medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Evaluating the impact of Hazelwood mine fire event on students' educational development with Bayesian interrupted time-series hierarchical meta-regression

Caroline X. Gao
School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; Centre for Youth Mental Health, University of Melbourne, Parkview, Victoria, Australia; Orygen, Parkview, Victoria, Australia

Jonathan C. Broder
School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria Australia

Sam Brilleman
School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Emily Berger
Department of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Jillian Ikin
School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Catherine L. Smith
School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Tim C. H. Campbell
Monash Rural Health, Monash University, Churchill, Victoria, Australia

Rory Wolfe
School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Fay Johnston
Menzies Institute for Medical Research, University of Tasmania, Hobart Tasmania, Australia

Yuming Guo
School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Matthew Carroll
Monash Rural Health, Monash University, Churchill, Victoria, Australia

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

20 March 2021

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Disasters and other community-wide events can introduce significant interruptions and trauma to impacted communities. Children and young people can be disproportionately affected with additional educational disruptions. With the increasing threat of climate change, establishing a timely and adaptable framework to evaluate the impact of disasters on academic achievement is needed. However, analytical challenges are posed by the availability issue of individual-level data.

Methods: A new method, Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression, was developed to evaluate the impact of the 2014 Hazelwood mine fire (a six-week fire event in Australia) using only aggregated school-level data from the standardised National Assessment Program-Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) test. NAPLAN results and school characteristics (2008-2018) from 69 primary/secondary schools with different levels of mine fire-related smoke exposure were used to estimate the impact of the event. Using an interrupted time-series design, the model estimated immediate effects and post-interruption trend differences with full Bayesian statistical inference.

Results: Major academic interruptions across NAPLAN domains were evident in high exposure schools in the year post-mine fire (highest in Writing: 11.09 [95%CI: 3.16-18.93], lowest in Reading: 8.34 [95%CI: 1.07-15.51]). The interruption was comparable to a three to four-month delay in educational attainment and had not fully recovered after several years.

Conclusions: Considerable academic delays were found as a result of a mine fire, highlighting the need to provide educational and community-based supports in response to future events. Importantly, this work provides a statistical method using readily available aggregated data to assess the educational impacts in response to other disasters.

Keywords: Bayesian, time-series model, disaster, academic performance, trauma, landscape fire, mine fire

Key Messages:

• Although disasters impose substantial impacts on children and young people through many factors including trauma, illness, prolonged school interruption and reduced social support, population-level impact evaluation study is rare.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- This study provides an innovative method to evaluate the impact of disasters on students' academic performance using only readily accessible aggregated school-level data.
- Results suggest that a community-wide traumatic event, where immediate risk to life and property was minimal, can still have considerable and long-term educational impacts.

Word count: Main text: 3068; Abstract: 250

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Evaluating the impact of Hazelwood mine fire event on students' educational development with Bayesian interrupted time-series hierarchical meta-regression

Introduction

Each year, disasters, such as wildfires, floods, earthquakes and disease outbreaks affect 200 to 300 million people worldwide.[1] The frequency and severity of disasters have increased dramatically in recent years due to the rise in climate-related events such as wildfires.[2–4] Compared with adults, children and adolescents may be more vulnerable post disasters.[5] The health, social and economic disruption of disasters impose substantial impacts on children and adolescents through factors such as trauma, illness, prolonged school interruption and reduced social support.[6] Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, anxiety and behavioural problems are widely reported in children and adolescents impacted by disasters such as hurricanes and earthquakes.[7–9] Wildfires have also been found to cause traumatic experiences for children and young people.[10,11] The impact of disasters can also be long-term resulting in neurodevelopmental delays, impairment in social functioning and emotional and behavioural challenges associated with chronic stress and trauma.[12,13]

The impact of disasters on children varies vastly with regard to the level of exposure, type of disaster, pre-existing vulnerability and available support.[14] However, evaluating disaster impacts on children and adolescents at a population-level is challenging, due to difficulties in study recruitment, high risk of response bias and lack of pre-disaster measurements necessary for assessment of change.[15] As there is an established relationship between learning outcomes and adversity for children and adolescents,[16,17] evaluating changes in students' academic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

performance could provide unique insights into the level of impact of disasters on school-aged children and adolescents. Indeed, many studies have demonstrated the link between disaster exposure and academic challenges.[18–21] Nonetheless, accessing individual students' academic records is often difficult and requires complex ethics procedures, which can be particularly challenging following disaster events. In contrast, de-identified aggregated school-level data is more accessible. Hence there is a need for statistical models that can incorporate aggregated standardised academic testing results to evaluate the impact of disasters without losing substantial statistical power.

In February 2014, a bushfire ignited the Morwell coal mine adjacent to the Hazelwood Power Station (in the Latrobe Valley, Victoria, Australia) and burned for approximately six weeks. Whilst the flames themselves did not directly threaten homes or cause loss of life, heavy smoke concentrations throughout the six-week period resulted in physical ill-health and psychological distress in the local community and caused considerable school disruption.[22,23] The Hazelwood Health Study (HHS; www.hazelwoodhealthstudy.org.au), established to evaluate the health and wellbeing impact of the mine fire,[23,24] conducted a school survey to evaluate the psychological outcomes of the mine fire on students. A subsequent evaluation of National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) results of survey participants suggested academic delays in highly smoke-exposed areas.[25] However, the low participation rate in the survey, as is frequently the case in post-disaster studies, introduced risk of bias.[26,27] Hence the aggregated school-level NAPLAN data from all Victorian schools were obtained to further consolidate our findings.

In this study, we developed a Bayesian interrupted time-series hierarchical meta-regression model to evaluate the impact of the Hazelwood mine fire on academic performance. Using this method, instead of individual-level data, only aggregated school-level data from standardised academic tests is required for evaluating spatial and temporal profiles of community-wide

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

traumatic events. Here, we have presented detailed analysis procedures and results to inform the conduct of research concerning educational outcomes after disasters.

Methods

Study design

The modelled particulate matter exposure during the mine fire period suggested that the town Morwell (a statistical area level 2 area[28] closest to the mine fire) experienced the highest smoke concentrations.[29] The wider Latrobe Valley (statistical area level 3 [SA3] area which includes Morwell) suffered a moderate level of exposure.[29] Due to wind direction, the nearby SA3 area of Wellington, with similar socioeconomic profile to Latrobe Valley, had little to no exposure to the smoke. Therefore Wellington was chosen as the comparison area for this analysis. Hence, 69 primary and secondary schools in the area were classified into three exposure groups: Morwell (high exposure), the remainder of the Latrobe Valley (moderate exposure) and Wellington (no/low exposure), see Figure 1.

NAPLAN and school profile data

In Australia, NAPLAN tests are conducted annually in May for Grade 3, 5, 7 and 9 students and NAPLAN examines educational domains of reading, writing, numeracy, spelling and grammar/punctuation.[30] As NAPLAN assesses incremental learning, students' scores are expected to increase when they are re-tested at each two-year interval. Aggregated school-level NAPLAN data (mean score and SE for each domain) were requested from the Australian, Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) for all Victorian schools between 2008 and 2018. School profiles, including total enrolments, school sector (government, non-government), school type (primary, secondary), gender proportion and Index of Community

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) based on school location, were provided by ACARA for each year.

Statistical methods

School characteristics (in 2014) and NAPLAN participation rate (2008-2018) were first compared across the three exposure groups. School-level mean NAPLAN scores pre- and post-mine fire were visualised using box plots by exposure group for each educational domain and student grade level.

To increase interpretability of results, the NAPLAN scores were first centred against the matching mean regional scores (for the same year, grade and educational domain) to represent the difference from the regional Victorian average. Hierarchical two-level meta-regression models were carried out in a Bayesian modelling framework to estimate the association between mine fire exposure and centred NAPLAN scores. The first level random effects (random intercepts) were modelled at the school-level, and the nested second level random effects (random intercepts) were modelled as student cohorts (e.g. the cohort of students progressing from Grade 3 in 2014 to Grade 5 in 2016 at the same school). The centred mean NAPLAN score at Grade g level for cohort c students in given school s was modelled as follows:

$$y_{s,g,c} \sim N(\beta \boldsymbol{X_{s,g}} + \theta_{s,c} + \theta_s + \theta_e, {\tau_{s,g,c}}^2)$$

The terms θ_s and $\theta_{s,c}$ are the random effects for the school s and cohort c in that school, respectively. θ_e is the random error term. We assume $\theta_{s,c} \sim N(0, \sigma^2_{s,c})$, $\theta_s \sim N(0, \sigma^2_s)$ and $\theta_e \sim N(0, \sigma^2_e)$. The fixed effect matrix $\boldsymbol{X_{s,g}}$ includes values of potential confounding factors: school characteristics (ICSEA, total enrolments, percentage of girls, school sector, grade level, long-term trend (year) as well as mine fire exposure effect variables detailed below with an illustration of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

meaning of the effect coefficients β. $\tau_{s,g,c}$ is simply the standard error of the mean NAPLAN score of the given school, student cohort and grade level (input data obtained from ACARA).

The mine fire exposure effect was evaluated using the interrupted time-series design[31] with a time-specific interruption variable to capture the immediate effect of the mine fire on that year's NAPLAN results, and an interaction between the time interruption variable and year to capture any change in underlying trends from pre- to post-mine fire. It was assumed that there would be no interruption effect in the no/low exposure group, and mine fire interruption effects as well as post interruption trend differences were evaluated separately for the high and moderate exposure groups, summarised as follows:

$$\beta_{e1}E_m + \beta_{e2}E_h + \beta_{e3}E_m I_{post} + \beta_{e4}E_h I_{post} + \beta_{e5}E_m I_{post} T_{post} + \beta_{e6}E_h I_{post} T_{post}$$

where E_m and E_h are indicator variables for moderate and high exposure. I_{post} is the indicator variable for pre or post-mine fire (0 for 2008-2013 and 1 for 2014-2018). T_{post} is the post-mine fire time variable (0 for 2008-2014, 1 for 2015, 2 for 2016 etc.). Therefore, β_{e1} and β_{e2} can be interpreted as the prior-mine fire differences when comparing moderate and high exposure schools with no/low exposure schools. These two coefficients are subsequently referred to as the fixed intercepts. The coefficients β_{e3} and β_{e4} can be interpreted as the mine fire interruptions effect (relative to the students' developmental trajectories) for moderate and high exposure schools, respectively. The coefficients β_{e5} and β_{e6} are the post-mine fire trend differences compared with the trend before the mine fire. Other than $\beta_{e1}, \beta_{e2} \ldots \beta_{e6}$, the vector of coefficients, β, also contains coefficients of other confounding variables detailed above.

Estimation was conducted by Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling implemented in the Stan[32] programming language via RStan package.[33] Stan is a platform for high-performance full Bayesian statistical inference using "No-U-Turn Sampler" (NUTS).[34] Weakly informative prior distributions were used for standard deviations (SDs) of random effects, namely,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

$\sigma_{s,c} \sim TN(10, 5^2)$, $\sigma_s \sim TN(10, 5^2)$ and $\sigma_e \sim TN(10, 5^2)$, where TN is the truncated normal distribution with support over the range $[0, infinity)$. The mean of 10 for prior distributions of the random effects was chosen based on preliminary exploratory evaluation of all Victorian schools. Weakly informative prior distributions $N(0, 50^2)$ were used for all fixed effect parameters (non-informative priors base on uniform distributions can lead to a range of model fitting issues)[32,35].

Separate models were estimated for each testing domain. Results were reported as the posterior mean of estimated coefficients (4 Monte Carlo chains with 2000 iterations each), 95% credible interval (CI) and the probability of estimated coefficients (β) being greater or less than 0. Predicted centred NAPLAN score for schools were calculated and visualised for each testing domain and exposure group using line plots.

A range of sensitivity analyses were undertaken to test the robustness of results, which included using different prior distributions and excluding cohort random effects. Also, two schools in Morwell were relocated during the mine fire event and remained at their relocation sites for an extended period afterwards; hence sensitivity analyses were conducted excluding the two relocated schools. Code for fitting the models using synthetic data is provided in the Supplementary Material I.

Results

The characteristics of schools across exposure groups are presented in Table 1. ICSEA socio-educational advantage scores were lower for schools in the high exposure group (Morwell) compared to schools in moderate and no/low exposure groups. Other school characteristics, including the percentage of girls, number of students, school sector and NAPLAN test participation rates were comparable between exposure groups. Distributions of NAPLAN scores pre-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

and post-mine fire for each domain and grade level were plotted by exposure group, see Figure 2. While there was a general trend across all exposure groups for NAPLAN performance to decline post-mine fire, this was greater in higher exposure schools.

Results from Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models are displayed in Table 2 and Figure 3. Compared with the Victorian regional average, there was an estimated downward trend for the schools in the three exposure groups across all domains of testing (see Figure 3 and Table S1 to S5 in Supplementary Material II). As shown in Table 2, NAPLAN scores were found to be similar between schools in the moderate vs no/low exposure group pre-mine fire after controlling for other confounding factors (i.e. there was no evidence that the fixed intercept mode coefficients for moderate exposure differed from 0). However, pre-mine fire NAPLAN scores were estimated to be lower in schools in the high exposure group for most domains when compared with no/low exposure schools (fixed intercept for high exposure ranged between -3 to -14, Table 2).

Table 2 also shows that there were substantial interruption effects post-mine fire in high exposure schools across all domains, with estimated mean score reductions of: -10.91 (95%CI: -18.68, -3.08) for grammar and punctuation; -10.9 (95%CI: -17.98, -3.67) for numeracy; -8.34 (95%CI: -15.51, -1.07) for reading; -10.31 (95%CI: -17.39, -3.38) for spelling and -11.09 (95%CI: -18.93, -3.16) for writing. After the initial drop in academic performance, there was evidence that writing, grammar and punctuation scores began to recover (positive slope) in high exposure schools, see Figure 3. However, there was no such improvement post-mine fire for spelling in high exposure schools (estimated slope of -1.49 post mine fire; 95%CI: -4.20, 1.21). Also, the predicted centred NAPLAN scores in 2018 were found to be lower compared with the pre-mine fire period in all domains for high exposure schools (see Figure 3), which indicates incomplete recovery five years post-mine fire.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The choice of prior distributions for the SDs of random effects were found to have little impact on results; however, using a weakly informative prior distribution reduced the time taken to fit the Bayesian models compared with using a non-informative prior distribution. Sensitivity analysis excluding the cohort random effects (only the school level clustering is considered) produced very similar results except for a slightly larger mine fire interruption effect for high exposure schools (see Table S6). Models excluding the two relocated schools showed results that were consistent with all schools, but with slightly smaller interruption effects (see Table S7). This suggests that school relocation might have an adverse impact on NAPLAN performance additional to the mine fire exposure or the adverse effects were stronger in those schools (relocated) closest to the mine fire.

Discussion

This study provides an innovative method to evaluate the impact of disasters on students' academic performance using only readily accessible aggregated school-level data. Results suggest that the Hazelwood mine fire had a major impact on academic performance in schools in the high exposure area. The impact was consistent across all NAPLAN testing domains, with about a 10-point score reduction in the year of the event based on NAPLAN testing approximately three months post-mine fire. Typically, NAPLAN scores increase from an average score of approximately 400 in Grade 3, to 600 in Grade 9 (about 33 points per year),[36] which means that the delay in educational attainment in high exposure schools was equivalent to about three to four-month. While there was some recovery in academic performance in high exposure schools across all academic domains except for spelling, performance levels remained below those seen prior to the mine fire some four years afterwards.

Both the results and method in this study are novel. We identified, for the first time, evidence of academic interruptions across all NAPLAN domains following a prolonged wildfire where

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the fire, itself, did not directly threaten life and property, but caused extreme air pollution. This highlights the substantial vulnerability of children and young people resulting from a community-level traumatic event associated with poor air quality. The impact of the mine fire on academic performance may be due to numerous factors, including disruption to day-to-day operations,[22] traumatic symptoms caused by the mine fire,[37] known associations between air pollution and impaired cognitive function,[38,39] adverse physical health effects of exposure to the Hazelwood mine fire-related air pollution (e.g. respiratory symptoms),[40] ongoing distress experienced by students, teachers and parents[22,41,42] and possibly reduced support from family and community. Given academic underachievement can lead to unemployment, disadvantage and ill-health later in life,[43] it is critical that these impacts are recognised and responded to.

Although the theoretical link between disasters and educational outcomes has been well-established,[14] most studies have only evaluated the disaster impact on school attendance or drop-out rates[19,20,44] and rarely on academic delays. One study suggested more than 75% of the African American children evacuated to escape Hurricane Katrina (which resulted in the loss of more than 1300 lives, 800,000 homes and 110 schools) experienced a decline in grades.[45] To our knowledge, only Gibbs and colleagues evaluated the impact of disasters using national standardised tests.[21] The authors reported that exposure to the 2009 Black Saturday bushfire in Australia (loss of 173 lives, 2,000 homes and 3 schools) was associated with delays in academic achievement from Grade 3 to 5 in reading and numeracy but not in writing, spelling, and grammar domains.[21] However, only one cohort of students (Grade 3 in 2011) were evaluated. Our study, on the other hand, endorsed the time-series design with more historical data which may increase the likelihood of identifying interruptions.

Potential links between air pollution and cognitive development, educational and behavioral outcomes in children is an area of rapidly increasing research. Associations have been seen with chronic air pollution and cognitive function and educational attainment,[46] but we are not aware

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of previous research evaluating associations between medium-duration air pollution episodes and long term outcomes. Although our study design cannot delineate the relative contributions of all possible factors such as psychological trauma, disruption to schooling, or air pollution exposure, it indicates a possible linkage which warrants further investigation.

This paper provides an easily adaptable method to evaluate the impact of different types of community-level traumatic exposures (e.g. disasters and disease outbreaks) on school-aged children and adolescents using only aggregated school-level data. This method has a few advantages. Firstly, it enables the evaluation of the spatial and temporal profile of the impact, which could be used to inform policy and resource allocation in academic settings post disasters. Secondly, the proposed method uses only summary statistics at the school-level without losing substantial statistical power to detect meaningful differences. Accessing aggregated data avoids the research challenges faced when attempting to recruit individuals in communities post-disaster, and the associated costs for this more intensive approach. Lastly, the interrupted time-series design also allowed researchers to compare academic outcomes pre- and post-mine fire and to observe trends some years before and after the disaster. This provides essential information for teachers, schools and education departments to be able to plan and implement educational modifications and accommodate student's additional needs post-disaster.

There are some limitations of this study. The model assumes that student NAPLAN scores within schools were normally distributed, which could be unrealistic if, for example, distributions were skewed. Although the number of schools in the high exposure group was modest, most of these schools had over 150 students enrolled, so the mine fire interruption effects identified are likely to be robust. Random slopes for schools, an extension of the model applied, was not considered due to the unwarranted increase in modelling complexity with limited data. Random slope and intercept models can be used where there are more schools and time points available. The aggregated nature of the data prohibited evaluating individual-level risk factors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

More detailed region-specific data on other risk factors, such as service availability, were not available for this analysis but in principle could be included in the proposed model.

Conclusion

This analysis shows that an extended air pollution event resulted in a delay in academic performance across multiple educational domains, which had not fully recovered after several years. While the available research to date has focused on the educational impact of major disasters, the current study shows that a community-wide traumatic event, with minimal immediate risk to life and property, can also have considerable long-term educational impacts. This highlights the need to respond to community-wide disaster events, providing targeted support during and following the event, in the hope of preventing or ameliorating any educational impacts.

This paper provides a novel statistical method for using readily available aggregated data to assess educational impacts of disasters. Implementing research programs post-disasters is enormously challenging. Accordingly, an approach that enables accurate and timely assessment of educational impacts without impost on the community is invaluable. The model provided here could readily be used to look at the impact of other extended events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, which has impacted on access to, and delivery of, schooling worldwide.

Funding

This work was funded by the Victorian Department of Health and Human Services. The paper presents the views of the authors and does not represent the views of the Department.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Ethics approval

All procedure of the study was approved by the Monash University Human Research Ethics (project number: 5834) and the Victorian Department of Education and Training.

Conflict of Interest

There are no disclosures to report. All authors report no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data underlying this article were provided by Australian, Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). Data will be shared on request to the corresponding author with the permission of ACARA. However, a synthetically generated data set based on the source data for the tutorial part of the paper is available at `https://github.com/CarolineXGao/NAPLAN_impact`.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the Latrobe Valley and Gippsland communities for their support and participation in the Hazelwood Health Study. We also like to acknowledge Prof Rob Hyndman for his generous sharing of the Rmarkdown LaTex template (`https://github.com/robjhyndman/MonashEBSTemplates`) for writing this paper in the Rmarkdown environment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Tables and figures

Table 1: *School profile (in year 2014) and NAPLAN participation rate by exposure area*

Characteristic	Overall (N = 69)	No to low exposure (N = 34)	Moderate exposure (N = 28)	High exposure (N = 7)
ICSEA	963 (938, 998)	974 (954, 998)	962 (942, 1,006)	922 (906, 944)
Proportion of girls	0.49 (0.45, 0.51)	0.49 (0.45, 0.51)	0.49 (0.46, 0.51)	0.47 (0.44, 0.51)
Total enrolments	153 (79, 316)	108 (47, 254)	165 (118, 340)	204 (142, 280)
School type				
Combined	1 (1.4%)	1 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Primary	60 (87%)	29 (85%)	25 (89%)	6 (86%)
Secondary	8 (12%)	4 (12%)	3 (11%)	1 (14%)
School sector				
Government	53 (77%)	26 (76%)	22 (79%)	5 (71%)
Non-government	16 (23%)	8 (24%)	6 (21%)	2 (29%)
Participation rate				
2008	0.97 (0.93, 1.00)	0.97 (0.93, 1.00)	0.97 (0.94, 1.00)	0.96 (0.92, 0.99)
2010	0.94 (0.88, 0.98)	0.97 (0.89, 1.00)	0.94 (0.91, 0.96)	0.82 (0.80, 0.85)
2012	0.94 (0.91, 1.00)	0.97 (0.92, 1.00)	0.93 (0.90, 0.96)	0.92 (0.88, 0.95)
2014	0.96 (0.90, 0.98)	0.96 (0.95, 0.98)	0.93 (0.88, 0.97)	0.94 (0.92, 0.96)
2016	0.94 (0.91, 0.97)	0.95 (0.91, 0.97)	0.94 (0.91, 0.97)	0.92 (0.88, 0.93)
2018	0.94 (0.89, 0.97)	0.94 (0.88, 0.97)	0.94 (0.90, 0.95)	0.97 (0.91, 0.99)

Note: Statistics presented are median (IQR) and n (%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2: *Estimated intercept, mine fire interruption effect and post-mine fire trend difference for moderate and high exposure schools estimated from Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models*

	Moderate exposure				High exposure			
	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)
Grammar and Punctuation								
Fixed intercept	-3.90	-13.13, 5.31		0.20	-11.61	-25.28, 2.18		0.05
Mine fire interruption effect	-1.78	-5.73, 2.13		0.19	-10.91	-18.68, -3.08		0.004
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.92	-0.51, 2.35	0.11		2.37	-0.73, 5.37	0.06	
Numeracy								
Fixed intercept	-5.66	-13.94, 2.60		0.08	-12.07	-24.26, 0.23		0.028
Mine fire interruption effect	-0.44	-4.20, 3.28		0.41	-10.90	-17.98, -3.67		<0.001
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.79	-0.56, 2.13	0.13		1.61	-1.21, 4.43	0.13	
Reading								
Fixed intercept	-1.87	-10.19, 6.39		0.33	-13.41	-26.26, -0.19		0.024
Mine fire interruption effect	-1.18	-4.84, 2.57		0.27	-8.34	-15.51, -1.07		0.013
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.69	-0.61, 2.01	0.15		1.05	-1.63, 3.85	0.23	
Spelling								
Fixed intercept	-0.52	-8.45, 7.05		0.45	-3.68	-16.16, 8.34		0.27
Mine fire interruption effect	-1.44	-4.91, 2.09		0.21	-10.31	-17.39, -3.38		0.003
Post-mine fire trend difference	-0.42	-1.68, 0.85	0.74		-1.49	-4.20, 1.21	0.86	
Writing								
Fixed intercept	1.01	-6.83, 8.71		0.61	-7.53	-19.63, 4.62		0.11
Mine fire interruption effect	3.56	-0.52, 7.55		0.96	-11.09	-18.93, -3.16		0.003
Post-mine fire trend difference	-0.60	-2.01, 0.82	0.80		2.44	-0.60, 5.50	0.06	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: *Map of mine fire exposed SA2 in Victoria. Superimposed dots are the location of schools in the impacted area.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: *Box plot of school mean NAPLAN score for pre-mine fire period and post-mine fire period by exposure group for each domain and grade level*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: *Trends of predicted centred NAPLAN scores (predicted margins when all covariates fixed at reference values) with error bars by exposure group for each academic domain. Note: centred NAPLAN scores represent score differences of schools compared with the regional Victorian average scores in the matching year, grade level and domain; the grey line indicates the time of the mine fire*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Guha-Sapir D, Hoyois P, Wallemacq P, Below R. Annual disaster statistical review 2016: The numbers and trends [Internet]. Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters; 2016. Available from: https://www.emdat.be/sites/default/files/adsr_2016.pdf
2. UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR). The human cost of disasters: An overview of the last 20 years (2000-2019) [Internet]. UNDRR; 2020. Available from: https://www.undrr.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/Human%20Cost%20of%20Disasters%202000-2019%20FINAL.pdf
3. Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) C for. CRED crunch 58 - disaster year in review [Internet]. CRED; 2019. Available from: https://cred.be/sites/default/files/CC58.pdf
4. Xu R, Yu P, Abramson MJ, et al. Wildfires, global climate change, and human health. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;**383**(22):2173–2181. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsr2028985
5. Norris FH, Friedman MJ, Watson PJ, Byrne CM, Diaz E, Kaniasty K. 60,000 disaster victims speak: Part i. An empirical review of the empirical literature, 1981-2001. *Psychiatry*. 2002;**65**(3):207–39. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.65.3.207.20173
6. Saylor CF. Children and disasters. New York: New York : Plenum Press; 1993.
7. Kar N. Psychological impact of disasters on children: Review of assessment and interventions. *World J Pediatr*. 2009;**5**(1):5–11. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12519-009-0001-x
8. Kar N, Bastia BK. Post-traumatic stress disorder, depression and generalised anxiety disorder in adolescents after a natural disaster: A study of comorbidity. *Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health*. Springer; 2006;**2**(1):17. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-0179-2-17

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

9. McLaughlin KA, Fairbank JA, Gruber MJ, et al. Serious emotional disturbance among youths exposed to hurricane Katrina 2 years postdisaster. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2009;**48**(11):1069–1078. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181b76697

10. McFarlane AC, Clayer J, Bookless C. Psychiatric morbidity following a natural disaster: An Australian bushfire. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*. Springer; 1997;**32**(5):261–268. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00789038

11. Yelland C, Robinson P, Lock C, et al. Bushfire impact on youth. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 2010;**23**(2):274–277. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.20521

12. Lubit R, Rovine D, Defrancisci L, Eth S. Impact of trauma on children. *Journal of Psychiatric Practice*. 2003;**9**(2):128–138. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/00131746-200303000-00004

13. Caffo E, Forresi B, Lievers LS. Impact, psychological sequelae and management of trauma affecting children and adolescents. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*. 2005;**18**(4):422–428. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/01.yco.0000172062.01520.ac

14. Peek L. Children and disasters: Understanding vulnerability, developing capacities, and promoting resilience—an introduction. *Children Youth and Environments*. JSTOR; 2008;**18**(1):1–29. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7721/chilyoutenvi.18.1.0001%20

15. Kousky C. Impacts of natural disasters on children. *The Future of children*. JSTOR; 2016;73–92.

16. Perfect MM, Turley MR, Carlson JS, Yohanna J, Saint Gilles MP. School-related outcomes of traumatic event exposure and traumatic stress symptoms in students: A systematic review of research from 1990 to 2015. *School Mental Health: A Multidisciplinary Research and Practice Journal*. 2016;**8**(1):7–43. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-016-9175-2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

17. Romano E, Babchishin L, Marquis R, Fréchette S. Childhood maltreatment and educational outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 2015;**16**(4):418–437. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014537908

18. Husain SA, Allwood MA, Bell DJ. The relationship between PTSD symptoms and attention problems in children exposed to the Bosnian war. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*. 2008;**16**(1):52. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426607310847

19. Perez-Pereira M, Tinajero C, Rodriguez MS, Peralbo M, Sabucedo JM. Academic effects of the prestige oil spill disaster. *Span J Psychol*. 2012;**15**(3):1055–68.

20. Siriwardhana C, Pannala G, Siribaddana S, Sumathipala A, Stewart R. Impact of exposure to conflict, tsunami and mental disorders on school absenteeism: Findings from a national sample of sri lankan children aged 12-17 years. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;**13**:560. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-13-560

21. Gibbs L, Nursey J, Cook J, et al. Delayed disaster impacts on academic performance of primary school children. *Child Development*. 2019;**90**(4):1402–1412. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13200

22. Berger E, Carroll M, Maybery D, Harrison D. Disaster impacts on students and staff from a specialist, trauma-informed Australian school. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma*. 2018;**11**:1–10. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40653-018-0228-6

23. Ikin J, Carroll M, Walker J, et al. Cohort Profile: The Hazelwood Health Study Adult Cohort. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020 Jul; Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyaa083

24. Melody SM, Wheeler AJ, Dalton M, et al. Cohort Profile: The Hazelwood Health Study Latrobe Early Life Follow-Up (ELF) Study. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020 Oct;**49**(6):1779–1780. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyaa136

25. Berger E, Gao CX, Jonathan B, Campbell TCH, Maybery D, Carroll M. The impact of a mine fire and smoke event on academic outcomes for primary and secondary school students. *PsyArXiv*. 2020; Available from: https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/unms5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

26. Pullins LG, McCammon SL, Lamson AS, Wuensch KL, Mega L. School-based post-flood screening and evaluation: Findings and challenges in one community. *Stress, Trauma, and Crisis*. Taylor & Francis; 2005;**8**(4):229–249. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15434610500406343

27. Salloum A, Overstreet S. Grief and trauma intervention for children after disaster: Exploring coping skills versus trauma narration. *Behaviour research and therapy*. Elsevier; 2012;**50**(3):169–179. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2012.01.001

28. Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS). https://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/d3310114.nsf/home/australian+statistical+geography+standard+(asgs);

29. Luhar AK, Emmerson KM, Reisen F, Williamson GJ, Cope ME. Modelling smoke distribution in the vicinity of a large and prolonged fire from an open-cut coal mine. *Atmospheric Environment*. 2020;**229**:117471. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2020.117471

30. Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA). https://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/assessment/f-10assessment/naplan/Pages/Index.aspx;

31. Bernal JL, Cummins S, Gasparrini A. Interrupted time series regression for the evaluation of public health interventions: A tutorial. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;**46**(1):348–355. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyw098

32. Stan Development Team. Stan user's guide, version 2.25 [Internet]. 2020. Available from: https://mc-stan.org

33. Stan Development Team. RStan: The R interface to Stan [Internet]. 2020. Available from: http://mc-stan.org/

34. Hoffman MD, Gelman A. The no-u-turn sampler: Adaptively setting path lengths in Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *J Mach Learn Res*. 2014;**15**(1):1593–1623. Available from: https://jmlr.org/papers/volume15/hoffman14a/hoffman14a.pdf

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

35. Gelman A, Simpson D, Betancourt M. The prior can often only be understood in the context of the likelihood. *Entropy*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute; 2017;**19**(10):555. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/e19100555

36. Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). NAPLAN achievement in reading, writing, language conventions and numeracy: National report for 2019 [Internet]. Sydney: ACARA; 2019. Available from: https://nap.edu.au/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2019-naplan-national-report.pdf?Status=Temp&sfvrsn=2

37. Maybery D, Jones R, Dipnall JF, et al. A mixed-methods study of psychological distress following an environmental catastrophe: The case of the hazelwood open-cut coalmine fire in australia. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*. Taylor & Francis; 2020;**33**(2):216–230. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2019.1695523

38. Clifford A, Lang L, Chen R, Anstey KJ, Seaton A. Exposure to air pollution and cognitive functioning across the life course–a systematic literature review. *Environmental research*. Elsevier; 2016;**147**:383–398. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2016.01.018

39. Marcotte DE. Something in the air? Air quality and children's educational outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*. Elsevier; 2017;**56**:141–151. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.12.003

40. Johnson AL, Dipnall JF, Dennekamp M, et al. Fine particulate matter exposure and medication dispensing during and after a coal mine fire: A time series analysis from the hazelwood health study. *Environmental Pollution*. Elsevier; 2019;**246**:1027–1035. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.12.085

41. Broder JC, Gao CX, Campbell TCH, et al. The factors associated with distress following exposure to smoke from an extended coal mine fire. *Environ Pollut*. 2020;**266**(Pt 2):115131. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115131

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

42. Berger E, Maybery D, Carroll M. Children's perspectives on the impact of the hazelwood mine fire and subsequent smoke event. *Child & youth care forum*. Springer; 2020. p. 707–724. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-020-09551-8

43. Bowman S, McKinstry C, McGorry P. Youth mental ill health and secondary school completion in Australia: Time to act. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*. 2017;**11**(4):277–289. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/eip.12357

44. Pietro GD. The academic impact of natural disasters: Evidence from l'aquila earthquake. *Education Economics*. Routledge; 2018;**26**(1):62–77. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2017.1394984

45. Peek L, Richardson K. In their own words: Displaced children's educational recovery needs after Hurricane Katrina. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2010;**4 Suppl 1**:S63–70. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1001/dmp.2010.10060910

46. Forns J, Dadvand P, Esnaola M, et al. Longitudinal association between air pollution exposure at school and cognitive development in school children over a period of 3.5 years. *Environmental research*. Elsevier; 2017;**159**:416–421. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.08.031

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Supplementary material I - Tutorial for Bayesian interrupted time series hierarchical meta-regression

Import library packages

```
library(pacman)
p_load(c("tidyverse",  "rstan", "bayesplot","kableExtra"), character.only = TRUE)
```

Import data

The data as well as the analysis code used in this tutorial can be directly downloaded from Github repository: https://github.com/CarolineXGao/NAPLAN_impact.

```
# use file path of saved NAPLAN data
naplan <- read.csv(here::here("Data","naplan_fake_data.csv"))
```

The variables in the data set are:

Variable name	Details
ID	School ID
Cohort_ID	Cohort ID, which reflects the same cohort of students during NAPLAN assessment (e.g. grade 3 2003, grade 5 2005, grade 7 2007, grade 9 2009)
Year	Year of NAPLAN assessment
Grade	Grade of students who completed NAPLAN assessment
Domain	Domain of NAPLAN assessment, this domain is grammar and punctuation
ICSEA	Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage per school and year
N_student	Number of students enroled in the school in the year of NAPLAN test
P_girls	Proportion of female students in the school and year of NAPLAN test
Government	Whether the school is a government school
Exposure_group	Location of school as a proxy for coalmine fire exposure: Morwell schools - High exposure, non-Morwell Latrobe Valley schools - Moderate exposure, and Wellington Schools - No/low exposure
ScoreDif	Mean NAPLAN score of the school - Victorian regional schools mean score for the matching year and grade level (mean NAPLAN score difference)
SE	Standard error of mean NAPLAN score for the school, year and grade level

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Modelling

Prepare data for modelling

A number of variables need to be changed for Bayesian modeling with Stan. Categorical variables, including grade (Grade) and exposure group (Exposure_group), need to be re-coded as dummy variables. Binary variables should be 0 or 1 (Government vs non-Government). In order to intemperate intercept of the model here we also center the numeric variables at the mean value and year at the start of the cohort (2008). Finally, interaction effects need to be created prior to the modelling. Grade 7 and 9 were combined due to relatively smaller numbers. Also the estimated effect size were also very similar when included separately.

```
naplan <- naplan %>%
  mutate(
         # years after and during coalmine fire
         Fire = ifelse(Year >= 2014, 1, 0),
         # change year to start from 0 (0 being 2008)
         Year = as.numeric(as.factor(Year)) - 1,
         # dummy variable for grade 5
         Grade5 = ifelse(Grade == "Year 5", 1, 0),
         # dummy variable for grade 7/9
         Grade79 = ifelse(Grade == "Year 7" | Grade == "Year 9", 1, 0),
         # standardised proportion of girls
         P_girls = scale(P_girls),
          # standardised ICSEA
         ICSEA = scale(ICSEA),
         # standardised total enrolments
         N_student = scale(N_student),
         # government vs non-government
         Government = ifelse(Government == "Yes", 1, 0),
         # dummy variable for fixed intercept (moderate exposure)
         Moderate_exposure = ifelse(Exposure_group == "Moderate exposure", 1, 0),
         # dummy variable for fixed intercept (high exposure)
         High_exposure = ifelse(Exposure_group == "High exposure", 1, 0),
         # post mine fire interruption (moderate exposure)
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
        Moderate_exposure_fire = Moderate_exposure*Fire,
        # post mine fire interruption (high exposure)
        High_exposure_fire = High_exposure*Fire,
        # post mine fire trend difference (moderate exposure)
        Moderate_exposure_fire_year = Moderate_exposure*Fire*(Year - 6),
        # post mine fire trend difference (high exposure)
        High_exposure_fire_year = High_exposure*Fire*(Year - 6)
        )
```

Stan model block

When using Rmarkdown file, stan code can be directly included as a block of code with specification of {stan output.var = "StanModel"} in the code block. In this model we use weakly informative priors, $N(10, 5)$, for the SDs of the random school effects, random cohort effects as well as random error $N(10, 5)$. 10 was chosen because when using two-level mixed-effects models with the mean score differences as the outcome variable, the estimated error terms are close to 10.

```
data {
  int<lower=0> N; // number of data points
  int<lower=1> C; //number of cohorts
  int<lower=1> J; //number of schools
  int<lower=1, upper=C>  cohortID[N]; //cohort id
  int<lower=1, upper=J>  schoolID[N]; //school id
  int<lower=1> K; // number of predictors
  matrix[N, K] x;   // predictor matrix
  vector[N] y; // outcome
  real<lower=0> sigma[N]; // s.e.'s of outcome
}
parameters {
  real alpha; // intercept

  //SD
  real<lower=0> theta_c; //  for random intercepts for cohorts
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
  real<lower=0> theta_s; // for random intercepts for schools
  real<lower=0> theta_t;  // for random error

  //non-centered parameterization
  vector[C] eta_c; //  for random intercepts for cohorts
  vector[J] eta_s; //  for random intercepts for schools
  vector[N] eta_t; //  for random error
  vector[K] beta; // coefficients for predictors
}
transformed parameters {
  vector[C] sigma_c; // random effect of cohort
  vector[J] sigma_s; // random effect of school
  sigma_c = theta_c*eta_c;
  sigma_s = theta_s*eta_s;

}
model {
  eta_c ~ normal(0, 1); // cohort random effects
  eta_s ~ normal(0, 1); // school random effects
  eta_t ~ normal(0, 1); // error

  //prior for SD
  theta_c ~ normal(10, 5); // cohort random effects
  theta_s ~ normal(10, 5); // school random effects
  theta_t ~ normal(10, 5); // random  error

  //prior for coef
  to_vector(beta) ~ normal(0, 50);

  {
  vector[N] mu; // vector of means for all observations
  for (i in 1:N)
    mu[i] = alpha + x[i]*beta + sigma_c[cohortID[i]] +
    sigma_s[schoolID[i]]  + theta_t*eta_t[i];
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
    y ~ normal(mu, sigma);
  }
}
```

Run Stan model

Input data is needed to be saved in a list.

```
predictors <- c("Year",
              "ICSEA",
              "Grade5",
              "Grade79",
              "P_girls",
              "N_student",
              "Government",
              "Moderate_exposure",
              "High_exposure",
              "Moderate_exposure_fire",
              "High_exposure_fire",
              "Moderate_exposure_fire_year",
              "High_exposure_fire_year")

names <- c( "Year",
          "ICSEA (standardised)",
          "Grade 5",
          "Grade 7 and 9",
          "Proportion of girls (standardised)",
          "Total Enrolments (standardised)",
          "Government",
          "Fixed intercept (moderate exposure)",
          "Fixed intercept (high exposure)",
          "Mine fire interruption effect (moderate exposure)",
          "Mine fire interruption effect (high exposure)",
          "Post-mine fire trend difference (moderate exposure)",
          "Post-mine fire trend difference (high exposure)")
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
#Input data stored in a list
input_data <- list(N = nrow(naplan),
                C = length(unique(naplan$Cohort_ID)),
                J = max(naplan$ID),
                cohortID = naplan$Cohort_ID,
                schoolID = naplan$ID,
                K = length(predictors),
                x = naplan[,predictors],
                y = naplan$ScoreDif,
                sigma = naplan$SE)
```

The next stage is to run the simulation using the Stan model defined as 'StanModel'

```
set.seed(12345)
#run stan model
options(mc.cores = parallel::detectCores())
fited_model <- rstan::sampling(StanModel, data = input_data,
          iter = 4000, warmup = 2000,
          control = list(adapt_delta = 0.90))
```

```
fited_model <- readRDS(file = "sampled.Rds")
#saveRDS(fited_model, file = "sampled.Rds")
```

Next we extract results

```
#extract fitted model
extract_model <- rstan::extract(fited_model)
#check mcmc_trace plot
posterior <- as.array(fited_model)

# Save names of SD for random intercepts and errors
thetas <- names(fited_model)[str_detect(names(fited_model),"theta")]
thetas_names <- c("SD of cohort random intercept",
                "SD of school random intercept",
                "SD of test error")
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
print(fited_model, pars = c("alpha", thetas,
                            paste0("beta[",1:length(predictors),"]")),
      probs = c(0.5, 0.025, 0.975))
```

```
## Inference for Stan model: 832db374c6d4af44fc1e1f951141a4d4.
## 4 chains, each with iter=4000; warmup=2000; thin=1;
## post-warmup draws per chain=2000, total post-warmup draws=8000.
##
##            mean se_mean   sd    50%   2.5% 97.5% n_eff Rhat
## alpha     -1.32    0.10 4.97  -1.36 -10.99  8.55  2538    1
## theta_c    9.80    0.02 0.79   9.80   8.25 11.33  1755    1
## theta_s   15.87    0.03 1.69  15.80  12.83 19.41  3043    1
## theta_t    2.94    0.05 1.31   3.05   0.28  5.25   711    1
## beta[1]   -0.36    0.00 0.25  -0.36  -0.85  0.12  6474    1
## beta[2]    6.28    0.02 1.14   6.28   4.06  8.49  3814    1
## beta[3]    4.86    0.01 1.01   4.86   2.89  6.82 13630    1
## beta[4]    7.01    0.06 4.38   7.00  -1.60 15.69  5260    1
## beta[5]    2.83    0.01 0.80   2.84   1.26  4.37  9852    1
## beta[6]   -3.79    0.03 2.05  -3.77  -7.82  0.18  3634    1
## beta[7]  -12.89    0.09 4.94 -12.96 -22.55 -3.12  2721    1
## beta[8]   -3.94    0.09 4.52  -4.01 -12.67  5.00  2559    1
## beta[9]  -11.29    0.13 7.10 -11.32 -25.20  2.67  3192    1
## beta[10]  -1.39    0.02 2.05  -1.37  -5.45  2.66  8782    1
## beta[11] -10.93    0.04 4.06 -10.96 -18.96 -2.82  9621    1
## beta[12]   0.88    0.01 0.73   0.88  -0.56  2.32  8411    1
## beta[13]   2.28    0.02 1.53   2.28  -0.68  5.24  9924    1
##
## Samples were drawn using NUTS(diag_e) at Sun Oct 25 14:46:23 2020.
## For each parameter, n_eff is a crude measure of effective sample size,
## and Rhat is the potential scale reduction factor on split chains (at
## convergence, Rhat=1).
```

Full model diagnostics can be evaluated using an interactive shinystan package. Here we provide a few static diagnostic plots.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
color_scheme_set("mix-brightblue-gray")
mcmc_trace(posterior,
           pars = c("alpha",thetas,
                    paste0("beta[",1:length(predictors),"]"))) +
  xlab("Post-warmup iteration")
```



Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) plot shows no signs of poor mixing for each coefficient. There was no warning of divergent transitions (using non-centred parameterisation centered parameterisation can help with avoiding divergent transitions), which can be diagnosed using diagnostic plots for the NUTS. All continuous variables are confounding variables (we are not interested in estimating effect sizes from these parameters), hence they were all standardised in the analysis to improve model fitting speed. If any variable of interest is a continuous variable, the original parameters can be easily recovered (see Stan manual) post standardisation.

The *mcmc_pairs* function is used to visualize the univariate histograms as well as bivariate scatter plots for key parameters. It is useful in identifying multicollinearity (strong correlation) and other non-identifiability issues (banana-like shapes).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
mcmc_pairs(posterior,
           pars = c("alpha", thetas,
                    paste0("beta[",1:length(predictors),"]"),"lp__"),
           off_diag_args = list(size = 1.5))
```



There is a negative association between sampled coefficients of the intercept term (alpha) and school sector (government, beta[7]). This is possible as school sector (government vs non-government) is the most important predictor of school-level NAPLAN results. Hence the sampled intercept will be impacted by the sampled coefficient of the school sector.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Model summary

Mean and credible intervals

```
summary <- summary(fited_model,
                   pars = c("alpha",thetas,
                            paste0("beta[",1:length(predictors),"]")),
                   probs = c(0.5, 0.025, 0.975))

names_coef <- c("Intercept", thetas_names, names)

summary <- summary$summary %>%
  as.data.frame() %>%
  mutate(Variable = names_coef ) %>%
  select(Variable, everything())
Summary.Table <- summary %>%
  mutate(Mean = format(round( mean, 2), nsmall = 2),
         `95% CI` = paste0(format(round(`2.5%`,2),nsmall = 2) ,", ",
                           format(round(`97.5%`,2),nsmall = 2))) %>%
  select(Variable, Mean,`95% CI`)

# extract simulated betas and add posterior probability of over or under 0.
B <- data.frame(extract_model$beta)
names(B) <- names
B$ID = rownames(B)
#calculate p over 0 and under 0
p <- B %>%
  as_tibble %>%
  reshape2::melt() %>%
  rename(Variable = variable) %>%
  group_by(Variable) %>%
  summarise(`p (x<0)` = ifelse(mean(value < 0) < 0.001,"<0.001",
                               format(round(mean(value < 0),3),nsmall = 3)) ,
            `p (x>0)` = ifelse(mean(value > 0) < 0.001,"<0.001",
                               format(round(mean(value > 0),3),nsmall = 3))) %>%
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
  ungroup()

#merge with result table
Summary.Table <- left_join( Summary.Table, p)

options(knitr.kable.NA = '')
Summary.Table %>%
  kable(align = c("l","c","c","c","c"),booktabs = T,linesep = "") %>%
  kable_styling(bootstrap_options = "striped",
                full_width = F, latex_options = "hold_position")
```

Variable	Mean	95% CI	p (x<0)	p (x>0)
Intercept	-1.32	-10.99, 8.55		
SD of cohort random intercept	9.80	8.25, 11.33		
SD of school random intercept	15.87	12.83, 19.41		
SD of test error	2.94	0.28, 5.25		
Year	-0.36	-0.85, 0.12	0.926	0.074
ICSEA (standardised)	6.28	4.06, 8.49	<0.001	1.000
Grade 5	4.86	2.89, 6.82	<0.001	1.000
Grade 7 and 9	7.01	-1.60, 15.69	0.054	0.946
Proportion of girls (standardised)	2.83	1.26, 4.37	<0.001	1.000
Total Enrolments (standardised)	-3.79	-7.82, 0.18	0.969	0.031
Government	-12.89	-22.55, -3.12	0.994	0.006
Fixed intercept (moderate exposure)	-3.94	-12.67, 5.00	0.808	0.192
Fixed intercept (high exposure)	-11.29	-25.20, 2.67	0.942	0.058
Mine fire interruption effect (moderate exposure)	-1.39	-5.45, 2.66	0.755	0.245
Mine fire interruption effect (high exposure)	-10.93	-18.96, -2.82	0.997	0.004
Post-mine fire trend difference (moderate exposure)	0.88	-0.56, 2.32	0.113	0.887
Post-mine fire trend difference (high exposure)	2.28	-0.68, 5.24	0.071	0.929

Plot marginal effects

Here we obtain predicted margins using the posterior distribution of coefficients using the following steps:

- Obtain design matrix with confounding variables fixed at reference values
- Calculate posterior distribution of NAPLAN score difference by year and exposure zone
- Plot posterior mean (with error bar) of NAPLAN score difference for each year and exposure zone

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
# create design matrix for calculating marginal effects
Design_matrix <- naplan %>%
   # include the intercept and year variable
   mutate(alpha = 1,Test_year = 2008 + Year) %>%
   select(alpha,predictors,
         Test_year,Exposure_group) %>%
   mutate_at(vars(ICSEA:Government) , function(x) x = mean(x)) %>%
   distinct()



# Obtain contrasts
Matrix <- data.matrix(Design_matrix %>%
                 select(-Test_year, -Exposure_group))
Coef <- t(data.matrix(cbind(extract_model$alpha, extract_model$beta)))
Predicted <- data.frame(Matrix %*% Coef)

names(Predicted) <- paste0("Scores",1:length(Predicted))

# Plot
cbind(Design_matrix[,c("Test_year", "Exposure_group")], Predicted)  %>%
  gather(Measures, scores,-Test_year, -Exposure_group) %>%
  group_by(Test_year, Exposure_group) %>%
  summarise(mean = mean(scores), sd = sd(scores)) %>%
  ggplot( aes(x = Test_year, y = mean,
              group = Exposure_group, col = Exposure_group)) +
  geom_line(size = 1, position = position_dodge(0.4)) +
  geom_errorbar(aes(ymin = mean - sd, ymax = mean + sd),
                position = position_dodge(0.4), size = 0.75) +
  labs(x = "Year",
       y = "Predicted mean NAPLAN score difference",
       col = "Exposure group") +
  geom_vline(xintercept = 2013.66, color = "black",
             size = 2, alpha = 0.3) +
  scale_color_manual(values = c('#fdbb84', '#ef6548','#990000')) +
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


```
scale_x_continuous(limits = c(2008, 2019), breaks = seq(2008, 2018, 1)) +
theme_bw() +
theme(axis.text.x  = element_text(hjust = -0.7,v = -0.1),
      legend.text = element_text(size = 12),
      legend.title = element_text(size = 12),
      axis.title.x = element_text(size = 12,vjust = -0.2),
      axis.title.y = element_text(size = 12),
      legend.position = "bottom")
```



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Supplementary material II

Table S1: *Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models for grammar and punctuation*

	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)
Intercept	-1.19	-11.15, 8.74		
SD of cohort random intercept	9.71	8.21, 11.25		
SD of school random intercept	15.98	12.92, 19.49		
SD of test error	2.69	0.22, 5.03		
Year	-0.37	-0.85, 0.12		0.07
ICSEA (standardised)	6.12	3.91, 8.30	<0.001	
Grade 5	4.73	2.69, 6.77	<0.001	
Grade 7 and 9	7.22	-1.15, 15.68	0.048	
Proportion of girls (standardised)	2.81	1.21, 4.39	<0.001	
Total enrolments (standardised)	-3.79	-7.73, 0.13		0.029
Government	-12.98	-22.62, -3.34		0.003
Fixed intercept (moderate exposure)	-3.90	-13.13, 5.31		0.20
Fixed intercept (high exposure)	-11.61	-25.28, 2.18		0.05
Mine fire interruption effect (moderate exposure)	-1.78	-5.73, 2.13		0.19
Mine fire interruption effect (high exposure)	-10.91	-18.68, -3.08		0.004
Post-mine fire trend difference (moderate exposure)	0.92	-0.51, 2.35	0.11	
Post-mine fire trend difference (high exposure)	2.37	-0.73, 5.37	0.06	

Table S2: *Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models for numeracy*

	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)
Intercept	-2.09	-11.43, 7.13		
SD of cohort random intercept	9.71	8.34, 11.06		
SD of school random intercept	14.67	11.84, 17.86		
SD of test error	5.66	4.17, 7.12		
Year	-0.38	-0.84, 0.07		0.05
ICSEA (standardised)	5.98	3.95, 8.00	<0.001	
Grade 5	3.40	1.69, 5.12	<0.001	
Grade 7 and 9	11.85	3.60, 20.18	0.004	
Proportion of girls (standardised)	1.14	-0.25, 2.52	0.05	
Total enrolments (standardised)	-4.75	-8.43, -0.93		0.008
Government	-7.93	-17.02, 0.92		0.042
Fixed intercept (moderate exposure)	-5.66	-13.94, 2.60		0.08
Fixed intercept (high exposure)	-12.07	-24.26, 0.23		0.028
Mine fire interruption effect (moderate exposure)	-0.44	-4.20, 3.28		0.41
Mine fire interruption effect (high exposure)	-10.90	-17.98, -3.67		<0.001
Post-mine fire trend difference (moderate exposure)	0.79	-0.56, 2.13	0.13	
Post-mine fire trend difference (high exposure)	1.61	-1.21, 4.43	0.13	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S3: *Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models for reading*

	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)
Intercept	-3.70	-13.03, 5.71		
SD of cohort random intercept	9.47	8.05, 10.90		
SD of school random intercept	15.05	12.05, 18.55		
SD of test error	2.78	0.48, 4.65		
Year	-0.37	-0.82, 0.10		0.06
ICSEA (standardised)	5.83	3.84, 7.93	<0.001	
Grade 5	3.77	1.90, 5.71	<0.001	
Grade 7 and 9	7.66	-0.35, 15.70	0.030	
Proportion of girls (standardised)	1.93	0.48, 3.41	0.005	
Total enrolments (standardised)	-3.77	-7.62, -0.08		0.022
Government	-9.77	-19.02, -0.30		0.022
Fixed intercept (moderate exposure)	-1.87	-10.19, 6.39		0.33
Fixed intercept (high exposure)	-13.41	-26.26, -0.19		0.024
Mine fire interruption effect (moderate exposure)	-1.18	-4.84, 2.57		0.27
Mine fire interruption effect (high exposure)	-8.34	-15.51, -1.07		0.013
Post-mine fire trend difference (moderate exposure)	0.69	-0.61, 2.01	0.15	
Post-mine fire trend difference (high exposure)	1.05	-1.63, 3.85	0.23	

Table S4: *Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models for spelling*

	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)
Intercept	-0.79	-9.41, 7.90		
SD of cohort random intercept	10.38	9.19, 11.59		
SD of school random intercept	13.64	11.05, 16.70		
SD of test error	1.31	0.07, 3.04		
Year	-0.48	-0.91, -0.03		0.016
ICSEA (standardised)	4.54	2.63, 6.41	<0.001	
Grade 5	3.62	1.87, 5.37	<0.001	
Grade 7 and 9	5.35	-2.65, 13.79	0.10	
Proportion of girls (standardised)	1.38	-0.07, 2.82	0.030	
Total enrolments (standardised)	-0.94	-4.61, 2.74		0.31
Government	-8.05	-16.52, 0.07		0.026
Fixed intercept (moderate exposure)	-0.52	-8.45, 7.05		0.45
Fixed intercept (high exposure)	-3.68	-16.16, 8.34		0.27
Mine fire interruption effect (moderate exposure)	-1.44	-4.91, 2.09		0.21
Mine fire interruption effect (high exposure)	-10.31	-17.39, -3.38		0.003
Post-mine fire trend difference (moderate exposure)	-0.42	-1.68, 0.85	0.74	
Post-mine fire trend difference (high exposure)	-1.49	-4.20, 1.21	0.86	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S5: *Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models for writing*

	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)
Intercept	-1.50	-10.28, 7.31		
SD of cohort random intercept	6.38	4.50, 8.03		
SD of school random intercept	13.94	11.41, 16.87		
SD of test error	7.80	6.36, 9.20		
Year	-0.62	-1.06, -0.16		0.002
ICSEA (standardised)	8.66	6.64, 10.66	<0.001	
Grade 5	3.26	1.35, 5.15	<0.001	
Grade 7 and 9	12.12	4.43, 19.72	<0.001	
Proportion of girls (standardised)	1.57	0.19, 3.00	0.012	
Total enrolments (standardised)	-4.70	-8.38, -0.97		0.006
Government	-13.89	-22.57, -5.43		<0.001
Fixed intercept (moderate exposure)	1.01	-6.83, 8.71		0.61
Fixed intercept (high exposure)	-7.53	-19.63, 4.62		0.11
Mine fire interruption effect (moderate exposure)	3.56	-0.52, 7.55		0.96
Mine fire interruption effect (high exposure)	-11.09	-18.93, -3.16		0.003
Post-mine fire trend difference (moderate exposure)	-0.60	-2.01, 0.82	0.80	
Post-mine fire trend difference (high exposure)	2.44	-0.60, 5.50	0.06	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S6: *Estimated intercept, mine fire interruption effect and post-mine fire trend difference for moderate and high exposure schools estimated from Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models (excluding cohort effect)*

	Moderate exposure				High exposure			
	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)
Grammar and Punctuation								
Fixed intercept	-4.27	-12.81, 4.26		0.16	-9.73	-22.73, 3.59		0.07
Mine fire interruption effect	-0.51	-4.71, 3.71		0.40	-13.41	-21.56, -5.17		0.001
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.45	-1.08, 1.94	0.28		2.64	-0.52, 5.78	0.05	
Numeracy								
Fixed intercept	-5.55	-13.48, 2.35		0.08	-10.67	-22.94, 1.61		0.043
Mine fire interruption effect	-1.00	-5.02, 2.95		0.31	-13.92	-21.59, -6.39		<0.001
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.71	-0.73, 2.11	0.16		2.35	-0.56, 5.36	0.06	
Reading								
Fixed intercept	-2.36	-10.30, 5.79		0.29	-12.06	-23.96, 0.19		0.027
Mine fire interruption effect	-0.77	-4.65, 3.11		0.35	-10.53	-17.84, -2.99		0.002
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.61	-0.78, 1.99	0.19		1.54	-1.30, 4.40	0.14	
Spelling								
Fixed intercept	-0.16	-7.79, 7.32		0.48	-0.99	-12.18, 10.33		0.43
Mine fire interruption effect	-2.73	-6.59, 1.12		0.08	-15.79	-23.19, -8.20		<0.001
Post-mine fire trend difference	-0.04	-1.41, 1.31	0.52		-0.18	-3.05, 2.60	0.55	
Writing								
Fixed intercept	0.81	-6.87, 8.67		0.58	-7.07	-18.97, 5.12		0.12
Mine fire interruption effect	3.72	-0.10, 7.75		0.97	-13.05	-21.02, -5.16		<0.001
Post-mine fire trend difference	-0.61	-2.04, 0.82	0.80		2.87	-0.21, 5.90	0.034	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.28.212554516; this version posted April 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S7: *Estimated intercept, mine fire interruption effect and post-mine fire trend difference for moderate and high exposure schools estimated from Bayesian hierarchical meta-regression models (excluding relocated schools)*

	Moderate exposure				High exposure			
	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)	β	95% CI	P($\beta < 0$)	P($\beta > 0$)
Grammar and Punctuation								
Fixed intercept	-3.66	-12.53, 5.03		0.21	-12.03	-27.29, 3.05		0.06
Mine fire interruption effect	-1.96	-5.93, 1.97		0.16	-8.51	-17.39, 0.23		0.027
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.87	-0.53, 2.29	0.12		1.62	-1.61, 4.80	0.16	
Numeracy								
Fixed intercept	-5.06	-13.33, 3.40		0.11	-12.22	-26.71, 1.56		0.041
Mine fire interruption effect	-0.70	-4.35, 3.05		0.35	-7.56	-15.76, 0.73		0.036
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.70	-0.64, 2.01	0.15		1.08	-1.95, 4.09	0.24	
Reading								
Fixed intercept	-1.77	-10.09, 6.51		0.34	-15.64	-30.60, -1.11		0.018
Mine fire interruption effect	-1.28	-4.88, 2.43		0.24	-5.58	-13.63, 2.43		0.08
Post-mine fire trend difference	0.64	-0.67, 1.96	0.17		1.19	-1.85, 4.19	0.22	
Spelling								
Fixed intercept	-0.23	-7.62, 7.54		0.46	-5.96	-19.44, 7.43		0.19
Mine fire interruption effect	-1.65	-5.14, 1.81		0.18	-7.77	-15.87, 0.05		0.026
Post-mine fire trend difference	-0.47	-1.72, 0.76	0.77		-2.09	-5.07, 0.73	0.92	
Writing								
Fixed intercept	1.25	-6.57, 9.06		0.62	-9.44	-23.14, 4.23		0.08
Mine fire interruption effect	3.33	-0.49, 7.25		0.96	-9.95	-18.76, -1.17		0.014
Post-mine fire trend difference	-0.70	-2.11, 0.72	0.84		2.30	-1.00, 5.55	0.09	