

1 **Contributions of neighborhood social environment and air**  
2 **pollution exposure to Black-White disparities in epigenetic**  
3 **aging**

4 Isabel Yannatos<sup>1</sup>, Rebecca T. Brown<sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, Corey T. McMillan<sup>1\*</sup>

5  
6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Neurology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

7 <sup>2</sup>Division of Geriatric Medicine, Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania,  
8 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

9 <sup>3</sup>Geriatrics and Extended Care, Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Veterans Affairs Medical Center,  
10 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

11 <sup>4</sup>Center for Health Equity Research and Promotion, Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Veterans  
12 Affairs Medical Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

13 <sup>5</sup>Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia,  
14 Pennsylvania

15  
16 \* Corresponding author

17 Email: [cmcmilla@penmedicine.upenn.edu](mailto:cmcmilla@penmedicine.upenn.edu) (CTM)

18

19

## 20 **Abstract**

21 Racial disparities in many aging-related health outcomes are persistent and pervasive  
22 among older Americans, reflecting accelerated biological aging for Black Americans compared  
23 to White, known as weathering. Environmental determinants that contribute to weathering are  
24 poorly understood. Having a higher biological age, measured by DNA methylation (DNAm), than  
25 chronological age is robustly associated with worse age-related outcomes and higher social  
26 adversity. We hypothesize that individual socioeconomic status (SES), neighborhood social  
27 environment, and air pollution exposures contribute to racial disparities in DNAm aging  
28 according to GrimAge and Dunedin Pace of Aging methylation (DPoAm). We perform  
29 retrospective cross-sectional analyses among 2,960 non-Hispanic participants (82% White, 18%  
30 Black) in the Health and Retirement Study whose 2016 DNAm age is linked to survey responses  
31 and geographic data. DNAm aging is defined as the residual after regressing DNAm age on  
32 chronological age. We observe Black individuals have significantly accelerated DNAm aging on  
33 average compared to White individuals according to GrimAge (239%) and DPoAm (238%). We  
34 implement multivariable linear regression models and threefold decomposition to identify  
35 exposures that contribute to this disparity. Exposure measures include individual-level SES,  
36 census-tract-level socioeconomic deprivation and air pollution (fine particulate matter, nitrogen  
37 dioxide, and ozone), and perceived neighborhood social and physical disorder. Race and gender  
38 are included as covariates. Regression and decomposition results show that individual-level SES  
39 is strongly associated with and accounts for a large portion of the disparity in both GrimAge and  
40 DPoAm aging. Higher neighborhood deprivation for Black participants significantly contributes  
41 to the disparity in GrimAge aging. Black participants are more vulnerable to fine particulate

42 matter exposure for DPoAm, perhaps due to individual- and neighborhood-level SES, which may  
43 contribute to the disparity in DPoAm aging. DNAm aging may play a role in the environment  
44 “getting under the skin”, contributing to age-related health disparities between older Black and  
45 White Americans.

46

## 47 **Introduction**

48         There are severe racial disparities in age-related health in the United States. Black  
49 Americans have earlier onset, higher prevalence, and reduced survival of age-related diseases  
50 relative to their White counterparts due to the “cumulative impact of repeated experience with  
51 social or economic adversity and political marginalization” [1,2]. Early health deterioration has  
52 been termed weathering and reflects accelerated aging [3,4]. Across many biomarkers of aging,  
53 Black Americans are biologically older than their White counterparts of the same chronological  
54 age [5]. There is evidence that individual socioeconomic status (SES), neighborhood deprivation  
55 and segregation, and discrimination may play a role in these disparities [6–8]. However, the  
56 social and structural determinants of weathering are not well understood and the contributions  
57 of individual and neighborhood factors known to impact age-related health have not been  
58 quantified.

59         Social epigenetics posits that DNAm is a mediating link between social and structural  
60 determinants of health and both age-related health outcomes and health disparities, though  
61 there is limited work directly testing this hypothesis [9,10]. Social and structural determinants  
62 of health are the conditions in which individuals are born, live, learn, work, and age [11].  
63 Structural factors such as racial segregation and discrimination, exclusionary economic policy,

64 and environmental racism influence an individual's socioeconomic resources and exposure to  
65 environmental conditions, such as the social environment of one's neighborhood and physical  
66 pollutants. These determinants are known to be important for age-related health and health  
67 disparities, but there is limited understanding of the biological mechanisms by which they  
68 affect health outcomes. There is evidence that DNAm aging may be one such mechanism.

69         Markers of biological aging using DNA methylation (DNAm) have emerged as robust  
70 measures of weathering, especially GrimAge and Dunedin Pace of Aging Methylation (DPoAm).  
71 These measures both strongly predict many age-related outcomes, including lung disease,  
72 cognitive decline, functional decline, and mortality [12–19]. Racial disparities in these measures  
73 have been documented and shown to mediate racial disparities in health status and decline and  
74 mortality [5]. They are also associated with social and structural determinants, including  
75 individual SES and aspects of the neighborhood social environment [8,16–20]. To the best of  
76 our knowledge, prior studies have not quantified the contribution of specific social or structural  
77 determinants to the racial disparity in DNAm aging, nor examined whether GrimAge and  
78 DpoAm are associated with air pollution exposure.

79         The neighborhood social and physical environments are important determinants for  
80 age-related health. Neighborhood socioeconomic deprivation, perceived neighborhood  
81 disorder (i.e., reporting less social cohesion and safety and more physical disorder), and air  
82 pollution exposure have all been linked to health status and decline in older adults. A growing  
83 body of research shows that living in a neighborhood with a greater proportion of people with  
84 low socioeconomic resources is associated with many adverse health outcomes for older adults  
85 regardless of their individual SES [21–30]. There are mixed results on the health effects of

86 perceived social and physical disorder in one’s neighborhood, but disorder is associated with  
87 risk of functional decline, cardiovascular disease, and dementia [24,27,31–35]. Exposure to fine  
88 particulate matter (PM2.5) air pollution is an established risk factor for mortality and several  
89 age-related diseases and nitrogen dioxide is associated with several of these outcomes as well  
90 [36–40]. The risks of air pollution exposure may be even higher for older adults than for the  
91 general population [38].

92       Historic and current structural and environmental racism and persistent racial  
93 residential segregation result in inequitable distributions of these social determinants, where  
94 Black Americans have fewer socioeconomic resources and higher exposure to unfavorable and  
95 unhealthy conditions in their neighborhood environment [41–43]. The large impact of the  
96 inequitable distribution of individual socioeconomic status (SES) on health disparities is well  
97 documented [44]. Black older adults are more likely to live in a neighborhood with higher  
98 deprivation, disorder, and pollution than their White counterparts and these inequities also  
99 contribute to health disparities [32,45–47]. For example, neighborhood socioeconomic  
100 composition explains large portions of the racial disparities in COVID-19 infection in Chicago  
101 and self-rated health among older adults [48,49]. Neighborhood stress contributes to the racial  
102 disparity in hypertension [50]. Air pollution contributes to racial disparities in hypertension,  
103 Alzheimer’s disease, and likely other age-related diseases [51–53].

104       Furthermore, the relationship between measured environmental exposures and age-  
105 related outcomes may be different between racial groups. Black Americans appear to have  
106 greater risk from the same amount of PM2.5 pollution than their White counterparts; Black  
107 Medicare beneficiaries had three times greater risk of mortality and Black women had twice the

108 risk of Alzheimer's Disease due to PM2.5 [52,54]. There is also some evidence that risk of  
109 functional limitations due to neighborhood physical disorder may differ between racial groups  
110 [32]. Since race is a social construct, any differences in risk between racial groups can be  
111 attributed to structural and social determinants that affect either amount of exposure or  
112 defenses against a detrimental neighborhood exposure. Research is needed to determine  
113 whether risk from social environment exposures differ, whether differences contribute to racial  
114 disparities in outcomes, and the determinants that influence these differences. Threefold  
115 decomposition, a technique more common in the social sciences than in health sciences, is well  
116 suited to evaluating how the distribution of both an exposure and risk contribute to disparities.

117         In this study we investigate the extent to which different levels of neighborhood  
118 exposures and different risks due to those exposures between Black and White older Americans  
119 contribute to racial disparities in DNAm aging. We first hypothesize that individual-level SES  
120 greatly contributes to the DNAm aging disparity but does not fully explain it. We further  
121 hypothesize that neighborhood exposures with a larger racial disparity and stronger association  
122 with biological aging contribute more to the DNAm aging disparity (specifically, neighborhood  
123 deprivation, PM2.5, and NO<sub>2</sub> contribute more than neighborhood disorder and ozone). Finally,  
124 we hypothesize that Black participants have greater risk due to PM2.5 than White and perhaps  
125 to other neighborhood exposures as well. We test these hypotheses using a large nationally  
126 representative sample of adults 50 and over, two robust markers of biological aging as  
127 outcomes, and two complementary analytical techniques, regression and decomposition. This  
128 study builds on the weathering literature by identifying specific environmental-level factors that  
129 contribute to racial disparities in biological aging, including air pollution, and by examining not

130 only different levels of environmental exposures between racial groups but also potentially  
131 different levels of risk.

132

## 133 **Methods**

### 134 **Data**

135           The Health and Retirement Study (HRS) is sponsored by the National Institute on Aging  
136 (grant number NIA U01 AG009740) and is conducted by the University of Michigan. Surveys are  
137 administered by phone or in person biannually with a nationally representative population of  
138 Americans aged 50 or older [55]. In 2016, a subset of HRS participants provided a venous blood  
139 sample of which a representative subsample (N=4018) was selected for DNA methylation  
140 (DNAm) measurement [56]. We link epigenetic data with data from the 2016 wave of the HRS  
141 survey, the Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire (2008-2014), and the HRS Contextual Data  
142 Resource (CDR). The Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire is given to half of HRS  
143 respondents in each wave as a self-administered questionnaire after completing a face-to-face  
144 interview [57]. Response rates are 73-83%. The CDR is a restricted data set which includes  
145 geographic identifiers and data drawn from sources such as the American Community Survey  
146 and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) [58,59].

### 147 **Ethics Statement**

148           All data were collected by HRS following written informed consent under a protocol  
149 approved by an IRB at the University of Michigan. We report secondary analyses approved by  
150 an IRB at the University of Pennsylvania.

## 151 **Population**

152 We include self-identified non-Hispanic White and Black individuals in the DNAm sub-  
153 sample with complete exposure and covariate data. 366 individuals were excluded for missing  
154 any variables. Our final sample comprises 2,960 participants; 82% (N=2438) are White, 18%  
155 (N=522) are Black.

## 156 **Measures**

### 157 **DNA methylation aging**

158 Whole blood samples collected in EDTA tubes were sent to the CLIA-certified Advanced  
159 Research and Diagnostic Laboratory at the University of Minnesota for centralized processing.  
160 DNAm was measured using the Infinium Methylation EPIC BeadChip. Samples were randomized  
161 across plates, run in duplicate, and quality controlled. Values for GrimAge and Dunedin Pace of  
162 Aging methylation (DPoAm) were estimated based on published CpG sites and weights [16,17].  
163 GrimAge is reported in units of biological years, while DPoAm is reported in units of biological  
164 years per chronological year as a measure of pace of aging. For both, we regress value on  
165 chronological age and use the residual to measure individuals' DNAm aging, consistent with  
166 previous work [60]. A residual greater than zero indicates higher clock value than expected  
167 based on chronological age, i.e., accelerated DNAm aging. We repeat this regression including  
168 ten ancestry-informative principal components, as described below, and without population  
169 weighting and report results in S1 Table. We then divide by the root mean square to scale the  
170 residuals for ease of comparison between the two clock measures.

### 171 **Environmental exposures**



172 For exposure to neighborhood socioeconomic deprivation and air pollution, we use  
173 census-tract-level data based on participants' census tract of residence in 2014.

174 **Social Deprivation Index (SDI):** The SDI is a composite measure of socioeconomic  
175 deprivation based on seven characteristics, such as percent of the population under the poverty  
176 line or unemployed, constructed using data from the American Community Survey [61,62]. We  
177 use the publicly available census-tract-level 2015 SDI score.

178 **Air pollution:** Mean level of particulate matter air pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), Nitrogen Dioxide  
179 (NO<sub>2</sub>), and Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) per census tract are available from the EPA as part of the CDR. We use  
180 average 2014 levels at participants' 2014 residential census tracts for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and O<sub>3</sub>. The most  
181 recent data available for NO<sub>2</sub> are for 2010, so we use the average 2010 level at participants'  
182 2010 residential census tract.

183 **Neighborhood disorder:** We use participant evaluations of their neighborhood in the  
184 Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire as measures of perceived neighborhood social and  
185 physical disorder [57]. Respondents rated their agreement on a seven-point scale to each of  
186 eight statements. Four statements relate to social disorder (sense of belonging,  
187 trustworthiness, friendliness, and helpfulness among neighbors) and four to physical disorder  
188 (presence of vandalism, litter, vacant buildings, and sense of safety) in their neighborhood  
189 (defined as everywhere within a 20-minute walk or half a mile of your home). We use the most  
190 recent response from 2008-2014 for each respondent and the average score across the four  
191 items, log-transformed and scaled to normalize distributions. Higher scores indicate greater  
192 perceived disorder.

193 **Covariates**

194 We use self-reported race, ethnicity, and gender. Participants who identified as Hispanic  
195 or Latino or as a race other than Black or White are excluded. The HRS survey treats gender as  
196 binary and does not distinguish between assigned sex or gender identity. “Sex-mismatched”  
197 blood samples were removed from DNAm measurement, so there is likely no representation of  
198 trans or intersex individuals in this dataset. Education is categorized based on years of formal  
199 schooling completed. We use an index of household income and wealth to avoid collinearity.  
200 Household income is the sum of respondent and spouse annual income. Household wealth is  
201 the sum of all assets, including second homes, minus debts. We log transform income and  
202 wealth, calculate a Z score for each, average the Z scores, then use weighted quartiles. Race,  
203 gender, education, and quartile of wealth/income are included as covariates in all analyses.

#### 204 **Sample weights**

205 HRS provides sample weights for the DNAm subsample to adjust for probability of  
206 participation. More detail on weights can be found in the documentation [56]. We impute  
207 missing sample weights (N=143 missing) using the mean value and include weighting in all  
208 regression analyses.

#### 209 **Ancestry-informative principal components**

210 We perform a supplementary analysis correcting for ancestry-informative genetic  
211 markers to account for population stratification, which varies between ancestry groups and can  
212 influence DNAm [63]. Ten ancestry-specific principal components are available for a portion of  
213 the White (European ancestry) and Black (African ancestry) participants and were included as  
214 covariates in supplemental regression of GrimAge and DPoAm values on chronological age (S1  
215 Table) [64].

## 216 **Analytic Approach**

217 All analyses are conducted in R statistical software (version 4.2.1) and code is available  
218 at [github.com/pennbindlab](https://github.com/pennbindlab) [65]. We use two complementary analytic strategies.

219 **Linear Regression Models:** We first implement stepwise linear regression. We perform  
220 univariate linear regression to assess the association between DNAm aging and race alone,  
221 which defines the total racial disparity. We then add individual-level covariates (age, gender,  
222 education, and wealth/income). To evaluate associations between DNAm aging and the  
223 environment we then add each environmental exposure individually (Social Deprivation Index,  
224 perceived social disorder, perceived physical disorder, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>). We perform  
225 sensitivity analysis to assess whether residential mobility biases the results by excluding  
226 individuals who moved between 2010 and 2016 (N=667) (S2 and S3 Tables). We assess whether  
227 the relationships between the exposures and DNAm aging differs between racial groups by  
228 adding interaction terms with race. We assess factors that may influence vulnerability to PM<sub>2.5</sub>  
229 exposure using interaction terms with PM<sub>2.5</sub>. All models include sample weighting, as  
230 described above. P-values are Bonferroni corrected to account for six comparisons. AIC  
231 (Aikake's Information Criterion) is shown as a goodness-of-fit indicator.

232 **Threefold Decomposition:** Next, we implement Kitagawa-Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition  
233 to quantify how each covariate and environmental measure contribute to the disparity in  
234 DNAm aging using the package `Oaxaca()` (version 0.1.5) [66,67]. Threefold decomposition  
235 separates these contributions into endowment, coefficient, and interaction effects. The  
236 endowment effect indicates the portion of the disparity due to differences in the levels of the  
237 explanatory variables between groups. The coefficient effect reflects the portion of the

238 disparity due to differences in the coefficient of the variables between groups, i.e. different  
239 associations or vulnerabilities to the exposures between groups. The interaction effect accounts  
240 for differences in endowments and coefficients that exist simultaneously. We use linear  
241 regression as the underlying models for decomposition and run 10,000 bootstrap samples to  
242 calculate 95% confidence intervals.

243

## 244 **Results**

### 245 **There are large racial disparities in DNAm aging and environmental** 246 **exposures**

247 Descriptive statistics by race are shown in Table 1. The overall sample has an average  
248 age of 71 years and is 41% male. Black participants are significantly younger, more likely to be  
249 women, less educated, and have lower income/wealth than White participants on average  
250 ( $p < 0.001$ ). They also have higher levels of all environmental exposures except ozone; Black  
251 participants are exposed to higher levels of neighborhood social deprivation, perceived social  
252 and physical disorder, PM2.5, and nitrogen dioxide ( $p < 0.001$ ). Effect sizes for these disparities  
253 are medium to large (Cohen's  $d > 0.5$ ), with the difference in social deprivation being  
254 particularly striking. Black participants on average have higher rates of DNAm aging than White  
255 participants in both GrimAge and DPoAm aging ( $p < 0.001$ ); Black participants on average have  
256 accelerated DNAm aging while White participants have slightly decelerated DNAm aging. Scaled  
257 residuals are shown in Table 1 and used in all analyses for ease of comparison between the two  
258 DNAm aging measures. Unscaled residuals show that the difference between Black and White

259 participants' DNAm aging is 1.4 biological years according to GrimAge, and 0.03 biological years  
 260 (or 0.36 biological months) per chronological year according to DPoAm (S1 Table). The effect  
 261 size for disparities in all DNAm aging measures are moderate (Cohen's  $d \sim 0.3$ ).

262 **Table 1. Sample characteristics and racial disparities**

Characteristic	Overall, N = 2,960 <sup>1</sup>	White, N = 2,438 <sup>1</sup>	Black, N = 522 <sup>1</sup>	p-value <sup>2</sup>	Effect Size <sup>3</sup>
<b>Age (years)</b>	71.33 (9.53)	72.08 (9.54)	67.81 (8.69)	<0.001	0.468
<b>Gender</b>				<0.001	0.085
Male	1,218 (41%)	1,051 (43%)	167 (32%)		
Female	1,742 (59%)	1,387 (57%)	355 (68%)		
<b>GrimAge aging</b>	0.03 (1.00)	-0.02 (0.99)	0.28 (1.03)	<0.001	0.304
<b>DunedinPoAm aging</b>	0.03 (1.00)	-0.03 (0.98)	0.31 (1.04)	<0.001	0.334
<b>Education</b>				<0.001	0.164
College +	839 (28%)	740 (30%)	99 (19%)		
Some College	773 (26%)	644 (26%)	129 (25%)		
High School	974 (33%)	803 (33%)	171 (33%)		
< High School	374 (13%)	251 (10%)	123 (24%)		
<b>Wealth/Income Quartile</b>				<0.001	0.325
4	702 (24%)	680 (28%)	22 (4.2%)		
3	751 (25%)	671 (28%)	80 (15%)		
2	803 (27%)	644 (26%)	159 (30%)		
1	704 (24%)	443 (18%)	261 (50%)		
<b>Social Deprivation Index</b>	-0.12 (0.98)	-0.32 (0.89)	0.79 (0.80)	<0.001	1.31
<b>Social Disorder</b>	-0.06 (0.96)	-0.16 (0.93)	0.41 (0.98)	<0.001	0.600
<b>Physical Disorder</b>	-0.06 (0.95)	-0.17 (0.92)	0.46 (0.96)	<0.001	0.670
<b>PM2.5 (µg/m<sup>3</sup>)</b>	9.52 (1.91)	9.36 (1.94)	10.26 (1.61)	<0.001	0.506
<b>Ozone (µg/m<sup>3</sup>)</b>	38.17 (3.89)	38.40 (4.01)	37.09 (3.04)	<0.001	0.367
<b>NO<sub>2</sub> (ppb)</b>	8.23 (4.14)	7.78 (3.80)	10.37 (4.93)	<0.001	0.590

Sample characteristics overall and by race. Significance of comparison between White and Black groups shown.

<sup>1</sup>Mean (SD); n (%)

<sup>2</sup>Wilcoxon rank sum test; Pearson's Chi-squared test

<sup>3</sup>Cohen's D; Cramer's V

263

264           Sensitivity analyses show that the absolute disparity in DNAm aging remains the same

265 whether sample weights are applied and whether ancestry-informative genetic markers are

266 included in the regression (S1 Table). The racial disparity in DNAm aging is not due to sampling

267 bias nor genetic background.

## 268 **Stepwise multivariable regression models**

269           Regressing DNAm aging on race gives the total disparity between White and Black  
270 participants in GrimAge and DPoAm aging in scaled units, shown in the first column of Table 2  
271 and Table 3, respectively. The disparity in GrimAge is 0.30 units (95% CI 0.18, 0.42;  $p < 0.001$ ),  
272 and the disparity in DPoAm is 0.35 units (95% CI 0.23, 0.47;  $p < 0.001$ ). Adding individual-level  
273 covariates in the second column shows that gender and individual-level socioeconomic status  
274 (SES) are significantly associated with both GrimAge and DpoAm aging. Being female (GrimAge  
275  $\beta = -0.73$ , 95% CI -0.8, -0.67; DpoAm  $\beta = -0.2$ , 95% CI -0.27, -0.13;  $p < 0.001$ ) is associated with  
276 decreased DNAm aging while having less education (GrimAge  $\beta = 0.51$ , 95% CI 0.38, 0.63; DPoAm  
277  $\beta = 0.39$ , 95% CI 0.26, 0.53;  $p < 0.001$  for less than high school compared to college or more), or  
278 having lower wealth/income (GrimAge  $\beta = 0.53$ , 95% CI 0.43, 0.64; DPoAm  $\beta = 0.32$ , 95% CI 0.21,  
279 0.44;  $p < 0.001$  for the lowest quartile compared to the highest quartile) is associated with  
280 increased DNAm aging. These associations tend to be larger in magnitude with GrimAge than  
281 DPoAm aging. Adding these individual-level factors reduces the association between GrimAge  
282 aging and race from 0.30 to 0.13 (95% CI 0.02, 0.24) units and to non-significance, implying that  
283 these factors strongly contribute to the racial disparity in GrimAge aging. The association  
284 between DPoAm aging and race remains significant after adding these factors, but the  
285 magnitude is reduced from 0.35 to 0.21 (95% CI 0.09, 0.33,  $p < 0.01$ ) units, implying that  
286 individual-level SES contributes somewhat to the disparity in DPoAm aging.

287

288 **Table 2. GrimAge aging: Multivariable associations with individual covariates and neighborhood**  
 289 **exposures.**

<b>GrimAge<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Total disparity<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Individual SES<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>SDI<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Social Disorder<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Physical Disorder<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>PM2.5<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Ozone<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>NO<sub>2</sub><sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Race</b>								
White	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Black	0.30*** (0.18,0.42)	0.13 (0.02,0.24)	0.08 (-0.03,0.20)	0.11 (0.00,0.22)	0.12 (0.01,0.23)	0.13 (0.02,0.24)	0.13 (0.02,0.24)	0.13 (0.02,0.24)
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Female	—	-0.73*** (-0.80,-0.67)	-0.73*** (-0.79,-0.66)	-0.72*** (-0.79,-0.66)	-0.73*** (-0.79,-0.66)	-0.73*** (-0.80,-0.67)	-0.73*** (-0.80,-0.67)	-0.73*** (-0.80,-0.67)
<b>Education</b>								
College +	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Some College	—	0.26*** (0.17,0.34)	0.25*** (0.17,0.34)	0.25*** (0.17,0.34)	0.25*** (0.17,0.34)	0.26*** (0.17,0.34)	0.26*** (0.17,0.34)	0.26*** (0.17,0.34)
High School	—	0.30*** (0.21,0.38)	0.29*** (0.20,0.38)	0.30*** (0.21,0.38)	0.29*** (0.21,0.38)	0.29*** (0.21,0.38)	0.30*** (0.21,0.38)	0.30*** (0.21,0.38)
< High School	—	0.51*** (0.38,0.63)	0.50*** (0.37,0.62)	0.50*** (0.38,0.63)	0.50*** (0.38,0.63)	0.51*** (0.38,0.63)	0.51*** (0.38,0.63)	0.51*** (0.38,0.63)
<b>Quartile Wealth/Income</b>								
4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3	—	0.15** (0.06,0.24)	0.14* (0.05,0.23)	0.15** (0.06,0.23)	0.15** (0.06,0.24)	0.15** (0.06,0.24)	0.15** (0.06,0.24)	0.15** (0.06,0.24)
2	—	0.41*** (0.31,0.50)	0.38*** (0.28,0.47)	0.40*** (0.30,0.49)	0.40*** (0.31,0.50)	0.41*** (0.31,0.50)	0.41*** (0.31,0.50)	0.41*** (0.31,0.50)
1	—	0.53*** (0.43,0.64)	0.49*** (0.38,0.60)	0.52*** (0.41,0.62)	0.52*** (0.42,0.63)	0.53*** (0.43,0.64)	0.53*** (0.43,0.64)	0.53*** (0.43,0.64)
<b>Neighborhood Exposure</b>								
(Intercept)	-0.05* (-0.09,-0.02)	-0.09 (-0.17,-0.02)	0.06* (0.02,0.09)	0.04 (0.00,0.07)	0.02 (-0.02,0.06)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.008	0.213	0.215	0.214	0.213	0.213	0.213	0.213
AIC	9,064	8,393	8,387	8,390	8,394	8,395	8,395	8,395

Results of linear regression models with GrimAge aging as the outcome.

<sup>1</sup>β (95% confidence interval) \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

290

291

292 **Table 3. DPoAm aging: Multivariable associations with individual covariates and neighborhood**  
 293 **exposures.**

DPoAm <sup>1</sup>	Total disparity <sup>1</sup>	Individual SES <sup>1</sup>	SDI <sup>1</sup>	Social Disorder <sup>1</sup>	Physical Disorder <sup>1</sup>	PM2.5 <sup>1</sup>	Ozone <sup>1</sup>	NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Race</b>								
White	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Black	0.35*** (0.23,0.47)	0.21** (0.09,0.33)	0.18* (0.05,0.30)	0.20** (0.08,0.32)	0.21** (0.09,0.33)	0.21** (0.09,0.33)	0.21** (0.09,0.33)	0.20** (0.08,0.33)
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Female	—	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)	-0.19*** (-0.26,-0.12)	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)
<b>Education</b>								
College +	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Some College	—	0.18*** (0.09,0.27)	0.18** (0.08,0.27)	0.18** (0.08,0.27)	0.18** (0.08,0.27)	0.18** (0.09,0.27)	0.18*** (0.09,0.27)	0.18*** (0.09,0.27)
High School	—	0.23*** (0.13,0.32)	0.22*** (0.13,0.32)	0.23*** (0.14,0.32)	0.23*** (0.13,0.32)	0.23*** (0.13,0.32)	0.23*** (0.13,0.32)	0.23*** (0.14,0.32)
< High School	—	0.39*** (0.26,0.53)	0.39*** (0.25,0.52)	0.39*** (0.25,0.53)	0.39*** (0.25,0.53)	0.39*** (0.26,0.53)	0.39*** (0.26,0.53)	0.40*** (0.26,0.53)
<b>Quartile Wealth/Income</b>								
4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3	—	0.06 (-0.04,0.15)	0.05 (-0.04,0.15)	0.05 (-0.04,0.15)	0.06 (-0.04,0.15)	0.06 (-0.04,0.15)	0.06 (-0.04,0.15)	0.06 (-0.03,0.15)
2	—	0.20*** (0.09,0.30)	0.17** (0.07,0.28)	0.19** (0.08,0.29)	0.19** (0.09,0.30)	0.20*** (0.09,0.30)	0.20*** (0.09,0.30)	0.20*** (0.10,0.30)
1	—	0.32*** (0.21,0.44)	0.29*** (0.18,0.41)	0.31*** (0.19,0.42)	0.32*** (0.20,0.43)	0.32*** (0.21,0.44)	0.32*** (0.21,0.44)	0.32*** (0.21,0.44)
<b>Neighborhood Exposure</b>								
(Intercept)	-0.06** (-0.10,-0.03)	-0.22*** (-0.31,-0.14)	-0.20*** (-0.28,-0.11)	-0.22*** (-0.30,-0.14)	-0.22*** (-0.30,-0.14)	-0.25* (-0.44,-0.07)	-0.13 (-0.47,0.22)	-0.26*** (-0.37,-0.15)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.012	0.059	0.060	0.060	0.059	0.059	0.059	0.059
AIC	8,973	8,843	8,841	8,842	8,844	8,845	8,844	8,844

Results of linear regression models with DPoAm aging as the outcome.

<sup>1</sup>β (95% confidence interval) \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

294

295 We then add each environmental exposure separately to the model. The social  
 296 deprivation index (SDI) is significantly associated with GrimAge aging (β=0.06, 95% CI 0.02, 0.09;  
 297 p<0.05), and further reduces the association between GrimAge aging and race to 0.08 (95% CI -  
 298 0.03, 0.2) units (Table 2, column 3). The SDI is not significantly associated with DPoAm aging  
 299 after correcting for multiple comparisons but has a positive coefficient (β=0.04, 95% CI 0.0,



300 0.08) (Table 3, column 3). Adding SDI reduces the magnitude and significance of the association  
301 between DPoAm aging and race to 0.18 (95% CI 0.05, 0.18;  $p < 0.05$ ) units. Together these  
302 results imply that lower neighborhood socioeconomic resources are associated with higher  
303 GrimAge aging and contribute to the Black-White disparity in DNAm aging.

304 The association between perceived social disorder and GrimAge aging has a positive  
305 coefficient ( $\beta = 0.04$ , 95% CI 0.0, 0.07) but is not significant after correcting for multiple  
306 comparisons (Table 2, column 4). Adding social disorder has a smaller effect on the association  
307 with race than adding SDI but reduces the association slightly to 0.11 units (95% CI 0.0, 0.22).  
308 Perceived social disorder did not have an association nor affect the racial disparity in DPoAm  
309 aging (Table 3, column 4). Neither physical disorder nor the air pollution measures are  
310 associated with either measure nor do they affect the association between DNAm aging and  
311 race.

312 To account for potential misclassification, we repeat these models excluding individuals  
313 who moved between 2010 and 2016 (S2 and S3 Tables). The overall magnitude of the race  
314 coefficient decreases across all models, but patterns in the magnitude of the racial disparity  
315 remain. The race coefficient is reduced upon addition of individual SES and SDI to the model.  
316 The association between SDI and GrimAge aging is attenuated but remains positive ( $\beta = 0.05$ ,  
317 95% CI 0.01, 0.09).

## 318 **Interaction models**

319 To investigate differences in risk due to environmental exposures between racial  
320 groups, we implement linear regression models with interaction terms between each exposure  
321 measure and race. Only the interaction between race and PM2.5 with DPoAm aging as the

322 outcome is statistically significant (Table 4 and Fig 1, full results in S4 Table). Black individuals  
323 appear more vulnerable to PM2.5 exposure in terms of DPoAm aging ( $\beta=0.10$ , 95% CI 0.03,  
324 0.17;  $p<0.05$ ). There were no significant interaction terms for GrimAge aging as the outcome  
325 (S5 Table).

326

327 **Fig 1. Predicted association between DPoAm aging and PM2.5 by social determinants.**

328 Estimated marginal mean values of DPoAm aging from models shown in Table 4. Interactions  
329 between PM2.5 and race (A), gender (B), wealth/income (C), and Social Deprivation Index (D)  
330 shown in solid lines, 95% confidence intervals shaded.

331

332 **Table 4. DPoAm aging: Interactions between environmental and social determinants and PM2.5**  
333 **pollution exposure.**

DPOAm <sup>1</sup>	Race <sup>1</sup>	Gender <sup>1</sup>	Individual SES <sup>1</sup>	SDI <sup>1</sup>
<b>Race</b>				
White	—	—	—	—
Black	-0.81 (-1.5,-0.09)	0.21** (0.09,0.33)	0.19** (0.07,0.32)	0.16 (0.03,0.29)
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	—	—	—	—
Female	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)	0.30 (-0.05,0.65)	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)	-0.20*** (-0.27,-0.13)
<b>Education</b>				
College + Some College	0.17** (0.08,0.27)	0.18*** (0.09,0.27)	0.18** (0.08,0.27)	0.17** (0.08,0.27)
High School	0.23*** (0.13,0.32)	0.23*** (0.13,0.32)	0.22*** (0.13,0.31)	0.22*** (0.13,0.32)
< High School	0.39*** (0.26,0.53)	0.40*** (0.26,0.53)	0.38*** (0.24,0.52)	0.38*** (0.24,0.52)
<b>Quartile Wealth/Income</b>				
4	—	—	—	—
3	0.06 (-0.03,0.16)	0.06 (-0.04,0.15)	-0.52 (-1.0,-0.07)	0.06 (-0.04,0.15)
2	0.20*** (0.09,0.30)	0.20** (0.09,0.30)	-0.07 (-0.55,0.41)	0.18** (0.08,0.29)
1	0.32*** (0.20,0.43)	0.33*** (0.21,0.44)	-0.30 (-0.79,0.19)	0.30*** (0.18,0.42)
<b>Race * PM2.5</b>				
Black * PM2.5	0.10* (0.03,0.17)			
<b>Gender * PM2.5</b>				
Female * PM2.5		-0.05* (-0.09,-0.02)		
<b>Quartile Wealth/Income * PM2.5</b>				
3 * PM2.5			0.06 (0.01,0.11)	
2 * PM2.5			0.03 (-0.02,0.08)	
1 * PM2.5			0.07 (0.02,0.12)	
<b>Social Deprivation Index</b>				
				-0.14 (-0.32,0.05)
<b>Social Deprivation Index * PM2.5</b>				
				0.02 (0.00,0.04)
<b>PM2.5</b>				
	0.00 (-0.02,0.01)	0.03 (0.01,0.06)	-0.03 (-0.06,0.00)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)
<b>(Intercept)</b>				
	-0.19 (-0.38,0.00)	-0.54*** (-0.81,-0.27)	0.08 (-0.22,0.39)	-0.27* (-0.46,-0.07)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.061	0.062	0.062	0.061
AIC	8,839	8,838	8,841	8,842

Results of linear regression models with DPOAm aging as the outcome.

<sup>1</sup>β (95% confidence interval) \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

335 Racial differences in risk from environmental exposures are due to structural and social  
336 determinants. To identify the determinants that may influence the relationship between PM2.5  
337 and DPoAm aging we implement models with DPoAm aging as the outcome and interaction  
338 terms between PM2.5 and gender, education, wealth/income, SDI, and perceived social and  
339 physical disorder (S6 Table). There is a significant interaction between gender and PM2.5,  
340 shown in Table 4 and Fig 1, where women appear less vulnerable to PM2.5 exposure ( $\beta=-0.05$ ,  
341 95% CI -0.09, -0.02;  $p<0.05$ ). No other interaction terms are statistically significant; however,  
342 there are positive interactions with the lowest quartile of wealth/income ( $\beta=0.07$ , 95% CI 0.12,  
343 0.02) and with SDI ( $\beta=0.02$ , 95% CI 0.0, 0.04). These interactions indicate that lower individual  
344 SES and higher neighborhood deprivation are associated with increased vulnerability to PM2.5  
345 (Fig 1). Individual- and neighborhood-level SES may play a role in the relationship between  
346 PM2.5 exposure and DPoAm aging.

## 347 **Decomposition results**

348 We use threefold Kitagawa-Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition to further quantify the  
349 contribution of individual and environmental variables to the racial gap in DNAm aging.  
350 Endowment terms quantify the contribution of different levels of the variables between groups  
351 and coefficient terms quantify the contribution of different relationships between the variables  
352 and DNAm aging between groups (Fig 2). Full results, including interaction terms, are shown in  
353 S7 Table. The negative endowment term of gender (GrimAge -0.08, 95% CI -0.12, -0.05; DPoAm  
354 -0.02, 95% CI -0.04, -0.01) indicates that if the gender balance were the same for both Black and  
355 White groups, the gap in DNAm aging would be larger. In this sample there are a greater  
356 portion of female Black participants (68%) than female White participants (57%), and female

357 gender is associated with decreased DNAm aging. If the Black sample were also 57% female,  
358 their average DNAm aging would be even higher and the racial disparity would be larger (27.4%  
359 larger for GrimAge and 6.8% for DPoAm).

360

361 **Fig 2. Threefold decomposition of individual and neighborhood contributions to racial**  
362 **disparity in DNAm aging.** Magnitude of the endowment and coefficient terms and 95%  
363 confidence intervals for GrimAge (A) and DPoAm (B) aging.

364

365 Differences in individual-level SES between racial groups contribute strongly to the race  
366 gap in DNAm aging. A positive coefficient term for some college for DPoAm (0.08, 95% CI 0.03,  
367 0.12) shows that the relationship between receiving this level of education and DNAm aging  
368 may be different for Black and White individuals. A significant positive endowment term for less  
369 than high school (GrimAge 0.03, 95% CI 0.02, 0.05; DPoAm 0.02, 95% CI 0.01, 0.04) shows that  
370 more Black than White individuals receiving less than a high school education contributes to  
371 the gap in DNAm aging (11.1% for GrimAge, 6.7% for DPoAm). Similarly, a positive endowment  
372 term for the lowest quartile of wealth/income (GrimAge 0.07, 95% CI 0.04, 0.09; DPoAm 0.05,  
373 95% CI 0.02, 0.08) shows that more Black individuals being at the lowest wealth/income level  
374 contributes to their higher levels of DNAm aging than White individuals (GrimAge 21.5%;  
375 DPoAm 14.4%).

376 The significant positive endowment term of SDI for GrimAge aging (0.06, 95% CI 0.02,  
377 0.11) supports the linear regression results. Greater levels of neighborhood socioeconomic  
378 deprivation for Black participants contributes to the disparity in GrimAge aging (21.1%). The

379 endowment term of SDI for DPoAm aging is positive but not statistically significant (0.02, 95% CI  
380 -0.03, 0.08). No other environmental exposures have significant endowment terms. The large  
381 coefficient term of PM2.5 for DPoAm aging (0.49, 95% CI -0.09, 1.07) is not statistically  
382 significant but is consistent with the interaction model result that there may be racial  
383 differences in risk from PM2.5 exposure which contribute to the disparity in DPoAm aging.

384

## 385 **Discussion**

386 We investigated how individual- and neighborhood-level social determinants of aging  
387 contribute to weathering, measured by GrimAge and Dunedin Pace of Aging methylation  
388 (DPoAm) aging. We found that, as expected based on the literature, Black participants had  
389 faster DNAm aging and greater disadvantage in individual socioeconomic status (SES),  
390 neighborhood deprivation, perceived neighborhood disorder, and air pollution exposure than  
391 White participants. Lower levels of education and wealth/income for Black participants  
392 contribute substantially to the disparities in both GrimAge and DPoAm aging but did not fully  
393 explain them. Higher levels of neighborhood disadvantage for Black participants further  
394 contribute to the disparity in GrimAge, while greater risk due to fine particulate matter (PM2.5)  
395 air pollution may contribute to the disparity in DPoAm. These findings suggest avenues for  
396 further research and action to advance progress toward eliminating racial disparities in aging.

397 While these results are largely consistent with previous literature, this work also  
398 presents novel findings. Work in social epigenetics has previously observed associations  
399 between DNAm aging with individual-level SES and neighborhood disadvantage, but to our  
400 knowledge this is the first study to quantify the contribution of these exposures to disparities in

401 DNAm aging [7,8,20,60,68]. Inequitable levels of education, income, and wealth are well  
402 established as drivers of racial disparities in health; our findings from regression and  
403 decomposition analyses reinforce this body of evidence by showing that racial disparities in the  
404 level of education and wealth/income are the largest contributors to the disparity in DNAm  
405 aging [44]. Inequitable distribution between the highest and lowest levels of education and  
406 wealth/income between Black and White participants explains up to 33% of the disparity in  
407 GrimAge aging and 21% of the disparity in DPoAm aging.

408         This work also builds on the growing literature showing that disparities in neighborhood  
409 deprivation also contribute to racial health disparities. Associations between both GrimAge and  
410 DPoAm aging and neighborhood deprivation have been found previously, however there have  
411 been mixed results on whether neighborhood deprivation has a significant independent effect  
412 after controlling for individual SES [7,8,20,68]. We find a significant independent association  
413 and quantify the contribution of neighborhood deprivation to the racial disparity in GrimAge  
414 (21%). Perceived social and physical disorder do not contribute significantly to DNAm aging  
415 disparities, reflecting the less consistent evidence of associations with health for subjective  
416 measures of the environment compared to objective measures [24]. More work is needed to  
417 determine whether other aspects of the neighborhood, such as the built environment or crime  
418 rates, contribute to racial disparities in aging and to ascertain the mechanisms by which  
419 neighborhood deprivation is associated with DNAm aging. Potential mediators include health  
420 behaviors, social networks, psychosocial wellbeing and stress.

421         Although associations have been found between air pollution and other epigenetic  
422 clocks and with DNAm in epigenome-wide association studies, this is the first study to our

423 knowledge to assess associations between air pollution and GrimAge and DPoAm aging [69–  
424 71]. We find that only Black participants have a significant association between PM2.5 and  
425 DPoAm aging. There are no significant associations for White participants, for GrimAge, nor for  
426 other air pollutants (nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) nor ozone). We expected that ozone would not be  
427 significantly associated with DNAm aging nor contribute to disparities given that ozone  
428 exposure is similar across racial groups (indeed slightly higher for White participants in our  
429 sample) and that there is little evidence of association between ozone and DNAm. In contrast,  
430 NO<sub>2</sub> exposure has a large racial disparity and is associated with DNAm and many health  
431 outcomes [38,39,45]. The null findings for NO<sub>2</sub> may be partly due to data limitations; the most  
432 recent year available is 2010, while data for PM2.5 and ozone are available from 2014. When  
433 we repeat the model with PM2.5 using 2010 exposure, there is no longer a significant  
434 interaction with race (S4 Table).

435 Higher risk of Alzheimer’s disease and mortality from the same measured PM2.5  
436 exposure for Black than for White Americans has previously been documented [52,54]. Our  
437 results suggest that Black adults’ risk may be higher for DPoAm aging as well and that  
438 individual- and neighborhood-level SES may play a role in this disparity. It remains unclear  
439 whether the increased risk is due to measurement error, where Black individuals have higher  
440 personal exposure levels than White individuals who live in a census tract with the same  
441 average PM2.5 level, or to factors that influence sensitivity to the effects of PM2.5 exposure.  
442 Social and structural determinants play a role in both levels of personal PM2.5 exposure and in  
443 the effect of PM2.5. For example, individual- and neighborhood-level SES may influence time  
444 spent outdoors, time spent outside one’s neighborhood, and levels of indoor air pollution. They



445 also contribute to psychosocial and physiological stress which could weaken one's defenses  
446 against PM2.5.

447         Results for GrimAge and DPoAm are largely consistent with some notable distinctions.  
448 While gender and education are significantly associated with and contribute to disparities in  
449 both measures, the strength and magnitude of these associations and contributions tend to be  
450 larger for GrimAge. While only GrimAge is significantly associated with neighborhood social  
451 deprivation, only DPoAm shows a difference in PM2.5 vulnerability. These differences indicate  
452 that the two measures of DNAm aging may capture slightly different underlying biological  
453 processes or aspects of aging. Smoking was included as a biomarker in the creation of GrimAge,  
454 so if tobacco smoking and PM2.5 influence DNAm at overlapping CpG sites the effect of PM2.5  
455 may be masked [17]. DPoAm was constructed using data from a birth cohort in Dunedin, New  
456 Zealand, at ages 26-38 while GrimAge used data from the Framingham Heart Study Offspring  
457 cohort which has a wider geographic and age range (average age approximately 70 years) [16].  
458 These different training sets may contribute to GrimAge being more sensitive to late-life social  
459 and environmental conditions. While both measures were trained on predominantly White  
460 cohorts and may measure biological aging less accurately in Black populations, the racial  
461 disparity remains after correcting for ancestry-informative principal components (S1 Table).

462         Our finding that women have decelerated DNAm aging compared to men is also  
463 consistent with previous literature [8,19,20,60]. It is unknown whether this effect is attributable  
464 to sex, gender, or a combination thereof given gaps in current measurement practices [11].  
465 Future research on the structural, social, and biological determinants of this sex/gender  
466 difference is needed. Research using an intersectional approach, which recognizes that multiply

467 marginalized groups such as Black women face unique structural and social conditions, is also  
468 needed.

469         These results benefit from several strengths and careful consideration of weaknesses.  
470 We use two complementary analytical approaches, regression and decomposition, and find  
471 generally consistent results. This study is well powered with a large sample and accounts for  
472 potential sampling bias by using population weights. Complete case analysis inherently adjusts  
473 for missingness but likely underestimates the racial disparity since participants excluded for  
474 missing data are more likely to be Black and have higher DNAm aging. Survival bias may also  
475 result in underestimation of the disparity in DNAm aging. There is potential for residual  
476 confounding and selection bias despite adjusting for demographics and individual SES. We are  
477 not able to adjust for length of tenure at participants' residential location. A sensitivity analysis  
478 excluding participants who changed location between 2010 and 2016 finds that the magnitude  
479 of the racial disparity was lower and the association between GrimAge and SDI is attenuated.  
480 There is also potential misclassification bias as an individual's exposure to neighborhood  
481 deprivation or air pollution may differ from the average level in their census tract. More  
482 granular geographic data may more accurately capture neighborhood exposures but is not  
483 available in this study.

484         A major limitation in this study and in the field is lack of longitudinal DNAm data.  
485 Availability of DNAm outcomes at only one time point precludes analysis of trajectories of  
486 biological aging and assessment of causality. There are also limited data sets that integrate data  
487 on social and environmental exposures with markers of biological aging, which limits the  
488 potential for cross-validation of results. It will be important for future studies to collect

489 longitudinal data to investigate whether change in exposures result in change to DNAm aging  
490 and which periods of the life course are most important for weathering. Data on a greater  
491 variety of social and structural determinants on the individual and geographic level will also be  
492 important to investigate which exposures are most important and which factors moderate  
493 susceptibility to exposures.

494         Disparities in DNAm aging mediate significant portions of the racial disparities in a  
495 variety of age-related health outcomes [5]. Eliminating disparities in biological aging, or  
496 weathering, would greatly reduce the persistent and pervasive disparities in health between  
497 aging Black and White Americans. It is crucial to identify the factors contributing to weathering  
498 and to take action to address them. This study and others suggest that eliminating the racial  
499 gaps in education, income, and wealth would go a long way toward alleviating weathering but  
500 are not sufficient to eliminate it [44]. Interventions on the neighborhood level are also needed,  
501 as is attention to differences in risk from pollutants between populations.

502

## 503 **Acknowledgements**

504 This work was supported by National Institutes of Health (R01-AG066152, R01-AG070885, P30-  
505 AG072979), Pennsylvania Department of Health (2019NF4100087335), and Penn Institute on  
506 Aging. The authors thank Drs. Sharon Xie, Shana Stites, Courtney Boen, and Ganga Bey for their  
507 feedback during analyses and drafting this manuscript. We used R packages emmeans()  
508 (version 1.8.0, <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/emmeans/>) and gtsummary (version  
509 1.6.1, <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/gtsummary/index.html>) to produce figures and  
510 tables for publication.

511

## 512 **References**

- 513 1. Hummer RA, Gutin I. Racial/Ethnic and Nativity Disparities in the Health of Older U.S. Men  
514 and Women. In: Hayward MD, Majmundar MK, editors. Future Directions for the  
515 Demography of Aging: Proceedings of a Workshop. Washington, D.C.: National Academies  
516 Press; 2018. pp. 31–66. doi:10.17226/25064
- 517 2. Geronimus AT, Hicken M, Keene D, Bound J. “Weathering” and Age Patterns of Allostatic  
518 Load Scores Among Blacks and Whites in the United States. *Am J Public Health*. 2006;96:  
519 826–833. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2004.060749
- 520 3. Ferraro KF, Kemp BR, Williams MM. Diverse Aging and Health Inequality by Race and  
521 Ethnicity. *Innov Aging*. 2017;1: 1–11. doi:10.1093/geroni/igx002
- 522 4. Forde AT, Crookes DM, Suglia SF, Demmer RT. The weathering hypothesis as an explanation  
523 for racial disparities in health: a systematic review. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2019;33: 1–18.  
524 doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2019.02.011
- 525 5. Graf GH, Crowe CL, Kothari M, Kwon D, Manly JJ, Turney IC, et al. Testing Black-White  
526 Disparities in Biological Aging Among Older Adults in the United States: Analysis of DNA-  
527 Methylation and Blood-Chemistry Methods. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2021;00: 1–13.  
528 doi:10.1093/aje/kwab281
- 529 6. Simons RL, Lei M-K, Beach SRH, Barr AB, Simons LG, Gibbons FX, et al. Discrimination,  
530 segregation, and chronic inflammation: Testing the weathering explanation for the poor  
531 health of Black Americans. *Dev Psychol*. 2018;54: 1993–2006. doi:10.1037/dev0000511

- 532 7. Simons RL, Lei M-K, Klopack E, Beach SRH, Gibbons FX, Philibert RA. The effects of social  
533 adversity, discrimination, and health risk behaviors on the accelerated aging of African  
534 Americans: Further support for the weathering hypothesis. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020 [cited 12  
535 May 2021]. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113169
- 536 8. Lei M-K, Berg MT, Simons RL, Beach SRH. Neighborhood structural disadvantage and  
537 biological aging in a sample of Black middle age and young adults. *Soc Sci Med*. 2022;293:  
538 114654. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114654
- 539 9. Mancilla VJ, Peeri NC, Silzer T, Basha R, Felini M, Jones HP, et al. Understanding the  
540 Interplay Between Health Disparities and Epigenomics. *Front Genet*. 2020;11.  
541 doi:10.3389/fgene.2020.00903
- 542 10. Shantz E, Elliott SJ. From social determinants to social epigenetics: Health geographies of  
543 chronic disease. *Health Place*. 2021;69: 102561. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2021.102561
- 544 11. Stites SD, Midgett S, Mechanic-Hamilton D, Zuelsdorff M, Glover CM, Marquez DX, et al.  
545 Establishing a Framework for Gathering Structural and Social Determinants of Health in  
546 Alzheimer’s Disease Research Centers. *The Gerontologist*. 2022;62: 694–703.  
547 doi:10.1093/geront/gnab182
- 548 12. Hillary RF, Stevenson AJ, McCartney DL, Campbell A, Walker RM, Howard DM, et al.  
549 Epigenetic measures of ageing predict the prevalence and incidence of leading causes of  
550 death and disease burden. *Clin Epigenetics*. 2020;12: 1–12. doi:10.1186/s13148-020-  
551 00905-6

- 552 13. Maddock J, Castillo-Fernandez J, Wong A, Cooper R, Richards M, Ong KK, et al. DNA  
553 Methylation Age and Physical and Cognitive Aging. *J Gerontol Ser A*. 2020;75: 504–511.  
554 doi:10.1093/gerona/glz246
- 555 14. Wang C, Ni W, Yao Y, Just A, Heiss J, Wei Y, et al. DNA methylation-based biomarkers of age  
556 acceleration and all-cause death, myocardial infarction, stroke, and cancer in two cohorts:  
557 The NAS, and KORA F4. *EBioMedicine*. 2021;63: 103151. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2020.103151
- 558 15. Verschoor CP, Lin DTS, Kobor MS, Mian O, Ma J, Pare G, et al. Epigenetic age is associated  
559 with baseline and 3-year change in frailty in the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging. *Clin*  
560 *Epigenetics*. 2021;13: 163. doi:10.1186/s13148-021-01150-1
- 561 16. Belsky DW, Caspi A, Arseneault L, Baccarelli A, Corcoran DL, Gao X, et al. Quantification of  
562 the pace of biological aging in humans through a blood test, the DunedinPoAm DNA  
563 methylation algorithm. Hagg S, Tyler JK, Hagg S, Justice J, Suderman M, editors. *eLife*.  
564 2020;9: e54870. doi:10.7554/eLife.54870
- 565 17. Lu AT, Quach A, Wilson JG, Reiner AP, Aviv A, Raj K, et al. DNA methylation GrimAge  
566 strongly predicts lifespan and healthspan. *Aging*. 2019;11: 303–327.  
567 doi:10.18632/aging.101684
- 568 18. Oblak L, van der Zaag J, Higgins-Chen AT, Levine ME, Boks MP. A systematic review of  
569 biological, social and environmental factors associated with epigenetic clock acceleration.  
570 *Ageing Res Rev*. 2021;69: 101348. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2021.101348
- 571 19. Avila JF, Turney IC, Esie P, Vonk JMJ, Weir VR, Belsky DW, et al. Socioeconomic Status,  
572 Biological Aging, and Memory in a Diverse National Sample of Older US Men and Women.  
573 2021 [cited 22 Jun 2021]. doi:10.1101/2021.06.04.21258370

- 574 20. Schmitz LL, Zhao W, Ratliff SM, Goodwin J, Miao J, Lu Q, et al. The Socioeconomic Gradient  
575 in Epigenetic Ageing Clocks: Evidence from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis and  
576 the Health and Retirement Study. *Epigenetics*. 2021; 1–23.  
577 doi:10.1080/15592294.2021.1939479
- 578 21. Arcaya M, Tucker-Seeley R, Kim R, Schnake-Mahl A, So M, Subramanian S. Research on  
579 Neighborhood Effects on Health in the United States: A Systematic Review of Study  
580 Characteristics. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 2016;168: 16–29. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.08.047
- 581 22. Clarke P, Morenoff J, Debbink M, Golberstein E, Elliott MR, Lantz PM. Cumulative Exposure  
582 to Neighborhood Context: Consequences for Health Transitions Over the Adult Life  
583 Course. *Res Aging*. 2014;36: 115–142. doi:10.1177/0164027512470702
- 584 23. Meijer M, Röhl J, Bloomfield K, Grittner U. Do neighborhoods affect individual mortality? A  
585 systematic review and meta-analysis of multilevel studies. *Soc Sci Med*. 2012;74: 1204–  
586 1212. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.11.034
- 587 24. Yen IH, Michael YL, Perdue L. Neighborhood Environment in Studies of Health of Older  
588 Adults. *Am J Prev Med*. 2009;37: 455–463. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.06.022
- 589 25. Weden MM, Carpiano RM, Robert SA. Subjective and objective neighborhood  
590 characteristics and adult health. *Soc Sci Med*. 2008;66: 1256–1270.  
591 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.11.041
- 592 26. Wight RG, Cummings JR, Miller-Martinez D, Karlamangla AS, Seeman TE, Aneshensel CS. A  
593 multilevel analysis of urban neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and health in late  
594 life. *Soc Sci Med*. 2008;66: 862–872. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.11.002

- 595 27. Powell-Wiley TM, Baumer Y, Baah FO, Baez AS, Farmer N, Mahlobo CT, et al. Social  
596 Determinants of Cardiovascular Disease. *Circ Res.* 2022;130: 782–799.  
597 doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.121.319811
- 598 28. Zhao Y-L, Qu Y, Ou Y-N, Zhang Y-R, Tan L, Yu J-T. Environmental factors and risks of cognitive  
599 impairment and dementia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ageing Res Rev.*  
600 2021;72: 101504. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2021.101504
- 601 29. Besser LM, McDonald NC, Song Y, Kukull WA, Rodriguez DA. Neighborhood Environment  
602 and Cognition in Older Adults: A Systematic Review. *Am J Prev Med.* 2017;53: 241–251.  
603 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2017.02.013
- 604 30. Wu Y-T, Prina AM, Brayne C. The association between community environment and  
605 cognitive function: a systematic review. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* 2015;50: 351–  
606 362. doi:10.1007/s00127-014-0945-6
- 607 31. Kim ES, Chen Y, Kawachi I, VanderWeele TJ. Perceived neighborhood social cohesion and  
608 subsequent health and well-being in older adults: An outcome-wide longitudinal  
609 approach. *Health Place.* 2020;66: 102420. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102420
- 610 32. Millar RJ. Neighborhood Cohesion, Disorder, and Physical Function in Older Adults: An  
611 Examination of Racial/Ethnic Differences. *J Aging Health.* 2020;32: 1133–1144.  
612 doi:10.1177/0898264319890944
- 613 33. Duchowny KA, Glymour MM, Cawthon PM. Is perceived neighbourhood physical disorder  
614 associated with muscle strength in middle aged and older men and women? Findings from  
615 the US health and retirement study. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2020;74: 240–247.  
616 doi:10.1136/jech-2019-213192



- 617 34. Nguyen TT, Rist PM, Glymour MM. Are self-reported neighbourhood characteristics  
618 associated with onset of functional limitations in older adults with or without memory  
619 impairment? *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2016;70: 1017–1023. doi:10.1136/jech-2016-  
620 207241
- 621 35. Wong R, Wang Y. Role of Neighborhood Physical Disorder and Social Cohesion on Racial and  
622 Ethnic Disparities in Dementia Risk. *J Aging Health*. 2022;0: 1–10.  
623 doi:10.1177/08982643221101352
- 624 36. Landrigan PJ, Fuller R, Acosta NJR, Adeyi O, Arnold R, Basu N (Nil), et al. The Lancet  
625 Commission on pollution and health. *The Lancet*. 2018;391: 462–512. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
626 6736(17)32345-0
- 627 37. Konduracka E, Rostoff P. Links between chronic exposure to outdoor air pollution and  
628 cardiovascular diseases: a review. *Environ Chem Lett*. 2022; 1–18. doi:10.1007/s10311-  
629 022-01450-9
- 630 38. Simoni M, Baldacci S, Maio S, Cerrai S, Sarno G, Viegi G. Adverse effects of outdoor  
631 pollution in the elderly. *J Thorac Dis*. 2015;7: 34–45. doi:10.3978/j.issn.2072-  
632 1439.2014.12.10
- 633 39. Huangfu P, Atkinson R. Long-term exposure to NO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> and all-cause and respiratory  
634 mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ Int*. 2020;144: 105998.  
635 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.105998
- 636 40. Shi L, Steenland K, Li H, Liu P, Zhang Y, Lyles RH, et al. A national cohort study (2000-2018)  
637 of long-term air pollution exposure and incident dementia in older adults in the United  
638 States. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12: 6754. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-27049-2

- 639 41. Williams DR, Collins C. Racial residential segregation: a fundamental cause of racial  
640 disparities in health. *Public Health Rep.* 2001;116: 404–416.
- 641 42. Gee GC, Payne-Sturges DC. Environmental Health Disparities: A Framework Integrating  
642 Psychosocial and Environmental Concepts. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2004;112: 1645–1653.  
643 doi:10.1289/ehp.7074
- 644 43. Roux AVD, Mair C. Neighborhoods and health. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2010;1186: 125–145.  
645 doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.05333.x
- 646 44. Williams DR, Mohammed SA, Leavell J, Collins C. Race, socioeconomic status, and health:  
647 Complexities, ongoing challenges, and research opportunities. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.*  
648 2010;1186: 69–101. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.05339.x
- 649 45. Liu J, Clark LP, Bechle MJ, Hajat A, Kim S-Y, Robinson AL, et al. Disparities in Air Pollution  
650 Exposure in the United States by Race/Ethnicity and Income, 1990–2010. *Environ Health*  
651 *Perspect.* 2021;129: 127005. doi:10.1289/EHP8584
- 652 46. Ailshire J, García C. Unequal Places: The Impacts of Socioeconomic and Race/Ethnic  
653 Differences in Neighborhoods. *Generations.* 2018;42: 20–27.
- 654 47. Jones MR, Diez-Roux AV, Hajat A, Kershaw KN, O’Neill MS, Guallar E, et al. Race/Ethnicity,  
655 Residential Segregation, and Exposure to Ambient Air Pollution: The Multi-Ethnic Study of  
656 Atherosclerosis (MESA). *Am J Public Health.* 2014;104: 2130–2137.  
657 doi:10.2105/AJPH.2014.302135
- 658 48. Tung EL, Peek ME, Rivas MA, Yang JP, Volerman A. Association Of Neighborhood  
659 Disadvantage With Racial Disparities In COVID-19 Positivity In Chicago: Study examines the

660 association of neighborhood disadvantage with racial disparities in COVID-19 positivity in  
661 Chicago. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2021;40: 1784–1791. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2021.00695

662 49. Cagney KA, Browning CR, Wen M. Racial Disparities in Self-Rated Health at Older Ages:  
663 What Difference Does the Neighborhood Make? *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2005;60:  
664 S181–S190. doi:10.1093/geronb/60.4.S181

665 50. Mujahid MS, Roux AVD, Cooper RC, Shea S, Williams DR. Neighborhood Stressors and  
666 Race/Ethnic Differences in Hypertension Prevalence (The Multi-Ethnic Study of  
667 Atherosclerosis). *Am J Hypertens*. 2011;24: 187–193. doi:10.1038/ajh.2010.200

668 51. Song L, Smith GS, Adar SD, Post WS, Guallar E, Navas-Acien A, et al. Ambient air pollution as  
669 a mediator in the pathway linking race/ethnicity to blood pressure elevation: The multi-  
670 ethnic study of atherosclerosis (MESA). *Environ Res*. 2020;180: 108776.  
671 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2019.108776

672 52. Younan D, Wang X, Gruenewald T, Gatz M, Serre ML, Vizuete W, et al. Racial/Ethnic  
673 Disparities in Alzheimer’s Disease Risk: Role of Exposure to Ambient Fine Particles.  
674 Newman AB, editor. *J Gerontol Ser A*. 2021;77: 977–985. doi:10.1093/gerona/glab231

675 53. Marwah H, Rosseau N, Mangipudi S, Ward C, Keswani A. Investigating air pollution as a  
676 contributor to health disparities during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Ann*  
677 *Allergy Asthma Immunol*. 2021;127: 269–271. doi:10.1016/j.anai.2021.04.030

678 54. Di Q, Wang Y, Zanobetti A, Wang Y, Koutrakis P, Choirat C, et al. Air Pollution and Mortality  
679 in the Medicare Population. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;376: 2513–2522.  
680 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1702747

- 681 55. Sonnegga A, Faul JD, Ofstedal MB, Langa KM, Phillips JW, Weir DR. Cohort Profile: the Health  
682 and Retirement Study (HRS). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2014;43: 576–585. doi:10.1093/ije/dyu067
- 683 56. Eileen Crimmins, Kim, Jung Ki, Jonah F, Faul J. HRS Epigenetic Clocks. Ann Arbor, Michigan:  
684 University of Michigan Survey Research Center; 2020 Sep. Available:  
685 <https://hrsdata.isr.umich.edu/data-products/epigenetic-clocks>
- 686 57. Smith J, Ryan L, Fisher GG, Sonnegga A, Weir D. Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire.  
687 Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Survey Research Center; 2017 Jul p. 72.  
688 Available: [https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/biblio/HRS%202006-](https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/biblio/HRS%202006-2016%20SAQ%20Documentation_07.06.17_0.pdf)  
689 [2016%20SAQ%20Documentation\\_07.06.17\\_0.pdf](https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/biblio/HRS%202006-2016%20SAQ%20Documentation_07.06.17_0.pdf)
- 690 58. Available Restricted Data Products | Health and Retirement Study. [cited 17 Sep 2021].  
691 Available: <https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/data-products/restricted-data/available-products>
- 692 59. Ailshire JA. Health and Retirement Study—Contextual Data Resource (HRS–CDR). PAA;  
693 2017. Available: <https://paa.confex.com/paa/2017/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/16846>
- 694 60. Crimmins EM, Thyagarajan B, Levine ME, Weir DR, Faul J. Associations of Age, Sex,  
695 Race/Ethnicity, and Education With 13 Epigenetic Clocks in a Nationally Representative  
696 U.S. Sample: The Health and Retirement Study. *J Gerontol Ser A.* 2021; 1–7.  
697 doi:10.1093/gerona/glab016
- 698 61. Social Deprivation Index (SDI). [cited 17 Sep 2021]. Available: [https://www.graham-](https://www.graham-center.org/rgc/maps-data-tools/sdi/social-deprivation-index.html)  
699 [center.org/rgc/maps-data-tools/sdi/social-deprivation-index.html](https://www.graham-center.org/rgc/maps-data-tools/sdi/social-deprivation-index.html)
- 700 62. Butler DC, Petterson S, Phillips RL, Bazemore AW. Measures of Social Deprivation That  
701 Predict Health Care Access and Need within a Rational Area of Primary Care Service  
702 Delivery. *Health Serv Res.* 2013;48: 539–559. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2012.01449.x

- 703 63. Price AL, Patterson NJ, Plenge RM, Weinblatt ME, Shadick NA, Reich D. Principal  
704 components analysis corrects for stratification in genome-wide association studies. *Nat*  
705 *Genet.* 2006;38: 904–909. doi:10.1038/ng1847
- 706 64. Ware EB, Schmitz LL, Faul J. HRS Polygenic Scores: 2006-2010 Genetic Data. Ann Arbor,  
707 Michigan: University of Michigan Survey Research Center; 2017 Jun. Available:  
708 [https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/biblio/PGENSCORES\\_0.pdf](https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/biblio/PGENSCORES_0.pdf)
- 709 65. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R  
710 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021. Available: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 711 66. Hlavac M. oaxaca: Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition in R. SSRN Electron J. 2014 [cited 15 Feb  
712 2022]. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2528391
- 713 67. Hlavac M. oaxaca: Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition in R. 2022. Available: [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=oaxaca)  
714 [project.org/package=oaxaca](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=oaxaca)
- 715 68. Lawrence KG, Kresovich JK, O'Brien KM, Hoang TT, Xu Z, Taylor JA, et al. Association of  
716 Neighborhood Deprivation With Epigenetic Aging Using 4 Clock Metrics. *JAMA Netw Open.*  
717 2020;3. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.24329
- 718 69. Wu Y, Qie R, Cheng M, Zeng Y, Huang S, Guo C, et al. Air pollution and DNA methylation in  
719 adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Environ Pollut.*  
720 2021;284: 117152. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2021.117152
- 721 70. Rider CF, Carlsten C. Air pollution and DNA methylation: effects of exposure in humans. *Clin*  
722 *Epigenetics.* 2019;11. doi:10.1186/s13148-019-0713-2

723 71. Alfano R, Herceg Z, Nawrot TS, Chadeau-Hyam M, Ghantous A, Plusquin M. The Impact of  
724 Air Pollution on Our Epigenome: How Far Is the Evidence? (A Systematic Review). Curr  
725 Environ Health Rep. 2018;5: 544–578. doi:10.1007/s40572-018-0218-8

726

## 727 **Supporting Information**

728 **S1 Table. Racial disparity in DNAm aging with weights or ancestry-informative principal**  
729 **components.** Mean DNAm aging is shown in unscaled units.

730

731 **S2 Table. GrimAge aging: Multivariable regression models excluding individuals who moved**  
732 **2010-2016.** Results of linear regression models with GrimAge aging as the outcome excluding  
733 667 participants whose residential census tract changed.

734

735 **S3 Table. DPoAm aging: Multivariable regression models excluding individuals who moved**  
736 **2010-2016.** Results of linear regression models with DPoAm aging as the outcome excluding  
737 667 participants whose residential census tract changed.

738

739 **S4 Table. DPoAm aging: Interactions between neighborhood exposures and race.** Results of  
740 linear regression models with DPoAm aging as the outcome.

741





742 **S5 Table. GrimAge aging: Interactions between neighborhood exposures and race.** Results of  
743 linear regression models with GrimAge aging as the outcome.

744

745 **S6 Table. DPoAm aging: Interactions between neighborhood and social determinants and**  
746 **PM2.5 pollution exposure.** Results of linear regression models with DPoAm aging as the  
747 outcome.



748

749 **S7 Table. Threefold decomposition of individual and neighborhood contributions to racial**  
750 **disparity in DNAm aging.** Full results of decomposition for GrimAge and DPoAm.





## A: GrimAge



## B: DPoAm

