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Abstract

**Background & Objectives:** While exposure to fine particulate matter air pollution (PM$_{2.5}$) is known to cause adverse health effects, its impact on postoperative outcomes in US adults remains understudied. Perioperative exposure to PM$_{2.5}$ may induce inflammation that insidiously interacts with the systemic inflammatory response after surgery, leading to higher postoperative complications.

**Methods:** We conducted a single center, retrospective cohort study using data from 64,313 surgical patients living along Utah's Wasatch Front and undergoing elective surgical procedures at a single academic medical center from 2016-2018. Patients’ addresses were geocoded and linked to daily Census-tract level PM$_{2.5}$ estimates preoperatively. We hypothesized that elevated PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations in the seven days prior to surgery would be associated with an increase in a bundle of major postoperative complications. A hierarchical Bayesians regression model was fit adjusting for age, sex, season, neighborhood disadvantage, and the Elixhauser index of comorbidities.

**Results:** Postoperative complications increased in a dose-dependent manner with higher concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ exposure, with a relative increase of 7% in the odds of complications for every 10ug/m3 increase in the highest single-day 24-hr PM$_{2.5}$ exposure during the 7 days prior to surgery. The association persisted after controlling
for comorbidities and potential confounders; our inferences were robust to modeling choices and sensitivity analysis.

**Discussion & Conclusion:** In this large Utah cohort, exposure to elevated PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations in the week before surgery was associated with increased postoperative complications in a dose-dependent manner, suggesting a potential impact of air pollution on surgical outcomes. These findings merit replication in larger datasets to identify populations at risk and to define the interaction and impact of different pollutants. PM$_{2.5}$ exposure is a potential perioperative risk factor and, given the unmitigated air pollution in urban areas, a global health concern.

**Keywords:** air pollution, particulate matter, postoperative complications, surgery, PM2.5, perioperative medicine, health registry, clinical informatics
Introduction

Short-term exposure to air pollution, especially fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) is a well-established risk factor for cardiovascular, respiratory, metabolic, and neurologic morbidity, and mortality worldwide$^{1-6}$. While regulatory action in high income countries on PM$_{2.5}$ has resulted in reductions in exposure over the past several decades, the increasing prevalence of wildfires has threatened to undo this progress$^7$ and portends to worsen globally with climate change. In addition, millions suffer globally under high levels of PM$_{2.5}$, especially in megacities and the highly populated urban areas in Asia$^{8,9}$. Despite the well-established risk to cardiopulmonary health, a knowledge gap remains regarding the impact of individual perioperative patient air pollution exposure (IPAPE) on postoperative complications. This phenomenon has thus far been described in only a small number of studies$^{10-14}$ and none of which have examined major post-operative medical complications in the U.S. adult surgical population as a whole.

Post-operative complications continue to be a significant source of morbidity and mortality after surgery$^{15-18}$. For instance, cardiac complications after non-cardiac surgery continue to be a source of significant morbidity and costs, and a focus of research for risk stratification tools such as the Revised Cardiac Risk Index$^{19,20}$. Pulmonary complications after surgery also continue to plague patients globally, with pulmonary complication rates in the US varying from $2 - 5\%^{21}$. Likewise, infectious complications such as sepsis surgical site infections and urinary tract infections (UTI), while dramatically lower than in the pre-antibiotic era, continue to plague at risk populations in the perioperative period with national registry studies reporting a greater than $5\%$
incidence\textsuperscript{22}. Despite the prevalence of these risks, commonly used risk calculators and models do not currently incorporate any contribution from air pollution.

**Mechanism: The overlap of air pollution systemic inflammation and the surgical stress response**

The mechanism that produces air pollution caused systemic inflammation is well established. Small airborne pollutants enter through the lungs or skin\textsuperscript{23} and disseminate across the body. Such pollutants can be found in every organ system, including the lungs, brain, the heart, and gastrointestinal tract among others\textsuperscript{24}. IPAPE may lead to an inflammatory response that compounds the surgical stress response (SSR)\textsuperscript{25,26}, including pulmonary inflammation, endothelial dysfunction, thrombosis, and membranous nephropathy\textsuperscript{27-30}. Several prior studies investigate the association between air pollution and adverse surgical outcomes, but were small and limited to specialized populations like organ transplant recipients\textsuperscript{12-14,31}. A recent analysis of over 19 million patients in China found increased 30-day postoperative mortality associated with higher preoperative PM\textsubscript{2.5} concentrations at the city-level, especially among patients with preexisting cardiopulmonary conditions\textsuperscript{11}. Likewise, a recent study from South Korea found a similar mortality risk among cancer patients\textsuperscript{12}. However, both of these studies focus on mortality, not morbidity, and pollution levels in China far exceed those encountered in the U.S. or along the Wasatch Front in Utah, where this study took place. The Korean study utilized annual exposure to air pollution, which contrasts with our acute exposure design.
Quasi natural experiment

The Salt Lake metropolitan region of Northern Utah is an ideal setting to study acute pollution exposures. The unique mountain geography of the “Wasatch Front,” along with frequent wood burning, an in-land port, the intersection of two major interstate highways, and a national train depot, work together to produce the increased occurrence of extreme pollution events in the region, which dramatically impact ambient PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations$^{32-34}$. This results in inversion conditions during the winter, with warm air aloft the valley trapping cold air and pollutants in the densely populated valley below. Similarly, in the summer when wildfires throughout the American West dominate pollution exposures, the geological bowl produced by the intersection of multiple mountain ranges that comprise the Wasatch Front act as a shield that accumulates wildfire smoke in the metropolitan region. Due to the various air pollution events common to the region, the random exposure of patients to variable air pollution prior to surgery leads to a quasi-natural experiment as patients are scheduled for surgery regardless of air pollution considerations.

Our objective is to estimate the impact of preoperative particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) air pollution on a bundle of post-operative complications. We hypothesize that exposure to PM$_{2.5}$ in the 7-day period prior to surgery results in increased risk of a bundle of post-operative complications, controlling for comorbidities, confounders, and other well documented drivers of post-operative complications$^{35,36}$ in a hierarchical Bayesian regression model.
Methods

Study Design and Data Sources

We performed a single center cohort analysis of the University of Utah local Multi-Center Perioperative Outcomes Group (MPOG) electronic health registry, which was supplemented with data from the University of Utah Health’s Epic database for the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018. We adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies (STROBE) statement and principles. The study was approved as Exemption Category 4 by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Utah, with IRB approval number 00142167.

Study Population: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Extracting information from our Epic and local MPOG instances we included elective and non-emergent general anesthesia cases performed at University of Utah Health operating room locations on or after January 1, 2016 and on or before December 31, 2018. We excluded cases with ASA 5 or 6, age <18 years, ICU transfers, cases performed without general anesthesia, as well as obstetric, electroconvulsive therapy, and bronchoscopy procedures. We only included cases where geocoding could match to an address. We limited our study area further to State of Utah counties along the Wasatch Front, as these counties episodically experience some of the worst particulate matter pollution in the US, and globally, due to inversion events where cold air becomes trapped along the mountain valleys, and are also impacted by wildfire smoke. As such, we included only patients residing in the Counties of Salt Lake, Utah, Davis, Weber, Cache, and Box Elder, all of which are served by the University of Utah Health.
locations in Salt Lake and Davis Counties of Utah. Further exclusions were made based on availability of the PM$_{2.5}$ estimates and ability to assign Elixhauser Comorbidity scores (Figure 1).

**Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) Exposure**

Daily fine particulate matter with diameter <2.5μm (PM2.5) measurements were obtained from a public dataset of machine learning-derived daily PM$_{2.5}$ concentration estimates at the County, Zip Code and Census Tract for 11 Western States 2008-2018$^{40}$. These estimates utilize a combination of EPA and state-level ground sensors and satellite derived pollution estimates to provide validated and accurate concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ across the Western US. We then matched these estimates to individual patients at the census tract of their geocoded home address. For our primary analysis, we utilized the maximum value of PM$_{2.5}$ within 7 days of surgery, which included the day of surgery itself, for two reasons: (1) inversion and pollution events in northern Utah tend to be of short duration$^{33}$, so as to ensure catchment of short-lived events without obscuring them with use of multiple day means, the maximum value in the window was used and (2) prior literature suggests pollution effects on inflammation and thrombosis may manifest over 1-4 weeks, but most acutely within days of the exposure event$^{41,42}$. 
Outcome Bundle: Major Post-operative Complications

The primary outcome was a composite of major postoperative complications occurring during in-hospital stays after surgery as derived from their presence in the discharge diagnosis codes captured in Epic and our local MPOG database\textsuperscript{43-45}, including: pneumonia, surgical site infection, urinary tract infection, sepsis, stroke, myocardial infarction, or thromboembolic event. We classified the presence of any post-operative complication into a binary outcome measure, with a positive (yes) being the presence of any complication, while negative (no) being that no complications were present.

Covariates

Multivariable models were adjusted for patient age, sex, year, season, County of residence, neighborhood deprivation, which is an index of poverty, race, education and income generated by the National Neighborhood Data Archive (NANDA)\textsuperscript{46}, and the Elixhauser comorbidity index\textsuperscript{35,36}. Elixhauser comorbidity index was utilized in place of the American Society of Anesthesiologists Physical Classification Score (ASA-PS) as it has demonstrated equivalent reliability in predicting post-operative outcomes\textsuperscript{47-49}, and as it is a validated model that relies on documented comorbidities and can be calculated based on Epic data rather than subjective assessments at the bedside. We assigned Elixhauser comorbidity scores to all patients utilizing their EPIC records following standard assignment procedures as outline by Syed et al\textsuperscript{50}. We hypothesized that complications would rise with increasing Elixhauser comorbidity index score.
Statistical Analysis

We investigated the impact of PM$_{2.5}$ exposure on postoperative complications (outcome) using a multivariable Bayesian model. We utilized a three-season exposure model to adjust for possible confounding factors, where summer months (Jun-Aug) were considered “fire season”, winter months (Dec-Mar) were considered “inversion” season, and spring months (Feb-May) were considered a baseline period. Thus, all months were included in the model.

Model fit was by hierarchical Bayesian regression methods using Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms, specifically Hamiltonian Monte Carlo with the No-U-Turn Sampler having more rapid convergence for high-dimensional models. Models were run with six chains, 2000 iterations and a 50% thinning of the initial estimates. For the beta regression parameters, we used two different weakly informative prior distributions to test for sensitivity of parameter estimates. These were the standard normal distribution $N(0, 1)$ and the R2D2M2(0.25, 4, 05) prior$^{51}$. The priors for the variance parameters with the exponential ($\exp(1)$) and the R2D2M2(0.25, 4, 05) priors$^{51}$. County was included in the statistical model as group effect.

Convergence characteristics of the model estimation was assessed using the Gelman-Rubin R-hat statistic, effective sample size (ESS), chain mixing, and chain autocorrelation. The posterior predictive distribution was used to generate a predictive accuracy metric as measured by leave-one-out cross-validation. Nested models were compared by expected-log-predictive-density. Model fits and parameter values were
explored using conditional effects, $R^2$ coefficient of determination, and Bayesian hypothesis testing.

Model results are presented as parameter estimates and odds ratio transformed values using means, medians, standard deviations, and 95% credible intervals (CI). A 95% credible interval has a 95% probability of containing the true parameter value. Model coefficients are also presented with forest plots to show the probability of direction. Analyses were conducted using R Statistical Software v4.4.1, and used two software packages built on STAN (brms) and a Hamiltonian MonteCarlo based software to estimate Bayesian models. Additional data and model description was done in the R language using the tableone, loo, mcmcplot, posterior, and tidybayes packages.

**Results**

**Study Population Characteristics**

Our initial cohort of patients was $n=96,302$ for the study period of January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018, as downloaded from DataDirect. After application of exclusion criteria detailed in Figure 1, a cohort of $n=65,487$ patients remained. Systematically missing PM$_{2.5}$ values for one week prevented the creation of lag values for 1174 cases, thus reducing the analysis cohort to 64,313 patients. The majority of exclusions occurred from limiting the sample to the Wasatch Front counties ($n=26,485$, or 85.9% of exclusions). Median age was 51.58 years (SD=17.82) and a majority were female (55.3%). Most patients had low comorbidity burden, with a mean Elixhauser of 0.97 (SD=1.8). A majority of patients presented from Salt Lake County ($n=42,881$), which is
the highest population county in the state. There was also a slight increase in total cases per year from 19,995 in 2016, to 21,950 in 2018. Table 1 presents baseline characteristics of patients.

**Post-Operative Complications**

The overall rate of the composite complication outcome was 4.3% (n=2,766 events among total cohort of 64,313); complication rates are presented in Table 2 broken down by population characteristics in a bivariate analysis (yes vs. no complications). The complication rate varied from a low of 3.77% in Davis County to a high of 6.30% in Box Elder County. While female patients dominated the cohort, they were less likely to experience complications than males (46% vs. 54%, respectively). As expected, complication rates increased with a greater Elixhauser comorbidity index, with those without complications having a mean index of 0.78 (SD=1.43) while those with complications had a mean index of 5.01 (SD=3.66) (p<0.001). We also observed a slight downtrend in complications over time, from 4.53% in 2016 to 3.93% in 2018 (p=0.004). Complications did not vary significantly by season (p=0.843). Finally, we observed that when PM$_{2.5}$ was dichotomized by the EPA daily limit, there was a significantly increased complication rate, from 4.3% (n=2676/60176) on days below 35 ug/m3 PM$_{2.5}$, to 6.2% (n=90/1371). The exposure to high pollution did not differ greatly between Counties, nor did it vary by season. These results are summarized in table 3.
Multivariable Exposure Analysis of PM$_{2.5}$ impact on outcome bundle

Model estimation satisfied usual criteria (Gelman-Rubin R-hat, ESS, posterior predictive error checks). There was no significant autocorrelation. The posterior density plots for model parameters indicate reasonable unimodal distributions. Our sensitivity analysis exploring both two weakly informative priors did not change the inferences or results. Our findings were robust to model parameters and model specifications.

In our main Bayesian multivariable model, we found an increased risk of post-operative complications with increasing concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ with a regression coefficient estimate of 0.01 with a 95% CI (0.00-0.01). A Bayesian hypothesis test showed a 98% probability of an increasing odds of complications with increasing PM$_{2.5}$. In clinical terms there is a 7% increase in the chance of complication for every 10ug/m3 increase in the maximum PM2.5 observed in the 7-day preoperative period; that is the increase in the odds of a complication was 1.07, for every 10ug/m3 rise in PM2.5 concentrations. This dose dependent increase in exposure to a maximum PM2.5 in the 7-day preoperative period thus results in an over 22% (95%CI: 1%-49%) increase in the odds of a complication when PM$_{2.5}$ exceeded 30 ug/m3 for any day in the 7-day preop window. This increase was noted in a curvilinear fashion, as presented in Figure 2. There was no apparent change in this relationship across seasons as we defined them for this region (fire, inversion, other), nor did the inclusion of neighborhood disadvantage alter the findings. The impact of PM$_{2.5}$ was of greater magnitude among patients with a higher Elixhauser comorbidity score, especially for those with Elixhauser of 3 or greater
compared to those with Elixhauser <1, as shown in Figure 3. Overall the parameters in
the model explained about 1/4\(^{th}\) of the variance (R\(^2\) = 0.28).

Discussion

Summary of Findings

In our single center cohort of over 60,000 patients undergoing elective surgery at an
academic medical center near the Wasatch front in Utah, we found that increased
exposure to PM\(_{2.5}\) in the 7-days prior to surgery was associated with significantly higher
risk of postoperative complications, confirming our primary hypothesis. The findings
were statistically highly significant, and the effect size is consistent with risk observed in
the air pollution epidemiology literature\(^53\), providing further confirmation of our findings.
There appeared to be a dose-response relationship, with over 20% increased risk of
complications at the highest PM\(_{2.5}\) concentrations compared to low concentrations, with
significant increase in risk above an apparent cut-off exposure of 35 ug/m\(^3\) (Table 3).
This association and the cutoff were consistent across all patient age groups, with those
with higher Elixhauser Co-morbidity status appearing to have greater susceptibility to
elevated PM\(_{2.5}\)(Figure 3). Age, sex, County, year of procedure, neighborhood
deviation (a measure of social distress) and season appeared to have minimal
fluence on the association. We found that the rate our complication bundle decreased
year over year, while the distribution of Elixhauser remained consistent, and the
exposure to air pollution remained comparable between years.
Implications for clinical practice, research and policy

To our knowledge, this is the first large-scale study demonstrating the acute impact of individual patient air pollution exposure on postsurgical inpatient outcomes (our complications bundle) in a large surgical patient cohort in an OECD country\textsuperscript{10,14}. The implications are threefold; our study should inform: (1) Policy, demonstrating a potentially novel and unaccounted for susceptible population (surgery patients), (2) Individual patient scheduling decisions for high-risk patients (elevated Elixhauser index) and targeted mitigation (masks, indoor air filters), and (3) Further research into the pathophysiological mechanisms of healing after surgery in human and animal studies.

Policy Implications

While air pollution in some regions of the U.S. have improved dramatically since the 1970s, improvements have often benefitted some groups over others. For instance, Black Americans are exposed to higher annual concentrations of air pollution containing fine particulate matter than their White counterparts\textsuperscript{54}. Minority populations often face greater pollution burdens and may also be more susceptible to their health effects due to their lack of access to health services and lower income and educational status, which reduces accessibility to pollution information and knowledge\textsuperscript{54} and other forms of prevention. This problem tracks globally as well. Today, air pollution is considered a leading causes of health complications and mortality worldwide, especially affecting lower-income groups, who tend to be more exposed and vulnerable\textsuperscript{55}. Consequently, the burdens presented in this research have policy implications for public health and contribute to the literature on health disparities across populations,
In addition, climate change is expected to increase the incidence of wildfire by 29% worldwide\textsuperscript{56}, which will further burden urban and developing regions disproportionately. While these regions are already facing a growing severity of pollution impacts, this research suggests that the interaction of surgery and pollution will also lead to increasing medical and health burdens. For instance, in China where approximately 10\% of GDP\textsuperscript{57} is spent on the health effects of pollution, a 1\% increase of PM\textsubscript{2.5} currently leads to a 2.942\% increase in household healthcare expenditure\textsuperscript{58} and these numbers are expected to grow over the next ten years. Subsequently, developing states, global megacities, and urban areas in Asia are already faced with tough and costly choices that may lead to further sacrifices in human health. Economically, the impact of air pollution on surgery outcomes will further contribute to decreases in labor productivity for the patient and the family, and, therefore, a lower tax base for these communities. In addition, poor surgical outcomes lead to inefficient use of hospital resources, increases the costs of insurance for all, and maybe lead to long term welfare costs, especially where loss of life is concerned. When combined with the disproportionate health disparities, the scale of costs are dramatic for all major population areas.

**Scheduling and Targeted Mitigation**

Targeted mitigation efforts around the perioperative period may reduce complications attributable to PM\textsubscript{2.5} exposure among susceptible patients. Surgical delay or protection from pollution during high-risk periods through use of indoor HEPA filtration systems...
could be considered for patients with planned procedures (if they work indoors or from home) during seasonal inversion events or wildfire smoke conditions. Huang et al’s study from China\(^1\), though it focused on mortality, found a beneficial economic impact from rescheduling elective surgery cases in at-risk populations, in their case especially surgical oncology patients, during high pollution events. This sophisticated econometric study indicates that similar scheduling mitigation may be cost-effective in other global contexts. The implications for elective and non-urgent major surgery, especially during wildfire events, merit further study with multidisciplinary teams.

Research implications and Future Directions

Our findings lead to several new research questions. Our ability to identify high risk populations through sub-group analyses was limited due to sample size, and extension of our study to more years and more sites should help elucidate questions regarding the most vulnerable surgical populations. Additional outcomes should be studied to corroborate our findings and refine the impact of air pollution, incorporating outcome measures such as length of stay, mortality, and additional long- and short-term outcomes. Ours and others future epidemiological studies should also guide and be balanced with animal models where more precise biochemical mechanisms can be uncovered. We are also concerned that social determinants of health might confound the association of small particle pollution with post-surgical outcomes and will study this association in subsequent investigations. Finally, while we did identify that the relationship with PM\(_{2.5}\) appeared to accelerate with higher concentrations of pollution,
formulating this exposure mathematically into a functional relationship will be a challenge for future research.

**Strength and Limitations**

This study has several strengths:

1. The natural experiment present in this case due to the natural geography of Utah creates a unique strength to this study in that the same population is exposed to low and high concentrations of pollution, with the main variable of exposure being the essentially random timing of surgery.

2. We examined a large cohort of nearly 100,000 patients over a 3-year contemporary period. We utilized precise PM$_{2.5}$ estimates at the small census tract level and investigated the effects across the full range of PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations. We tested different exposure windows and adjusted for clinical comorbidities.

3. Our outcome was a previously used and validated as a composite of serious complications encompassing major morbidity events. We specifically focused on major morbidity complications that are meaningful outcomes for quality improvement and risk mitigation efforts around elective surgery timing as well as patient optimization and that are plausibly related to IPAPE. We controlled for individual patient comorbidities with the validated and widely used Elixhauser comorbidity index.
Our study has some limitations:

1. Exposure: While our study leveraged a large sample size, we estimated IPAPE based on a wildfire exposure model based on census tract locations. This model does not account for proximity to highways, industrial sources, or other sources of PM\textsubscript{2.5} pollution that may be more chronic rather than episodic in nature. This model also used daily mean exposure estimates and lacked elevation in the model. Both factors could be biased in terms of missing peaks of exposure within 24-hour windows and at different elevations, which could lead to further bias in exposure estimates. Additionally, we evaluated PM\textsubscript{2.5} mass concentration and did not have data on particulate composition that may influence toxicity\textsuperscript{59}.

2. Mitigation and social determinants of health: We could also not control for in-home filtration or other personal mitigation measures, which may be less available to those of lower incomes, non-English Language speakers, and in more socially vulnerable neighborhoods. Our preliminary results indicate minimal influence from these factors, and is an aspect we plan to investigate with future research.

3. Population: Our cohort was predominantly white and treated at a single health system, although population-level variability in PM\textsubscript{2.5} exposure was leveraged. We did not account for patient reported or EHR recorded race and ethnicity, which may confound our results. Despite the Salt Lake City region’s reputation for homogeneity, the metropolitan area is close to the median diversity index for
mid-size US cities. As a result, the findings of this study could be generalized to similar metropolitan areas, both larger and smaller, though the region is dominated by white and Hispanic populations.

4. Analysis Type: As a retrospective analysis, unmeasured confounding is also a possibility, as is incorrect inferences due to the ecological fallacy, we discussed in detail elsewhere\(^{60}\), though the use of residential address mitigates this in part.

**Comparison with the literature and proposed mechanistic pathways**

Our findings among over 60,000 patients along Utah’s heavily polluted Wasatch Front build on limited prior data on air pollution and postoperative outcomes. In the China analysis, city-level PM\(_{2.5}\) during the week prior to surgery was associated with 1% higher adjusted 30-day mortality per 10 \(\mu g/m^3\) increase in PM\(_{2.5}\)\(^{11}\). Their mortality association was stronger at higher PM\(_{2.5}\) levels (>100 \(\mu g/m^3\)), similar to our findings. The few other studies that have examined adverse impacts of air pollution on perioperative outcomes have been limited in scope, methodologies and patient populations: A majority of these studies examined only organ transplants\(^{14}\), while a reasonable suspicion given their immunocompromised nature, they are a relatively small and high-risk patient populations thus limiting generalizability. Spencer-Hwang et al found that kidney transplants have an increased risk of fatal MI with increasing ozone, in a dose-dependent manner\(^{61}\), while studies of lung transplant recipients suggest that proximity to major roads can increase risk of chronic allograft dysfunction\(^{14}\). Recent data from California also suggests pediatric patients are susceptible to adverse pulmonary
events under anesthesia during wildfire events, especially those with reactive airway disease$^{13}$.

The 7-day PM$_{2.5}$ exposure timeframe corresponds to the period when detrimental effects of pollution on inflammatory, thrombotic, and immune pathways implicated in surgical complications may become manifest$^{62}$. For example, PM$_{2.5}$ instigates systemic inflammation through release of IL-1, IL-6, and CRP as well as reactive oxygen species$^{63,64}$. Resultant endothelial dysfunction promotes a prothrombotic state over 7-14 days$^{65}$. Surgical trauma induces a similar acute phase response and immunomodulation$^{27,28,66}$, which combined with the biological impact from recent pollution exposure could synergistically heighten complication risk.

Taken as a whole, the literature is suggestive of adverse impacts from air pollution, and most notably fine particulate matter, on outcomes after surgery, though major gaps exist on which pollution source may be most harmful, which patient population may be most affected, and there is a need for better understanding of the pathophysiology of the mechanisms. We furthermore need to define interactions between specific pollutants, social determinants of health, and specific surgical disease processes, as well as which timing of exposure may be most detrimental. Further studies should explore possible mitigation efforts, either pre-operatively or post-operatively, for example the offering of patient bedroom air filters or patient masks preoperatively, or the rescheduling of elective high-risk patients during extreme exposure events, like wildfires.
Conclusions

In our single center cohort study, we found that elevated individual patient exposure to small particles in the week prior to surgery was associated with significantly increased postoperative complications. We demonstrated a dose-response relationship in all age groups and regardless of patient co-morbidity (as measured by the Elixhauser index) in a large cohort at an academic medical center in Utah. This clearly demonstrates a statistically significant impact of air pollution exposure on surgical outcomes, with an effect size consistent with the broader pollution literature\textsuperscript{53}.

We need to further define individual patient risk related to particulate matter pollution, the interaction with other pollutants and with social determinants of health. Our results cover a wide swath of surgical specialties and thus have implications for much of elective surgery performed in areas suffering from periodic acute pollution episodes, such as inversion events and much more commonly with climate change, wildfire smoke. At-risk patients may benefit from pollution mitigation and close monitoring in the postoperative period after procedures preceded by heavy pollution exposure. Overall, our findings highlight that limiting particulate matter exposure through clean air policies and practices can have wide-ranging health benefits beyond just cardiopulmonary disease, including reducing complications of surgery.
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Figures

Figure 1: Consort Flow Diagram: This figure details our initial cohort downloaded from Data Direct from MPOG.org and the process of exclusion criteria applied to generate our final cohort. Of note, the greatest number of patients eliminated was when excluding those who lived outside of the Wasatch Front study area.

```
Cases Filtered Using Data Direct (e.g. 2016-2018, Adults, Procedure Type, etc.) (n = 96302)

→ Invalid Addresses (n = 3522)

→ Geocoded to Valid Addresses (n = 92680)

→ Outside Wasatch Front (n = 26405)

→ Wasatch Front (n = 66195)

→ University of Colorado PM2.5 Estimates by Tract (n = 65564)

→ No UoC PM2.5 Available (n = 631)

→ Negative PM2.5 (n = 72)

→ Positive PM2.5 (n = 85432)

→ No Elixhauser Comorbidity Scores (n = 0)

→ Elixhauser Comorbidity Scores (n = 85492)

→ No NaNDA Data (n = 5)

→ NaNDA Social Determinants of Health (n = 85487)

→ Final Data Set (n = 85487)
```
Figure 2: Maximum PM2.5 in the 7 days pre-operatively (Lag0-Lag6) vs. Complication Rate. Complication rate is shown as absolute value, so here 0.04 = 4% complication rate. The PM2.5 values are the maximum observed in the 7-day preop window, in ug/m3, Lag 0 is day of surgery.
Figure 3: Complications vs. Maximum PM2.5 In the 7-day preoperative exposure window. PM2.5 is again presented in ug/m3. As noted, the overall complication rate for those with higher Elixhauser comorbidity index is higher at baseline, but rose more quickly with elevations in PM2.5. This response to PM2.5 continued to increase in magnitude as Elixhauser index increased.
# Tables

## Table 1: Cohort Characteristics by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>p-test</th>
<th>SMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>64313</td>
<td>19995 (31.1)</td>
<td>22368 (34.8)</td>
<td>21950 (34.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complications (%)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>61547 (95.7)</td>
<td>19089 (95.5)</td>
<td>21371 (95.5)</td>
<td>21087 (96.1)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2766 (4.3)</td>
<td>906 (4.5)</td>
<td>997 (4.5)</td>
<td>863 (3.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elix (mean (SD))</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97 (1.80)</td>
<td>0.94 (1.69)</td>
<td>0.99 (1.89)</td>
<td>0.99 (1.82)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (%)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28760 (44.7)</td>
<td>9031 (45.2)</td>
<td>9942 (44.4)</td>
<td>9787 (44.6)</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35553 (55.3)</td>
<td>10964 (54.8)</td>
<td>12426 (55.6)</td>
<td>12163 (55.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season (%)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>21626 (33.6)</td>
<td>6210 (31.1)</td>
<td>7591 (33.9)</td>
<td>7825 (35.6)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>21677 (33.7)</td>
<td>7258 (36.3)</td>
<td>7258 (32.4)</td>
<td>7161 (32.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>21010 (32.7)</td>
<td>6527 (32.6)</td>
<td>7519 (33.6)</td>
<td>6964 (31.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantage (mean (SD))</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean (SD))</td>
<td>51.58 (17.82)</td>
<td>51.38 (17.80)</td>
<td>51.90 (17.80)</td>
<td>51.43 (17.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CountyName (%)</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>889 (1.4)</td>
<td>257 (1.3)</td>
<td>308 (1.4)</td>
<td>324 (1.5)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>1572 (2.4)</td>
<td>439 (2.2)</td>
<td>533 (2.4)</td>
<td>600 (2.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>9818 (15.3)</td>
<td>3073 (15.4)</td>
<td>3480 (15.6)</td>
<td>3265 (14.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>42881 (66.7)</td>
<td>13433 (67.2)</td>
<td>14861 (66.4)</td>
<td>14587 (66.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Cohort characteristics dichotomized by presence of a complication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>p-test</th>
<th>SMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>64313</td>
<td>61547</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complications = Yes (%)</td>
<td>2766 (4.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2766 (100.0)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProcedureYear Factor (%)</td>
<td>2016 19995 (31.1)</td>
<td>19089 (31.0)</td>
<td>906 (32.8)</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017 22368 (34.8)</td>
<td>21371 (34.7)</td>
<td>997 (36.0)</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018 21950 (34.1)</td>
<td>21087 (34.3)</td>
<td>863 (31.2)</td>
<td>3.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elix (mean (SD))</td>
<td>0.97 (1.80)</td>
<td>0.79 (1.43)</td>
<td>5.01 (3.66)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>1.521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex = Female (%)</td>
<td>35553 (55.3)</td>
<td>34281 (55.7)</td>
<td>1272 (46.0)</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season (%)</td>
<td>None 21626 (33.6)</td>
<td>20708 (33.6)</td>
<td>918 (33.2)</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire 21677 (33.7)</td>
<td>20745 (33.7)</td>
<td>932 (33.7)</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cars 21010 (32.7)</td>
<td>20094 (32.6)</td>
<td>916 (33.1)</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantage1317 (mean (SD))</td>
<td>0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.04)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean (SD))</td>
<td>51.58 (17.82)</td>
<td>51.41 (17.85)</td>
<td>55.26 (16.75)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CountyName (%)</td>
<td>Box Elder 889 (1.4)</td>
<td>833 (1.4)</td>
<td>56 (2.0)</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cache 1572 (2.4)</td>
<td>1508 (2.5)</td>
<td>64 (2.3)</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davis 9818 (15.3)</td>
<td>9448 (15.4)</td>
<td>370 (13.4)</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake 42881 (66.7)</td>
<td>41022 (66.7)</td>
<td>1859 (67.2)</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah 5486 (8.5)</td>
<td>5218 (8.5)</td>
<td>268 (9.7)</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weber 3667 (5.7)</td>
<td>3518 (5.7)</td>
<td>149 (5.4)</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Cohort characteristics dichotomized by whether or not exposed to maximum of 35ug/m³ in pre-operative period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Max PM2.5 &gt; 35</th>
<th>Max PM2.5 &lt;35</th>
<th>SMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>64313</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>62852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complications (%)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>61547 (95.7)</td>
<td>1371 (93.8)</td>
<td>60176 (95.7)</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2766 (4.3)</td>
<td>90 (6.2)</td>
<td>2676 (4.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProcedureYear Factor (%)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>19995 (31.1)</td>
<td>354 (24.2)</td>
<td>19641 (31.2)</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>22368 (34.8)</td>
<td>678 (46.4)</td>
<td>21690 (34.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>21950 (34.1)</td>
<td>429 (29.4)</td>
<td>21521 (34.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elix (mean (SD))</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97 (1.80)</td>
<td>1.08 (1.87)</td>
<td>0.97 (1.80)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (%)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28760 (44.7)</td>
<td>674 (46.1)</td>
<td>28086 (44.7)</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35553 (55.3)</td>
<td>787 (53.9)</td>
<td>34766 (55.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season (%)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>21626 (33.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>21626 (34.4)</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>21677 (33.7)</td>
<td>741 (50.7)</td>
<td>20936 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>21010 (32.7)</td>
<td>720 (49.3)</td>
<td>20290 (32.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantage (mean (SD))</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean (SD))</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.58 (17.82)</td>
<td>50.70 (17.79)</td>
<td>51.60 (17.82)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CountyName (%)</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>889 (1.4)</td>
<td>21 (1.4)</td>
<td>868 (1.4)</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>1572 (2.4)</td>
<td>46 (3.1)</td>
<td>1526 (2.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>9818 (15.3)</td>
<td>240 (16.4)</td>
<td>9578 (15.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>42881 (66.7)</td>
<td>957 (65.5)</td>
<td>41924 (66.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>5486 (8.5)</td>
<td>119 (8.1)</td>
<td>5367 (8.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>3667 (5.7)</td>
<td>78 (5.3)</td>
<td>3589 (5.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>