PRSS Pakistan Review of Social Sciences (PRSS)
ISSN : 2708-0951

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Rizwana Wajid
Research Fellow, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi

Urban Air Pollution and Public Health: A Critical Secondary-Data Synthesis of Exposure, Inequality, and Policy Effectiveness

Abstract

Air pollution in the urban world continues to be a major and uneven factor in morbidity and premature death. This document provides a critical synthesis of secondary data from global burden assessment, international air-quality, epidemiological studies, systematic assessments, and policy assessments. It asks, not only, if urban air pollution harms well-recognized human health. But also how impacts are incurred, whose health is most affected, how reliable workload assessments can be interpreted, and the policies that are most justified. Synthesis shows that fine particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, and ozone are associated with cardiovascular, respiratory, metabolic, developmental, and neurological outcomes, including concentrations occurring under many existing statutory norms. However, the evidence base has major limitations: monitoring is geographically unequal, modelled exposure can hide extremes at the neighbourhood level, multipollutant mixtures complicate causal attribution, and health impact models depend on assumptions often invisible to policy users. Therefore, the strongest political case is not for isolated individual protection or short-lived awareness campaigns but for structural emissions reductions in transport, energy, industry, buildings, and urban planning. Equity should be considered a primary performance criterion, as the average citywide improvements may coexist in vulnerable communities with persistent hotspots. The document concludes that urban governance of air-quality should include public health data, source-specific reporting, and spatial equity indicators. Transparent uncertainty analysis, rather than rely on the adherence to a single concentration threshold.

Keywords: Urban Air Pollution; PM2.5; Public Health; Environmental Justice; Secondary Data; Air-Quality Policy

1. Introduction

Air pollution has shifted from being the main pollution to being a key risk of public health. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2021) has strengthened its global Air Quality Directive values after reviewing evidence of health effects at concentrations below previous thresholds, while the State of Global Air 2024 assessment resulted in 8.1 million deaths as a result of ambient, household, and ozone air pollution in 2021 (Health Effects Institute [HEI], 2024). This scale of burden is essential; however, analysis of public health at the city level requires more than a repetition of global mortality. Impacts in urban areas have been influenced by traffic flows, electricity generation, household energy, industry, construction, waste incineration, secondary aerosols, urban shapes, and regional transport. Exposure to different sources in one city interacts with the quality of housing, occupation, mobility, income, and access to health care, thereby creating considerable differences.

A critical outlook is required, as the accuracy of the estimated air pollution burden could obscure methodological uncertainties. Epidemiological associations are highly consistent with fine particles (PM2.5), but the observed pollutant is also a marker for mixtures where toxicity varies according to source and chemical composition. Concentration response features must be extrapolated across populations and exposure areas, while monitoring scarcity in many low- and middle-income cities raises satellite dependency and modelling estimates. Evidence that air pollution is damaging does not automatically determine which factors will benefit the healthcare sector with real political and financial constraints. Urban policies should differentiate between source control, exposure management, and individual protection, rather than being considered interchangeable.

This paper develops critical secondary data synthesis around four questions. First, what is the strongest evidence of the health effects of major urban air pollutants? Second, how did social and spatial inequalities influence exposure and vulnerability? Third, what uncertainties and biases limit the interpretation of secondary datasets and epidemiological evidence? Fourth, what are the best policy approaches in line with evidence? This contribution involves linking epidemiology to environmental justice and policy design, arguing that the corresponding end figure public health is not only a lower mean pollution, but also a lower aggregate impact and a deeper inequality in exposure.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Development of the Urban Air Pollution and Health Evidence Base

From the documentation of acute pollution, the literature on urban air pollution has evolved into an assessment of the chronic impact of health effects on large populations. Early cohort and time series studies have produced consistent relationships between particulate pollution and

cardiopulmonary mortality, hospitalisation, and lung cancer (Pope et al., 2002; Dominici et al., 2006). Subsequent studies have strengthened this interpretation by demonstrating mortality benefits as the concentrations of fine particles decreased and identifying associations, even at relatively low levels of exposure (Laden et al., 2006; Di et al., 2017). Meta-analytical data now support the interrelationship between long-term exposure to particulate matter and mortality for both causes and specific causes, whereas nitrogen dioxide and ozone are also related to respiratory and mortality effects (Chen & Hoek, 2020; Huangfu & Atkinson, 2020). The literature provides a strong basis for treating urban air pollution as a public health determinant rather than just a quality problem. However, the obvious consistency of epidemiological signals must not be confused with the uniformity of risk. Pollutant composition, source characteristics, exposures to the population, and basic health conditions vary significantly between cities, limiting the mere reassignment of one concentration-response evaluation between environments.

2.2 Exposure Assessment, Causal Interpretation, and Burden Estimation

Much of the literature is concerned with measuring exposure. Regulatory monitors provide high-quality observations but are often too scarce to produce variations at the neighbourhood scale. Therefore, global and regional assessments combine ground-level monitoring with chemical transport models of satellite retrievals, land use information, and statistical calibration information (Brauer et al., 2016; van Donkelaar et al., 2016). These methods significantly extend spatial coverage but also introduce model dependence and can smooth out local hotspots. This is particularly important in cities where transport corridors, industrial sites, ports, and power generation occur. Residential combustion generates strong different exposure patterns within a short distance. Source apportionment research confirms that urban particles are heterogeneous, and the dominant contributors differ geographically (Karagulian et al., 2015). As equal mass of particles could emerge from different chemical mixtures, the mass of PM2.5 provides a useful indicator of population levels but not an incomplete description of toxicity.

Causal literature is the most powerful, where epidemiology, toxicology, biological mechanisms, temporal coherence, and interventional evidence converge. Cardiovascular routes, such as inflammation, oxidative stress, autonomic dysfunction, vasodilation, and thrombosis, are well documented, and wider evidence involves air pollution and respiratory and multisystem effects (Brook et al., 2010; Schraufnagel et al., 2019a, 2019b; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2019). Global estimates of the health burden include another analytical layer. Studies such as Cohen et al. (2017) and Burnett et al. (2018) translate exposure surfaces and concentration response functions into classified mortality, while the State of Global Air reports provide these estimates for political purposes (Health Effects Institute, 2024). Such estimates are essential for comparing risk scales; however, they continue to depend on exposure models, baseline disease rates, counterfactual assumptions, and the selected risk function. In order to have a critical interpretation, it is therefore necessary to focus on uncertainty rather than to regard one burden's assessment as an immediate fact.

2.3 Environmental Justice and the Policy Literature

The second big literature demonstrates that urban pollution has a social structure. Evaluations point out that socio-economic disadvantages often result from a higher exposure, although the direction and extent of inequalities differ from country to country and from pollutant to individual pollutant (Hajat et al., 2015). More space-based studies show that citywide improvements can coexist with long disparities because exposure depends on the housing situation, transport infrastructure, land use, employment, and distribution of harmful activities (Colmer et al., 2020; Tessum et al., 2019, 2021). The policy issue has been shifted by these data from whether air quality on average is improving to whether such improvement benefits are expected of the most vulnerable and vulnerable groups. It also challenges policy-assessments that are only based on the Metropolis average or the legal compliance threshold.

Policy investigation increasingly supports resource reduction and cross-sector urban planning as a result of an exclusive focus on personal avoidance. In many areas, the combustion of fossil fuels and traffic continue to lead to avoidable mortality rates, while changing mobility, energy, buildings, and land use can also benefit air quality, climate, and health (Lelieveld et al., 2015; Vohra et al., 2021; Nieuwenhuijsen, 2020). Personal protection can reduce exposure in some individuals. However, access to these measures is unequal, and they do not eliminate emissions from urban environments (Rajagopalan et al., 2020). Therefore, the unresolved issue in the literature is not whether cleaner air improves health, but how to identify the most responsible source-specific interventions, measure distributional effects, and communicate uncertainty without weakening prevention issues. This study addresses this gap by incorporating scientific data on exposure, health, environmental justice, and policy effectiveness into a secondary synthesis of data.

3. Methodology

3.1 Review Design and Secondary Data Sources

This document uses a structured synthesis of integrative reviews and secondary data rather than primary data collection. The results come from WHO air-quality guidelines and health policies, HEI Global Last Reporting, the Great British Cohort Study, and multicity studies, systematic reviews and meta-analyses, environmental justice research, and city air-quality intervention evaluations. The sources of methodological influence, multinational, recent, or directly associated with cause and effect interpretation and policies were prioritised. When setting up relationships that will continue to support the present risk assessment, the studies of the Foundation were retained.

The analysis is clearly critical instead of just descriptive. Four aspects of this were compared: impact measurement, health outcome, distributional equity, and effects of intervention. Particular attention was paid to points where evidence is often overly interpreted, including the assumption that city-wide averages are an individual attack, that all PM2.5 is equally toxic, that a statistically significant link determines the responsible source, and that measured concentration's reduction necessarily requires equitable reduction in the health risk. As the case is an integrative review, it does not mean that the preregistered systematic verification has been concluded, or that the screening was made. Its purpose is analytical synthesis of high-value secondary evidence.

3.2 Analytical Limitations of Secondary Evidence

The analysis of secondary data is powerful because it allows for a comparison of large populations, long periods, and many political conditions, but is not neutral. Global exposure assessments are often mixed with satellite retrievals, chemical transport models, land use information, and monitors. This hybrid architecture is scientifically refined, but uncertainty is greater where monitors are scarce. Consequently, countries with weaker monitoring systems may be placed on global maps with visual accuracy's same degree as those with thick networks, but there are differences in confidence in which they rely. Policy users should therefore differentiate between the estimated concentration of measured concentration and, where possible, reporting intervals of uncertainty.

The second challenge relates to the exposure metric itself. PM2.5 is determined from the aerodynamic diameter and mass, not toxicity. One microgram of secondary sulfate is treated as a microgram rich in transition metals or black carbon in a mass-based norm despite plausible variations in toxicity. The present findings help to control PM2.5 completely, as it is a robust population health indicator. However, source-specific controls can have a different level of benefits for each remote mass. Thus, research and regulation should be translated into complementary metrics of composition and source without sacrificing the comparability of PM2.5 masses.

The third topic is the burden's allocation. Global evaluations such as Cohen et al. (2017), Burnett et al. (2018), Fuller et al. (2022), and HEI (2024) estimate the expected mortality by combining exposure areas, baseline diseases, and concentration response functions. This is counterfactual model estimates, not a list of individual fatalities from pollution. Its value is relative and policy-oriented, but apparent numerical accuracy can be misleading. Differences between estimated burdens are typically based on alternative counterfactual concentrations, response functions, disease categories, and assumptions. Critical research should show these assumptions instead of selecting the largest estimate.

4. Findings

4.1 Urban Exposure and Pollutant Complexity

As particles that are small enough to enter deep into the lungs are consistently associated with death and disease, PM2.5 continues to be the dominant indicator in global health impact assessment. Long-term cohort observations of the American Cancer Society combined exposure to fine particles with cardiopulmonary and lung cancer mortality (Pope et al., 2002). More recently, the study showed that mortality concentrations were lower, as well as much larger populations. Di et al. (2017) reported increased mortality that was associated with PM2.5 and ozone even below the current regulatory standards in the United States Medicare population. A multicity analysis in 652 cities experienced a short-term increase in all-cause, cardiovascular, and respiratory mortality, which was associated with particulate pollution (Liu et al., 2019). Chen and Hoek (2020) in a systematic evaluation supporting the revision of the WHO Directive concluded that exposure to long-term PM2.5 was linked to all-cause and cause-specific mortality, and that associations remained clear at low exposure levels.

However, the value of urban air for human health cannot be reduced to the mass of PM2.5. Nitrogen dioxide is strongly associated with burns and traffic-related pollution and is of independent importance for health, although it also serves as a marker of complex traffic mixtures. Huangfu and Atkinson (2020) found increased mortality associated with long-term exposure to NO2, while ozone bears a distinct oxidative burden, and in some areas, such as heat and photochemical conditions, it is more difficult to control. WHO (2021) has treated various guidelines for pollutants corresponding to PM2.5, PM10, ozone, NO2, sulfur dioxide, and carbon monoxide. A single pollutant regulatory framework risks missing the

fact that the inhabitants of the city experience simultaneous exposures.

Source apportionment is equally important. Particulate matter from urban areas has been shown by Karagulian et al. (2015) to be from volatile local and regional sources, while transportation is important but not widespread in many cities. Lelieveld et al. (2015) has also shown that the mortality rate by source varies geographically, with the share of energy in the housing, agriculture, road traffic, and power generation sectors different from region to region. Vohra et al. (2021) estimated an extremely high mortality burden from fossil fuel-related PM2.5, which illustrates how cost estimates can significantly change when different exposure-response functions and source definitions are used. This variation does not support the non-adaptation of load modelling, but rather causes the estimation to be represented as model-dependent rather than direct recognition of deaths that are observed in clinical records.

Table 1. Major urban pollutants, dominant sources, and policy significance

Pollutant	Common urban sources	Key health concern	Critical policy issue
PM2.5	Combustion, secondary aerosols, industry, traffic, domestic fuel, regional transport	Cardiovascular and respiratory disease, mortality, multi-organ effects	Mass is a robust indicator but does not capture source-specific toxicity
NO2	Road traffic, combustion appliances, power and industry	Respiratory effects and mortality associations	Often both a toxicant and a marker of traffic mixture
O3	Secondary photochemical formation from precursor emissions	Respiratory morbidity and mortality	Nonlinear chemistry means local precursor control can have complex effects
PM10	Road dust, construction, coarse particles, combustion	Respiratory and cardiovascular outcomes	Coarse and fine fractions have different sources and control options

4.2 Public-Health Effects and Causal Interpretation

The strongest causal case relates to cardiovascular and respiratory diseases. The mechanism and epidemiological evidence support the pulmonary inflammation pathways, oxidative stress, autonomic imbalance, endothelial dysfunction, thrombosis, and systemic vascular effects (Brook et al., 2010; Rajagopalan et al., 2020). These channels help explain why air pollution is not only linked to respiratory effects but is also related to ischaemic heart disease and stroke. Schraufnagel et al. (2019a, 2019b) also stressed that air pollution affects multi-organ systems, raising doubts about the narrow assumption that air quality is mainly a matter of lung health.

The range of diseases is continuously expanding. Air pollution has been associated with metabolic diseases and adverse effects of pregnancy and development, while recent evidence from a systematic review showed that there was a link between environmental pollution in long-term and clinical dementia, although the risk of bias was still significant (Wilker et al., 2023). The prolonged likely endpoints pose a policy problem. Legal and regulatory impact assessments may be lagging behind scientific assessments as they only generate money for a combination of health outcomes where concentration response functions are mature. Therefore, even when epidemiological evidence is strong, the economic case for cleaner air can be underestimated.

Causal language must be calibrated simultaneously. Observational studies cannot randomise communities to long-term pollution exposures; therefore, causal inference depends on consistency, temporality, exposure gradients, natural experiments, mechanistic plausibility, and robustness to confounding. The intensity of PM2.5 data indicates convergence between these lines instead of a separate study. Nevertheless, residual confounding, exposure defects, enclosure mobility, indoor infiltration, occupational exposure, and related noise or heat conditions may continue to affect the estimates. This is particularly relevant for emerging endpoints, where fewer studies are available, and the outcome is heterogeneous.

4.3 Environmental Inequality and Differential Vulnerability

Urban air pollution is also a problem of environmental justice. Hajat et al. (2015) examined the evidence that socio-economic disadvantages often involve a higher level of exposure to atmospheric pollution, even though patterns differ in different countries and towns. The United States, Colmer et al. (2020) felt that racial and ethnic differences in PM2.5 exposure persist despite significant general air quality improvements. Tessum et al. (2019, 2021) has also indicated that consumption patterns and source-specific emissions may result in systematic exposure differentials for colour communities. These findings undermine the notion that equal

percentage reductions necessarily yield equivalent benefits to health in all sources.

Three of these mechanisms add to the importance of inequality. First, exposure has been spatially clustered around roads, industry, freight corridors, ports, and incineration sources. Second, vulnerability is socially acceptable in the sense that chronic diseases, occupational exposure, housing, and access to health care have an impact on the consequences of similar environmental concentrations. Third, political potential is uneven: communities with the highest risk can have the least impact on placement, enforcement, or transport. An equity-blind policy can therefore lower the city average and largely keep microenvironments with the highest risk at their level unchanged.

This is a point that has practical consequences for monitoring. If a town improves while the nearby road or neighbourhood hotspots are missing, a scarce regulatory network can properly identify a city. Satellite and chemical transport models are expanding their spatial coverage but continue to be calibrated using uneven monitoring infrastructure and could reduce the peak levels of small areas. Better low-cost sensors, mobile surveillance, and high-resolution models can help, but they also pose a governance challenge: data generation does not guarantee enforcement. The key metric should be to determine whether the evidence will change investment, approval, and emissions control decisions in the most exposed areas.

4.4 Policy Effectiveness: From Exposure Avoidance to Source Reduction

Available policy data favour structural reduction of sources, rather than reliance on individual evasions. Personal actions such as high-efficiency indoor filtration, reducing outdoor activity during severe episodes, or well-fitted masks can reduce exposure for some individuals, and Rajagopalan et al. (2020) provide useful evidence-based discussion. However, personal protection places responsibility upon residents, depends on the resources and conditions of the housing, and cannot respond to the population exposure at the source. Hence, it should be understood as an additional risk reduction measure and not a substitute for emission reduction measures.

Transport policy is an important instrument for cities, as it can reduce both combustion and road exposure. Low-emission zones, fleet standards, electrification, public transport, active travel, park reform, and compact land use planning may bring overlapping benefits in terms of air quality, climate, noise, physical activity, and road safety. The key issue is the design of policy packages. Electricity reduces tailpipe emissions, but it does not remove braking systems, tires, and ground dust, nor does it solve congestion or inequitable road placement. Similarly, the low-emission zone may improve mean concentrations, while vehicles and traffic of the elderly move to peripheral areas unless monitoring of distributional effects is carried out.

Energy and industrial policies are equally important in cities where coal, fuel oil, diesel, brick kilns, and waste incineration have made an important contribution. The cross-sectoral nature of PM2.5 means that municipal air-quality plans may fail if important sources lie outside the city’s sovereignty. This creates a discrepancy between spatial impacts and legal frameworks for control. Hence, regional air pollution, emission inventories, and mandatory source standards are vital. Health institutions should also be integrated into transport and planning decisions instead of consulting them only after the project is created.

Another concern is the use of legal compliance as the endpoint. The WHO's guideline values are recommendations that are based on health rather than universal legal standards (WHO, 2021). Low exposure evidence for concentrations indicates that the national limit values should not be interpreted as zero risk. The policy's purpose should be to produce a continuous reduction by giving high priority to sources and areas where there is little health gain. This is particularly important when the legal limits are far less strict than the WHO directives.

5. Discussion

There is considerable evidence that urban air pollution is a causal problem in public health; however, it does not support simplistic policy stories. First, there is not one single problem of urban air pollution. Cities differ in their source profiles, meteorology, form, background pollution, and vulnerability to populations. Second, it is not necessarily the pollutants that are most beneficial to the accountability of the sources that are the easiest to measure. Third, monitoring improvements alone do not guarantee a reduction in exposure. Fourth, citywide progress could be hiding distributive failure.

An extra defensible policy framework will bring together four layers. The first is health protection, with the WHO Guidelines being a guideline and not setting a clearly harmless threshold for the most important pollutants. Second, source accountability, which measures and links modelled concentrations to the emission sectors, who want to address the causes, rather than symptoms. The third is equity, requiring routine reporting on neighbourhood exposure and social vulnerability, rather than just city resources. The fourth is uncertainty transparency, which documents the confidence and assumptions behind modelled concentrations and attributable health forecasts.

That framework also changes the way that it is needed to evaluate the success. With a higher average decrease in clean neighbourhoods, a city that reduces average annual PM2.5 at a modest level in high-population and heavily exposed neighbourhoods could receive more health benefits than a city. Similarly, interventions on health impacts and impacts, and not just emissions inventories, should be assessed. Consequently, public health evaluation should integrate concentration, population, time activities, and vulnerability. In addition to the abstract sense of cleaner ambient air, the goal is to reduce inhalation exposure and reduce disease burden.

6. Conclusion

Urban air pollution is one of the most compelling examples of health risks that can be prevented arising from infrastructure, energy, transport, and planning. Secondary data are strong for PM2.5 and will increasingly apply to NO2, ozone, and the broader spectrum of disease effects. However, critical reading suggests that policy cannot be based solely on estimates of overall mortality and compliance with the regulations. Exposure measurement is uneven, exposure estimates are model dependent, pollutant mixtures are difficult to classify, and social inequality influences exposure and vulnerability.

Consequently, the policy implications are structural. Cities must reduce emissions at the source, coordinate sectoral and geographical boundary activities, use high-resolution monitoring to identify hotspots, and estimate distribution and average improvements. Personal protection can reduce the risks in the episode, but it cannot replace environmentally friendly transport, energy, industry, and urban design. The most important step is to show air pollution's adverse effects on the evaluation of which combinations of interventions are the most effective, equitable, and sustainable to reduce cumulative exposure for renowned public health and environmental policy research.

References

Apte, J. S., Brauer, M., Cohen, A. J., Ezzati, M., & Pope, C. A., III. (2018). Ambient PM2.5 reduces global and regional life expectancy. Environmental Science & Technology Letters, 5(9), 546-551. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.8b00360

Bell, M. L., McDermott, A., Zeger, S. L., Samet, J. M., & Dominici, F. (2004). Ozone and short-term mortality in 95 US urban communities, 1987-2000. JAMA, 292(19), 2372-2378. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.292.19.2372

Brauer, M., Freedman, G., Frostad, J., van Donkelaar, A., Martin, R. V., Dentener, F., van Dingenen, R., Estep, K., Amini, H., Apte, J. S., Balakrishnan, K., Barregard, L., Broday, D., Feigin, V., Ghosh, S., Hopke, P. K., Knibbs, L. D., Kokubo, Y., Liu, Y., ... Cohen, A. (2016). Ambient air pollution exposure estimation for the Global Burden of Disease 2013. Environmental Science & Technology, 50(1), 79-88. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b03709

Brook, R. D., Rajagopalan, S., Pope, C. A., III, Brook, J. R., Bhatnagar, A., Diez-Roux, A. V., Holguin, F., Hong, Y., Luepker, R. V., Mittleman, M. A., Peters, A., Siscovick, D., Smith, S. C., Jr., Whitsel, L., & Kaufman, J. D. (2010). Particulate matter air pollution and cardiovascular disease: An update to the scientific statement from the American Heart Association. Circulation, 121(21), 2331-2378. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181dbece1

Burnett, R., Chen, H., Szyszkowicz, M., Fann, N., Hubbell, B., Pope, C. A., III, Apte, J. S., Brauer, M., Cohen, A., Weichenthal, S., Coggins, J., Di, Q., Brunekreef, B., Frostad, J., Lim, S. S., Kan, H., Walker, K. D., Thurston, G. D., Hayes, R. B., ... Spadaro, J. V. (2018). Global estimates of mortality associated with long-term exposure to outdoor fine particulate matter. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115(38), 9592-9597. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1803222115

Chen, J., & Hoek, G. (2020). Long-term exposure to PM and all-cause and cause-specific mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Environment International, 143, 105974. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105974

Cohen, A. J., Brauer, M., Burnett, R., Anderson, H. R., Frostad, J., Estep, K., Balakrishnan, K., Brunekreef, B., Dandona, L., Dandona, R., Feigin, V., Freedman, G., Hubbell, B., Jobling, A., Kan, H., Knibbs, L., Liu, Y., Martin, R., Morawska, L., ... Forouzanfar, M. H. (2017). Estimates and 25-year trends of the global burden of disease attributable to ambient air pollution: An analysis of data from the Global Burden of Diseases Study 2015. The Lancet, 389(10082), 1907-1918. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30505-6

Colmer, J., Hardman, I., Shimshack, J., & Voorheis, J. (2020). Disparities in PM2.5 air pollution in the United States. Science, 369(6503), 575-578. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz9353

Di, Q., Wang, Y., Zanobetti, A., Wang, Y., Koutrakis, P., Choirat, C., Dominici, F., & Schwartz, J. D. (2017). Air pollution and mortality in the Medicare population. New England Journal of Medicine, 376(26), 2513-2522. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1702747

Dominici, F., Peng, R. D., Bell, M. L., Pham, L., McDermott, A., Zeger, S. L., & Samet, J. M. (2006). Fine particulate air pollution and hospital admission for cardiovascular and respiratory diseases. JAMA, 295(10), 1127-1134. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.295.10.1127

European Environment Agency. (2024). Harm to human health from air pollution in Europe: Burden of disease status, 2024. European Environment Agency.

Fuller, R., Landrigan, P. J., Balakrishnan, K., Bathan, G., Bose-O'Reilly, S., Brauer, M., Caravanos, J., Chiles, T., Cohen, A., Corra, L., Cropper, M., Ferraro, G., Hanna, J., Hanrahan, D., Hu, H., Hunter, D., Janata, G., Kupka, R., Lanphear, B., ... Yan, C. (2022). Pollution and health: A progress update. The Lancet Planetary Health, 6(6), e535-e547. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(22)00090-0

Hajat, A., Hsia, C., & O'Neill, M. S. (2015). Socioeconomic disparities and air pollution exposure: A global review. Current Environmental Health Reports, 2(4), 440-450. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-015-0069-5

Health Effects Institute. (2024). State of Global Air 2024. Health Effects Institute.

Huangfu, P., & Atkinson, R. (2020). Long-term exposure to NO2 and O3 and all-cause and respiratory mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Environment International, 144, 105998. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105998

Karagulian, F., Belis, C. A., Dora, C. F. C., Pruss-Ustun, A. M., Bonjour, S., Adair-Rohani, H., & Amann, M. (2015). Contributions to cities' ambient particulate matter (PM): A systematic review of local source contributions at global level. Atmospheric Environment, 120, 475-483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.08.087

Khomenko, S., Cirach, M., Pereira-Barboza, E., Mueller, N., Barrera-Gomez, J., Rojas-Rueda, D., de Hoogh, K., Hoek, G., & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. (2021). Premature mortality due to air pollution in European cities: A health impact assessment. The Lancet Planetary Health, 5(3), e121-e134. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30272-2

Laden, F., Schwartz, J., Speizer, F. E., & Dockery, D. W. (2006). Reduction in fine particulate air pollution and mortality: Extended follow-up of the Harvard Six Cities study. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 173(6), 667-672. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.200503-443OC

Landrigan, P. J., Fuller, R., Acosta, N. J. R., Adeyi, O., Arnold, R., Basu, N., Balde, A. B., Bertollini, R., Bose-O'Reilly, S., Boufford, J. I., Breysse, P. N., Chiles, T., Mahidol, C., Coll-Seck, A. M., Cropper, M. L., Fobil, J., Fuster, V., Greenstone, M., Haines, A., ... Zhong, M. (2018). The Lancet Commission on pollution and health. The Lancet, 391(10119), 462-512. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32345-0

Lelieveld, J., Evans, J. S., Fnais, M., Giannadaki, D., & Pozzer, A. (2015). The contribution of outdoor air pollution sources to premature mortality on a global scale. Nature, 525, 367-371. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15371

Liu, C., Chen, R., Sera, F., Vicedo-Cabrera, A. M., Guo, Y., Tong, S., Coelho, M. S. Z. S., Saldiva, P. H. N., Lavigne, E., Matus, P., Ortega, N. V., Garcia, S. O., Pascal, M., Stafoggia, M., Scortichini, M., Hashizume, M., Honda, Y., Hurtado-Diaz, M., Cruz, J., ... Kan, H. (2019). Ambient particulate air pollution and daily mortality in 652 cities. New England Journal of Medicine, 381(8), 705-715. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1817364

Miller, K. A., Siscovick, D. S., Sheppard, L., Shepherd, K., Sullivan, J. H., Anderson, G. L., & Kaufman, J. D. (2007). Long-term exposure to air pollution and incidence of cardiovascular events in women. New England Journal of Medicine, 356(5), 447-458. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa054409

Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2020). Urban and transport planning pathways to carbon neutral, liveable and healthy cities: A review of the current evidence. Environment International, 140, 105661. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105661

Pope, C. A., III, Burnett, R. T., Thun, M. J., Calle, E. E., Krewski, D., Ito, K., & Thurston, G. D. (2002). Lung cancer, cardiopulmonary mortality, and long-term exposure to fine particulate air pollution. JAMA, 287(9), 1132-1141. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.9.1132

Pope, C. A., III, Ezzati, M., & Dockery, D. W. (2009). Fine-particulate air pollution and life expectancy in the United States. New England Journal of Medicine, 360(4), 376-386. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa0805646

Pope, C. A., III, & Dockery, D. W. (2006). Health effects of fine particulate air pollution: Lines that connect. Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association, 56(6), 709-742. https://doi.org/10.1080/10473289.2006.10464485

Rajagopalan, S., Brauer, M., Bhatnagar, A., Bhatt, D. L., Brook, J. R., Huang, W., Munzel, T., Newby, D., Siegel, J., & Brook, R. D. (2020). Personal-level protective actions against particulate matter air pollution exposure: A scientific statement from the American Heart Association. Circulation, 142(23), e411-e431. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000931

Schraufnagel, D. E., Balmes, J. R., Cowl, C. T., De Matteis, S., Jung, S.-H., Mortimer, K., Perez-Padilla, R., Rice, M. B., Riojas-Rodriguez, H., Sood, A., Thurston, G. D., To, T., Vanker, A., & Wuebbles, D. J. (2019a). Air pollution and noncommunicable diseases: Part 1, the damaging effects of air pollution. Chest, 155(2), 409-416. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2018.10.042

Schraufnagel, D. E., Balmes, J. R., Cowl, C. T., De Matteis, S., Jung, S.-H., Mortimer, K., Perez-Padilla, R., Rice, M. B., Riojas-Rodriguez, H., Sood, A., Thurston, G. D., To, T., Vanker, A., & Wuebbles, D. J. (2019b). Air pollution and noncommunicable diseases: Part 2, air

pollution and organ systems. Chest, 155(2), 417-426. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2018.10.041

Tessum, C. W., Apte, J. S., Goodkind, A. L., Muller, N. Z., Mullins, K. A., Paolella, D. A., Polasky, S., Springer, N. P., Thakrar, S. K., Marshall, J. D., & Hill, J. D. (2019). Inequity in consumption of goods and services adds to racial-ethnic disparities in air pollution exposure. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116(13), 6001-6006. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1818859116

Tessum, C. W., Paolella, D. A., Chambliss, S. E., Apte, J. S., Hill, J. D., & Marshall, J. D. (2021). PM2.5 polluters disproportionately and systemically affect people of color in the United States. Science Advances, 7(18), eabf4491. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abf4491

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2019). Integrated science assessment for particulate matter (EPA/600/R-19/188). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

van Donkelaar, A., Martin, R. V., Brauer, M., Hsu, N. C., Kahn, R. A., Levy, R. C., Lyapustin, A., Sayer, A. M., & Winker, D. M. (2016). Global estimates of fine particulate matter using a combined geophysical-statistical method with information from satellites, models, and monitors. Environmental Science & Technology, 50(7), 3762-3772. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b05833

Vohra, K., Vodonos, A., Schwartz, J., Marais, E. A., Sulprizio, M. P., & Mickley, L. J. (2021). Global mortality from outdoor fine particle pollution generated by fossil fuel combustion: Results from GEOS-Chem. Environmental Research, 195, 110754. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.110754

Wilker, E. H., Osman, M., & Weisskopf, M. G. (2023). Ambient air pollution and clinical dementia: Systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ, 381, e071620. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2022-071620

World Health Organization. (2021). WHO global air quality guidelines: Particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10), ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and carbon monoxide. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2024). Compendium of WHO and other UN guidance on health and environment: Air pollution and health. World Health Organization.