

1 Title: Ambient nitrogen dioxide in 47,187 neighborhoods across 326 cities in eight Latin
2 American countries: population exposures and associations with urban features

3

4 Josiah L. Kephart PhD^{1,2}, Nelson Gouveia PhD MD³, Daniel A. Rodriguez PhD⁴, Katy Indvik
5 MSc¹, Tania Alfaro MD⁵, José Luis Texcalac PhD⁶, J. Jaime Miranda PhD MD^{7,8}, Usama Bilal
6 PhD MD^{1,9*}, Ana V. Diez Roux PhD MD^{1,9*}

- 7 1. Urban Health Collaborative, Dornsife School of Public Health, Drexel University,
8 Philadelphia, USA
- 9 2. Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, Dornsife School of Public
10 Health, Drexel University, Philadelphia, USA
- 11 3. Department of Preventive Medicine, University of Sao Paulo Medical School, Sao Paulo,
12 Brazil
- 13 4. Department of City and Regional Planning and Institute for Transportation Studies,
14 University of California, Berkeley, California, USA
- 15 5. Escuela de Salud Pública, Universidad de Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile
- 16 6. Department of Environmental Health, Center for Population Health Research, National
17 Institute of Public Health, Cuernavaca, Mexico
- 18 7. CRONICAS Centre of Excellence in Chronic Diseases, Universidad Peruana Cayetano
19 Heredia, Lima, Peru
- 20 8. The George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney,
21 Australia
- 22 9. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Dornsife School of Public Health, Drexel
23 University, Philadelphia, USA

24 *Joint senior authors

25

26 Corresponding Author:

27 Josiah L. Kephart, PhD MPH

28 jlk465@drexel.edu

29 Dornsife School of Public Health

30 Drexel University

31 3600 Market St, 7th floor

32 Philadelphia, PA, 19104, USA

33

34 ABSTRACT

35 Background: Health research on ambient nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) is sparse in Latin America,
36 despite the high prevalence of NO₂-associated respiratory diseases in the region. This study
37 describes within-city distributions of ambient NO₂ concentrations at high spatial resolution and
38 urban characteristics associated with neighborhood ambient NO₂ in 326 Latin American cities.

39 Methods: We aggregated estimates of annual surface NO₂ at 1 km² spatial resolution for 2019,
40 population counts, and urban characteristics compiled by the SALURBAL project to the
41 neighborhood level (i.e., census tracts). We described the percent of the urban population living
42 with ambient NO₂ levels exceeding WHO Air Quality Guidelines. We used multilevel models to
43 describe associations of neighborhood ambient NO₂ concentrations with population and urban
44 characteristics at the neighborhood and city levels.

45 Findings: We examined 47,187 neighborhoods in 326 cities from eight Latin American
46 countries. Of the ~236 million urban residents observed, 85% lived in neighborhoods with
47 ambient annual NO₂ above WHO guidelines. In adjusted models, higher neighborhood-level
48 educational attainment, closer proximity to the city center, and lower neighborhood-level
49 greenness were associated with higher ambient NO₂. At the city level, higher vehicle congestion,
50 population size, and population density were associated with higher ambient NO₂.

51 Interpretation: Almost nine out of every 10 residents of Latin American cities live with ambient
52 NO₂ concentrations above WHO guidelines. Increasing neighborhood greenness and reducing
53 reliance on fossil fuel-powered vehicles warrant further attention as potential actionable urban
54 environmental interventions to reduce population exposure to ambient NO₂.

55 Funding: Wellcome Trust, National Institutes of Health, Cotswold Foundation

56 Keywords: nitrogen dioxide, air pollution, exposure, Latin America, urban environment, health

57

58 1. Introduction

59 Ambient nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) is a ubiquitous urban air pollutant produced by fossil fuel
60 combustion. NO₂ is emitted by outdoor and indoor point sources, such as industrial processes
61 and household cooking and heating,⁽¹⁾ and through mobile sources, such as exhaust from fossil
62 fuel-powered vehicles⁽¹⁾. Under certain atmospheric conditions, NO₂ can rapidly transform to
63 other chemical structures and is a key ingredient in the formation of ground-level ozone⁽¹⁾.
64 Because of NO₂'s tendency to rapidly transform over time and space, ambient NO₂
65 concentrations can have highly granular spatial variability within cities^(2, 3, 4). This variability is
66 often linked to spatially-varying social characteristics, resulting in within-city social disparities
67 in NO₂ exposures⁽⁵⁾.

68 Historically, epidemiologic research on NO₂ has faced the challenge of examining NO₂ exposure
69 within complex mixtures of co-occurring pollutants, such as exhaust from fossil fuel-powered
70 vehicles, and many epidemiologic analyses have approached ambient NO₂ as a proxy for traffic-
71 related air pollutant mixtures⁽⁴⁾. However rapidly growing evidence supports increased attention
72 to the role of NO₂ itself as an independent risk factor for health⁽⁶⁾. Exposure to NO₂ contributes
73 to respiratory disease⁽¹⁾ and all-cause mortality^(7, 8, 9, 10), among other health effects⁽¹⁾.
74 Children, the elderly, and individuals with respiratory disease are particularly susceptible to the
75 health effects of NO₂ exposure⁽¹⁾. In 2021, the WHO lowered the Air Quality Guideline for
76 annual NO₂ by 75% (from 40 ug/m³ to 10 ug/m³), citing growing evidence of the impacts of
77 NO₂ on health⁽¹¹⁾. The updated WHO air quality guidelines and, specifically, the substantial
78 reductions in guidelines for NO₂ warrants renewed attention towards who is exposed to harmful
79 ambient NO₂ concentrations and how ambient NO₂ can be reduced in urban settings that remain
80 highly dependent on fossil fuels for transit and industry.

81 To date, limited research has examined population exposures to ambient NO₂ and urban factors
82 associated with ambient NO₂ in Latin America. Even fewer studies have examined within-city
83 differences in NO₂ concentrations in the region. However, Latin America has both high
84 urbanization (80% of the population lives in urban areas)⁽¹²⁾ and a high prevalence of NO₂-
85 associated respiratory diseases⁽¹³⁾. A 2019 study of asthma incidence attributable to ambient
86 NO₂ found that Lima, Peru and Bogotá, Colombia were among the top three cities globally for
87 asthma incidence attributable to NO₂ exposure⁽¹³⁾. A 2022 study of 968 urban areas in Latin
88 America estimated that 16% of pediatric asthma cases in Latin American cities are attributable to
89 ambient NO₂ exposures⁽¹⁴⁾. Despite the substantial health impacts of ambient NO₂ in the region,
90 ambient NO₂ monitoring networks in the region are sparse⁽¹⁵⁾. However, recent advances in
91 satellite-derived global estimates of surface NO₂ at fine spatial resolution⁽¹⁴⁾ provide novel
92 opportunities to examine social disparities and spatial variations in population exposures to NO₂
93 within and between cities in this highly urbanized region.

94 To address these knowledge gaps on population exposures to ambient NO₂ in Latin America and
95 the relationship between NO₂ and the urban environment, this study aims to describe population
96 exposures to ambient NO₂ and urban characteristics associated with differences in ambient NO₂
97 exposure at the census tract level within 326 Latin American cities.

98 2. Methods

99 2.1. Study setting

100 This study was conducted as part of the *Salud Urbana en América Latina* (SALURBAL) project.
101 The SALURBAL study protocol was approved by the Drexel University Institutional Review
102 Board (ID no. 1612005035). This international scientific collaboration has compiled and
103 harmonized data on social, environmental, and health characteristics for hundreds of cities in 11
104 Latin American countries(16). Cities in SALURBAL are composed of clusters of administrative
105 units (i.e., municipalities) encompassing the visually apparent urban built-up area as identified
106 using satellite imagery(17). Cities were defined as all urban agglomerations within the 11
107 countries that contained more than 100,000 residents as of 2010(17), facilitating examination of a
108 diverse set of cities, from small cities to megacities. The SALURBAL project previously
109 published an analysis of the variability and predictors ambient fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5})
110 across the Latin American region(18), focusing on larger administrative units (i.e.,
111 municipalities).

112 In this analysis, we examine neighborhood-level ambient NO₂ in 326 cities in Argentina, Brazil,
113 Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, and Panama. Cities in El Salvador, Nicaragua,
114 and Peru were excluded due to the lack of available data at the neighborhood level.
115 Neighborhood administrative units varied in name and official definition by country. We used
116 the country-specific, small-area administrative units most analogous to U.S. census tracts,
117 henceforth referred to as “neighborhoods.” Detailed information on the administrative units and
118 census used for each country is available in Supplementary Table S1. Across countries, these
119 neighborhoods had a median population of 2,063 and a median area of 0.34 km² (equivalent to a
120 square with 0.58 km sides).

121 2.2. Neighborhood NO₂ exposures

122 We used estimates published in 2022 of annual surface NO₂ at 1 km² spatial resolution(14).
123 These estimates were based on a previous land use regression (LUR) model of mean surface NO₂
124 from 2010-2012 at 100 m resolution(19). The LUR estimates were subsequently adjusted for bias
125 using chemical transport models and scaled to an extended timeframe (annual means from 2005-
126 2020) using satellite NO₂ columns from the Ozone Monitoring Instrument v. 4.0 product(14, 20).
127 For this analysis, we used NO₂ estimates from the year 2019, the most recent year before the
128 dramatic changes in ambient air pollution associated with the COVID-19 pandemic(21). To
129 estimate neighborhood annual mean NO₂, we averaged the values of all NO₂ raster grid cells
130 overlapping or contained within the neighborhood spatial boundary, area-weighting for the
131 proportion of each grid cell contained within the neighborhood boundary. The resulting output
132 was an estimate of annual surface NO₂ in the year 2019 for each neighborhood in the study area.

133 2.3. Neighborhood and city characteristics

134 We used data on neighborhood characteristics and population compiled from national census
135 bureaus and other sources by the SALURBAL project(17). We used the most recent available
136 census for each country; information on the year of each census used is available in
137 Supplementary Table 1. At both the neighborhood and city levels, the SALURBAL project

138 previously estimated population density (population divided by built-up area), educational
139 attainment (% of the population aged 25 years or older who completed primary education or
140 above), intersection density (density of the set of nodes with more than one street emanating
141 from them per km² of built-up area), and area median greenness measured by the normalized
142 difference vegetation index (NDVI). NDVI was calculated using MODIS satellite-based
143 observations from the MODIS vegetation product, MOD13Q1.006 for 2015 at a 250 m spatial
144 resolution(22). We computed the maximum NDVI value for 2019 at 250 m resolution to present
145 the ‘greenest’ condition of each grid cell, then calculated the median across grid cells contained
146 within each neighborhood. At the neighborhood level, we also calculated distance from the city
147 center as the Euclidean distance (km) between the neighborhood centroid and city hall. At the
148 city level, we also estimated city population, GDP per capita (computed as purchasing power
149 parities in constant 2011 international USD of each city in 2015 using estimates from the first
150 subnational administrative level, typically equivalent to departments or states(23)), and city-level
151 traffic congestion (increase in road vehicle travel time due to congestion in the street
152 network(24)).

153 2.4. Statistical analysis

154 We calculated summary statistics and boxplots of neighborhood NO₂ concentrations, overall and
155 stratified by country. Due to the small number of cities represented by each country, we pooled
156 cities from Costa Rica (N=1 city), Guatemala (N=2), and Panama (N=3) into a single country
157 grouping for Central America for all analyses. For comparability with the NO₂ data source, we
158 transformed the WHO annual guideline from µg/m³ to parts per billion (ppb; 10 µg/m³ ≈ 5.3
159 ppb) under standard assumptions (atmospheric pressure at sea level and 25°C temperature). We
160 created summary statistics of the population living in neighborhoods with ambient NO₂ levels
161 above and below annual WHO Air Quality Guidelines (10 µg/m³), overall and by country. We
162 summarized city-level mean NO₂ for descriptive analysis by aggregating neighborhood NO₂
163 estimates to the city-level using a population-weighted average.

164 To estimate between-country vs. between-city vs. within-city variation in neighborhood ambient
165 NO₂ exposures, we used a mixed effects one-way ANOVA with random intercepts for city and
166 country.

167 We used multilevel univariable and multivariable models to describe associations between
168 neighborhood-level ambient NO₂ concentrations and population and urban characteristics at the
169 neighborhood and city levels. All independent variables were operationalized as z-scores of the
170 overall study distribution for each respective variable. We first conducted a univariable analysis
171 of each independent variable and the dependent variable of neighborhood annual NO₂. We then
172 modeled all neighborhood- and city-level predictors together. The percent change in variance
173 between empty and multivariable models was calculated to describe the total variance explained
174 by the multivariable model. All univariable and multivariable models were adjusted for country
175 as a fixed effect and city as a random intercept.

176 Data processing and analyses were conducted in R version 4.1.0(25).

177 2.5. Role of the funding source

178 The funding sources had no role in the analysis, writing, or decision to submit the manuscript.

179 3. Results

180 3.1. Population and urban characteristics of study area

181 We examined 47,187 neighborhoods in 326 cities in eight Latin American countries (Table 1).
182 The geographic locations of observed cities are presented in Figure 1. Within study cities, urban
183 neighborhoods in Central American cities (median [interquartile range (IQR)] NDVI, 0.59
184 [0.32]) and Brazil (0.57 [0.34]) were greenest while neighborhoods in Chilean cities were the
185 least green (0.32 [0.26]). Neighborhoods in Colombia had the highest population density (12.7
186 [16.9] thousand residents per km²) while neighborhoods in Brazil were the least dense (3.9
187 [7.1]). At the city level, Central American cities had the greatest traffic congestion (36% [40%]
188 longer trip duration than free-flow conditions due to congestion) while cities in Brazil were the
189 least congested (9% [6%] longer trip duration due to congestion). Neighborhood and city
190 population and characteristics are described overall and by country in Table 1.

Table 1. Population characteristics and urban form of study neighborhoods (N=47,187) within 326 Latin American cities. Results presented as number (N) or Median (interquartile range).

	Total	Argentina	Brazil	Central America ^a	Chile	Colombia	Mexico
Neighborhood level							
N of neighborhoods	47,187	2,044	4,004	5,563	744	3,064	31,768
Population density ^b	5.7 (9.0)	6.5 (7.4)	3.9 (7.1)	6.1 (12.4)	8.0 (7.9)	12.7 (16.9)	5.5 (8.2)
Education (% primary school)	89.7 (12.9)	90.8 (11.0)	67.4 (14.9)	78.6 (31.9)	91.6 (8.0)	81.5 (20.6)	91.7 (8.8)
Intersection density ^c	132 (127)	87 (49)	88 (91)	76 (129)	170 (133)	111 (310)	154 (117)
Greenness (NDVI)	0.45 (0.31)	0.41 (0.29)	0.57 (0.34)	0.59 (0.32)	0.32 (0.26)	0.51 (0.3)	0.41 (0.3)
Distance from city center (km)	8.4 (11.6)	15.7 (23.7)	10.3 (15.5)	9.3 (8.9)	4.8 (7.5)	4.7 (6.6)	8.2 (11.4)
City level							
N of cities	326	22	152	6	21	33	92
City population (thousands)	307 (462)	332 (433)	255 (402)	1,153 (2,172)	243 (208)	369 (463)	396 (655)
GDP per capita (USD thousands)	14.8 (10.2)	19.6 (11.0)	19.3 (12.4)	15.8 (13.3)	17.7 (13.6)	11.8 (4.9)	14.0 (6.1)
Traffic congestion index ^d	11% (11)	10% (4)	9% (6)	36% (40)	27% (12)	32% (13)	13% (10)
Population density ^b	6.8 (3.4)	5.5 (1.8)	6.2 (2.7)	7.9 (1.0)	7.1 (2.3)	15.9 (5.8)	6.5 (2.2)
Education (% primary school)	73.0 (16.5)	79.8 (3.9)	65.7 (8.1)	86.7 (11.1)	89.8 (3.8)	83.7 (4.2)	79.6 (8.6)
Intersection density ^c	87.9 (33.4)	81.2 (22.3)	82.2 (21.1)	60.9 (12.2)	120.5 (19.2)	121.6 (31.1)	92.9 (30.8)
Greenness (NDVI)	0.82 (0.10)	0.79 (0.15)	0.82 (0.08)	0.88 (0.05)	0.75 (0.51)	0.86 (0.03)	0.76 (0.23)

^aCentral America grouping includes urban neighborhoods in Costa Rica (N=1 city), Guatemala (N=2), and Panama (N=3)

^bThousands of residents per square kilometer

^cIntersections per square kilometer of built-up area

^dPercent longer trip duration due to traffic congestion, as a percentage of trip time without congestion




Figure 1. Location of study cities (N=326) and city-level population-weighted annual concentration of ambient NO₂ in 2019. The WHO guideline for annual NO₂ is 10 µg/m³ (≈ 5.3 ppb) and all neighborhoods that exceed this guideline are represented by yellow, orange, red, or purple.

3.2. Ambient NO₂ neighborhood concentrations and population exposures

In Figure 1, we present the population-weighted city-level mean NO₂ for context (as distinct from the primary analysis of neighborhood-level concentrations). City-level NO₂ concentrations appear to have strong variation between many cities in close proximity, suggesting the importance of local drivers of ambient NO₂. In Figure 2, we present neighborhood-level NO₂ for two selected cities of varying sizes: the metropolitan area of Buenos Aires, Argentina (population ≈ 16 million; Panel A) and Quetzaltenango, Guatemala (population ≈ 295,000; Panel B). In both selected cities, as typical across study cities, neighborhood NO₂ concentrations trend higher with greater proximity to the urban core. Consistent with the overall findings of Figures 1 2, our variance decomposition model showed that 9.4% of total variance in neighborhood NO₂ was between countries, 30.3% of variance was between cities, and 60.3% of variance was within cities.




Figure 2. Within-city variation in neighborhood-level ambient NO₂ in two selected cities with varying population and geographic sizes (note the panel-specific scale bars). Gray lines represent neighborhood boundaries and colors represent annual mean ambient NO₂ in 2019. In Panel A, the metropolitan area of Buenos Aires, Argentina (population ≈ 16 million). In Panel B, Quetzaltenango, Guatemala (population ≈ 295,000). In both cities, neighborhood NO₂ concentrations trend higher with greater proximity to the urban core. The WHO guideline for annual NO₂ is 10 μg/m³ (≈ 5.3 ppb) and all neighborhoods that exceed this guideline are represented by yellow, orange, red, or purple.

The median neighborhood annual NO₂ ppb across all countries was 10.2 ppb, nearly twice the WHO annual guideline of 5.3 ppb (Table 2). Median neighborhood NO₂ varied between countries, ranging from 8.4 ppb in Brazil to 10.9 ppb in Argentina. We observed substantial variation in NO₂ concentrations within countries (Table 2 and Figure 3). For example, in Colombia, the 5th percentile neighborhood NO₂ concentration was 1.4 ppb while the 95th percentile concentration was 21.0 ppb. Across all countries a large proportion of neighborhoods exceeded WHO guidelines. The highest proportion of neighborhoods exceeding the guidelines was observed in Chile (95% of neighborhoods had NO₂ concentrations above guidelines and 5% of neighborhoods had NO₂ concentrations approximately four times greater than guidelines) and lowest in Central America (70.8% of neighborhoods exceeded guidelines).

Table 2. Neighborhood ambient NO₂ concentrations and population exposures among 47,187 study neighborhoods in 326 Latin American cities.

Country	Study Population (millions)	Study population above NO ₂ guidelines ^a (millions)	Percent of study population above NO ₂ guidelines ^a	Mean neighborhood NO ₂ ppb ^b	5 th percentile neighborhood NO ₂ ppb	Median neighborhood NO ₂ ppb	95 th percentile neighborhood NO ₂ ppb
Total	236.0	199.5	84.6 %	10.3	3.6	10.2	17.2
Argentina	23.7	21.9	91.9 %	10.3	2.9	10.9	16.1
Brazil	108.4	84.6	78.0 %	8.7	2.2	8.4	16.2
Central America ^c	6.6	4.7	70.8 %	9.0	2.8	9.2	16.2
Chile	2.8	2.7	97.2 %	11.6	5.9	10.6	20.8
Colombia	20.4	17.4	85.5 %	10.3	1.4	9.4	21.0
Mexico	74.0	68.2	92.2 %	10.7	4.9	10.5	17.1

^a WHO annual NO₂ guidelines (10 µg/m³ ≈ 5.3 parts per billion)

^b ppb = parts per billion

^c Central America grouping includes urban neighborhoods in Costa Rica (N=1 city), Guatemala (N=2), and Panama (N=3)




Figure 3. Annual ambient NO₂ within 47,187 urban neighborhoods in Latin America. Each dot represents annual NO₂ in one neighborhood. The red horizontal line represents the 2021 WHO guidelines for annual NO₂ ($10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3 \approx 5.3 \text{ ppb}$). The grey dashed line represents the pre-2021 guideline for annual NO₂ ($40 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3 \approx 21 \text{ ppb}$), for reference. AR=Argentina; BR=Brazil; CA=cities in the Central American countries of Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Panama; CL=Chile; CO=Colombia; MX=Mexico.

Our study area included ≈ 236 million residents, ranging from 2.8 million residents in Chile to 108.4 million residents in Brazil (Table 2). Of these ≈ 236 million residents, nearly 200 million people (84.6% of total residents) lived with annual ambient NO₂ concentrations above WHO guidelines. The percentage of residents living with ambient NO₂ levels above guidelines varied from 97.2% of residents in Chilean cities to 70.8% of residents of Central American cities. All other countries had large majorities of residents living with ambient NO₂ that exceeded guidelines (Mexico 92.2% of residents, Argentina 91.9%, Colombia 85.5%, and Brazil 78.0%).

3.3. Population and urban characteristics associated with NO₂ exposure

Table 3 shows associations of neighborhood and city-level characteristics with neighborhood NO₂ ambient concentrations. In the multilevel model adjusting for both neighborhood and city characteristics, higher neighborhood population density (0.06 higher NO₂ ppb per unit higher population density z-score [95% confidence interval (CI) 0.04 to 0.08 ppb]) and higher educational attainment (0.64 ppb per unit higher education z-score [95% CI 0.61 to 0.67]) were associated with higher neighborhood NO₂. Conversely, lower neighborhood NO₂ was associated with more greenness (-2.22 ppb per unit NDVI z-score [95% CI -2.25 to -2.19]) and greater distance from the city center (-0.87 ppb per unit distance z-score [95% CI -0.90 to -0.85]). In this same model, higher city-level population density, population size, and traffic congestion were associated with higher NO₂. Our comparison of empty and multivariable models (both adjusted for country group) indicated that 69% of the between-city variability and 79% of the between-neighborhood variability was explained by the full host of predictors.

Table 3. Mean differences in neighborhood ambient NO₂ concentration (ppb) associated with a one-unit z-score increase in neighborhood- and city-level features in 47,187 urban neighborhoods in Latin America.

		Univariable		Multivariable (all)	
		Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Neighborhood-Level	Population density*	0.61	0.58 to 0.65	0.06	0.04 to 0.08
	Education*	1.80	1.77 to 1.84	0.64	0.61 to 0.67
	Intersection density*	0.56	0.53 to 0.59	0.02	-0.01 to 0.04
	Greenness*	-2.84	-2.87 to -2.82	-2.22	-2.25 to -2.19
	Distance from city center*	-1.79	-1.82 to -1.76	-0.87	-0.90 to -0.85
City-level	Population density*	0.47	0.10 to 0.84	0.34	0.06 to 0.63
	Education*	1.55	1.12 to 1.98	-0.05	-0.33 to 0.42
	Intersection density*	0.63	0.33 to 0.93	0.08	-0.15 to 0.30
	Greenness/vegetation*	-0.88	-1.16 to -0.61	0.08	-0.14 to 0.30
	Population size*	0.76	0.53 to 1.00	0.31	0.11 to 0.51
	GDP*	0.21	-0.05 to 0.47	-0.04	-0.23 to 0.16
	Congestion*	1.33	0.99 to 1.68	0.55	0.23 to 0.87

*All independent variables have been z-transformed using the distribution of all study neighborhoods or cities, respectively. Estimates in bold font represent coefficients with statistical significance of p<0.05. Univariable and multivariable models were adjusted for country group.

4. Discussion

We performed a highly spatially resolute descriptive analysis among ≈ 236 million residents of over 47,000 urban neighborhoods in 326 Latin America cities, examining 1) population exposure to ambient NO₂ and 2) associations between neighborhood ambient NO₂ concentrations and population characteristics and urban form. We found four key findings. First, nearly nine out of 10 residents, or around 200 million people, are exposed to ambient NO₂ concentrations that exceed the current WHO guidelines. Second, we found that NO₂ variability was widest within cities rather than between cities or countries. Third, larger, denser, and more congested cities had higher NO₂. Last, within cities, we found that neighborhoods with less vegetation and closer to the city center had higher NO₂. These findings highlight the magnitude of harmful human exposure to ambient NO₂ in cities across Latin America, reveal important within-city differences in NO₂ exposures, and highlight potential interventions that might reduce exposures to this harmful urban air pollutant.

We found a mean NO₂ concentration of 10.3 ppb at the neighborhood level in 2019. We are not aware of other regional analyses of neighborhood-level NO₂ or within-city variation of NO₂ in Latin America, yet the concentrations we observed are similar to a city-level analysis by Anenberg and colleagues using the same NO₂ source, that found an overall population-weighted NO₂ concentration of 10.6 ppb across urban Latin America in the same year (14). Anenberg and colleagues estimated that urban NO₂ across Latin America was higher than urban areas of sub-Saharan Africa (7.1 ppb) and similar to urban South Asia (10.1 ppb) and high-income countries (11.1 ppb). Given the 75% reduction in annual NO₂ guidelines in the 2021 WHO Air Quality Guidelines(11), urban populations worldwide find themselves with long-term NO₂ concentrations above the updated guidelines established to protect public health. Our highly spatially granular analysis of urban Latin America finds that Latin American cities are no exception, with 85% of the 236 million residents in our study area living in neighborhoods with NO₂ concentrations above WHO guidelines.

Few studies have examined the substantial within-city variation in population exposure to ambient NO₂ and the associations of urban and population characteristics with neighborhood differences in NO₂ concentrations within Latin America. Understanding the drivers of between-city and within-city differences in ambient NO₂ exposure is critical to design policies that promote health and health equity in this highly urbanized region. Our study is unique in its breadth (all cities of 100,000 residents or more in eight countries) and in our examination of how neighborhood and city level factors independently relate to urban NO₂ exposure. We found that higher population density at both the city and neighborhood levels were independently associated with higher NO₂. This is consistent with regional studies in the US (5) and Europe (26) and emphasizes the nature of NO₂ pollution as a spatially-varying byproduct of local anthropogenic fossil fuel combustion. In models adjusted for city and neighborhood-level factors, we found that greenness at the neighborhood-level, but not city-level, was associated with lower neighborhood NO₂. Overall, cities that had more vehicular traffic congestion tended to have higher NO₂ levels. This is unsurprising given the continued dominance of fossil fuels for motor vehicles and transit, and the role of fossil fuel motorized transit in generating NO₂ (1). Taken together these findings

suggest that reducing city-level congestion (of fossil-fuel powered vehicles) and increasing neighborhood greenness warrant further attention as potential actionable environmental interventions to reduce population exposure to NO₂ in urban areas.

Our findings emphasize the need for context-specific analyses of pollution exposures among populations in the Global South, where population patterns in urban areas and environmental justice concerns may be distinct from better-studied cities in high-income countries(27). Specifically, our unexpected finding of a positive association between neighborhood educational attainment and neighborhood ambient NO₂ (i.e., neighborhoods with higher education experience higher NO₂ concentrations). This corroborates a study of São Paulo(28), but contrasts with multicity studies of neighborhood ambient NO₂ in Europe(29) and the United States(5). In these high-income settings, ambient NO₂ is often higher in lower SES areas, driven largely by neighborhood urbanicity and proximity to highways. Contrasting associations between neighborhood SES and ambient air pollutants may reflect different patterns of residential segregation, specifically how segregation by SES is distributed between the urban core and urban periphery. These patterns of residential segregation by urbanicity may be evolving over time, and there is evidence in some Latin American countries that wealthier urban residents are migrating away from city centers to peripheral “private” neighborhoods outside the city center (30). However, in many Latin American cities, regardless of air pollution in their residential neighborhoods, individuals with lower SES experience substantially higher personal exposure to air pollution due to longer times spent commuting on roads with high levels of traffic-related air pollutants (31), such as NO₂. Furthermore, individuals living in lower SES areas may experience greater health impacts of air pollution compared to those in higher SES areas due to a higher prevalence of chronic conditions and lower access to medical care(27, 32). Quantifying population exposures at the place of residence is only one step in the process of understanding the true impact of NO₂ exposure on health disparities (27).

While we examined congestion at the city level and intersection density at the city and neighborhood levels, we were unable to look at traffic volume within the city or differences in vehicle fleet age or fuel type, which is a major driver of intra-urban variation in NO₂ at the neighborhood level(33). Fossil-fuel powered vehicles are a major source of ambient NO₂ and limiting their use through policies that support electric vehicles and public transit warrants critical attention as potential interventions to reduce urban NO₂. We were also unable to include measures of indoor exposures to NO₂ generated by indoor or household burning of fossil fuels, such as gas appliances, which is a major source of NO₂ exposure (34, 35). In Latin America, indoor air pollution exposure from household cooking and heating varies by urbanicity and socioeconomic status (35, 36, 37) and it is likely that there are intra- and inter-urban differences in personal exposure to NO₂ which are not captured by our measures of residential ambient NO₂. Furthermore, while we examined neighborhood ambient NO₂ and urban form from 2019, we used neighborhood-level population data from the most recent census for each country, with a mode census year of 2010 (Supplemental Table S1). Given larger regional trends in population growth(38) and urbanization(12), it is plausible that our estimates of population exposures based on census data are underestimates in this urbanizing region.

Our study reports on an unprecedented analysis of over 47,000 neighborhoods across this highly urbanized region of the Global South. By compiling small area census records with a new, spatially resolved estimate of ambient NO₂, this analysis provides novel and practical evidence of within-city differences in neighborhood-level population exposure to NO₂ in the context of recently updated WHO guidelines. This evidence can support urban policymakers and practitioners by guiding the development of policies and interventions that reduce urban NO₂ exposure by targeting specific features of the urban environment in Latin America and beyond.

Conclusion

Among 236 million residents of over 47,000 neighborhoods in 326 Latin American cities, nearly 9 in 10 people live in neighborhoods with ambient NO₂ levels that exceed WHO guidelines. Neighborhoods that are denser, closer to the urban core, and have less vegetation have higher levels of NO₂, compared to less dense neighborhoods in the urban periphery. Cities with higher vehicle congestion, population size, and population density have higher levels of ambient NO₂. Our findings suggest that 1) increasing neighborhood-level greenness and 2) reducing city-level pollution from fossil fuel-powered vehicles by promoting active and public transit and vehicle fleet electrification have potential as actionable interventions to reduce ambient NO₂ exposures in Latin American cities.

Declaration of interests

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments and funding sources

This study was financially supported by the Wellcome Trust [205177/Z/16/Z]. The authors acknowledge the contribution of all SALURBAL project team members. For more information on SALURBAL and to see a full list of investigators, see <https://drexel.edu/lac/salurbal/team/>. SALURBAL acknowledges the contributions of many different agencies in generating, processing, facilitating access to data or assisting with other aspects of the project. Please visit <https://drexel.edu/lac/data-evidence> for a complete list of data sources. JLK was supported by the Drexel FIRST (Faculty Institutional Recruitment for Sustainable Transformation) Program, National Institutes of Health grant number U54CA267735-02, and the Cotswold Foundation Postdoctoral Fellowship Grant# 230356. UB was also supported by Office of the Director of the National Institutes of Health under award number DP5OD026429. The funding sources had no role in the analysis, writing, or decision to submit the manuscript.

Author contributions

JLK, UB, and AVDR conceptualized the analysis. AVDR acquired funding. AVDR and UB provided supervision. JLK curated data, completed the formal analysis, and created the original draft of the manuscript. All authors had access to underlying data and contributed to methodology and manuscript review and editing.

References

1. U.S. EPA. Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) for Oxides of Nitrogen – Health Criteria (Final Report, 2016). 2016.
2. Marcon A, Panunzi S, Stafoggia M, Badaloni C, de Hoogh K, Guarda L, et al. Spatial variability of nitrogen dioxide and formaldehyde and residential exposure of children in the industrial area of Viadana, Northern Italy. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int*. 2021;28(22):28096-106.
3. Luminati O, Ledebur de Antas de Campos B, Fluckiger B, Brentani A, Roosli M, Fink G, et al. Land use regression modelling of NO₂ in Sao Paulo, Brazil. *Environ Pollut*. 2021;289:117832.
4. Levy I, Mihele C, Lu G, Narayan J, Brook JR. Evaluating multipollutant exposure and urban air quality: pollutant interrelationships, neighborhood variability, and nitrogen dioxide as a proxy pollutant. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2014;122(1):65-72.
5. Kerr GH, Goldberg DL, Anenberg SC. COVID-19 pandemic reveals persistent disparities in nitrogen dioxide pollution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2021;118(30).
6. Forastiere F, Peters A. Invited Perspective: The NO₂ and Mortality Dilemma Solved? Almost There! *Environ Health Perspect*. 2021;129(12):121304.
7. Huang S, Li H, Wang M, Qian Y, Steenland K, Caudle WM, et al. Long-term exposure to nitrogen dioxide and mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021;776:145968.
8. Huangfu P, Atkinson R. Long-term exposure to NO₂ and O₃ and all-cause and respiratory mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ Int*. 2020;144:105998.
9. Qian Y, Li H, Rosenberg A, Li Q, Sarnat J, Papatheodorou S, et al. Long-Term Exposure to Low-Level NO₂ and Mortality among the Elderly Population in the Southeastern United States. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2021;129(12):127009.
10. Meng X, Liu C, Chen R, Sera F, Vicedo-Cabrera AM, Milojevic A, et al. Short term associations of ambient nitrogen dioxide with daily total, cardiovascular, and respiratory mortality: multilocation analysis in 398 cities. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n534.
11. World Health Organization, . WHO global air quality guidelines: particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and carbon monoxide. 2021.
12. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, . World Urbanization Prospects 2018: Highlights. 2019.
13. Achakulwisut P, Brauer M, Hystad P, Anenberg SC. Global, national, and urban burdens of paediatric asthma incidence attributable to ambient NO₂ pollution: estimates from global datasets. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2019;3(4):e166-e78.
14. Anenberg SC, Moheggh A, Goldberg DL, Kerr GH, Brauer M, Burkart K, et al. Long-term trends in urban NO₂ concentrations and associated paediatric asthma incidence: estimates from global datasets. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2022;6(1):e49-e58.
15. Riojas-Rodriguez H, da Silva AS, Texcalac-Sangrador JL, Moreno-Banda GL. Air pollution management and control in Latin America and the Caribbean: implications for climate change. *Rev Panam Salud Publica*. 2016;40(3):150-9.
16. Diez Roux AV, Slesinski SC, Alazraqui M, Caiaffa WT, Frenz P, Jordan Fuchs R, et al. A Novel International Partnership for Actionable Evidence on Urban Health in Latin America: LAC-Urban Health and SALURBAL. *Glob Chall*. 2019;3(4):1800013.
17. Quistberg DA, Diez Roux AV, Bilal U, Moore K, Ortigoza A, Rodriguez DA, et al. Building a Data Platform for Cross-Country Urban Health Studies: the SALURBAL Study. *J Urban Health*. 2019;96(2):311-37.

18. Gouveia N, Kephart JL, Dronova I, McClure L, Granados JT, Betancourt RM, et al. Ambient fine particulate matter in Latin American cities: Levels, population exposure, and associated urban factors. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021;772:145035.
19. Larkin A, Geddes JA, Martin RV, Xiao Q, Liu Y, Marshall JD, et al. Global Land Use Regression Model for Nitrogen Dioxide Air Pollution. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2017;51(12):6957-64.
20. Lamsal LN, Krotkov NA, Vasilkov A, Marchenko S, Qin W, Fasnacht Z, et al. Ozone Monitoring Instrument (OMI) Aura nitrogen dioxide standard product version 4.0 with improved surface and cloud treatments. 2021. p. 455-79.
21. Kephart JL, Avila-Palencia I, Bilal U, Gouveia N, Caiaffa WT, Diez Roux AV. COVID-19, Ambient Air Pollution, and Environmental Health Inequities in Latin American Cities. *J Urban Health*. 2021;98(3):428-32.
22. Didan K. MOD13Q1 MODIS/Terra Vegetation Indices 16-Day L3 Global 250m SIN Grid V006. In: DAAC NELP, editor. 006 ed2015.
23. Kummu M, Taka M, Guillaume JHA. Gridded global datasets for Gross Domestic Product and Human Development Index over 1990-2015. *Sci Data*. 2018;5:180004.
24. Delclos-Alio X, Rodriguez DA, Olmedo NL, Ferrer CP, Moore K, Stern D, et al. Is city-level travel time by car associated with individual obesity or diabetes in Latin American cities? Evidence from 178 cities in the SALURBAL project. *Cities*. 2022;131:103899.
25. R Core Team, . R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2022.
26. Samoli E, Stergiopoulou A, Santana P, Rodopoulou S, Mitsakou C, Dimitroulopoulou C, et al. Spatial variability in air pollution exposure in relation to socioeconomic indicators in nine European metropolitan areas: A study on environmental inequality. *Environ Pollut*. 2019;249:345-53.
27. Gouveia N, Slovic AD, Kanai CM, Soriano L. Air Pollution and Environmental Justice in Latin America: Where Are We and How Can We Move Forward? *Curr Environ Health Rep*. 2022;9(2):152-64.
28. Habermann M, Souza M, Prado R, Gouveia N. Socioeconomic inequalities and exposure to traffic-related air pollution in the city of Sao Paulo, Brazil. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2014;30(1):119-25.
29. Temam S, Burte E, Adam M, Anto JM, Basagana X, Bousquet J, et al. Socioeconomic position and outdoor nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) exposure in Western Europe: A multi-city analysis. *Environ Int*. 2017;101:117-24.
30. Sawyer L, Schmid C, Streule M, Kallenberger P. Bypass urbanism: Re-ordering center-periphery relations in Kolkata, Lagos and Mexico City. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*. 2021;53(4):675-703.
31. Guzman LA, Beltran C, Morales R, Sarmiento OL. Inequality in personal exposure to air pollution in transport microenvironments for commuters in Bogotá. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*. 2023;11:100963.
32. do Nascimento FP, de Almeida MF, Gouveia N. Individual and contextual socioeconomic status as effect modifier in the air pollution-birth outcome association. *Sci Total Environ*. 2022;803:149790.
33. Lovasi GS, Treat CA, Fry D, Shah I, Clougherty JE, Berberian A, et al. Clean fleets, different streets: evaluating the effect of New York City's clean bus program on changes to estimated ambient air pollution. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol*. 2022.
34. Kephart JL, Fandino-Del-Rio M, Williams KN, Malpartida G, Lee A, Steenland K, et al. Nitrogen dioxide exposures from LPG stoves in a cleaner-cooking intervention trial. *Environ Int*. 2021;146:106196.
35. Kephart JL, Fandino-Del-Rio M, Williams KN, Malpartida G, Steenland K, Naeher LP, et al. Nitrogen dioxide exposures from biomass cookstoves in the Peruvian Andes. *Indoor Air*. 2020;30(4):735-44.

36. Schilmann A, Ruiz-García V, Serrano-Medrano M, de la Sierra de la Vega LA, Olaya-García B, Estevez-García JA, et al. Just and fair household energy transition in rural Latin American households: are we moving forward? *Environmental Research Letters*. 2021;16(10).
37. Pollard SL, Williams KN, O'Brien CJ, Winiker A, Puzzolo E, Kephart JL, et al. An evaluation of the Fondo de Inclusion Social Energetico program to promote access to liquefied petroleum gas in Peru. *Energy Sustain Dev*. 2018;46:82-93.
38. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, . *World Population Prospects 2019: Highlights*. 2019.