

1 **Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factor Control Following Release from Carceral Facilities**

2
3 JA Aminawung,¹ LB Puglisi,¹ B. Roy,² N Horton,¹ JE Elumn,¹ H. Lin,³ K Bibbins-Domingo,⁴ H.

4 Krumholz,^{5,6} EA Wang¹

5 1 SEICHE Center for Health and Justice, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale University
6 School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut

7 2 Department of Population Health, New York University, New York

8 3 School of Social Work, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

9 4 Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco,
10 San Francisco, California

11 5 Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Yale New Haven Hospital, New Haven,
12 Connecticut

13 6 Section of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven,
14 Connecticut

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

1 **Abstract**

2 *Background:* Incarceration is a social determinant of cardiovascular health but is rarely
3 addressed in clinical settings or public health prevention efforts. People who have been
4 incarcerated are more likely to develop cardiovascular disease (CVD) at younger ages and have
5 worse cardiovascular outcomes compared with the general population, even after controlling for
6 traditional risk factors. This study aims to identify incarceration-specific factors that are
7 associated with uncontrolled CVD risk factors to identify potential targets for prevention.

8 *Methods:* Using data from Justice-Involved Individuals Cardiovascular Disease Epidemiology
9 (JUSTICE), a prospective cohort study of individuals released from incarceration with CVD risk
10 factors, we examine the unique association between incarceration-specific factors and CVD
11 risk factor control, including systolic blood pressure (SBP \geq 140 mmHg, diastolic blood pressure
12 (DBP) \geq 90, body mass index (BMI) \geq 40, glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) \geq 8%, and low-density
13 lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-c) \geq 160). Incarceration-specific factors include the conditions of
14 confinement (jail vs. prison, time in solitary confinement), and collateral sanctions following
15 release (barriers to housing, food, employment due to criminal record). Variables associated
16 with uncontrolled CVD risk factors were included in the multivariate model to examine the
17 unique contribution of each risk factor with uncontrolled CVD risk factors.

18 *Results:* Participants (N=471), mean age of 45.0 \pm SD 10.8 years were disproportionately men
19 (89%), from racially minoritized groups (79%), and poor (91% below the 100% federal poverty
20 level). Over half (54%) had at least one uncontrolled CVD risk factor at baseline. People
21 released from jail, compared with prison, had lower Life's Essential 8 scores for blood pressure
22 and smoking. Having been incarcerated in jail, as compared with prison, was associated with an
23 increased odds of having an uncontrolled CVD risk factor, even after adjusting for age, race and
24 ethnicity, gender, perceived stress, and life adversity score (AOR 1.62, 95% CI 1.02-2.57).

25 *Discussion:* Release from jail is associated with poor CVD risk factor control and requires
26 tailored intervention, which is informative as states design and implement the Centers of

1 Medicare & Medicaid Services Reentry 1115 waiver, which allows Medicaid to cover services
2 prior to release from correctional facilities.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 **Introduction**

2
3 Mass incarceration and its effects on cardiovascular health remains understudied and
4 largely invisible to the scientific community despite its effect on the 80 million individuals who
5 have a criminal record and their families and communities. The term mass incarceration refers
6 to the unparalleled rates of incarceration in the United States (US), its disproportionate
7 concentration among Black families and communities, and the vast system of laws that maintain
8 this status quo and prevent people with criminal records from obtaining publicly-funded services
9 and from re-entering the labor force.¹ There are 1.9 million individuals currently incarcerated and
10 over 7 million incarcerations yearly, disproportionately of racially minoritized populations.²
11 Recent data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics show cardiovascular disease (CVD) to be a
12 leading cause of death among people incarcerated in state prisons and local jails,³ where the
13 imprisonment of Black men is six times higher and Black women double the rates of their White
14 counterparts.^{4,5} Following release from incarceration, people have higher hospitalization rates
15 from complications of diabetes and hypertension and increased CVD mortality compared with
16 the general population.^{6,7}

17 The impact of incarceration on CVD risk traverses the life course, as incarceration in
18 young adulthood is associated with incident hypertension and the development of left ventricular
19 hypertrophy and CVD 20 to 30 years after the imprisonment episode, even after controlling for
20 clinical risk factors and sociodemographic characteristics.^{8,9} Incarceration may impact CVD risk
21 factor management in various ways unique to the carceral experience. Reduced access to illicit
22 drugs and alcohol, a ban on smoking in almost all federal prisons and a majority of state
23 prisons,¹⁰ and enforced medication adherence may improve overall health while incarcerated.¹¹
24 But individuals have limited opportunities for exercise, choice of diet, and self-management of
25 medications while imprisoned, especially in the most extreme conditions in maximum security
26 prisons or solitary confinement, where movement is extremely restricted as people are detained
27 in their cells for up to 23 hours a day.^{12,13}

1 Release from carceral systems can introduce further precarity, as many prisons and jails
2 do not provide discharge planning, including medications or referrals to primary care or specialty
3 appointments.¹⁴ Many individuals have had limited to no use of the community health care
4 system prior to incarceration and do not know how to obtain their medications from a pharmacy
5 or self-manage their CVD risk factors. Close to two thirds of people with health conditions
6 released from incarceration have been found to have inadequate health literacy, which is
7 associated with decreased confidence in taking medications and increased emergency
8 department visits in the community.¹⁵ After release, the collateral sanctions of having a criminal
9 record or being surveilled by community corrections through parole or probation can further
10 affect their health.¹⁶ The National Inventory of Collateral Consequences of Conviction notes
11 44,000 laws that prohibit the provision of social needs and civil rights of people who have
12 criminal records, including lifetime voter disenfranchisement, housing restrictions, food stamp
13 bans, barriers to employment and healthcare access, and restitutions of debt to the criminal
14 legal system.¹⁷ These health-related social needs directly impact cardiovascular disease risk
15 factor prevalence and control.¹⁸

16 Almost a decade ago, the National Heart, Lung, Blood Institute (NHLBI) and American
17 Heart Association summarized in separate reports the need to better understand the unique
18 impact of mass incarceration on cardiovascular health.^{19,20} They highlighted the importance of
19 studying how mass incarceration affects CVD risk factor control immediately following release
20 and conceptualized incarceration's impact as a place of residence and a system of practices
21 and policies that affect carceral healthcare delivery. But this is challenging as national health
22 surveillance studies and existing NHLBI cohort studies do not include detailed measures of
23 individual level exposure to mass incarceration.^{20,21} We aimed to describe how mass
24 incarceration affects CVD risk factor control among individuals just released from carceral
25 facilities, hypothesizing that the conditions of one's confinement and collateral sanctions
26 following release would affect CVD risk factor control. By identifying various features of mass

1 incarceration that affect CVD risk factors, we can identify novel place-based and legal and
2 policy prevention efforts to improve CVD risk factor control for the millions of Americans
3 impacted by incarceration.

4

5 **Methods**

6 *Study Design*

7 This study uses data from a prospective, observational cohort, **JUST**ice-Involved
8 **I**ndividuals **C**ardiovascular Disease **E**pidemiology (JUSTICE, R01 HL137696), whose protocol
9 has been described in detail previously.²² Briefly, we recruited individuals released from a
10 carceral facility to New Haven, Bridgeport, and Hartford, Connecticut. Connecticut is one of six
11 states in the country with a unified prison and jail system (prisons house people incarcerated for
12 sentences longer than one year, and jails house those awaiting adjudication of crime or people
13 with sentences of less than a year, in general) and has one of the highest racial disparities in
14 sentencing in the country (over 70% of the incarcerated population are Black and Latino
15 individuals).²³ These features make it an ideal setting to study how differential exposure to
16 carceral systems affects CVD risk factors, primarily among racially minoritized populations.

17

18 *Population*

19 Eligibility criteria for the JUSTICE study included release from a carceral facility within
20 the past three months and the presence of any of the following CVD risk factors: hypertension,
21 diabetes, obesity, or hyperlipidemia. We chose to include participants with baseline CVD risk
22 factors to target individuals at higher risk of poor CVD outcomes, improving our ability to
23 measure the impact of criminal legal exposures during incarceration and in the community on
24 CVD risk factor control. We excluded individuals with a known terminal illness, given the
25 intention to follow participants for 12 months, and with serious mental illness, as they may be
26 limited in their ability to consent to study participation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Study Procedures

At the baseline visit, we used a teach-to-goal method developed to ensure participant understanding of the study design and protocol.²⁴ All participants provided informed written consent. A trained research assistant administered a baseline survey, gathering information on sociodemographic data, clinical, psychosocial, behavioral, and medical factors associated with CVD risk factors, and exposure to incarceration and community corrections policies related to CVD management and collateral sanctions (barriers to employment, housing, and food based on criminal record) following release. We also measured participant weight, height, and blood pressure and then performed point-of-care testing to measure lipids and glycosylated hemoglobin. We measured participant blood pressure in a sitting position after they had rested for at least 15 minutes, with a second reading taken, if necessary, per study protocol, using an Omron Hem 705CP[®] blood pressure monitor and an appropriately sized cuff.²⁵ We measured participants' weight using a digital medical grade floor scale and height using a stadiometer and computed body mass index (kg/m²) from the participant's weight and height values. We obtained total cholesterol and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-c) concentration using a portable Cardiocheck[®] professional analyzer and HbA1c using A1CNow+[®] multi-test point of care testing system.²⁶ The visit activities lasted between 60 and 90 minutes on average. Midway through this study, we were awarded a supplement that enabled us to measure sleep health, as previously described.²⁷ All participants were compensated \$60 for their time to complete the baseline study procedures.

Criminal legal exposure

We examined exposure to incarceration as a place of residence and a system of laws and practices that affect individuals during imprisonment and following release as independent variables of interest. We asked participants the total number of times and the total number of

1 years they had been incarcerated over their lifetime and computed the most recent incarceration
2 length from self-reported incarceration start and end dates. We inquired where they served their
3 most recent (index) incarceration (jail/prison) and exposure to solitary confinement (also
4 referred to as residential segregation or administrative segregation), a carceral system sanction
5 in which people are held in 8 by 6-foot cells for close to 23 hours daily. Participants' residence
6 following release was categorized by whether they resided in a halfway house (a transitional
7 house where they remain under the carceral system, where people have less opportunity to
8 control their diet and exercise) or lived in other congregate settings or home.

9 Participants were also asked if they were experiencing post-incarceration collateral
10 sanctions, including difficulties obtaining employment, driver's and occupational licenses,
11 government benefits, housing, food access due to a criminal record, and wage garnishment for
12 child support and other forms of debt. We also asked whether they had conditions to their
13 release, including monitoring through parole (early release mechanism from prison) and
14 probation (supervision of people in the community in lieu of incarceration after conviction.)

15

16 *Cardiovascular disease risk factor control*

17 The primary dependent variable was any uncontrolled CVD risk factor, which was defined as
18 systolic blood pressure (SBP) ≥ 140 mmHg or diastolic blood pressure (DBP) ≥ 90 mmHg, body
19 mass index (BMI) ≥ 40 kg/m², glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) $\geq 8\%$, or low-density lipoprotein
20 cholesterol (LDL-c) ≥ 160 , based on the values measured at the baseline visit.^{28,29}

21

22 *Cardiovascular Health*

23 We measured cardiovascular health using the American Heart Association's Life's
24 Essential Eight (LE8) to identify areas for possible prevention and because cardiovascular
25 health is associated with mortality.³⁰ The LE8 score (0–100 scale) was the average score for
26 eight individual components (blood pressure, cholesterol, blood glucose, body mass index, diet,

1 physical activity, sleep, and smoking) that affect cardiovascular health. In the general population,
2 an average score of 0 to 49 is defined as *low* cardiovascular health, 50 to 79
3 is *moderate* cardiovascular health, and 80 to 100 is *high* cardiovascular health.³¹ Below we
4 describe how we scored each of the eight components on a 0-100 scale.

5

6 **Diet**

7 Diet was assessed using an adapted version of the Eating At America's Table Study (EATS)
8 questionnaire.³² Participants reported how often they ate a serving of vegetables, fruits, or foods
9 cooked in fat since being released from prison. After reversing the foods cooked in the fat score,
10 we added the scores from each food to obtain the EATS score. Based on an NIH "all-day" diet
11 screener score, we categorized the scores as follows: a score of less than 4 received 0 points.³³
12 Those who scored between 4 and 8 received between 25 and 75 points, and those with a score
13 of 8 and above received 100 points.

14

15 **Physical Activity**

16 Participants were asked if they participated in any vigorous activities outside of work.³⁴ To
17 obtain physical activity time, we multiplied the number of times per week by the exercise
18 duration in minutes. Individuals who reported not participating in vigorous activity outside of
19 work were given 0 points. Greater than or equal to 150 physical activity minutes received 100
20 points. Physical activity minutes between 0 and 150 minutes and received scores from 20 to 90,
21 as described in Table 1.

22

23 **Sleep**

24 Participants' average hours of sleep since release from a carceral facility were assessed using
25 the Pittsburg Sleep Quality Index (PSQI).³⁵ The optimal sleep was 7 to <9 hours per night (100
26 points), and 0 points were awarded for sleep <4 hours per night. Other sleep durations received

1 points between 0 and 100, as described in Table 1. The first 154 participants had missing data
2 on PSQI because they were enrolled before the sleep supplement was awarded. For these
3 participants, we employed a regression-based imputation on participant age, gender, place of
4 residence, perceived stress, and self-efficacy.

5

6 **Smoking**

7 Smoking status was self-reported through a series of questions that assessed participants' use
8 of cigarettes. Because of restricted access to cigarettes while incarcerated or even after
9 release, if they were living in a halfway house, we ascertained their smoking history with several
10 questions. We asked about lifetime smoking history, including if they had smoked more than
11 100 cigarettes in their lifetime, smoked regularly before the last incarceration, and if they
12 currently smoked cigarettes. Current smokers received 0 points. Participants who were no
13 longer smoking received between 25 and 75 points, depending on lifetime cigarette use, as
14 described in Table 1. Participants who never smoked received 100 points.

15

16 **Body Mass Index**

17 A body mass index score of less than 25 kg/m² received 100 points, while a score of 40 kg/m²
18 and above received 0 points. Scores between 25 and 40 kg/m² were assigned points between
19 15 and 70.

20

21 **Cholesterol**

22 Non-HDL-c (total cholesterol minus HDL-c) of <130 mg/dL was considered optimal (100 points).
23 Non-HDL-c of 220 mg/dL or more received 0 points. Values between 130 and 220 mg/dL
24 received scores between 20 and 60.

25

1 **Blood Glucose**

2 A HbA1c of <5.7% received 100 points. Participants with an HbA1c \geq 10.0% received 0 points.

3 Values of HbA1c between 5.7% and 10.0% received scores between 10 and 60.

4

5 **Blood Pressure**

6 Participants with a systolic blood pressure of <120 and diastolic blood pressure of <80 mmHg

7 received 100 points. Participants with a systolic blood pressure of \geq 160 mmHg and diastolic

8 blood pressure of \geq 100 mmHg received zero points. Systolic blood pressure values between

9 120 and 159mmHg and diastolic values between 80 and 99mmHg, were scored between 25

10 and 75 points.

11

12 *Demographic Variables (Covariates)*

13 The participant's age at the baseline visit was calculated in years from the participant's self-

14 reported date of birth. Gender was self-reported at the time of the interview with male, female,

15 and transgender being the only options for selection. Race and ethnicity were self-reported from

16 the options non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, non-Hispanic Other (including Asian,

17 Hawaiian, and Native American), and Hispanic. We conceptualized race and ethnicity as social

18 constructs that result in differential exposure to incarceration and health care due to structural

19 racism.³⁶ We include measures of race and ethnicity in these analyses to highlight the

20 disproportionate impact of mass incarceration on those who are racialized as Black individuals

21 and to determine whether the observed association between carceral exposures and CVD risk

22 factor control is different among those of a minoritized population.

23

24 *Analytical approach*

25 We described participants characteristics and then, using t-tests, Mann Whitney U test and chi

26 square tests, we examined CVD risk factor control at baseline by sociodemographic and clinical

1 characteristics, exposure to various features of mass incarceration, especially conditions of
2 confinement and collateral consequences of having a criminal record. We next examined factors
3 associated with having any uncontrolled CVD risk factor using multivariable logistic regression
4 by adjusting for all the covariates related to uncontrolled CVD risk factors in the bivariate
5 analyses. We computed component and total LE8 scores, and by place of last incarceration, to
6 identify targets for policy and prevention efforts to reduce the carceral systems' impact on
7 cardiovascular health. A sensitivity analysis excluding participants with imputed sleep scores
8 yielded similar sleep component and total LE8 scores. Thus, we elected to report scores for the
9 whole sample. Statistical analyses were performed in SPSS version 29.0.1. Statistical
10 significance for all analyses was defined as 2-sided alpha =0.05. The Yale Human Investigation
11 Committee and the Office of Human Research Protections approved this study.

12

13 **Results**

14 The mean age of participants (N=471) was 45.0 years \pm standard deviation (SD) 10.8
15 and ranged from 22 to 71 years. Participants were disproportionately men (89%), of racially
16 minoritized groups (79%), and poor (91% below the 100% federal poverty level), reflective of the
17 Connecticut Department of Correction population. Median incarceration length of those
18 returning from jail was 9 months and 26 months for those returning from prison. Over three-
19 quarters of participants (77%) lived in halfway houses, 20% reported going 24 hours without
20 food in the past month, and 86% reported being unemployed. Seventy-eight percent of
21 participants had been diagnosed with hypertension, 47% with hyperlipidemia, and 28% with
22 diabetes. (Table 2).

23 Over half of the participants (N=252) had at least one uncontrolled CVD risk factor at
24 baseline. Those with uncontrolled CVD risk factors were older compared to those with controlled
25 CVD risk factors (45.9 vs. 43.9 years). We observed no differences in CVD risk factor control by
26 gender or self-reported race and ethnicity (Table 3). There were also no differences in CVD risk

1 factor control by housing status, marital status, or any measure of socioeconomic status,
2 including educational attainment, employment status, current income, or insurance status.

3 A higher proportion of those released from jail had an uncontrolled CVD risk factor
4 compared with those released from prison (62% vs. 51%, $p=0.05$). Solitary confinement was not
5 associated with CVD risk factor control following release (48% vs. 52%, $p=0.53$). There were no
6 differences in CVD risk factor control at baseline among those exposed to collateral sanctions of
7 having a criminal record, including those related to employment, housing, or debt. A higher
8 proportion of participants who reported difficulties with paying child support had uncontrolled
9 CVD risk factors compared to those who did not (60% vs. 40%, $p=0.14$), though the difference
10 was not statistically significant (Table 3).

11 Average perceived stress score was lower among those with any uncontrolled CVD risk
12 factors compared with those without (15.2 ± 7.6 vs. 16.6 ± 6.9 , $p=0.04$), as was the cumulative
13 adversity score (15.9 ± 6.6 vs. 17.7 ± 6.6 , $p=0.004$). There was no difference in scores for
14 general self-efficacy (33.0 ± 5.2 vs. 33.1 ± 5.2 , $p=0.89$), depression as measured by the PHQ-9
15 (6.8 ± 5.9 , 7.5 ± 6.1 , $p=0.21$), or reports of everyday discrimination (15.2 ± 7.1 , 15.7 ± 7.2 , p
16 $=0.44$) among those with and without uncontrolled CVD risk factors (Table 3).

17 In multivariate analysis, after adjusting for participant age and gender, being
18 incarcerated in jail as opposed to prison was associated with an increased odds of having
19 uncontrolled CVD risk factor (AOR 1.59, 95% CI 1.01-2.50). The addition of perceived stress,
20 and life adversity score in the multivariate model did not change the effect size of the
21 association between incarceration in jail on uncontrolled CVD risk factors (AOR 1.62, 95% CI
22 1.02-2.57) (Figure 1).

23 Our sample's average LE8 score was 50.64, and total LE8 was not different among
24 those who spent their last incarceration in jail compared to prison (49.85 vs 50.86). Among the
25 eight domains of LE8, blood pressure ($p=0.02$) and smoking ($p<0.001$) were significantly worse

1 among those incarcerated in jail compared with those incarcerated in prison, while diet was
2 better among those who had been incarcerated in jail compared with prison (Table 4).

3

4

5 **Discussion**

6 Release from jail, compared with prison, is significantly associated with having an
7 uncontrolled CVD risk factor, amongst those with underlying hypertension, diabetes,
8 hyperlipidemia, or obesity. This finding has bearing on population health, given that 7 million
9 individuals move through jails yearly in the United States, and more than 62% have a known
10 cardiovascular risk factor.³⁷ It is plausible that the disruption to the life by being incarcerated is
11 what disrupts CVD risk factor management. Even one day in jail can lead to the loss of
12 employment, housing, and healthcare. Further, medications and devices available in the
13 community are often different or unavailable in carceral facilities and thus can lead to worsening
14 of CVD risk factor control.³⁸

15 Surprisingly, while the vast majority of participants report having health insurance upon
16 release, less than half of these individuals report having a primary care physician upon release,
17 supporting other research showing that enrollment in Medicaid is necessary though not
18 sufficient to engage individuals just released from the carceral system into primary care. Also,
19 though those released from jail have higher rates of uncontrolled CVD risk factors, the rates of
20 those in prison were high, and there remains a need to address risk factors in the entire
21 population of those who have experienced incarceration.

22 These data are relevant because jails and prisons have been some of the only places in
23 the US where federal Medicaid and Medicare funds cannot be used to pay for health care
24 services due to the Medicaid Inmate Exclusion Policy.³⁹ But the design and implementation of
25 the Centers of Medicare & Medicaid Service's new Medicaid 1115 Reentry Waiver may allow
26 state Medicaid programs for the first time to cover services that address chronic health

1 conditions like CVD and its risk factors as individuals transition from carceral systems back to
2 the community. With this historic change of policy, Medicaid can now be used to cover services
3 for people who are incarcerated and eligible for Medicaid and returning home to their
4 communities within 90 days. Already, two states have 1115 waivers approved, with at least 20
5 more applications pending.⁴⁰ Our data indicate that to improve the disproportionately high
6 hospitalization and death rates from CVD immediately upon release from correctional systems,
7 jails should be included as targets of intervention.

8 Furthermore, our results demonstrate that focusing on hypertension control and smoking
9 cessation are important areas to prioritize for quality-of-care improvement – as they are both
10 highly prevalent conditions that cause significant morbidity following release. A recent feasibility
11 trial in an urban jail found that nicotine replacement therapy was feasible to initiate and maintain
12 following release, though there were no differences in abstinence rates between the groups that
13 received standard behavioral health education compared with nicotine replacement therapy and
14 counseling.⁴¹ Future work needs to be conducted on how best to improve the transition of
15 healthcare in and out of jail, which are usually short stay facilities, to the community for CVD risk
16 factors and may also require examining how incarceration (movement from the community to
17 the jail) affects these outcomes.

18 We found that people with uncontrolled CVD risk factors had lower rates of psychosocial
19 stress and lifetime cumulative adversity than those with controlled CVD risk factors. These data
20 conflict with large studies of non-incarcerated people that find that psychosocial factors and
21 lifetime cumulative adversity are associated with worse uncontrolled CVD risk factors and
22 incident CVD.^{42,43} One plausible explanation noted in the literature is that experience with
23 previous stressors creates resilience in individuals and later produces less stress even when life
24 is out of control. For instance, racially minoritized populations who have consistently lived under
25 economic and social adversities have reported lower psychosocial stress rates than their White
26 counterparts.⁴⁴ Also, several studies have started examining the connection between biological

1 measures of stress and exposure to incarceration at the individual level, which provides an
2 opportunity to evaluate the physiologic manifestations of stress, even if they are not recognized
3 at the same psychological level. For example, a recent study using data from the National
4 Longitudinal Adolescent Health Survey, found a relationship between incarceration lengths of
5 greater than a year and elevated CRP levels, even after adjusting for sociodemographic and
6 clinical factors.⁴⁵ Another study found incarceration exposure predicted epigenetic accelerated
7 aging; more frequent incarceration episodes were associated with accelerated aging as
8 measured by GrimAge in a dose-dependent manner,⁴⁶ even after adjustment for neighborhood
9 factors.⁴⁷ These findings suggest exposure to incarceration may trigger a response that affects
10 a biological stress signature of physiological deterioration, independent of perceived
11 psychosocial stress. Longitudinal data with direct biological measures of stress will be important
12 to examine the temporal relationship between psychosocial stress, lifetime cumulative adversity,
13 and CVD risk factors.

14 This study has several limitations. For one, no conclusions about cause and effect can
15 be derived from this study due to its cross-sectional design. For example, worse CVD risk factor
16 outcomes may contribute to incarceration in jails instead of prison; individuals with more
17 advanced disease and poor functional health status may be more likely to be sentenced to
18 shorter sentences, though we adjusted for age in multivariate analysis. These effect-cause
19 relationships deserve further exploration in future longitudinal analyses. This study was
20 conducted in Connecticut among people just released from carceral facilities who largely have
21 access to health insurance immediately post release. Further studies would need to explore the
22 association between incarceration-specific risk factors and uncontrolled CVD risk factors in
23 other localities, especially in the South, where the use of solitary confinement and collateral
24 sanctions following release is far higher. Additionally, given that Connecticut has a unified
25 correctional system with the same health system and electronic health record in prisons, this
26 study is biased toward finding less of a difference between those incarcerated in jail and prison,

1 and thus our findings may underestimate this difference in other states. The length of
2 incarceration jail is longer than is typical most jail stays in the country and may not be reflective
3 of all carceral facilities, as presentencing during COVID-19 substantially lengthened in
4 Connecticut and throughout the country. Lastly, this study recruited during the COVID-19
5 pandemic when people in jails, prisons, and halfway houses were subject to tremendous
6 stressors given facility-wide lockdowns, quarantine and isolation policies, and high COVID-19
7 morbidity and mortality rates in correctional facilities. These conditions likely affected managing
8 CVD risk factors control in carceral systems and following release.

9

10 **Conclusion**

11 In a statewide study of a unified correctional system, having been released from a jail, a pre-
12 sentencing and shorter-sentence carceral facility, was associated with higher rates of
13 uncontrolled CVD risk factors than being released from prison. Plausible explanations include
14 disruptions in employment, healthcare, and family supports and poor transition of care from the
15 community into jail and back. Longitudinal studies designed to better understand the
16 relationships between exposure to mass incarceration and CVD risk factors are needed to
17 inform specific interventions to achieve cardiovascular health equity. Medicaid Reentry Section
18 1115 Demonstration projects provide an opportunity to specifically focus on interventions to
19 improve cardiovascular health and should include a focus on those being released from jails.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1
2

Table 1: Measurement and Scoring of Life's Essential 8³¹

Cardiovascular health metric	Method of measurement	Scoring	
Diet	Eating at America's Table (EATS) "All Day Screener"	Points	EATS score
		100	8.0 – 10
		80	6.0 – 7.99
		50	5.0 – 5.99
		25	4.0 – 4.99
		0	0 – 3.99
Physical activity	Physical activity questionnaire, min/week	Points	Minutes/week
		100	≥150
		90	120–149
		80	90–119
		60	60–89
		40	30–59
		20	1–29
0	0		
Smoking	Smoking history	Points	Status
		100	Never smoker
		75	Quit (other)
		50	Quit (≥ 5 cig/week before last incarceration)
		25	Quit (≥ 100 cigarettes in lifetime)
0	Current smoker		
Sleep	Average sleep per night	Points	Hours of sleep
		100	7 to <9
		90	9 to <10
		70	6 to <7
		40	5 to <6 or ≥10
		20	4 to <5
0	<4		
Body mass index	(Weight (kg)/height (m) ²)	Points	BMI, kg/m²
		100	<25
		70	25.0–29.9
		30	30.0–34.9
		15	35.0–39.9
0	≥40.0		
Non-HDL-c	Point of care measured total cholesterol minus HDL-c	Points	Non-HDL-c, mg/dL
		100	<130
		60	130–159
		40	160–189
		20	190–219
0	≥220		
Blood glucose	Glycosylated hemoglobin	Points	%
		100	<5.7
		60	5.7–6.3

Cardiovascular health metric	Method of measurement	Scoring	
		40	6.4 – 6.9
		30	7.0–7.9
		20	8.0–8.9
		10	9.0–9.9
		0	≥10.0
Blood pressure	Measured systolic and diastolic blood pressure, mm Hg	Points	mm Hg
		100	<120/<80
		75	120–129/<80
		50	130–139 or 80–89
		25	140–159 or 90–99
0	≥160 or ≥100		

1

2

1
2
3

Table 2. Participant characteristics at baseline visit (N=471).

Sociodemographic characteristic	No.	%
Age, mean (SD), [range]	45.0 (10.8), [21-72]	
Race		
Hispanic	128	27.2%
Non-Hispanic Black	229	48.6%
Non-Hispanic Other	13	2.8%
Non-Hispanic White	101	21.4%
Gender		
Female	51	10.8%
Male	420	89.2%
Education		
Less than high school	109	23.1%
GED	97	20.6%
High school graduate	138	29.3%
Some college/technical education	112	23.8%
College graduate	15	3.2%
Marital status		
Single	355	75.4%
Married	44	9.3%
Separated, widowed divorced	72	15.3%
Average monthly income		
No income	309	65.6%
Less than \$500	92	19.5%
\$500-\$999	21	4.5%
\$1000 or more	43	9.1%
Clinical Factors (history)		
Diabetes	132	28.0%
Coronary Disease	63	13.4%
Hypercholesteremia	219	46.5%
Hypertension	369	78.3%
Obesity, BMI \geq 30 kg/m ²	283	60.1%
History of drug use disorder	273	58.0%
History of alcohol use disorder	124	26.3%
Behavioral Factors (post-release)		
Smoking	277	58.8%
Number of current daily cigarettes*, median (IQR)	5 (6)	
Alcohol Use	20	4.2%

Cocaine Use	18	3.8%
Physical exercise	248	53%
Psychosocial factors, mean (SD), [range]		
Everyday Discrimination (9-items)	15.41 (7.10), [9-47]	
Perceived Stress Scale (10-items)	15.84 (7.29), [0-38]	
General Self-Efficacy Scale (10-items)	33.06 (5.33), [1-40]	
Depression (PHQ-9) (9-items)	7.10 (6.01), [0-26]	
PTSD Symptom Scale (17-items)	20.63 (14.21), [0-51]	
Cumulative Adversity Interview (33-items)	16.77 (6.68), [0-31]	
Structural factors		
Employed	67	14.2%
Health Insurance	440	93.4%
Insurance Type		
Medicaid	423	96.1%
Medicare	14	3.2%
Have a primary care provider	217	46.1%
Housing Status		
Homeless	19	4.0%
Transitional Home	368	78.1%
Living with Family/Friends	43	9.1%
Rent or Own	41	8.7%
Living in a halfway house	363	77.1%
Correctional specific factors/collateral sanctions		
Lifetime incarceration		
One time	50	10.6%
2 - 5 times	205	43.5%
6-10 times	99	21.0%
More than 10 times	113	24.0%
Lifetime incarcerated; months, median (IQR)	132 (180)	
Index incarceration		
Jail	103	21.9%
Prison	368	78.1%
Length of incarceration; months, median (IQR)	21 (42)	
On Parole	222	47.1%
On Probation	97	20.6%
Solitary confinement during last Incarceration	178	37.8%
Saw health care provider during last incarceration	335	71.1%
Co-payment when incarcerated†	196	58.5%
Discriminated by health care providers†	192	57.3%
Receiving disability insurance	19	4.0%

Receiving Food Stamps	126	26.8%
Without food for a whole day since release	94	20.0%
Child Support	91	19.3%
Barriers to Employment / Licensure based on criminal record	348	73.9%
Debt / Restitution	170	36.1%
Barriers to Housing based on criminal record	39	8.3%

1
2 Notes: SD=standard deviation, IQR= interquartile range; PTSD = Post traumatic stress disorder; PHQ=
3 Patient health questionnaire
4 *=current smokers; † = participants who reported seeing a provider during last incarceration;
5 ††=participants who reported taking medications.
6
7
8

9 Table 3: Participant characteristics and CVD risk factor control at baseline.
10

Characteristic	Controlled CVD risk factors (N=219)	Uncontrolled CVD risk factors (N=252)	p-value
Sociodemographic characteristic			
Age, mean (SD)	43.90 (11.25)	45.91 (10.27)	0.04
Race			0.08
Hispanic	27.4%	27.0%	
Non-Hispanic Black	45.7%	51.2%	
Non-Hispanic Other	1.4%	4.0%	
Non-Hispanic White	25.6%	17.9%	
Gender			0.42
Female	9.6%	11.90%	
Male	90.4%	88.10%	
Education			0.62
Less than high school	23.7%	22.6%	
GED	22.4%	19.0%	
High school graduate	27.4%	31.0%	
Some college/technical education	22.4%	25.0%	
College graduate	4.1%	2.4%	
Marital status			0.98
Single	75.3%	75.4%	
Married	9.6%	9.1%	
Separated, widowed divorced	15.1%	15.5%	
Average monthly income			0.48
No income	66.8%	66.1%	

Less than \$500	18.4%	21.0%	
\$500-\$999	6.0%	3.2%	
\$1000 or more	8.8%	9.7%	
Behavioral Factors (post-release)			
Smoking	67.2%	65.2%	0.66
Alcohol Use	4.1%	4.4%	0.89
Cocaine Use	3.2%	4.4%	0.51
Physical exercise	50.7%	54.4%	0.42
Psychosocial factors, mean (SD),			
Everyday Discrimination	15.69 (7.12)	15.18 (7.08)	0.44
Perceived Stress Scale	16.59 (6.89)	15.20 (7.57)	0.04
General Self-Efficacy Scale	33.09(5.24)	33.02 (5.41)	0.89
Depression (PHQ-9)	7.47 (6.10)	6.78 (5.93)	0.21
PTSD	22.22 (13.22)	18.99 (15.08)	0.15
Lifetime Cumulative Adversity	17.72 (6.63)	15.94 (6.62)	<0.01
Structural factors			
Employed	12.3%	15.9%	0.27
Health Insurance	92.2%	94.4%	0.34
Primary care provider	46.8%	46.2%	0.89
Housing Status			0.56
Homeless	3.2%	4.8%	
Transitional Home	80.8%	75.8%	
Living with Family/Friends	7.8%	10.3%	
Rent or Own	8.2%	9.1%	
Living in a halfway house	78.5%	75.8%	0.48
Correctional specific factors/collateral sanctions			
Lifetime incarceration			0.79
One time	11.5%	10.0%	
2 - 5 times	41.7%	45.8%	
6-10 times	21.1%	21.3%	
More than 10 times	25.7%	22.9%	
Lifetime incarcerated; months, median (IQR)	132 (180)	136 (180)	0.64
Recent incarceration			0.05
Jail	17.8%	25.4%	
Prison	82.2%	74.6%	
Length of incarceration; months, median (IQR)	25 (42)	20 (42)	0.27
Current Parole	45.2%	48.8%	0.43
Current Probation	20.1%	21.0%	0.8

Solitary confinement	39.6%	36.8%	0.53
Saw health care provider during last incarceration	68.5%	73.4%	0.24
Current SSDI	5.0%	3.2%	0.31
Current Food Stamps	26.0%	27.5%	0.72
Without food for a whole day since release	20.5%	19.4%	0.77
Child Support	16.4%	21.8%	0.14
Barriers to Employment / Licensure based on criminal record	73.1%	74.6%	0.7
Debt / Restitution	36.1%	36.1%	0.99
Barriers to Housing based on criminal record	7.8%	8.7%	0.7

1

2


3

4

5 Table 4: Life's Essential 8 scores stratified by Place of Last Incarceration

LE8 component	LE8 score			Place of recent incarceration				P_value
	N	Mean	SE	Jail		Prison		
				Mean	SE	Mean	SE	
Blood glucose	449	75.03	1.46	77.22	3.07	74.43	1.66	0.43
Blood lipids (non-HDL cholesterol)	446	84.26	1.17	86.53	2.32	83.62	1.36	0.31
Blood pressure	461	46.58	1.35	40.75	2.94	48.2	1.51	0.02
Body mass index	457	41.4	1.44	43.08	3.23	40.87	1.6	0.53
Diet	464	44.0	1.46	52.28	2.86	41.64	1.67	0.003
Physical exercise	455	30.9	1.65	26.67	3.42	32.11	1.88	0.174
Sleep health	470	61.1	1.32	60.29	3.01	61.28	1.47	0.75
Smoking	469	24.57	1.58	14.81	2.76	27.32	1.85	<0.001
Total score	471	50.64	0.55	49.85	11.08	50.86	12.25	0.45

1
2
3



4
5

Figure 1. Logistic regression for uncontrolled CVD risk factor at baseline visit.

1 **Funding**

2

3 This work is supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute grant R01

4 HL137696, awarded to Dr. Emily Wang.

5

6

7

8 **Role of the Funder**

9 The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute had no role in the design and conduct of

10 the study; management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; manuscript preparation,

11 and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

12 **Author Disclosures**

13 Dr Harlan Krumholz reported receiving expenses and/or personal fees from Element

14 Science, Eyedentify, and F-Prime, and is a co-founder of Hugo Health, Refactor Health,

15 and Ensign-AI. He is associated with contracts, through Yale New Haven Hospital, from

16 the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and through Yale University from

17 Janssen, Johnson & Johnson Consumer, and Pfizer, outside the submitted work. No

18 other disclosures were reported.

19

20 **Author contributions**

21 JAA: Methodology, Data curation, Formal analysis, Writing- Original draft preparation,

22 Writing- Reviewing and Editing. LBP: Writing- Original draft preparation, Writing-

23 Reviewing and Editing. BR: Writing- Reviewing and Editing. NH: Writing- Reviewing and

24 Editing. JEE: Writing- Reviewing and Editing. HL: Writing- Reviewing and Editing. KBD:

25 Writing- Reviewing and Editing. HK: Writing- Reviewing and Editing. EAW:

1 Conceptualization, Methodology, Funding acquisition, Writing- Original draft preparation,
2 Writing- Reviewing and Editing, Supervision.

3

4 **Disclaimer**

5 The analysis, interpretation or conclusions drawn from these data are the responsibility
6 of the authors and do not represent the views of neither the National Heart, Lung, and
7 Blood Institute nor the United States Department of Health and Human Services or any
8 of its affiliates. The authors assume full responsibility for all analyses, interpretations,
9 and conclusions.

10

11 **Prior presentation:** EPI | Lifestyle 2024 Scientific Sessions; Chicago March 18-21,
12 2024.

13

14 **Acknowledgement**

15 We are grateful and acknowledge the efforts of the study team members who
16 consented and collected participant data (Reynold Jules, Bernice Kwarteng, Cerella
17 Criag, Marisol Fomakoye and Edgar Jones). We also acknowledge outreach efforts by
18 Monya Saunders and Tino Negron to identify potential participants, and the
19 collaboration of Intercommunity Health care.

20

21 **Data availability statement**

22 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the principal
23 investigator (EAW) upon reasonable request.

1 References

- 2 1. Garland D. *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*.
3 University of Chicago Press; 2012.
- 4 2. New report Mass Incarceration: The Whole Pie 2022 provides the most comprehensive
5 look at U.S. incarceration since the start of the pandemic. 2022;
6 <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2022.html>. Accessed May 1, 2022.
- 7 3. Carson EA. Mortality in state and federal prisons, 2001–2018 Statistical tables.
8 *Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of*
9 *Justice Statistics*. 2021.
- 10 4. Robey JP, Massoglia M, Light MT. A Generational Shift: Race and the Declining
11 Lifetime Risk of Imprisonment. *Demography*. 2023;60(4):977-1003.
- 12 5. Carson EA. *Prisoners in 2021 – Statistical Tables*. Bureau of Justice Statistics;2022.
- 13 6. Wang EA, Wang Y, Krumholz HM. A high risk of hospitalization following release from
14 correctional facilities in medicare beneficiaries: A retrospective matched cohort study,
15 2002 to 2010. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2013;173(17):1621-1628.
- 16 7. Binswanger IA, Stern MF, Deyo RA, et al. Release from Prison — A High Risk of
17 Death for Former Inmates. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2007;356(2):157-165.
- 18 8. Coleman J, Lloyd-Jones DM, Ning H, et al. Association between incarceration and
19 incident cardiovascular disease events: results from the CARDIA cohort study. *BMC*
20 *Public Health*. 2021;21(1):214.
- 21 9. Wang EA, Pletcher M, Lin F, et al. Incarceration, incident hypertension, and access to
22 health care: findings from the coronary artery risk development in young adults
23 (CARDIA) study. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009;169(7):687-693.
- 24 10. Zhang J. Prison smoking bans in the United States: current policy, impact and obstacle.
25 *Journal of Hospital Management and Health Policy*. 2018;2(5).
- 26 11. Springer SA, Pesanti E, Hodges J, Macura T, Doros G, Altice FL. Effectiveness of
27 antiretroviral therapy among HIV-infected prisoners: reincarceration and the lack of
28 sustained benefit after release to the community. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004;38(12):1754-1760.
- 29 12. Arrigo BA, Bullock JL. The psychological effects of solitary confinement on prisoners in
30 supermax units reviewing what we know and recommending what should change.
31 *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.
32 2008;52(6):622-640.
- 33 13. Frost NA. *Administrative Segregation in US Prisons*, Northeastern University; 2016.
- 34 14. Puglisi L, Calderon JP, Wang EA. What does health justice look like for people returning
35 from incarceration? *AMA journal of ethics*. 2017;19(9):903-910.
- 36 15. Hadden KB, Puglisi L, Prince L, et al. Health Literacy Among a Formerly Incarcerated
37 Population Using Data from the Transitions Clinic Network. *Journal of urban health :
38 bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*. 2018;95(4):547-555.
- 39 16. Hawks L, Wang EA, Howell B, et al. Health status and health care utilization of US
40 adults under probation: 2015–2018. *American Journal of Public Health*.
41 2020;110(9):1411-1417.
- 42 17. Kirk DS, Wakefield S. Collateral consequences of punishment: A critical review and path
43 forward. *Annual Review of Criminology*. 2018;1:171-194.
- 44 18. Powell-Wiley TM, Baumer Y, Baah FO, et al. Social determinants of cardiovascular
45 disease. *Circulation research*. 2022;130(5):782-799.

- 1 19. NHLBI. The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Workshop: "Cardiovascular
2 Diseases in the Inmate and Released Prison Population". 2016;
3 [http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/research/reports/nhlbi-workshop-cardiovascular-diseases-
5 inmate-and-released-prison-population](http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/research/reports/nhlbi-workshop-cardiovascular-diseases-
4 inmate-and-released-prison-population). Accessed September 16, 2016.
- 6 20. Havranek EP, Mujahid MS, Barr DA, et al. Social determinants of risk and outcomes for
7 cardiovascular disease: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association.
8 *Circulation*. 2015;132(9):873-898.
- 9 21. Wang EA, Aminawung JA, Wildeman C, Ross JS, Krumholz HM. High incarceration
10 rates among black men enrolled in clinical studies may compromise ability to identify
11 disparities. *Health Affairs*. 2014;33(5):848-855.
- 12 22. Howell BA, Puglisi LB, Aminawung J, et al. A prospective cohort study examining
13 exposure to incarceration and cardiovascular disease (Justice-Involved Individuals
14 Cardiovascular Disease Epidemiology–JUSTICE study): a protocol paper. *BMC Public
15 Health*. 2022;22(1):331.
- 16 23. Connecticut profile. 2021; <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/profiles/CT.html>. Accessed
17 March 5, 2024.
- 18 24. Sudore RL, Landefeld CS, Williams BA, Barnes DE, Lindquist K, Schillinger D. Use of
19 a modified informed consent process among vulnerable patients: a descriptive study. *J
20 Gen Intern Med*. 2006;21(8):867-873.
- 21 25. Vera-Cala LM, OrosteGUI M, Valencia-Angel LI, Lopez N, Bautista LE. Accuracy of the
22 Omron HEM-705 CP for blood pressure measurement in large epidemiologic studies. *Arq
23 Bras Cardiol*. 2011;96(5):393-398.
- 24 26. Whitley HP, Yong EV, Rasinen C. Selecting an A1C Point-of-Care Instrument. *Diabetes
25 Spectrum : A Publication of the American Diabetes Association*. 2015;28(3):201-208.
- 26 27. Elumn JE, Saeed GJ, Aminawung J, et al. The sleep justice study - a prospective cohort
27 study assessing sleep as a cardiometabolic risk factor after incarceration: a protocol paper.
28 *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23(1):2107.
- 29 28. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, Kansagra D. Hemoglobin A1c Targets for Glycemic Control With
30 Pharmacologic Therapy for Nonpregnant Adults With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A
31 Guidance Statement Update From the American College of Physicians. *Annals of
32 Internal Medicine*. 2018;168(8):569-576.
- 33 29. Ueda P, Gulayin P, Danaei G. Long-term moderately elevated LDL-cholesterol and blood
34 pressure and risk of coronary heart disease. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(7):e0200017.
- 35 30. Vaduganathan M, Mensah GA, Turco JV, Fuster V, Roth GA. The Global Burden of
36 Cardiovascular Diseases and Risk. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*.
37 2022;80(25):2361-2371.
- 38 31. Williams A, Nolan TS, Brock G, et al. Association of Socioeconomic Status With Life's
39 Essential 8 Varies by Race and Ethnicity. *Journal of the American Heart Association*.
40 2023;12(18):e029254.
- 41 32. Eating at America's table study. Quick food scan.
42 https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/diet/shortreg/instruments/eats_by-meal.pdf. Accessed May
43 23, 2017.
- 44 33. Institute NC. Eating at America's Table, All Day Screener. 2021;
45 <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/diet/screeners/fruitveg/instrument.html>.
- 46 34. Gabriel KP, Sidney S, Jacobs DR, Jr., et al. Convergent validity of a brief self-reported
physical activity questionnaire. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2014;46(8):1570-1577.

- 1 35. Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF, 3rd, Monk TH, Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The Pittsburgh Sleep
2 Quality Index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry Res.*
3 1989;28(2):193-213.
- 4 36. Hardeman RR, Homan PA, Chantarat T, Davis BA, Brown TH. Improving the
5 measurement of structural racism to achieve antiracist health policy: Study examines
6 measurement of structural racism to achieve antiracist health policy. *Health Affairs.*
7 2022;41(2):179-186.
- 8 37. Maruschak LM, Berzofsky M, Unangst J. Medical Problems of State and Federal
9 Prisoners and Jail Inmates, 2011–12. In: US Department of Justice, ed. Washington DC:
10 Bureau of Justice Statistics; 2015.
- 11 38. Curran J, Saloner B, Winkelman TNA, Alexander GC. Estimated Use of Prescription
12 Medications Among Individuals Incarcerated in Jails and State Prisons in the US. *JAMA*
13 *Health Forum.* 2023;4(4):e230482.
- 14 39. Winkelman T, Young A, Zakerski M. Inmates are excluded from Medicaid—Here’s why
15 it makes sense to change that.. Retrieved from University of Michigan Institute for
16 Healthcare Policy ...; 2017.
- 17 40. Saloner B. A Chance to Modernize Health Care behind Bars — Section 1115 Medicaid
18 Inmate Exclusion Waivers. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2023;389(16):1449-1451.
- 19 41. Winkelman TNA, Ford BR, Dunsiger S, et al. Feasibility and Acceptability of a Smoking
20 Cessation Program for Individuals Released From an Urban, Pretrial Jail: A Pilot
21 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Network Open.* 2021;4(7):e2115687-e2115687.
- 22 42. Satyjeet F, Naz S, Kumar V, et al. Psychological Stress as a Risk Factor for
23 Cardiovascular Disease: A Case-Control Study. *Cureus.* 2020;12(10):e10757.
- 24 43. Santosa A, Rosengren A, Ramasundarahettige C, et al. Psychosocial Risk Factors and
25 Cardiovascular Disease and Death in a Population-Based Cohort From 21 Low-, Middle-,
26 and High-Income Countries. *JAMA Network Open.* 2021;4(12):e2138920-e2138920.
- 27 44. Williams DR. Stress and the Mental Health of Populations of Color: Advancing Our
28 Understanding of Race-related Stressors. *J Health Soc Behav.* 2018;59(4):466-485.
- 29 45. Boen CE. Criminal justice contacts and psychophysiological functioning in early
30 adulthood: Health inequality in the carceral state. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior.*
31 2020;61(3):290-306.
- 32 46. Berg MT, Rogers EM, Riley K, Lei M-K, Simons RL. Incarceration exposure and
33 epigenetic aging in neighborhood context. *Social Science & Medicine.* 2022;310:115273.
- 34 47. Berg MT, Rogers EM, Lei M-K, Simons RL. Losing Years Doing Time: Incarceration
35 Exposure and Accelerated Biological Aging among African American Adults. *Journal of*
36 *health and social behavior.* 2021;62(4):460-476.

37