Race/ethnic inequalities in cardiovascular disease: Examining burden mitigation in low-risk black Americans (multi-cohort study)

Seyed E Mousavi, MPH (Email: mousavi.e@tbzmed.ac.ir | ORCID: 0000-0003-4747-5639)[a]
G. David Batty, DSc FRSE (david.batty@ucl.ac.uk | 0000-0003-1822-5753)[b]

[a]Social Determinants of Health Research Center, Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran
[b]Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, London, UK

Correspondence: David Batty, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, 1-19 Torrington Place, London, UK, WC1E 6BT. E. david.batty@ucl.ac.uk

Manuscript characteristics: 2598 words, 4 figures, & 1 supplemental file (4 tables)

Funding: The present paper received no direct funding. GDB is supported by the UK Medical Research Council (MR/P023444/1) and the US National Institute on Aging (1R56AG052519-01, 1R01AG052519-01A1).

Contributions: GDB and SEM generated the idea for the present manuscript, developed an analytical plan, and wrote the manuscript. SEM built the dataset and conducted all data analyses.

Conflict of Interest: None.

Abstract

Background: While the greater burden of cardiovascular disease (CVD) in black Americans relative to white is well-documented, whether standard care targeting conventional risk factors (e.g., blood pressure, cigarette smoking) or social determinants of health (e.g., education, income) mitigate this inequality is largely untested.

Methods: In this multicohort study, we used baseline ethnicity and risk factor data from the US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES, 10 cohorts initiated 1999-2018) with study member linkage to national registries for cause-specific mortality. Low risk was denoted by favourable levels of five biological, three behavioural, and five social determinants of CVD, separately and collectively. Cox proportional hazard regression models were used to summarise the association of ethnicity with CVD mortality.

Results: The analytical sample of 50,065 individuals (25934 women; mean baseline age 53) contributed 473,949 person-years at risk during a mean follow-up of 9.5 yr. This surveillance period gave rise to 9118 deaths, 2908 of which were ascribed to CVD. In age- and sex-adjusted analyses, as anticipated, black American had a markedly higher burden of CVD deaths (hazard ratio; 95% confidence interval: 1.51; 1.30, 1.77) and other major cause of death relative to whites. These elevated CVD rates in black Americans persisted in low-risk strata of biological and behavioural risk factors whether these groups were based on individual characteristics or aggregated using the Framingham algorithm. Similar observations of raised CVD rates in black study members were also made for social determinants of health when separate indices were considered, however, collectively, a marked reduction in the risk of CVD was apparent in black Americans relative to white for one (1.09; 0.78, 1.51), two (0.99; 0.67, 1.48), or three or more (1.31; 0.81, 2.12) favourable social determinants.

Conclusions: Black Americans in favourable social circumstances appear to have similar CVD mortality relative to whites with the same characteristics.

Introduction

Examination of ethnic/race inequalities in health in America has a long research tradition[1] and one that is perhaps most clearly exemplified by the evidence base for cardiovascular disease (CVD). Rates of vascular disease in black Americans, historically lower than white,[2,3] was seen to reverse in 1989.[4,5] Despite a recent decline in absolute mortality rates in black minorities, alongside a degree of convergence, a greater burden of CVD relative to those of European (white) ancestry persists.[6]

Central to understanding these inequalities has been ascertaining the extent to ethnicity/race is embodied. There is substantial and consistent evidence that biological (e.g., blood pressure), behavioural (e.g., smoking, alcohol intake), and social factors (e.g., education, income) at least partially explain black-white inequalities.[7] Of these, social characteristics, which in themselves have complex economic, environmental, structural causes appear to offer the most explanatory power.[8,9]

It would follow that these CVD inequalities would be markedly diminished or even eliminated in Black people who have a low background risk for chronic disease based on specific risk factors and standard risk algorithms widely deployed in clinical practice (e.g., Framingham). In the only study of which we are aware, however, the magnitude of black-white association with CVD was essentially preserved after stratification of study members into lower-risk groups.[7] Indeed, contrary to expectations, hazard ratios for CVD decreased as level of aggregated risk increased.

Relatedly, untested is the mitigating impact on CVD deaths, if any, of favourable levels of more distal causes – the so called social determinants of health.[10] Broadly defined, these characteristics include economic stability, education, psychosocial support, and healthcare access.[11] If the black-

white differential in CVD remains in lower risk groups this would collectively signal that standard care targeting conventional risk factors and amelioration of the structural causes of social determinants black populations do not usefully mitigate excess disease risk.

While examination of the impact of risk mitigation on rates of CVD in black Americans would potentially have policy and clinical utility, the evidence base is very modest. This may be because testing is required in datasets with a sufficiently wide array of ethnic minority groups that are also large enough to facilitate analyses in population subgroups of low-risk Americans. To address these questions, we aggregated data from ten prospective cohort studies conducted in the last two decades in the US as part of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) collaboration.

Methods

We used ten NHANES prospective cohort studies initiated between 1999 to 2018.[12] Conducted biennially, the objective of these studies is to assess the health and nutritional status of non-institutionalized Americans. In each data-collection cycle, a multistage probability sampling design is utilised to select participants who are representative of all fifty US states including the District of Columbia.[13] Selected population subgroups are oversampled, including people low-income individuals, those of African and Mexican origin, and those at opposing ends of the age spectrum (aged 12–19 versus >=60 years).[14]

Following review, ethical approval was provided by the National Center for Health Statistics Research Ethics Review Board (https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/about/erb.html). Participants provided separate written consent for different study components (i.e., interviews, physical examinations, blood draw). All data were anonymised for the purposes of data analysis and are

freely available for download from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/). In composing our manuscript we followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement guidelines.[15]

Of 101,316 individuals comprising the ten NHANES studies, we omitted participants <25 years of age because this group generated few vascular deaths; a further 126 people were excluded owing to failed linkage to mortality records (figure 1). This resulted in an analytical sample of 50,065 individuals (25934 women). Race/ethnicity was self-reported and categorised for the purposes of the present analyses as non-Hispanic White; non-Hispanic Black; Mexican American; other Hispanic; and other race (other races and multiracial).[16]

Assessment of CVD risk factors

Eight CVD risk factors were assessed using questionnaire, medical examination, and laboratory analyses. Of the health behaviours, physical activity was based on self-rated vigorous occupational/recreational activity – continuous exertion causing large increases in breathing/heart rate for >= 10 minutes); moderate work/recreational activity – continuous exertion causing small increases in breathing/heart rate for >= 10 minutes; or commuting by walking or cycling for at least 10 minutes continuously.[17] Positive response to any of these items denoted being physically active. Individuals were also asked whether they had smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their life; those responding negatively were categorised as non-smoker. For alcohol intake, participants estimated units consumed per week during the preceding 12 months; non-drinkers were never-consumers or those with an intake of less than one unit per week.

Physical and biological risk factor measurement was made during medical examinations conducted by health technicians in a mobile facility. Standing height was quantified using a stadiometer and body weight using a digital weight scale. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated using standard formulae,[18] with normal body weight denoted as 18.5-< 25 kg/m². After resting for five minutes in a seated position, three consecutive blood pressure readings were made and their average used in the present analyses.[19] Normotensive was defined as systolic blood pressure <140 mmHg and diastolic blood pressure <90 mmHg. Serum total cholesterol levels were directly measured using an enzymatic assay and values of <240 mg/dL regarded as favourable.[20] High-density lipoprotein (HDL) was measured using the heparin-Mn or direct HDL cholesterol immunoassay method; the threshold for favourable levels was sex-specific (≥40 mg/dL for men; ≥50 mg/dL for women). Plasma glucose was based on blood drawn after a minimum of 8 hours fasting and assayed using an enzymatic method, whereas glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c) was measured using the Ion-exchange high-performance liquid chromatography method and enzymatic assay. These data were standardised to the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial and National Glycohemoglobin Standardization Program reference methods,[20] and people without diabetes mellitus defined as those free of the condition based on enquiries about health professional diagnosis and an HbA1c<6.5% or fasting blood sugar<126 mg/dL.

We used the Framingham Risk Score to estimate the 10-year probability of the occurrence of a CVD event.[21] Computations for each participant were based on age, sex, high-density lipoprotein, total cholesterol, systolic blood pressure, use of blood pressure-lowering medication, current smoking status, and diabetes mellitus status. Individuals were then categorised into low (score <10) and low-moderate (< 20) risk strata.

Assessment of the social determinants of health

Five social determinants of health were captured from questionnaire responses. For educational achievement (less than 9th grade; 9-11th grade; high school graduate/GED or equivalent; some college/associate degree; college graduate or above), we used 'some college' or greater to denote advantage.[16] Enquiries about employment status referred to engagement in work in the prior week (working at a job/business; with a job/business but not at work; looking for work; or not working at a job/business); we used any mention of being in work as an indication of employment. For marital status (married, widowed, divorced, separated, never married, living with partner) we created a co-habiting variable for study members who were married or living with their partner. Access to healthcare, based on self-reported availability of a place to go for advice/care when sick, was self-reported by the study member. Lastly, the ratio of family income to poverty was estimated by dividing household income by the US Department of Health and Human Service poverty threshold. We used thresholds specific to survey year: for instance, for a family of four in 1999 (first baseline study), it was $16,900, while in 2018 it was $25,465.[22] A ratio of two or more was regarded as being advantageous for this social indice. We derived an total social determinants score based on the presence of 1 only, 2 only, or three or more advantageous circumstances.

Ascertainment of total and cause-specific mortality

Individual-participant linkage was made to national death records from study initiation (1999) until 2019, providing information on cause and date of death.[23,24] Version 10 of the International Classification of Disease (ICD-10) was used to code cardiovascular mortality, comprising diseases of heart (I00-I09, I11, I13, I20-I51) and cerebrovascular diseases (I60-I69).[25] Secondary mortality endpoints were cancer (C00-C97) and a residual group, 'other causes', for mortality not ascribed to CVD or cancer.[24]

Statistical analyses

We summarised the association of ethnicity/race with major causes of death using survey-weighted Cox proportional hazards regression.[26,27] Hazard ratios and corresponding 95% confidence intervals were adjusted for age and sex, and for age alone in sex-stratified analyses. Survey features such as clusters, strata, and weights (divided by ten for each study) were incorporated into the analyses.[26,27] All statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.3.3 (Vienna, Austria).

Results

Race/ethnicity and major causes of death

The analytical sample of 50,065 individuals (25,934 women; age 52.6 yr. at baseline) contributed 473,949 person-years at risk during a mean follow-up of 9.5 yr. This surveillance period gave rise to 9118 deaths, 2908 of which were attributable to CVD, 2003 to cancer, and 4207 to other causes.

As anticipated, relative to whites, black Americans had a raised risk of mortality across all major endpoints with the strongest effect seen for CVD: all-causes (hazard ratio; 95% confidence interval: 1.34; 1.19, 1.50), CVD (1.51; 1.30, 1.77), and other causes (1.26; 1.04, 1.52) (supplemental table 1 and figure 2). While there was also a higher burden of deaths from all cancers combined during follow-up in study members identifying as black, this was of borderline statistical significance (1.28; 1.00;1.64). In contrast, and again as expected, study members from other ethnic groups – people of Mexican descent (0.88; 0.64, 1.21), other Hispanics (0.84; 0.67, 1.07), and other minorities (0.89; 0.74, 1.07) combined – typically experienced a lower risk of total mortality and other outcomes. That the 95% confidence intervals for risk estimates in these non-

black groups all included unity led us to focus subsequent analyses on black-white risk differentials. There was no strong evidence of effect modification of the race/ethnicity—death association by sex.

Race/ethnicity and mortality: Impact of low-risk strata

Next, we examined if the demonstrated raised risk of total and CVD mortality in black Americans relative to white was impacted by membership of an array of low-risk subgroups – individually and in aggregate. Corresponding results for other minority groups are shown in the supplemental file (supplemental tables 2-5).

In analyses of low-risk groups based on CVD risk factors (figure 3), the elevated rate of CVD in the full cohort for black Americans versus white, recapitulated in the figure for the purposes of comparison, was very similar to that for people with favourable levels of individual risk factors. These risk strata included those who were physically active (1.51; 1.15, 1.99), diabetes-free (1.54; 1.20, 1.97), normal weight (1.58; 1.22, 2.04), and normotensive (1.58; 1.22, 2.04). There was a suggestion of a modest degree of risk mitigation for these race/ethic inequalities in non-smokers (1.42; 1.07, 1.87) and non-drinkers (1.31; 1.11, 1.55) but Black individuals still had a higher burden of vascular disease mortality at conventional levels of statistical significance.

Likewise, examining the same association in low (2.94; 2.04, 4.25) and low-moderate (2.41; 1.92, 3.03) risk categories by aggregating those vascular risk factors that comprise the Framingham index did not reveal any appreciable risk reduction. Hazard ratios for the risk of CVD in black versus white study members were, in fact, slightly higher in these strata, although statistical precision was lower as evidenced by the broad confidence intervals. The pattern of association when total mortality was the outcome of interest was similar to that for CVD.

When we compared rates of CVD and total mortality in black and white populations according to favourable levels of five social determinants of health, there was, little evidence of a marked lowering in the magnitude of CVD risk in black people according to these social characteristics, a potential exception being for study members who education exceeded that of higher school (1.40; 0.94, 2.08) (figure 4). In people characterised by any one (1.09; 0.78, 1.51) or any two (0.99; 0.67, 1.48) favourable social determinant, however, the raised burden of CVD in black Americans was essentially eliminated. There was, however, some departure from this observation in the category of study members with three of more favourable characteristics. Similar findings were apparent in analyses where total mortality was the outcome under investigation.

Discussion

The main findings of our study were that, in individuals classified as low risk for CVD based on well-established behavioural and physiological risk factors, the black-white differential in CVD and total mortality rates persisted. This appeared to be the case whether low risk was denoted by single or multiple risk factors. While similar observations were made for individual social determinants of health, when the five indices were combined, there was evidence of a similar burden of CVD and total mortality in both black and white Americans, although this was not consistent across the risk strata.

Comparison with existing studies

We replicated the well-described pattern of mortality risk across different minority groups, whereby Americans of Mexican and other Hispanic origin had a mortality advantage relative to whites, whereas in black Americans rates were markedly raised. In the only study of which we are aware to quantify CVD rates in minority groups otherwise at low risk based on conventional risk

factors, the black-white differential persisted.[7] The same observational was made for the highest affluence group – the only social determinant utilised by the authors.

Study strengths and limitations

While a series of studies have tested whether multivariable adjustments for differences in black-white groups according to behavioural, biological, and psychosocial characteristics explain these well-established health differentials, our focus on low risk groups is unusual. We used data from NHANES in which hard-to-reach communities, in particular those from minority backgrounds, were over-sampled. Study members are uncommonly well-characterised for social determinants of health in addition to classic risk factors for CVD. Our work is of course not without its shortcomings. Categorising study members into low risk strata occasionally resulted in some underpowered analyses as evidenced by the wide confidence intervals.

In conclusion, in an observation that requires replication, Black Americans in favourable social circumstances appear to have CVD rates similar to whites with the same characteristics. Low risk denoted by conventional behavioural and physiological determinants did not seem to have the same mitigating effect.

References

1. Trask JW. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MORTALITY RATES OF THE COLORED POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES. *Am J Public Health (N Y)* 1916; **6**(3): 254-9.
2. Keil JE, Sutherland SE, Hames CG, et al. Coronary disease mortality and risk factors in black and white men. Results from the combined Charleston, SC, and Evans County, Georgia, heart studies. *Arch Intern Med* 1995; **155**(14): 1521-7.
3. Hames CG, Rose K, Knowles M, Davis CE, Tyroler HA. Black-white comparisons of 20-year coronary heart disease mortality in the Evans County Heart Study. *Cardiology* 1993; **82**(2-3): 122-36.
4. Liao Y, Cooper RS. Continued adverse trends in coronary heart disease mortality among blacks, 1980-91. *Public Health Rep* 1995; **110**(5): 572-9; discussion 0-2.
5. Davey Smith G, Neaton JD, Wentworth D, Stamler R, Stamler J. Mortality differences between black and white men in the USA: contribution of income and other risk factors among men screened for the MRFIT. MRFIT Research Group. Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial. *Lancet* 1998; **351**(9107): 934-9.
6. Kyalwazi AN, Loccoh EC, Brewer LC, et al. Disparities in Cardiovascular Mortality Between Black and White Adults in the United States, 1999 to 2019. *Circulation* 2022; **146**(3): 211-28.
7. Thomas AJ, Eberly LE, Davey Smith G, Neaton JD, Stamler J. Race/ethnicity, income, major risk factors, and cardiovascular disease mortality. *Am J Public Health* 2005; **95**(8): 1417-23.
8. Sorlie PD, Backlund E, Keller JB. US mortality by economic, demographic, and social characteristics: the National Longitudinal Mortality Study. *Am J Public Health* 1995; **85**(7): 949-56.
9. Post WS, Watson KE, Hansen S, et al. Racial and Ethnic Differences in All-Cause and Cardiovascular Disease Mortality: The MESA Study. *Circulation* 2022; **146**(3): 229-39.
10. Davis SK, Gebreab S, Quarells R, Gibbons GH. Social determinants of cardiovascular health among black and white women residing in Stroke Belt and Buckle regions of the South. *Ethn Dis* 2014; **24**(2): 133-43.
11. Kivimäki M, Batty DG, Kawachi I, Steptoe A. The Routledge international handbook of psychosocial epidemiology: Routledge; 2017.
12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. 2025.
13. Johnson CL, Dohrmann SM, Burt VL, Mohadjer LK. National health and nutrition examination survey: sample design, 2011-2014. *Vital Health Stat 2* 2014; (162): 1-33.
14. Statistics NCfH. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). 2025. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/hus/sources-definitions/nhanes.htm (accessed on 01 Oct 2025).
15. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet* 2007; **370**(9596): 1453-7.
16. Survey NHaNE. Demographic Variables and Sample Weights (DEMO_J). 2025. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Data/Nhanes/Public/2017/DataFiles/DEMO_J.htm (accessed on 01 Oct 2025).
17. Survey NHaNE. MEC Interviewers Procedures Manual. 2025. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/public/2017/manuals/2017_MEC_Interviewers_Procedures.pdf (accessed on 01 Oct 2025).
18. Survey NHaNE. Anthropometry Procedures Manual. 2025. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/public/2017/manuals/2017_Anthropometry_Procedures_Manual.pdf (accessed on 01 Oct 2025).
19. Survey NHaNE. Blood Pressure Procedures Manual. 2025. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/public/2019/manuals/2019-Blood-Pressure-Procedures-Manual-508.pdf (accessed on 01 Oct 2025).
20. Survey NHaNE. MEC Laboratory Procedures Manual. 2025. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/public/2017/manuals/2017_MEC_Laboratory_Procedures_Manual.pdf (accessed on 01 Oct 2025).
21. D'Agostino RB, Vasan RS, Pencina MJ, et al. General Cardiovascular Risk Profile for Use in Primary Care. *Circulation* 2008; **117**(6): 743-53.
22. Service UDoHaH. Poverty Guidelines. 2025. https://aspe.hhs.gov/topics/poverty-economic-mobility/poverty-guidelines (accessed on 01 Oct 2025).

23. Hyattsville MUSDoHaHS, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data. 2025. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/NhanesCitation.aspx (accessed on 01 Oct 2025).
24. Hyattsville M. National Center for Health Statistics Division of Analysis and Epidemiology. Continuous

NHANES Public-use Linked Mortality Files, 2019. 2022. Available from:

https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data-linkage/mortality-public.htm. .
25. World Health Organization. International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (10th revision). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010.
26. Henning Best CW. The SAGE handbook of regression analysis and causal inference. *Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Ltd* 2014.
27. Heeringa SG WB, Berglund PA. Regression with Complex Samples. In: The SAGE Handbook of Regression Analysis and Causal Inference. *London: SAGE Publications Ltd* 2014: 225–48.

Figure 1. Derivation of analytical sample:
National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (1999-2018)



Figure 2. Black versus white inequalities in major causes of mortality: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (1999-2018)



Figure 3. Black versus white inequalities in total and CVD mortality in individuals with favourable CVD risk factor: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (1999-2018)



Figure 4. Black versus white inequalities in mortality in individuals with favourable social determinants of health: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (1999-2018)