**Supplementary Material**

**Table S1.** Difference (95% confidence interval)a in neurobehavioral score associated within living in each quartile of residential proximity to the nearest floricultural plantation, compared to living furthest (>605m) from a plantation.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPSY-2 Domain** | **Quartile of Residential Proximity** | | | |
| **0-185m**  **(n=77)** | **186-350m**  **(n=76)** | **351-605m**  **(n=76)** | **>605m**  **(n=78)** |
| Total | -0.14 (-0.65, 0.36) | -0.26 (-0.77, 0.25) | -0.02 (-0.53, 0.48) | *ref* |
| Attention & Inhibitory Control | -0.23 (-0.98, 0.52) | -0.03 (-0.79, 0.73) | 0.29 (-0.45, 1.04) | *ref* |
| Language | -0.74 (-1.49, 0.01) | -0.98 (-1.74, -0.21) b | -0.91 (-1.66, -0.16) b | *ref* |
| Memory & Learning | 0.03 (-0.63, 0.70) | -0.28 (-0.95, 0.40) | -0.25 (-0.91, 0.42) | *ref* |
| Sensorimotor | 0.46 (-0.62, 1.55) | -0.02 (-1.12, 1.08) | 0.73 (-0.35, 1.81) | *ref* |
| Visuospatial | 0.32 (-0.68, 1.31) | 0.38 (-0.63, 1.39) | 0.68 (-0.31, 1.68) | *ref* |

a Linear regression models were adjusted for age, sex, race, height-for-age z-score, hemoglobin, maternal education, and cohabitation with a flower plantation worker.

b p<0.05

**Table S2.** Difference (95% confidence interval)a in neurobehavioral scores associated with total growing area within 100m of participants’ residences.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPSY-2 Domain** | **Total growing area within 100m of participants’ residences** | | |
| **0 m2**  **(n=265)** | **1-546 m2**  **(n=21)** | **>546 m2**  **(n=21)** |
| Total | *ref* | -0.22 (-0.91, 0.47) | -0.22 (-0.94, 0.49) |
| Attention & Inhibitory Control | *ref* | -0.78 (-1.83, 0.26) | -0.46 (-1.51, 0.59) |
| Language | *ref* | -0.44 (-1.48, 0.60) | -0.58 (-1.65, 0.49) |
| Memory & Learning | *ref* | 0.29 (-0.63, 1.20) | -0.18 (-1.12, 0.76) |
| Sensorimotor | *ref* | 0.11 (-1.38, 1.60) | 1.07 (-0.46, 2.60) |
| Visuospatial | *ref* | -0.80 (-2.17, 0.57) | -0.33 (-1.75, 1.08) |

a Linear regression models were adjusted for age, sex, race, height-for-age z-score, hemoglobin, maternal education, and cohabitation with a flower plantation worker.

**Table S3.** Odds ratios (95% confidence intervals)a of low neurobehavioral score associated with total growing area within 100m participants’ residences.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPSY-2 Domain** | **Total growing area within 100m** | | |
| **0 m2**  **(n=265)** | **1-546 m2**  **(n=21)** | **>546 m2**  **(n=21)** |
| Total | *ref* | 2.84 (0.51,15.77) | 2.17 (0.48,9.81) |
| Attention & Inhibitory Control | *ref* | 2.19 (0.69,7.01) | 1.20 (0.35,4.08) |
| Language | *ref* | 2.22 (0.58,8.51) | 4.84 (1.59,14.76) b |
| Memory & Learning | *ref* | 1.63 (0.61,4.35) | 1.88 (0.68,5.15) |
| Sensorimotor | *ref* | 1.07 (0.33,3.47) | 0.49 (0.11,2.28) |
| Visuospatial | *ref* | 1.72 (0.46,6.45) | 0.92 (0.19,4.34) |

a Logistic regression models were adjusted for age, sex, race, height-for-age z-score, hemoglobin, maternal education, and cohabitation with a flower plantation worker

b p<0.05

**Table S4.** Difference (95% confidence interval)a in neurobehavioral scores associated with living 100m closer to the edge of the nearest floriculture crop in sensitivity analyses further adjusting for household income and household pesticide use.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPSY-2 Domain** | **Additional adjustment**  **for income** | **Additional adjustment for pesticide use at the residence** |
| Total | -0.03 (-0.08, 0.03) | -0.03 (-0.08, 0.03) |
| Attention & Inhibitory Control | -0.03 (-0.11, 0.06) | -0.04 (-0.13, 0.04) |
| Language | -0.10 (-0.19, -0.02) b | -0.11 (-0.20, -0.02) b |
| Memory & Learning | -0.01 (-0.09, 0.06) | -0.03 (-0.10, 0.05) |
| Sensorimotor | 0.02 (-0.10, 0.14) | 0.01 (-0.11, 0.14) |
| Visuospatial | 0.03 (-0.08, 0.14) | 0.07 (-0.04, 0.18) |

a Logistic regression models were adjusted for age, sex, race, height-for-age z-score, hemoglobin, maternal education, and cohabitation with a flower plantation worker

b p<0.05

**Table S5.** Effect modification of association between distance to the nearest floricultural crop and neurobehavior, by child sex.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | **Difference (95% CI)a** | |  | |  |
| **NEPSY-II Domain** | **Girls** | | | **Boys** | | | **p-value for interaction** |
| Total | -0.02 | (-0.09, 0.05) | | -0.02 | | (-0.09, 0.05) | 0.98 |
| Attention &  Inhibitory Control | -0.09 | (-0.19, 0.01) | | 0.00 | | (-0.12, 0.11) | 0.18 |
| Language | -0.08 | (-0.19, 0.02) | | -0.09 | | (-0.20, 0.03) | 0.86 |
| Memory & Learning | 0.01 | (-0.08, 0.11) | | -0.05 | | (-0.15, 0.05) | 0.30 |
| Sensorimotor | -0.07 | (-0.22, 0.08) | | 0.15 | | (-0.01, 0.32) | 0.08 |
| Visuospatial | 0.07 | (-0.06, 0.21) | | 0.03 | | (-0.12, 0.19) | 0.79 |

a Difference in neurobehavior score per 100m decrease in distance to the nearest floricultural crop, in models adjusted for age, race, height-for-age z-score, hemoglobin, maternal education, and cohabitation with a flower plantation worker.