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#### Abstract

Background and Purpose: Healthy People establishes objectives to monitor the nation's health. Healthy People 2020 (HP2020) included objectives to reduce national stroke and coronary heart disease (CHD) mortality by $20 \%$ (to 34.8 and 103.4 deaths per 100,000, respectively). Documenting the proportion and geographic distribution of counties meeting neither the HP2020 target nor an equivalent proportional reduction can help identify high-priority geographic areas for future intervention.

Methods: County-level mortality data for stroke (ICD-10 codes I60-I69) and CHD (I20-I25) and bridged-race population estimates were used. Bayesian spatiotemporal models estimated agestandardized county-level death rates in 2007 and 2017 which were used to calculate and map the proportion and $95 \%$ credible interval (CI) of counties achieving neither the national HP2020 target nor a $20 \%$ reduction in mortality.

Results: In 2017, 45.8\% of counties (CI: 42.9, 48.3) met neither metric for stroke mortality. These counties had a median stroke death rate of 42.2 deaths per 100,000 in 2017, representing a median $12.8 \%$ decline. For CHD mortality, $26.1 \%$ (CI: 25.0, 27.8) of counties met neither metric. These counties had a median CHD death rate of 127.1 deaths per 100,000 in 2017, representing a $10.2 \%$ decline. For both outcomes, counties achieving neither metric were not limited to counties with traditionally high stroke and CHD death rates.

Conclusions: Recent declines in stroke and CHD mortality have not been equal across US counties. Focusing solely on high mortality counties may miss opportunities in the prevention and treatment of cardiovascular disease and in learning more about factors leading to successful reductions in mortality.


## Introduction

For over forty years, the Healthy People initiative has included objectives to improve outcomes for coronary heart disease (CHD) and stroke, ${ }^{1}$ which are prevalent causes of death in the United States (US). ${ }^{2}$ Healthy People 2020 (HP2020) included objectives to reduce

[^0]mortality from CHD and stroke by $20 \%$ to 103.4 and 34.8 deaths, respectively, per 100,000 population over the goal period. ${ }^{3}$ Interim results suggested that the national HP2020 mortality target would be met for CHD, but not for stroke. ${ }^{3}$

Assessing county-level achievement of the national HP2020 CHD and stroke mortality targets, as well as an equivalent proportional decline of $\geq 20 \%$ in county-level stroke and CHD death rates, can help public health professionals identify counties that may benefit from greater resources. When considered alongside a county's health-related resources and barriers, these trend analyses also support Healthy People's overarching goals of promoting health equity and eliminating disparities. ${ }^{4,5}$ Therefore, this analysis describes the proportion and geographic distribution of counties meeting neither the national HP2020 targets for stroke and CHD mortality nor an equivalent proportional decline over the goal period.

## Materials and Methods

We obtained deaths for all ages in 3,136 US counties with underlying causes listed as stroke (International Classification of Diseases [ICD-10] codes I60-I69) or CHD (ICD-10 codes I20-I25) from the National Vital Statistics System and bridged-race population estimates from the National Center for Health Statistics. As specified in the HP2020 methodology, we used age-standardized death rates in 2007 for baseline and 2017 for follow-up.

Bayesian multivariate space-time conditional autoregressive models generated posterior distributions for county-level CHD and stroke death rates (per 100,000), age-standardized to the 2000 U.S. population, in 2007 and $2017 .{ }^{6}$ We summarized county-level death rates as medians, interquartile ranges (IQR), and median percent change (calculated as the difference in death rates between 2017 and 2007, divided by the 2007 rate). Posterior distributions of death rates were used to calculate the proportion and $95 \%$ credible interval (CI) and map the geographic distribution of counties that had: 1) achieved the national HP2020 target, 2) reduced death rates by $\geq 20 \%$ but not achieved the national HP2020 target, 3) reduced death rates by <20\% and not achieved the national HP2020 target, or 4) could not be conclusively classified. All analyses were completed in R; user-generated code is available upon request.

## Results

For stroke, $45.8 \%$ (CI: 42.9, 48.3) of counties achieved neither the national HP2020 target nor reduced death rates by $\geq 20 \%$ during 2007-2017. These counties reduced stroke death rates by a median $12.8 \%$ (IQR: $-16.6,-7.7$ ) to a final rate of 42.2 deaths per 100,000 population (IQR: 38.6, 47.4) and were concentrated in the Deep South; Appalachia; Midwest; and the Pacific Coast (Figure 1). Approximately 22.7\% (CI: 20.7, 25.0) did not achieve the national HP2020 target but reduced stroke death rates by $\geq 20 \%$. These counties reduced stroke death rates by a median $24.6 \%-27.4,-22.4$ ) to a final rate of 42.4 deaths per 100,000 population (IQR: 39.2, 47.0). Approximately $26.7 \%$ (CI: 25.4, 28.4) of counties achieved the national HP2020 target.

For CHD, $26.1 \%$ (CI: 25.0, 27.8) of counties achieved neither the national HP2020 target nor reduced death rates by $\geq 20 \%$ during 2007-2017 (Table 1). These counties reduced CHD death rates by a median $10.2 \%$ (IQR: $-15.2,-1.7$ ) to a final rate of 127.1 deaths per 100,000
(IQR: 115.1, 149.9), and were concentrated in a band stretching from northern Appalachia through New Mexico (Figure 1). Approximately $16.5 \%$ (CI: 15.4, 17.7) did not achieve the national HP2020 target but reduced CHD death rates by $\geq 20 \%$. These counties reduced CHD death rates by $27.5 \%$ (IQR: $-32.7,-24.1$ ) to a final rate of 121.6 deaths per 100,000 (IQR: 111.7, 135.8). Approximately $54.8 \%$ (CI: 53.7, 55.7) of counties achieved the national HP2020 target.

## Discussion

About one-half and one-quarter of US counties, respectively, neither met the national HP2020 target nor reduced death rates by $\geq 20 \%$ for stroke and CHD mortality. The greater improvements in county-level CHD mortality as compared to stroke may be partly explained by suboptimal recognition of stroke signs and symptoms, ${ }^{7}$ geographic disparities in recombinant tissue plasminogen activator utilization, ${ }^{8}$ or other factors. By examining both death rates and trends, these results can inform geographically-focused programs, interventions, and policies at the county level, which is especially critical given recently stalled declines in stroke and CHD mortality. ${ }^{9,10}$

These findings support continued focus on cardiovascular disease prevention and treatment in the southern U.S. as well as expanding focus to other geographic areas of the country experiencing adverse mortality-related trends. Some counties outside of the traditionally high-burden areas in the southern U.S. (e.g., the Stroke Belt for stroke mortality; West Virginia through Oklahoma for CHD mortality ${ }^{4,5}$ ) neither met the national HP2020 target nor reduced death rates by $\geq 20 \%$. These counties were concentrated in Appalachia, the Midwest, and West Coast for stroke, and in the Midwest and Northern Plains for CHD. Additionally, some counties within traditionally high-burden areas reduced mortality by $\geq 20 \%$ (e.g., South Georgia and South Carolina for stroke; Tennessee and Oklahoma for CHD). These counties experienced large declines in mortality amid stagnating national trends, ${ }^{9,10}$ representing opportunities to understand programs, policies, and interventions addressing risk factors, treatments, and social determinants of health contributing to these counties' successes.

A key strength of this analysis is the Bayesian spatiotemporal model, which estimated precise, reliable death rates in counties with small death or population counts. ${ }^{11}$ A limitation is that detecting the targeted reduction in death rates in counties with small death count and population sizes may be more difficult due to less precision in the estimated rates. The potential for misclassification of underlying cause of death reported on death certificate data was minimized by using broad ICD-10 categories for CHD and stroke. ${ }^{12}$ Finally, this analysis considered only mortality from CHD and stroke, not level of functional impairment following these events.
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## Non-Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms:

| CHD | Coronary Heart Disease |
| :--- | :--- |
| CI | Credible Interval |
| HP | Healthy People |
| ICD-10 | International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision |
| IQR | Interquartile Range |
| US | United States |
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## Summary:

Local progress toward HP2020 stroke and CHD mortality objectives has been uneven. Focusing solely on high mortality counties may miss opportunities in preventing and treating cardiovascular disease.

## CHD Death Rates



Figure 1.
Counties by achievement of national Healthy People 2020 (HP2020) targets* and equivalent proportional reduction in coronary heart disease (CHD) and stroke mortality — United States, 2007-2017
*HP2020 targets: 34.8 stroke deaths and 103.4 CHD deaths per 100,000 population.
${ }^{\dagger}$ Could not be classified due to uncertainty in Bayesian estimates.
County-level achievement of national Healthy People 2020 (HP2020) targets ${ }^{*}$ and equivalent proportional reduction in stroke and coronary heart disease (CHD) mortality — United States, 2007-2017

|  | Counties |  | Median age-standardized death rate (IQR) |  | Median percent change (IQR) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% (95\% CI) | 2007 | 2017 | 2007-2017 |
| Stroke Mortality |  |  |  |  |  |
| Met HP2020 target | 849 | 26.7 (25.4, 28.4) | 38.5 (35.4, 41.7) | 32.0 (29.8, 33.4) | -18.1 (-22.9, -13.2) |
| Did not meet HP2020 target, $220 \%$ decline | 648 | 22.7 (20.7, 25.0) | 56.7 (52.1, 63.1) | 42.4 (39.2, 47.0) | -24.6 (-27.4, -22.4) |
| Did not meet HP2020 target, <20\% decline | 1,496 | 45.8 (42.9, 48.3) | $47.7(43.8,53.4)$ | 42.2 (38.6, 47.4) | -12.8 (-16.6, -7.7) |
| Inconclusive ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 143 | 4.6 | 46.4 (44.9, 47.7) | 35.7 (35.1, 36.6) | -21.2 (-23.0, -20.3) |
| CHD Mortality |  |  |  |  |  |
| Met HP2020 target | 1,757 | 54.8 (53.7, 55.7) | 110.7 (96.3, 125.7) | 84.1 (73.1, 93.6) | -26.0 (-32.5, -17.4) |
| Did not meet HP2020 target, $20 \%$ decline | 500 | 16.5 (15.4, 17.7) | 170.1 (157.3, 194.2) | 121.6 (111.7, 135.8) | -27.5 (-32.7, -24.1) |
| Did not meet HP2020 target, <20\% decline | 799 | 26.1 (25.0, 27.8) | $141.2(127.5,162.2)$ | 127.1 (115.1, 149.9) | -10.2 (-15.2, -1.7) |
| Inconclusive ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 80 | 2.6 | 138.6 (135, 143.8) | 105.6 (104.1, 110.5) | -21.9 (-24.2, -20.3) |

Abbreviations: $\mathrm{CI}=$ Credible interval, $\mathrm{IQR}=$ interquartile range

* National HP2020 targets: 34.8 stroke deaths and 103.4 CHD deaths per 100,000 population

[^1]
[^0]:    Correspondence: Rebecca Woodruff, PhD; 4770 Buford Hwy NE, Chamblee, GA 30341404-498-5986. okp9@cdc.gov.
    Disclosures:
    None.

[^1]:    ${ }^{\dagger}$ Could not be classified due to uncertainty in Bayesian estimates.

