Provided for non-commercial research and education use. Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the author's institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

http://www.elsevier.com/authorsrights

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY © 2019 BY THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY FOUNDATION PUBLISHED BY ELSEVIER

### EDITORIAL COMMENT

# Mechanistic Understanding of Socioeconomic Disparities in Cardiovascular Disease\*



Gregory E. Miller, PHD,<sup>a</sup> Edith Chen, PHD,<sup>a</sup> Daichi Shimbo, MD<sup>b</sup>

emographers have noted socioeconomic disparities in morbidity and mortality for more than a century. But, it was not until Marmot's pioneering studies of British civil servants began to appear in the 1980s (1,2) that socioeconomic status (SES) started to receive serious attention as a cardiovascular risk factor. In the ensuing years, we have learned a great deal about the scope and scale of these disparities (3,4). The gap is large, and it is growing. In a recent meta-analysis of 22 million adults, low education was associated with a 42% to 66% increased risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD) (5,6). We have also learned a great deal about the relative importance of various mechanisms thought to underlie these disparities. Genetic variations and lifestyle differences both play a role, and so does access to health care. Yet, none of these factors can fully explain the gaps (7). These observations, coupled with animal studies indicating that there is a robust, lasting physiological response to subordination, have led researchers with a focus on health disparities to hypothesize that stressors associated with low SES may contribute directly to CVD pathogenesis (8,9). Consistent with that view, research has found higher levels of multiple CVD biomarkers in low-SES populations, including endothelial dysfunction,

inflammation, and platelet activation (9). But, convincing evidence for this hypothesis is lacking.

Against that backdrop, this issue of the Journal features a fascinating and important report from Tawakol et al. (10), examining a putative stressassociated neurobiological pathway connecting low SES with CVD risk. The paper leverages a statistical technique called mediation path analysis to integrate data on neighborhood conditions, whole-body <sup>18</sup>Ffluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/ computed tomography imaging, and CVD outcomes. In doing so, it offers the most detailed mechanistic account to date of how low SES, a stress exposure, "gets inside of the body" to accelerate CVD progression. Briefly, the results suggest that adverse neighborhood SES factors, such as low median income and high crime rate, induce persistent activation of the amygdala, a brain region that is centrally involved in judging the degree of threat posed by external stimuli. In turn, higher amygdala activation is associated with greater metabolic activity in the bone marrow.

#### SEE PAGE 3243

Based on previous evidence, the authors suggest that this connection is mediated by the sympathetic nervous system, which, under conditions of threat, causes hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells to egress from bone marrow (11-13). This stress-related mobilization of progenitor cells is selective, and it is dominated by immature myeloid cells with a strong pro-inflammatory skew (14). Once in circulation, these cells migrate to sites of trauma and infection, including atherosclerotic lesions. This chain of events helps to explain the findings in the study by Tawakol et al. (10) that individuals with higher <sup>18</sup>F-fluorodeoxyglucose bone marrow uptake show greater metabolic activity in the aortic wall, and over the

<sup>\*</sup>Editorials published in the *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of *JACC* or the American College of Cardiology.

From the <sup>a</sup>Institute for Policy Research and Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois; and the <sup>b</sup>Center for Behavioral Cardiovascular Health, Department of Medicine, Columbia University, New York, New York. Preparation of this commentary was supported by National Institutes of Health grants R01HL116470, R01HD093718, and R01HL122328. All authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose. Philip Greenland, MD, served as Guest Associate Editor for this paper.

ensuing 5 years, increased risk of CVD events, defined as cardiac death, myocardial infarction, unstable angina, stroke, peripheral artery disease with revascularization, or heart failure.

The pathogenic sequence depicted in this scenario will sound familiar to many readers. This conceptual model maps closely onto the contemporary understanding of atherosclerosis as a chronic inflammatory disease of the vessel wall, maintained by leukocytes initially recruited there to remove debris, repair damage, and clear pathogens. By situating the findings in this pathogenic framework, the study illustrates how neighborhood socioeconomic factors intersect with biological processes at the forefront of cardiovascular research and practice. In a similar way, the study gives researchers with a focus on health disparities a mechanistic roadmap to begin following that is drawn from basic science insights, yet feasible to navigate in human subjects.

Like all highly innovative studies, this one raises numerous questions. As such, the findings of the study should be considered promising rather than definitive. For instance, it is uncertain what "stress" exposure at the individual level is being captured by median household income. In the United States, neighborhoods are often comprised of households with similar levels of income, wealth, and education. However, there is socioeconomic heterogeneity between individuals, particularly in neighborhoods with high minority predominance (15). These observations create some ambiguity about the meaning of the paper's findings, because its statistical models do not contain markers of individual SES. Thus, one possible explanation of the study's findings is that neighborhoods are simply acting as a proxy for households. In that case, the chain of events depicted would be understood as an individualized response to stressors and exposures associated with low individual-level SES. However, the findings could also reflect exposures at the level of the neighborhood, which are not mediated through socioeconomic conditions of its constituent households. Indeed, lower-income neighborhoods can lack fresh food, health care, and safe space for exercise. They also have relatively high amounts of violent crime, as well as traffic-related and industry-related air pollution (16). These features would presumably elevate the CVD risk of residents, irrespective of their individual SES. A blended scenario is also plausible, where both neighborhood and individual SES factors initiate the cascade described by Tawakol et al. (10). Clarifying the relative importance of individual versus neighborhood conditions in the cascade is an important task for future research, because each scenario offers a distinct set of opportunities for research, practice, and policy.

The results from Tawakol et al. (10) highlight the importance of the amygdala in connecting SES with CVD. In subsequent research, it will be important to ask which other brain regions are involved, and whether additional insights might be gleaned from a network-based approach. Of special interest here is the cortico-basal ganglia circuit, which supports reward-related brain functions and is implicated in CVD risk behaviors like smoking, consumption of calorically dense foods, and obesity (17). Low SES is associated with structural and functional alterations of this circuitry (18,19), so like the amygdala, it is likely to play a role in the origin of CVD disparities. Also of interest is the prefrontal executive control system, which can exert top-down influences on threat and reward circuitries, and facilitates impulse control, as well as regulation of thoughts, feelings, and physiology during stress (20). Again, SES affects the structure and function of these prefrontal regions, as well as the architecture of white matter pathways connecting them with other brain regions (19,21,22). A recent study of children in Chicago illustrated how considering these networks has the potential to enhance understanding of neighborhood risks like those studied here (23). Similar to previous work, it found that youth in high-violence neighborhoods had more cardiovascular risk, as reflected in adiposity metrics, insulin resistance, and metabolic syndrome. But, these risks were only present among youth with lower functional connectivity of the brain's central executive network, which supports emotion regulation, suppression of unwanted thoughts, and self-control. For youth who displayed higher connectivity in this network, there was no association between neighborhood violence and cardiovascular risk, suggesting that this might be a neural marker of (or contributor to) resilience.

Finally, in considering ways to ameliorate CVD disparities, Tawakol et al. (10) suggest using medications to interrupt the cascade their study identifies. We agree that it is difficult to substantially alter SES, and that downstream processes offer promising targets for intervention. In that regard, there is mounting evidence to suggest we can mitigate some of the pathological processes that Tawakol et al. (10) identify by improving the social conditions of low-SES youth, even without bolstering income or education. For instance, 1 randomized trial of low-SES adolescents found that volunteering reduced

## **Author's Personal Copy**

obesity, cholesterol, and inflammation (24). Also notable are long-term follow-ups of individuals who, as children, participated in randomized trials aimed at optimizing early caregiving and strengthening family relationships. As adults, these individuals showed larger amygdala volumes, lower inflammatory biomarkers, and fewer metabolic syndrome signs relative to nonparticipating control subjects (25-27). These findings are preliminary, and larger-scale trials are needed to clarify the efficacy and durability of these interventions. Still, they illustrate the potential for mitigating disparities by targeting processes downstream of SES.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Dr. Gregory E. Miller, Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, 2029 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois 60208. E-mail: greg.miller@northwestern.edu. Twitter: @DaichiShimbo.

#### REFERENCES

**1.** Marmot MG, Shipley MJ, Rose G. Inequalities in death—specific explanations of a general pattern. Lancet 1984;1:1003-6.

**2.** Marmot MG, Smith GD, Stansfeld S, et al. Health inequalities among British civil servants: the Whitehall II study. Lancet 1991;337:1387-93.

**3.** Adler NE, Rehkopf DH. U.S. disparities in health: descriptions, causes, and mechanisms. Annu Rev Public Health 2008;29:235–52.

**4.** Braveman PA, Cubbin C, Egerter S, Williams DR, Pamuk E. Socioeconomic disparities in health in the United States: what the patterns tell us. Am J Public Health 2010;100 Suppl 1:S186-96.

 Backholer K, Peters SAE, Bots SH, Peeters A, Huxley RR, Woodward M. Sex differences in the relationship between socioeconomic status and cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Epidemiol Community Health 2017;71:550-7.

 Singh GK, Siahpush M, Azuine RE, Williams SD. Widening socioeconomic and racial disparities in cardiovascular disease mortality in the United States, 1969–2013. Int J MCH AIDS 2015;3:106–18.

7. Schultz WM, Kelli HM, Lisko JC, et al. Socioeconomic Status and Cardiovascular Outcomes: Challenges and Interventions. Circulation 2018; 137:2166-78.

**8.** Gianaros PJ, Manuck SB. Neurobiological pathways linking socioeconomic position and health. Psychosom Med 2010;72:450-61.

**9.** Steptoe A, Kivimäki M. Stress and cardiovascular disease: an update on current knowledge. Annu Rev Public Health 2013;34:337-54.

**10.** Tawakol A, Osborne MT, Wang Y, et al. Stress-associated neurobiological pathway linking

socioeconomic disparities to cardiovascular disease. J Am Coll Cardiol 2019;73:3243-55.

**11.** Lapidot T, Kollet O. The brain-bone-blood triad: traffic lights for stem-cell homing and mobilization. Hematology Am Soc Hematol Educ Program 2010;2010:1-6.

**12.** Powell ND, Sloan EK, Bailey MT, et al. Social stress up-regulates inflammatory gene expression in the leukocyte transcriptome via beta-adrenergic induction of myelopoiesis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2013;110:16574–9.

**13.** Heidt T, Sager HB, Courties G, et al. Chronic variable stress activates hematopoietic stem cells. Nat Med 2014;20:754-8.

**14.** Reader BF, Jarrett BL, McKim DB, Wohleb ES, Godbout JP, Sheridan JF. Peripheral and central effects of repeated social defeat stress: monocyte trafficking, microglial activation, and anxiety. Neuroscience 2015;289:429-42.

**15.** Pattillo M. Black middle-class neighborhoods. Ann Rev Sociol 2005;31:305–29.

**16.** Diez Roux AV, Mair C. Neighborhoods and health. Ann NY Acad Sci 2010;1186:125-45.

**17.** Volkow ND, Wise RA, Baler R. The dopamine motive system: implications for drug and food addiction. Nat Rev Neurosci 2017;18:741-52.

**18.** Gianaros PJ, Manuck SB, Sheu LK, et al. Parental education predicts corticostriatal functionality in adulthood. Cereb Cortex 2011;21: 896–910.

**19.** Gianaros PJ, Marsland AL, Sheu LK, Erickson KI, Verstynen TD. Inflammatory pathways link socioeconomic inequalities to white matter architecture. Cereb Cortex 2013;23: 2058-71. **20.** Gianaros PJ, Marsland AL, Kuan DC, et al. An inflammatory pathway links atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk to neural activity evoked by the cognitive regulation of emotion. Biol Psychiatry 2014;75:738–45.

**21.** Kim P, Evans GW, Angstadt M, et al. Effects of childhood poverty and chronic stress on emotion regulatory brain function in adulthood. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2013;110:18442-7.

**22.** Noble KG, Houston SM, Brito NH, et al. Family income, parental education and brain structure in children and adolescents. Nat Neurosci 2015;18: 773-8.

**23.** Miller GE, Chen E, Armstrong CC, et al. Functional connectivity in central executive network protects youth against cardiometabolic risks linked with neighborhood violence. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2018;115:12063-8.

**24.** Schreier HM, Schonert-Reichl KA, Chen E. Effect of volunteering on risk factors for cardiovascular disease in adolescents: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA Pediatr 2013;167:327-32.

**25.** Miller GE, Brody GH, Yu T, Chen E. A familyoriented psychosocial intervention reduces inflammation in low-SES African American youth. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2014;111:11287-92.

**26.** Campbell F, Conti G, Heckman JJ, et al. Early childhood investments substantially boost adult health. Science 2014;343:1478-85.

**27.** Brody GH, Gray JC, Yu T, et al. Protective prevention effects on the association of poverty with brain development. JAMA Pediatr 2017;171:46-52.

KEY WORDS cardiovascular disease, neurobiology, positron emission tomography, socioeconomic disparities, stress