- 1 <u>Title:</u> Built Environment Features Obtained from Google Street View Are Associated with Coronary
- 2 Artery Disease Prevalence: A Deep-Learning Framework
- 3
- <u>Authors:</u> Zhuo Chen, PhD; Yassin Khalifa, PhD; Jean-Eudes Dazard, PhD; Issam Motairek, MD; Sanjay
 Rajagopalan, MD*; Sadeer Al-Kindi, MD*
- 6
- 7 *Contributed Equally
- 8

9 Affiliations

- 10 Harrington Heart and Vascular Institute, University Hospitals, and School of Medicine, Case Western
- 11 Reserve University, Cleveland, OH
- 12

13 Corresponding Authors

- 14 Sadeer Al-Kindi, MD, FACC
- 15 Assistant Professor of Medicine
- 16 University Hospitals Harrington Heart and Vascular Institute
- 17 Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine
- 18 11100 Euclid Ave, Cleveland, OH 44106
- 19 Email: sadeer.al-kindi@uhhospitals.org
- 20
- 21 OR
- 22
- 23 Sanjay Rajagopalan, MD, FACC
- 24 Herman K Hellerstein Professor of Cardiovascular Research
- 25 Director, Cardiovascular Research Institute
- 26 University Hospitals Harrington Heart and Vascular Institute
- 27 Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine
- 28 11100 Euclid Ave, Cleveland, OH 44106
- 29 Email: sanjay.rajagopalan@uhhospitals.org
- 30
- 31 Key words: Cardiovascular risk, neighborhood, phenotypes, socio-environmental, machine learning
- 32 33 **Wo**
- 33 <u>Word count:</u>34
- 35 Disclosures: None of the authors have conflicts of interest relevant to the contents of
- 36 this manuscript.
- 37
- 38 **<u>Funding</u>**: This work was funded by the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities
- Award # P50MD017351 and 1R35ES031702-01 awarded to Dr. Rajagopalan.

40 Abstract

- 41 Background: Built environment plays an important role in development of cardiovascular disease. Tools
- 42 to evaluate the built environment using machine vision and informatic approaches has been limited. We
- 43 sought to investigate the association between machine vision-based built environment and prevalence of
- 44 cardiometabolic disease in urban cities.

45 Methods: This cross-sectional study used features extracted from Google Street view (GSV) images to 46 measure the built environment and link them with prevalence of cardiometabolic disease. Convolutional 47 neural networks, light gradient boosting machines and activation maps were utilized to predict health 48 outcomes and identify feature associations with coronary heart disease (CHD). The study obtained 0.53 49 million GSV images covering 789 census tracts in 7 cities (Cleveland, OH; Fremont, CA; Kansas City, MO; 50 Detroit, MI; Bellevue, WA; Brownsville, TX; and Denver, CO). Analyses were conducted from February 51 2022 to December 2022. We used census tract-level data from the Centers for Disease Control and 52 Prevention's PLACES dataset. Main outcomes included census tract-level estimated prevalence of CHD 53 based on GSV built environment features.

- Results: Built environment features extracted from GSV using deep learning predicted 63% of the census tract variation in CHD prevalence. The ExtraTrees Regressor achieved the best result among all models with the lowest average mean absolute error of 1.11% and Root mean square of error of 1.58. The addition of GSV features outperformed and improved a model that only included census-tract level age, sex, race, income and education. Activation maps from the features revealed a set of neighborhood
- 59 features represented by buildings and roads associated with CHD prevalence.
- 60 Conclusions: In this cross-sectional study, a significant portion of CHD prevalence were explained by GSV-
- based built environment factors analyzed using deep learning, independent of census tract demographics.
- 62 Machine vision enabled assessment of the built environment could help play a significant role in designing
- 63 and improving heart-heathy cities.

64 Introduction

65 Coronary heart disease (CHD) accounts for over 50% of mortality from heart disease in the United States, 66 responsible for nearly 400,000 deaths in 2020¹. Despite advances in prevention and treatment over the 67 past decade in the United States² CHD remains the leading cause of death in the United States since 1950 68 with increasing evidence for non-conventional risk factors playing a large than anticipated role than 69 previously suspected^{1,3}.

70

71 Socioenvironmental factors are amongst the leading non-traditional risk factors increasingly implicated in

72 CHD development^{4–6}. These factors include social determinants such as race, income, education, and

73 culture as well as the factors in the built environment and factors in the ambient environment such as

- noise, and air pollution all of which have been to exert significant effects on CHD. ^{5–8}
- 75

Large-scale integrated assessment of the environment at the neighborhood can facilitate rapid and complete assessment of its impact on CHD. Such data is however scarce, partly because of the costly and time-consuming nature of neighborhood audits, and inconsistent measurements and standards for data collection. Machine vision approaches such as Google Street View (GSV) has become an increasingly popular approach for virtual neighborhood audits since its launch in 2007. GSV image coverage has been

- 81 consistently expanding in recent years achieving almost full coverage in the United States⁹. Previous
- 82 studies have shown GSV results are comparable to field assessments and have been used to assess the

83 built environment features such as greenspace^{10,11}, buildings¹², and roads¹³.

84

65 GSV images further become a favored data source for large-scale studies due to the open availability of such data, arguably the largest compendium of machine vision enabled assessment of large tracts of the

- 87 earth, and the standardized approaches used. Deep learning approaches such as convolutional neural
- networks (CNN) have been widely used in many studies and applications, given their excellent
 performance in tasks such as image classification, object detection, and image segmentation¹⁴. The use of
- 90 such approaches to rapidly assess and extract built environment features from GSV images using deep
- 91 learning can help facilitate integrated assessment and capture other aspects that may not be otherwise
- 92 included. The goal of this study is to use GSV images to assess built environment and use them to estimate
- 93 CHD prevalence at the census tract level.
- 94

95 <u>Methods</u>

96 Data source for coronary heart disease

97 The prevalence of census-tract coronary heart disease (CHD) was obtained from the CDC PLACES, a project 98 that provided chronic disease risk factors, health outcomes, and clinical preventive services. This project, 99 is a collaboration between the Centers for Disease Central and Prevention (CDC), the Pebert Wood

- is a collaboration between the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Robert WoodJohnson Foundation, and the CDC Foundation, measures CHD prevalence using data from Behavioral Risk
- Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), where people aged \geq 18 are surveyed to report whether or not they
- Factor surveinance system (BKFSS), where people aged ≥ 10 are surveyed to report whether or not they
- have been told by a doctor, nurse, or other health professional that they had angina or coronary heart disease. We collected the CHD prevalence data for 789 census tracts in 7 cities: Bellevue, WA; Brownsville,
- 104 TX; Cleveland, OH; Denver, CO; Detroit, MI; Fremont, CA; and Kansas City, KS.
- 104 TX, Cleveland, OH, Denver, CO, Den
- 105

106 Google street view data

107 Environment information was derived from approximately 0.53 million GSV images for the 7 cities (143K

- 108 for Detroit, 59K for Kansas City, 70K for Cleveland, 65K for Brownsville, 38K for Fremont, 35K for Bellevue,
- and 120K for Denver). The GSV images were downloaded via Google Street View Static Application
- 110 Programming Interface (API) from 2020-2021. GSV API provides users with street-level panoramic
- imagery which captures the visual domain of pedestrians in thousands of cities worldwide. The GSV

images of each census tract were downloaded in a grid pattern in the corresponding tract with an interval

of 100m. At each location where GSV images were retrieved, four images were gathered from different

directions (i.e., the cardinal directions: N, E, S, and W.), which composes a panoramic view of the

- surroundings at that location. When latitude and longitude coordinates are provided, the API searches
- within a 50-meter radius for a photograph closest to this location. The API would not return any images
- 117 if no available images could be found.
- 118

119 To process these images and gain environment information from them, a pre-trained deep convolutional neural network (DCNN) Place365 CNN¹⁵ was used as the feature extractor to obtain the deep features of 120 121 the image. Here, the deep features are the outputs of the deep layers in the hierarchy of the network. 122 Compared with the shallow features in the shallow layers, these deep features represent the semantic 123 information of the GSV images. Details of how the extraction was performed can be found in e Figure 1 in 124 the Supplement. We used Place365 CNN as the feature extractor because the images trained on Place365 125 CNN are more similar to that of GSV. Place365 CNN was trained on the subset of Places Database, which 126 contains more than 10 million images consisting of 400+ unique scene categories such as towers, soccer 127 fields, streets, swimming pools, and train station platforms. Compared with the ImageNet database, the 128 diversity of environmental features found in the Places Database was believed to be representative of 129 what is contained in GSV images. Through feature extraction, we obtained 4096 features representing the

- average built environment information for each census tract.
- 131

132 Statistical Analysis

133 Features Visualization using Grad-CAM

Elastic net regression models¹⁶ were used to estimate the census tract-level CHD prevalence by using the 134 135 DCNN-extracted features from GSV images. There are 4096 features and elastic net can handle this high 136 dimensional data by applying L1 and L2 regularization. Ten-fold cross-validation was repeated 3 times to 137 find the best parameters of the elastic net. Elastic net can select important features by simultaneously 138 performing feature selection and feature shrinkage, so we used it to select top features according to the 139 coefficients of each feature. The top features can be evaluated by examining the magnitudes and signs of 140 their coefficients in the elastic net mode, thus understanding how each feature is associated with CHD 141 prevalence. The top features were then visualized as the saliency map in the original GSV images using Grad-CAM technique¹⁷, which provides certain explanations of what environmental features the CNN 142 143 thinks to be associated with neighborhood CHD prevalence.

144

145 Machine Learning Models with CNN-extracted Features

146 A variety of machine-learning predictive models were used and compared to explore the association 147 between the CNN-extracted features of GSV images and the tract-level CHD prevalence. The models for 148 this analysis included ExtraTrees regressor (ET), AdaBoost regressor (AB), Random Forest Regressor (RF), 149 Gradient Boosting Regressor (GB), Extreme Gradient Boosting Regressor (XGB), and Light Gradient 150 Boosted Machine Regressor (LGBM). All models were estimated using a 10-fold cross-validation technique 151 for a more robust result. For 10-fold cross-validation, the dataset is split into 10 equal-sized subsets, and 152 the model is trained on 9 subsets and tested on the remaining 1 subset. This process is repeated 10 times 153 until all 10 subsets were used once as the testing set. R-squared values were reported as the measure of 154 association between the CNN-extracted features of GSV images and the tract-level CHD prevalence. The 155 performance of each model was also evaluated using the mean absolute error (MAE) and root mean 156 squared error (RMSE).

157

158 Multilevel Modeling with Demographics and Socio-Economic Factors

159 We analyzed the effects of common demographic and socio-economic factors (DSE) as well as CNN-160 extracted features of GSV images (GSV) associated with the CHD. We built multilevel regression models 161 to account for the effect of these factors including city, age, sex, race, income and education. A multivariate Sparse Partial Least Squares (SPLS) regression¹⁸ was applied first to the CNN-extracted 162 features to reduce the dimensionality issue and the effect of noise. The selected SPLS components and 163 164 the demographic and socio-economic factors were then used to fit a Linear Mixed-Effect regression model. 165 Three models were compared in this analysis: 1) a model containing both DSE factors and SPLS components (Combined Model); 2) a model with DSE factors alone (DSE Model); 3) a model with the SPLS 166 167 components alone (GSV Model). Model performance was assessed using goodness of fits measures such 168 as Likelihood Ratios Tests (as it applied), AIC and BIC criteria. In addition, all models were compared by 169 using R squared values obtained from a Light Gradient Boosted Machine (LGBM) and Random Forest (RF) 170 predictive model, which represent the amount of variance explained by each set of independent variables. 171 The comparison was done using a 10-fold cross validation scheme.

172

173 <u>Results</u>

174 Regression results with CNN Features

The 4096 CNN-extracted features from GSV images were able to explain more than 63% of the variance 175 176 $(R^2 = 0.634)$ on the tract-level CHD prevalence in 7 cities (Figure 1). The ET achieved the best result among 177 all models with the lowest average MAE of 1.11 and RMSE of 1.58. The actual estimate from CDC's CHD 178 prevalence and the model-predicted CHD prevalence were mapped for all census tracts in 7 cities (Figure 179 2). There was a good agreement between the actual estimates and predicted CHD prevalence across all 180 census tracts in 7 cities. We found a small number of extreme values that were underestimated by the 181 models in certain census tracts of Detroit and Cleveland. The CHD prevalence of these underestimated 182 census tracts was often more than 12%. When examining the CNN-extracted features using t-SNE, we 183 noticed clustering of census tracts with similar values of CHD prevalence (eFigure2 in the supplement) 184

185

186 Visualization of Top CNN Features

Grad-CAM was utilized to visualize top CNN-extracted features identified from the elastic net model. The saliency maps generated by the Grad-CAM, suggested that feature #1555, which seemed to highlight deteriorated buildings (suggesting neighborhood blight), had a positive association with CHD prevalence (Figure 3a). Another feature (feature #484) that was positively associated with CHD was found to be highlighting road cracks as shown in Figure 3b. In contrast, feature #204 in Figure 3c had a negative association with CHD prevalence, and its heatmap highlighted trees along the road. Feature #1732, seeming to focus on well built houses, also had a negative association with CHD prevalence (Figure 3d).

194 195

196 **Comparison of CNN Features with Demographics and Socio-Economic Factors**

197 With SPLS, an optimal model was obtained with h = 7 SPLS components ($\eta = 0.6$), yielding a model with 816 CNN-extracted features that explain $R_{XY}^2 > 66.7\%$ variance of CHD prevalence in the census tracts. 198 199 All three models were compared with Table 1 shows model comparisons for all three models Likelihood 200 Ratios Tests (LRT, also see eMethods in the Supplement). eTable 1 in the Supplement shows the 201 corresponding regression estimates and ANOVA results. Table 2 and Supplemental eTable 2 show the 202 amount of total explained variance of the GSV models and demographic and socioeconomic (DSE) variables (Table 2: LGBM, eTable 2: RF). After adjusting for each individual variable, we found that the 203 204 combined model (GSV + DSE) demonstrated a better Goodness of Fit, with statistically significant higher 205 log-likelihood and lower AIC/BIC when compared to GSV or DSE model alone (Table 1). Also, we found 206 that nearly all the SPLS components are statistically significant (eTable 1 in the Supplement). Although the

DSE model has lower AIC and BIC values, with a significant LRT, when compared to the GSV model alone
(Table 1), the GSV features alone explain more variance of CHD prevalence than the DSE variables (Table
2). Altogether, this indicates that GSV features and traditional demographics and socio-economics
variables are both significantly associated and predictive of CHD prevalence.

211

212 Discussion

While many epidemiological studies have examined associations between cardiovascular disease and individual built environmental features (e.g. greenspace, urban architecture, street connectivity, food availability), our approach focused on machine vision derived physical environment, relying on convolutional neural networks (CNN) and its related techniques to extract features.

217

218 Our results showed a good association ($R^2 = 0.634$) between the CNN-extracted features from GSV and 219 CHD at the census tract level in 7 cities. This indicated that the CNN-extracted features could capture 220 neighborhood features impacting cardiovascular health. The predicted CHD prevalence using CNN-221 extracted features tended to underestimate in certain areas compared to observed CHD prevalence 222 especially in Detroit and Cleveland. This may suggest that certain CHD-related factors may either not be 223 embedded in these environments at these locations or that perhaps features not captured by street view images, such as demographic factors, ambient factors and other demographic and traditional variables 224 may play a much larger role in these environments. 225

226

227 Our approach took the advantage of the knowledge that fully connected layers in the CNN contain condensed information of the input imagery that can be extracted and utilized for a variety of purposes. 228 We utilized a pre-trained deep convolutional neural network (DCNN) Place365 CNN¹⁵, so that the deep 229 230 features from the CNN may be more representative of the built environment. One advantage of this 231 approach is that predefined relevant features in the built environment is not required. The 4096-232 dimensional deep features embeds all essential information of the built environment in the imagery so 233 that we could retain relevant features as much as reasonably possible. Conversely, the disadvantage of 234 using deep features from a pre-trained CNN is that it becomes difficult to identify corresponding physical 235 features that impact CHD at the neighborhood level. To alleviate this issue and provide certain 236 interpretations of the deep features, we utilized Grad-CAM techniques to visualize the CHD-related 237 features with a saliency map.

238

Grad-CAM highlighted several potential built environment features that are either associated with higher or lower CHD at the neighborhood level. Deteriorated houses and roads are a feature of urban blight associated with higher CHD. This feature may in turn embody other features in the neighborhood that drive cardiovascular risk, including lack of space for physical activity^{7,19}, limited access to nutritionallybalanced food²⁰, lack of access to health care²¹. Street greenery on the other hand was highlighted as associated with lower CHD prevalence. This agrees with previous studies that showed a robust association between green space and decreased cardiovascular risks^{22,23}.

246

247 The results of multilevel modeling using demographics and socio-economic factors, indicate that 248 demographics and socio-economic variables, were still better predictors of CHD prevalence, than GSV 249 features. One explanation is obviously the fact that physical environmental feature even if they represent 250 a "meta" framework for other mediators, may not be sufficient to convey the risk conveyed by other 251 factors which may be sparsely represented. Another reason may be that GSV features may engender 252 increased model complexity, by virtue of including 4096 features (Table 1). However, GSV features alone 253 could still explain preponderant proportion of variance in CHD prevalence (Table 2 and eTable1 in the 254 Supplement). Therefore, by incorporating GSV features into regular DSE variables, one could help improve

the prediction of CHD prevalence at the neighborhood level. Our results further suggest that GSV features
 indeed may be helpful in highlighting specific built environment information related to CHD prevalence at

257 the neighborhood level as illustrated by Grad-CAM methods, which provided a way of identifying built

258 environment information.259

260 There are multiple limitations of this study that should be noted. Firstly, the GSV images used in the study are only available along major streets and roads, and there are some populations who do not live in such 261 262 neighborhood. However, given the fact that most population live around the urban neighborhood where 263 GSV are abundant, we believe this would not significantly affect the results for majority of census tracts. 264 Further, although Place365 database contains 400+ unique scene categories, it may not include all 265 features that can be found in the built environment. Small objects such as trash, other environmental pollutants and physical domains that may translate into better urban guality of life, may be difficult for 266 computer vision techniques like CNN to detect in a GSV image ²⁴. Additionally, the census tracts with CHD 267 prevalence data are from 7 representative U.S cities of CDC PLACES dataset, and may not generalize to all 268 269 census tracts in the U.S., especially rural areas²⁵. Future work is needed to examinate the disparities of 270 urban and rural areas and its cardiovascular-related built environment features.

271

272 <u>Conclusion</u>

273 Built environment impacts cardiovascular health outcome. In this study, we used Google Street View (GSV) 274 and a scene-pretrained convolutional neural network (CNN) to assess the built environment. We found 275 CNN-extracted features explain significant portion of coronary heart disease (CHD) prevalence at the 276 census tract level. Compared to traditional demographic and socio-economic factors, GSV provides unique 277 information that may relate to CHD such as buildings, greenspace and roads as suggested by the activation 278 maps from Grad-CAM technique. The outcomes of our study provides proof of concept for machine-vision 279 enabled identification of urban network features associated with risk that in principle, may enable rapid 280 identification and targeting interventions in at-risk neighborhoods to reduce cardiovascular burden. 281

282 <u>References</u>

- Tsao CW, Aday AW, Almarzooq ZI, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics—2022 Update: A Report
 From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2022;145(8):e153-e639.
- 285 doi:10.1161/CIR.000000000001052
- Health, United States, Annual Perspective, 2020-2021. National Center for Health Statistics (U.S.);
 2022. doi:10.15620/cdc:122044
- 3. Heron M, Anderson RN. Changes in the Leading Cause of Death: Recent Patterns in Heart Disease and
 Cancer Mortality. *NCHS Data Brief*. 2016;(254):1-8.
- Havranek EP, Mujahid MS, Barr DA, et al. Social Determinants of Risk and Outcomes for
 Cardiovascular Disease. *Circulation*. 2015;132(9):873-898. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000228
- Al-Kindi SG, Brook RD, Biswal S, Rajagopalan S. Environmental determinants of cardiovascular
 disease: lessons learned from air pollution. *Nature Reviews Cardiology*. 2020;17(10):656-672.
 doi:10.1038/s41569-020-0371-2
- 295 6. Bhatnagar A. Environmental Determinants of Cardiovascular Disease. *Circulation Research*.
 2017;121(2):162-180. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.306458

297 7. Sallis JF, Floyd MF, Rodríguez DA, Saelens BE. Role of built environments in physical activity, obesity,

- and cardiovascular disease. *Circulation*. 2012;125(5):729-737.
- 299 doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.110.969022
- Rajagopalan S, Landrigan PJ. Pollution and the Heart. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;385(20):1881-1892.
 doi:10.1056/NEJMra2030281
- 302 9. Google. How Street View works and where we will collect images next. Google Maps Street View.
 303 Accessed February 2, 2023. https://www.google.com/streetview/how-it-works/
- Seiferling I, Naik N, Ratti C, Proulx R. Green streets Quantifying and mapping urban trees with
 street-level imagery and computer vision. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 2017;165:93-101.
 doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.05.010
- Lu Y. Using Google Street View to investigate the association between street greenery and
 physical activity. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 2019;191:103435.
 doi:10.1016/J.LANDURBPLAN.2018.08.029
- Kang J, Körner M, Wang Y, Taubenböck H, Zhu XX. Building instance classification using street
 view images. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*. 2018;145:44-59.
 doi:10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2018.02.006
- Nagata S, Nakaya T, Hanibuchi T, Amagasa S, Kikuchi H, Inoue S. Objective scoring of streetscape
 walkability related to leisure walking: Statistical modeling approach with semantic segmentation of
 Google Street View images. *Health & Place*. 2020;66:102428. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102428
- 316 14. LeCun Y, Bengio Y, Hinton G. Deep learning. *Nature*. 2015;521(7553):436-444.
 317 doi:10.1038/nature14539
- Thou B, Lapedriza A, Khosla A, Oliva A, Torralba A. Places: A 10 Million Image Database for Scene
 Recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. 2018;40(6):1452-1464.
 doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2017.2723009
- 321 16. Zou H, Hastie T. Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *Journal of the Royal* 322 *Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*. 2005;67(2):301-320. doi:10.1111/j.1467 323 9868.2005.00503.x
- Selvaraju RR, Cogswell M, Das A, Vedantam R, Parikh D, Batra D. Grad-CAM: Visual Explanations
 from Deep Networks via Gradient-Based Localization. *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. Published online 2017:618-626. doi:10.1007/s11263-019-01228-7
- 18. Chun H, Keleş S. Sparse partial least squares regression for simultaneous dimension reduction
 and variable selection. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol*. 2010;72(1):3-25. doi:10.1111/j.14679868.2009.00723.x
- 19. Chandrabose M, Rachele JN, Gunn L, et al. Built environment and cardio-metabolic health:
 systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Obesity Reviews*. 2019;20(1):41-54.
 doi:10.1111/obr.12759

333 20. Gondi KT, Larson J, Sifuentes A, et al. Health of the Food Environment Is Associated With Heart
 334 Failure Mortality in the United States. *Circulation: Heart Failure*. 2022;15(12):e009651.
 335 doi:10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.122.009651

White-Williams C, Rossi LP, Bittner VA, et al. Addressing Social Determinants of Health in the
 Care of Patients With Heart Failure: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association.
 Circulation. 2020;141(22):e841-e863. doi:10.1161/CIR.00000000000767

Pereira G, Foster S, Martin K, et al. The association between neighborhood greenness and
 cardiovascular disease: an observational study. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12:466. doi:10.1186/1471 2458-12-466

342 23. Mitchell R, Popham F. Effect of exposure to natural environment on health inequalities: an
343 observational population study. *Lancet*. 2008;372(9650):1655-1660. doi:10.1016/S0140344 6736(08)61689-X

- Ross CE, Mirowsky J. Disorder and Decay: The Concept and Measurement of Perceived
 Neighborhood Disorder. *Urban Affairs Review*. 1999;34(3):412-432.
- 347 doi:10.1177/107808749903400304
- Loccoh EC, Joynt MKE, Wang Y, Kazi DS, Yeh RW, Wadhera RK. Rural-Urban Disparities in
 Outcomes of Myocardial Infarction, Heart Failure, and Stroke in the United States. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2022;79(3):267-279. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2021.10.045

351

353 **Figures**



354 355 Figure 1. Scatterplot of the actual estimated (observed) and predicted CHD prevalence (in percentage) in

356 seven cities. The Black dotted line represents the y = x line.





Kansas City, KS

- Figure 2. Maps of the actual estimates of cardiovascular heart disease (CHD) prevalence (left) and
- predicted CHD prevalence (right, in percentage). The predicted CHD prevalence is obtained by averaging
- the results from 100 random trials based on k-fold cross-validation (with k = 10).



- images (left) and their activation maps (right) for the features associated with higher CHD prevalence.
- 389 Images (c) and (d) show the two pairs of GSV images (left) and their activation maps (right) for the
- 390 features associated with lower CHD prevalence.
- 391

392 **Tables**

393

Table 1. AIC, BIC Criteria and Likelihood Ratios Tests (LRT) of LMM models by Model Combination for

- 395 CHD Prevalence. Models: GSV = the reduced LMM model with only the selected SPLS components CHD:
- h = 7 obtained from the full CNN features; DSE = the reduced LMM model with only the Demographics
- 397 and Socio-Economic variables; Combined = the full LMM model with both sets of independent variables
- 398 from GSV and DSE.

CHD

LMM Model	AIC	BIC	Log. Lik.	Test	LRT	p-value
Combined	757.0	835.0	-368.0			
DSE	930.0	967.0	-457.0	Combined vs. DSE	178.0	< 1.00E-4
Combined	757.0	835.0	-368.0			
GSV	984.0	1029.0	-482.0	Combined vs. GSV	227.0	< 1.00E-4
DSE	930.0	967.0	-457.0			
GSV	984.0	1029.0	-482.0	DSE vs. GSV	49.0	< 1.00E-4

399

401 Table 2. Total Explained Variance of the LGBM Prediction Model by Model Combination for CHD

402 Prevalence.

CHD	R²			
LGBM Model	Median	Mean	Std. Error	
DSE	0.360	0.149	0.553	
GSV	0.591	0.597	0.057	

404 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

405

406 Supplementary Information Text

407 Multilevel Modeling of Demographics and Socio-Economic Effects

408 Population Demographics and Socio-Economic status variables are well-known factors associated with 409 the prevalence of disease such as those of interest in this study. To assess the contribution of these 410 effects besides the CNN-extracted features to the crude prevalence of CHD a multilevel-level regression 411 model was built to simultaneously account for the effect of City, as well as variables Age (Median), Sex (Female %), Race (White %), Income (Median \$), and Education (< High School %) in addition to the 4096 412 413 CNN-extracted features. Further, to reduce the dimensionality of the problem and to reduce the effect of noise on the error rates of our inferences, we followed a two-step modeling strategy. In the first step, 414 a multivariate Sparse Partial Least Squares (SPLS) regression²⁷ was applied to the CNN-extracted 415 416 features to consider a reduced set of selected SPLS components (latent variables/factors), to which 417 dimension reduction was further applied by imposing sparsity on their loadings (CNN-extracted features). This was done by using shrinkage estimates of regression coefficients (loadings of component) 418 419 with combined L1- and L2-penalized estimation. The two tuning parameters of the multivariate Sparse PLS regression model are: (i) the number $h \in \left[1, \min(p, (\frac{f-1}{f})n)\right]$ of components that enter the Linear 420 421 Mixed Effects Model (where f is the number of folds and p is the dimensionality and n is the sample 422 size), and (ii) the sparsity parameter that controls the amount of shrinkage by a combination of the L1-423 and L2-penalties. Both were tuned simultaneously by 10-fold Cross-Validation. In the second step, a 424 Mixed-Effect regression model was fitted with the first few selected SPLS components augmented with 425 the other Demographics and Socio-Economic variables, all treated here as fixed-effects, and where City was treated as a random effect. Departure from normality of the univariate dependent variable (CHD 426 427 Prevalence) was tested by EDA analysis and Shapiro-Wilks test. A Box-Cox transformation of the 428 response was applied to minimize departure from normality. Because the dependent variables are 429 continuous, modeling was done by fitting a Linear Mixed Effects Model (LMM). The modeling is entirely 430 supervised because multivariate SPLS regression seeks latent components that not only capture the 431 most variance in the X-space (multivariate independent variables) but also the most covariance with the 432 response Y (univariate dependent variable of disease prevalence). Finally, AIC and BIC criteria as well as 433 Likelihood Ratios Tests (as it applied) were used for model comparison between the full model and the reduced models with the Demographics and Socio-Economic variables alone or the selected SPLS 434 components alone. Goodness of fit results of all models were also compared by the R^2 amount of 435 436 explained variance achieved by each set of independent variables in the cross validated Random Forest

437 (RF) and Light Gradient Boosted Machine (LGBM) predictive models as described above.

438 **Comparison of CNN Features with Recognized Factors**

- 439 An optimal model could be obtained after model parameter tuning by cross-validation with a maximum
- of h = 7 SPLS components and $\eta = 0.6$, yielding a final model comprising s = 2031 selected loadings or
- 441 CNN-extracted features. This resulted in a SPLS model with a cumulative explained variance of CHD:
- 442 $R_{XY}^2 > 66.7\%$. Additional selection of the CNN-extracted features was done by excluding loadings with

- 443 0-containing 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals, resulting in a final model of CHD: *s* = 816 loadings.
- 444 Model specification only included main random and fixed effects and no random interaction effect was
- found significant. Also, a structure for the covariance matrix was deemed not necessary (not statistically
- 446 significantly different).
- 447 We further refer to the Google Satellite View (GSV) model, as the reduced LMM model where only the
- selected SPLS components (CHD: h = 7) obtained from the full CNN features enter into the model.
- Likewise, we refer to the Demographics and Socio-Economic (DSE) model, as the reduced LMM model
- 450 where only the Demographics and Socio-Economic variables enter into the model. We compared the
- 451 regression estimates and Goodness of Fit (GOF) measures between these reduced models and the
- 452 Combined LMM model, where both sets of independent variables enter simultaneously. For all three
- 453 models, Table 1 shows model comparisons by GOF and Likelihood Ratios Tests (LRT), and Supplemental
- eTable 1 shows the corresponding regression estimates and ANOVA results. Likewise, Table 2 shows the
- amount of total explained variance by predictive modeling (Table 2: LGBM, Supplemental eTable2: RF).

457 Supplementary Figures



458

459 eFigure 1. Workflow of the GSV feature extract and regression method. A Places365 pre-trained

460 convolutional neural network – ResNet-50 was used as a feature extractor to obtain the deep features

461 from GSV images. The aggregated feature vector was used in regression to predict CHD prevalence.



462

eFigure 2. T-SNE projection of the 4096 features from GSV data for the tracts of 7 cities. The projected

464 points are colored by CHD prevalence (%) of the census tract.

466 Supplementary Tables

CHD							
	Effects	Coeff.	Std. Error	t-value	p-value	F-value	p-value
Combined	sex	< 0.1	< 0.1	2.870	0.004	3428	< 0.0001
	Age	< 0.1	< 0.1	14.92	< 0.001	150	< 0.0001
	Race	< 0.1	< 0.1	-3.450	0.001	94.000	< 0.0001
	Income	< 0.1	< 0.1	-10.36	< 0.001	515	< 0.0001
	Education	1.2	0.18	6.790	< 0.001	132	< 0.0001
	Comp.1	44.2	19.56	2.260	0.024	52.000	< 0.0001
	Comp.2	-23.2	11.02	-2.11	0.035	6.000	< 0.0181
	Comp.3	36.5	9.65	3.780	< 0.001	59.000	< 0.0001
	Comp.4	32	9.95	3.220	0.001	7.000	0.0109
	Comp.5	-41.2	10.75	-3.83	< 0.001	1.000	0.4663
	Comp.6	35.7	10.25	3.480	0.001	10	0.0014
	Comp.7	49.5	10.67	4.640	< 0.001	21	< 0.0001
DSE	Sex	0.011	0.034	3.22	0.001	18	< 0.0001
	Age	0.042	0.025	17.06	< 0.001	142	< 0.0001
	Race	-0.006	0.001	-6.37	< 0.001	85	< 0.0001
	Income	0	0	-10.42	< 0.001	297	< 0.0001
	Education	1.903	0.181	10.49	< 0.001	110	< 0 <u>.0001</u>
GSV	Comp.1	61.8	26.19	2.36	0.019	115	< 0.0001
	Comp.2	-25.4	13.3	-1.91	0.057	54	< 0.0001
	Comp.3	58.7	11.64	5.04	< 0.001	137	< 0.0001
	Comp.4	73.9	12.96	5.7	< 0.001	23	< 0.0001
	Comp.5	-51.9	14.09	-3.69	< 0.001	5	0.0248
	Comp.6	36.2	12.74	2.86	0.004	5	0.0258
	Comp.7	82.2	13.51	6.08	< 0.001	37	< 0.0001

467 eTable 1. Regression Estimates and ANOVA Results by Model Combination for CHD Prevalence.

468

469 eTable 2. Total Explained Variance of the RF Prediction Model by Model Combination for CHD

470 Prevalence.

471

CHD	R ²			
RF Model	Median	Mean	Std. Error	
DSE	0.328	0.160	0.559	
GSV	0.613	0.615	0.045	