

1 **Using parametric g-computation to estimate the effect of long-term exposure**
2 **to air pollution on mortality risk and simulate the benefits of hypothetical**
3 **policies: the Canadian Community Health Survey cohort (2005 to 2015)**

4 Chen Chen¹, Hong Chen^{2,3,4,5*}, Aaron van Donkelaar⁶, Richard T. Burnett², Randall V. Martin⁶,
5 Li Chen², Michael Tjepkema⁷, Megan Kirby-McGregor⁸, Yi Li⁸, Jay S. Kaufman⁸, Tarik
6 Benmarhnia^{1*}

7 ¹Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California,
8 USA

9 ²Environmental Health Science and Research Bureau, Health Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

10 ³Public Health Ontario, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

11 ⁴ICES, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

12 ⁵Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

13 ⁶Department of Energy, Environmental, and Chemical Engineering, Washington University in St.
14 Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, USA

15 ⁷Health Analysis Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

16 ⁸Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, McGill University,
17 Montreal, Quebec, Canada

18

19 *Co-senior authors

20 Corresponding author: Chen Chen (chc048@ucsd.edu)

21 Address: 8885 Biological Grade, La Jolla, CA 92037, USA

22

23 **Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare they have nothing to disclose.

24

25 **Funding:** This study was funded by Health Canada (#810630). The funder supported the study
26 design, data collection and analysis in this study.

27

28

29 **Abstract**

30 **Background**

31 Numerous epidemiological studies have documented the adverse health impact of long-term
32 exposure to fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) on mortality even at relatively low levels. However,
33 methodological challenges remain to consider potential regulatory intervention's complexity and
34 provide actionable evidence on the predicted benefits of interventions. We propose the
35 parametric g-computation as an alternative analytical approach to such challenges.

36 **Method**

37 We applied the parametric g-computation to estimate the cumulative risks of non-accidental
38 death under different hypothetical intervention strategies targeting long-term exposure to PM_{2.5}
39 in the Canadian Community Health Survey cohort from 2005 to 2015. On both relative and
40 absolute scales, we explored benefits of hypothetical intervention strategies compared to the
41 natural course that 1) set the simulated exposure value at each follow-up year to a threshold
42 value if exposure was above the threshold (8.8 µg/m³, 7.04 µg/m³, 5 µg/m³, and 4 µg/m³); and 2)
43 reduce the simulated exposure value by a percentage (5% and 10%) at each follow-up year. We
44 used the three-year average PM_{2.5} concentration with one-year lag at the postal code of
45 respondents' annual mailing addresses as their long-term exposure to PM_{2.5}. We considered
46 baseline and time-varying confounders including demographics, behavior characteristics, income
47 level, and neighborhood socioeconomic status. We also included the R syntax for reproducibility
48 and replication.

49 **Results**

50 All hypothetical intervention strategies explored led to lower 11-year cumulative mortality risks
51 than the estimated value under natural course without intervention, with the smallest reduction of
52 0.20 per 1000 participants (95% CI: 0.06 to 0.34) under the threshold of 8.8 µg/m³, and the
53 largest reduction of 3.40 per 1000 participants (95% CI: -0.23 to 7.03) under the relative
54 reduction of 10% per interval. The reductions in cumulative risk, or numbers of deaths that
55 would have been prevented if the intervention was employed instead of maintaining status quo,
56 increased over time but flattened towards the end of follow-up. Estimates among those ≥65 years
57 were greater with a similar pattern. Our estimates were robust to different model specifications.

58 **Discussion**

59 We found evidence that any intervention further reducing the long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} would
60 reduce the cumulative mortality risk, with greater benefits in the older population, even in a
61 population already exposed to low levels of ambient PM_{2.5}. The parametric g-computation used
62 in this study provides flexibilities in simulating real world interventions, accommodates time-
63 varying exposure and confounders, and estimates adjusted survival curves with clearer
64 interpretation and more information than a single hazard ratio, making it a valuable analytical
65 alternative in air pollution epidemiological research.

66 Introduction

67 As collective efforts in previous decades have successfully reduced the level of fine particulate
68 matter (PM_{2.5}) globally, quantifying the effectiveness of policies that further reduce ambient
69 PM_{2.5} is becoming particularly important in supporting evidence-based policymaking. Indeed,
70 previous studies found consistent evidence of deleterious associations between long-term
71 exposure to low levels of PM_{2.5} (e.g., below the current health-based standards or guidelines) and
72 risk of mortality¹⁻⁶ and morbidity,⁷⁻⁹ suggesting potential reductions in health burden if the PM_{2.5}
73 level were to be further reduced. While the evaluation of exposure-response functions in
74 existing studies provides important information in understanding the potential effectiveness of
75 policies, further methodological considerations are required to estimate the potential benefits of
76 realistic interventions.

77 First, evidence suggested that the risk associated with the changes in acute exposure to PM_{2.5}
78 could vary with time,¹⁰⁻¹³ potentially due to changes in chemical compositions of PM_{2.5} with
79 different toxicity and population susceptibility towards PM_{2.5}.^{14,15} Similar disparity in toxicity
80 across long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} components was also observed,^{16,17} suggesting that such
81 temporal changes could exist in risk associated with long-term exposure to PM_{2.5}. In other words,
82 it is important to use analytical methods flexible enough to incorporate such temporal changes in
83 estimation of related health burdens. However, existing studies of health impacts of long-term
84 exposure to PM_{2.5} generally considered time-fixed exposure and confounders (see Table S1 for a
85 narrative review of recent studies on health impact of long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} and their
86 methodological considerations). Furthermore, the most widely used estimate for exposure-
87 response function in this field is a single hazard ratio (HR) for the follow-up period estimated
88 with a standard Cox-proportional hazard model (Table S1), which is assumed to be constant over
89 time and precludes consideration of temporal changes. Although extension of a Cox-proportional
90 hazard model could provide period-specific HRs that incorporate temporal changes,¹⁸ recent
91 developments in causal inference literature raise concern about the ambiguity in the causal
92 interpretation of HR and period-specific HRs.¹⁹ Specifically, period-specific HRs have a built-in
93 selection bias because susceptible people exposed to higher PM_{2.5} are more likely to die early if
94 PM_{2.5} truly increases risk of mortality, and are removed from the susceptible population in later
95 time.²⁰ This differential depletion of susceptible subjects over time can lead to artificially
96 diminished or even reversed period-specific HR later in study even when the cumulative survival
97 is still lower among those exposed to higher PM_{2.5}, violating the proportional assumption and
98 hindering interpretation.²¹

99 Second, calculation of health burden related to long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} commonly employed
100 exposure-response function previously estimated with the static intervention strategy, where a
101 fixed change of exposure value was assigned to the entire population.^{22(chap19)} However, the more
102 flexible and realistic dynamic intervention strategy, where the exposure value was assigned
103 based on individuals' history of covariates including exposure, is hard to apply when existing
104 exposure-response functions are used.^{22(chap19)} Methods capable of incorporating dynamic
105 intervention strategy to imitate complexities in actual regulatory interventions are needed to
106 provide direct evidence on effectiveness of air pollution control policies.²³ To fill this gap in
107 knowledge translation, we propose the parametric g-computation as an analytical alternative in

108 air pollution epidemiological research, which could better predict the effectiveness of
109 hypothetical policies while being more flexible in resembling real world interventions.

110 G-computation (also known as g-formula) is a generalization of non-parametric standardization
111 developed under the potential outcome framework for causal inference,²⁴ and parametric g-
112 computation is a variation that employs parametric modeling. Under the consistency (i.e., the
113 exposure is defined unambiguously, and all exposed individuals receive the same version of
114 treatment),^{22(chap3),25} exchangeability (i.e., no unmeasured confounding or informative
115 censoring),²⁵ and positivity (i.e., probability of receiving every exposure conditioning on
116 confounders is greater than zero) assumptions,^{22(chap3)} and a time-to-event outcome setting, g-
117 computation can provide marginal causal risk estimates at each follow-up time point under
118 hypothetical intervention strategies (i.e. adjusted survival curves), while allowing other
119 population characteristics to be altered according to the intervention.²⁶ Particularly, parametric g-
120 computation excels in estimating adjusted survival curves under dynamic intervention strategies.
121 In other words, g-computation can directly answer causal questions such as: how many lives
122 could we save if we promulgate a policy that further reduces air pollution to levels lower than the
123 current standard among those whose exposure were above the current standard, compared to
124 maintaining the status quo? Although parametric g-computation has been widely applied in other
125 fields of epidemiology,²⁷⁻³⁰ application in air pollution studies remains limited. Previous
126 applications in this field either focused on a small cohort in occupational settings,³¹⁻³³ or
127 modelled simple air pollution changes on asthmatic outcomes among children (i.e. not
128 considering time-varying confounding nor changes in effect estimates over time).^{34,35}

129 In this study, we aim to demonstrate the use of parametric g-computation to evaluate the
130 effectiveness of hypothetical intervention strategies targeting long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} on
131 reducing mortality using a Canadian cohort experiencing low PM_{2.5} exposure from 2005 to 2015.
132 This analytical alternative can account for previously unaddressed complexities, refine the effect
133 estimates with less restrictive identification conditions and provide estimates more intuitive to
134 policy makers.

135 **Methods**

136 *Study population*

137 We created a retrospective cohort with respondents to the Canadian Community Health Survey
138 (CCHS) from three enrolling cycles in the years of 2000/2001, 2003 and 2005, respectively.³⁶⁻³⁸
139 CCHS is a national cross-sectional survey collecting health status, health care utilization and
140 health determinants information of the Canadian population, covering the population 12 years
141 and over in the ten provinces and the three territories. The survey excluded individuals living on
142 reserves and other Aboriginal settlements, full-time members of the Canadian Forces, the
143 institutionalized population, and residents of certain remote regions.

144 Among CCHS respondents who gave permission to share and link their information with other
145 administrative datasets, we obtained their mailing address history and death records through
146 December 31st, 2015 via Statistics Canada's Social Data Linkage Environment, using
147 probabilistic methods based on common identifiers.^{2,39} We focused on non-accidental death as

148 outcome (International Classification of Diseases ninth revision codes 001 to 799 and
149 International Classification of Diseases tenth revision codes A to R) in this study. To facilitate
150 pooling of results across cycles, we restricted the cohort to participants who were alive on
151 January 1st, 2005 and used this date as the start of follow-up for all cycles. We also restricted our
152 cohort to individuals older than 25 years and younger than 80 years in 2005 thus all cohort
153 participants were adults and followed for 11 years or till death. Besides, we dropped respondents
154 without data for covariates including exposure in 2005. This study was approved by the Health
155 Canada-Public Health Agency of Canada Research Ethics Board.

156 *Exposure assessment*

157 To estimate respondents' long-term exposure to PM_{2.5}, we utilized the ground-level PM_{2.5}
158 concentrations from V4.NA.02.MAPLE of the Atmospheric Composition Analysis Group of
159 Washington University,⁴⁰ which covers all of North America below 70°N. The 0.01° × 0.01°
160 (roughly equivalent to 1×1km² at the latitudes where most Canadians live) annual estimates of
161 PM_{2.5} from 2001 to 2015 were derived using satellite retrievals of aerosol optical depth and
162 chemical transport model simulations, and calibrated with ground-based observations using
163 geographically weighted regression.⁴¹ The annual estimates of PM_{2.5} closely agree with long-
164 term cross-validated ground measurements at fixed-site monitors (n=2,312) across North
165 America (R²=0.70).⁴¹ Using the ground-level PM_{2.5} concentration surfaces described above, we
166 first assigned the annual PM_{2.5} concentration of the grid cell into which the postal code centroid
167 falls as the postal code specific annual PM_{2.5} concentrations. Then we calculated respondents'
168 annual long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} as three-year average postal code specific PM_{2.5}
169 concentrations with one-year lag based on their mailing address history (e.g., a respondent's
170 long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} in 2013 is the average of their postal code specific PM_{2.5}
171 concentrations in 2010, 2011 and 2012).² We utilized three-year average with one-year lag to
172 represent long-term exposure of PM_{2.5} so that the exposure always precedes the outcome and the
173 timeframe is consistent with the regulatory review of Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards
174 for annual PM_{2.5}.⁴² This metric of long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} was widely used in previous
175 Canada based studies of long-term health impacts of PM_{2.5}.^{2,43,44}

176 *Covariates other than exposure*

177 In this section we summarized the data sources and meaning of covariates in this study while the
178 covariate selection to control for in our model will be discussed in the statistical analysis section.
179 We used covariates to describe the collection of exposure, time-fixed confounders, and time-
180 varying confounders in this study. Baseline characteristics of respondents were ascertained at the
181 time of enrollment into CCHS via self-report and were processed using the same method as
182 previous studies,^{2,43} including sex, age (converted to value in 2005), body mass index, marital
183 status, immigrant status, visible minority, indigenous status, smoking status, alcohol
184 consumption, consumption of fruits and vegetables, leisure physical activity, working status, and
185 educational attainment (details of variable categorization in Table 1). By using 2005 as the start
186 of follow-up time for all individuals, we assumed that all baseline characteristics other than age
187 ascertained at the time of enrollment would remain the same through the entire follow-up period.

188 We also obtained characteristics of the respondents and their neighborhoods through linkage
189 with administrative datasets using similar methods as previous studies.^{2,43} Specifically, we
190 obtained annual income quintile of respondents through linkage with tax data based on common
191 identifiers.⁴³ For person-years with missing annual family income, we imputed them with the
192 nearest prior values and the proportions of missing are 5.21%, 4.97% and 4.69% for Cycle
193 2000/2001, 2003 and 2005, respectively. We also obtained annual characteristics of
194 neighborhoods through linkage with census data from the nearest census year based on
195 respondents' mailing address postal codes, including community size at census metropolitan area
196 level and four Canadian Marginalization Index at census dissemination area level. The Canadian
197 Marginalization Index summarizes dissemination area-level socioeconomic status into four
198 dimensions using principal component analysis to reduce the dimensionality of census data: the
199 immigration and visible minority index combines information on proportion of recent
200 immigrants and proportion of people self-identify as visible minority; the households and
201 dwellings index combines information on types and density of residential accommodations and
202 family structure characteristics; the material resources index combines information on access to
203 and attainment of basic material needs; and the age and labour force index combines information
204 on participation in labour force and proportion of seniors.⁴⁵ Last, we obtained airshed (six
205 distinct regions of Canada that cut cross jurisdictional boundaries and showed similar air quality
206 characteristics and air movement patterns within each region) to capture large scale spatial
207 variation,⁴⁶ and urban form information of respondents' neighborhoods in 2005 to capture
208 urbanicity of participants' residence, through linkage with census data.²

209 *Hypothetical intervention strategies*

210 In this study, we explored three types of intervention strategies: 1) applying the simulated value
211 of time-varying covariates without any intervention (natural course); 2) setting the simulated
212 long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} value at each follow-up year to a threshold value if PM_{2.5} was
213 higher than the threshold (threshold intervention); and 3) reducing the simulated PM_{2.5} value by a
214 fixed percentage at each interval (i.e., follow-up year) (relative reduction intervention).
215 Threshold values explored are the current Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards for PM_{2.5} of
216 8.8 µg/m³, 80% of the current Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards for PM_{2.5} (or 7.04
217 µg/m³), the new World Health Organization (WHO) air quality guideline of 5 µg/m³, and a PM_{2.5}
218 level that was further below the WHO guideline (4 µg/m³). Interval-specific relative reduction
219 values explored are 10% and 5% per interval. To avoid extensive model extrapolation, we
220 restricted the relative reduction intervention so that subjects with exposure below 1.8 µg/m³, the
221 background PM_{2.5} level in Canada,⁴⁷ will not be further reduced. The first type of intervention
222 strategy represents the predicted covariates based on the observed data without intervening and
223 serves as the reference for other strategies. The second and the third are dynamic intervention
224 strategies that incorporate the impact of intervention on covariates during earlier time points
225 while simulating covariates in later time points.

226 *Statistical analysis*

227 We applied parametric g-computation with different hypothetical intervention strategies
228 targeting long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} to understand the benefits of intervention strategies on

229 cumulative risk of non-accidental death. We conducted g-computation analysis for each
230 enrollment cycle separately and pooled the results across cycles using meta-regression. Briefly,
231 we estimated the cumulative mortality risk at each follow-up year standardized to the distribution
232 of the confounders and long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} in the study population, with all time-
233 varying covariates (confounders and PM_{2.5}) conditioned on covariates history, with and without
234 intervention on PM_{2.5} (i.e., adjusted survival curves). Next, we calculated the differences in
235 cumulative mortality risks between the natural course and other intervention strategies on both
236 absolute and relative scales to provide estimates for the benefits of hypothetical intervention
237 strategies compared to maintaining status quo. We pooled results with fixed-effect meta-
238 regression, which calculates a weighted average of cycle specific estimates with weights equal to
239 the inverse of the variance using the “meta” package.⁴⁸

240 The proof of parametric g-computation are described extensively elsewhere,^{22(chap21),29} and
241 detailed description of how to implement such an approach in a setting similar to our study was
242 previously published,²⁸ with available R package for easy implementation.⁴⁹ However, since the
243 application of parametric g-computation is limited in air pollution studies, we include a diagram
244 (Figure 1) to summarize the four steps that carry out the g-computation in a time-to-event setting
245 with time-varying exposure and confounders, and describe the steps in details below.

246 *Steps to implement parametric g-computation*

247 In Step 1, we fitted a pooled logistic model (i.e., discrete-time hazard model) and adjusted for
248 baseline characteristics, time-varying characteristics, quadratic function of year and interaction
249 between long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} and categorical year. The pooled logistic model estimated
250 the probability of death during the year conditioning on survival till the start of the year given all
251 covariates (including PM_{2.5}), which allowed the conditional probability of death and its
252 association with PM_{2.5} to vary over year. We chose confounders to control for in the outcome
253 model based on substantive knowledge of the relationship between long-term PM_{2.5} and
254 mortality as summarized in the simplified directed acyclic graph (Figure S1). We included a full
255 list of covariates in Table 1 with specific forms of covariates in Table 2. We included both
256 individual socioeconomic status indicators (e.g., education and family income) and community
257 socioeconomic status indicators (e.g., Canadian Marginalization Index for dissemination area) to
258 fully capture the variation in socioeconomic status among cohort participants, which is a major
259 source of residual confounding. We also included individual behavior indicators like dietary and
260 exercise patterns, which are strong risk factors for mortality, precede the exposure, and might
261 share common unmeasured causes with the exposure, even though they might not directly cause
262 the exposure.⁵⁰ To note, in the setting when only time-fixed covariates were used, we could
263 estimate marginal adjusted survival curves directly using outputs from this pooled logistic model
264 by predicting the probability of death standardized to the distributions of covariates under the
265 intervention of interest (e.g., setting the baseline level of exposure to a specific value while
266 keeping all baseline covariates the same as observed for all participants).^{19,51} However, in our
267 study setting of time-varying covariates and time-to-event outcome, we also need to model time-
268 varying covariates (including PM_{2.5}) so that we could simulate time-varying covariates at all
269 follow-up years for all participants, especially for periods after participants’ death.^{28,29}

270 In Step 2, we modeled the time-varying covariates (including PM_{2.5}) using linear regressions
271 while including variables such as previous-year value of the covariate of interest, baseline
272 characteristics, same-year values of time-varying covariates set to occur before the covariate of
273 interest, and quadratic function of time. The choice of independent variables in covariate models
274 are based on substantive knowledge as summarized in the simplified directed acyclic graph
275 (Figure S1). We summarized the list of all covariates in Table 1 and the specific forms of
276 covariates included in covariate models in Table 2. We set the sequence of time-varying
277 covariates as community size, income, immigration and visible minority, material resources,
278 households and dwellings, age and labour force and long-term exposure to PM_{2.5}. Since previous
279 studies using different cycles of CCHS found a supra-linear PM_{2.5}-mortality association,^{2,43,52,53}
280 we used natural logarithm transformed long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} as the independent variable
281 in both the outcome and covariate model in the main analysis.

282 In Step 3, we simulated new datasets based on the intervention strategies. For each intervention,
283 we randomly sampled 10,000 subjects from the cohort with replacement (i.e., Monte Carlo
284 sampling) and created an empty dataset of all sampled subjects for all follow-up years till the end
285 of period of interest (normally the end of follow-up as in this study but extrapolation is possible
286 with extra assumptions). We only simulated new datasets for 10,000 subjects instead of the
287 number of participants in study cohorts (~60,000 participants in each cohort) to save
288 computation time and similar practice was conducted before with smaller cohort.²⁹ Next, we
289 assigned the baseline values of all covariates (values of baseline covariates and values of time-
290 varying covariates at start of follow-up) in each simulated dataset to the same as its original
291 dataset, then altered the relevant covariate values based on the intervention strategy (e.g., setting
292 the baseline long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} to 5 µg/m³ if it is higher than 5 µg/m³ in the threshold
293 intervention of 5 µg/m³ but could include other covariates if needed). Last, we simulated time-
294 varying covariates at each year after baseline based on their history with covariate models
295 estimated in the second step and altered the covariates based on the intervention strategy.

296 In Step 4, with the simulated datasets and outcome model from the first step, we calculated for
297 each subject the probability of dying during each year conditioning on surviving to the beginning
298 of this year, standardized to the distribution of the confounders and long-term exposure to PM_{2.5}
299 under the intervention strategies, regardless of their observed outcomes. Next, we calculated for
300 each subject the cumulative mortality risk at each year as the cumulative sum of the
301 abovementioned conditional probability of mortality times the probability of surviving till the
302 beginning of the time interval. The estimated cumulative mortality risk at each year is the average
303 of estimates from all subjects for all hypothetical interventions. We also calculated the absolute
304 difference in cumulative mortality risk and percentage change in cumulative mortality risk with
305 estimated cumulative mortality risk from natural course as reference.

306 Besides, we calculated the 95% confidence intervals (CI) for all estimates using standard errors
307 from 200 bootstrap iterations.⁵⁴ In each iteration, we randomly sampled the same number of
308 participants as in the original cohort with replacement and ran the four steps described above to
309 calculate cumulative mortality risks under intervention strategies. We chose this number of
310 iteration because we were constrained by available computational resources (>1h of

311 computational time for each bootstrap iteration), and the original application of parametric g-
312 computation in time-varying covariates and time-to-event setting used the same number.²⁹ Future
313 studies with more computational resources might consider larger number of bootstrap iteration.

314 *Sensitivity analyses*

315 To test the robustness of our results to model misspecification, we considered a number of
316 different model specifications for both outcome and covariate models including: 1) reordering
317 the sequence of time-varying covariates in covariate models by moving age and labour force to
318 before the other Canadian Marginalization Index, moving income to after Canadian
319 Marginalization Index, and moving PM_{2.5} to the first place among all covariates; 2) extending the
320 extent of history modeled by including previous year and two-year previous values of all the
321 time-varying covariates in the covariate models other than just the previous-year value of the
322 covariate of interest; and 3) including time-varying covariates other than long-term PM_{2.5} as
323 categorical in the outcome model and using the multinomial logistic model for them in covariate
324 model instead of modeling them as continuous with bounds using linear model (see Table 2 for
325 details of model specifications for each time-varying covariates in main analysis). We also
326 visually evaluated the simulated and observed adjusted survival curves and histories of
327 covariates under no intervention in the main analysis as a heuristic check of model
328 misspecification.²⁷

329 Next, to facilitate comparison with previous studies, we used long-term PM_{2.5} in original scale in
330 all models as sensitivity analysis, which assumed the same log-linear PM_{2.5}-mortality association
331 used in other cohorts^{4,7} instead of the supra-linear one supported by previous studies of different
332 cycles of the CCHS cohort.^{2,43,52,53} Besides, we also ran a Cox-proportional hazard model with
333 the same specification as the outcome model in our main analysis except that we included no
334 time variable and used long-term PM_{2.5} in original scale, which assumed a log-linear PM_{2.5}-
335 mortality association.

336 Last, since most deaths occurred among older individuals and age could modify the health
337 impact of long-term exposure to PM_{2.5}, we conducted a subset analysis restricted to cohort
338 participants aged ≥ 65 years at the time of enrollment. Since it took up to 24 hours to run one
339 round of sensitivity analysis without bootstrapping, we were unable to perform bootstrapping to
340 calculate CIs for sensitivity analyses due to computational constraints and did not present
341 variances for our estimates. We pooled cycle-specific estimates from sensitivity analyses by
342 averaging the estimates in each cycle. All analyses were done in R version 4.0.5⁵⁵ with the
343 “gfoRmula” package.⁴⁹ The R code to replicate these analyses and a simulated dataset are
344 available at the following link: https://github.com/suthlam/cchs_g_computation.git.

345 **Results**

346 We observed 6,475 (10.4%), 6,525 (10.5%), and 6,135 (9.2%) non-accidental deaths in the 11
347 years of follow-up starting from 2005 among the three cycles of CCHS cohorts of 62,365, 62,380,
348 and 66,385 participants, respectively (Table 1). The three cycle cohorts were comparable in all
349 descriptive statistics (Table 1). Without any hypothetical intervention, the observed average
350 long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} in three cycles of our cohort decreased slightly from 6.4 ± 2.2

351 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $6.5 \pm 2.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $6.5 \pm 2.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in 2005 to $5.8 \pm 2.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $6.0 \pm 2.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, and $6.0 \pm$
352 $2.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in 2015, respectively (Table 1).

353 All hypothetical intervention strategies explored in this study led to lower 11-year cumulative
354 mortality risks than the estimated value under a natural course without intervention, 102.5 per
355 1000 participants (95% confidence interval (CI): 100.3 to 104.8 per 1000 participants). The
356 reductions in 11-year cumulative mortality risks from the natural course were 0.20 per 1000
357 participants (95% CI: 0.06 to 0.34 per 1000 participants) under the threshold of $8.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, 0.63
358 per 1000 participants (95% CI: 0.18 to 1.07 per 1000 participants) under the threshold of 7.04
359 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, 1.87 per 1000 participants (95% CI: 0.53 to 3.21 per 1000 participants) under the
360 threshold of $5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, 3.08 per 1000 participants (95% CI: 0.85 to 5.31 per 1000 participants)
361 under the threshold of $4 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, 1.68 per 1000 participants (95% CI: -0.15 to 3.51 per 1000
362 participants) under the relative reduction of 5% per interval, and 3.40 per 1000 participants (95%
363 CI: -0.23 to 7.03 per 1000 participants) under the relative reduction of 10% per interval. To note,
364 the reduction in 11-year cumulative mortality risks could also be interpreted as the number of
365 deaths that would have been prevented if the intervention was employed instead of maintaining
366 status quo. Changes in relative scale showed similar pattern (Table 3). To fulfill the four
367 threshold intervention strategies, averages of 18.7%, 38.3%, 72.0% and 91.4% of subjects
368 experienced change in their natural course exposure every year, respectively, while 100% had
369 their exposure changed under the two relative reduction intervention strategies (Table 3). The
370 corresponding reductions in average simulated $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ from the start of follow-up to the end of
371 year 11 ranged from 0.13 to $1.87 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for threshold intervention strategies, and 1.25 to 2.18
372 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for relative reduction intervention strategies (Table 3). Across all strategies, we observed
373 steady expansions in differences of yearly cumulative mortality risks between the natural course
374 and other strategies until the 7th year of follow-up, after which the differences remain constant
375 and shrink during the last year of follow-up (Figure 2 with numeric results in Table S2). In the
376 main analysis, we pooled estimates of yearly cumulative mortality risks across cycles using
377 random-effect meta-regression and pooled estimates of differences (absolute and relative scale)
378 in cumulative mortality risks using fixed-effect meta-regression. Cycle-specific results with
379 corresponding I^2 values are summarized in Figure S2 with numeric results in Table S3.

380 Heuristic checks of model fitting in the main analysis support the robustness of our estimates: 1)
381 the cumulative mortality risk estimated by parametric g-computation under the natural course
382 closely tracked the value observed (Figure S3); and 2) the observed mean values of all time-
383 varying covariates were similar to those simulated under the natural course over time (Figure S3).
384 To note, since participants had no time-varying covariates recorded after their death while we
385 simulated participants' time-varying covariates for all years, differences between observed and
386 simulated covariates are expected, especially later in the study period. Furthermore, sensitivity
387 analyses with different model specifications (different sequence of time-varying covariate, extent
388 of history modeled, and parametrization of time-varying confounders) resulted in similar
389 estimates as the main analysis (Figure 3, numeric results in Table S4).

390 When assuming a log-linear $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ -mortality association in the sensitivity analysis (compared to
391 the supra-linear association assumed in main analysis by log-transforming the exposure),

392 reductions in 11-year cumulative mortality risks comparing other intervention strategies to the
393 natural course ranged from 0.01 per 1000 participants to 1.65 per 1000 participants, slightly
394 smaller than main analysis assuming a supra-linear PM_{2.5}-mortality association (log-transformed
395 PM_{2.5} used as exposure in modeling) (Table S4). The Cox model assuming a log-linear PM_{2.5}-
396 mortality association found 15.6% (95% CI: 4.0 to 28.5%) increase in hazard of death per 10
397 µg/m³ increase in PM_{2.5}. When focusing on cohort participants ≥65 years at the start of follow-up,
398 reductions in 11-year cumulative mortality risks comparing other intervention strategies to the
399 natural course ranged from 0.49 per 1000 participants to 7.07 per 1000 participants (Table S4),
400 which is larger than the main analysis using the general population ≥35 years.

401 **Discussion**

402 In this study, we applied the parametric g-computation as an analytical alternative that is
403 particularly valuable for air pollution epidemiological research, especially for evaluating specific
404 intervention strategies. With application in a large Canadian cohort, we demonstrated how to
405 incorporate consideration of complex time structure in the data and how to calculate causally
406 interpretable cumulative risk estimates over the follow-up time (i.e., adjusted survival curves)
407 with parametric g-computation. We described that any intervention further reducing the long-
408 term exposure to PM_{2.5} would reduce the cumulative mortality risk, even in a region with
409 relatively low levels of ambient PM_{2.5}. Such reduction in cumulative risk increased over time and
410 flattened towards the end of follow-up on both relative and absolute scales. The older population
411 also experienced greater benefits from the explored hypothetical intervention strategies than the
412 general population.

413 Numerous observational studies found positive associations between long-term exposure to
414 PM_{2.5} and non-accidental mortality. A meta-analysis reported a pooled effect estimate of 6% (95%
415 CI: 4 to 8%) increase in hazard of death per 10 µg/m³ increase in PM_{2.5} (HR-1).⁵ A recent study
416 in a similar Canadian cohort from 2000 to 2012 found 11% (95% CI: 4 to 18%) increase in
417 hazard of non-accidental death per 10 µg/m³ increase in chronic exposure to PM_{2.5} with a Cox
418 proportional hazard model.² Our sensitivity analysis using Cox model without time-varying
419 coefficients found similar numeric results [15.6% (95% CI: 4.0 to 28.5%)]. Although we can't
420 directly compare our estimates from the main analysis to previous results given the difference in
421 interventions explored, the consistent reductions in cumulative mortality risk over follow-up time
422 across intervention strategies when compared to natural course in this study lend further support
423 to previous findings that PM_{2.5} is detrimental to health even at levels below current standards.
424 For example, we identified a 0.19% (95% CI: 0.05 to 0.33%) decrease in 11-year cumulative
425 mortality risk comparing the hypothetical intervention strategy with threshold of 8.8 µg/m³ to
426 natural course, which provided evidence of health benefits from policies that further reduce the
427 air pollution level to below current Canada standard of 8.8 µg/m³, which is lower than the 12
428 µg/m³ standard of U.S. explored by previous studies.^{4,9} To facilitate comparison with previous
429 studies assuming a log-linear PM_{2.5}-mortality association, we included sensitivity analysis using
430 PM_{2.5} on the normal scale and found reduced cumulative mortality risks in all hypothetical
431 interventions compared to maintaining status quo but the numeric values are smaller than those
432 in the main analysis. The observed difference in the numeric values of analysis assuming log-
433 linear association and analysis assuming supra-linear association is a combination of difference

434 in how the exposure-response relationship is modeled and how the exposure model performs.
435 However, given the existing evidence in Canadian cohorts and similarity between observed
436 survival curve and estimated survival curve using parametric g-computation under no
437 intervention in the main analysis,^{2,43,52,53} we have confidence in the validity of results assuming a
438 supra-linear association.

439 More importantly, we demonstrated how to incorporate more flexibilities in simulating real
440 world interventions with g-computation in this study and provide intuitive estimates for benefits
441 of such interventions. Taking the hypothetical intervention strategy with threshold of the current
442 Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards as an example, the average long-term exposure to
443 PM_{2.5} in 2005 was around 6.5 µg/m³, below the standard of 8.8 µg/m³. However, some cohort
444 participants were exposed to PM_{2.5} levels higher than 8.8 µg/m³ during some years of follow-up
445 and our hypothetical intervention only affected these subject-years by reducing their exposure to
446 8.8 µg/m³, which represented a three-cycle average of 18.7% of subjects across all years. Since
447 the observed PM_{2.5} levels decreased without any intervention in our study, fewer subjects were
448 directly intervened on in later years under threshold intervention strategies, which explained the
449 flattened differences in cumulative risks between intervention strategies in later years. However,
450 all time-varying covariates after the intervention on PM_{2.5} would change accordingly due to the
451 intervention on PM_{2.5}, thus influencing future outcomes as well. Such dynamic intervention
452 strategy incorporated considerations of people who could be intervened on and are more realistic
453 than the static intervention strategy commonly employed in health burden estimation with
454 traditional exposure-response function, which sets change in exposure at a fixed value for all
455 individuals throughout the period of interest. Besides, although we only provided differences in
456 cumulative risk as compared to the natural course, it is easy to estimate differences between any
457 two hypothetical intervention strategies.

458 Furthermore, the estimated cumulative risks over the follow-up time by g-computation (i.e.,
459 adjusted survival curves) and corresponding comparisons of values between different
460 hypothetical interventions provided clearer causal interpretation and more information than a
461 single HR or period-specific HRs, which is generally used in air pollution studies (Table S1). In
462 the context of health impacts from chronic exposure to PM_{2.5}, HR can change over time since the
463 toxicity of PM_{2.5} (e.g., chemical composition of PM_{2.5}) and susceptibility of population to PM_{2.5}
464 could change over time, while standard Cox model assumed constant HR and period-specific HR
465 from extensions of Cox had built-in bias that led to ambiguity in causal interpretation.⁵⁶ On the
466 other hand, the cumulative mortality risks estimated in this study avoided such ambiguity in
467 interpretation while also demonstrating the change of intervention effect over time.¹⁹ Also,
468 obtaining the casually interpretable absolute differences in cumulative risks between hypothetical
469 intervention strategies over time could be particularly helpful for comparing different scenarios
470 regarding public health benefits.⁵⁷ Besides, if policies affecting air pollutants such as PM_{2.5} could
471 further affect prognostic covariates influencing both future PM_{2.5} levels and health outcomes
472 (commonly referred to as exposure-confounder feedback), traditional regression methods based
473 on adjustment in a multivariable model would fail and lead to biased estimates for the effect
474 while g-computation is designed to particularly solve this problem.^{24,26,58} An example of such
475 exposure-confounder feedback is that people might move due to high level of PM_{2.5} in their

476 current community and subsequently change the characteristics of their community of residence,
477 while the characteristics of their current community also affect the level of $PM_{2.5}$ and probability
478 of death. Controlling for such community characteristics is necessary for confounding control
479 but doing so with traditional methods will remove the indirect effect mediated through
480 community characteristics and introduce collider-stratification bias⁵⁹ if any unmeasured
481 confounder of the community characteristics and death exists.⁵⁸ However, making moving
482 decision based on community level of $PM_{2.5}$ is unlikely in countries with relatively low $PM_{2.5}$
483 like Canada and exposure-confounder feedback is expected to be negligible in our study, but it is
484 possible in countries with higher $PM_{2.5}$.

485 This study has a few limitations that need to be acknowledged. First, parametric g-computation
486 can only account for measured confounders and lack of conditional exchangeability (i.e., residual
487 confounding) might exist due to unmeasured confounders or measurement errors of existing
488 confounders, regardless of our extensive list of confounders considered based on substantive
489 knowledge on risk factors of $PM_{2.5}$ exposure and death (Figure S1). For example, we assumed
490 many individual behavior, demographic, and socioeconomic variables to be time-invariant (e.g.,
491 employment status and body mass index) due to data availability (these variables were only
492 reported once at the time of enrollment) while they likely changed over the study period.
493 However, we also included time-varying individual income and community demographic and
494 socioeconomic variables in our models, which mitigated the concern of residual confounding
495 from these baseline variables. Besides, like other cohort studies of air pollution, we utilized
496 postal-code level $PM_{2.5}$ levels as surrogates for individual exposure to $PM_{2.5}$, which might
497 introduce exposure misclassification.⁶⁰ Recent studies showed that such bias may either not bias
498 effect estimates⁶¹ or bias these estimates towards the null,⁶² making our estimates more
499 conservative.

500 Second, although we explored different model specifications and found similar results in
501 sensitivity analyses, we cannot rule out the possibility of model misspecification, especially
502 given the fact that parametric g-computation requires correct model specification of both the
503 outcome and covariate models to achieve unbiased results. Notably, McGrath et al. demonstrated
504 that the “g-null paradox”, a form of model misspecification that was traditionally believed to
505 cause false rejection of null hypothesis under sharp null effect,⁶³ is unavoidable in parametric g-
506 computation even when the sharp null hypothesis does not hold, and recommended more flexible
507 models in analysis.⁶⁴ However, the magnitude of bias depends on the extent of exposure-
508 confounder feedback and time-varying confounding. In the context of this study, we would
509 expect relatively small exposure-confounder feedback thus less concern over g-null paradox.
510 Also, consistent results from sensitivity analysis using more flexible models supported the
511 robustness of our results.

512 Third, being an active research field, the existing R package for parametric g-computation does
513 not support features like incorporation of spline functions of time-varying covariates in the
514 model, direct estimation of randomized interventional strategy,⁶⁵ model fit checking with
515 significance tests, or bias analysis. However, the current package provided enough flexibility for
516 our study to employ flexible models that mitigated the possibility of violating the positivity

517 assumption via model extrapolation. For example, we were able to incorporate flexible supra-
518 linear $PM_{2.5}$ -mortality association and temporal changes in the conditional probability of
519 mortality in the estimation as supported by previous studies, incorporate restricted cubic spline
520 function of baseline age in all models, and conduct sensitivity analysis with categorical time-
521 varying confounders. Besides, although not relevant to our cohort since we had the all-cause
522 mortality as the outcome and no loss to follow-up, right censoring and informative loss to
523 follow-up could be handled by parametric g-computation and the existing R package by
524 simulating data on participants as though they had not been censored.⁶⁶ It is worth mentioning
525 that other methods could also handle the methodological considerations that g-computation
526 addresses—consideration of complex time structure and reporting of adjusted survival curves—
527 and have been applied in air pollution epidemiological research, including Inverse Probability of
528 Treatment Weighting (IPTW).⁶ Furthermore, some recent approaches such as the targeted
529 maximum likelihood estimation can also be used to directly evaluate individualized dynamic
530 intervention strategies of continuous exposures and provide doubly robust estimates that are less
531 vulnerable to model misspecification with valid statistical inference when data-
532 adaptive/machine-learning methods are incorporated.^{67,68}

533 Finally, $PM_{2.5}$ is a mixture of varying chemical components and toxicity and is generated from
534 different sources of emissions (e.g. traffic, industries, and wildfires). In this paper, we focused on
535 $PM_{2.5}$ without distinguishing the $PM_{2.5}$ composition nor the sources of emissions. This
536 potentially violated the consistency assumption (i.e. no-multiple-versions-of-treatment and all
537 exposed individuals received the same version of treatment). If there is any unmeasured
538 confounder of the “version of treatment” and outcome relationship, the effect estimates could be
539 biased according to a recent simulation study, with magnitude and direction of such bias
540 depending on the strength of confounding.⁶⁹ In future studies, it would be important to consider
541 the possible differential toxicity of $PM_{2.5}$ components and define hypothetical interventions
542 targeting different sources of $PM_{2.5}$ emissions separately.

543 **Conclusion**

544 This study demonstrated the benefits of using parametric g-computation as an analytical
545 alternative for air pollution epidemiological research, especially for evaluating the potential
546 effects of realistic dynamic intervention strategies in the time-to-event setting with time-varying
547 exposure and confounders. With a large Canadian cohort, we calculated causally interpretable
548 cumulative risk estimates over the follow-up time and corresponding benefits compared to
549 maintaining status quo. We also found that any intervention further reducing the long-term
550 exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ would reduce the cumulative mortality risk from maintaining the status quo,
551 even in a population already exposed to relatively low levels of ambient $PM_{2.5}$.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for participants of the Canadian Community Health Survey cohort at the start of follow-up (2005) by cycle.

Characteristics	Cycle 2000/2001	Cycle 2003	Cycle 2005
Cohort size	62365 ^a	62380 ^a	66835 ^a
Non-accidental deaths (%)	6475 (10.4)	6525 (10.5)	6135 (9.2)
Time-fixed covariates			
Age [mean (SD)], years	52.1 (13.4)	52.1 (14.4)	50.9 (14.9)
Sex, %			
Female	45.2	45.9	46.2
Male	54.8	54.1	53.8
BMI, %			
Normal weight (18.5–24.9)	37.5	32.2	32.0
Overweight (25.0–29.9)	36.7	39.8	39.8
Obese 1 (30.0–34.9)	16.4	19.1	18.9
Obese 2 (≥ 35)	6.8	8.1	8.4
Underweight (< 18.5)	2.6	0.8	0.9
Marital status, %			
Married or common-law	65.9	64.3	63.0
Separated, widowed, or divorced	19.6	20.8	20.8
Single	14.5	14.9	16.2
Immigrant status, %			
Immigrant	10.7	11.3	11.6
Time lived in Canada among immigrants [mean (SD)], years	37.4 (13.3)	36.8 (13.9)	35.7 (14.1)
Non-immigrant	89.3	88.7	88.4
Visible minority status, %			
Visible minority	5.4	6.3	4.4
Not a visible minority	94.6	93.7	95.6
Indigenous status, %			
Indigenous	1.8	2.3	0 ^b
Non-indigenous	98.2	97.7	100
Smoking status, %			
Never smoker	26.8	27.6	29.0
Occasional smoker	44.5	47.7	47.1
Smoke under 10 cigarettes/day	3.8	4.3	4.2
Smoke 11-20 cigarettes/day	6.0	5.6	5.7
Smoke 20+ cigarettes/day	10.9	9.0	8.6
Former smoker	8.0	5.8	5.4
Alcohol consumption, %			
Never drinker	4.4	4.2	4.1
Occasional drinker	13.1	13.7	13.6
Regular drinker, binge unknown	20.3	18.7	18.2
Regular, non-binge drinker	29.4	31.0	30.4
Regular, binge drinker	26.9	26.7	27.3
Former drinker	5.9	5.7	6.4
Daily consumption of fruits and vegetables, %			
Under 5 servings/day	64.7	59.6	29.9
5–10 servings/day	32.4	37.0	19.6
10+ servings/day	2.9	3.4	1.6
Choose to not answer ^c	NA	NA	48.9
Employment status, %			
Employed	66.6	62.3	61.8

Not employed	2.6	2.6	2.3
Not in work force	30.8	35.1	35.9
Education, %			
No high school diploma	24.1	22.4	20.6
High school	18.9	18.0	15.4
Any post-secondary	42.0	42.5	46.1
University	15.0	17.1	17.9
Leisure time physical activity, %			
Active	21.2	24.0	23.4
Moderately active	25.4	26.4	26.7
Inactive	53.4	49.6	49.9
Urban form, %			
Active urban core	6.2	7.0	7.0
Transit reliant suburb	3.9	4.3	4.6
Auto reliant suburb or no data	26.5	29.4	29.3
Exurb	4.8	5.0	4.8
Non-CMA/CA ^d	58.6	54.3	54.3
Airshed, %			
Western	12.0	10.7	10.4
Prairie	16.0	14.9	13.5
Western Central	9.1	8.6	7.8
Southern Atlantic	17.2	14.6	17.3
East Central	44.1	49.3	48.9
Northern	1.6	1.9	2.1
Time-varying covariates			
Community size, %			
Population > 1,500,000	13.5	14.7	16.9
Population 500,000-1,499,999	10.3	11.9	10.4
Population 100,000-499,999	20.4	21.0	19.7
Population 30,000-99,999	14.7	13.2	12.4
Population 10,000-29,999	7.4	7.0	7.5
Non-CMA/CA ^d	33.7	32.2	33.1
Annual family income quintile, %			
1 st quintile (lowest)	19.0	19.1	19.3
2 nd quintile	19.7	19.3	19.1
3 rd quintile	19.9	19.8	19.5
4 th quintile	20.7	20.4	20.8
5 th quintile (highest)	20.7	21.4	21.3
Canadian marginalization index—age and labour force, %			
1 st quintile (lowest marginalization)	14.4	15.3	14.8
2 nd quintile	13.5	13.6	13.7
3 rd quintile	13.7	13.9	14.1
4 th quintile	22.2	20.9	20.8
5 th quintile (highest marginalization)	36.2	36.3	36.6
Canadian marginalization index—material resources, %			
1 st quintile (lowest marginalization)	15.5	15.7	15.2
2 nd quintile	16.8	16.9	17.0
3 rd quintile	20.8	20.8	20.2
4 th quintile	18.1	17.8	17.0
5 th quintile (highest marginalization)	28.8	28.8	30.6
Canadian marginalization index—immigration and visible minority, %			
1 st quintile (lowest marginalization)	42.6	41.4	41.8
2 nd quintile	26.9	26.9	26.5

3 rd quintile	17.0	17.3	15.9
4 th quintile	8.5	9.0	9.9
5 th quintile (highest marginalization)	5.0	5.4	5.9
Canadian marginalization index—households and dwellings, %			
1 st quintile (lowest marginalization)	22.7	21.2	21.7
2 nd quintile	28.3	27.7	27.1
3 rd quintile	21.0	21.7	21.0
4 th quintile	17.3	17.8	17.6
5 th quintile (highest marginalization)	10.7	11.6	11.8
Average PM _{2.5} of previous three years [mean (SD)], µg/m ³	6.4 (2.2)	6.5 (2.3)	6.5 (2.3)
Average PM _{2.5} of previous three years [median (minimum, 25 th percentile, 75 th percentile, maximum)], µg/m ³	5.9 (1.7, 15.0, 4.6, 7.8)	6.1 (1.7, 4.7, 8.1, 15.0)	6.1 (1.6, 4.6, 8.2, 15.0)

Note: BMI, Body Mass Index; PM_{2.5}, particulate matter < 2.5 µm diameter.

^aRounded to the nearest 5 or 0 in the last digit to protect privacy

^bWe did not include the indigenous status indicator in models of Cycle 2005.

^cConsumption of fruit and vegetable was listed with an additional option in Cycle 2005 but not in the other two cycles.

^dNot categorized as census metropolitan area (CMA) or census agglomeration status (CA) and likely in rural area.

Table 2. Details for covariate formats and model types for both outcome and covariate models in main analysis.

Variable Name	Type as independent variable	Type as dependent variable and corresponding model used
Time-fixed covariates		
Age in 2005 ^a	Restricted cubic spline function with 5 knots	Not predicted
Sex	Binary	Not predicted
BMI	5 categories	Not predicted
Marital status	3 categories	Not predicted
Immigrant	An indicator for immigrant and a interaction term between the indicator and a continuous variable for years in Canada among immigrants	Not predicted
Visible minority	Binary	Not predicted
Indigenous status	Binary	Not predicted
Smoking status	6 categories	Not predicted
Alcohol consumption	6 categories	Not predicted
Daily consumption of fruit and vegetables	4 categories	Not predicted
Leisure time physical activity	3 categories	Not predicted
Employment status	3 categories	Not predicted
Education attainment	4 categories	Not predicted
Urban form	5 categories	Not predicted
Air shed	6 categories	Not predicted
Time-varying covariates		
Time	Year and quadratic term of Year ^b	Not predicted
Community size	Continuous	Bounded normal ^c (1 to 6) and linear regression
Annual family income quintile	Continuous	Bounded normal (1 to 5) and linear regression
Canadian Marginalization Index for immigration and visible minority	Continuous	Bounded normal (1 to 5) and linear regression
Canadian Marginalization Index for material resources	Continuous	Bounded normal (1 to 5) and linear regression
Canadian Marginalization Index for households and dwellings	Continuous	Bounded normal (1 to 5) and linear regression
Canadian Marginalization Index for age and labour force	Continuous	Bounded normal (1 to 5) and linear regression
Three-year average PM _{2.5} concentration with one-year lag	Natural logarithm transformed	Normal with linear regression

Note: BMI, Body Mass Index; PM_{2.5}, particulate matter < 2.5 μm diameter.

^aIn subset analysis restricted to cohort participants older or equal to 65 years, we used restricted cubic spline function with 3 knots for age.

^bCategorical year was used in the interaction terms between time and the exposure.

^cVariables with bounded normal category was modeled and simulated by using the standardized value (subtracting the minimum value and dividing by the range) in linear regression. Simulated values that fall outside the observed range are set to the minimum or maximum of the observed range.

Table 3. Summaries of estimated 11-year cumulative mortality risk under different intervention strategies pooled across cycles and differences in estimated risk compared to natural course in relative and absolute scale, and corresponding average simulated PM_{2.5} and proportion of subjects with exposure changed for all intervention strategies.

Intervention strategy	11-year CMR (per 1000 participants) (95% CI)	Difference in 11-year CMR (per 1000 participants) (95% CI)	Percentage change in 11-year CMR (95% CI)	Average percentage of subjects with exposure changed^a	Average simulated PM_{2.5} concentration (µg/m³)^a
Natural course	102.5 (100.3, 104.8)	Reference	Reference	0	5.62
Threshold of 8.8 µg/m ³	102.3 (100.1, 104.6)	-0.20 (-0.34, -0.06)	-0.19 (-0.33, -0.05)	18.7	5.49
Threshold of 7.04 µg/m ³	102.0 (99.7, 104.2)	-0.63 (-1.07, -0.18)	-0.60 (-1.03, -0.17)	38.3	5.21
Threshold of 5 µg/m ³	100.9 (98.4, 103.5)	-1.87 (-3.21, -0.53)	-1.79 (-3.11, -0.48)	72.0	4.42
Threshold of 4 µg/m ³	99.8 (96.7, 102.9)	-3.08 (-5.31, -0.85)	-2.95 (-5.14, -0.77)	91.4	3.75
5% reduction per interval	101.4 (98.6, 104.2)	-1.68 (-3.51, 0.15)	-1.61 (-3.40, 0.17)	100	4.37
10% reduction per interval	99.8 (95.6, 103.9)	-3.40 (-7.03, 0.23)	-3.27 (-6.81, 0.28)	100	3.44

Note: CMR: Cumulative Mortality Risk; PM_{2.5}, particulate matter < 2.5 µm diameter.

^aThis is the three-cycle average of the mean value across all years.

Figure 1. Diagram of g-computation with time-to-event outcome and time-varying covariates. Arrow indicates information needed from previous box.






Figure 2. Differences in yearly cumulative mortality risks pooled across cycles comparing different intervention strategies to natural course, with weights equal to the inverse of variance. Numeric results are presented in Table S2.



Note: T8.8, threshold value (reduced to threshold value if above) set at the current Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ of $8.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; T7.04: threshold value set at 80% of the current Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ (or $7.04 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$); T5: threshold value set at the new World Health Organization guideline of $5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; T4: threshold value set at a $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ level that was further below the World Health Organization guideline ($4 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$); R90: yearly relative reduction values set at 10% per interval; and R95: yearly relative reduction values set at 5% per interval.

Figure 3. Differences in 11-year cumulative mortality risks comparing different intervention strategies to natural course for main analysis and sensitivity analyses. Numeric results are presented in Table 3 and Table S4.



Note: T8.8, threshold value (reduced to threshold value if above) set at the current Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards for $PM_{2.5}$ of $8.8 \mu g/m^3$; T7.04: threshold value set at 80% of the current Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards for $PM_{2.5}$ (or $7.04 \mu g/m^3$); T5: threshold value set at the new World Health Organization guideline of $5 \mu g/m^3$; T4: threshold value set at a $PM_{2.5}$ level that was further below the World Health Organization guideline ($4 \mu g/m^3$); R90: yearly relative reduction values set at 10% per interval; R95: yearly relative reduction values set at 5% per interval; O1: placing Canadian Marginalization Index-age and labour force before the other Canadian Marginalization Index in occurring sequence of time-varying covariate; O2: moving income to after Canadian Marginalization Index in occurring sequence of time-varying covariate; O3: moving $PM_{2.5}$ to the first in occurring sequence of time-varying covariate; TV: adding all time-varying covariates of previous year and two-year previous to covariate model; Cat: including time-varying covariates other than long-term $PM_{2.5}$ as categorical in outcome model and using multinomial logistic model for them in covariate model; Org: using long-term $PM_{2.5}$ in original scale in all models; and 65+: subset analysis restricted to cohort participants older or equal to 65 years.

References

1. Beelen R, Raaschou-Nielsen O, Stafoggia M, et al. Effects of long-term exposure to air pollution on natural-cause mortality: an analysis of 22 European cohorts within the multicentre ESCAPE project. *The Lancet*. 2014;383(9919):785-795. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62158-3
2. Christidis T, Erickson AC, Pappin AJ, et al. Low concentrations of fine particle air pollution and mortality in the Canadian Community Health Survey cohort. *Environmental Health*. 2019;18(1). doi:10.1186/s12940-019-0518-y
3. Crouse DL, Peters PA, van Donkelaar A, et al. Risk of Nonaccidental and Cardiovascular Mortality in Relation to Long-term Exposure to Low Concentrations of Fine Particulate Matter: A Canadian National-Level Cohort Study. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2012;120(5):708-714. doi:10.1289/ehp.1104049
4. Di Q, Wang Y, Zanobetti A, et al. Air pollution and mortality in the Medicare population. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2017;376(26):2513-2522. doi:10.1056/NEJMoal702747
5. Hoek G, Krishnan RM, Beelen R, et al. Long-term air pollution exposure and cardio-respiratory mortality: a review. *Environmental Health*. 2013;12:43. doi:10.1186/1476-069X-12-43
6. Wu X, Braun D, Schwartz J, Kioumourtzoglou MA, Dominici F. Evaluating the impact of long-term exposure to fine particulate matter on mortality among the elderly. *Science Advances*. Published online June 26, 2020:eaba5692. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aba5692
7. Cesaroni G, Forastiere F, Stafoggia M, et al. Long term exposure to ambient air pollution and incidence of acute coronary events: prospective cohort study and meta-analysis in 11 European cohorts from the ESCAPE Project. *BMJ*. 2014;348:f7412. doi:10.1136/bmj.f7412
8. Yazdi MD, Wang Y, Di Q, et al. Long-Term Association of Air Pollution and Hospital Admissions Among Medicare Participants Using a Doubly Robust Additive Model. *Circulation*. Published online February 22, 2021. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.050252
9. Makar M, Antonelli J, Di Q, Cutler D, Schwartz J, Dominici F. Estimating the causal effect of low levels of fine particulate matter on hospitalization. *Epidemiology*. 2017;28(5):627-634. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000690
10. Bi J, D'Souza RR, Rich DQ, et al. Temporal changes in short-term associations between cardiorespiratory emergency department visits and PM2.5 in Los Angeles, 2005 to 2016. *Environmental Research*. 2020;190:109967. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.109967
11. Breitner S, Stölzel M, Cyrys J, et al. Short-term mortality rates during a decade of improved air quality in Erfurt, Germany. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2009;117(3):448-454. doi:10.1289/ehp.11711

12. Chen C, Warrington JA, Dominici F, et al. Temporal variation in association between short-term exposure to fine particulate matter and hospitalisations in older adults in the USA: a long-term time-series analysis of the US Medicare dataset. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2021;5(8):e534-e541. doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00168-6
13. Dominici F, Peng RD, Zeger SL, White RH, Samet JM. Particulate air pollution and mortality in the United States: did the risks change from 1987 to 2000? *Am J Epidemiol*. 2007;166(8):880-888. doi:10.1093/aje/kwm222
14. Atkinson RW, Mills IC, Walton HA, Anderson HR. Fine particle components and health—a systematic review and meta-analysis of epidemiological time series studies of daily mortality and hospital admissions. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol*. 2015;25(2):208-214. doi:10.1038/jes.2014.63
15. Rohr AC, Wyzga RE. Attributing health effects to individual particulate matter constituents. *Atmos Environ (1994)*. 2012;62:130-152. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.07.036
16. Wyzga RE, Rohr AC. Long-term particulate matter exposure: Attributing health effects to individual PM components. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association*. 2015;65(5):523-543. doi:10.1080/10962247.2015.1020396
17. Yang Y, Ruan Z, Wang X, et al. Short-term and long-term exposures to fine particulate matter constituents and health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environmental Pollution*. 2019;247:874-882. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2018.12.060
18. Zhang Z, Reinikainen J, Adeleke KA, Pieterse ME, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CGM. Time-varying covariates and coefficients in Cox regression models. *Ann Transl Med*. 2018;6(7):121. doi:10.21037/atm.2018.02.12
19. Hernán MA. The Hazards of Hazard Ratios. *Epidemiology*. 2010;21(1):13-15. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181c1ea43
20. Flanders WD, Klein M. Properties of 2 Counterfactual Effect Definitions of a Point Exposure. *Epidemiology*. 2007;18(4):453-460. doi:10.1097/01.ede.0000261472.07150.4f
21. Stovitz SD, Banack HR, Kaufman JS. “Depletion of the susceptibles” taught through a story, a table and basic arithmetic. *BMJ Evid Based Med*. 2018;23(5):199. doi:10.1136/bmjebm-2018-110972
22. Hernán MA, Robins JM. Causal Inference: What If. Published online 2020:311.
23. Zigler CM, Dominici F. Point: Clarifying Policy Evidence With Potential-Outcomes Thinking—Beyond Exposure-Response Estimation in Air Pollution Epidemiology. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2014;180(12):1133-1140. doi:10.1093/aje/kwu263
24. Robins J. A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure period—application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect. *Mathematical Modelling*. 1986;7(9):1393-1512. doi:10.1016/0270-0255(86)90088-6

25. Cole SR, Frangakis CE. The Consistency Statement in Causal Inference: A Definition or an Assumption? *Epidemiology*. 2009;20(1):3-5. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e31818ef366
26. Naimi AI, Cole SR, Kennedy EH. An Introduction to G Methods. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. Published online December 30, 2016:dyw323. doi:10.1093/ije/dyw323
27. Chiu YH, Chavarro JE, Dickerman BA, et al. Estimating the effect of nutritional interventions using observational data: the American Heart Association's 2020 Dietary Goals and mortality. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2021;(nqab100). doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqab100
28. Keil AP, Edwards JK, Richardson DR, Naimi AI, Cole SR. The parametric G-formula for time-to-event data: towards intuition with a worked example. *Epidemiology*. 2014;25(6):889-897. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000160
29. Taubman SL, Robins JM, Mittleman MA, Hernán MA. Intervening on risk factors for coronary heart disease: an application of the parametric g-formula. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2009;38(6):1599-1611. doi:10.1093/ije/dyp192
30. Westreich D, Cole SR, Young JG, et al. The parametric g-formula to estimate the effect of highly active antiretroviral therapy on incident AIDS or death. *Stat Med*. 2012;31(18):2000-2009. doi:10.1002/sim.5316
31. Keil AP, Buckley JP, Kalkbrenner AE. Bayesian G-Computation for Estimating Impacts of Interventions on Exposure Mixtures: Demonstration With Metals From Coal-Fired Power Plants and Birth Weight. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2021;(kwab053). doi:10.1093/aje/kwab053
32. Neophytou AM, Costello S, Picciotto S, et al. Diesel Exhaust, Respirable Dust, and Ischemic Heart Disease: An Application of the Parametric g-formula. *Epidemiology*. 2019;30(2):177-185. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000954
33. Neophytou AM, Costello S, Picciotto S, et al. Accelerated lung function decline in an aluminum manufacturing industry cohort exposed to PM2.5: an application of the parametric g-formula. *Occup Environ Med*. 2019;76(12):888-894. doi:10.1136/oemed-2019-105908
34. Garcia E, Urman R, Berhane K, McConnell R, Gilliland F. Effects of policy-driven hypothetical air pollutant interventions on childhood asthma incidence in southern California. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2019;116(32):15883-15888. doi:10.1073/pnas.1815678116
35. Urman R, Garcia E, Berhane K, McConnell R, Gauderman WJ, Gilliland F. The Potential Effects of Policy-driven Air Pollution Interventions on Childhood Lung Development. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2019;201(4):438-444. doi:10.1164/rccm.201903-0670OC

36. Government of Canada SC. Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) Cycle 1.1. Published October 24, 2007. Accessed September 26, 2021. <https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&Id=3359>
37. Government of Canada SC. Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) Cycle 2.1. Published October 24, 2007. Accessed September 26, 2021. <https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&Id=4995>
38. Government of Canada SC. Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) Cycle 3.1. Published October 24, 2007. Accessed September 26, 2021. <https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&Id=22642>
39. Sanmartin C, Decady Y, Trudeau R, et al. Linking the Canadian Community Health Survey and the Canadian Mortality Database: An enhanced data source for the study of mortality. *Health Rep.* 2016;27(12):10-18.
40. van Donkelaar A, Martin RV, Li C, Burnett RT. Regional Estimates of Chemical Composition of Fine Particulate Matter Using a Combined Geoscience-Statistical Method with Information from Satellites, Models, and Monitors: V4.NA.02.MAPLE. Published online January 30, 2019. doi:10.5281/zenodo.6557778
41. van Donkelaar A, Martin RV, Li C, Burnett RT. Regional Estimates of Chemical Composition of Fine Particulate Matter Using a Combined Geoscience-Statistical Method with Information from Satellites, Models, and Monitors. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2019;53(5):2595-2611. doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b06392
42. The Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards. Accessed June 11, 2022. <https://ccme.ca/en/air-quality-report#slide-7>
43. Pinault L, Tjepkema M, Crouse DL, et al. Risk estimates of mortality attributed to low concentrations of ambient fine particulate matter in the Canadian community health survey cohort. *Environ Health.* 2016;15:18. doi:10.1186/s12940-016-0111-6
44. Pinault LL, Weichenthal S, Crouse DL, et al. Associations between fine particulate matter and mortality in the 2001 Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort. *Environmental Research.* 2017;159:406-415. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.08.037
45. Ontario Community Health Profiles Partnership. Canadian Marginalization Index (CAN-Marg)-Home. Accessed October 14, 2020. <http://www.ontariohealthprofiles.ca/canmargCAN.php>
46. Crouse DL, Philip S, van Donkelaar A, et al. A New Method to Jointly Estimate the Mortality Risk of Long-Term Exposure to Fine Particulate Matter and its Components. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6(1):18916. doi:10.1038/srep18916
47. Health Canada. Health Impacts of Air Pollution in Canada 2021 Report. Published March 15, 2021. Accessed June 17, 2021. <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/2021-health-effects-indoor-air-pollution.html>

48. Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. *Evidence-Based Mental Health*. 2019;22(4):153-160. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2019-300117
49. McGrath S, Lin V, Zhang Z, et al. gfoRmula: An R Package for Estimating the Effects of Sustained Treatment Strategies via the Parametric g-formula. *Patterns*. 2020;1(3). doi:10.1016/j.patter.2020.100008
50. VanderWeele TJ, Shpitser I. A new criterion for confounder selection. *Biometrics*. 2011;67(4):1406-1413. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0420.2011.01619.x
51. Snowden JM, Rose S, Mortimer KM. Implementation of G-Computation on a Simulated Data Set: Demonstration of a Causal Inference Technique. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2011;173(7):731-738. doi:10.1093/aje/kwq472
52. Nasari MM, Szyszkowicz M, Chen H, et al. A class of non-linear exposure-response models suitable for health impact assessment applicable to large cohort studies of ambient air pollution. *Air Qual Atmos Health*. 2016;9(8):961-972. doi:10.1007/s11869-016-0398-z
53. Pappin AJ, Christidis T, Pinault LL, et al. Examining the Shape of the Association between Low Levels of Fine Particulate Matter and Mortality across Three Cycles of the Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2019;127(10):107008. doi:10.1289/EHP5204
54. Efron B, Tibshirani R. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman & Hall; 1993.
55. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Published online 2021. <https://www.R-project.org/>
56. Stensrud MJ, Hernán MA. Why Test for Proportional Hazards? *JAMA*. 2020;323(14):1401. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.1267
57. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S, Dvorin EL, Welch HG. Ratio measures in leading medical journals: structured review of accessibility of underlying absolute risks. *BMJ*. 2006;333(7581):1248. doi:10.1136/bmj.38985.564317.7C
58. Daniel RM, Cousens SN, Stavola BLD, Kenward MG, Sterne J a. C. Methods for dealing with time-dependent confounding. *Statistics in Medicine*. 2013;32(9):1584-1618. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.5686>
59. Hernan MA, Hernandez-Diaz S, Robins JM. A Structural Approach to Selection Bias. 2004;15(5):11.
60. Sheppard L, Burnett RT, Szpiro AA, et al. Confounding and exposure measurement error in air pollution epidemiology. *Air Qual Atmos Health*. 2012;5(2):203-216. doi:10.1007/s11869-011-0140-9

61. Richmond-Bryant J, Long TC. Influence of exposure measurement errors on results from epidemiologic studies of different designs. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol*. 2020;30(3):420-429. doi:10.1038/s41370-019-0164-z
62. Samoli E, Butland BK, Rodopoulou S, et al. The impact of measurement error in modeled ambient particles exposures on health effect estimates in multilevel analysis: A simulation study. *Environmental Epidemiology*. 2020;4(3). doi:10.1097/EE9.0000000000000094
63. Robins JM, Wasserman LA. Estimation of Effects of Sequential Treatments by Reparameterizing Directed Acyclic Graphs. *arXiv:13021566 [stat]*. Published online 1997. Accessed July 20, 2021. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1302.1566>
64. McGrath S, Young JG, Hernán MA. Revisiting the g-null Paradox. *Epidemiology*. 2022;33(1):114-120. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000001431
65. VanderWeele TJ, Vansteelandt S, Robins JM. Effect decomposition in the presence of an exposure-induced mediator-outcome confounder. *Epidemiology*. 2014;25(2):300-306. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000034
66. Keil AP, Edwards JK. A Review of Time Scale Fundamentals in the g-Formula and Insidious Selection Bias. *Curr Epidemiol Rep*. 2018;5(3):205-213. doi:10.1007/s40471-018-0153-0
67. Muñoz ID, van der Laan M. Population intervention causal effects based on stochastic interventions. *Biometrics*. 2012;68(2):541-549. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0420.2011.01685.x
68. van der Laan MJ, Petersen ML. Causal effect models for realistic individualized treatment and intention to treat rules. *Int J Biostat*. 2007;3(1):Article 3. doi:10.2202/1557-4679.1022
69. Weichenthal S, Ripley S, Korsiak J. Fine Particulate Air Pollution and the “No-Multiple-Versions-of-Treatment” Assumption: Does Particle Composition Matter for Causal Inference? *American Journal of Epidemiology*. Published online November 4, 2022:kwac191. doi:10.1093/aje/kwac191