


Supplemental material

Halonen et al.

**“Studying socioeconomic characteristics of residential areas and risk of death: Is choice of spatial unit an issue?”**



**eFigure 1. Inhabited areas in Finland (grey) and areas in which study participants live (black). Spatial unit 1×1 km square.**

**eTable 1.** Descriptive statistics of individual-level variables.

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Statistic</b>	<b>N missing</b>
Sex, n (%)		-
Men	36 144 (24.6)	
Women	110 687 (75.4)	
Individual occupational status, n (%)		120
High	42 789 (29.2)	
Intermediate	69 688 (47.5)	
Low	34 234 (23.4)	
Individual level of education, n (%)		-
High	73 922 (50.3)	
Intermediate	52 708 (35.9)	
Low	20 201 (13.8)	
Housing tenure, n (%)		2920
Owner	82 647 (57.4)	
Other	61 262 (42.6)	
Median (IQR) age, y	41.0 (32.0-51.0)	-
Median (IQR) time of residence, y	6.0 (1.8-12.0)	-
Median (IQR) follow-up time, y	12.0 (11.0-12.0)	

IQR= interquartile (25% - 75%) range

**eTable 2.** Correlations between spatial units for each area characteristic.

<b>Area characteristics</b>	<b>Pearson r</b>			
	250 x 250 m vs. 1 x 1 km	250 x 250m vs. 10 x 10 km	250 x 250 m vs. Zip-code area	250 x 250 m vs. Town
Socioeconomic deprivation, <i>z-score</i>	0.63 *	0.36 *	0.47 *	0.32 *
Median household income, <i>k€</i>	0.71 *	0.47 *	0.59 *	0.45 *
Low education, %	0.66 *	0.37 *	0.53 *	0.32 *
Unemployment rate, %	0.62 *	0.37 *	0.45 *	0.36 *
Household crowding, <i>m<sup>2</sup> per person</i>	0.60 *	0.30 *	0.37 *	0.29 *

\* P-value &lt;0.01