Wildland Fire-Related Smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and Cardiovascular Disease ED Visits in the Western United States

Linzi Li, MPH, MSPH[1], Wenhao Wang, MPH[2], Howard H. Chang, PhD[3], Alvaro Alonso, MD, PhD[1], Yang Liu, PhD[2]

1. Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University
2. Gangarosa Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University
3. Department of Biostatistics, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University

Abstract

Background

The impact of short-term exposure to fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) due to wildland fire smoke on the risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD) remains unclear. We investigated the association between short-term exposure to wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and Emergency Department (ED) visits for acute CVD in the Western United States from 2007 to 2018.

Methods

ED visits for primary or secondary diagnoses of atrial fibrillation (AF), acute myocardial infarction (AMI), heart failure (HF), stroke, and total CVD were obtained from hospital associations or state health departments in California, Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, and Utah. ED visits included those that were subsequently hospitalized. Daily smoke, non-smoke, and total $PM_{2.5}$ were estimated using a satellite-driven multi-stage model with a high resolution of 1 km. The data were aggregated to the zip code level and a case-crossover study design was employed. Temperature, relative humidity, and day of the year were included as covariates.

Results

We analyzed 49,759,958 ED visits for primary or secondary CVD diagnoses, which included 6,808,839 (13.7%) AFs, 1,222,053 (2.5%) AMIs, 7,194,474 (14.5%) HFs, and 808,396 (1.6%) strokes. Over the study period from 2007-01-01 to 2018-12-31, the mean smoke $PM_{2.5}$ was 1.27 (Q1: 0, Q3: 1.29) $\mu g/m^3$. A 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increase in smoke $PM_{2.5}$ was associated with a minuscule decreased risk for AF (OR 0.994, 95% CI 0.991-0.997), HF (OR 0.995, 95% CI 0.992-0.998), and CVD (OR 0.9997, 95% CI 0.996-0.998), but not for AMI and stroke. Adjusting for non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$ did not alter these associations. A 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increase in total $PM_{2.5}$ was linked to a small increased risk for all outcomes except stroke (OR for CVD 1.006, 95% CI 1.006-1.007). Associations were similar across sex and age groups.

Conclusion

We identified an unexpected slight lower risk of CVD ED visits associated with short-term wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ exposure. Whether these findings are due to methodological issues, behavioral changes, or other factors requires further investigation.

Background

The surge in wildfire occurrences globally in recent decades has raised alarms about the role of climate change.[1] The repercussions of climate change include exacerbating fire frequency and endangering human livelihoods, ecosystems, and public health.[1-3] Coupled with warming and drought climatic conditions, severe fire events can catalyze vegetation changes, implicating rapid ecosystem shifts and reductions in valued resources.[1,4,5] In the United States, the wildfire-burned area has increased approximately fourfold over the past four decades, and the trend is expected to continue as a result of climate warming, earlier spring, and other factors.[6] The western US, an area prone to wildfire disasters, often faces consecutive years marked by both drought and heightened fire weather.[7] Since 1986, the frequency of large wildfires and the area burned in the western US have been observed to be four and six and a half times the average level between 1970 and 1986.[6] Smoke from wildfires significantly contributes to fine particulate matter in the atmosphere, a form of air pollution consisting of particles with a diameter of less than 2.5 micrometers ($PM_{2.5}$).[8,9] The contribution of wildfire smoke to $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations across the US has increased since the mid-2000s, now representing up to half of the total $PM_{2.5}$ in western regions, a stark increase from less than 20% around 2015.[6,10] Additionally, smoke influences the trends in extreme $PM_{2.5}$ days in western and mid-western states. Evidence shows that since 2012, the rise in the number of days above 35 $\mu g/m^3$ of $PM_{2.5}$ would have been lower without wildfire smoke, and the days surpassing 35 $\mu g/m^3$ of $PM_{2.5}$ would not have exceeded the threshold absent wildfire smoke on that day.[11]

Long-term exposure to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ is linked with several adverse cardiometabolic health outcomes and cardiopulmonary disease, including increased blood glucose, endothelial dysfunction, incident cardiovascular disease (CVD) events, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, pneumonia, and all-cause mortality.[12-14] Recognized as a substantial contributor to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ levels, wildfire smoke has been identified as a potential environmental risk factor for CVD, which includes a range of heart and blood vessel disorders and stroke.[9,15-18] Between 2017 and 2020, nearly 10% of US adults, totaling 28.6 million individuals, experienced some form of CVD, including coronary artery disease (CAD), heart failure (HF), stroke.[19] Moreover, CVD complications significantly compound the burden for both individuals and the healthcare system worldwide. CVD can exacerbate or increase the risk of other chronic conditions, such as

diabetes, kidney disease, and functional decline, further impairing the quality of life and potentially leading to early death.[19] Globally, CVD is the primary cause of death, responsible for 19.9 million (95% UI 18.4, 21.2) deaths in 2021 with 13.3% of these CV deaths attributable to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ exposure.[20,21] In the US, among the Medicare enrollees, exposure to a 12-month chronic $PM_{2.5}$ was associated with 1.56-fold (95% CI 1.55, 1.57) increase in CV mortality.[13]

Previous literature has documented the potential pathophysiologic mechanisms through which wildfire smoke can contribute to CVD. Inhaled PM that accumulates in the alveoli may be a trigger of a series of adverse reactions that lead to CVDs, including inflammation, oxidative stress, thrombosis and coagulation, and vascular dysfunction.[22-24] Individual susceptibility conditions and concomitant existing air co-pollutants, such as preexisting CAD and ozone could worsen these effects.[22,25] Numerous epidemiological studies have investigated the cardiovascular effects of wildfire smoke. However, the transient nature of wildfire events introduces challenges in defining the exposure time window and ensuring consistency in the measurement of PM during wildfire events. There are discrepancies in whether the acute PM exposure should be based on 3-day averages or one-hour daily peak averages, and whether chronic PM exposure should be quantified using annual averages or extreme daily wildfire PM. Although certain past studies have indicated that wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ increased CVD morbidity and mortality, these associations have not been consistent across regions, populations, and periods, partially due to different wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ concentration measures.[26,27] Measuring smoke $PM_{2.5}$ have challenges, including limited spatial monitoring coverage, Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) data availability, model performance in extreme concentrations, temporal and spatial variability and etc. In a global time series study in 749 locations, short-term wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ did not have a substantial impact on CV mortality in the US (RR 1.014, 95% CI 0.998, 1.031), while wildfire-related $PM_{2.5}$ was associated with a higher risk of CV mortality in the pooled result of all the areas.[28]

Therefore, we aim to add to the evidence by exploring the association between exposure to short-term wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ exposure and emergency department (ED) visits for CVD in the western United States from 2007 to 2018, using satellite-driven exposure measures.

Methods

Emergency department visit data

ED visits for CVDs in five western US states were obtained from hospital associations or state health departments. The states and corresponding data ranges are: California (2007-2018), Arizona (2010-2018), Nevada (2009-2016), Oregon (2014-2018), and Utah (2007-2016). An ED visit was classified as either outpatient or inpatient care directly from the ED. The ED visit record contains service date, age in years, sex, race, zip code, and International Classification of Diseases (ICD) diagnosis codes. Visits before October 1, 2015 used ICD 9th version (ICD-9) and visits afterward used ICD 10th version (ICD-10). The CVDs of interest in this study were acute myocardial infarction (AMI), stroke, HF, atrial fibrillation (AF), and total CVD that was defined as total circulatory disease. We included both the primary and secondary diagnoses of CVDs. The ICD codes used for identification were AMI (ICD-9:410; ICD-10: I21, I22), stroke (ICD-9: 430, 431, 434, 436; ICD-10: I60, I61, I62), HF (ICD-9: 428; ICD-10: I50), AF (ICD-9: 427.3x; ICD-10: I48), and total circulatory diseases (ICD-9: 390-459; ICD-10: I00-I99). This study received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Emory University (STUDY00004823), which also granted an exemption from informed consent requirements due to the impracticability of obtaining consent from each individual patient and the minimal risk associated with the study.

Exposure measures

Daily wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ was estimated using a multi-stage, chemical transport modeling-based framework at a high spatial resolution of 1 km. This model incorporates advanced air quality $PM_{2.5}$ simulations, various satellite remote sensing products, meteorological analyses, land use information, and comprehensive ground-level observations. The total $PM_{2.5}$ model was developed using data from areas impacted by wildfire smoke, while the background $PM_{2.5}$ model was based on data from areas without wildfire smoke. Both models were applied to predict $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations in various scenarios. The difference between total $PM_{2.5}$ and background $PM_{2.5}$ was calculated to isolate the $PM_{2.5}$ contribution from wildfire smoke. Detailed modeling system information has been published elsewhere.[29] The wildfire smoke, total, and non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$ data were further aggregated to the patients' zip code level of each day. For all ED records in Nevada, the aggregation was performed by matching the first four digits of the zip codes due to

the unavailability of the full zip codes in this state. Additionally, the contribution of smoke $PM_{2.5}$ to total $PM_{2.5}$ were modeled in sensitivity analysis.

Covariates

In this study, relative humidity, average temperature, and day of the year were accounted for as confounding variables. Daily average temperature was calculated by averaging the minimum and maximum temperatures, and daily relative humidity was estimated using the Magnus formula.[30] Daymet data on daily minimum and maximum temperatures in degrees Celsius and vapor pressure in pascals, with a resolution of 1 km from 2007 to 2018, were sourced from the Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center for Biogeochemical Dynamics.[31] The Daymet meteorological data were also aggregated to each patient's zip code level each day.

Statistical analysis

We used a case-crossover study design to investigate the associations between short-term smoke $PM_{2.5}$ exposure and ED visits for CVD in the Western United States.[32] The time-stratified approach was used in the control selection— each ED visit (case) was matched with up to 4 non-event days based on the day of the week in the same calendar month.[33,34] Because the selection of possible control dates that form a stratum do not depend on the event date, the time-stratified approach is not subject to bias resulting from the time trend.[34] Additionally, stable characteristics at the individual level (e.g., sex, age, socioeconomic status) are automatically controlled for in the control selection phase. We then performed conditional logistic regression to estimate the associations between smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ with CVD ED visits. We adjusted for non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$ in the model examining the effect of smoke $PM_{2.5}$ because wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ can interact with ambient air pollutants. The model specifications are shown below:

$$logit(P_{ED}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 smoke\ PM_{2.5} + ns(RH) + ns(temp) + ns(doy)$$

$$logit(P_{ED}) = \beta_0 + \beta_{1a} smoke\ PM_{2.5} + \beta_{1b} non_smoke\ PM_{2.5} + ns(RH) + ns(temp) + ns(doy)$$

$$logit(P_{ED}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 total\ PM_{2.5} + ns(RH) + ns(temp) + ns(doy)$$

P_{ED} represents the probability of occurrence of the ED visits for CVD events. For the primary analyses, the outcomes were any primary and secondary diagnosis of the ED visits for CVD events. Relative humidity (RH), average temperature (temp), and day of the year (doy) were modeled using natural splines (ns). The degrees of freedom for the ns function were 3. For wildfire smoke, non-smoke, and total $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and covariates, we used 1-, 2-, and 3-day averages leading up to and including the day of the ED visit. For sensitivity analysis, we conducted the following: 1) stratified the study population by sex (male and female) and age (<65 years and ≥65 years); 2) examined the effect of the ratio of $\frac{smoke\ PM_{2.5}}{total\ PM_{2.5}}$ and tested an interaction between the ratio and total $PM_{2.5}$ as following:

$$logit(P_{ED}) = \beta_0 + \beta_{1a}\frac{smoke\ PM_{2.5}}{total\ PM_{2.5}} + ns(RH) + ns(temp) + ns(doy) + \beta_{1b}\frac{smoke\ PM_{2.5}}{total\ PM_{2.5}} * total\ PM_{2.5}$$

; 3) estimate the associations between smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ with primary CVD ED visits. Odds ratios (ORs) and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) were reported. All the analyses were conducted in R 4.2.2 (2022-10-31; available at: https://cran.r-project.org/bin/windows/base/old/4.2.2/).

Results

In total, 49,759,958 ED visits with a primary or secondary CVD diagnosis were available. Among those, 6,808,839 (14%) were visits for AFs, 1,222,053 (2%) were visits for AMIs, 7,194,474 (14%) were visits for HFs, and 808,396 (2%) were visits for strokes. The average age at the time of the visit was 64 (standard deviation 17.4) years, and 61% of the patients were female. Table 1 shows the characteristics of those who were included in this study with ED visits for primary or secondary diagnoses of CVD. Over the study period from 2007-01-01 to 2018-12-31, the average wildfire smoke, non-smoke, and total $PM_{2.5}$ were 1.11 (IQR 1.29) μg/m^3, 7.64 (IQR 5.15) μg/m^3, and 8.77 (IQR 5.77) μg/m^3, respectively. The distributions of smoke $PM_{2.5}$, total $PM_{2.5}$, non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$, and the ratio of smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ over the study period are shown in Figure 1.

Wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and CVD ED visits in the Western US

During the study period, 10 μg/m^3 higher smoke $PM_{2.5}$ on the day of the ED visit was associated with a small decrease in the risk of ED visits for AF (OR 0.994, 95% CI 0.991, 0.997), HF (OR 0.995, 95% CI 0.992, 0.998), and CVD (OR 0.997, 95% CI 0.996, 0.998). However, there was no association observed with AMI and stroke. The same results were found between 2-day and 3-day moving average smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and each outcome (Table 2). Further adjusting for non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$ in the model did not change the associations substantively for all CV outcomes. Total $PM_{2.5}$ increased the risk of ED visits for CVDs. A 10 μg/m^3 higher total $PM_{2.5}$ on the day was associated with a slightly increased risk of ED visits for AF (OR 1.005, 95% CI 1.004, 1.007), AMI (OR 1.010, 95% CI 1.006, 1.015), HF (OR 1.008, 95% CI 1.006, 1.010), and CVD (OR 1.006, 95% CI 1.006, 1.007), but not for stroke (OR 1.001, 95% CI 0.994, 1.007). The 2-day and 3-day moving average total $PM_{2.5}$ showed similar effects on all CV outcomes (Table 2).

Stratified analysis

The analysis stratified by age (<65 and ≥ 65 years) provided similar results to the main analysis. In both age groups, an increased 1-, 2-, and 3-day smoke resulted in a slight decrease in the risk or no risk change of all CV outcomes. Adjusting for non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$ in addition did not change the results significantly. Higher 1-, 2-, and 3-day total $PM_{2.5}$ were associated with higher risks of ED visits for all CV outcomes (Supplemental Table 1). Sex minimally modified the association between smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and HF, but not for AF, AMI, stroke, and CVD. Similar to the results in the total population, higher total $PM_{2.5}$ was associated with a marginally elevated risk of ED visits for all CV outcomes except stroke among both males and females (Supplemental Table 2).

The ratio of smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ with CVD ED visits

In the model where the ratio of smoke $PM_{2.5}$ to total $PM_{2.5}$ was modeled as a continuous variable, a 10% increase in the ratio was related to a slightly lower risk of ED visits for AF (1-day OR:0.998, 95% CI 0.997, 0.9997), HF (1-day OR: 0.997, 95% CI 0.996, 0.998), and CVD (1-day OR: 0.999, 95% CI 0.998, 0.999). No significant association was found between the ratio and the risk of ED visits for AMI and stroke. The quartiles of the ratio did not show a remarkable effect on any of the outcomes consistently across models using different days of exposure (Supplemental Table 3).

Wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and primary CVD ED visits

A 10 μg/m^3 higher smoke $PM_{2.5}$ in the model of 1-, 2-, and 3-day was associated with slightly lower risks of HF and total CVD, but not with the risks of AF, AMI, and stroke consistently. Further adjusting for non-smoke did not modify the results. Total $PM_{2.5}$ showed an effect on increasing the risk of all the primary CV endpoints, and the results were only significant for total CVD (Supplemental Table 4).

Discussion

This study explored the association between short-term $PM_{2.5}$ from wildland fires and ED visits for CVDs in five states in the Western US from 2007 to 2018. With a large sample size of over 49 million, we were able to detect very small effect sizes. Consistent with prior research, total $PM_{2.5}$ was associated with an increased risk of ED visits for CVD.[13,35] Unexpectedly, though, we found small, but statistically significant, reductions in risk of ED visits for CVD associated with higher exposure to smoke $PM_{2.5}$. The results were not substantially different across different sex and age (<65 and ≥ 65 years) groups.

Current evidence from epidemiological or environmental exposure studies regarding the links between short-term smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and CVDs is inconsistent, but in general does not support increased risk of CVD with greater short-term exposure to smoke $PM_{2.5}$. A recent review of the impact of wildfires on CV health highlighted that the existing evidence linking CVD with $PM_{2.5}$ and other air pollutants is mixed.[36] In a US study from 2008 to 2010, increases in $PM_{2.5}$ in days with wildfire smoke exposure (smoke days) were similarly associated with all-cause cardiovascular hospitalizations as similar increases in non-wildfire smoke days.[37] A similar study in Colorado reported null results regarding the link between smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and any CVD (OR: 0.998, 95% CI 0.984, 1.011) or specific types of CVD including AMI, HF, dysrhythmia, ischemic heart disease and peripheral or cerebrovascular disease, with small effect sizes.[27] In a study investigating source-apportioned $PM_{2.5}$ and ED visits for CVD in Atlanta, US, biomass burning $PM_{2.5}$ with lag 0 did not present a significant effect on the risk of CVD ED visits; total ambient $PM_{2.5}$ with lag 0 was not associated with most CV outcomes except for ischemic stroke.[38] During the wildfire period in Canada, no increased risk of physician visits for CVD was observed related to an elevated 2-day $PM_{2.5}$, but in the post-wildfire period, an increased risk of

physician visits for HF (11%, 95% CI 3%-21%) and ischemic heart disease (19%, 95% CI 7%-33%) among seniors was found.[39] It has been reported that the wildfire-related $PM_{2.5}$ in California from 2015 to 2017 was unfavorably associated with a higher risk of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest across multiple lag days (2 day OR: 1.7, 95% CI 1.18, 2.13).[40] A study in 204 US counties found short-term exposure to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ to be associated with an increased risk of CVD hospital admission rates without statistical significance.[41] However, the measurements of $PM_{2.5}$ were in three density categories, which reduced statistical power and precision. It is important to note that the cardiovascular associations with $PM_{2.5}$ vary depending on the duration of exposure (short-term vs. long-term), the source of $PM_{2.5}$, and the air pollution regulations in the area where $PM_{2.5}$ levels are high. Furthermore, different study designs, air quality measurements and monitoring, lack of long-term follow-up, and neglect of gaseous species and other hazardous pollutants also contribute to the controversial findings between smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and CVD ED visits.

Several factors may explain the lack of increased CVD risk associated with short-term exposure to smoke $PM_{2.5}$. First, the impact of smoke $PM_{2.5}$ within a short window of exposure might be too subtle to affect acute ED visits for CVD compared to ambient $PM_{2.5}$. While fire smoke is becoming a major contributor of $PM_{2.5}$ pollution in the US, the estimated contribution was up to 25% of total $PM_{2.5}$ in the contiguous US,[11] and the long-term effect of wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ on CVD might be limited compared with ambient $PM_{2.5}$.[42] Smoke plumes are often localized and episodic, causing significant variations in $PM_{2.5}$ levels in short durations, while non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$ is more widespread and persistent. The stable temporal and spatial patterns of non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$ might have led to a broader and consistent population impact on CVD risk. In the case that the short-term total $PM_{2.5}$ serves as a proxy for long-term exposure, the observed impact of total $PM_{2.5}$ may be attributed to prolonged exposure. Moreover, the progression of each type of CVD is complex and multifactorial. The precipitating conditions involved in the hypothesized mechanisms of CVD may require a long time to develop, such as arterial occlusion and ischemic necrosis for AMI and stroke,[43] left ventricular diastolic or systolic dysfunction for HF,[44] and vulnerable atrial structural and functional substrates for AF.[45] The risk of acute CVD attributable to several days of exposure to wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ may be diminutive compared to other well-established risk factors. Second, public health advisories and regulations during wildfire seasons and events, and awareness of susceptibility to air pollution may mitigate the adverse health

effects of smoke $PM_{2.5}$, as people might stay indoors or seek shelter during wildfires, thereby reducing their true exposure to high levels of smoke $PM_{2.5}$. Moreover, the pattern of behavior change might be different among younger and older adults.[46] Third, although the case-crossover study design can naturally control for confounding by non-time-dependent factors, time-varying factors and other behaviors subject to change might still confound the associations. For example, some people might stop engaging in outdoor physical activities and stay indoor during the wildfire episode. Changes in behavioral risk factors in days with high smoke $PM_{2.5}$ could even explain the small, but significant, reduction in CVD risk with higher short-term smoke $PM_{2.5}$ exposure. Fourth, the presence of other air pollutants, such as CO, SO_2, and O_3, due to wildfires may contribute to the risk of acute CVD, but these were not fully accounted for in this study.

This study has several strengths. This study included a large number of ED visits for CV outcomes across five US states over 12 years, enabling us to detect the small effect of wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$. Additionally, the exposure was measured using a high-performance satellite-driven approach with high spatial resolution, offering complete coverage and greater accuracy than monitor-based data. However, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, ED visit data only capture acute CVD events. CVD events requiring long-term medical attention were not included. Second, the exposure and ED visit data were at the zip code level. Misclassification of the patient's true residential zip code and mismeasurement of the smoke $PM_{2.5}$ exposure may lead to information bias. Third, as mentioned above, residual time-dependent confounding was possible due to the case-crossover study design and unmeasured air pollutants.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study examined the relationship between short-term wildfire $PM_{2.5}$ exposure and ED visits for CVD across five Western US states from 2007 to 2018. Although we found statistical significance between smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ with ED visits for some CV outcomes and total CVD, the effect sizes were small and their public health and clinical significance remains uncertain. Further studies with more advanced study designs and more accurate study measures are warranted to investigate the effect of wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ on CV health.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for the support of the health data sources listed in the following sentence and their contributing hospitals. The ED visits data used to produce this publication were acquired from the Arizona Department of Health Services; California Office of Statewide Planning and Development, now California Department of Health Care Access and Information; Nevada Division of Health Care Financing and Policy (DJCFP), released through the Center for Health Information Analysis (CHIA) of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Oregon Healthcare Enterprises, Inc., Apprise Health Insights, a subsidiary of the Oregon Association of Hospitals & Health Systems; and Utah Department of Health, Office of Health Care Statistics (OHCS). The authors thank the ENVISION investigators for their enthusiastic collaboration and effort. The analysis, interpretation, conclusions, and views presented in this paper are solely those of the authors and do not reflect the official positions or conclusions of the listed data sources. The authorization to release this information does not imply any endorsement of the study or its findings by these data sources. The data sources, along with their employees, officers, and agents, do not make any representations, warranties, or guarantees regarding the accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or suitability of the information presented here.

Disclosures

None.

Data sharing

In accordance with the agreement with each state, the ED visit data is prohibited from sharing to protect health information. The Daymet daily 1 km meteorological data are available in the Oak Ridge National Laboratory data archive (https://doi.org/10.3334/ORNLDAAC/2129). The zip code level wildfire smoke $PM_{2.5}$ data are available on Figshare (https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.25016510).

Funding

This work was supported by the National Heart, Lung, And Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number 1R01ES032140 (Liu) and R01ES027892 (Chang), and the American Heart Association under Award Number 23PRE1020888 (Li). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.



Figure 1. Histograms of smoke $PM_{2.5}$ (a), total smoke $PM_{2.5}$ (b), non-smoke $PM_{2.5}$ (c), smoke $PM_{2.5}$ within 25 $/m^3$ and the frequency within 500,000 (d), log (smoke $PM_{2.5}$+1) (e), and the ratio of smoke $PM_{2.5}$/total $PM_{2.5}$ (f). Period 2007-01-01 to 2018-12-31.

Table 1. Characteristics of subjects with primary or secondary diagnosis of total CVD (N=49,759, 958)

		Statistics	
Age, yrs		64 (17.4)	
Female		30,095,611 (60.5%)	
Race			
	White	39,128,609(78.6%)	
	Black	6,685,553 (13.4%)	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	467,695 (0.9%)	
	Asian/Pacific islander	3,964,921 (8.0%)	
	Other race	800,727 (1.6%)	
CV Outcomes		Primary or secondary diagnosis	Primary diagnosis
	AF	6,808,839 (13.7%)	867,623 (9.6%)
	AMI	1,222,053 (2.5%)	786,445 (8.7%)
	HF	7,194,474 (14.5%)	1,172,596 (13.0%)
	Stroke	808,396 (1.6%)	635,225 (7.0%)
	Total CVD	49,759,958 (100%)	9,022,749 (100%)

Notes: Data are shown as mean (SD) or N (percentage). Percentages of race do not add up to 100% due to missing data and overlapping categories.

Table 2. Effect of 1-, 2-, and 3-days smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ on CVD ED visits

		AF	AMI	HF	Stroke	CVD
Smoke $PM_{2.5}$						
Not adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.994 (0.991, 0.997)	0.999 (0.992, 1.006)	0.995 (0.992, 0.998)	0.996 (0.985, 1.008)	0.997 (0.996, 0.998)
	2-day	0.992 (0.989, 0.995)	0.997 (0.990, 1.005)	0.994 (0.991, 0.997)	0.996 (0.984, 1.008)	0.996 (0.993, 0.999)
	3-day	0.992 (0.989, 0.995)	0.998 (0.990, 1.006)	0.994 (0.991, 0.997)	0.993 (0.980, 1.006)	0.996 (0.995, 0.997)
Adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.991 (0.988, 0.994)	0.997 (0.989, 1.004)	0.992 (0.989, 0.995)	0.996 (0.985, 1.007)	0.995 (0.994, 0.996)
	2-day	0.989 (0.986, 0.992)	0.994 (0.987, 1.002)	0.990 (0.987, 0.993)	0.996 (0.984, 1.008)	0.994 (0.993, 0.995)
	3-day	0.989 (0.986, 0.992)	0.994 (0.986, 1.002)	0.990 (0.987, 0.993)	0.993 (0.980, 1.006)	0.993 (0.992, 0.995)
Total $PM_{2.5}$						
	1-day	1.005 (1.004, 1.007)	1.010 (1.006, 1.015)	1.008 (1.006, 1.010)	1.001 (0.994, 1.007)	1.006 (1.006, 1.007)
	2-day	1.005 (1.003, 1.007)	1.010 (1.005, 1.010)	1.008 (1.006, 1.010)	0.999 (0.991, 1.006)	1.006 (1.005, 1.007)
	3-day	1.005 (1.003, 1.007)	1.010 (1.005, 1.016)	1.008 (1.006, 1.010)	0.995 (0.988, 1.003)	1.006 (1.005, 1.007)

Notes: Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals are presented. AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; HF, heart failure; CVD, cardiovascular disease. ORs correspond to every 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increase in $PM_{2.5}$. All the models were adjusted for daily relative humidity, average temperature, and day of the year. Exposure and covariates were modeled as the value on the day of ED visit, and 2- and 3-day moving averages leading up to and including the day of the ED visit.

Supplemental Table 1. Effect of 1-, 2-, and 3-days smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ on CVD ED visits among those < 65 and ≥ 65 years

		AF	AMI	HF	Stroke	CVD
<65 years						
Smoke $PM_{2.5}$						
Not adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.996 (0.989, 1.002)	0.993 (0.981, 1.005)	0.999 (0.994, 1.003)	0.981 (0.963, 1.000)	0.998 (0.996, 1.000)
	2-day	0.994 (0.987, 1.001)	0.992 (0.979, 1.005)	0.998 (0.992, 1.003)	0.987 (0.968, 1.010)	0.998 (0.996, 0.999)
	3-day	0.994 (0.986, 1.001)	0.993 (0.979, 1.007)	0.998 (0.992, 1.004)	0.983 (0.963, 1.010)	0.997 (0.995, 0.999)
Adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.994 (0.988, 1.001)	0.991 (0.979, 1.004)	0.997 (0.992, 1.002)	0.981 (0.963, 1.000)	0.996 (0.995, 0.998)
	2-day	0.992 (0.985, 0.999)	0.990 (0.977, 1.004)	0.995 (0.990, 1.001)	0.987 (0.968, 1.010)	0.996 (0.994, 0.998)
	3-day	0.991 (0.984, 0.999)	0.991 (0.977, 1.005)	0.995 (0.990, 1.001)	0.984 (0.963, 1.010)	0.995 (0.993, 0.997)
Total $PM_{2.5}$						
	1-day	1.003 (0.998, 1.007)	1.004 (0.996, 1.012)	1.006 (1.003, 1.009)	0.995 (0.984, 1.010)	1.005 (1.004, 1.010)
	2-day	1.002 (0.998, 1.007)	1.002 (0.993, 1.010)	1.006 (1.002, 1.009)	0.993 (0.981, 1.000)	1.005 (1.004, 1.010)
	3-day	1.002 (0.997, 1.007)	1.000 (0.991, 1.010)	1.006 (1.002, 1.010)	0.990 (0.977, 1.000)	1.005 (1.003, 1.010)
≥65 years						
Smoke $PM_{2.5}$						
Not adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.993 (0.990, 0.997)	1.002 (0.993, 1.011)	0.994 (0.990, 0.997)	1.005 (0.991, 1.019)	0.996 (0.994, 0.998)
	2-day	0.992 (0.988, 0.995)	1.000 (0.991, 1.009)	0.992 (0.989, 0.996)	1.001 (0.986, 1.016)	0.995 (0.994, 0.997)
	3-day	0.992 (0.988, 0.996)	1.000 (0.990, 1.010)	0.992 (0.988, 0.996)	0.997 (0.981, 1.014)	0.995 (0.993, 0.997)
Adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.991 (0.988, 0.994)	0.999 (0.990, 1.010)	0.990 (0.987, 0.994)	1.004 (0.990, 1.018)	0.994 (0.992, 0.995)
	2-day	0.989 (0.985, 0.992)	0.996 (0.987, 1.005)	0.988 (0.985, 0.992)	1.001 (0.986, 1.016)	0.993 (0.991, 0.994)
	3-day	0.989 (0.985, 0.992)	0.995 (0.985, 1.005)	0.988 (0.984, 0.991)	0.998 (0.982, 1.014)	0.992 (0.990, 0.994)
Total $PM_{2.5}$						
	1-day	1.005 (1.003, 1.008)	1.013 (1.008, 1.019)	1.008 (1.006, 1.011)	1.005 (0.997, 1.013)	1.007 (1.006, 1.008)
	2-day	1.005 (1.002, 1.007)	1.014 (1.007, 1.020)	1.008 (1.006, 1.010)	1.001 (0.992, 1.010)	1.007 (1.005, 1.008)
	3-day	1.005 (1.002, 1.007)	1.015 (1.008, 1.020)	1.008 (1.006, 1.011)	0.997 (0.988, 1.007)	1.006 (1.005, 1.007)

Notes: Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals are presented. AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; HF, heart failure; CVD, cardiovascular disease. ORs correspond to every 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increase in $PM_{2.5}$. All the models were adjusted for daily relative humidity, average temperature, and day of the year. Exposure and covariates were modeled as the value on the day of ED visit, and 2- and 3-day moving averages leading up to and including the day of the ED visit.

Supplemental Table 2. Effect of 1-, 2-, and 3-days smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ on CVD ED visits among different sex groups

		AF	AMI	HF	Stroke	CVD
Male						
Smoke $PM_{2.5}$						
Not adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.992 (0.987, 0.997)	0.996 (0.983, 1.010)	0.995 (0.990, 1.000)	0.991 (0.972, 1.009)	0.997 (0.995, 0.999)
	2-day	0.989 (0.984, 0.995)	0.993 (0.978, 1.008)	0.992 (0.987, 0.998)	0.987 (0.967, 1.007)	0.996 (0.993, 0.998)
	3-day	0.989 (0.984, 0.995)	0.994 (0.979, 1.010)	0.991 (0.986, 0.997)	0.842 (0.962, 1.004)	0.995 (0.992, 0.997)
Adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.990 (0.985, 0.995)	0.994 (0.981, 1.008)	0.992 (0.987, 0.998)	0.990 (0.971, 1.009)	0.995 (0.993, 0.997)
	2-day	0.987 (0.981, 0.992)	0.991 (0.976, 1.006)	0.989 (0.984, 0.995)	0.987 (0.967, 1.008)	0.993 (0.991, 0.995)
	3-day	0.987 (0.981, 0.992)	0.992 (0.976, 1.008)	0.988 (0.982, 0.994)	0.983 (0.962, 1.005)	0.992 (0.990, 0.994)
Total $PM_{2.5}$						
	1-day	1.003 (1.000, 1.006)	1.008 (1.000, 1.015)	1.006 (1.003, 1.009)	1.000 (0.990, 1.010)	1.006 (1.005, 1.007)
	2-day	1.004 (1.000, 1.007)	1.007 (0.998, 1.020)	1.007 (1.004, 1.010)	0.994 (0.983, 1.005)	1.006 (1.004, 1.007)
	3-day	1.004 (1.000, 1.007)	1.007 (0.998, 1.020)	1.007 (1.000, 1.011)	0.990 (0.978, 1.002)	1.005 (1.004, 1.007)
Female						
Smoke $PM_{2.5}$						
Not adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.995 (0.990, 1.000)	1.012 (0.996, 1.028)	0.999 (0.994, 1.004)	0.992 (0.974, 1.010)	0.998 (0.996, 0.999)
	2-day	0.994 (0.988, 0.999)	1.012 (0.995, 1.030)	0.999 (0.993, 1.004)	0.993 (0.973, 1.013)	0.997 (0.996, 0.999)
	3-day	0.993 (0.988, 0.990)	1.014 (0.995, 1.033)	0.998 (0.993, 1.004)	0.989 (0.968, 1.011)	0.997 (0.995, 0.990)
Adjusting for non-smoke	1-day	0.993 (0.988, 0.998)	1.011 (0.994, 1.027)	0.996 (0.991, 1.001)	0.991 (0.973, 1.010)	0.996 (0.994, 0.998)
	2-day	0.991 (0.986, 0.997)	1.011 (0.993, 1.028)	0.995 (0.990, 1.000)	0.992 (0.972, 1.012)	0.995 (0.993, 0.997)
	3-day	0.991 (0.985, 0.997)	1.013 (0.994, 1.032)	0.994 (0.989, 1.000)	0.989 (0.967, 1.010)	0.994 (0.992, 0.996)
Total $PM_{2.5}$						
	1-day	1.007 (1.003, 1.010)	1.010 (1.001, 1.019)	1.012 (1.009, 1.015)	1.001 (0.992, 1.011)	1.007 (1.005, 1.008)
	2-day	1.006 (1.003, 1.009)	1.011 (1.001, 1.021)	0.999 (0.993, 1.004)	1.002 (0.992, 1.013)	1.007 (1.006, 1.008)
	3-day	1.006 (1.002, 1.009)	1.012 (1.001, 1.023)	1.012 (1.009, 1.016)	1.000 (0.988, 1.011)	1.006 (1.005, 1.008)

Notes: Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals are presented. AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; HF, heart failure; CVD, cardiovascular disease. ORs correspond to every 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increase in $PM_{2.5}$. All the models were adjusted for daily relative humidity, average temperature, and day of the year. Exposure was modeled as the $PM_{2.5}$ on the day of ED visit, and 2- and 3-day moving averages of the $PM_{2.5}$ leading up to and including the day of the ED visit.

Supplemental Table 3. Effect of 1 day, 2-day, and 3-day average ratio of smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and total $PM_{2.5}$ on CVD ED visits

			AF	AMI	HF	Stroke	CVD
Continuous	1-day		0.998 (0.997, 0.999)	1.000 (0.997, 1.003)	0.997 (0.996, 0.998)	1.001 (0.997, 1.005)	0.999 (0.998, 0.999)
	2-day		0.998 (0.996, 0.999)	0.999 (0.996, 1.002)	0.996 (0.995, 0.997)	1.002 (0.997, 1.006)	0.998 (0.998, 0.999)
	3-day		0.997 (0.996, 0.999)	0.999 (0.995, 1.002)	0.995 (0.994, 0.997)	1.002 (0.997, 1.007)	0.998 (0.997, 0.998)
Quartile	1-day	2nd vs. 1st	1.005 (0.996, 1.014)	1.017 (0.995, 1.039)	0.999 (0.991, 1.008)	1.008 (0.979, 1.038)	1.002 (0.998, 1.005)
		3rd vs. 1st	1.009 (0.992, 1.025)	0.979 (0.939, 1.019)	1.015 (0.999, 1.032)	1.026 (0.967, 1.089)	1.008 (1.002, 1.015)
		4th vs. 1st	0.975 (0.932, 1.020)	1.012 (0.905, 1.132)	1.006 (0.961, 1.052)	1.043 (0.872, 1.248)	1.002 (0.984, 1.020)
	2-day	2nd vs. 1st	1.032 (1.004, 1.060)	1.004 (0.980, 1.027)	0.996 (0.986, 1.006)	1.000 (0.969, 1.032)	1.000 (0.997, 1.004)
		3rd vs. 1st	1.061 (1.011, 1.113)	0.973 (0.932, 1.016)	0.998 (0.981, 1.016)	1.036 (0.973, 1.104)	1.009 (1.002, 1.016)
		4th vs. 1st	1.103 (0.962, 1.265)	0.969 (0.859, 1.093)	0.985 (0.938, 1.034)	1.131 (0.931, 1.374)	0.998 (0.979, 1.018)
	3-day	2nd vs. 1st	0.998 (0.988, 1.009)	1.016 (1.991, 1.041)	1.006 (0.996, 1.016)	1.001 (0.968, 1.036)	1.003 (0.999, 1.007)
		3rd vs. 1st	1.004 (0.986, 1.022)	0.988 (0.945, 1.012)	0.999 (0.981, 1.017)	1.010 (0.945, 1.080)	1.011 (1.003, 1.018)
		4th vs. 1st	0.965 (0.917, 1.015)	1.050 (0.927, 1.190)	1.001 (0.951, 1.054)	1.136 (0.929, 1.390)	1.005 (0.984, 1.025)

Notes: Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals are presented. For the models that smoke $PM_{2.5}$/total $PM_{2.5}$ was modeled as a continuous variable, the ORs correspond to every 10% increase in the ratio. AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; HF, heart failure; CVD, cardiovascular disease. All the models were adjusted for daily relative humidity, average temperature, and day of the year. Exposure was modeled as the $PM_{2.5}$ on the day of ED visit, and 2- and 3-day moving averages of the $PM_{2.5}$ leading up to and including the day of the ED visit.

Supplemental Table 4. Effect of 1 day, 2-day, and 3-day smoke PM2.5 and total PM2.5 on primary CVD ED visits

		AF	AMI	HF	Stroke	CVD
Smoke $PM_{2.5}$						
Not adjusting for non-smoke	1 day	0.991 (0.982, 0.999)	0.993 (0.984, 1.002)	0.989 (0.979, 0.999)	0.999 (0.986, 1.011)	0.996 (0.993, 0.998)
	2 days	0.993 (0.984, 1.001)	0.991 (0.982, 1.001)	0.986 (0.975, 0.997)	0.999 (0.985, 1.013)	0.996 (0.993, 0.999)
	3 days	0.992 (0.983, 1.002)	0.991 (0.981, 1.001)	0.984 (0.973, 0.996)	0.995 (0.980, 1.010)	0.995 (0.992, 0.998)
Adjusting for non-smoke	1 day	0.988 (0.980, 0.996)	0.991 (0.982, 1.000)	0.986 (0.976, 0.996)	0.999 (0.986, 1.012)	0.994 (0.991, 0.997)
	2 days	0.989 (0.981, 0.998)	0.989 (0.979, 0.999)	0.982 (0.971, 0.993)	1.000 (0.986, 1.014)	0.994 (0.991, 0.997)
	3 days	0.989 (0.980, 0.999)	0.989 (0.978, 0.999)	0.980 (0.968, 0.991)	0.996 (0.981, 1.011)	0.993 (0.990, 0.996)
Total $PM_{2.5}$						
	1 day	1.004 (0.998, 1.010)	1.005 (0.999, 1.011)	1.014 (1.009, 1.019)	0.999 (0.991, 1.006)	1.004 (1.002, 1.006)
	2 days	1.005 (0.999, 1.011)	1.004 (0.998, 1.011)	1.014 (1.008, 1.020)	0.997 (0.989, 1.005)	1.004 (1.002, 1.006)
	3 days	1.005 (0.998, 1.011)	1.004 (0.997, 1.010)	1.015 (1.008, 1.021)	0.994 (0.985, 1.003)	1.003 (1.001, 1.005)

Notes: Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals are presented. AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; HF, heart failure; CVD, cardiovascular disease. ORs correspond to every 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increase in $PM_{2.5}$. All the models were adjusted for daily relative humidity, average temperature, and day of the year. Exposure and covariates were modeled as the value on the day of ED visit, and 2- and 3-day moving averages leading up to and including the day of the ED visit.

References

1. Jones MW, Abatzoglou JT, Veraverbeke S, et al. Global and Regional Trends and Drivers of Fire Under Climate Change. *Reviews of Geophysics.* 2022;60(3).
2. Ellis TM, Bowman DM, Jain P, Flannigan MD, Williamson GJ. Global increase in wildfire risk due to climate‐driven declines in fuel moisture. *Global change biology.* 2022;28(4):1544-1559.
3. Watts N, Amann M, Arnell N, et al. The 2019 report of The Lancet Countdown on health and climate change: ensuring that the health of a child born today is not defined by a changing climate. *The Lancet.* 2019;394(10211):1836-1878.
4. Prichard SJ, Hessburg PF, Hagmann RK, et al. Adapting western North American forests to climate change and wildfires: 10 common questions. *Ecological Applications.* 2021;31(8).
5. Brown T, Leach S, Wachter B, Gardunio B. The extreme 2018 northern California fire season. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society.* 2020;101(1):S1-S4.
6. Burke M, Driscoll A, Heft-Neal S, Xue J, Burney J, Wara M. The changing risk and burden of wildfire in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 2021;118(2):e2011048118.
7. Richardson D, Black AS, Irving D, et al. Global increase in wildfire potential from compound fire weather and drought. *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science.* 2022;5(1):23.
8. Zhang D, Wang W, Xi Y, et al. Wildfire worsens population exposure to PM2.5 pollution in the Continental United States. *Res Sq.* 2023.
9. Liu JC, Pereira G, Uhl SA, Bravo MA, Bell ML. A systematic review of the physical health impacts from non-occupational exposure to wildfire smoke. *Environmental research.* 2015;136:120-132.
10. O'Dell K, Ford B, Fischer EV, Pierce JR. Contribution of Wildland-Fire Smoke to US PM2.5 and Its Influence on Recent Trends. *Environmental Science & Technology.* 2019;53(4):1797-1804.
11. Burke M, Childs ML, de la Cuesta B, et al. The contribution of wildfire to PM2.5 trends in the USA. *Nature.* 2023;622(7984):761-766.
12. Erqou S, Clougherty JE, Olafiranye O, et al. Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Racial Differences in Cardiovascular Disease Risk. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol.* 2018;38(4):935-942.
13. Pun VC, Kazemiparkouhi F, Manjourides J, Suh HH. Long-Term PM2.5 Exposure and Respiratory, Cancer, and Cardiovascular Mortality in Older US Adults. *American Journal of Epidemiology.* 2017;186(8):961-969.
14. Pope Iii CA, Burnett RT, Thun MJ, et al. Lung cancer, cardiopulmonary mortality, and long-term exposure to fine particulate air pollution. *Jama.* 2002;287(9):1132-1141.
15. Hadley MB, Henderson SB, Brauer M, Vedanthan R. Protecting cardiovascular health from wildfire smoke. *Circulation.* 2022;146(10):788-801.

16. Mahsin M, Cabaj J, Saini V. Respiratory and cardiovascular condition-related physician visits associated with wildfire smoke exposure in Calgary, Canada, in 2015: a population-based study. *International Journal of Epidemiology.* 2022;51(1):166-178.
17. Hahn MB, Kuiper G, O'Dell K, Fischer EV, Magzamen S. Wildfire Smoke Is Associated With an Increased Risk of Cardiorespiratory Emergency Department Visits in Alaska. *GeoHealth.* 2021;5(5).
18. Aguilera R, Corringham T, Gershunov A, Benmarhnia T. Wildfire smoke impacts respiratory health more than fine particles from other sources: observational evidence from Southern California. *Nature Communications.* 2021;12(1):1493.
19. Martin SS, Aday AW, Almarzooq ZI, et al. 2024 Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics: A Report of US and Global Data From the American Heart Association. *Circulation.* 2024.
20. Martin SS, Aday AW, Almarzooq ZI, et al. 2024 Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics: A Report of US and Global Data From the American Heart Association. *Circulation.* 2024.
21. Murray CJ, Aravkin AY, Zheng P, et al. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The lancet.* 2020;396(10258):1223-1249.
22. Brook RD, Rajagopalan S, Pope CA, et al. Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease. *Circulation.* 2010;121(21):2331-2378.
23. Rajagopalan S, Al-Kindi SG, Brook RD. Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology.* 2018;72(17):2054-2070.
24. Rajagopalan S, Brauer M, Bhatnagar A, et al. Personal-Level Protective Actions Against Particulate Matter Air Pollution Exposure: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation.* 2020;142(23):e411-e431.
25. Bhatnagar A. Cardiovascular pathophysiology of environmental pollutants. *American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology.* 2004;286(2):H479-H485.
26. Heaney A, Stowell JD, Liu JC, Basu R, Marlier M, Kinney P. Impacts of Fine Particulate Matter From Wildfire Smoke on Respiratory and Cardiovascular Health in California. *GeoHealth.* 2022;6(6).
27. Stowell JD, Geng G, Saikawa E, et al. Associations of wildfire smoke PM2. 5 exposure with cardiorespiratory events in Colorado 2011–2014. *Environment international.* 2019;133:105151.
28. Chen G, Guo Y, Yue X, et al. Mortality risk attributable to wildfire-related PM2.5 pollution: a global time series study in 749 locations. *The Lancet Planetary Health.* 2021;5(9):e579-e587.
29. Zhang D, Wang W, Xi Y, et al. Wildland Fires Worsened Population Exposure to PM(2.5) Pollution in the Contiguous United States. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2023;57(48):19990-19998.
30. Lawrence MG. The Relationship between Relative Humidity and the Dewpoint Temperature in Moist Air: A Simple Conversion and Applications. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society.* 2005;86(2):225-234.
31. Thornton M, Shrestha R, Wei Y, Thornton P, Kao S, Wilson B. Daymet: Daily Surface Weather Data on a 1-km Grid for North America, Version 4 R1. ORNL DAAC, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA. In:2022.
32. Maclure M. The Case-Crossover Design: A Method for Studying Transient Effects on the Risk of Acute Events. *American Journal of Epidemiology.* 1991;133(2):144-153.

33. Levy D, Lumley T, Sheppard L, Kaufman J, Checkoway H. Referent Selection in Case-Crossover Analyses of Acute Health Effects of Air Pollution. *Epidemiology.* 2001;12(2):186-192.
34. Janes H, Sheppard L, Lumley T. Case-crossover analyses of air pollution exposure data: referent selection strategies and their implications for bias. *Epidemiology.* 2005;16(6):717-726.
35. Krittanawong C, Qadeer YK, Hayes RB, et al. PM2.5 and Cardiovascular Health Risks. *Current Problems in Cardiology.* 2023;48(6):101670.
36. Williams VA, Perreault LR, Yazbeck CT, Micovic NA, Oakes JM, Bellini C. Impact of Wildfires on Cardiovascular Health. *Circulation Research.* 2024;134(9):1061-1082.
37. DeFlorio-Barker S, Crooks J, Reyes J, Rappold AG. Cardiopulmonary Effects of Fine Particulate Matter Exposure among Older Adults, during Wildfire and Non-Wildfire Periods, in the United States 2008–2010. *Environmental Health Perspectives.* 2019;127(3):037006.
38. Pennington AF, Strickland MJ, Gass K, et al. Source-Apportioned PM2.5 and Cardiorespiratory Emergency Department Visits: Accounting for Source Contribution Uncertainty. *Epidemiology.* 2019;30(6):789-798.
39. Mahsin MD, Cabaj J, Saini V. Respiratory and cardiovascular condition-related physician visits associated with wildfire smoke exposure in Calgary, Canada, in 2015: a population-based study. *International Journal of Epidemiology.* 2021;51(1):166-178.
40. Jones CG, Rappold AG, Vargo J, et al. Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrests and Wildfire-Related Particulate Matter During 2015-2017 California Wildfires. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2020;9(8):e014125.
41. Dominici F, Peng RD, Bell ML, et al. Fine particulate air pollution and hospital admission for cardiovascular and respiratory diseases. *Jama.* 2006;295(10):1127-1134.
42. Gao Y, Huang W, Xu R, et al. Association between long-term exposure to wildfire-related PM2.5 and mortality: A longitudinal analysis of the UK Biobank. *Journal of Hazardous Materials.* 2023;457:131779.
43. Widimský P, Kožnar B, Vaško P, Peisker T, Štětkářová I. Acute myocardial infarction and acute stroke: What are the differences? Focus on reperfusion therapy. *Cor et Vasa.* 2013;55(2):e111-e116.
44. Arrigo M, Jessup M, Mullens W, et al. Acute heart failure. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers.* 2020;6(1):16.
45. Nattel S, Burstein B, Dobrev D. Atrial Remodeling and Atrial Fibrillation. *Circulation: Arrhythmia and Electrophysiology.* 2008;1(1):62-73.
46. Laumbach R, Meng Q, Kipen H. What can individuals do to reduce personal health risks from air pollution? *J Thorac Dis.* 2015;7(1):96-107.