## WEBVTT

- 1.00:00:07.216 --> 00:00:09.966 < v.> Welcome to this special seminar < / v > 00:00:07.216 --> 00:00:09.966 < v.> Welcome to this special seminar < / v > 00:00:09.966 < v.
- 2 00:00:10.800 --> 00:00:13.340 being sponsored by the Yale Center
- $3\ 00:00:13.340 --> 00:00:15.290$  on Climate Change in Health.
- $4~00:00:15.290 \longrightarrow 00:00:20.290$  And it's a pleasure to welcome Daniel Carrión
- $5~00:00:23.310 \longrightarrow 00:00:25.910$  who is currently a postdoctoral Fellow
- $6~00:00:25.910 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.290$  in Environmental Medicine and Public Health
- 7 00:00:28.290 --> 00:00:31.793 at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai.
- 8~00:00:33.040 --> 00:00:35.210 He received his PhD from
- 9 00:00:35.210  $\rightarrow$  00:00:38.790 Columbia Mailman School of Public Health
- 10~00:00:38.790 --> 00:00:42.530 from the Department of Environmental Health Sciences
- $11\ 00:00:42.530 \longrightarrow 00:00:45.110$  and it was in their Climate and Health Program,
- $12\ 00{:}00{:}45.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}50.110$  which is a really great program that our own Chi Chen
- $13\ 00:00:51.910 \longrightarrow 00:00:54.533$  has been closely associated with in the past.
- $14\ 00:00:56.199 \dashrightarrow 00:01:00.110$  And so we're really looking forward to Daniel's presentation
- 15 00:01:00.110 --> 00:01:02.890 on Climate, Energy and Inequity:
- $16\ 00{:}01{:}02.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}05.340$  from Exposures to Epidemiology.
- $17\ 00:01:05.340 \longrightarrow 00:01:06.563$  So, Daniel, welcome.
- $18\ 00:01:07.950 \longrightarrow 00:01:09.283 < v \longrightarrow Thank you so much. < / v >$
- $19\ 00:01:10.300 --> 00:01:13.030$  So I'm excited to speak to you all today
- $20\ 00:01:13.030 \longrightarrow 00:01:16.223$  and just by way of a little bit more introduction,
- 21 00:01:17.130 --> 00:01:22.130 I completed my BA at Ithaca College in 2008,
- $22\ 00:01:22.250 \longrightarrow 00:01:24.540$  and if you remember 2008,
- $23\ 00{:}01{:}24.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}27.590$  that was right when the global recession happened,
- $24\ 00:01:27.590 \longrightarrow 00:01:30.710$  so a great time to graduate from college.
- $25~00{:}01{:}30.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}33.600$  So I had two part-time jobs, one where I was working

- $26\ 00{:}01{:}33.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}36.290$  actually for the Health Department in Tompkins County
- $27\ 00{:}01{:}36.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39.890$  in New York state, and the other one where I was working
- $28\ 00{:}01{:}39.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}42.240$  for the Solid Waste Division where I was doing composting
- $29\ 00:01:42.240 \longrightarrow 00:01:45.260$  and recycling education and outreach.
- $30\ 00:01:45.260 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.530$  I then ended up leaving
- 31 00:01:46.530 --> 00:01:48.360 and going to Hudson River Healthcare,
- $32\ 00{:}01{:}48.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}52.940$  which is a network of federally qualified health centers
- 33 00:01:52.940 --> 00:01:57.320 across New York state, about 25 at the time,
- $34~00{:}01{:}57.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}01.530$  where I was helping manage outreach
- $35\ 00:02:01.530 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.640$  and programming for folks with HIV, folks who were homeless,
- $36\ 00:02:05.640 --> 00:02:09.020$  folks in public housing, and migrant farm workers.
- $37\ 00:02:09.020$  -->  $00:02:11.507\ \mathrm{I}$  was concurrently doing my masters in public health
- 38 00:02:11.507 --> 00:02:13.200 and environmental health sciences
- 39 00:02:13.200 --> 00:02:15.360 at New York Medical College.
- 40~00:02:15.360 --> 00:02:17.590 And then after completing my MPH
- 41 00:02:17.590 --> 00:02:20.940 ended up leaving to go to Columbia university
- $42\ 00:02:20.940 --> 00:02:24.170$  where I started a pipeline program called
- 43 00:02:24.170 --> 00:02:26.370 the Summer Public Health Scholars program,
- 44 00:02:26.370 --> 00:02:29.760 a CDC funded program to increase the diversity
- 45 00:02:29.760 --> 00:02:31.910 of the public health workforce,
- 46 00:02:31.910 --> 00:02:33.653 specifically around health equity.
- 47 00:02:34.680 --> 00:02:38.380 I then started my PhD as Rob mentioned
- $48\ 00:02:38.380 \dashrightarrow 00:02:41.980$  in the department of environmental health sciences
- $49\ 00:02:41.980 --> 00:02:44.108$  and the climate and health program
- $50\ 00:02:44.108 \longrightarrow 00:02:46.649$  and completed that in 2019.

- 51~00:02:46.649 --> 00:02:51.350 And then now at the Icahn School of Medicine as a post-doc.
- 52~00:02:51.350 --> 00:02:55.600 And so I'm excited to tell you about the work that I've done
- 53 00:02:55.600 --> 00:02:59.140 in the most recent part of this journey,
- $54\ 00:02:59.140 --> 00:03:03.010$  which I characterize being at this nexus of climate energy
- 55 00:03:03.010 --> 00:03:05.020 and health inequity.
- $56~00{:}03{:}05.020 --> 00{:}03{:}09.240$  So we all know that energy lies at the source of our climate
- $57\ 00:03:09.240 \longrightarrow 00:03:13.310$  crisis, societal decisions on where we derive energy,
- $58\ 00:03:13.310 \longrightarrow 00:03:18.310$  how much we need and what we use it for
- $59\ 00:03:19.260 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.040$  are all leading to increasing global temperatures
- $60\ 00:03:23.040 --> 00:03:26.593$  that we have been observing and we'll continue to see.
- 61 00:03:28.440 --> 00:03:30.810 But we've run a dynamic tension here, right?
- $62\ 00:03:30.810 \longrightarrow 00:03:34.780$  Because energy is fundamental to public health.
- 63 00:03:34.780 --> 00:03:38.260 It's fundamental for folks to stay healthy,
- $64\ 00:03:38.260 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.730$  from the energy that we use to cook with,
- $65\ 00:03:40.730 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.400$  to the energy that we use in the winter to stay warm,
- $66\ 00:03:44.400 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.700$  to the energy that we use in the summer to stay cool,
- $67\ 00:03:48.700 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.080$  we need energy.
- $68\ 00:03:51.080 \longrightarrow 00:03:53.300$  And so I've been fortunate to work in all three
- 69 00:03:53.300 --> 00:03:55.763 of these spaces, thinking about this,
- $70~00:03:55.763 \longrightarrow 00:03:59.010$  these energy tensions in public health,
- 71 00:03:59.010 --> 00:04:00.430 but for the scope of this talk,
- 72 00:04:00.430 --> 00:04:03.230 I'm going to only tell you about two of them,
- 73 00:04:03.230 --> 00:04:05.410 which is about my work in household energy and air
- 74 00:04:05.410 --> 00:04:07.310 pollution related to cooking,

- $75~00:04:07.310 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.040$  and then more recently temperature epidemiology
- $76\ 00:04:10.040 --> 00:04:11.813$  from summertime temperatures.
- 77~00:04:14.350 --> 00:04:18.370 So quickly about my dissertation work and household energy
- $78~00:04:18.370 \dashrightarrow 00:04:21.473$  and air pollution in low and middle income countries.
- 79~00:04:22.450 --> 00:04:27.450 As background, 3 billion people around the world
- 80 00:04:27.690 --> 00:04:29.900 experience energy poverty,
- $81\ 00:04:29.900 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.070$  which is characterized by cooking and or heating with wood,
- $82\ 00:04:34.070 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.053$  dung, charcoal, or other biomass fuels.
- $83\ 00:04:39.630$  --> 00:04:44.500 And although the proportion is decreasing overall
- $84\ 00:04:44.500 --> 00:04:48.940$  of the population that relies on these fuels
- 85 00:04:48.940 --> 00:04:50.620 because of population growth,
- $86\ 00{:}04{:}50.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55.000$  the absolute counts are actually increasing and the highest
- 87 00:04:55.000 --> 00:04:57.853 increases are actually in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- $88\ 00:04:59.010 --> 00:05:03.080$  And so this is the stove that you would see in many parts
- $89\ 00:05:03.080$  --> 00:05:07.800 of Sub-Saharan Africa, it's called the three stone fire,
- $90\ 00:05:07.800 --> 00:05:11.140$  which you might guess because there are three stones
- 91 00:05:11.140 --> 00:05:15.133 that prop up a pot and underneath biomass is combusted.
- 92 00:05:18.080 --> 00:05:20.680 We're concerned about this because the combustion of that
- 93 00:05:20.680 --> 00:05:25.680 biomass leads to a mixture of compounds collectively
- $94\ 00:05:25.820 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.050$  referred to as household air pollution.
- 95 00:05:29.050 --> 00:05:33.560 And so that comprises CO2 particulate matter,
- 96 00:05:33.560 --> 00:05:35.030 carbon monoxide,

 $97\ 00:05:35.030 --> 00:05:39.580$  polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons amongst others,

 $98\ 00{:}05{:}39.580$  -->  $00{:}05{:}43.300$  and both the deforestation associated with biomass

 $99\ 00:05:43.300 --> 00:05:47.000$  harvesting depending on country and the combustion

 $100\ 00:05:47.000 --> 00:05:50.343$  are projected to actually contribute to climate change.

 $101\ 00:05:52.390 \dashrightarrow 00:05:55.930$  And we also know that exposure to household air pollution

 $102\ 00{:}05{:}55{.}930 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{-}}} 00{:}05{:}59{.}530$  is associated premature deaths each year,

 $103\ 00{:}05{:}59.530 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}06{:}02.530$  millions of premature deaths each year,

 $104\ 00:06:02.530$  --> 00:06:07.300 the largest proportion from lower respiratory infections.

 $105~00{:}06{:}07.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}10.390$  And you might know that lower respiratory infections

 $106\ 00:06:10.390 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.840$  are actually the leading killer of children

 $107\ 00{:}06{:}12.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}16.330$  under five in lower and middle income countries.

 $108~00{:}06{:}16.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}19.370$  And so it's widely agreed that the solution here

 $109\ 00:06:19.370 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.920$  is to scale up cleaner cooking alternatives

 $110\ 00:06:22.920$  --> 00:06:27.233 like liquified petroleum, gas, electric, and induction.

111 00:06:29.650 --> 00:06:32.700 And in Ghana, as in many other countries,

 $112\ 00{:}06{:}32.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}37.170$  LPG represents the cheapest and most accessible options

 $113\ 00{:}06{:}37.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}41.560$  of the three that I just mentioned because the other two

 $114\ 00{:}06{:}41.560$  -->  $00{:}06{:}45.570$  electric and induction requires stable and extensive

115 00:06:45.570 --> 00:06:47.980 electricity grids that don't exist

 $116\ 00:06:47.980 \longrightarrow 00:06:49.573$  in many parts of the world.

117 00:06:50.420 --> 00:06:52.260 But if you're unfamiliar with this literature,

- $118\ 00{:}06{:}52.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}55.125$  I would understand if some folks in the audience
- $119\ 00{:}06{:}55.125 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}59.480$  are confused at how using a fossil fuel can actually help us
- $120\ 00:06:59.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:00.883$  fight climate change.
- $121\ 00{:}07{:}03.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}06.330$  The atmospheric science behind this is complicated
- 122 00:07:06.330 --> 00:07:09.160 and outside the scope of my talk today,
- $123\ 00{:}07{:}09.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}12.270$  but rest assured that the international panel on climate
- 124 00:07:12.270 --> 00:07:16.110 change indicates that activities consistent
- $125\ 00{:}07{:}16.110 --> 00{:}07{:}19.380$  with the greenhouse gas emission reductions needed
- 126 00:07:19.380 --> 00:07:23.020 for a warming of 1.5 degrees Celsius
- $127\ 00:07:24.180 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.780$  world includes transitions to clean cookstoves
- $128\ 00{:}07{:}28.780 \longrightarrow 00{:}07{:}32.363$  that are gas based or electric based.
- 129 00:07:33.353 --> 00:07:37.330 And unfortunately, atmosphere projections
- $130\ 00{:}07{:}37.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}40.490$  that are Ghana-specific are actually unavailable
- $131\ 00:07:40.490 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.450$  at the moment, but one done in Cameroon
- 132 00:07:45.450 --> 00:07:48.960 undergoing a similar LPG transition
- $133\ 00{:}07{:}48.960 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}07{:}53.710$  shows that there are projected net cooling benefits
- $134\ 00{:}07{:}53.710 --> 00{:}07{:}58.140$  of switching to LPG rather than continued use
- $135\ 00:07:58.140 --> 00:08:00.370$  of biomass fuels.
- $136\ 00{:}08{:}00.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}04.321$  And so this then represents in many parts of the world
- $137\ 00:08:04.321 --> 00:08:06.730$  climate mitigation opportunity
- $138\ 00:08:06.730 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.513$  with potential health co-benefits.
- $139\ 00{:}08{:}11.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}14.910$  And so my thesis works set out to try and provide evidence
- $140\ 00:08:14.910 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.030$  to support clean cooking efforts.
- $141\ 00:08:18.030 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.540$  The relationship between energy,

- $142\ 00:08:19.540 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.900$  poverty and disease can be described as a pathway
- $143\ 00:08:22.900 \longrightarrow 00:08:26.600$  from poverty to energy poverty,
- 144 00:08:26.600 --> 00:08:29.670 which then causes household air pollution,
- $145\ 00{:}08{:}29.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}32.580$  and then the exposure to that household air pollution
- $146\ 00:08:32.580 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.203$  leads to a whole host of diseases.
- $147\ 00:08:36.260 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.460$  And there are particularly three parts of this pathway
- $148\ 00:08:39.460 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.610$  that we can try to interrupt in this relationship
- $149\ 00:08:43.610 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.363$  between poverty and disease in this context.
- $150\ 00:08:47.210 --> 00:08:50.990$  So we can focus on making the clean available,
- 151 00:08:50.990 --> 00:08:54.860 which is a moniker from the late Kirk Smith,
- $152\ 00:08:54.860 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.570$  essentially saying identifying interventions
- 153 00:08:57.570 --> 00:09:00.140 to increase the uptake of clean cookstoves
- $154\ 00:09:00.140 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.493$  like induction or LPG.
- 155 00:09:04.310 --> 00:09:06.210 We could interrupt this part of the pathway,
- $156\ 00:09:06.210 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.717$  which is to make the available clean by identifying ways
- $157\ 00:09:10.717 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.010$  to reduce exposures from biomass combustion,
- $158\ 00{:}09{:}15.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}18.700$  such as improved cookstoves that have interventions
- 159 00:09:18.700 --> 00:09:21.200 like increasing ventilation,
- $160\ 00:09:21.200 --> 00:09:24.083$  thereby increasing the efficiency of combustion.
- 161 00:09:26.140 --> 00:09:29.600 And then finally, we can do health research
- 162 00:09:29.600 --> 00:09:31.670 to understand biological pathways
- $163\ 00{:}09{:}31.670 \longrightarrow 00{:}09{:}35.313$  for improved treatments or interventions.
- $164\ 00{:}09{:}37.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}41.040$  My work was particularly focused on these two parts
- $165~00{:}09{:}41.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}45.840$  of the pathway, and I'll quickly sum up my dissertation
- 166 00:09:45.840 --> 00:09:50.790 in one slide, which is the first paper

 $167\ 00:09:50.790 \longrightarrow 00:09:53.740$  in my dissertation was where I

 $168\ 00:09:53.740 --> 00:09:58.310$  created a new framework to try and understand why recipients

 $169\ 00:09:58.310 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.430$  of new cookstoves often end up

170 00:10:01.430 --> 00:10:04.160 stopping using those cookstoves

 $171\ 00{:}10{:}04.160 --> 00{:}10{:}08.680$  and we refer to this as stove use discontinuance

172 00:10:08.680 --> 00:10:11.480 Acknowledging that a lot of people who receive

 $173\ 00:10:11.480 \longrightarrow 00:10:16.480$  new cookstoves end up stopping their use in the longer term,

 $174\ 00{:}10{:}17.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}21.290$  we ended up then trying to design an intervention

 $175\ 00:10:21.290 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.610$  to support a government effort.

 $176~00{:}10{:}23.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}28.540$  So the government actually freely distributes LPG stoves

 $177\ 00:10:28.540 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.550$  in rural areas in Ghana.

 $178\ 00{:}10{:}30.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}35.550$  And so we designed and implemented an intervention

 $179\ 00:10:36.170 --> 00:10:39.623$  to try and increase the long-term use of those stoves.

 $180\ 00:10:40.660 --> 00:10:43.890$  The findings suggest that more fundamental policy changes

 $181\ 00{:}10{:}43.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}48.890$  are actually needed just rather than a simple intervention.

182 00:10:49.080 --> 00:10:53.520 And finally understanding biological pathways

183 00:10:53.520 --> 00:10:55.870 from data from a cohort study,

 $184\ 00:10:55.870 --> 00:11:00.330$  we used banked nasal swabs from infants

 $185\ 00:11:00.330 \longrightarrow 00:11:02.750$  of the age of one or less

 $186\ 00:11:02.750 --> 00:11:05.740$  and found that household air pollution is associated

 $187\ 00:11:05.740 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.660$  with increased presence of bacterial and not viral microbes.

 $188\ 00{:}11{:}10.660$  -->  $00{:}11{:}13.800$  And this is important because there's other literature

 $189\ 00:11:13.800 \longrightarrow 00:11:17.380$  that otherwise indicates that household air pollution may be

 $190\ 00:11:17.380 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.310$  contributing to bacterial forms of pneumonia

191 00:11:21.310 --> 00:11:23.290 and not viral forms of pneumonia

 $192~00{:}11{:}23.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}26.620$  and so this is trying to understand that ideological pathway

 $193\ 00:11:26.620 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.620$  a little bit better.

 $194\ 00:11:30.760 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.120$  So with that very brief overview of my thesis work,

 $195~00{:}11{:}35.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}38.690$  I wanted to spend more time on my current portfolio,

196 00:11:38.690 --> 00:11:40.900 which is focused on ambient temperature,

 $197\ 00{:}11{:}40.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}44.203$  temperature epidemiology, and energy insecurity.

 $198\ 00:11:47.250 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.760$  And the motivation here is simple.

 $199\ 00:11:50.760 --> 00:11:52.370$  We're living it right now.

 $200\ 00:11:52.370 \longrightarrow 00:11:55.800$  Climate change means that there's an increased frequency

 $201~00{:}11{:}55.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}58.540$  and intensity of extreme heat events

 $202\ 00:11:58.540 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.890$  and hotter average summers.

 $203\ 00{:}12{:}00.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}04.620$  And we know that those higher temperatures are associated

 $204~00{:}12{:}04.620 \to 00{:}12{:}08.310$  with a whole host of health outcomes from cardiovascular

205 00:12:08.310 --> 00:12:10.780 to respiratory, to renal,

 $206\ 00:12:10.780 \longrightarrow 00:12:15.090$  to even violence and other non-health outcomes,

 $207\ 00:12:15.090 --> 00:12:19.053$  but still very health relevant like educational performance.

 $208\ 00:12:20.340$  --> 00:12:24.330 And there's also work that shows that increased ambient

 $209\ 00{:}12{:}24.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}27.640$  temperatures are associated with perinatal outcomes

210 00:12:27.640 --> 00:12:29.760 like pre-term birth.

211 00:12:29.760 --> 00:12:31.730 And there's an important opportunity here

- 212 00:12:31.730 --> 00:12:34.980 because temperature epi has been largely focused
- 213 00:12:34.980 --> 00:12:37.440 on older adult populations
- $214\ 00{:}12{:}37.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}41.120$  and so there's an opportunity to grow the literature
- 215 00:12:41.120 --> 00:12:43.883 thinking about pediatric populations.
- 216 00:12:46.560 --> 00:12:48.940 So I first want to tell you about a study
- 217 00:12:48.940 --> 00:12:50.890 that we're wrapping up right now,
- $218~00{:}12{:}50.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}54.820$  thinking about the case process over design as a way
- $219\ 00{:}12{:}54.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}58.200$  of studying the relationship between ambient temperature
- $220\ 00:12:58.200 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.623$  and preterm birth.
- $221\ 00:13:04.450 \longrightarrow 00:13:06.350$  And the motivation here
- $222\ 00:13:06.350 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.100\ I$  think is also simple for a public health crowd.
- $223\ 00:13:10.100 --> 00:13:15.100$  That preterm birth is a major health outcome
- 224 00:13:15.850 --> 00:13:19.460 that's associated with high infant mortality.
- $225\ 00{:}13{:}19.460 \longrightarrow 00{:}13{:}22.710$  It's also one of the most pronounced and persistent
- 226 00:13:22.710 --> 00:13:25.680 racial disparities that we know of,
- 227 00:13:25.680 --> 00:13:29.220 and it not only represents poor health
- $228\ 00{:}13{:}29.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}32.830$  potentially in the immediacy of birth,
- $229\ 00:13:32.830 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.890$  but also potentially a trajectory of poor health
- 230 00:13:36.890 --> 00:13:38.500 in the long term.
- 231 00:13:38.500  $\rightarrow$  00:13:42.650 Many of the health outcomes are also health disparities
- $232\ 00:13:42.650 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.933$  for communities of color.
- $233\ 00{:}13{:}45.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}47.510$  And there's a growing literature on the relationship
- $234\ 00{:}13{:}47.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.700$  between ambient temperature and preterm birth.
- $235\ 00{:}13{:}50.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}53.960$  One of the initial studies identifying this association
- 236 00:13:53.960 --> 00:13:57.670 was actually from Bosu at all in 2010,

- $237\ 00:13:57.670 --> 00:14:00.010$  a study based in California using
- $238\ 00:14:00.010 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.083$  the case crossover study design.
- $239\ 00{:}14{:}04.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}07.020$  So if you're unfamiliar with the case crossover study
- 240 00:14:07.020 --> 00:14:09.460 design, a quick introduction.
- $241\ 00{:}14{:}09.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}14.460$  It's a case-only study design that compares the case time
- $242\ 00{:}14{:}15.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}19.600$  to control times when the event did not happen.
- $243\ 00{:}14{:}19.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}23.310$  And it's been widely used in air pollution epidemiology
- $244\ 00:14:23.310 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.363$  and is increasingly used in temperature epidemiology.
- 245 00:14:28.210 --> 00:14:31.393 It's a temporal comparison,
- $246\ 00{:}14{:}32.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}35.470$  meaning that it's comparing the same person to themselves
- $247\ 00:14:35.470 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.290$  at different time points.
- $248\ 00{:}14{:}37.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}41.010$  And so a real perk there is that then it's not vulnerable
- 249 00:14:41.010 --> 00:14:43.663 to person level forms of confounding.
- $250\ 00:14:47.210$  --> 00:14:52.210 However, proper control selection is then pivotal for proper
- $251~00{:}14{:}52.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}55.400$  inference because you want to make sure that you
- $252\ 00{:}14{:}55.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}58.700$  are controlling for potential temporal confounders
- $253\ 00:14:58.700 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.760$  and other temporal forms of bias.
- $254~00{:}15{:}01.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}06.760$  And a key assumption of this design is that there are no
- $255\ 00:15:07.310 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.890$  trends in the risk of the outcome over time.
- $256~00{:}15{:}10.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}14.032$  And it was actually pointed out in a commentary
- $257\ 00{:}15{:}14.032 \to 00{:}15{:}17.890$  from that original Bosu paper that I mentioned

 $258\ 00{:}15{:}17.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}21.720$  that preterm birth actually violates this assumption.

 $259\ 00{:}15{:}21.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}25.150$  And this should be pretty intuitive to folks in the audience

260 00:15:25.150 --> 00:15:29.680 because the risk of birth changes

 $261\ 00:15:29.680 --> 00:15:32.910$  pretty secularly over gestation.

 $262\ 00:15:32.910 --> 00:15:35.070$  And so this is something that we need to think about

 $263\ 00:15:35.070 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.764$  if we're using this study design

 $264\ 00:15:37.764 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.333$  for ambient environmental exposures.

 $265\ 00:15:44.910 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.730$  However six other studies have employed this study design

266 00:15:48.730 --> 00:15:52.400 for preterm birth since 2010,

 $267\ 00:15:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.780$  specifically for ambient temperature that we're aware of.

 $268\ 00:15:55.780 --> 00:15:58.030$  And I'm sure that number is much higher

 $269\ 00:15:58.030 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.573$  if we also consider air pollution.

 $270\ 00{:}16{:}05.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}09.890$  So that this was a great opportunity for a simulation study.

271 00:16:09.890 --> 00:16:11.510 So for those who are unfamiliar,

 $272\ 00{:}16{:}11.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}15.080$  a simulation study are essentially computational experiments

 $273\ 00{:}16{:}15.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}18.750$  where we can test the behavior of our epidemiological

274 00:16:18.750 --> 00:16:21.653 studies under controlled circumstances.

 $275\ 00{:}16{:}23.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}28.200$  So first what we do is we create a dataset and then we embed

 $276\ 00:16:28.200 --> 00:16:31.940$  a known association in that dataset.

 $277\ 00:16:31.940 \dashrightarrow 00:16:34.990$  We then test our epidemiological analysis'

 $278\ 00:16:34.990 \longrightarrow 00:16:38.040$  ability to recover that association.

 $279\ 00:16:38.040 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.520$  Then we try to repeat,

 $280\ 00:16:39.520 --> 00:16:43.110$  or we repeat this a thousand times to represent

281 00:16:43.110 --> 00:16:47.160 some of the stochasticity of the underlying distribution.

- $282\ 00:16:47.160 \longrightarrow 00:16:49.170$  And then we could see if different strategies
- $283\ 00:16:49.170 --> 00:16:50.950$  or specifications of models
- $284\ 00:16:50.950 \longrightarrow 00:16:53.583$  can actually improve our inference.
- 285 00:16:55.750 --> 00:16:59.390 More specific, what data did I use to do this?
- 286 00:16:59.390 --> 00:17:02.865 Well, LaGuardia Airport has temperature data
- $287\ 00:17:02.865 --> 00:17:06.040$  readily available for download online.
- $288\ 00{:}17{:}06.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08.650$  So we downloaded LaGuardia temperature data
- $289\ 00:17:08.650 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.943$  as our exposure data.
- $290\ 00:17:12.210$  --> 00:17:15.980 And then for our health data, we actually downloaded CDC
- 291 00:17:15.980 --> 00:17:20.980 wonder data to create estimates of daily preterm births
- $292\ 00:17:21.510 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.510$  by gestational age from 20 to 36 weeks.
- 293 00:17:27.860 --> 00:17:30.350 And just as a quick definitional thing,
- $294\ 00{:}17{:}30.350 {\: -->\:} 00{:}17{:}33.810$  preterm birth is generally a birth that take place
- $295\ 00:17:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.733$  before 37 weeks.
- $296\ 00:17:36.720 \longrightarrow 00:17:41.720$  We got these data for 2007 and 2018 from,
- $297\ 00:17:42.080 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.010$  and then we created data sets with a range
- $298\ 00:17:46.010 --> 00:17:51.010$  of simulated effects ranging from  $0.9\ to\ 1.25$ .
- 299 00:17:51.210 --> 00:17:53.490 I don't think anyone thinks that temperature
- 300 00:17:53.490 --> 00:17:56.080 is protective of preterm birth,
- $301\ 00{:}17{:}56.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00.500$  but we wanted to see how mall eable these models
- $302\ 00:18:00.500 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.163$  were to different underlying assumptions.
- 303~00:18:05.550 --> 00:18:10.220 And then we do these case crossovers to see how our model
- $304\ 00:18:10.220 \longrightarrow 00:18:13.980$  does at recovering the simulated effects.
- $305\ 00{:}18{:}13.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}17.640$  We ended up doing this using a time stratified control
- $306\ 00:18:17.640 \longrightarrow 00:18:21.290$  selection for three different time periods.

- 307 00:18:21.290 --> 00:18:24.380 So we did it for a two week time stratified,
- $308~00{:}18{:}24.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}28.850$  a 28 day time stratified, and a month time stratified.
- $309\ 00:18:28.850 \longrightarrow 00:18:33.140$  And we limit our case crossover to warm month analyses,
- 310~00:18:33.140 --> 00:18:36.040 which is consistent with other studies in this literature.
- $311\ 00{:}18{:}37.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}40.680$  And again, we do this a thousand times to kind of represent
- $312\ 00{:}18{:}40.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}43.580$  some of that stochasticity of the underlying distribution.
- $313\ 00:18:45.940 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.110$  So these are the input data that we use.
- $314\ 00:18:50.110 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.860$  So up here are, is the temperature data
- 315 00:18:54.860 --> 00:18:56.680 from LaGuardia Airport
- $316\ 00{:}18{:}57.530 {\: -->\:} 00{:}19{:}00.940$  and down here are the estimated number of births
- $317~00{:}19{:}00.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}05.660$  on a given day that we used from the CDC wonder database.
- $318\ 00:19:05.660 --> 00:19:08.040$  And then this orange region
- $319\ 00:19:08.040 --> 00:19:12.193$  is the warm month time period that we used.
- $320\ 00:19:14.640 --> 00:19:16.920$  So the main result that I'm showing you here
- $321\ 00:19:16.920 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.520$  is for absolute bias.
- $322\ 00{:}19{:}19{:}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}22.690$  And so absolute bias is simply the difference between
- $323\ 00{:}19{:}22.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}26.810$  the simulated relative risk with the coefficient that we get
- $324\ 00:19:26.810 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.913$  from the case crossover in the log scale.
- $325\ 00{:}19{:}31.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}34.160$  And I'm showing you first a relative risk of one,
- 326~00:19:34.160 --> 00:19:38.320 meaning that there's no association between temperature
- $327\ 00:19:38.320 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.920$  and preterm birth.
- $328\ 00:19:39.920 --> 00:19:43.320$  And you could see that using all three of these study

- $329\ 00{:}19{:}43.320 --> 00{:}19{:}48.260$  designs, we actually get relatively unbiased results
- $330~00:19:48.260 \dashrightarrow 00:19:51.463$  with the medians hovering around zero.
- $331\ 00:19:53.610 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.540$  If we look across the entire range of our embedded effects,
- $332\ 00{:}19{:}57.540 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}20{:}01.880$  we see relatively consistent results where all three
- $333\ 00:20:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:20:06.880$  of these case control selection designs actually yield
- $334\ 00:20:07.140 --> 00:20:11.650$  relatively unbiased results, with our two-week stratified,
- $335\ 00:20:11.650 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.300$  yielding the noisiest results characterized here
- $336\ 00:20:16.300 \longrightarrow 00:20:19.703$  by a wider intercore tile range.
- $337\ 00:20:20.750 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.950$  And then when we looked at coverage,
- $338\ 00:20:22.950 \longrightarrow 00:20:26.070$  so coverage would be the coverage
- $339\ 00:20:26.070 \longrightarrow 00:20:29.297$  of the 95% confidence intervals.
- $340\ 00{:}20{:}29.297 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}32.950$  What percentage of the time does the confidence interval
- 341 00:20:32.950 --> 00:20:36.240 actually include the true embedded effect?
- $342\ 00:20:36.240 --> 00:20:38.690$  And you would hope for a model that that would be
- $343\ 00:20:39.542 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.220$  consistently 95% of the time.
- $344\ 00{:}20{:}41.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}45.120$  And indeed we see that these models are relatively stable
- 345~00:20:45.120 --> 00:20:50.120 with approximately 95% at all of these risks embedded.
- $346~00{:}20{:}54.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}59.760$  So this is really important work because this shores up
- $347\ 00:21:00.160 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.930$  the evidence that we have
- $348\ 00:21:01.930 \longrightarrow 00:21:04.520$  for the case crossover study design
- 349 00:21:04.520 --> 00:21:09.520 and ambient exposures and preterm birth,
- $350\ 00:21:09.810 \longrightarrow 00:21:11.860$  which I think is really important.
- $351\ 00{:}21{:}11.860 \to 00{:}21{:}15.320$  We ended up doing  $24{,}000$  simulations and corresponding

- $352\ 00:21:15.320 --> 00:21:18.100$  case crossovers, finding that the models
- $353\ 00:21:18.100 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.270$  are relatively unbiased.
- $354\ 00{:}21{:}20.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}23.560$  And we're excited about wrapping up this project
- $355\ 00:21:23.560 \longrightarrow 00:21:27.240$  because we've tried to enhance reproducibility
- $356\ 00{:}21{:}27.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}31.450$  of our findings and results by using the targets package
- 357 00:21:31.450 --> 00:21:36.450 in R, which then means that other folks
- $358\ 00{:}21{:}36.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}41.650$  can go and rerun these analyses and can actually swap out
- 359 00:21:41.710 --> 00:21:44.980 different years or regions and their analysis,
- $360\ 00:21:44.980 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.863$  which aids an extensibility of this analysis.
- $361\ 00{:}21{:}50.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}54.960$  And now we're actually using the case crossover analysis
- $362\ 00:21:56.050 \longrightarrow 00:21:58.900$  to think about a national level analysis
- $363\ 00:21:58.900 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.420$  that we're doing actually in Mexico
- $364\ 00{:}22{:}02.420$  -->  $00{:}22{:}04.973$  and hopefully future studies in the U.S. as well.
- $365~00:22:08.270 \dashrightarrow 00:22:10.880$  But much the same way that we're thinking about
- $366~00{:}22{:}10.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}14.550$  epidemiological methods, we're also thinking about improving
- 367~00:22:14.550 --> 00:22:16.710 our exposure methods.
- $368\ 00:22:16.710 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.980$  And so here, I want to tell you about a project
- $369\ 00:22:18.980 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.790$  that we just published on,
- $370\ 00{:}22{:}20.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}24.460$  thinking about a one kilometer hourly air temperature model
- 371 00:22:24.460 --> 00:22:26.950 across the Northeastern United States
- $372\ 00:22:26.950 \longrightarrow 00:22:29.300$  from Maine to Virginia
- $373\ 00:22:29.300 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.820$  and this is fusing ground data
- $374\ 00:22:32.820 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.163$  with satellite remote sensing data.
- $375\ 00:22:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.200$  And the inspiration for me here is that there is a small,

- $376\ 00:22:43.200 \longrightarrow 00:22:46.800$  but growing literature on temperature disparities,
- $377\ 00{:}22{:}46.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}51.627$  that temperature is perhaps unevenly experienced
- 378 00:22:51.627 --> 00:22:55.960 based on race, ethnicity, income,
- $379\ 00:22:55.960 \longrightarrow 00:22:59.640$  and other forms of potential vulnerability.
- 380 00:22:59.640 --> 00:23:03.810 And so one limitation, however,
- $381\ 00:23:03.810 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.520$  with some of these past studies is that they either use land
- $382\ 00:23:07.520 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.260$  surface temperature, which is remotely sensed
- $383\ 00:23:10.260 \longrightarrow 00:23:13.780$  with satellites and related to air temperature,
- $384\ 00:23:13.780 \longrightarrow 00:23:16.470$  but not exactly air temperature,
- $385\ 00:23:16.470 \longrightarrow 00:23:20.590$  or they use forms of land cover,
- $386\ 00:23:20.590 \longrightarrow 00:23:24.470$  and land use that are associated with temperature,
- $387\ 00{:}23{:}24.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}27.960$  but again, not empirical measures of temperature
- $388\ 00:23:27.960 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.350$  and so an opportunity then to try and grow this literature,
- $389\ 00{:}23{:}32.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}35.943$  thinking about these potential temperature disparities.
- $390\ 00:23:38.760 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.360$  So the goal here is to create this one kilometer
- $391\ 00:23:42.360 --> 00:23:44.410$  hourly air temperature model
- $392\ 00:23:44.410 \longrightarrow 00:23:46.350$  to be able to produce predictions
- $393\ 00:23:46.350 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.350$  between the time period of 2003 to 2019.
- 394 00:23:51.440 --> 00:23:54.730 So we ended up using national oceanic,
- 395 00:23:54.730 --> 00:23:59.600 atmospheric and atmospheric administration data
- $396\ 00:23:59.600 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.510$  for ground stations throughout this region
- $397\ 00:24:02.510 \longrightarrow 00:24:05.350$  as our ground truths for air temperature.
- $398\ 00:24:05.350 \longrightarrow 00:24:07.890$  And so that's what's depicted in red
- $399\ 00:24:07.890 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.500$  across our study region.
- $400\ 00{:}24{:}09.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}13.470$  These are the locations of all of the ground sensors

- $401\ 00:24:13.470 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.260$  that we used in our model.
- $402\ 00{:}24{:}16.260$  -->  $00{:}24{:}20.528$  We then collected 34 predictors that we thought
- $403\ 00{:}24{:}20.528 --> 00{:}24{:}24.490$  would help us characterize the spatial and temporal patterns
- $404\ 00:24:24.490 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.853$  of cooling and heating throughout the day.
- $405\ 00{:}24{:}28.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}32.230$  And the goal here is to be able to create consistent
- $406~00{:}24{:}32.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}36.090$  and reliable predictions of air temperature across
- 407 00:24:36.090 --> 00:24:38.020 this region, even in places
- $408\ 00:24:38.020 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.163$  that we don't have ground observations.
- $409\ 00{:}24{:}46.150$  -->  $00{:}24{:}49.990$  So we tested five different statistical approaches
- $410\ 00:24:49.990 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.557$  to actually create these predictions
- $411\ 00:24:54.557 --> 00:24:59.320$  and show their differences in performance in our paper.
- 412 00:24:59.320 --> 00:25:00.870 For the sake of time,
- 413 00:25:00.870 --> 00:25:03.060 I'm just going to tell you the punchline,
- $414\ 00{:}25{:}03.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06.820$  which is that we ended up using the XG boost model
- $415\ 00:25:06.820 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.100$  for our final predictions.
- $416\ 00{:}25{:}09.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}14.070$  So the XG boost model is a powerful machine learning model
- $417\ 00:25:14.070 \longrightarrow 00:25:18.610$  that we used and had to adapt to create
- $418\ 00:25:18.610 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.563$  a spatial temporal predictions.
- $419\ 00{:}25{:}23.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}26.970$  And what we ended up doing was actually comparing
- $420\ 00:25:26.970 --> 00:25:31.970$  our XG boost model to the NLDAS-2 model.
- $421~00{:}25{:}32.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}36.600$  So NLDAS-2, if you're unfamiliar is a NASA product
- $422\ 00:25:36.600 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.490$  that also gives hourly predictions
- $423\ 00:25:39.490 --> 00:25:43.310$  and it's what the CDC uses for their heat and health

- $424\ 00{:}25{:}43.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}47.960$  tracking system, as well as some of their research.
- $425\ 00{:}25{:}47.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}50.550$  And so we thought that this was an important model
- $426\ 00:25:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:25:52.003$  to benchmark again.
- $427\ 00:25:56.130 \longrightarrow 00:25:59.210$  So these are the predictions from our XG boost model,
- $428\ 00:25:59.210$  --> 00:26:03.620 from the hottest midnight of our data set, July 22nd, 2011.
- $429\ 00{:}26{:}04.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}08.980$  And so you can see across this Northeast region
- 430 00:26:08.980 --> 00:26:11.090 from Virginia to Maine,
- 431  $00:26:11.090 \longrightarrow 00:26:15.163$  that we reconstruct a great deal of spatial heterogeneity.
- 432 00:26:16.530 --> 00:26:18.750 Again, this is for one hour,
- $433\ 00:26:18.750 \longrightarrow 00:26:23.120$  the highest midnight of our time period.
- $434\ 00:26:23.120 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.120$  And when we zoom in to a sub region,
- 435 00:26:28.700 --> 00:26:31.163 this, in this case being New York City,
- $436\ 00{:}26{:}33.500 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}26{:}37.120$  we see that we reconstruct a great deal of spatial
- $437\ 00{:}26{:}37.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}41.063$  heterogeneity from the urban heat island effect.
- 438 00:26:42.410 --> 00:26:45.060 And I should have mentioned earlier,
- 439 00:26:45.060 --> 00:26:48.790 I mentioned that NLDAS-2 is hourly,
- $440\ 00:26:48.790 \longrightarrow 00:26:52.520$  but it's actually at a much coarser spatial resolution.
- $441\ 00{:}26{:}52.520 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}26{:}57.520$  So these larger grid cells overlaid our predictions
- $442\ 00:26:57.650 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.680$  are actually the NLDAS-2 grid cells.
- $443\ 00:27:01.680 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.190$  And it's important to note here that in this one,
- 444 00:27:06.190 --> 00:27:10.200 NLDAS-2 grid cell, you have most of Manhattan
- $445\ 00{:}27{:}10.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}13.610$  a big chunk of the Bronx and a little bit of Queens

- $446\ 00:27:13.610 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.240$  that would get one prediction for all of that region,
- 447 00:27:18.240 --> 00:27:20.970 with the NLDAS-2 predictions,
- $448\ 00{:}27{:}20.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}24.790$  but we can reconstruct a great deal of heterogeneity
- $449\ 00:27:24.790 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.543$  within that region.
- $450\ 00:27:29.210 \longrightarrow 00:27:32.360$  And we think that that then is related
- $451\ 00:27:32.360 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.890$  to the performance of these models.
- $452\ 00{:}27{:}34.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}39.890$  So these are the root mean squared errors from just 2019
- $453\,00:27:39.960 --> 00:27:44.960$  from our XG boost model versus the NLDAS-2 model.
- $454\ 00{:}27{:}45.520 {\:{\mbox{--}}}> 00{:}27{:}50.520$  So RMSE is a measure of predictive accuracy and the goal
- $455\ 00:27:51.230 \longrightarrow 00:27:53.920$  is to have lower RMSEs.
- $456\ 00:27:53.920 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.450$  And so we show that our model
- $457\ 00:27:56.450 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.160$  has a low RMSE of 1.4 Celsius,
- $458~00{:}28{:}01.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}06.160$  whereas the NLDAS-2 model has a RMSE of 2.4 Celsius.
- $459\ 00:28:08.870 \longrightarrow 00:28:13.720$  When we look across the entire region across all years,
- $460\ 00{:}28{:}13.720$  -->  $00{:}28{:}17.420$  we see that the XG boost predictions have one third
- $461~00{:}28{:}17.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}22.273$  of the mean squared error of the NLDAS-2 predictions.
- $462\ 00:28:25.960 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.950$  But given the small literature on temperature disparities,
- $463\ 00{:}28{:}28.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}32.880$  we were curious to see if our model was also associated
- $464\ 00:28:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.540$  with a measure of social vulnerability.
- $465\ 00:28:36.540 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.540$  And so what we decided to do was actually conduct a limited
- $466\ 00:28:41.750 --> 00:28:46.030$  application to look at the relationship between our model

- $467\ 00:28:46.030 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.030$  and the NLDAS-2 model with social vulnerability.
- $468~00{:}28{:}51.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}56.150$  So what we did was we used the CDCs social vulnerability
- $469\ 00:28:56.150 \longrightarrow 00:29:01.150$  index, which are a composite of 15 census variables.
- $470\ 00:29:01.680 \longrightarrow 00:29:06.680$  including socioeconomic status, housing, transportation,
- $471\ 00{:}29{:}06.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}11.760$  language isolation, amongst other characteristics.
- $472\ 00{:}29{:}12.063 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}16.010$  And these are variables that the CDC uses to identify
- 473 00:29:16.010 --> 00:29:19.210 communities that may need support before,
- $474\ 00:29:19.210 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.540$  during or after a disaster.
- $475\ 00:29:22.540 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.620$  The results from the social vulnerability index
- $476\ 00:29:25.620 \longrightarrow 00:29:27.530$  are proportional.
- $477\ 00:29:27.530 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.490$  It produces measures from zero to one.
- $478\ 00:29:31.490 \longrightarrow 00:29:36.490$  And so we decided to use mixed models
- $479\ 00{:}29{:}36.620$  -->  $00{:}29{:}41.620$  to associate our XG boost model and the NLDAS model
- $480\ 00:29:42.670 --> 00:29:47.400$  with social vulnerability to see how they were associated
- $481\ 00:29:47.400 --> 00:29:51.410$  with social vulnerability at the census tract level.
- $482\ 00:29:51.410 --> 00:29:53.730$  We wanted this to be a limited application
- $483\ 00:29:53.730 \longrightarrow 00:29:58.230$  so we only did it for one hour of one day from that hottest
- $484\ 00:29:58.230 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.653$  midnight that I showed you earlier.
- $485\ 00:30:03.750 \longrightarrow 00:30:06.893$  And here are the results.
- 486 00:30:06.893 --> 00:30:08.500 So, as I mentioned earlier,
- $487\ 00{:}30{:}08.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}12.010$  the CDC social vulnerability index is a proportional measure
- $488\ 00:30:12.010 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.780$  from zero to one.
- 489 00:30:13.780 --> 00:30:18.500 And so for a unit increase of the CDC SVI,

- $490~00{:}30{:}19.600$  -->  $00{:}30{:}23.500$  we see that the NLDAS-2 model shows an increase
- 491 00:30:23.500 --> 00:30:27.520 of temperature of 0.18 Celsius.
- $492\ 00:30:27.520 --> 00:30:30.250$  However, when we look at the XG boost model,
- $493\ 00{:}30{:}30{:}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}35{.}030$  we see that our model has a stronger relationship
- $494\ 00:30:35.030 \longrightarrow 00:30:36.840$  with an increase in temperature,
- $495\ 00:30:36.840 --> 00:30:41.833$  average temperature of 0.71 Celsius.
- $496~00{:}30{:}44.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}48.610$  And just to ground that in some places that you might know,
- 497 00:30:48.610 --> 00:30:52.410 so if we look at New York City,
- $498\ 00:30:52.410 \longrightarrow 00:30:57.100$  two boroughs of New York City, Manhattan and the Bronx,
- $499\ 00:30:57.100 \longrightarrow 00:31:01.590$  and then we look at two counties in upstate New York,
- $500\ 00:31:01.590 --> 00:31:05.623$  you would see that the NLDAS-2 model has a very,
- $501\ 00{:}31{:}07.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}11.300$  very shallow gradient of temperature and social
- $502~00{:}31{:}11.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}15.960$  vulnerability across these temperature predictions
- 503 00:31:15.960 --> 00:31:18.060 However, with our XG boost model,
- $504\ 00:31:18.060 --> 00:31:22.530$  because we reconstruct much more spatial heterogeneity,
- $505\ 00:31:22.530 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.950$  we see much more of a strong relationship
- $506\ 00:31:28.094 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.323$  with the social vulnerability index.
- $507\ 00{:}31{:}32.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}36.280$  So with the caveat that this is one hour of one day,
- $508~00{:}31{:}36.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}39.810$  what this implies to us is that there's potentially exposure
- $509\ 00:31:39.810 --> 00:31:43.800$  misclassification in coarser models.
- $510~00{:}31{:}43.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}48.380$  And that that exposure misclassification may be differential
- $511\ 00:31:48.380 \longrightarrow 00:31:50.453$  by neighborhood vulnerability.

- $512\ 00:31:53.430 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.870$  So as a takeaway here,
- $513\ 00:31:55.870 --> 00:32:00.020$  we've created highly accurate air temperature predictions
- 514 00:32:00.020 --> 00:32:03.120 that we think are right for application
- 515 00:32:03.120 --> 00:32:06.780 to social science, exposure science,
- $516\ 00:32:06.780 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.203$  and epidemiological studies.
- 517 00:32:11.040 --> 00:32:13.203 But wait, there's more,
- 518 00:32:13.203 --> 00:32:15.710 I think that this is a great segue
- $519\ 00:32:15.710 --> 00:32:19.240$  because I'm currently expanding on these questions
- $520\ 00:32:19.240 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.810$  with work that I'm doing at the moment.
- $521~00{:}32{:}22.810 --> 00{:}32{:}26.670$  And so right now, I want to quickly tell you about work
- $522\ 00{:}32{:}26.670 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}32{:}30.900$  that I have underway to try and explore these exposure
- $523\ 00:32:30.900 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.900$  disparities further and point to its potential importance
- $524\ 00:32:36.220 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.030$  for epidemiological methods.
- $525\ 00:32:39.030 \longrightarrow 00:32:42.550$  And so this is about thinking about residential segregation,
- 526 00:32:42.550 --> 00:32:46.193 air temperature, and circulatory mortality.
- 527 00:32:49.250 --> 00:32:51.360 So for the first part of the analysis,
- $528\ 00:32:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.410$  I'll be looking at exposure disparities,
- $529\ 00:32:54.410 --> 00:32:56.970$  similar to the methods that I just showed you,
- $530\ 00:32:56.970 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.730$  but with some key differences.
- 531 00:32:59.730 --> 00:33:03.163 So unlike the last analysis,
- $532\ 00{:}33{:}03.163 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}06.830$  this time I actually want to look at the differences
- $533\ 00:33:06.830 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.070$  and the predictions by race.
- 534~00:33:09.070 --> 00:33:12.770 We know that we have suggestions from past literature
- $535\ 00:33:12.770 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.120$  that there are differences in exposure by race
- $536\ 00:33:16.120 --> 00:33:19.540$  and ethnicity and so we want to look at this

- $537\ 00:33:19.540 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.540$  by race and ethnicity as well
- $538\ 00:33:24.550 \longrightarrow 00:33:27.998$  now that we have air temperature predictions.
- $539~00:33:27.998 \dashrightarrow 00:33:31.850$  And so what we decided it had to do was we decided to
- $540\ 00:33:31.850 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.090$  aggregate our models to the census tract level
- $541\ 00{:}33{:}35.090 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}33{:}39.770$  like we did before and then we wanted to see what
- $542\ 00{:}33{:}39.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}44.770$  the differences were potentially in an experienced summer.
- $543~00{:}33{:}45.580 --> 00{:}33{:}49.840$  And so what I did was I wanted to compare are the summer time
- $544~00{:}33{:}49.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}54.050$  aggregates so I borrowed from the energy literature
- $545\ 00:33:54.050 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.560$  and computed cooling degree days.
- $546\ 00:33:57.560 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.540$  So if you're unfamiliar with cooling degree days,
- 547 00:34:00.540 --> 00:34:04.160 generally speaking, what it is is measures
- $548~00{:}34{:}04.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}08.480$  of how much hotter a day is than a threshold value.
- $549\ 00{:}34{:}08.480$  -->  $00{:}34{:}11.500$  Generally in the U.S., the threshold value that's used
- $550~00{:}34{:}11.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}16.460$  is 65 degrees Fahrenheit, or 18.3 degrees Celsius
- $551\ 00:34:17.800 --> 00:34:21.810$  So, as an example, if today is 67,
- $552\ 00:34:21.810 --> 00:34:25.750$  which I wish that it were, but if it were 67 outside today,
- 553 00:34:25.750 --> 00:34:28.830 that would give us two cooling degree days.
- $554\ 00:34:28.830 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.490$  And then you repeat that for every other day,
- $555~00{:}34{:}31.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}34.950$  and then add up all of those cooling degree days
- $556\ 00:34:34.950 \longrightarrow 00:34:37.293$  for the summertime values.
- 557 00:34:38.610 --> 00:34:42.200 For now I'm only conducting a comparison
- $558\ 00:34:42.200$  --> 00:34:46.470 of exposure experiences by black and white people,

 $559\ 00{:}34{:}46.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}50.720$  but in the future, I want to consider more racial groups

 $560~00{:}34{:}50.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}55.307$  to try and characterize these exposure disparities better.

 $561\ 00:34:56.880 \longrightarrow 00:35:01.800$  And you can imagine that if we see differences by race,

 $562~00{:}35{:}01.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}05.680$  some one could make an argument that it might be

563 00:35:05.680 --> 00:35:08.540 because different people live

 $564\ 00:35:08.540 \longrightarrow 00:35:10.830$  in different parts of the region.

 $565~00:35:10.830 \dashrightarrow 00:35:15.430$  So for example, saying that more white folks live

566~00:35:15.430 --> 00:35:19.680 in the Northern most parts of the region like Maine

567~00:35:19.680 --> 00:35:22.100 and more black folks live in the Southern most part

 $568\ 00:35:22.100 \longrightarrow 00:35:24.700$  of the region like Virginia.

 $569\ 00{:}35{:}24.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}29.700$  And so we wanted to then make this within county comparison

570 00:35:30.850 --> 00:35:35.320 within geographic compact geographies,

 $571\ 00:35:35.320 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.670$  to look at exposure disparities within these

 $572\ 00:35:39.670 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.730$  more relevant administrative units.

 $573\ 00:35:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.370$  And so to address that,

 $574\ 00:35:45.370 --> 00:35:49.380$  we then took a similar approach of comparing tracks

575 00:35:49.380 --> 00:35:52.790 within counties with our predictor variable,

 $576\ 00:35:52.790 --> 00:35:57.570$  being the proportion of the census tract

577 00:35:57.570 --> 00:36:00.460 that was comprised of black folks,

 $578~00{:}36{:}00.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}05.410$  and then using random intercepts and slopes by county

579 00:36:05.410 --> 00:36:08.143 to then get county level comparisons.

580 00:36:11.240 --> 00:36:13.390 On the epidemiological side of things,

581~00:36:13.390 --> 00:36:16.100 you can imagine that getting health data that covers

- 582 00:36:16.100 --> 00:36:19.520 the entirety of this region is pretty difficult
- $583\ 00:36:19.520 --> 00:36:23.260$  so we use it as an opportunity to get creative.
- 584 00:36:23.260 --> 00:36:26.990 We, again, access to CDC wonder data
- 585 00:36:26.990 --> 00:36:30.040 and although I'm interested in child health,
- $586\ 00:36:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.890\ \mathrm{CDC}$  wonder data has some major limitations
- $587\ 00:36:33.890 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.100$  if we're thinking about a rarer health outcome
- $588\ 00:36:37.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.523$  like preterm birth.
- $589\ 00:36:40.390 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.840$  Data are provided are at very coarse geographies.
- $590\ 00{:}36{:}43.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}48.210$  In this case, data are only provided at the county level,
- 591~00:36:48.210 --> 00:36:51.900 and they're also only provided for course time spans.
- $592~00{:}36{:}51.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}56.900$  And then data that are counts that are below 10
- $593\ 00:36:57.700 --> 00:37:00.243$  are suppressed for privacy concerns.
- 594~00:37:02.170 --> 00:37:06.923 So, because CVD mortality is a much more common event,
- $595~00:37:06.923 \longrightarrow 00:37:11.923$  we decided to conduct this analysis with CVD mortality.
- 596 00:37:12.202 --> 00:37:14.170 There are still however,
- 597 00:37:14.170 --> 00:37:17.880 a fair amount of suppressions of data
- 598~00:37:17.880 --> 00:37:19.410 and so to deal with that,
- $599~00{:}37{:}19.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}23.590$  we ended up using a left censored Poisson regression
- $600\ 00{:}37{:}23.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}28.590$  since there would be left censoring for lower counts.
- $601~00{:}37{:}28.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}32.220$  And really one of the things that I'm getting at here is
- $602\ 00:37:32.220$  --> 00:37:37.000 around this question of exposure misclassification.
- $603\ 00{:}37{:}37.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}40.010$  So for example, in many environmental epidemiology studies,
- $604\ 00{:}37{:}40.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}43.170$  there's often times an analysis that looks at effect

- $605\ 00{:}37{:}43.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}47.150$  modification by race, often finding higher effect estimates
- $606\ 00:37:47.150 \longrightarrow 00:37:49.320$  based on race and ethnicity.
- $607\ 00{:}37{:}49.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}51.980$  And while there are sometimes reasons to think that this
- $608\ 00:37:51.980 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.545$  might be the case, depending on exposure and context,
- $609~00{:}37{:}55.545 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}00.530~I$  am often left wondering if it's potentially a consequence
- $610\ 00{:}38{:}00.530 {\:{--}{>}\:} 00{:}38{:}04.910$  of underlying exposure disparities that our exposure models
- $611\ 00:38:04.910 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.463$  are not picking up.
- 612 00:38:07.670 --> 00:38:10.040 And so with that inspiration,
- 613 00:38:10.040 --> 00:38:13.503 I ended up doing four different regressions,
- $614\ 00:38:14.810 --> 00:38:19.640$  two regressions for white folks using both exposure models
- $615~00{:}38{:}19.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}23.350$  and two regressions for black folks using both regression
- $616\ 00:38:23.350 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.660$  models or prediction models, I should say.
- $617\ 00:38:26.660 \longrightarrow 00:38:29.170$  And since this ended up being at the county level,
- $618~00{:}38{:}29.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}32.870$  I tried to preserve some of the exposure differences
- $619\ 00:38:32.870 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.870$  by computing weighted by track level racial composition,
- $620\ 00:38:38.820 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.123$  aggregated up to the county level.
- $621\ 00:38:46.670 --> 00:38:51.350$  So these are preliminary results just for the year 2019.
- $622~00{:}38{:}52.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}57.180$  So this plot is simply looking at the distributions by race
- $623\ 00:38:57.180 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.920$  across the 13 states including DC.
- $624~00{:}39{:}01.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}05.150$  And what we see here is that actually both models
- $625\ 00:39:05.150 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.470$  appear to reconstruct a temperature disparity
- $626\ 00:39:09.470 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.970$  between whites and blacks.

- $627~00{:}39{:}11.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}16.970$  However, our XG boost model has a much more smoothed out
- 628 00:39:17.914 --> 00:39:22.493 distribution for black folks.
- $629\ 00:39:23.870 \longrightarrow 00:39:28.190$  And when we actually look at the median values experienced,
- $630~00{:}39{:}28.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}31.830$  we see that they're about the same for white folks,
- $631\ 00:39:31.830 \longrightarrow 00:39:34.200$  but between these two prediction models.
- $632\ 00:39:34.200 --> 00:39:38.470$  But in fact, we have higher exposures for black folks
- 633 00:39:38.470 --> 00:39:40.283 with our XG boost model.
- $634\ 00:39:41.360 --> 00:39:44.080$  But this is just looking across the entire region,
- $635\ 00{:}39{:}44.080 --> 00{:}39{:}47.370$  this isn't actually of the results from our analysis
- $636\ 00:39:47.370 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.580$  and so from that linear mixed effect model
- 637 00:39:49.580 --> 00:39:51.580 that I mentioned earlier,
- $638\ 00{:}39{:}51.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}56.410$  we look to see at how these were related to the proportion
- $639~00{:}39{:}56.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}00.420$  of black people living inside of a census tract
- $640\ 00:40:00.420$  --> 00:40:05.420 and we found that a zero to one increase for the proportion
- $641~00{:}40{:}06.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}11.130$  of folks was associated with 25 higher cooling degree days
- $642\ 00:40:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:40:13.700$  for the NLDS to model.
- 643 00:40:13.700 --> 00:40:15.820 But for the XG boost model,
- $644\ 00{:}40{:}15.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}20.043$  we reconstruct approximately 68 cooling degree days.
- $645\ 00{:}40{:}22.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}26.990$  And so we think that this is potentially important
- 646 00:40:26.990 --> 00:40:29.870 for reconstructing some of these potential
- $647\ 00{:}40{:}29.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}33.540$  exposure disparities and on the epidemiological
- $648\ 00:40:33.540 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.890$  side of things, when we do a stratified model
- $649\ 00{:}40{:}37.890 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}40{:}41.900$  for white folks, we see a modest but significant effect

- $650\ 00:40:41.900 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.360$  of approximately 1.04.
- $651~00:40:45.360 \dashrightarrow 00:40:47.880$  But when we look at those as effect estimates
- $652\ 00{:}40{:}47.880 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>}\ 00{:}40{:}52.760$  for black folks, we see much higher effect estimates
- $653\ 00:40:52.760 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.320$  for both models.
- $654~00{:}40{:}54.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}59.317$  However, this is for the NLDAS-2 model with about 1.24
- $655\ 00:41:00.270 \longrightarrow 00:41:01.783$  as the effect estimate.
- $656\ 00:41:03.510 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.670$  It was mentioned in the slide
- $657\ 00:41:04.670 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.580$  but I should've said it before,
- $658\ 00:41:06.580 --> 00:41:11.170$  these are scaled per 92 cooling degree days
- 659 00:41:11.170 --> 00:41:14.520 or one cooling degree day average increase
- $660\ 00:41:14.520 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.883$  across our time span.
- 661 00:41:18.198 --> 00:41:21.490 And so for the XG boost model,
- $662\ 00:41:21.490 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.830$  we see that we get a much lower,
- $663\ 00:41:24.830 \longrightarrow 00:41:29.700$  but still higher than for whites effect estimate of 1.14.
- $664\ 00:41:31.570 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.220$  So what this means to me,
- $665\ 00{:}41{:}34.220 {\: \hbox{\scriptsize -->}\:} 00{:}41{:}39.220$  or implies to me that there is potentially exposure
- $666\ 00:41:39.270 --> 00:41:42.620$  misclassification that can appear
- $667\ 00:41:43.840 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.690$  in epi models as greater susceptibility.
- $668~00{:}41{:}48.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}51.610$  And so I think that there is an opportunity here to think
- $669\ 00{:}41{:}51.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}56.010$  further about these models and what they can lend us
- $670\ 00:41:56.010 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.103$  for health disparities types of research.
- $671\ 00{:}42{:}01.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}06.690$  So some next steps here is that I have data for more years
- 672 00:42:06.780 --> 00:42:09.900 than just 2019, so I'm going to include more years
- $673\ 00:42:09.900 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.680$  in this analysis.
- $674~00{:}42{:}11.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}15.810$  We also know that there are exposure disparities

- $675\ 00:42:15.810 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.650$  for other forms of environmental contaminants
- $676\ 00:42:19.650 \longrightarrow 00:42:22.610$  like ozone or PM2.5.
- 677 00:42:22.610 --> 00:42:25.460 And so I want to potentially control for these
- 678 00:42:25.460 --> 00:42:28.571 as spatial temporal confounders,
- $679\ 00:42:28.571 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.510$  potentially contributing to these relationships.
- 680~00:42:32.510 --> 00:42:37.403 And then I want to include explicit measures of segregation.
- $681\ 00:42:38.420 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.500$  So, as I mentioned, I showed the proportion of black folks,
- $682\ 00{:}42{:}42.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}46.270$  but there's a whole host of literature that actually shows
- $683\ 00:42:46.270$  --> 00:42:50.010 different measures of segregation like the dissimilarities
- $684\ 00{:}42{:}50.010$  -->  $00{:}42{:}53.750$  index or the index of concentration at the extremes.
- $685\ 00:42:53.750 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.540$  And I would like to use these
- $686\ 00:42:55.540 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.163$  as potential predictors in these models.
- $687~00{:}43{:}01.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}06.420$  And then finally, I want to analyze these disparities
- $688\ 00:43:06.420 \longrightarrow 00:43:09.200$  in relation to energy data
- $689\ 00{:}43{:}09.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}14.200$  because I'm interested in studying some quantitative
- $690\ 00{:}43{:}14.750 \to 00{:}43{:}18.543$  research between energy burden and energy insecurity,
- $691\ 00:43:19.550 \longrightarrow 00:43:21.150$  which leads me to some of my
- 692 00:43:21.150 --> 00:43:23.703 future directions and opportunities.
- 693 00:43:25.640 --> 00:43:28.700 So if you're unfamiliar with energy insecurity,
- $694\ 00{:}43{:}28.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}33.230$  this is a relatively new framework that my colleague
- $695\ 00{:}43{:}33.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}38.230$  Diana Hernandez at Columbia has used and described
- $696\ 00:43:39.650 \longrightarrow 00:43:42.080$  as a framework that outlines the interplay
- 697 00:43:42.080 --> 00:43:45.600 between energy needs, financial constraints,
- $698\ 00:43:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:43:48.130$  and behavioral adaptations.

 $699~00{:}43{:}48.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}53.130$  So I think a lot of us are familiar with this concept

 $700\ 00:43:53.524$  --> 00:43:57.710 in what's referred to as the heat or eat dilemma.

 $701\ 00:43:57.710 --> 00:44:01.210$  So the heat or eat dilemma describes the kind of precarious

 $702\ 00:44:01.210 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.820$  situation that historically poor families have been put in

703 00:44:05.820 --> 00:44:08.570 of during the winter time,

 $704\ 00:44:08.570 \longrightarrow 00:44:13.570$  do they keep themselves warm or do they forgo some staples,

 $705\ 00:44:14.440 \longrightarrow 00:44:19.327$  like a healthy meal, or perhaps they get their heating

706 00:44:20.670 --> 00:44:22.950 from some sort of precarious thing

 $707~00{:}44{:}22.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}27.160$  like opening their oven and putting a fan next to their oven

708 00:44:27.160 --> 00:44:29.373 to keep their home warm, right?

 $709~00{:}44{:}30.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}33.233$  We've heard the stories if not done it yourselves,

710 00:44:35.100 --> 00:44:36.930 but I think in a warming climate,

 $711\ 00:44:36.930 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.783$  we need to start having a conversation on analogous,

712 00:44:41.810 --> 00:44:45.770 what I'm coining the heat stroke or go broke dilemma.

713 00:44:45,770 --> 00:44:48,610 What does it mean to think about that

 $714\ 00:44:48.610 \longrightarrow 00:44:53.400$  there are folks who potentially have ACs in their homes,

 $715\ 00:44:53.400 --> 00:44:56.143$  but can't afford to run those ACs.

716 00:44:57.930 --> 00:45:00.440 How do we think about that

 $717\ 00:45:00.440 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.210$  they may be foregoing other important staples of their lives

 $718\ 00:45:05.210 --> 00:45:09.400$  on the other side of things to cool their homes.

719 00:45:09.400 --> 00:45:12.310 And so I think that there's a real opportunity

720 00:45:12.310 --> 00:45:16.430 for climate epidemiology and climate and health research

 $721\ 00:45:16.430 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.883$  to engage with some of this.

 $722\ 00{:}45{:}21.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}25.160$  And finally, I'm also interested in continuing to integrate

723~00:45:25.160 --> 00:45:28.590 the social and environmental determinants of health.

724~00:45:28.590 --> 00:45:32.920 So I didn't attend the society for epidemiologic research

725 00:45:32.920 --> 00:45:35.460 conference this year, but I saw on Twitter

 $726\ 00:45:35.460 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.320$  that one of the big takeaways was a quote from Jay Kaufman,

 $727\ 00:45:39.320 \longrightarrow 00:45:43.830$  who said that all epidemiology is social epidemiology.

728~00:45:43.830 --> 00:45:48.240 And I think that that lends a real opportunity for us

 $729\ 00:45:48.240 \longrightarrow 00:45:53.240$  to think about borrowing from the social epidemiology

 $730\ 00:45:53.610 --> 00:45:56.780$  literature and also lending our tools

 $731\ 00:45:56.780 --> 00:45:59.670$  to the social epidemiology literature.

 $732\ 00:45:59.670 --> 00:46:04.100$  So we recently just published a paper

733 00:46:04.100 --> 00:46:05.950 in Nature Communications

734 00:46:05.950 --> 00:46:09.540 where we actually used environmental exposure

 $735\ 00:46:09.540 --> 00:46:12.270$  mixtures methods that were designed

736 00:46:12.270 --> 00:46:15.300 for the environmental health sciences,

 $737\ 00:46:15.300 \longrightarrow 00:46:18.010$  and actually implied it to thinking about neighborhood

 $738\ 00{:}46{:}18.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}21.980$  disadvantage to try and understand some of the infection

739 00:46:21.980 --> 00:46:26.973 disparities that we're seeing in New York city for COVID-19.

740 00:46:27.970 --> 00:46:32.120 And so I think that there's an opportunity here to continue

 $741\ 00:46:32.120 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.380$  to, you know, trade and learn lessons

 $742\ 00:46:35.380 \longrightarrow 00:46:39.273$  across the different areas of public health.

743 00:46:40.800 --> 00:46:45.020 I'm also conducting a large natality analysis that I

 $744\ 00:46:45.020$  --> 00:46:50.020 mentioned earlier in Mexico and soon hopefully accessing

 $745\ 00:46:51.040 --> 00:46:54.573$  data for also New York state.

 $746~00{:}46{:}55.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}00.180$  And we're trying to apply mixtures methods in this context

 $747\ 00:47:00.180 \longrightarrow 00:47:05.180$  as well thinking about perinatal and climate epidemiology.

748 00:47:05.220 --> 00:47:07.270 I also want to continue to expand

749 00:47:07.270 --> 00:47:09.650 my own environmental justice lens.

750 00:47:09.650 --> 00:47:12.330 I think a lot of focus in environmental health

 $751\ 00:47:12.330 --> 00:47:15.560$  has been on distributive justice,

 $752\ 00{:}47{:}15.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}18.620$  but what does it mean to also think about different forms

753 00:47:18.620 --> 00:47:20.130 of environmental justice,

754 00:47:20.130 --> 00:47:23.750 like procedural justice or restorative justice

 $755\ 00:47:23.750 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.780$  in these contexts?

 $756\ 00{:}47{:}25.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}29.040$  And then finally, I'm hoping to get more engaged

757 00:47:29.040 --> 00:47:32.520 in community and policy engaged research to try and find

 $758\ 00{:}47{:}32.520 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}47{:}37.130$  climate energy and health leverage points that we can use

 $759\ 00:47:37.130 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.030$  to create a more health equitable

 $760\ 00:47:40.030 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.013$  and climate equitable future.

761 00:47:43.800 --> 00:47:48.770 So of course this research relies on a ton of folks to help

 $762\ 00:47:48.770 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.210$  make this possible, so thank you to all of those folks,

 $763\ 00:47:52.210 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.693$  as well as the funding that has made this all possible.

 $764\ 00:47:57.500 --> 00:47:59.933$  And with that, I will open up for questions.

765 00:48:04.750 --> 00:48:08.950 <v -> So, yeah, thank you, Daniel, for a very well-presented </v>  $766\ 00:48:08.950 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.093$  and interesting talk.

 $767\ 00:48:12.770 \longrightarrow 00:48:15.020\ I\ could\ start\ with\ a\ question.$ 

 $768\ 00:48:15.020 \longrightarrow 00:48:18.260$  Well, maybe other people are thinking about theirs,

 $769\ 00{:}48{:}18.260 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}48{:}23.260$  so you spoke a lot about temperature exposure disparities

 $770\ 00:48:28.620 \longrightarrow 00:48:32.140$  and then introduced how energy,

 $771\ 00:48:32.140 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.530$  so you have the temperature exposure disparities,

 $772\ 00:48:35.530 \longrightarrow 00:48:37.280$  and then on top of that,

 $773\ 00:48:37.280 \longrightarrow 00:48:41.970$  you have the people with the highest temperature exposure

 $774\ 00{:}48{:}41.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}45.950$  having less of an ability to deal with that high temperature

 $775\ 00:48:45.950 \longrightarrow 00:48:50.700$  exposure and that part you didn't address as much,

 $776~00{:}48{:}50.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}53.700$  you know, understand that you can only do so much,

777 00:48:53.700 --> 00:48:55.680 but I'm wondering, you know,

 $778\ 00:48:55.680 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.680$  have you thought about ways to measure that,

779 00:49:01.338 --> 00:49:05.980 let's call it energy insecurity in epidemiologic studies

 $780\ 00:49:05.980 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.133$  in order to make that next step?

 $781\ 00:49:09.860 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.860 < v \longrightarrow Yeah$ , absolutely. </v>

 $782\ 00:49:10.860 --> 00:49:15.380$  So I'm interested in this in two different ways.

 $783~00{:}49{:}15.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}20.380$  So I think that we could do work to actually collect data

784 00:49:20.800 --> 00:49:24.440 from folks to try and get a better sense,

 $785\ 00{:}49{:}24.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}29.440$  a better quantitative sense of people's energy insecurity.

 $786\ 00:49:30.670 \longrightarrow 00:49:35.097$  So Diana has developed actually an energy insecurity

 $787\ 00:49:36.570 --> 00:49:41.570$  screening tool and so it would be great to try

788 00:49:41.950 --> 00:49:44.240 and get that screening tool out there

789~00:49:44.240 --> 00:49:48.210 as part of larger studies so that we can understand

 $790\ 00:49:48.210 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.960$  the kind of geographic distribution

791 00:49:50.960 --> 00:49:55.170 of this energy insecurity and trying to overlay that

 $792~00{:}49{:}55.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}58.660$  potentially with what we know about temperature.

 $793\ 00:49:58.660 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.130$  So that's on one end.

794 00:50:00.130 --> 00:50:05.130 On the other end, I think the lower hanging fruit

 $795\ 00:50:07.440 \longrightarrow 00:50:10.320$  is actually to access energy data.

796 00:50:10.320 --> 00:50:13.760 And so this is something that we're working on right now

 $797~00:50:13.760 \longrightarrow 00:50:18.760$  actually is to use energy data and pair that with

798~00:50:19.470 --> 00:50:23.220 our temperature predictions to see if we could see

 $799\ 00:50:23.220 \longrightarrow 00:50:27.680$  differences in the dose response relationship

 $800\ 00:50:27.680 --> 00:50:30.540$  between neighborhood temperature

801 00:50:30.540 --> 00:50:34.250 and energy utilization by neighborhood.

 $802\ 00:50:34.250 \longrightarrow 00:50:37.050$  And if we see differences in the slopes

 $803\ 00:50:37.050 --> 00:50:39.460$  between those neighborhoods,

804 00:50:39.460 --> 00:50:42.860 then that would imply to me that potentially

 $805\ 00:50:42.860 \longrightarrow 00:50:45.590$  those are differences in your response

 $806~00{:}50{:}45.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}50.590$  to the temperature and your ability to keep yourself cool.

 $807\ 00:50:50.810 --> 00:50:52.320$  Of course, that needs to be adjusted

808 00:50:52.320 --> 00:50:54.918 for many, many different things,

 $809\ 00{:}50{:}54.918 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}50{:}59.918$  but that is where I'm thinking as a lower hanging fruit

 $810\ 00:51:00.260 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.733$  using administrative data at the moment.

811 00:51:04.200 --> 00:51:08.073 < v ->Great, other questions, comments? </v>

- 812 00:51:10.180 --> 00:51:13.090 <v ->I have a question or a comment and observation,</v>
- $813\ 00:51:13.090 \longrightarrow 00:51:15.690$  first of all, this is an amazing presentation.
- $814\ 00:51:15.690 \longrightarrow 00:51:18.720$  It's brilliant work, and it could not be more timely.
- $815\ 00{:}51{:}18.720 \operatorname{--}{>} 00{:}51{:}22.510$  And I'm going to go to your last point, talking about,
- 816 00:51:22.510 --> 00:51:25.650 you know, the application of your work and of this research
- $817\ 00:51:25.650 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.080$  within the current policy development work
- $818\ 00:51:29.080 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.990$  at the federal level right now.
- $819\ 00{:}51{:}30.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}33.800$  And I think that you're diving in and focusing in
- $820\ 00:51:33.800 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.020$  on that exposure data and how
- 821 00:51:36.020  $\rightarrow$  00:51:39.280 we're not getting an accurate indication of what
- $822\ 00:51:39.280 \longrightarrow 00:51:42.330$  the risk are is vitally important
- $823\ 00:51:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:51:44.490$  and there are a couple of proceedings right now, you know,
- $824\ 00:51:44.490 \longrightarrow 00:51:47.820$  with the executive order 13895,
- $825\ 00:51:47.820 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.380$  with executive order 14009.
- 826 00:51:50.380 --> 00:51:54.230 There's an OMB, a docket open until July six.
- $827\ 00:51:54.230 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.180$  There's another FEMA docket open until July 21st,
- 828 00:51:58.180 --> 00:52:02.490 is how are you, whether you are planning
- $829\ 00:52:02.490 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.520$  or whether you could consider
- $830\ 00:52:04.520 \longrightarrow 00:52:07.350$  taking your research and getting it into these
- 831 00:52:07.350 --> 00:52:10.090 and other dockets because that is setting
- 832 00:52:10.090 --> 00:52:14.050 the administrative record where we can start changing how
- $833\ 00:52:14.050 \longrightarrow 00:52:16.990$  the federal government is thinking about this.
- $834\ 00:52:16.990 --> 00:52:21.380$  So I don't know what your thoughts are in trying to move

 $835\ 00:52:21.380 \longrightarrow 00:52:23.420$  in those spaces.

836  $00:52:23.420 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.376 < v \longrightarrow Yeah$ , no, absolutely.

 $837\ 00:52:25.376 --> 00:52:29.690$  And I would definitely look to others who are closer

 $838\ 00:52:29.690 \longrightarrow 00:52:34.150$  to the policy landscape to help me figure out

839 00:52:34.150 --> 00:52:36.430 what the leverage points are.

840 00:52:36.430 --> 00:52:41.040 The most proximal leverage point that I'm aware of

 $841\ 00:52:41.040 \longrightarrow 00:52:43.710$  is actually what environmental justice folks

 $842\ 00:52:43.710 --> 00:52:45.750$  are talking about right now.

 $843\ 00:52:45.750 --> 00:52:50.560$  Folks that We Act are talking about that the low income home

 $844\ 00{:}52{:}50.560 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>} 00{:}52{:}55.560$  energy assistance program has been historically used for

845 00:52:55.958 --> 00:53:00.958 helping to keep folks warm during the winter,

 $846\ 00{:}53{:}00.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}05.630$  but has been lesser so used to help keep folks cool

 $847\ 00:53:05.630 \longrightarrow 00:53:07.410$  during the summer.

 $848\ 00:53:07.410 \longrightarrow 00:53:11.850$  And so we already have a policy instrument in place

849 00:53:11.850 --> 00:53:15.080 to identify the people who need the help,

 $850\ 00:53:15.080 \longrightarrow 00:53:20.080$  but we don't have the dollars allocated to the right part,

851 00:53:20.341 --> 00:53:24.980 potentially the right part of the exposure distribution.

 $852\ 00:53:24.980 \longrightarrow 00:53:29.813$  And so I think that that is the most proximal policy

 $853\ 00{:}53{:}29.813 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}34.010$  instrument that I'm aware of that could help move the needle

 $854\ 00:53:34.010 --> 00:53:36.403$  towards improving public health.

 $855\ 00:53:38.380 \longrightarrow 00:53:39.660 < v \longrightarrow That's fantastic. < /v >$ 

856 00:53:39.660 --> 00:53:41.670 You know I would also throw out taking that

 $857\ 00:53:41.670 --> 00:53:44.320$  as that illustration applying the national environmental

858 00:53:44.320 --> 00:53:46.640 policy act and the resurgence and undoing

 $859~00{:}53{:}46.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}48.630$  what the Trump administration did to that law

 $860~00{:}53{:}48.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}51.380$  because I think there's some opportunities for programmatic

 $861\ 00:53:51.380 \longrightarrow 00:53:54.476$  environmental impact statement reviews

 $862\ 00:53:54.476 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.110$  and it would be great to get your data, you know,

 $863\ 00:53:57.110 --> 00:53:59.500$  forming the basis of some of those types of actions.

 $864\ 00:53:59.500 \longrightarrow 00:54:00.760$  So thank you.

865 00:54:00.760 --> 00:54:01.660 <v ->Yeah, thank you.</v>

866 00:54:03.630 --> 00:54:05.363 <v ->Other questions or comments?</v>

867 00:54:12.960 --> 00:54:15.830 < v ->Maybe just a small technical question. </v>

 $868\ 00:54:15.830 \longrightarrow 00:54:18.350$  We know that using CDC wonder data

869 00:54:18.350 --> 00:54:21.790 for especially the birth outcome,

 $870\ 00{:}54{:}21.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}26.200$  this issue is you mentioned briefly that the temporary

871 00:54:26.200 --> 00:54:28.410 resolution is not good enough.

872 00:54:28.410 --> 00:54:31.520 They don't accurate give you the exact date.

 $873\ 00:54:31.520 \longrightarrow 00:54:33.820$  So I'm wondering how do you deal with

874 00:54:33.820 --> 00:54:36.183 in your time cross data with that?

 $875\ 00:54:38.510 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.470 < v \longrightarrow Oh \text{ yeah, for sure.} < / v >$ 

 $876\ 00{:}54{:}39.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}44.470$  So we ended up doing a lot of interpolation estimates.

877 00:54:47.430 --> 00:54:52.430 So for example CDC wonder can give you how many births

 $878\ 00:54:52.810 \longrightarrow 00:54:55.230$  there on it are in a day of the week,

 $879\ 00:54:55.230 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.420$  in a typical day of the week.

 $880\ 00{:}54{:}57.420 --> 00{:}55{:}00.270$  And it'll give you how many births there were in a month.

 $881\ 00:55:00.270 \dashrightarrow 00:55:05.120$  And so we ended up then doing a lot of averaging.

882 00:55:05.120 --> 00:55:09.090 Knowing Tuesdays, let's say are where, you know,

883 00:55:09.090 --> 00:55:11.350 30\% of the births are happening,

 $884\ 00:55:11.350 \longrightarrow 00:55:14.970\ 20\%$  are happening on Wednesdays, let's say.

 $885\ 00:55:14.970$  --> 00:55:19.970 Using that relationship, again with the longer month

886 00:55:20.890  $\rightarrow$  00:55:25.430 time span to then do a lot of smoothing and averaging

887 00:55:25.430  $\rightarrow$  00:55:28.320 to get an estimate of how many births there were.

888 00:55:28.320 --> 00:55:30.040 I don't think for this study

 $889\ 00:55:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:55:32.770$  we need an actual accurate number

890  $00:55:32.770 \longrightarrow 00:55:37.512$  of births because at the end of the day,

891 00:55:37.512 --> 00:55:42.512 you're creating your truth with the simulation methods.

892 00:55:44.230 --> 00:55:47.570 But it's just a way of making sure that we have good

 $893\ 00:55:47.570 \longrightarrow 00:55:52.060$  representation of the different age groupings

 $894\ 00:55:52.060 --> 00:55:54.750$  of different preterm births.

895 00:55:54.750 --> 00:55:59.750 Are there more 20 week olds perhaps being born in February

896 00:56:00.720 --> 00:56:03.740 rather than in June, right?

 $897\ 00:56:03.740 \longrightarrow 00:56:07.048$  Trying to preserve some of those distributions

898 00:56:07.048 --> 00:56:11.730 of the different weeks of gestation

 $899\ 00:56:11.730 \longrightarrow 00:56:13.830$  was where we spent a lot of our attention.

900 00:56:15.840 --> 00:56:17.990 < v ->Thanks yeah, that's makes a lot of sense.</r>

 $901\ 00:56:18.825 --> 00:56:21.290$  And I'm more thinking of like a new addition

 $902\ 00{:}56{:}22.237 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}56{:}24.560$  to your similar study in the future, your future work,

 $903\ 00:56:24.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:27.090$  if you want to extend to the whole U.S.

904 00:56:27.090  $\rightarrow$  00:56:31.010 that might be something to be carefully dealt with.

905 00:56:33.000 --> 00:56:33.950 < v -> Yeah, absolutely.< / v >

- 906 00:56:36.129 --> 00:56:38.083 < v -> So I, there's a question in the chat.< / v >
- $907\ 00:56:38.083 \longrightarrow 00:56:39.760$  I think this'll be the last question.
- 908 00:56:39.760 --> 00:56:42.380 It's from Taiwo Bello,
- 909 00:56:42.380 --> 00:56:46.580 Please, how convinced are you about these studies
- 910 00:56:46.580 --> 00:56:50.460 considering that Africa has the hottest temperature
- 911 00:56:50.460 --> 00:56:54.190 and majority had no cooling systems in place
- 912 00:56:54.190 --> 00:56:57.370 and what are the limitations of your research findings?
- 913  $00:56:57.370 \longrightarrow 00:56:58.203$  Thank you.
- 914 00:56:59.610 --> 00:57:00.570 < v -> Yeah, absolutely.< / v >
- 915 00:57:00.570 --> 00:57:05.186 So I think the temperature epidemiology
- 916 00:57:05.186 --> 00:57:07.980 generally shows that there is such a thing
- $917\ 00:57:07.980 \longrightarrow 00:57:11.370$  as acclimatization, that there are differences
- $918\ 00:57:11.370 \longrightarrow 00:57:13.960$  in people's response to different temperatures
- $919\ 00:57:13.960 --> 00:57:16.500$  in different parts of the world based on what
- 920 00:57:16.500 --> 00:57:18.983 they're historically exposed to.
- 921  $00.57:20.190 \longrightarrow 00.57:23.570$  And so to some degree,
- 922 00:57:23.570 --> 00:57:28.139 people are climatized to the places that they live in.
- 923 00:57:28.139 --> 00:57:33.139 Another factor that needs to be considered as well is that
- 924 00:57:33.516 --> 00:57:37.370 humidity is also very different in different parts
- $925\ 00:57:37.370 \longrightarrow 00:57:38.310$  of the world.
- 926 00:57:38.310 --> 00:57:41.927 So in Western Africa, for example,
- 927 00:57:41.927 --> 00:57:44.370 at least the places that I've done research,
- 928 00:57:44.370 --> 00:57:47.030 humidity is not as high
- 929 00:57:47.030 --> 00:57:51.720 as it is in the Caribbean, let's say,
- 930 00:57:51.720 --> 00:57:53.620 or in other parts of the world, right?
- 931 00:57:53.620 --> 00:57:57.460 And so humidity plays a big part in our ability

932 00:57:57.460 --> 00:58:01.100 to thermo regulate in our ability to dissipate heat.

933 00:58:01.100 --> 00:58:04.800 And so I think that that's an important part of this

 $934\ 00:58:04.800 \longrightarrow 00:58:07.950$  relationship that a lot of temperature epidemiology

 $935\ 00:58:07.950 \longrightarrow 00:58:12.410$  kind of grapples with to do this.

936 00:58:12.410 --> 00:58:16.747 And I think the last thing I should mention is I think

937 00:58:17.800 --> 00:58:20.980 that we don't have sufficient evidence in many parts

938 00:58:20.980 --> 00:58:25.620 of the world to necessarily say that that heat

939 00:58:25.620 --> 00:58:28.830 is not an issue in Africa.

 $940\ 00:58:28.830 \longrightarrow 00:58:33.100$  There are studies that show that heat is an issue in Africa,

 $941\ 00:58:33.100 \longrightarrow 00:58:35.530$  even though the dose response relationships

942 00:58:35.530 --> 00:58:39.460 may be different, but nonetheless people

943 00:58:39.460 --> 00:58:44.460 are impacted by heat in Sub-Saharan Africa as well

 $944\ 00:58:44.590 --> 00:58:49.360$  and I think it's actually a call for more research

 $945\ 00:58:49.360 \longrightarrow 00:58:51.800$  in the region to understand

946 00:58:51.800 --> 00:58:54.533 what those relationships look like.

947 00:58:56.710 --> 00:59:00.230 <<br/>v ->Okay, so thank you very much, Daniel.<br/></v>

948 00:59:00.230 --> 00:59:04.120 You gave a very interesting talk and congratulations

 $949\ 00:59:04.120 \longrightarrow 00:59:06.100$  on doing such great work.

950 00:59:06.100 --> 00:59:07.530 <v ->Thank you so much.</v>

951 00:59:07.530 --> 00:59:09.053 <v ->Okay, take care, everyone.</v>