

1 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

2 The Mediating Role of Sleep in the Association Between Environmental Noise and Mental 3 Health

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

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

6

7 1. Covariates

8 Covariates controlled for in this analysis were, age in years, sex, baseline mental health measured
9 by the SF-36 survey, labour force status (employed/unemployed/ not in labour force), household
10 income (<\$40,000/ \$40,000 - \$59,999/\$60,000-\$99,999/\$100,000-\$149,999/\$150,000), area
11 socioeconomic disadvantage (quintiles of the Australian Bureau of Statistics' Socio-Economic
12 Index for Areas (SEIFA) 2011 Index of relative socio-economic advantage/disadvantage), shift
13 worker (yes/no, where shift work includes regular evening or night shifts, rotating day/night
14 shifts, split shifts, or being on call), residence in a major city (yes/no), education level (Post-
15 graduate studies/ Undergraduate studies/Diploma or Cert III-IV/ year 12/< year 12), alcohol
16 consumption at baseline and follow-up (Never, rarely, weekly- less than daily, daily), and binary
17 indicators for the birth/adoption of a child, weather related damage to home, death of spouse or
18 child, major financial improvement or worsening, job loss, personal illness or injury, job changes,
19 being the victim of a property crime, pregnancy, changes in relationship status including
20 marriage, separating and reconciling with a partner and retirement.

21

22

23

24 **Appendix Table 1 Variable Availability Across Waves, 2013-2021**

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Noise	x		x		x		x		x	
Sleep		x				x				x
SF36 MH	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Covariates	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

25

26

27 **2. Associations Between Noise, Sleep and Mental Health**28 **Appendix Table 2 Associations Between Self-Reported Noise and Mental Health**

	Road Traffic Noise	P-value	Plane, Train and Industry Noise	P-value
2012-2013	-1.17 (-1.72, -0.63)	< 0.001	-0.22 (-0.80, 0.35)	0.448
2016-2017	-0.70 (-1.23, -0.16)	0.011	-0.82 (-1.39, -0.26)	0.004
2020-2021	-0.32 (-0.86, 0.22)	0.249	-0.48 (-1.06, 0.09)	0.101

29 Note: Linear regression models adjusted for age, sex, baseline mental health, household income, labour force status,
 30 education level, alcohol consumption at baseline, area socioeconomic disadvantage, shift work, residence in a major
 31 city, and several life events. Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).
 32
 33

34 **Appendix Table 3 Relative Odds of Sleep Quality with Noise Exposure**

	Road Traffic Noise	P-value	Plane, Train and Industry Noise	P-value
	(OR, 95% CI)		(OR, 95% CI)	
2012-2013	1.21 (1.10, 1.35)	< 0.001	1.08 (0.96, 1.20)	0.197
2016-2017	1.18 (1.07, 1.30)	0.001	1.19 (1.07, 1.31)	0.001
2020-2021	1.05 (0.95, 1.16)	0.307	1.03 (0.93, 1.14)	0.595

35 Note: Logistic regression models adjusted for age, sex, baseline mental health, household income, labour force
 36 status, education level, alcohol consumption at baseline, area socioeconomic disadvantage, shift work, residence in a
 37 major city, and several life events. Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).
 38

39 **Appendix Table 4 Associations Between Self-Reported Sleep Quality and Mental Health**

	Sleep Quality	P-value
2012-2013	-6.11 (-6.67, -5.55)	< 0.001
2016-2017	-6.27 (-6.79, -5.74)	< 0.001
2020-2021	-5.80 (-6.34, -5.26)	< 0.001

40 Note: Linear regression models adjusted for age, sex, baseline mental health, household income, labour force status,
 41 education level, alcohol consumption at follow up, area socioeconomic disadvantage, shift work, residence in a
 42 major city, and several life events. Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).
 43

44 3. Sensitivity Analyses

45 A sensitivity analysis was conducted by changing the definition of exposed for both traffic
46 and PTI noise, such that only individuals who reported “very common” exposure to noise were
47 classified as exposed to noise (as opposed to “very common” and “fairly common” in the primary
48 analysis). For road traffic noise, the total and indirect effect estimates, and proportions mediated,
49 were similar to those from the primary analysis across all years, but point estimates were less
50 precise (Appendix Table 5). For PTI noise, evidence for total and mediated effects were seen
51 only for 2016-17 in the primary analysis. With the narrower definition of exposed, the less
52 precise estimates contributed to weaker evidence for that period. Consistent with primary
53 analysis, no associations or mediation were observed for PTI noise in the other years.

54 **Appendix Table 5 Sensitivity Analysis: Exposure redefined as only “very common” exposure to noise**

	Total Effect	P- value	Natural Indirect Effect	P- value	Natural Direct Effect	P- value	Proportion Mediated	P- value
Road Traffic Noise								
2012-13	-1.03 (-1.92, -0.14)	0.023	-0.23 (-0.43, -0.03)	0.021	-0.80 (-1.66, 0.06)	0.067	0.22 (-0.01, 0.46)	0.061
2016-17	0.82 (-1.70, 0.06)	0.069	-0.26 (-0.46, -0.06)	0.010	-0.56 (-1.41, 0.30)	0.204	0.32 (-0.05, 0.70)	0.094
2020-21	-0.11 (-1.06, 0.84)	0.825	-0.05 (-0.22, 0.12)	0.573	-0.06 (-0.99, 0.87)	0.903	0.46 (-3.59, 4.51)	0.824
Plane, Train and Industry Noise								
2012-13	-0.08 (-1.00, 0.84)	0.872	-0.20 (-0.42, 0.01)	0.064	0.12 (-0.77, 1.02)	0.872	not estimated*	
2016-17	-0.95 (-1.86, -0.03)	0.042	-0.14 (-0.31, 0.03)	0.099	-0.81 (-1.70, -0.09)	0.077	0.15 (-0.05, 0.35)	0.151
2020-21	-0.70 (-1.78, 0.35)	0.190	-0.21 (-0.44, 0.01)	0.065	-0.49 (-1.52, 0.53)	0.347	0.30 (-0.19, 0.79)	0.227

55 Note: Linear regression models adjusted for age, sex, baseline mental health, household income, labour force status, education level, alcohol consumption at
56 baseline and follow up, area socioeconomic disadvantage, shift work, residence in a major city, and several life events.

57 Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).

58 * An interpretable proportion mediated could not be estimated for the PTI noise model in 2013-13 because signs among indirect, direct, and total effects were
59 opposing.

60 4. Interactions

61 Interactions

62 Minimal evidence of interaction between perceived noise exposure and sleep was found
 63 (Appendix Table 6). Causal mediation analysis makes no assumptions about whether exposure-
 64 mediator interaction is present; in this instance, observing only limited evidence of interaction
 65 suggests our decision to use causal mediation analysis over traditional mediation methods may
 66 have been unimportant, with results from both approaches likely to be similar.

67

68 Appendix Table 6 Exposure-mediator interactions in models of noise, sleep and mental 69 health

70

	Noise-Sleep interaction term P-value	
	Road Traffic Noise x Sleep Quality	Plane Train and Industry Noises
2012-2013	0.213	0.180
2016-2017	0.177	0.013
2020-2021	0.109	0.464

71 Note: Adjusted for age, sex, baseline mental health, household income, labour force status, education level and
 72 alcohol consumption at baseline and follow up, area socioeconomic disadvantage, shift work, residence in a major
 73 city, and several life events.

74

75