (solid line) occupying each CDC SVI decile (SV1 = least vulnerable; SV10 = most vulnerable), as well as the SVI distribution of individuals undergoing COVID-19 testing (dashed line). In the decile representing the least socially vulnerable, individuals underwent testing at higher rates than their corresponding population proportion. For other SVI deciles, individuals with lower vulnerability tended to tested at slightly higher rates than their population proportion, whereas those in the more vulnerable deciles tested at moderately lower rates than their population proportion.

COVID-19 Test Positivity. Whereas rates of testing among racial groups were fairly similar to their patient pool proportions, COVID-19 test positivity rates strongly diverged with respect to race and ethnicity. Similar to reports from other studies in the US, in this study, the Black and Hispanic groups tested positive at higher rates than their White and Asian counterparts. Hispanics individuals exhibited the highest rate of test positivity – double that of Black individuals, who had the second highest group rate.

Figure 1(b) shows COVID-19 test positivity rates by SVI decile. The most vulnerable SVI decile tested positive at 4.8 times the rate of the least vulnerable SVI decile. Overall, even after normalizing for the increased rate of testing in less vulnerable groups, the rate of test positivity remained elevated for those in the more vulnerable SVI deciles.

COVID-19 Hospitalization Rates. Table 3 lists the rates of hospitalization by race and ethnicity among those testing positive for COVID-19, comparing the hospitalization rate for all age groups with the hospitalization rate for those aged 60 years and over. White patients, who had

Table 3: **COVID-19 Hospitalization and Death by Race/Ethnicity and Age**

	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian	
Hospitalization Rate (All Ages)	5.36%	(100)	9.28%	(54)	6.87%	(187)	11.46%	(102)
Hospitalization Rate (60+ Years)	10.75%	(70)	17.45%	(26)	14.87%	(51)	26.92%	(70)
Death Rate (All Ages)	2.57%	(48)	2.58%	(15)	1.03%	(28)	3.60%	(32)
Death Rate (60+ Years)	6.76%	(44)	8.05%	(12)	6.12%	(21)	11.54%	(30)

N shown in parentheses.

the lowest test positivity rate (2.5%; Table 2), also had the lowest hospitalization rate (5.4% overall; 10.8% for age 60 and older). In contrast, Asian individuals, despite testing positive at the second lowest rate (3.7%), experienced the highest rate of hospitalization, both overall (11.5%), and in the 60 years and older age group (26.9%) – more than double the corresponding rates for White individuals.



Figure 2: **COVID-19 Hospitalization Rates by Race and Social Vulnerability Scores.**

Figure 2 shows hospitalization rates by SVI. A consistent relationship between social vulnerability and hospitalization rates was observed only for the White group. By contrast, Hispanic persons experienced similar hospitalization rates across SVI quintiles. For Asian and Black individuals, the relationship between hospitalization rates and SVI was variable. Notably, Asian patients, who had the highest hospitalization rates overall, also had the highest hospitalization rates in four of the five SVI quintiles and the second-highest rate in the remaining SVI quintile.

COVID-19 Death Rates. Table 3 also displays COVID-19 death rates by race. Between the four racial and ethnic groups, Asian individuals exhibited the highest mortality *rate*, both crude and age-adjusted. While the White group had the second lowest crude and age-adjusted mortality rate, as the most populous racial group, they had the highest *number* of COVID-19 deaths, both overall and in those aged 60 years and older. The Hispanic group had the lowest crude and age-adjusted mortality rate, but Figure 3 shows that the Hispanic group also had the lowest mean age at death.



Figure 3: **Average Years of Life Lost in Patients Dying of COVID-19, According to Race/Ethnicity**

For all of the groups, the vast majority of deaths occurred among those age 60 and over, but for Hispanic individuals, most of the deaths occurred close to age 60 whereas for White and Asian patients, most of the deaths were among those who were even older (commonly in their 80s and 90s). The average expected years-of-life-lost due to COVID-19 mortality for Hispanic individuals was 22.9 years, almost double that of White individuals, whose average years-of-life-lost was 11.5 years.

Discussion

We examined COVID-19 demographics in a geographic region of the US that facilitated differentiated examination of the effects of race and socioeconomic status amongst four racial and ethnic groups. The unique demographics of our study population, which included greater racial and ethnic as well as socioeconomic diversity than in most of the US, allowed us to draw some distinctions between the effects of race and ethnicity and the effects of social determinants (as encapsulated in the CDC Social Vulnerability Index) on COVID-19 outcomes. Our analysis uncovered multiple instances of discordance between the effects of race and ethnicity and the effects of social vulnerability on COVID-19 test positivity rates, morbidity, and mortality.

COVID-19 testing rates were inversely associated with increasing social vulnerability but not with race/ethnicity. By contrast, race/ethnicity was the dominant factor associated with elevated rates of hospitalization in the Black, Hispanic, and Asian groups, with no discernible consistent additional effect from social vulnerability. Only among White individuals was there noted a relationship between higher social vulnerability and modestly increased risk of hospitalization.

This study confirmed the well-established finding that Black and Hispanic individuals test positive at higher rates than White individuals in the US [10] as well as in Northern California [11], which includes the Bay Area from which the study population was drawn. Notably, however, we found that Asian individuals in the Bay Area had both the highest hospitalization and the highest mortality rates among the four largest racial and ethnic groups. Importantly, this elevated hospitalization rate was observed to be independent of any effects of social vulnerability. The observation that US Asian groups have had poorer outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic has been found in some studies [12, 13], though how they have fared appears to differ depending on context [14], with at least one meta-analysis suggesting paradoxically that Asian individuals with *higher* socioeconomic status were likelier to have poorer outcomes. Clearly, further study is needed, inasmuch as this association has not been investigated to the same degree as have the COVID-19 disparities experienced by the Black and Hispanic communities.

Study Limitations. Our study conclusions are specific to a vaccine-naive patient population that sought care at UCSF Health in 2020 and may not be generalizable to populations in other settings or at later time points in the pandemic. Furthermore, our study population differed somewhat in racial and ethnic composition from that of the Bay Area population. The reasons for this discrepancy could have reflected the region's geographic heterogeneity in the distribution of Asian individuals, as well as other factors, including but not limited to variations in patient access to or preference for UCSF Health care facilities, patient willingness to seek medical care, health insurance coverage-dictated limitations, and referral effects. Patients who lived a distance from a UCSF Health facility may have been less likely to seek care at UCSF Health and thus would been less likely to be included in the study population. For example, Santa Clara County, the most populous in the nine-county Bay Area, lies beyond the immediate referral zone of UCSF Health yet has highest percentage of Asian individuals (38.9%) in the region. Furthermore, it is conceivable that any such distance-related access barriers would have been more difficult to overcome for individuals with higher social vulnerability and lower socioeconomic status. At the same time, amongst large, regional health care systems in the San Francisco Bay Area during the study period, UCSF Health cared for a disproportionately greater share of uninsured and underinsured patients, the result of which may have tended to mitigate any potential selection bias against individuals with lower socioeconomic status.

Race and ethnicity were self-reported in this study. We excluded records in which more than one race was reported, as well as those in which no race or ethnicity reported. Besides those records in which race was reported as American Indian ($< 1\%$), we censored 9.3% of records due to these factors. Significant selection bias due to exclusion of this small proportion of records is possible, but likely to be low.

Self-reported residence address data were used for geocoding. We performed manual review and correction of certain errors where possible (e.g., misspelled street names, transposed zip code digits) but excluded records that could not be geocoded (e.g., missing street addresses). These limitations may have introduced some systematic errors, such as underreporting of homeless individuals or miscoding of records in which a mailing address rather than a place of residence had been entered. The magnitude of such errors in terms of creating systematic bias are unknown.

Socioeconomic vulnerability was calculated based on census tract data assigned from geocoded address data, a process that, while standard in demographic studies, could have introduced poten-

tial attribution error based on differences between group-level measures and individual-specific data. The electronic health record captures only a circumscribed subset of data regarding a given patient's social determinants, so studies conducted in similar fashion to ours [15] must necessarily rely on group-level rather than individual measurements.

It is possible that the number of COVID-19 positive tests, COVID-19 hospitalizations, and COVID-19-related mortality would be underreported if some patients had undergone negative testing at a UCSF Health site but subsequently underwent further testing, required hospitalization, died at another health care facility, or moved out of the area. To our knowledge, there have been no published studies that would suggest that any such effect would be more likely to affect one racial/ethnic group over another or to preferentially affect individuals of higher or lower social vulnerability.

Implications and Next Steps. Increased awareness of the finding that Asian individuals are a vulnerable COVID-19 subpopulation should prompt additional study of Asian group-specific causative factors underlying the observed increased rates of COVID-19-related hospitalization and death. Such investigation may not only be beneficial in designing interventions to address health disparities affecting Asian communities, in particular, but could also be potentially critical to identifying and mitigating the root causes of COVID-19-related racial disparities across the entire population. Indeed, the internal diversity of Asian communities and their unique attributes as an aggregated racial group provide valuable opportunities to better understand and hopefully mitigate the generalized problem of COVID-19-related racial disparities in the population as a whole. In particular, studies of socioeconomically diverse Asian populations such as that of the Bay Area may shed fresh insights that could help untangle the interplay of biomedical, social, and other determinants, not only for COVID-19 but potentially other health conditions as well.

Although often lumped together into one racial construct, Asian communities encompass wide diversity in ancestry, culture, religion, language, immigration status, educational attainment, socioeconomic status, and experience with racism (including internal, interpersonal, and structural) [16]. Further study and improved research methodologies, such as data disaggregation and uniform collection of Asian race and Asian subgroup/ethnicity data [17, 18, 19], are needed to better understand the factors contributing to the elevated risk for COVID-19 morbidity that the Asian group, as a whole, experiences. These studies should include more robust collection of individual-specific social determinants of health, further investigation of biomedical risk factors, and identification of relevant factors that may not be captured within current measures of social vulnerability, such as the multiple effects of structural and interpersonal racism [20] that could, as just one example, affect willingness of Asian individuals to seek or receive equitable and timely health care [21].

While identifying broad patterns of racial disparity in health outcomes and health care at a national level is important and relevant, alleviating structural inequality must occur through specific and intentional measures that are locally and contextually relevant. Accordingly, a comprehensive understanding of COVID-19 impacts on racial and ethnic groups in the US must include study of regions and subpopulations that differ substantially in makeup from the US as a whole, not only to better understand race-specific causation factors, but also to formulate data-driven strategies and policies to ameliorate racial disparities in COVID-19 outcomes. Any such mitigation strategy must consider the US not as a homogeneous entity but as a diverse collection of regional subpopula-

tions, some of which may differ substantially in their manifold demographic attributes, including racial and ethnic composition [22], socioeconomic distribution [22], and health-related characteristics [23], as well as structural aspects such as, for example, housing stock [24, 25], educational opportunities [26], employment characteristics [27], transportation networks [28], access to health care [22], historical evolution of neighborhoods[29], and experience of systemic racism [30].

Conclusion

The impact of COVID-19 has been felt by all races, albeit in different ways. In the San Francisco Bay Area, Black and Hispanic groups tested positive at the highest rates, but Asian individuals experienced the highest hospitalization and death *rates*. As the largest racial group, White persons tallied the greatest *number* of COVID-19-related deaths. At the same time, the Hispanic group lost the greatest number of potential years of life [31] and so suffered disproportionate *impact* from mortality due to COVID-19. To be sure, even while particular effects may vary, no racial group has been left unscathed by COVID-19, underscoring the need to understand individual-specific and group-related determinants of health, whether biomedical, social, or otherwise, to both address racial and racism-related health disparities [32] but also to positively impact the health of the entire population. Reducing both inter-group disparities as well as the absolute toll of COVID-19 remains an important target for study, intervention, and policy, inasmuch as racial disparities and health inequality impact not just the most vulnerable among us but all strata of our interconnected society.

References

[1] Poulson M, Neufeld M, Geary A, Kenzik K, Sanchez SE, Dechert T, et al. Intersectional Disparities Among Hispanic Groups in COVID-19 Outcomes. J Immigr Minor Health. 2020 10;23(1):4–10.

[2] COVID Tracker; 2021 [cited December 12, 2021]. Available from: https://covidtracking.com/race.

[3] Tirupathi R, Muradova V, Shekhar R, Salim SA, Al-Tawfiq JA, Palabindala V. COVID-19 disparity among racial and ethnic minorities in the US: A cross sectional analysis. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2020 November;38:101904.

[4] Gu T, Mack JA, Salvatore M, Prabhu Sankar S, Valley TS, Singh K, et al. Characteristics Associated With Racial/Ethnic Disparities in COVID-19 Outcomes in an Academic Health Care System. JAMA Netw Open. 2020 10;3(10):e2025197–e2025197.

[5] Khanijahani A, Iezadi S, Gholipour K, Azami-Aghdash S, Naghibi D. A systematic review of racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparities in COVID-19. Int J Equity Health. 2021 November 24;20(1):248.

[6] Bohn S, Bonner D, Lafortune J, Thorman T. Income inequality and economic opportunity in California. Public Policy Institute of California, Dec 2020; 2020. Available from: https://www.ppic.org/wp-content/uploads/incoming-inequality-and-economic-opportunity-in-california-december-2020.pdf.

[7] Ross AM, Treuhaft S. Who is low-income and very low income in the Bay Area?; 2020 [cited December 12, 2021]. Available from: https://nationalequityatlas.org/node/608410.

[8] Cutter SL. The Vulnerability of Science and the Science of Vulnerability. Ann Assoc Am Geogr. 2003 March;93(1):1–12.

[9] Karmakar M, PM PL, Tipirneni R. Association of Social and Demographic Factors With COVID-19 Incidence and Death Rates in the US. JAMA Netw Open. 2021 January;4(1):e2036462.

[10] Webb Hooper M, Nápoles A, Péez-Stable E. COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities. JAMA. 2020 June;323(24):2466–2467.

[11] Azar K, Shen Z, Romanelli R, SH SL, Smits K, Robinson S, et al. Disparities In Outcomes Among COVID-19 Patients In A Large Health Care System In California. Health Aff (Millword). 2020;39(7):1253–1262.

[12] Yan BW, Hwang AL, Ng F, Chu JN, Tsoh JY, Nguyen TT. Death Toll of COVID-19 on Asian Americans: Disparities Revealed. J Gen Intern Med. 2021 08;36(11):3545–3549.

[13] Ingraham NE, Purcell LN, Karam BS, Dudley RA, Usher MG, Warlick CA, et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Hospital Admissions from COVID-19: Determining the Impact of Neighborhood Deprivation and Primary Language. J Gen Intern Med. 2021;36(11):3462–3470.

[14] Wang D, Gee GC, Bahiru E, Yang EH, Hsu JJ. Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders in COVID-19: Emerging Disparities Amid Discrimination. J Gen Intern Med. 2020 10;35(12):3685–3688.

[15] Wortham J, Meador S, Hadler J, Yousey-Hindes K, See I, Whitaker M, et al. Census tract socioeconomic indicators and COVID-19-associated hospitalization rates-COVID-NET surveillance areas in 14 states. PLoS One. 2021 September;16(9):e0257622.

[16] Lancet. Racism in the USA: ensuring Asian American health equity. Lancet. 2021;397(10281):1237.

[17] Krieger N, Waterman P, Chen J, Testa C, Hanage W. Missing again: US racial and ethnic data for COVID-19 vaccination. Lancet. 2021 April;397(10281):1259–1260.

[18] Yom S, Lor M. Advancing health disparities research: The need to include Asian American Subgroup Populations. J Racial Ethn Health Disparities. 2021;17:1–35.

[19] Yi S, Doan L, Choi J, Wong J, Russo R, Chin M, et al. With No Data, There's No Equity: Addressing the Lack of Data on COVID-19 for Asian American Communities. EClinicalMedicine. 2021 October;41:101165.

[20] Muramatsu N, Chin M. Battling Structural Racism Against Asians in the United States: Call for Public Health to Make the "Invisible" Visible. J Public Health Manag Pract. 2022 January–February;28(Suppl 1):S2–S8.

[21] Shah A, Guo L, Magee M, Cheung W, Simon M, LaBreche A, et al. Comparing selected measures of health outcomes and health-seeking behaviors in Chinese, Cambodian, and Vietnamese communities of Chicago: results from local health surveys. J Urban Health. 2010 September;87(5):813–826.

[22] Magesh S, John D, Li W, Li Y, Mattingly-App A, Jain S, et al. Disparities in COVID-19 Outcomes by Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic-Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 2021 November;4(11):e2134147.

[23] Alcendor D. Racial Disparities-Associated COVID-19 Mortality among Minority Populations in the US. J Clin Med. 2020 July;9(8):2442.

[24] Taylor L. Housing and health: an overview of the literature. Health Affairs Policy Brief. 2018 June [cited August 20, 2021];Available from: http://healthaffairs.org/do/10.1377/hpb20180313.396577/full/.

[25] Linton S, Leifheit K, McGinty E, Barry C, Pollack C. Association Between Housing Insecurity, Psychological Distress, and Self-rated Health Among US Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Netw Open. 2021 September;4(9):e2127772.

[26] Casillas, Jr E, Wu G, Iantorno S, Ning W, Choi J, Chan P, et al. COVID-19: Highlighting Health Disparities in the Los Angeles Latinx Community. Clin Med Res. 2021 December;19(4):161–168.

[27] Selden T, Berdahl T. COVID-19 And Racial/Ethnic Disparities In Health Risk, Employment, And Household Composition. Health Aff (Millwood). 2020 September;39(9):1624–1632.

[28] Carrión D, Colicino E, Pedretti N, Arfer K, Rush J, DeFelice N, et al. Neighborhood-level disparities and subway utilization during the COVID-19 pandemic in New York City. Nat Commun. 2021 June;12(1):3692.

[29] Charles CZ. The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation. Annual Review of Sociology. 2003 August;29:167–207.

[30] Bailey Z, Agéor NKM, Graves J, Linos N, Bassett M. Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: evidence and interventions. Lancet. 2017 April;389(10077):1453–1463.

[31] Xu J, Chen J, Belin T, Brookmeyer R, Suchard M, Ramirez C. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Years of Potential Life Lost Attributable to COVID-19 in the United States: An Analysis of 45 States and the District of Columbia. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 March;18(6):2921.

[32] Williams D, Purdie-Vaughns V. Needed interventions to reduce racial/ethnic disparities in health. J Health Polit Policy Law. 2016;41:627–651.