medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Race, class, and place modify mortality rates for the top 12 causes of death in the United States, 1999-2021

AUTHORS
Allison Formanack, PhD*
University of Southern Mississippi

Ayush Doshi, MS*
Rupa Valdez, PhD
Ishan Williams, PhD, FGSA
J Randall Moorman, MD**
Pavel Chernyavskiy, PhD**
University of Virginia

Author notes: *, ** Contributed equally as first or senior authors

ABSTRACT
Objectives
To disarticulate the associations of race (whiteness), class (socioeconomic status), and place (county) with risk of cause-specific death in the US.
Methods
We studied mortality in US counties for 11 causes of death (1999-2019) and COVID-19 (2020-2021). We adjusted for race and age using the American Community Survey and socioeconomic status using the Area Deprivation Index. Bayesian regressions with spatial county effects were estimated for inference.
Results
County whiteness and socioeconomic status modified death rates; geospatial effects differed by cause of death. Other factors equal, a 20% increase in county whiteness was associated with 5-8% increase in death from three causes and 4-15% reduction in death from others, including COVID-19. Other factors equal, advantaged counties had significantly lower death rates, even when juxtaposed with disadvantaged ones. Geospatial patterns of residual risk varied by cause of death. For example, cancer and heart disease death rates were better explained by age, socioeconomic status, and county whiteness than were COVID-19 and suicide deaths.
Conclusions
There are important independent contributions from race, class, and geography to risk of death in the US.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Disparity and inequity in healthcare are legion in the United States (US). The National Institutes of Health considers population-based levels of analysis in health disparities to be environmental, sociocultural, behavioral, and/or biological. Among these categories of disparity, typical areas of focus in public health literature include geographical and socio-economic factors (environmental), racial and ethnic factors (sociocultural), health behaviors (behavioral), and physiological factors, such as the prevalence and type of disabilities (biological). Furthermore, the US Department of Health and Human Services formally recognized priority populations for disparities research include, but are not limited to: racial, ethnic, sexual orientation and gender minorities, socio-economically disadvantaged populations, rural populations, and disabled populations. Unfortunately, validated public data - with an appropriate level of geographic detail - that contain measurement of these factors and populations are limited. However, racial and ethnic composition (*race*), socio-economic status (*class*), and geographic location (*place*) have better established measures and validated data sources, and thus best lend themselves to further study and will be the focus of this article.

These three variables - self-reported race and ethnicity, class, and place - are risk factors for death, alongside, of course, age. To date, efforts focused on health disparity often look at one factor at a time rather than looking simultaneously at multiple factors. But we can expect interaction among them - for example, racial minorities, who have been historically marginalized in the US, tend to live communities with greater levels of disadvantage in the US. Less is known, however, how these variables will contribute to risk of death jointly in the presence of the others, nor how these effects will differ by cause of death. Moreover, the joint and independent contributions are not expected to be identical for all causes of death. For example, it is not intuitive that the the variables associated with health disparity and geospatial landscape are the same for suicide as they are for influenza. Here, we use a county-level regression framework to investigate how socioeconomic status, county racial make-up, and geography contribute to risk of age-adjusted mortality for the top-12 causes of death in 2020. This approach allows us to analyze the contribution of each factor adjusted for the others.

Race and ethnicity, that are social and cultural constructs and are not biologically based, are nevertheless known to impact death rates. Our focus is on the racial make-up of US counties, and our measure is the proportion of residents that identify as non-Hispanic white in the 5-year American Community Survey. We call this metric the “whiteness” of the county. Our research objective is to determine the association of whiteness, as a racial rather than ethnic identity, with rates of the top-12 causes of death in 2020, a list that prominently includes COVID-19. In the US, white raciality provides structural and systemic advantages that affect health outcomes, even as socio-cultural definitions of whiteness have shifted over time[3]. As a consequence of white racial dominance and structural racism, non-Hispanic whiteness is often regarded as normative and unmarked in relation to all other “marked” racial identities, in particular Black or African American. Thus, by focusing on non-Hispanic whiteness, our analysis aims to measure the effects of these associated systemic advantages on health outcomes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Class, by which we here mean socioeconomic status (SES), also affects health outcomes but can be harder to measure. We used the 2018 Area Deprivation Index (ADI) percentiles for US block-groups that were aggregated to the level of county[5]. The ADI is a factor-based index composed of 17 census indicators that measure neighborhood levels of education, employment, income, poverty, and housing[6]. By spatializing these factors, the ADI has been an effective predictor for mortality[6,7] and life expectancy[7,8]. Falling ADI[9] and rising food insecurity[10] are associated with cardiovascular mortality, and that high ADI is a risk factor for hospital readmission of the same magnitude as Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) and more than diabetes[11]. This is especially true for sepsis[12] and after surgery[13–16]. Importantly, we note that the ADI omits race as one of its factors but may well encode it through a combination of the included variables.

Place, like race and SES, has an impact on health outcomes. The integral role of place in health disparities is formally recognized by the US Department of Health and Human Services[17,18] via its Social Determinants of Health (SDH). As such, counties reflect the essential variability in socio-demographics and the built environment, and thereby serve as effective proxies for the SDH domains of Health Care Access and Quality, Neighborhood and Built Environment, and Social and Community Context. In addition, risk factors for common diseases cluster: for example, hypertension is more common in the southern US, and thus we can expect higher rates of death from heart and kidney disease. Most recently, the pandemic has thrown into especially sharp relief the differences in death rates across the country. Likewise, COVID vaccination [1] uptake varies regionally, as do local pandemic-related community prevention efforts, leading to strong geospatial patterns of pandemic mortality[2].

Our analysis of place-based risk bears elaboration. Here, we consider the patterns of ADI formed by adjacent counties in addition to the risk associated with residence in each county. To do so, we partition US counties into one of several geographic profiles: clusters of advantage and disadvantage, outliers of advantage and disadvantage, and neither clustered nor outlying counties. As such, our analysis formally reflects the (dis)advantage of each county relative to its neighbors, which could reflect large-scale structural hurdles otherwise not accounted for by analyzing each county individually.

In this work we bring race, class, and place into the same analytic frame to measure their interactions[21] in determining health care outcomes. Our statistical models also reveal the impact of latent variables - we call them *geographic risk modifiers* - that capture the joint impact of all factors not explicitly given by our measures of race, class, and place. We expect these factors to be complex and nuanced, and plausible mechanisms must draw on concepts of syndemics and intersectionality.

METHODS

We obtained US county level mortality counts and person-years at risk for the top 11 causes of death 1999-2019 from the CDC Wonder database[19], and for COVID-19 over 2020-2021 from the Johns Hopkins Center for Systems Science and Engineering[20]. COVID-19 mortality data included spanned January 1, 2020 through October 17, 2021. Due to missing ADI values, we

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

were able to analyze all but 7 counties, 4 of which were in the State of Hawaii. We show the unadjusted and unsmoothed mortality rates as cause-specific Z-scores in Supplementary Figure 1. Mapped in this manner, a county with a value of 2 for heart disease, for example, has an unadjusted and unsmoothed rate that is two standard deviations above the US average heart disease mortality.

ADI Clustering using Local Moran's I

To concentrate the effects of areal deprivation and reduce confounding with the smooth spatial county effects, we employed Local Moran's I[22] computed using GeoDa open-source software[23]. This analysis effectively assigns each county to either a deprivation cluster or outlier based on its Area Deprivation Index (ADI) and the ADI of its immediate neighbors. The resultant disadvantaged clusters were disadvantaged counties surrounded by disadvantage, whereas advantaged clusters were advantaged counties surrounded by advantage. Disadvantaged outliers and advantaged outliers were spatial outliers that are statistically significantly different from their neighbors. We used alpha=0.05 to detect clusters and outliers. Together with the non-cluster-non-outlier grouping - where Local Moran's *I* yielded p-values > 0.05 - we created a 5-level categorical variable that jointly reflects the levels of deprivation of each county, as well as that of its first-order neighbors.

Statistical Analysis

We estimated 12 Bayesian regression models - one per cause of death - each with a person-years-at-risk "offset term" (E_i) and explanatory variables consisting of: county age demographics (% aged under 18, % aged over 65) and the percentage of non-Hispanic white residents from the 5-year American Community Survey[24], as well as the 5-level ADI cluster type (reference = non-cluster-non-outliers). Each regression model also included a cause-specific spatial county effect (u_i) to account for spatial correlation, which was specified using the recent BYM2 formulation[25]. We used negative-binomial models that account for overdispersion in the data. The analysis was implemented using standard code within the brms package version 2.15 in R[26].

The expected count of cause-specific deaths for the *i*th county was specified as:

$$log(\mu_i) = log(E_i) + \beta_0 + \beta_1\, age18_i + \beta_2\, age65_i + \beta_3\, pctwhite_i + \beta_4\, DisadClust_i + \beta_5\, DisadOut_i + \beta_6\, AdvClust_i + \beta_7\, AdvOut_i + u_i$$
$$(u_1 \ldots u_N) \sim BYM2(\sigma, \rho | \boldsymbol{W}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{W}$ is the county adjacency matrix. Counties were deemed adjacent using the "queen" rule, that is, if their borders shared at least one vertex. The BYM2 formulation also estimates the standard deviation of the spatial effects (σ) and a spatial smoothing parameter (ρ) that reflects the strength of spatial correlation.

All quantitative explanatory variables were centered and scaled prior to analysis. We adjusted the prior distributions and the MCMC sampling parameters in each model to balance model execution times, which are typically long in spatial analysis, with convergence metrics. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

sampling strategy was adjusted until convergence was deemed acceptable for each cause of death. The details of our sampling parameters, as well as the prior distributions used, are shown as part of Supplementary Table 2.

As a sensitivity analysis, we used standard 5-year categorical age groups instead of continuous age percentages, as well as a more parsimonious spatial correlation structure (Intrinsic Conditional Autoregressive). Using categorical age groups resulted in lower uncertainty due to pseudo-replication across the age groups, but neither the direction nor the statistical significance of the coefficients were changed. Similarly, using a more parsimonious spatial correlation structure did not qualitatively alter our main findings. Thus, we report the results from analyses with the simplified age structure, as shown in the equation above.

RESULTS

Race: County whiteness predicted mortality rates

Greater county whiteness was associated with lower risk of death for 9 of 12 leading causes, after adjusting for age, class, and place (Figure 1). Counties with a higher proportion of white residents had at least 4% lower rates of 8 of the top 12 causes of death. The greatest disadvantages occurred in kidney disease, septicemia, diabetes and COVID-19, where death rates were 12 to 15% lower in counties with a higher proportion of white residents. Deaths due to suicide, chronic lower respiratory disease, and Alzheimer's disease were higher in whiter counties. The adjusted risk of death due to cancer, on the other hand, was less affected by county whiteness with Relative Risk (RR)=0.99 (95% Credible Interval 0.98, 0.99) per 20% increase in county whiteness.

Class: Area Deprivation Index clusters predicted mortality rates

We found that 696 (22.2%) counties were in a disadvantaged cluster, 504 counties (16.1%) were in an advantaged cluster, 21 counties (0.7%) were disadvantaged outliers, and 28 counties (0.9%) were advantaged outliers. The remaining counties (60.1%) were neither outliers nor members of a cluster. Advantaged-cluster counties were generally situated in states along the Pacific coast, in the Northeast metropolitan corridor and New England, and in portions of the Mountain West states (Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, and Utah). Disadvantaged-cluster counties were concentrated in non-coastal counties in the South, portions of the Midwest, and also in portions of Appalachia. An interactive online map of the computed clusters and outliers can be accessed here.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Race and cause of death. The data points are the cause-specific adjusted relative risks (RR) per 20% (1 SD) increase of county whiteness (percentage of non-Hispanic white residents) sorted according to the RR estimate. The bars are 95% equal-tail Credible Intervals. The RRs are adjusted for age, class (Area Deprivation Index clusters), and place (cause-specific spatial county effect); RR = 1 indicates that the risk is independent of race (county whiteness).

Residence in an advantaged cluster was associated with significantly lower risk for 9 of 12 causes of death. Relative to non-cluster-non-outlier counties, these Relative Risks (RR) ranged from 0.89 (95% CrI: 0.80, 0.99) for COVID-19 to 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) for cancer (Figure 2; bottom panel). Conversely, residence in a disadvantaged cluster was associated with significantly higher risk for 8 of 12 causes of death, with RRs ranging from 1.02 (1.01, 1.04) for cancer to 1.11 (1.07, 1.15) for influenza and pneumonia (Figure 2; top panel).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Class and cause of death. The data points are the cause-specific adjusted relative risk (RR) for counties belonging to a disadvantaged cluster, advantaged outlier, disadvantaged outlier, or advantaged cluster *vs*. non-cluster-non-outlier. All RR are adjusted for age, race, and class; RR within each panel are ranked by the total number of deaths. Open circles indicate that RR=1 was included in a 95% equal-tail Credible Interval; RR=1 indicates risk of death is independent of cluster type.

Residence in an outlier county was often associated with more extreme RR compared to residence in a cluster. For example, the RR for chronic lower respiratory disease in a disadvantaged outlier was 19.4% higher than a disadvantaged cluster. On the other hand, the RR for Alzheimer's disease in an advantaged outlier was 4.7% lower than in an advantaged cluster.

Surprisingly, Alzheimer's disease mortality was unlike all other causes of death with an RR substantially below 1 in disadvantaged outlier counties and not significantly different elsewhere.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Place: latent geographic risk differed markedly by cause of death

Latent spatial effects reflect patterns of risk attributable to geographic location, after accounting for county age, race, and class. In other words, these effects reflect the aggregate contribution to risk of unmeasured factors unique to each county. We present estimates on a common Relative Risk (RR) scale, motivating their interpretation as a *latent geographic risk modifier*, where RR = 1 reflects no modification beyond what is explained by the other variables.

Figure 3 shows that latent geographic risks for kidney disease, septicemia, and COVID-19 were generally elevated in the Southeast and Northeast, and in clusters for COVID-19 across parts of the South, Midwest, and the Mountain-West states. On the other hand, latent geographic risks for accidental deaths and suicides tended to be higher across the West, including Alaska. Latent geographic risks for Alzheimer's further differed and were localized in several counties within South Dakota, North Dakota, and Washington. Finally, latent geographic risks for chronic lower respiratory disease were localized in Colorado and Kentucky. To our surprise, the top two causes of death - heart disease and cancer - had the least variable spatial effects, with little modification of risk due to place after accounting for other risk factors in the model.

Latent geographic risks for heart disease, cancer, kidney disease, and septicemia were inter-correlated (Spearman $\rho > 0.65$), and thus co-located in a similar set of counties (Supplementary Figure 2). Similarly, latent geographic risks for stroke and heart disease ($\rho = 0.61$), and accidental injuries and sucide ($\rho = 0.56$) co-located. Conversely, latent geographic risks for suicide were statistically significantly anti-correlated with heart disease ($\rho = -0.15$), stroke ($\rho = -0.18$), and COVID-19 ($\rho = -0.37$), indicating those occur in different sets of counties.

The high correlation between cause-specific latent geographic risks and the observed mortality rates indicates important non-race, non-class risk factors. The Spearman correlations ranged from 0.88 (COVID-19) to 0.39 (cancer) (Supplementary Table 1). At the extremes, these correlations indicate cancer mortality patterns were much better explained by age, race, and class than patterns of COVID-19 mortality.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Place and cause of death. The US maps reflect spatially-structured risk estimated via the BYM2 model to adjust for age, race/ethnicity, and class. The color scale on the right reports the Relative Risk scale and can be interpreted as place-based multipliers of cause-specific risks of death.

DISCUSSION

For the top 12 causes of death in 2020, we jointly evaluated the impacts of self-reported race and ethnicity, class, and place at the county level. Our major finding is that race, class, and place each contribute to mortality risk independently of the others; that is, one cannot understand the effect of race by knowing class or place, and so forth. This suggests there are at least three mechanisms responsible for structural inequalities present in US healthcare today.

Race and ethnicity, measured here by county whiteness, was protective for 9 causes and not protective for 3 causes of death. We chose to analyze county whiteness (% of non-Hispanic white residents from the American Community Survey) for several reasons. First, while whiteness affords no physiological benefits, it historically affords social advantages that allow access to healthcare and other mechanisms for improved outcomes. For example, treatments for heart disease - the number one cause of death in the US - have long been known to be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

administered to fewer Black patients than white[27]. Second, working with county whiteness affords us sufficient range to maximize statistical power to detect differences when they are present. In fact, from a quantitative perspective, county-level data on every possible racial and ethnic subgroup are sparse and estimates will lead to imprecise estimates.

Class/SES, measured by the ADI, was associated with risk of death from all of the top 12 causes of death. As expected, we found that disadvantaged counties had worse outcomes and advantaged counties had better outcomes. To our surprise, we found that juxtaposition of counties with different levels of advantage did not have intermediate effects. That is, disadvantaged outlier counties did not benefit from the proximity of advantaged neighbors, nor did advantaged outlier counties suffer from disadvantaged neighbors. It is plausible that counties are geographically too large for these kinds of intermediate effects to arise; our work should be reproduced on smaller geographic units (e.g., census tracts) to determine if the patterns we observed persist. Additionally, there were relatively few ADI outlier counties (49 across both types of outliers), and we found no consistent features of these counties. We note, however, that 5 of the 28 advantaged outlier counties housed large research universities in the southern US, 4 of them in Mississippi alone. Within these counties, outcomes were much better than for their immediate neighbors. The mechanisms are not known but might include the presence of a stable workforce with healthcare benefits, as well as superior health and community infrastructure, for example: access to specialist physicians, community investment in greenspaces, and access to healthy foods.

Place, after adjusting for race and class, had a strong effect on mortality through geographic modifiers that differed substantially by cause of death. We observed broad patterns consistent with known geographic clusters, such as the “Heart Failure belt” and “Stroke belt” in the Southeast[28,29], the “Suicide belt” in the West[30], and to a lesser degree, “Cancer alley” in counties along the Mississippi River in the South[31,32]. Our analysis indicates clusters of COPD in Colorado and Kentucky, perhaps explained by the history of mining, evidenced by the presence of federal Black Lung clinics[33]. Additionally, our results highlight previously unreported regional patterns, such as the clustering of high-risk geographic modifiers for kidney disease and septicemia in the Eastern United States, notably excluding counties in Tennessee and Florida.

We note especially the effects of race, class, and place on COVID-19 deaths. Race had a profound effect: county whiteness protected against COVID deaths in this analysis, consistent with other reports. The effect was one of the strongest that we found and was matched only by diabetes mortality. Likewise, class had a strong effect: residents of advantaged clusters were most protected from COVID deaths among the twelve causes under study. Finally, with respect to place, we found complex nation-wide patterns of COVID-19 deaths. For example, several Native American nations in Arizona, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Montana have mortality risk in excess of what can be attributed to race and class, highlighting the local challenges of healthcare delivery in those locales. In stark contrast, large portions of the US West, and especially California, Oregon, Washington, Utah, and Nevada, were relatively protected from COVID-19 mortality, after adjusting for race and class. To our surprise, the state of Florida was not singled out as a risky locale for COVID-19 deaths. We speculate that the addition of age as

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

a predictor in the multivariable model did much to explain the death rate there, as it harbors a large proportion of residents over age 65.

While our analysis statistically isolates each variable from the others, we note the potential intersections of race, class, and place for some of the causes of death. For example, in areas that benefit from sustained economic growth (e.g., "Silicon Valley"), which may form advantaged clusters and outliers, we find favorable mortality for diabetes and chronic lower respiratory disease. Likewise, we find that class and race may intersect for Alzheimer's disease, which is not only of higher prevalence among African American/Black populations and underdiagnosed as well[34]. Finally, we find that place and race intersect in the western US, with higher county whiteness as well as rates of suicide[35] and other "deaths of despair"[36].

Taken together, we regard these intersections of race, place, and class as empirical evidence that support syndemics theory. As a conceptual framework, *syndemics* treats health inequities as a confluence of biosocial factors, in particular the structural, historical, and cultural systems that inform individual decision-making. Syndemics analyses have been done for each cause of death we identify in this paper, including COVID-19; however, there is little evidence that supports syndemics theories in practice. Here, we present an empirical basis for syndemics that shows where spatially-structured risk accentuates socially-structured risk. Specifically, we are able to demonstrate: (1) how whiteness affects mortality for the top 12 causes of death; (2) how socioeconomic advantage and disadvantage is mediated by racial and geographic proximity; and (3) that morbidities cluster in specific biosocial patterns independent of race and class. We argue that these conclusions cannot be reached without simultaneously attending to the intersection of race, class, and place as syndemic risk modifiers.

This work represents the first known evidence for syndemics theory that does not rely on behavioral data; however, we acknowledge several limitations. Using registry data carries an inherent risk of committing ecological bias. To this end, we emphasize that our smallest unit of analysis is the county and take care to limit our scope of inference no further. Counts of deaths due to COVID have been subject to underreporting[37], especially for racial and ethnic minorities. Thus, we are limited by the quality of the data publicly available through the CDC. Because we focus our article on race, class, and place, several potential risk factors were excluded from analysis, perhaps most prominently, biological sex. Indeed, there are known sex differences for several leading causes of deaths, including heart disease[38], cancer[39], and suicide[40]. Likewise, we do not consider other factors that contribute to health disparities, such as the prevalence and type of disabilities [41,42] in the population, or the prevalence of individuals who identify as something other than cisgender and heterosexual[43]. However, investigating the interaction of these factors with race, class, and place falls outside the scope of the current work, and presents a fecund direction for future research. Finally, we note that county whiteness is a function of self-reported race and ethnicity, ascertained at the county level through the American Community Survey. And, while we report non-Hispanic white as the reference standard, we note that the reality of racial makeup in the US is far more complex than a simple "white/non-white" binary.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

We offer three perspectives on public health implications. First, we offer evidence that race, class, and place should be avoided as proxies for one another in population health. For example, place-based phrases and statistical model formulations, such as “the South”, only account for place and do not accurately inform on class and race. Second, our article supports syndemics theory, in that we offer empirical evidence for race, class, and place as intersectional, rather than independent operators affecting differential outcomes in mortality for the top 12 causes of death. Finally, we highlight important independent contributions to mortality, modified by race, class, and place, and challenge public health researchers to target all three when developing interventions. In fact, we posit that an intervention that explicitly addresses all three is expected to have the greatest impact.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank D.S. Wessel, MD, for help with literature review and K. Krahn for assistance with manuscript preparation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS



Supplementary Figure 1. Unadjusted and unsmoothed mortality rates shown as Z-scores, standardized to the cause-specific mean mortality rate. The color scale corresponds to the number of standard deviations each county lies above/below the cause-specific mean mortality. By design, these data are not geographically smoothed; thus, readers are urged to apply care in interpreting extreme Z-scores in sparsely populated counties.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Supplementary Figure 2. Correlation among geographic risk modifiers (i.e., latent spatial effects) for each cause of death, adjusted for age, race, and class. Spearman correlations were used to capture possible non-linear relationships. Empty squares indicate correlation was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level. A clustering algorithm was applied to visually group like correlations together, as is apparent for kidney disease, cancer, heart disease, and septicemia, for example.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Cause of death with ranking by total deaths	Spearman correlation of spatial latent effects with observed mortality	Standard Deviation of log-spatial latent effects (95% Credible Interval)
1. Heart disease	0.592	0.75 (0.68, 0.82)
2. Cancer	0.399	0.47 (0.53, 0.51)
3. COVID-19	0.884	2.17 (2.07, 2.26)
4. Accidental injuries	0.757	0.98 (0.93, 1.04)
5. Chronic Lower Respiratory disease	0.675	1.01 (0.93, 1.10)
6. Stroke	0.635	0.78 (0.70, 0.86)
7. Alzheimer's disease	0.782	1.43 (1.28, 1.59)
8. Diabetes	0.709	1.23 (1.12, 1.36)
9. Kidney disease	0.709	1.33 (1.25, 1.41)
10. Influenza and pneumonia	0.756	1.23 (1.12, 1.35)
11. Suicide	0.798	0.94 (0.89, 0.99)
12. Septicemia	0.734	1.42 (1.34, 1.50)

Supplementary Table 1. Summary metrics of geographic risk modifiers (i.e. spatial latent effects) for each cause of death, estimated via the BYM2 model after adjusting for race, class, and place. High correlation between risk modifiers and observed mortality indicates that the latent effects reflect an important spatial process and the explanatory variables in the model are relatively poor predictors of cause-specific mortality. Spatial smoothing parameters close to 1 indicate strong spatial correlation among the latent effects; spatial smoothing parameters close to 0 indicate latent effects are spatially independent.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Cause of death with ranking by total deaths	Largest R-hat	Smallest Effective Sample Size	Divergent transitions (% of post-warmup)	Warm-up samples (total samples) per chain	Adapt delta parameter (Max treedepth)	Prior distributions used
1. Heart disease	1.01	449	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
2. Cancer	1.01	586	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
3. COVID-19	1.10	12	0 (0)	300 (1500)	0.90 (10)	$\beta \sim \square(0, 2.5);$ $\sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,1.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(0.5,0.5);$ $\lambda \sim \square(0.01,0.01)$
4. Accidental injuries	1.01	363	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
5. Chronic Lower Respiratory disease	1.01	316	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
6. Stroke	1.01	179	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
7. Alzheimer's disease	1.16	19	13 (0.11)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
8. Diabetes	1.06	67	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
9. Kidney disease	1.02	293	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
10. Influenza and pneumonia	1.05	97	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
11. Suicide	1.00	680	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$
12. Septicemia	1.00	298	0 (0)	500 (3500)	0.99 (15)	$\beta \propto 1; \sigma \sim \square^{+}(0,2.5);$ $\rho \sim \square(1,1); \lambda \sim \square^{+}(0,40)$

Supplementary Table 2. Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) implementation details for the top 12 causes of deaths. No-U-Turn Hamiltonian Monte Carlo via the brms package with 4 parallel chains was used for all estimation. All models underwent visual inspection of MCMC chains and parameter space to ensure satisfactory convergence occurred.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Madorsky, T. Z., Adebayo, N. A., Post, S. L., O'Brian, C. A. & Simon, M. A. Vaccine distrust: A predictable response to structural racism and an inadequate public health infrastructure. *Am. J. Public Health* **111**, S185–S188 (2021).
2. Zalla, L. C., Mulholland, G. E., Filiatreau, L. M. & Edwards, J. K. Racial/Ethnic and Age Differences in the Direct and Indirect Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on US Mortality. *Am. J. Public Health* **112**, 154–164 (2022).
3. Rambachan, A. Overcoming the racial hierarchy: the history and medical consequences of "caucasian". *J. Racial Ethn. Health Disparities* **5**, 907–912 (2018).
4. Tajeu, G. S. *et al.* Black-White Differences in Cardiovascular Disease Mortality: A Prospective US Study, 2003-2017. *Am. J. Public Health* **110**, 696–703 (2020).
5. Kind, A. J. H. & Buckingham, W. R. Making neighborhood-disadvantage metrics accessible - the Neighborhood Atlas. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **378**, 2456–2458 (2018).
6. Singh, G. K. Area deprivation and widening inequalities in US mortality, 1969-1998. *Am. J. Public Health* **93**, 1137–1143 (2003).
7. Singh, G. K. & Siahpush, M. Widening socioeconomic inequalities in US life expectancy, 1980-2000. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **35**, 969–979 (2006).
8. Singh, G. K. & Siahpush, M. Increasing inequalities in all-cause and cardiovascular mortality among US adults aged 25-64 years by area socioeconomic status, 1969-1998. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **31**, 600–613 (2002).
9. Khatana, S. A. M. *et al.* Association Between County-Level Change in Economic Prosperity and Change in Cardiovascular Mortality Among Middle-aged US Adults. *JAMA* **325**, 445–453 (2021).
10. Wang, S. Y. *et al.* Food Insecurity and Cardiovascular Mortality for Nonelderly Adults in the United States From 2011 to 2017: A County-Level Longitudinal Analysis. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Qual. Outcomes* **14**, e007473 (2021).
11. Kind, A. J. H. *et al.* Neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and 30-day rehospitalization: A

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

retrospective cohort study. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **161**, 765–774 (2014).

12. Galiatsatos, P. *et al.* The association between neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and readmissions for patients hospitalized with sepsis. *Crit. Care Med.* **48**, 808–814 (2020).
13. Ghirimoldi, F. M. *et al.* Association of Socioeconomic Area Deprivation Index with Hospital Readmissions After Colon and Rectal Surgery. *J. Gastrointest. Surg.* (2020) doi:10.1007/s11605-020-04754-9.
14. Mehaffey, J. H. *et al.* Community level socioeconomic status association with surgical outcomes and resource utilisation in a regional cohort: a prospective registry analysis. *BMJ Qual. Saf.* **29**, 232–237 (2020).
15. Mehaffey, J. H. *et al.* Socioeconomically Distressed Communities Associated With Long-term Mortality After Bariatric Surgery. *J. Surg. Res.* **243**, 8–13 (2019).
16. Mehaffey, J. H. *et al.* Socioeconomic "Distressed Communities Index" Improves Surgical Risk-adjustment. *Ann. Surg.* **271**, 470–474 (2020).
17. Healthy People 2020 |. https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/.
18. Healthy People 2030 | health.gov. https://health.gov/healthypeople.
19. CDC WONDER. https://wonder.cdc.gov/.
20. COVID-19 Map - Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html.
21. Poteat, T. Navigating the storm: how to apply intersectionality to public health in times of crisis. *Am. J. Public Health* **111**, 91–92 (2021).
22. Anselin, L. Local Indicators of Spatial Association-LISA. *Geogr. Anal.* **27**, 93–115 (1995).
23. Anselin, L., Syabri, I. & Kho, Y. Geoda: an introduction to spatial data analysis. in *Handbook of applied spatial analysis* (eds. Fischer, M. M. & Getis, A.) 73–89 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010). doi:10.1007/978-3-642-03647-7_5.
24. American Community Survey Information Guide. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/library/information-guide.html.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

25. Riebler, A., Sørbye, S. H., Simpson, D. & Rue, H. An intuitive Bayesian spatial model for disease mapping that accounts for scaling. *Stat. Methods Med. Res.* **25**, 1145–1165 (2016).

26. Bürkner, P.-C. brms: an *R* package for bayesian multilevel models using *stan*. *J. Stat. Softw.* **80**, (2017).

27. Mazimba, S. & Peterson, P. N. JAHA spotlight on racial and ethnic disparities in cardiovascular disease. *J. Am. Heart Assoc.* **10**, e023650 (2021).

28. Mujib, M., Zhang, Y., Feller, M. A. & Ahmed, A. Evidence of a "heart failure belt" in the southeastern United States. *Am. J. Cardiol.* **107**, 935–937 (2011).

29. Howard, G. & Howard, V. J. Twenty years of progress toward understanding the stroke belt. *Stroke* **51**, 742–750 (2020).

30. Castro, J. Where is the Suicide Belt | Causes of Suicide | Live Science. https://www.livescience.com/34470-suicide-belt.html (2013).

31. Terrell, K. A. & James, W. Racial Disparities in Air Pollution Burden and COVID-19 Deaths in Louisiana, USA, in the Context of Long-Term Changes in Fine Particulate Pollution. *Environmental Justice* (2020) doi:10.1089/env.2020.0021.

32. Singer, M. Down cancer alley: the lived experience of health and environmental suffering in Louisiana's chemical corridor. *Med. Anthropol. Q.* **25**, 141–163 (2011).

33. Rush, J. Black Lung Clinics Program | Official web site of the U.S. Health Resources & Services Administration. https://www.hrsa.gov/get-health-care/conditions/black-lung (2021).

34. Lennon, J. C. *et al.* Black and White individuals differ in dementia prevalence, risk factors, and symptomatic presentation. *Alzheimers Dement* (2021) doi:10.1002/alz.12509.

35. Hayes, S. L., Radley, D. C. & McCarthy, D. States of Despair: A Closer Look at Rising State Death Rates from Drugs, Alcohol, and Suicide. *Commonwealth Fund* (2018) doi:10.26099/wjrf-xt20.

36. Case, A. & Deaton, A. Rising morbidity and mortality in midlife among white non-Hispanic Americans in the 21st century. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **112**, 15078–15083 (2015).

37. Noppert, G. A. & Zalla, L. C. Who counts and who gets counted? health equity in infectious disease

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.14.22276404; this version posted June 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

surveillance. *Am. J. Public Health* **111**, 1004–1006 (2021).

38. Bugiardini, R. & Cenko, E. Sex differences in myocardial infarction deaths. *Lancet* **396**, 72–73 (2020).
39. Siegel, R. L., Miller, K. D. & Jemal, A. Cancer Statistics, 2017. *CA Cancer J. Clin.* **67**, 7–30 (2017).
40. Miranda-Mendizabal, A. *et al.* Gender differences in suicidal behavior in adolescents and young adults: systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Int. J. Public Health* **64**, 265–283 (2019).
41. Okoro, C. A., Hollis, N. D., Cyrus, A. C. & Griffin-Blake, S. Prevalence of disabilities and health care access by disability status and type among adults - United States, 2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **67**, 882–887 (2018).
42. Sage, R., Ward, B., Myers, A. & Ravesloot, C. Transitory and enduring disability among urban and rural people. *J. Rural Health* **35**, 460–470 (2019).
43. Jackson, C. L., Agénor, M., Johnson, D. A., Austin, S. B. & Kawachi, I. Sexual orientation identity disparities in health behaviors, outcomes, and services use among men and women in the United States: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health* **16**, 807 (2016).