**Methods**

In this paper, we aim to estimate the burden of childhood asthma due to NO2 exposure using state specific asthma incidence rates and compare the change in the estimated from those produced by Alotaibi et al. (2019).

*Census data*

We included populated census blocks of the contiguous United States (U.S.) for the year 2010 obtained from the National Historical Geographic Information System (NHGIS) website (Manson et al., 2018; US Census Bureau, 2010). Each block included information on total population of children <18 years, and whether the census block was designated as an urban or rural block. Urban blocks are stratified into urban clusters (≥2,500 and <50,000 people living in them) or urbanized areas (≥50,000 people). Median household income was available only for census block groups, which is a level higher than census block, divided into five categorized: <$20,000, $20,000 to <$35,000, $35,000 to <$50,000, $50,000 to <$75,000 and ≥$75,000. There were 2686 (0.04%) census blocks with missing median income data in 2010 which were excluded the analysis of median household income. Table 1 summarizes the geographical and demographic data.

*Asthma incidence and prevalence rates*

An incidence rate is defined as the number of new cases of a disease within a specified time period among an at-risk population. To estimate the childhood asthma incidence rate, we extracted the number of new asthma childhood cases and at-risk children for the year 2006 through 2010 using the Asthma Call Back Survey (ACBS) and Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) (CDC, 2009, 2011) and following the methods described by Winer et al. (2012). In brief, participants in the BRFSS were asked “Has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional ever said that the [name of child] has asthma?” if the answer is “yes”, the respondent is requested to participate in the ACBS follow up survey. The ACBS survey further asks “How old was the [name of child] when a doctor or other health professional first said [he/she] had asthma? How long ago was that?” a new asthma incident case would answer “within the past 12 months”. At-risk children are the sum of new childhood asthma cases and total children who never had asthma (i.e. subtracting the prevalent cases from total children).

Each sample is multiplied by its assigned final weight. The sum of weights for the BRFSS represents the total children population while the sum of weights for the ACBS represent total population with lifetime asthma. Not all states participated in the ACBS each year. States that participated more than once had had their original weights reweighted by dividing with the number of years of participation. We then estimated the state-specific average asthma incidence rates for the years 2006 through 2010. States not included in the data set; thus, did not have a specific incidence rate, were assigned the overall average asthma incidence rate. States not within the contiguous U.S. were excluded from the analysis.

*Data analysis*

* Downloaded ACBS data sets for year 2006-2010 from the ACBS website
* Downloaded BRFSS data sets for year 2006-2010 from BRFSS website
* Using R statistica software to run analysis
* Excluded states not within the contiguous US
* ACBS
  + Selected variables (X\_State, INCIDNT, CHLDWT\_F)
  + Each sample is multiplied by its weight
  + Stratified by state
  + Summed the weighted counts for each column of INCIDNT
  + We have a data frame for each year that includes:
    - Row for each state
    - Column for each answer for INCIDNT
    - Each cell is a representation of the total children within the state for each INCIDNT category.
    - The sum for each row represents the total children with asthma in the state.
* BRFSS
  + Selected variables (X\_STATE, CASTHDX2, X\_CHILDWT)
  + Each sample is multiplied by its weight
  + Stratified by state
  + Summed the weighted values for each column of CASTHDX2
  + We have a data frame for each year that includes:
    - Row for each state
    - Column for each answer for CASTHDX2
    - Each cell is a representation of the total children within the state for each CASTHDX2 category.
    - The sum for each row represents the total children in the state.
* Joined the two data frames by state:
  + Row represent state
  + Columns represent INCIDNT and CASTHDX2
* Estimate the asthma IR for each state:
  + At\_risk = `1\_ACBS` + `2\_BRFSS`
  + IR\_per1000 = `1\_ACBS` / At\_risk\*1000
* Estimate the asthma PRV for each state:
  + SAMPLE = `1\_BRFSS` + `2\_BRFSS`
  + EVER = `1\_BRFSS`
  + PRV\_per100 = EVER/ SAMPLE
* Results:
  + Multiple tables, each one represents a year
  + Each row is a state
* Aggregate estimate by state
  + Sum the weighted samples for each state
  + `IR per 1000` = `<12\_month`/ At\_risk\*1000 – using the summed counts across all the years by state
  + Each row is the total weighted results across the years for the state
* Aggregate estimate fir National IR
  + Sum the weighted samples across all states by year and divide by the number of year (here 5 year) [e.g. sum(`<12\_month`)/5]
  + Estimate the weighted average incidence rate

Add graphic section (…)

Explain in detail step by step to get the rates. Include the following:

* What data sets we downloaded
* How we read them in R
* What variables we extracted
* How we applied the weights
* How we joined the BRFSS and ACBS
* How we estimated the results
* samples estimated by state

*NO2 exposure assessment*

Annual average NO2 concentrations for each populated census block were available at the centroid location for the year 2010. Concentrations were derived from a land use regression model utilizing Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), satellite data and several GIS covariates. A detailed description of the model can be found at Bechle et al. (2015). NO2 concentrations were converted from ppb to ug/m3through multiplying by 1.88 (WHO, 2005).

*Concentration-response function*

We used a concentration-response function (CRF) of 1.05 (95% CI = 1.02-1.07) per 4ug/m3 of NO2. The CRF was obtained from a meta-analysis of 20 studies examining the association between exposure to traffic-related air pollution (TRAP) and risk of developing asthma among children (Khreis et al., 2017).

*Burden of disease estimate*

To estimate the burden of disease, we used a standard assessment methods described by Mueller et al. (2017) with the following steps:

We estimated the at-risk children for each state by subtracting the total number of prevalent cases from the total children within the state. We then estimated the number of asthma cases for each state by multiplying the state-specific childhood asthma incidence rate with at-risk children for each census block.

*At-risk children = Total children – (Total children \* Prevalence rate) (1)*

*Asthma incident cases = At-risk children \* Incidence rate (2)*

We then calculated the relative risk (RRdiff) for asthma due to exposure difference between estimated exposure levels (NO2 concentration at the census block level) and no exposure (zero NO2 concentration).

*RRdiff = e((ln(RR)/RRunit\*Exposure level) (3)*

Where RR is the CRF and RRunit is the exposure unit for the CRF. The population attributable fraction (PAF) is then estimated.

*PAF = (RRdiff – 1)/(RRdiff) (4)*

The attributable number of asthma incident cases (AC) is estimated by multiplying the PAF with the number of incident asthma cases at each census block. The AC is then summed up to get the total AC.

**Results**

*Asthma incidence rates*

Childhood asthma incidence rate was estimated for 32 states (Table 11 & 12). The average national incidence rate across 2006-2010 (IR = 12.1 per 1,000) was assigned to states that did not have a state-specific incidence rate. The state of Montana had the lowest childhood asthma incidence rate (IR = 4.3 per 1,000), while District of Columbia had the highest childhood asthma incidence rate (IR = 17.7 per 1,000).

Things to include:

* Presents the results of the incidence rates (samples, weighted estimates by year, refer to table by state)
* Mention missing states by year in the final joined data sets

*Asthma incident cases*

Using state-specific asthma incidence rates the estimated number of childhood asthma incident cases were 754,893 in 2010 (Table 3). By living location, 19% lived in a rural area, while 9% and 72% lived in an urban cluster and urbanized area, respectively. The largest percentage of childhood asthma cases (28%) lived in an income block group of $50,000 to <$75,000, while the lowest percentage (4%) lived in the lowest income block group of <$20,000.

*Attributable number of cases and fraction*

On average, we estimated a total of 132,829 childhood asthma cases attributable to NO2 exposure which accounted for 17.6% of all childhood asthma cases (Table 3). By living location, urbanized areas had the largest number of attributable cases totaling 109,581 cases and highest percentage of all asthma cases of 20.3%. Rural areas had total of 13,951 cases but accounting for the east percentage of all asthma cases with 9.8%, while urban clusters had only 9,296 cases representing 13% of all asthma cases. By income, $50,000 to <$75,000 had the largest number of cases attributable to NO2, 37,559 cases accounting for 16.8% of all asthma cases. However, the income group with the largest percentage of asthma cases was the lowest income group <$20,000, accounting for 20.8% of all asthma cases.

Mention state estimates

*Comparison with the main paper*

*Comparing total asthma cases*

Using state-specific asthma incidence rates the overall number of cases reduced by an average of 40,041 (5%) cases compared to estimates in the main paper (Table 5). By living location, the largest reduction was among urban clusters with a decrease by 4,204 (5.6%) cases followed by urbanized areas which reduced by 29,926 (5.2%) cases. By income group, the largest decrease in the number of cases was among the highest income groups by 13,123 (6.8%) cases, while the least decrease was among the lowest income group by 168 (0.6%) cases.

*Comparing attributable cases*

The total attributable cases reduced by 9,103 (6.4%) cases when compared to the main paper (Table 5). By living location, urbanized areas had the largest reduction of 8,040 (6.8%) cases while rural areas had the least reduction by 514 (3.6%) cases attributable to NO2 exposure. By income group, the highest income group also had the largest decrease in attributable cases by 2.994 (8.5%) and the lowest income group had the least decrease by 58 (1%) cases.

*Comparing attributable fractions*

The overall attributable fraction reduced 1.4% with urbanized areas having the largest reduction by 1.7% in terms of living location. In terms of income group the largest reduction was 1.8% for both $50,000 to <$75,000 and ≥$75,000 (Table 6).

*State estimates*

Table 7 summarizes the changes in total asthma incident cases and attributable cases by state after applying state specific asthma incidence rates. In brief, the state of Montana had the largest percent reduction in total childhood asthma incident cases of 64.1% while the state of Texas had the largest percent increase of 33.8%. The state of California had the largest decrease in numbers of total childhood asthma incident cases of 24,442 cases while the state of Texas had the largest increase in numbers by 25,019 cases.

**Discussion (bullet points)**

* Using state specific asthma incidence rates did not change the results much (within the range of the sensitivity analysis from the main paper)
* The state specific total number of asthma cases and attributable cases changed when applying state specific incidence rates (Table 7)
* The state-specific attributable fractions did not change. The reason is that the incident rate is applied uniformly across the state (spatially), thus the total asthma cases and total attributable cases will change with equal proportion when applying the new asthma incidence rate but not the AF. The AF is a function of CRF and exposure estimate regardless of the IR. Had we applied an incidence rate based on other factors like age, gender, race, income group, then the attributable fraction across the state would differ since the change won’t in incidence rate won’t be uniform within the state.
* The percentage of all asthma cases has a J shaped distribution when examining income groups. The lowest income group had the highest % then drops and rises again with the highest income group.
* Explore why the J shaped distribution is there,

**Tables and plots**

***Tables***

1. **Census data description**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Geographic characteristics | Total populated census blocks | 6,182,882 |
| Total census-designated urban areas | 3,590,278 |
| Demographic characteristics | Total population | 306,675,006 |
| Total population of children (birth – 18) | 73,690,271 (24%) |
| Mean (range) number of children in census blocks | 12 (0-2214) |
| Population of children by living location | Rural | 13,763,183 (19%) |
| Urban clusters (≥2,500 and <50,000 people) | 6,994,464 (9%) |
| Urbanized area (≥50,000 people) | 52,932,624 (72%) |
| Population of children by median household income | <20,000 | 2,614,804 (4%) |
| 20,000 to <35,000 | 12,770,843 (17%) |
| 35,000 to <50,000 | 18,573,954 (25%) |
| 50,000 to <75,000 | 21,953,876 (30%) |
| ≥75,000 | 17,763,239 (24%) |

1. **Summary of pollutant concentrations using populated census blocks only**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NO2 µg/m3** |  |
| Mean |  |
| Min |  |
| 25% |  |
| 50% |  |
| 75% |  |
| Max |  |

1. **Total childhood asthma incident cases, attributable number of cases, and percentage of cases due to NO2**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Asthma incident cases | AC | % of all asthma cases |
|  | Total | 754,893 | 132,829 | 17.6 |
| By living location (% of Total) | Rural | 142,559 (19%) | 13,951 (11%) | 9.8 |
| Urban cluster | 71,249 (9%) | 9,296 (7%) | 13.0 |
| Urbanized area | 541,085 (72%) | 109,581 (82%) | 20.3 |
| By median household income (% of Total) | <20,000 | 28,039 (4%) | 5,834 (4%) | 20.8 |
| 20,000 to <35,000 | 134,208 (18%) | 24,906 (19%) | 18.6 |
| 35,000 to <50,000 | 190,481 (25%) | 32,369 (24%) | 17.0 |
| 50,000 to <75,000 | 223,522 (30%) | 37,559 (28%) | 16.8 |
| ≥75,000 | 178,497 (24%) | 32,133 (24%) | 18.0 |

1. **Comparing results of state-specific asthma incidence cases with original incidence rate**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Asthma incident cases | AC | % of all asthma cases |
|  | Total | 794,934 | 141,931 | 17.9 |
| By living location (% of Total) | Rural | 148,470 (19%) | 14,466 (10%) | 9.7 |
| Urban cluster | 75,453 (9%) | 9,844 (7%) | 13.0 |
| Urbanized area | 571,011 (72%) | 117,621 (83%) | 20.6 |
| By median household income (% of Total) | <20,000 | 28,207 (4%) | 5,892 (4%) | 20.9 |
| 20,000 to <35,000 | 137,765 (17%) | 25,794 (18%) | 18.7 |
| 35,000 to <50,000 | 200,367 (25%) | 34,549 (24%) | 17.2 |
| 50,000 to <75,000 | 236,827 (30%) | 40,540 (29%) | 17.1 |
| ≥75,000 | 191,621 (24%) | 35,128 (25%) | 18.3 |

1. **Comparing results of the burden of disease using state-specific estimates with original estimates (Cases and attributable cases)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | State cases | Origin cases | Diff | % Diff | State AC | Origin AC | Diff | % Diff |
| Total | 754,893 | 794,934 | -40,041 | -5.0% | 132,829 | 141,931 | -9,103 | -6.4% |
| Rural | 142,559 | 148,470 | -5,911 | -4.0% | 13,951 | 14,466 | -514 | -3.6% |
| Urban cluster | 71,249 | 75,453 | -4,204 | -5.6% | 9,296 | 9,844 | -549 | -5.6% |
| Urbanized area | 541,085 | 571,011 | -29,926 | -5.2% | 109,581 | 117,621 | -8,040 | -6.8% |
| <20,000 | 28,039 | 28,207 | -168 | -0.6% | 5,834 | 5,892 | -58 | -1.0% |
| 20,000 to <35,000 | 134,208 | 137,765 | -3,558 | -2.6% | 24,906 | 25,794 | -889 | -3.4% |
| 35,000 to <50,000 | 190,481 | 200,367 | -9,885 | -4.9% | 32,369 | 34,549 | -2,180 | -6.3% |
| 50,000 to <75,000 | 223,522 | 236,827 | -13,305 | -5.6% | 37,559 | 40,540 | -2,981 | -7.4% |
| ≥75,000 | 178,497 | 191,621 | -13,123 | -6.8% | 32,133 | 35,128 | -2,994 | -8.5% |

1. **Comparing results of state-specific attributable fraction with original incidence estimates**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | State AF | Origin AF | Diff | % Diff |
| Total | 17.6% | 17.9% | -0.3% | -1.4% |
| Rural | 9.8% | 9.7% | 0.0% | 0.4% |
| Urban cluster | 13.0% | 13.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Urbanized area | 20.3% | 20.6% | -0.3% | -1.7% |
| <20,000 | 20.8% | 20.9% | -0.1% | -0.4% |
| 20,000 to <35,000 | 18.6% | 18.7% | -0.2% | -0.9% |
| 35,000 to <50,000 | 17.0% | 17.2% | -0.2% | -1.4% |
| 50,000 to <75,000 | 16.8% | 17.1% | -0.3% | -1.8% |
| ≥75,000 | 18.0% | 18.3% | -0.3% | -1.8% |

1. **Comparing results by state**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| State | State cases | Origin cases | Diff | % Diff | State AC | Origin AC | Diff | % Diff |
| Montana | 866 | 2,412 | -1,546 | -64.1% | 69 | 192 | -123 | -64.1% |
| Louisiana | 5,616 | 12,061 | -6,445 | -53.4% | 653 | 1,401 | -749 | -53.4% |
| Iowa | 4,193 | 7,853 | -3,660 | -46.6% | 519 | 971 | -453 | -46.6% |
| Illinois | 18,264 | 33,756 | -15,492 | -45.9% | 4,509 | 8,333 | -3,824 | -45.9% |
| New Mexico | 3,047 | 5,595 | -2,548 | -45.5% | 471 | 864 | -394 | -45.5% |
| Washington | 9,559 | 17,059 | -7,500 | -44.0% | 1,703 | 3,039 | -1,336 | -44.0% |
| Georgia | 19,165 | 26,878 | -7,713 | -28.7% | 2,772 | 3,887 | -1,115 | -28.7% |
| Kansas | 5,781 | 7,842 | -2,061 | -26.3% | 787 | 1,067 | -281 | -26.3% |
| Maine | 2,196 | 2,962 | -766 | -25.9% | 173 | 234 | -60 | -25.9% |
| California | 75,829 | 100,270 | -24,442 | -24.4% | 19,205 | 25,395 | -6,190 | -24.4% |
| Nebraska | 3,775 | 4,954 | -1,179 | -23.8% | 494 | 648 | -154 | -23.8% |
| New Jersey | 17,281 | 22,278 | -4,997 | -22.4% | 4,155 | 5,357 | -1,202 | -22.4% |
| Oklahoma | 8,619 | 10,029 | -1,410 | -14.1% | 1,154 | 1,342 | -189 | -14.1% |
| Utah | 8,142 | 9,396 | -1,254 | -13.3% | 1,672 | 1,929 | -258 | -13.3% |
| Maryland | 12,849 | 14,595 | -1,746 | -12.0% | 2,454 | 2,787 | -333 | -12.0% |
| Oregon | 8,517 | 9,347 | -829 | -8.9% | 1,180 | 1,295 | -115 | -8.9% |
| Delaware | 2,036 | 2,220 | -184 | -8.3% | 326 | 355 | -29 | -8.3% |
| Vermont | 1,285 | 1,394 | -110 | -7.9% | 126 | 136 | -11 | -7.9% |
| Connecticut | 8,265 | 8,814 | -549 | -6.2% | 1,502 | 1,601 | -100 | -6.2% |
| West Virginia | 4,003 | 4,179 | -176 | -4.2% | 578 | 603 | -25 | -4.2% |
| Alabama | 11,722 | 12,216 | -494 | -4.0% | 1,381 | 1,439 | -58 | -4.0% |
| Michigan | 24,356 | 25,287 | -931 | -3.7% | 4,056 | 4,211 | -155 | -3.7% |
| Kentucky | 10,650 | 11,040 | -389 | -3.5% | 1,591 | 1,649 | -58 | -3.5% |
| Virginia | 19,375 | 19,997 | -622 | -3.1% | 3,323 | 3,430 | -107 | -3.1% |
| New Hampshire | 3,017 | 3,099 | -82 | -2.6% | 329 | 338 | -9 | -2.6% |
| Arkansas | 7,476 | 7,675 | -199 | -2.6% | 864 | 887 | -23 | -2.6% |
| Massachusetts | 14,910 | 15,307 | -396 | -2.6% | 2,473 | 2,539 | -66 | -2.6% |
| South Carolina | 11,354 | 11,656 | -302 | -2.6% | 1,254 | 1,287 | -33 | -2.6% |
| Tennessee | 15,720 | 16,138 | -418 | -2.6% | 2,438 | 2,503 | -65 | -2.6% |
| South Dakota | 2,131 | 2,188 | -57 | -2.6% | 161 | 165 | -4 | -2.6% |
| Colorado | 12,879 | 13,221 | -342 | -2.6% | 3,009 | 3,089 | -80 | -2.6% |
| North Carolina | 23,976 | 24,613 | -637 | -2.6% | 3,099 | 3,182 | -82 | -2.6% |
| Florida | 42,055 | 43,173 | -1,118 | -2.6% | 5,360 | 5,502 | -142 | -2.6% |
| Nevada | 7,170 | 7,174 | -4 | -0.1% | 1,430 | 1,431 | -1 | -0.1% |
| Wyoming | 1,482 | 1,461 | 22 | 1.5% | 144 | 141 | 2 | 1.5% |
| Minnesota | 14,061 | 13,852 | 210 | 1.5% | 2,124 | 2,093 | 32 | 1.5% |
| Wisconsin | 14,694 | 14,450 | 244 | 1.7% | 2,154 | 2,118 | 36 | 1.7% |
| Idaho | 4,724 | 4,629 | 96 | 2.1% | 593 | 581 | 12 | 2.1% |
| North Dakota | 1,652 | 1,617 | 36 | 2.2% | 142 | 139 | 3 | 2.2% |
| Missouri | 15,821 | 15,377 | 445 | 2.9% | 1,898 | 1,845 | 53 | 2.9% |
| Pennsylvania | 31,619 | 30,120 | 1,499 | 5.0% | 6,310 | 6,011 | 299 | 5.0% |
| Rhode Island | 2,679 | 2,416 | 263 | 10.9% | 422 | 380 | 41 | 10.9% |
| Mississippi | 9,101 | 8,151 | 951 | 11.7% | 929 | 832 | 97 | 11.7% |
| New York | 53,600 | 46,655 | 6,945 | 14.9% | 13,504 | 11,754 | 1,750 | 14.9% |
| Ohio | 36,060 | 29,458 | 6,602 | 22.4% | 6,165 | 5,036 | 1,129 | 22.4% |
| Indiana | 21,263 | 17,350 | 3,913 | 22.6% | 3,852 | 3,143 | 709 | 22.6% |
| Arizona | 21,538 | 17,573 | 3,965 | 22.6% | 4,623 | 3,772 | 851 | 22.6% |
| D.C. | 1,433 | 1,088 | 346 | 31.8% | 386 | 293 | 93 | 31.8% |
| Texas | 99,084 | 74,065 | 25,019 | 33.8% | 14,316 | 10,701 | 3,615 | 33.8% |

1. **Air pollution concentration by state**
2. **Air pollution concentration by strata**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Mean | Min | Median | Max |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| By living location | Rural |  |  |  |  |
| Urban cluster |  |  |  |  |
| Urbanized area |  |  |  |  |
| By median household income | <20,000 |  |  |  |  |
| 20,000 to <35,000 |  |  |  |  |
| 35,000 to <50,000 |  |  |  |  |
| 50,000 to <75,000 |  |  |  |  |
| ≥75,000 |  |  |  |  |

1. **Childhood asthma survey summary by count**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **Mean** |
| Children sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ever asthma |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incident case |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| At-risk |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IR per 1,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRV per 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Childhood asthma survey summary by weights**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **Mean** |
| Weighted sample | 50,674,742 | 43,661,381 | 53,327,550 | 47,747,373 | 39,975,264 | 47,077,262 |
| Ever asthma | 6,493,224 | 5,763,409 | 7,218,400 | 6,279,938 | 5,158,455 | 6,182,685 |
| Incident case | 404,276 | 312,917 | 385,818 | 297,546 | 319,743 | 344,060 |
| At-risk | 30,825,589 | 36,050,557 | 26,491,259 | 25,942,087 | 22,900,850 | 28,442,068 |
| IR per 1,000 | 13.1 | 8.7 | 14.6 | 11.5 | 14.0 | 12.1 |
| PRV per 100 | 12.8 | 13.2 | 13.5 | 13.2 | 12.9 | 13.1 |

1. **Childhood asthma survey mean weighted summary by state**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State** | **Sample** | **Ever asthma** | **Incident** | **At-risk** | **IR per 1000** | **PRV per 100** |
| Arizona | 6,631,643 | 866,487 | 42,622 | 2,802,422 | 15.2 | 13.1 |
| California | 36,944,762 | 4,513,981 | 156,599 | 16,850,453 | 9.3 | 12.2 |
| Connecticut | 3,216,911 | 515,372 | 32,939 | 2,734,478 | 12.0 | 16.0 |
| D.C. | 550,985 | 109,403 | 3,184 | 179,493 | 17.7 | 19.9 |
| Georgia | 12,211,232 | 1,847,944 | 94,786 | 10,458,074 | 9.1 | 15.1 |
| Illinois | 12,758,371 | 1,580,896 | 37,799 | 5,673,571 | 6.7 | 12.4 |
| Indiana | 7,837,910 | 1,006,366 | 105,219 | 6,936,762 | 15.2 | 12.8 |
| Iowa | 3,410,014 | 287,609 | 11,510 | 1,829,734 | 6.3 | 8.4 |
| Kansas | 3,428,398 | 396,147 | 27,509 | 3,059,760 | 9.0 | 11.6 |
| Louisiana | 2,178,496 | 282,443 | 5,379 | 931,966 | 5.8 | 13.0 |
| Maine | 825,221 | 109,120 | 6,662 | 722,763 | 9.2 | 13.2 |
| Maryland | 6,754,689 | 1,002,976 | 64,871 | 5,816,584 | 11.2 | 14.8 |
| Michigan | 11,990,510 | 1,625,547 | 126,102 | 10,491,065 | 12.0 | 13.6 |
| Mississippi | 3,630,503 | 515,551 | 18,264 | 1,300,917 | 14.0 | 14.2 |
| Missouri | 5,518,464 | 766,864 | 46,410 | 3,600,272 | 12.9 | 13.9 |
| Montana | 1,059,004 | 102,944 | 3,296 | 768,012 | 4.3 | 9.7 |
| Nebraska | 2,201,248 | 204,905 | 18,262 | 2,014,605 | 9.1 | 9.3 |
| New Hampshire | 886,427 | 107,549 | 9,423 | 788,302 | 12.0 | 12.1 |
| New Jersey | 8,196,056 | 1,168,380 | 51,472 | 5,274,310 | 9.8 | 14.3 |
| New Mexico | 1,497,760 | 179,121 | 8,857 | 1,327,496 | 6.7 | 12.0 |
| New York | 17,587,681 | 2,781,426 | 221,226 | 15,027,481 | 14.7 | 15.8 |
| Ohio | 8,133,870 | 997,198 | 71,568 | 4,755,245 | 15.1 | 12.3 |
| Oklahoma | 3,491,913 | 487,287 | 24,628 | 2,285,659 | 10.8 | 14.0 |
| Oregon | 2,525,767 | 281,481 | 8,328 | 752,768 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
| Pennsylvania | 13,667,687 | 1,905,109 | 62,292 | 4,733,925 | 13.2 | 13.9 |
| Rhode Island | 907,043 | 145,915 | 5,476 | 384,117 | 14.3 | 16.1 |
| Texas | 26,030,068 | 3,420,044 | 381,999 | 22,992,023 | 16.6 | 13.1 |
| Utah | 3,963,227 | 404,738 | 30,221 | 2,902,955 | 10.4 | 10.2 |
| Vermont | 646,239 | 89,457 | 6,498 | 563,280 | 11.5 | 13.8 |
| Washington | 3,063,863 | 330,138 | 18,647 | 2,752,373 | 6.8 | 10.8 |
| West Virginia | 1,877,224 | 238,133 | 3,847 | 325,031 | 11.8 | 12.7 |
| Wisconsin | 3,890,403 | 410,615 | 14,404 | 1,174,447 | 12.3 | 10.6 |

***Boxplots (to be added after agreeing on form)***

1. **NO2 concentration**
2. **NO2 concentration by living location**
3. **NO2 concentration by median income grp**
4. **NO2 concentration by living location stratified into median income grp**
5. **NO2 concentration by median income grp stratified into living location**
6. **NO2 concentration by state**
7. **NO2 concentration by state and living location**
8. **NO2 concentration by state and median income grp**
9. **Attributable Fraction (AF)**
10. **AFconcentration by living location**
11. **AFconcentration by median income grp**
12. **AFconcentration by living location stratified into median income grp**
13. **AFconcentration by median income grp stratified into living location**
14. **AF by state and living location**
15. **AF by state and median income grp**

***Scatter plots (to be added after agreeing on form)***

1. **Total population by NO2 concentration**
2. **Total population by NO2 concentration and living location by color**
3. **Total population by NO2 concentration and Income by color**
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