

1 **The Mediating Role of Sleep in the Association Between Environmental Noise and Mental**

2 **Health**

3 Kaya Grocott¹ MSc, Adelle Mansour¹ MPH, Rebecca Bentley¹ PhD, Kate E. Mason¹ PhD

4 ¹Centre for Health Policy, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of

5 Melbourne

6

7 Word count: 3145 Pages: 24 Tables: 3 Figures: 1

8 All authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest or financial disclosures.

9

10

11 **ABSTRACT**

12 Exposure to environmental noise in residential areas has been associated with adverse mental
13 health outcomes; however, the mechanisms of this relationship remain underexplored. This study
14 investigates the contribution of reduced sleep quality to the negative association between
15 perceived neighbourhood environmental noise exposure and poor mental health. We used the
16 Household Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey and applied causal
17 mediation methods to examine the role of sleep in the association between self-reported exposure
18 to road traffic noise and plane, train and industry (PTI) noise and mental wellbeing at three time
19 points between 2012 and 2021. Road traffic noise was associated with poorer mental health in
20 2012-13 and 2016-17, while no evidence of an association was observed in 2020-2021 (the
21 period of COVID-related lockdowns in Australia). For the years where a significant association
22 was observed, mediation analyses suggest that reduced sleep quality accounts for 21% (in 2012-
23 13; 95% CI: 7–35%) and 33% (in 2016-17; 95% CI: 26–64%) of the total effect of perceived
24 traffic noise on mental health. Perceived PTI noise was associated with poorer mental health in
25 2016-2017 and 2020-2021, with mediation through sleep observed in 2016-2017 (proportion
26 mediated 20% (95% CI:3–38%)). Mediation by sleep quality was stronger among people
27 reporting exposure to multiple noise sources than among people reporting exposure to a single
28 noise source. As much as a third of the association between road traffic noise and poor mental
29 wellbeing may be due to poorer sleep quality following exposure to unwanted noise.

30 INTRODUCTION

31 Environmental noise, defined as unwanted or disruptive outdoor sound caused by human
32 activities, can adversely affect the health and wellbeing of individuals and is becoming
33 increasingly pervasive due to growing urbanisation[1,2]. Previous studies estimate that in western
34 Europe environmental noise accounts for the loss of 1.0-1.6 million disability-adjusted life years
35 (DALYs) annually, primarily due to its effects on health and wellbeing, including childhood
36 cognitive impairment, sleep disturbance, tinnitus and noise-annoyance[3]. Environmental noise
37 stems from several sources, ranging from transport (road, rail, air) and industry to recreation and
38 domestic activities[3]. With an expanding proportion of the global population living in urban
39 areas, understanding the health impact of environmental noise exposure in residential areas is
40 important[4].

41
42 Some research suggests chronic exposure to environmental noise is also associated with
43 increased stress, anxiety and depressive symptoms, although the quality of the currently available
44 evidence is generally low and results are heterogeneous [5,6]. Most studies rely on cross-
45 sectional data, and limited attention has been given to understanding the mediating factors that
46 would explain these associations. The most thoroughly studied mediator of the relationship
47 between noise and mental health is noise annoyance[7–11]. Among lesser understood candidate
48 mediators is sleep, which plays a crucial role in maintaining both physical and mental
49 wellbeing[12]. Improved sleep quality is known to contribute to good mental health[13], yet
50 night-time environmental noise can adversely impact sleep[14]. It can affect individual's sleep
51 quality, causing them to awaken or preventing them from falling asleep entirely[14]. Therefore, it
52 is highly plausible that adverse mental health effects associated with exposure to noise in the
53 neighbourhood environments surrounding people's homes are mediated by reduced sleep quality.

54 The small number of studies investigating sleep as a mediator of the relationship between noise
55 pollution and mental health are narrowly focussed, concentrating either on university student
56 populations[8–10] or a specific noise source (wind turbines[7]), and therefore may not be
57 generalisable to the wider population.

58
59 This study uses nationally representative panel data from a large sample of Australian households
60 to explore whether sleep mediates the association between environmental noise exposure and
61 mental health among the community-dwelling population aged 15 and above. Examining this
62 issue in the Australian context is important since the urban population accounts for approximately
63 70% of the total population[15], and the nation trails behind other regions with regard to
64 understanding the impact that exposure to environmental noise has on the community[16]. The
65 panel structure of the data used allows us to establish appropriate temporal ordering of the
66 exposure, potential mediators and the outcome.

67
68 We focus on perceived noise from road traffic and plane, train, and industry (PTI) noise: sources
69 that make up much of the environmental noise in residential areas[17]. Prior studies have shown
70 that perceived noise is associated with psychological stress and other mental health
71 outcomes[18,19]. While objective noise measurement is critical for evaluating the relationship
72 between environmental noise exposure and health[20], subjective experiences of noise are also
73 important. Subjective experiences of sound differ among individuals – the same sound may be
74 deemed as noise by some and not by others[21]. In the context of mental health effects in
75 particular, therefore, considering measures of perceived noise can contribute to a more nuanced
76 understanding of the impacts of noise in the residential environment.

77

78 By exploring the role of sleep as a potential mediator, we aim to improve current understanding
79 of the pathways through which transport and industry noise in the residential environment
80 impacts mental wellbeing, thereby contributing to the development of interventions and policies
81 to reduce environmental noise exposure and, ultimately, promote healthier communities.

82

83 **METHODS**

84 **Study Population**

85 This study used the Household Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey, a
86 longitudinal study running since 2001. HILDA follows Australians over the course of their lives
87 and collects data on households, family and relationships, financial wellbeing, participation in
88 work and education and health. It has previously been used to explore the relationship between
89 environmental noise and mental wellbeing[19]. The sampling unit is the household, whose
90 members are followed up annually. Using a multistage clustered, stratified design HILDA
91 commenced with a nationally representative sample of 7,682 Australian households and 13,969
92 people and has gradually expanded to include new members of original households, new
93 households formed by original participants, and a top-up sample in wave 11. The 2021 sample
94 (wave 21) consisted of 9,358 households with survey responses from 16,549 people[22]. The
95 HILDA dataset is deidentified and publicly available to approved researchers through the
96 Australian Government Department of Social Services
97 (<https://dataverse.ada.edu.au/dataverse/DSSLongitudinalStudies>). As such this study was exempt
98 from institutional review board approval.

99

100 **Measures**

101 *Mental health outcome:* Mental health was measured annually in HILDA using the mental health
102 component summary score of the validated Short Form 36 (SF-36) survey[23]. The SF-36 survey
103 is a self-rated health survey providing a comprehensive assessment that distinguishes between
104 mental and physical health[23]. The mental health summary score ranges from 0-100 with higher
105 scores indicative of better mental health.

106
107 *Noise exposure:* The HILDA survey asks participants biennially about the frequency of noise in
108 their neighbourhood: specifically, plane, train and industry (PTI) noise and road traffic noise.
109 Responses were recorded as 1 (never happens), 2 (very rare), 3 (not common), 4 (fairly common)
110 and 5 (very common). For analysis, we dichotomised noise exposure such that 1 indicated
111 fairly/very common noise exposure and 0 represented less frequent noise. We analysed road
112 traffic and PTI noise both separately and in combination. For the latter, we derived an additional
113 exposure variable to indicate whether each participant was exposed fairly/very commonly to 0
114 (no noise), 1 (road traffic noise only), 2 (PTI noise only) or 3 (both).

115
116 *Sleep quality:* Sleep quality has been measured in HILDA every four years since 2013.
117 Participants rate their sleep over the last 30 days on a scale from 1 (very good) to 4 (very bad).
118 This variable was dichotomised for analysis, with 1 indicating fairly/very bad sleep quality and 0
119 indicating fairly/very good sleep.

120
121 *Covariates:* We controlled for a range of demographic, socioeconomic, health and housing
122 covariates; specifically, sex, baseline mental health, labour force status, shiftwork status,
123 household income, education, alcohol consumption, several major life events, area disadvantage

124 and whether residing in a major city. The relative timing of the measurement used for each
125 covariate was determined by whether it was considered a potential mediator of the exposure-
126 outcome, exposure-mediator, and/or mediator-outcome association. See Appendix 1 for covariate
127 details.

128

129 **Statistical Analysis**

130 Data were analysed in Stata/SE 18.0 for three 1-year follow up periods: 2012-13, 2016-17 and
131 2020-21. Analyses were repeated for each period, with noise and baseline covariates measured in
132 the first year and sleep and mental health measured the following year. Binary life event
133 indicators were based on events reported in the second year, to capture events that occurred after
134 the measurement of noise and in the year leading up to the measurement of sleep and mental
135 health, to ensure appropriate temporal sequencing as these were considered potential confounders
136 only of the mediator-outcome association. The analytic samples were restricted to individuals
137 who did not experience a residential move during follow up, to minimise the chance of a
138 substantial change in noise exposure before sleep and mental health were measured. Complete
139 case analyses were performed.

140

141 Figure 1 depicts the relationships we investigated in our analyses. For each exposure (road traffic,
142 PTI and combined noise), we first estimated its association with mental health (using multiple
143 linear regression) and, separately, sleep quality (using multiple logistic regression), after
144 adjusting for potential confounders. We also used estimated associations between sleep quality
145 and mental health. We then used the ‘mediate’ package in Stata 18 to estimate total, direct and
146 natural indirect effects of noise exposure on mental health, and proportion mediated, with sleep
147 quality as the potential mediator. This approach is based on the potential-outcomes framework

148 that considers observed outcomes in relation to a counterfactual scenario of no exposure. Causal
149 mediation is more robust than traditional mediation methods such as the difference method
150 because it relies on fewer assumptions; in particular causal mediation allows for potential
151 exposure-mediator interactions and non-linear relationships rather than assuming these are not
152 present [24,25]. . As the presence of an exposure-mediator interaction was unknown from prior
153 research, we also tested for these to assess whether our decision to use a model that relaxes this
154 assumption was important for this relationship.

155

156 **Sensitivity analyses**

157 To examine the sensitivity of our results to the way noise exposure was defined, we repeated the
158 analysis redefining the exposed category to only those individuals exposed to noise “very
159 commonly”. This also allowed us to examine whether sleep quality is a stronger mediator in
160 individuals exposed to more frequent noise.

161

162 **RESULTS**

163

164 **Summary statistics**

165

166 Table 1 describes the sample of respondents for each follow-up period (2012-2013, 2016-2017
167 and 2020-2021) with sample sizes of 10,605, 11,536 and 10,991 respectively. The proportion of
168 participants reporting good sleep quality decreased slightly from 75.7% in 2013 to 71.7% in 2021.
169 Noise exposure for both road traffic noise and PTI noise remained relatively stable across the
170 three time periods, with an average of 26.8% of individuals reporting fairly/very common
171 exposure to road traffic noise and 22% reporting fairly/very common exposure to PTI noise.

172

173 **Associations between noise, sleep and mental health**

174 Frequent exposure to both road traffic and PTI noise were consistently associated with poorer
175 mental health, although the magnitude of the association varied between years (Appendix Table
176 2). Road traffic noise was more strongly associated with mental health than was PTI noise in
177 2012-2013 (road traffic: $\beta = -1.17$; 95% CI: -1.72, -0.63; PTI noise $\beta = -0.22$; 95% CI: -0.80,
178 0.35), while the effect of PTI noise on mental health appeared greater in 2016-2017 (road traffic:
179 $\beta = -0.70$; 95% CI: -1.23, -0.16; PTI noise $\beta = -0.82$; 95% CI: -1.39, -0.26) and 2020-2021 (road
180 traffic: $\beta = -0.32$; 95% CI: -0.86, 0.22; PTI noise $\beta = -0.48$; 95% CI: -1.06, 0.09). Road traffic
181 noise was associated with increased odds of poor sleep in 2012-2013 (OR = 1.21; 95% CI: 1.10,
182 1.35) and 2016-2017 (OR = 1.18; 95% CI: 1.07, 1.30) (Appendix Table 3). PTI noise was
183 associated with increased odds of poor sleep quality in 2016-2017 only (OR = 1.19; 95% CI: 1.07,
184 1.31). There was no evidence to support an association between any source of noise exposure and
185 sleep quality in 2020-21. A strong negative association between sleep quality and mental health
186 was observed for all years (2012-13: $\beta = -6.11$; 95% CI: -6.67, -5.55; 2016-17: $\beta = -6.27$; 95%
187 CI: -6.79, -5.74; 2020-21: $\beta = -5.80$; -6.34, -5.26) (Appendix Table 4).

188

189 **Mediation analysis**

190 Causal mediation analysis showed a strong negative indirect effect of road traffic noise on mental
191 health through sleep quality (Table 2) in both 2012-13 (natural indirect effect (NIE) = -0.22; 95%
192 CI: -0.34, -0.09) and 2016-17 (NIE = -0.21; 95% CI: -0.34, -0.-0.08). The proportions mediated
193 were estimated to be 21% (7%, 35%) and 33% (26%, 64%) respectively. In 2020-2021 there was
194 little to no evidence of an association between road traffic noise exposure and mental health and

195 therefore sleep could not act as a mediator, though the estimated effect sizes for the total and
196 indirect effect were consistently negative.

197
198 The indirect effect of PTI noise on mental health was less consistent across the years, however all
199 years had a negative indirect effect estimate (Table 2). The strongest indirect effect was observed
200 in 2016-17 (NIE = -0.17; 95% CI: -0.27, -0.06), accounting for 20% (3%, 38%) of the total effect.
201 No association between PTI noise and mental health was observed in 2012-2013 or 2020-2021.

202
203 When combined exposure to both PTI noise and road traffic noise was compared to exposure to
204 only one source of noise, the indirect effect of noise on mental health via sleep quality was larger
205 in those exposed to multiple noise sources than either source individually, in both 2012-13 and
206 2016-17 (Table 3). Consistent with results when noise sources were analysed separately, no total
207 or mediated effects were observed in 2020-21 for combined or lone source noise exposure.

208
209 There was only minimal evidence of exposure-mediator interaction (Appendix 4), any effect of
210 which will have been accounted for by using a causal mediation modelling approach.

211
212 **Sensitivity Analyses**
213 In the sensitivity analysis, when the exposed category was limited to those exposed very
214 commonly to noise, results for both road traffic noise and PTI noise were broadly consistent with
215 the primary analysis (Appendix Table 5).

216
217 **DISCUSSION**

218

219 Our study provides evidence that perceived road traffic noise exposure in the neighbourhood
220 adversely impacts mental health, with sleep quality appearing to mediate the association in both
221 2012-13 and 2016-17. In contrast, in 2020-21 evidence for any association between road traffic
222 noise exposure and mental health was limited, despite perceived road traffic noise levels
223 remaining stable. With much of Australia subject to COVID-19 lockdowns during 2020-21, it
224 may be that our findings for that period were influenced by a combination of increased time at
225 home, changes in objective levels of noise from various sources, working/schooling from home,
226 and competing influences on mental health at that time.

227
228 The association between mental health and self-reported noise from planes, trains and industry
229 (as opposed to road traffic) was inconsistent across years and across our various sensitivity
230 analyses, leading us to conclude that any mental health effect of PTI noise is likely to be weaker
231 than the effect of road traffic noise. However, results of our mediation analysis when PTI was
232 associated with mental health (in 2016-17 only) show evidence of an indirect pathway through
233 sleep, suggesting that if PTI noise does influence mental health, the relationship may be
234 mediated by sleep. When considering perceived exposure to multiple noise sources compared to
235 exposure to a single source of noise, multiple exposures also had larger sleep-mediated effects on
236 mental health.

237
238 Our findings are consistent with numerous previous studies reporting a negative association
239 between both perceived and actual traffic noise exposure in the neighbourhood and mental
240 health[19,26–29] and align with prior research concluding that mental health was less impacted
241 by PTI noise than road traffic noise[27]. Studies have shown that at the same levels of noise
242 railway noise is commonly perceived as less annoying than noise from road or air traffic however

243 frequency of trains, building and vibration factors may influence this relationship [14,30]. One
244 previous study showed that sleep is only a mediator when an individual also experiences some
245 level of noise annoyance[26]; it is plausible that this lower level of annoyance may be sufficient
246 to reduce the mental health impact of PTI noise[8]. Our results are also consistent with the
247 findings from research using objectively measured noise in showing cumulative effects of
248 multiple noise sources on mental health[27].

249
250 We are aware of four studies that have previously investigated the mediating role of sleep with
251 respect to noise and mental health[7–10]. However, these have been limited in their scope and
252 varied in results. Three of these studies were conducted in university students and, like the
253 current study, found sleep to be a mediator of the association between noise and mental health,
254 though one found this was only the case in individuals reporting noise annoyance. The remaining
255 study[7] conversely found no mediating effect of sleep, however it was limited to noise exposure
256 from wind turbines. Building on this limited existing evidence base, our study's strengths lie in
257 its longitudinal study design and large sample size allowing for a comprehensive exploration of
258 the mediating role of sleep in the noise-mental health relationship in the general adult population.
259 Repeating our analysis over three separate time periods introduced replication, enhancing the
260 credibility of the findings.

261
262 The study nonetheless has some limitations. First, in using self-reported measures of noise
263 exposure we are limited to perceptions of noise rather than objectively measured exposure, and
264 risk introducing bias due to measurement error. However, a previous study using the same dataset
265 employed an area-level aggregate measure of perceived environmental noise to reduce bias from
266 individual-level measurement error and found that associations with mental health were of a

267 similar magnitude to when using the individual measure [19]. Second, the study's exclusive focus
268 on transport and industry noise within the neighbourhood environment omitted noise from
269 neighbours and elsewhere within the neighbourhood as well as possible occupational and
270 commuting noise exposure. Third, we were also not able to consider the amount of time spent at
271 home, and thereby assume all individuals are equally exposed to the noise in their home
272 environment, when in truth differential exposure is likely and may have led us to underestimate
273 importantly larger effects in some groups of people. Relatedly, the source data also did not allow
274 us to consider the timing of noise exposures during the day/night, which may be vital in
275 understanding the impact of noise on sleep. Fourth, we relied on a single item self-reported
276 measure of sleep, as more comprehensive sleep measurement was not available. Future research
277 is needed using more robust measurement of sleep (e.g. validated sleep questionnaires and
278 actigraphy) as part of this relationship. Finally, our models did not include noise sensitivity. As
279 noise sensitivity could lead to increased reporting of environmental noise exposure and can be
280 increased by poor mental health, this omission introduces the possibility of reverse
281 causation[12,31].

282 Overall, our findings suggest that strategies aimed at improving sleep quality, especially in areas
283 impacted by high levels of environmental noise from multiple sources, have the potential to
284 improve population mental health. This could extend to the design of homes, and particularly
285 bedrooms, in aiming to protect against sleep disturbance caused by noise. Upstream interventions
286 aimed at reducing environmental noise in residential areas should consider the differential impact
287 of noise from various sources. Road traffic noise appears more harmful than PTI noise though
288 areas with high levels of both types of noise may place residents at the highest risk.

289
290 Future research should explore the role of sleep quality as a mediator in the context of different
291 noise sources and using validated measures of perceived and objectively measured noise and
292 sleep. Additionally, further consideration should be given to potential effect modification by co-
293 occurring exposures such as air and light pollution, and housing conditions and design features
294 (e.g. insulation, layout), which are likely to moderate or compound effects of noise on sleep and
295 mental health.

296

297 **Conclusions**

298 This study provides evidence to support the role of sleep quality in explaining the association
299 between noise exposure in the neighbourhood and mental health. We found that sleep quality
300 accounts for one-fifth to one-third of the estimated total effect of noise on mental health among
301 Australian adults. At present this is the only study to examine the mediating effects of sleep on
302 the mental health impact of environmental noise using national, longitudinal data. Further
303 longitudinal studies that make use of validated measures are warranted. Interventions that target
304 the layouts of neighbourhoods, transport management, and the design and construction of homes
305 to reduce the impact of noise exposures on sleep quality have the potential to improve
306 population-level health and wellbeing.

307 **References**

- 308 1. Moudon AV. Real noise from the urban environment: how ambient community noise affects
309 health and what can be done about it. *Am J Prev Med.* 2009;37:167–71.
- 310 2. Directive 2002/49/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 June 2002 relating
311 to the assessment and management of environmental noise [Internet]. [cited 2024 May 5].
312 Available from: [https://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/27d1a64e-08f0-4665-a258-](https://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/27d1a64e-08f0-4665-a258-96f16c7af072.0004.01/DOC_1)
313 [96f16c7af072.0004.01/DOC_1](https://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/27d1a64e-08f0-4665-a258-96f16c7af072.0004.01/DOC_1)
- 314 3. World Health Organisation Regional Office for Europe. Burden of Disease from
315 Environmental Noise: quantification of healthy life years lost in Europe [Internet]. World Health
316 Organisation; 2011. Available from: <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/326424>
- 317 4. United Nations. World Urbanization Prospects: The 2018 Revision [Internet]. 2018. Available
318 from: [https://population.un.org/Wup/Publications/Files/WUP2018-](https://population.un.org/Wup/Publications/Files/WUP2018-KeyFacts.pdf#:~:text=Globally%2C%20more%20people%20live%20in%20urban%20areas%20than,the%20world%E2%80%99s%20population%20is%20projected%20to%20be%20urban.)
319 [KeyFacts.pdf#:~:text=Globally%2C%20more%20people%20live%20in%20urban%20areas%20t](https://population.un.org/Wup/Publications/Files/WUP2018-KeyFacts.pdf#:~:text=Globally%2C%20more%20people%20live%20in%20urban%20areas%20than,the%20world%E2%80%99s%20population%20is%20projected%20to%20be%20urban.)
320 [han,the%20world%E2%80%99s%20population%20is%20projected%20to%20be%20urban.](https://population.un.org/Wup/Publications/Files/WUP2018-KeyFacts.pdf#:~:text=Globally%2C%20more%20people%20live%20in%20urban%20areas%20than,the%20world%E2%80%99s%20population%20is%20projected%20to%20be%20urban.)
- 321 5. Dzhambov AM, Lercher P. Road Traffic Noise Exposure and Depression/Anxiety: An Updated
322 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and*
323 *Public Health.* 2019;16:4134.
- 324 6. Lan Y, Roberts H, Kwan M-P, Helbich M. Transportation noise exposure and anxiety: A
325 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environmental Research.* 2020;191:110118.
- 326 7. Bakker RH, Pedersen E, Berg GP, Stewart RE, Lok W, Bouma J. Impact of Wind Turbine
327 Noise on Annoyance, elf-Reported Sleep Disturbance and Psychological Stress. *Science of the*
328 *Total Environment.* 2012;425:42–51.
- 329 8. Dzhambov AM, Markevych I, Tilov B, Arabadzhiev Z, Stoyanov D, Gatseva P, et al. Pathways
330 Linking Residential Noise and Air Pollution to Mental Ill-Health in Young Adults. *Environmental*
331 *Research.* 2018;166:458–65.
- 332 9. Peltz JS. The Day-to-Day Impact of Nighttime Noise Disturbances on College Students’
333 Psychological Functioning. *Journal of American College Health.* 2020;70:2061–9.
- 334 10. Peltz JS, Rogge RD. The Indirect Effects of Sleep Hygiene and Environmental Factors on
335 Depressive Symptoms in College Students. *Sleep Health.* 2016;2:159–66.
- 336 11. Gong X, Fenech B, Blackmore C, Chen Y, Rodgers G, Gulliver J, et al. Association Between
337 Noise Annoyance and Mental Health Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
338 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.* 2022;19.
- 339 12. Milojevich HM, Lukowski AF. Sleep and Mental Health in Undergraduate Students with
340 Generally Healthy Sleep Habits. *PLOS ONE.* 2016;11.

- 341 13. Scott AJ, Webb TL, Martyn-St James M, Rowse G, Weich S. Improving sleep quality leads to
342 better mental health: A meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Sleep Medicine Reviews*.
343 2021;60:101556.
- 344 14. Miedema HME. Annoyance Caused by Environmental Noise: Elements for Evidence-Based
345 Noise Policies. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2007;63:41–57.
- 346 15. Rural and remote health [Internet]. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. 2023 [cited
347 2024 Apr 7]. Available from: [https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/rural-remote-australians/rural-and-](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/rural-remote-australians/rural-and-remote-health)
348 [remote-health](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/rural-remote-australians/rural-and-remote-health)
- 349 16. Shannon J. The health effects of environmental noise.
- 350 17. Hume K, Brink M, Basner M. Effects of environmental noise on sleep. *NOISE & HEALTH*.
351 2012;14:297–302.
- 352 18. Kou L, Tao Y, Kwan M-P, Chai Y. Understanding the relationships among individual-based
353 momentary measured noise, perceived noise, and psychological stress: A geographic ecological
354 momentary assessment (GEMA) approach. *Health Place*. 2020;64:102285.
- 355 19. Li A, Martino A, Mansour A, Bentley R. Environmental Noise Exposure and Mental Health:
356 Evidence from a Population-Based Longitudinal Study. *American Journal of Preventative*
357 *Medicine*. 2022;6:39–48.
- 358 20. Brown A, Kamp I. WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A
359 Systematic Review of Transport Noise Interventions and Their Impacts on Health. *International*
360 *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2017;14.
- 361 21. Westman JC, Walters JR. Noise and stress: a comprehensive approach. *Environ Health*
362 *Perspect*. 1981;41:291–309.
- 363 22. Summerfield M, Garrard B, Nesa MK, Kamath R, Macalalad N, Watson N, et al. HILDA
364 User Manual – Release 21 [Internet]. Melbourne Institute: Applied Economic and Social
365 Research, University of Melbourne; 2021. Available from:
366 [https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/4384386/HILDA-User-](https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/4384386/HILDA-User-Manual-Release-21.0.pdf)
367 [Manual-Release-21.0.pdf](https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/4384386/HILDA-User-Manual-Release-21.0.pdf)
- 368 23. Keller SD, Ware JE, Bentler PM, Aaronson NK, Alonso J, Apolone G. Use of structural
369 equation modelling to test the construct validity of the SF-36 Health Survey in ten countries.
370 *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 1998;51:1179–88.
- 371 24. VanderWeele TJ. Mediation Analysis: A Practitioner’s Guide. *Annual Review of Public*
372 *Health*. 2016;37:17–32.
- 373 25. Imai K, Keele L, Tingley D. A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychological*
374 *Methods*. 2010;15:309–34.

- 375 26. World Health Organisation. Noise [Internet]. World Health Organisation. 2010 [cited 2023 Jul
376 21]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/europe/news-room/fact-sheets/item/noise>
- 377 27. Eze IC, Foraster M, Schaffner E, Vienneau D, Pieren R, Imboden M, et al. Incidence of
378 Depression in Relation to Transportation Noise Exposure and Noise Annoyance in the SPALDIA
379 Study. *Environment International*. 2020;144.
- 380 28. Ma J, Li C, Kwan M-P, Chai Y. A Multilevel Analysis of Perceived Noise Pollution,
381 Geographic Contexts and Mental Health in Beijing. *International Journal of Environmental
382 Research and Public Health* [Internet. 2018;
- 383 29. Gomm S, Bernauer T. Are Actual and Perceived Environmental Conditions Associated with
384 Variation in Mental Health? *Environmental Research*. 2023;
- 385 30. Gidlöf-Gunnarsson A, Ögren M, Jerson T, Öhrström E. Railway noise annoyance and the
386 importance of number of trains, ground vibration, and building situational factors. *Noise and
387 Health*. 2012;14:190.
- 388 31. Calm Clinic. Hypersensitivity To Sound and Anxiety Disorders: Symptoms, Causes and
389 Proven Solutions [Internet [Internet]. Calm Clinic. [cited 2023 Oct 18]. Available from:
390 <https://www.calmclinic.com/anxiety/symptoms/hypersensitivity-to-sound>

391

392

393 **Table 1: Characteristics of Study Sample**

| Covariate | 2012-2013 | 2016-2017 | 2020-2021 |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | N = 10,605 | N = 11,536 | N = 10,991 |
| Sex, % (n) | | | |
| Female | 53.07 (5628) | 53.06 (6121) | 54.07 (5944) |
| Male | 46.93 (4988) | 46.94 (5415) | 45.93 (5050) |
| Age, mean (SD) | 46.87 (18.15) | 47.02 (18.45) | 48.46 (18.49) |
| Household Income, % (n) | | | |
| < \$40,000 | 21.28 (2257) | 17.36 (2003) | 15.41 (1694) |
| \$40,000 - \$59,999 | 13.72 (1455) | 13.70 (1581) | 12.76 (1403) |
| \$60,000 – \$99,999 | 23.14 (2454) | 21.92 (2529) | 19.72 (2168) |
| \$100,000 – 149,999 | 21.54 (2284) | 22.85 (2636) | 21.48 (2361) |
| \$150,000 + | 20.32 (2155) | 24.16 (2787) | 30.63 (3368) |
| Labour force Status, % (n) | | | |
| Employed | 63.26 (6709) | 63.42 (7316) | 61.92 (6808) |
| Unemployed | 3.18 (337) | 3.42 (394) | 3.24 (356) |
| Not in labour force | 33.56 (3559) | 33.17 (3826) | 34.84 (3830) |
| Education Level, % (n) | | | |
| Post graduate degree or graduate certificate | 10.87 (1153) | 12.32 (1421) | 14.16 (1557) |
| Bachelor or honours | 14.16 (1502) | 15.06 (1737) | 16.66 (1832) |
| Diploma or Cert III/IV | 31.16 (3305) | 33.08 (3816) | 33.64 (3698) |
| Year 12 | 14.47 (1535) | 14.05 (1621) | 13.94 (1533) |

| | | | |
|--|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| < Year 12 | 29.33 (3110) | 25.49 (2941) | 21.59 (2374) |
| Urbanicity, % (n) | | | |
| Resides in a major city | 66.85 (7089) | 66.55 (7677) | 66.25 (7282) |
| Resides outside a major city | 33.15 (3516) | 33.45 (3859) | 33.75 (3709) |
| Area-level socio-economic disadvantage (quintiles), % (n) | | | |
| Q1 | 18.45 (1957) | 17.75 (2048) | 16.81 (1848) |
| Q2 | 19.19 (2035) | 19.64 (2266) | 19.67 (2162) |
| Q3 | 19.97 (2118) | 19.45 (2244) | 19.89 (2186) |
| Q4 | 21.19 (2247) | 21.14 (2439) | 21.80 (2396) |
| Q5 | 21.20 (2248) | 22.01 (2539) | 21.83 (2399) |
| Shift worker, % (n) | | | |
| Yes | 9.19 (975) | 9.35 (1079) | 8.61 (946) |
| No | 90.81 (9630) | 90.65 (10457) | 91.39 (10045) |
| Baseline Alcohol Consumption, % (n) | | | |
| Never | 18.36 (1947) | 19.43 (2242) | 19.72 (2168) |
| Rarely | 23.39 (2481) | 22.66 (2614) | 22.41 (2464) |
| Weekly – less than daily | 51.20 (5430) | 51.27 (5915) | 51.20 (5629) |
| Daily | 7.04 (747) | 6.63 (765) | 6.67 (733) |
| Alcohol Consumption at Follow Up, % (n) | | | |
| Never | 17.96 (1905) | 18.83 (2172) | 19.33 (2125) |
| Rarely | 23.39 (2481) | 22.65 (2613) | 23.51 (2585) |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Weekly – less than daily | 51.41 (5452) | 52.12 (6013) | 50.60 (5563) |
| Daily | 7.23 (767) | 6.40 (738) | 6.56 (721) |
| Sleep Quality, % (n) | | | |
| Good | 75.72 (8030) | 72.64 (8380) | 71.70 (7883) |
| Poor | 24.28 (2575) | 27.36 (3156) | 28.30 (3111) |
| Road Traffic Noise, % (n) | | | |
| Unexposed | 73.49 (7794) | 73.61 (8492) | 72.45 (7965) |
| Exposed | 26.51 (2811) | 26.39 (3044) | 27.55 (3029) |
| Plane, Train and Industry Noise, % (n) | | | |
| Unexposed | 78.27 (8301) | 78.03 (9001) | 77.70 (8542) |
| Exposed | 21.73 (2304) | 21.97 (2535) | 22.30 (2452) |
| Baseline Mental Wellbeing Score, mean (SD) | | | |
| | 75.31 (16.57) | 74.21 (17.35) | 72.09 (17.88) |
| Life Events, % (n) | | | |
| Birth/adoption of new child | 2.98 (316) | 3.22 (371) | 3.09 (340) |
| Damage to home from weather event | 1.17 (124) | 1.20 (139) | 1.16 (127) |
| Death of spouse or child | 0.64 (68) | 0.71 (82) | 0.75 (82) |
| Significant financial improvement | 2.91 (309) | 2.47 (285) | 2.73 (300) |
| Significant financial worsening | 2.47 (262) | 1.65 (190) | 1.65 (181) |
| Fired or made redundant | 3.39 (359) | 2.56 (295) | 2.42 (266) |
| Personal injury or illness | 8.89 (943) | 8.12 (937) | 8.02 (882) |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Changed jobs | 9.51 (1009) | 10.51 (1212) | 11.26 (1238) |
| Marriage | 1.78 (189) | 1.66 (191) | 1.50 (165) |
| Victim of property crime | 3.02 (320) | 2.38 (274) | 2.00 (220) |
| Pregnancy | 4.48 (475) | 4.57 (527) | 4.94 (543) |
| Got back together with partner | 0.65 (69) | 0.60 (69) | 0.49 (54) |
| Retired | 2.61 (277) | 2.04 (235) | 2.42 (266) |
| Separated | 2.31 (245) | 1.97 (227) | 2.30 (253) |

394

395

396 **Table 2: Mental Health Impact of Single source Noise Mediated by Sleep Quality**

| | Total Effect | P-value | Natural Indirect Effect | P-value | Natural Direct Effect | P-value | Proportion Mediated | P-value |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Road Traffic Noise | | | | | | | | |
| 2012-13 | -1.06 (-1.6, -0.50) | <0.001 | -0.22 (-0.34, -0.09) | 0.001 | -0.84 (-1.38, -0.30) | 0.002 | 0.21 (0.07, 0.35) | 0.004 |
| 2016-17 | -0.63 (-1.18, -0.09) | 0.023 | -0.21 (-0.34, -0.08) | 0.001 | -0.42 (-0.95, 0.11) | 0.118 | 0.33 (0.26, 0.64) | 0.034 |
| 2020-21 | -0.19 (-0.75, 0.36) | 0.500 | -0.06, (-0.17, 0.05) | 0.311 | -0.13 (-0.67, 0.41) | 0.631 | 0.31 (-0.65, 1.26) | 0.531 |
| Plane Train and Industry Noise | | | | | | | | |
| 2012-13 | -0.10 (-0.67, 0.48) | 0.740 | -0.08 (-0.21, 0.05) | 0.206 | -0.01 (-0.57, 0.54) | 0.959 | 0.85 (-4.01, 5.73) | 0.734 |
| 2016-17 | -0.81 (-1.38, -0.25) | 0.005 | -0.17 (-0.27, -0.06) | 0.002 | -0.65 (-1.20, -0.09) | 0.022 | 0.20 (0.03, 0.38) | 0.019 |
| 2020-21 | -0.45 (-1.04, 0.13) | 0.130 | -0.03 (-0.15, 0.09) | 0.596 | -0.42 (-1.00, 0.15) | 0.150 | 0.07 (-0.19, 0.32) | 0.592 |

397 Adjusted for age, sex, baseline mental health, household income, labour force status, education level, area socioeconomic disadvantage, shift work, residence in a
398 major city, alcohol consumption at baseline and follow up and several life events. Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).
399

400 **Table 3 Mental Health Impact of Multi- and Single-Source Noise Exposure Mediated by Sleep**

| | Total Effect | P | Natural Indirect Effect | P | Natural Direct Effect | P | Proportion Mediated | P |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------|
| <i>2012-13</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Road Traffic Noise Only | -1.09 (-1.77, -0.40) | 0.002 | -0.21 (-0.35, -0.06) | 0.005 | -0.88 (-1.54, -0.21) | 0.009 | 0.19 (0.04, 0.35) | 0.015 |
| Plane, Train and Industry Noise Only | 0.27 (-0.46, 1.01) | 0.47 | -0.03 (-0.18, 0.12) | 0.677 | 0.30 (-0.42, 1.02) | 0.409 | -0.12 (-0.81, 0.58) | 0.741 |
| Multiple Noise Sources | -0.90 (-1.71, -0.08) | 0.032 | -0.25 (-0.44, -0.05) | 0.016 | -0.65 (-1.45, 0.14) | 0.108 | 0.27 (-0.02, 0.56) | 0.067 |
| <i>2016-17</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Road Traffic Noise Only | -0.53 (-1.21, 0.15) | 0.128 | -0.15 (-0.31, 0.01) | 0.061 | -0.38 (-1.04, 0.28) | 0.263 | 0.29 (-0.13, 0.70) | 0.174 |
| Plane, Train and Industry Noise | -0.75 (-1.50, -0.00) | 0.050 | -0.08 (-0.19, 0.02) | 0.135 | -0.67 (-1.41, 0.07) | 0.075 | 0.11 (-0.05, 0.27) | 0.192 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|--------------|--|
| Only | | | | | | | | | |
| Multiple Noise Sources | -1.06 (-1.84, -0.28) | 0.008 | -0.33 (-0.52, -0.15) | <0.001 | -0.72 (-1.48, 0.03) | 0.061 | 0.32 (0.06, 0.58) | 0.016 | |
| <i>2020-21</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Road Traffic Noise Only | 0.04 (-0.64, 0.72) | 0.908 | -0.02 (-0.17, 0.13) | 0.832 | 0.06 (-0.61, 0.72) | 0.868 | -0.40 (-8.80, 8.00) | 0.925 | |
| Plane, Train and Industry Noise Only | -0.28 (-1.06, 0.50) | 0.482 | 0.04 (-0.13, 0.22) | 0.626 | -0.33 (-1.09, 0.44) | 0.406 | -0.16 (-1.00, 0.69) | 0.713 | |
| Multiple Noise Sources | -0.62 (-1.42, 0.19) | 0.132 | -0.09 (-0.24, 0.06) | 0.225 | -0.53 (-1.32, 0.26) | 0.189 | 0.15 (-0.13, 0.42) | 0.291 | |

- 401 Adjusted for age, sex, baseline mental health, household income, labour force status, education level, area socioeconomic disadvantage,
402 shift work, residence in a major city, alcohol consumption at baseline and follow up and several life events.
403 Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).

404 **Figures**

405 Figure 1 DAG

