Title

Long-term ozone exposure associated cause-specific mortality risks with adjusted metrics by cohort studies: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Authors

Haitong Zhe Sun[1,2], Pei Yu[3], Changxin Lan[4,5], Michelle Wan[1], Sebastian Hickman[1], Jayaprakash Murulitharan[1], Huizhong Shen[6], Le Yuan[1], Yuming Guo[3]*, Alexander T. Archibald[1,7]*

Affiliations

[1]   Centre for Atmospheric Science, Yusuf Hamied Department of Chemistry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 1EW, United Kingdom

[2]   Department of Earth Sciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 3EQ, United Kingdom

[3]   School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia

[4]   Institute of Reproductive and Child Health, Key Laboratory of Reproductive Health, National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China, Beijing 100191, China

[5]   Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Peking University, Beijing 100191, China

[6]   School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China

[7]   National Centre for Atmospheric Science, Cambridge CB2 1EW, United Kingdom

*   Correspondence to: Alexander T. Archibald (ata27@cam.ac.uk) and Yuming Guo (yuming.guo@monash.edu)

main-text 6749 words + 3 tables + 6 figures

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Long-term ozone (O_3) exposure could lead to a series of non-communicable diseases and increase the mortality risks. However, cohort-based studies were still rather rare, and inconsistent exposure metrics might impair the credibility of epidemiological evidence synthetisation. To provide more accurate meta-estimation, this review updated the systematic review with inclusion of recent studies and summarised the quantitative associations between O_3 exposure and cause-specific mortality risks based on unified exposure metrics.

METHODS: Research articles reporting relative risks between incremental long-term O_3 exposure and causes of mortality covering all-cause, cardiovascular diseases, respiratory diseases, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, pneumonia, ischaemic heart diseases, ischaemic stroke, congestive heart failure, cerebrovascular diseases, and lung cancer, estimated from cohort studies were identified through systematic searches in MEDLINE, Embase and Web of Science. Cross-metric conversion factors were estimated linearly by decadal of observations during 1990-2019. The Hunter-Schmidt random effect estimator was applied to pool the relative risks.

RESULTS: A total of 25 studies involving 226,453,067 participants (14 unique cohorts covering 99,855,611 participants) were included in the systematic review. After linearly adjusting the inconsistent O_3 exposure metrics into congruity, the pooled relative risks (RR) associated with every 10 nmol mol^{-1} (ppbV) incremental O_3 exposure, by mean of warm-season daily maximum 8-hour average metric, was: 1.014 with 95% confidence interval (CI) ranging 1.009–1.019 for all-cause mortality; 1.025 (95% CI: 1.010–1.040) for respiratory mortality; 1.056 (95% CI: 1.029–1.084) for COPD mortality; 1.019 (95% CI: 1.004–1.035) for cardiovascular mortality; and 1.096 (95% CI: 1.065–1.129) for congestive heart failure mortality. Insignificant mortality risk associations were found for ischaemic heart disease, cerebrovascular diseases and lung cancer.

DISCUSSION: This review covered up-to-date studies, expanded the O_3-exposure associated mortality causes into wider range of categories, and firstly highlighted the issue of inconsistency in O_3 exposure metrics. Non-intercept linear regression-based cross-metric RR conversion was another innovation, but limitation lay in the observation reliance, indicating further calibration with more credible observations available. Large uncertainties in the multi-study pooled RRs would inspire more future studies to corroborate or contradict the results from this review.

CONCLUSION: Adjustment for exposure metrics laid more solid foundation for multi-study meta-analysis, and wider coverage of surface O_3 observations are anticipated to strengthen the cross-metric conversion in the future. Ever-growing numbers of epidemiological studies supported unneglectable cardiopulmonary hazards and all-cause mortality risks from long-term O_3 exposure. However, evidences on long-term O_3 exposure associated health effects were still scarce, and hence more relevant studies are encouraged to cover more population with regional diversity.

REGISTRATION: The review was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42021270637).

FUNDING: This study is mainly funded by UK Natural Environment Research Council, UK National Centre for Atmospheric Science, Australian Research Council and Australian National Health and Medical Research Council.

Keywords

Ozone; long-term exposure; mortality; cohort; metric; respiratory; cardiovascular

Highlights

1. *Updated evidence for O_3-mortality associations from 25 cohorts has been provided.*
2. *Adjusting various O_3 exposure metrics can provide more accurate risk estimations.*
3. *Long-term O_3-exposure was associated with increased mortality from all-causes, respiratory disease, COPD, cardiovascular disease and congestive heart failure.*

1 INTRODUCTION

Atmospheric ozone (O_3) is a short-lived climate forcer.[1] Besides warming the global atmosphere, O_3 in the stratosphere can abate the radiation hazards from ultraviolet rays onto organisms, while O_3 in the ambient air is of detrimental defects on ecosystem and human health,[2-4] and hence health effects caused from exposure to surface O_3 have become a serious public concern. Short-term (i.e. hours to days) exposure to high-level O_3 can cause a series of acute symptoms like asthma, respiratory tract infection, myocardial infarction, and cardiac arrest;[5-8] and long-term (i.e. over years) exposure can lead to chronic health outcomes including but not limited to preterm delivery, stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases, and cerebrovascular diseases.[9-12] Long-term ambient O_3 exposure was estimated to be responsible for over 0.36 million premature deaths globally in 2019 according to the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) report released by the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME).[13]

Systematic reviews summarising the associations between the adverse health outcomes, and both the short-term and long-term O_3 exposures, have been performed in previous studies.[14-16] Studies on short-term O_3 exposure-induced morbidities are comparatively more abundant than the long-term O_3 exposure studies where the epidemiological evidences are less congruous. Some deficiencies are spotted in the two reviews for long-term O_3 exposure-associated mortality risk studies,[15, 16] the primary issue of which is the inconsistent use of various O_3 exposure metrics; however, no other reviews are found to remedy these flaws. As a secondary photolytic gaseous air pollutant, the warm-season and diurnal concentrations of surface O_3 will be much higher than cool-season and nocturnal concentrations,[17, 18] and thus the average and peak metrics of O_3 concentrations shall be of drastically different realistic implications.[19] Under this circumstance, directly pooling the relative risks scaled in different metrics might lead to biases.

Atkinson et al. (2016) explored 6 types of mortality causes, but searched the literatures only till 2015;[16] while Huangfu et al. (2019) updated the searches to 2018, but only 3 types of mortality causes were considered.[15] We thus determine to update the review on the health effects of O_3 to include more categories of mortalities together with covering the most recent publications. Additionally, GBD estimations ascribed long-term O_3-exposure induced all-cause mortality for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease,[13] which might lead to underestimations without considering other causes. It is reasonable to deduce that long-term O_3 exposure will exacerbate the mortality of certain diseases given that the short-term exposure increases the morbidity risks of the same diseases, and

thus scrutinising epidemiological evidences for multiple causes of mortality will provide
more credible supports to fill in this gap.

The primary innovation of our updated review is our taking full advantage of global
systemic stationary observations to explore the feasibility of adjusting the various
exposure metrics, and pooling the multi-study risks with the unified exposure metric, the
mean of warm-season daily maximum 8-hour average, in response to the up-to-date
suggestions from the Lancet global environmental health collaboration.[20] Through this
updated systematic review and meta-analysis on long-term O_3 exposure associated cause-
specific mortality risks, we aim to present and evaluate epidemiological evidences for 3
major questions not fully addressed by the previous 2 reviews, as (1) which mortality
causes shall be ascribed to long-term O_3 exposure; (2) have the risk associations changed
given the latest studies with more mature research design and methodologies; and (3)
how to estimate the quantities of the risk association strengths by the suggested exposure
metric. Both our methods and discoveries are expected to inspire future O_3-health studies,
and support relevant policy-making to benefit the global population.

2. METHODS

2.1 Search strategy

We searched 3 research databases (MEDLINE, Embase, and Web of Science) from 1
September, 2015 till 1 February, 2022 to finish our systematic review and meta-analysis,
updated from 2 previous reviews on long-term O_3 exposure-associated mortality.[15, 16]
Search terms also referred to these 2 previous systematic reviews with modifications to
enhance the inclusion of potential relevant studies, as we combined the keywords
relevant to the cause-specific mortalities (i.e. "mortality", "death", "premature death",
"all-cause", "non-accidental", "cardiopulmonary", "respiratory", "chronic obstructive
pulmonary disease", "pneumonia", cardiovascular, "lung cancer", "cerebrovascular",
"stroke", "ischaemic heart disease", "congestive heart failure"), the pollutant of research
interest (i.e. "ozone"), and qualified epidemiological study types (i.e. "long-term",
"cohort study", "prospective", "retrospective", "longitudinal study"). The detailed search
strategies were listed in Table S1. Health outcomes considered in the systematic review
were: mortality from (1) all causes (AC, ICD9: 001-799, ICD10: A00-R99); (2) all
respiratory diseases (RESP, ICD9: 460-519, ICD10: J00-J98); (3) chronic obstructive

pulmonary diseases and allied conditions (COPD, ICD9: 490-496, ICD10: J19-J46); (4) all cardiovascular diseases (CVD, ICD9: 390-459, ICD10:I00-I98); (5) all cerebrovascular diseases (CEVD, ICD9: 430-438, ICD10: I60-I69); (6) ischaemic heart disease (IHD, ICD9: 410-414, ICD10: I20-I25); (7) congestive heart failure (CHF, ICD9: 428, ICD10: I50); (8) ischaemic stroke (ICD9: 434, ICD10: I61-I64); (9) pneumonia (ICD9: 480-487, ICD10: J12-J18); and (10) lung cancer (LC, ICD9: 162, ICD10: C33-C34).

2.2 Study eligibility criteria

As an updated systematic review, literatures identified in the previous 2 reviews underwent examination together with the newly retrieved ones. Studies were included during screening following the criteria as: (1) the epidemiological research should be conducted based on cohorts; (2) the exposure should include O_3 as an individual risk factor; (3) the health outcomes should be all-cause or cause-specific deaths at individual level; (4) studies provided hazard ratio (HR), risk ratio (RR) or odds ratio (OR) and their 95% confidence intervals (CIs) clearly and reported by every increase unit (e.g. 10-ppbV) of exposure concentrations, assuming linear risk relationship with adjusting key confounders; (6) the study should be published as an original research article in scholarly peer-reviewed journals in English. For articles from the same cohort, only one single study covering the widest populations and the longest follow-up period was reserved for meta-analysis, unless the subgroups of participants and study follow-up periods are clearly stated to be of mild overlapping; We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines to process the included studies on ambient O_3 exposure induced mortality.

2.3 Study selection and scrutinisation

All searched literatures were archived in Clarivate™ Analytics Endnote X9.3.1 reference manager software. Two literature review investigators (HZS and CL) conducted title and abstract pre-screening independently for all web-searched records and reviewed the full text for the pre-screened studies. Disagreements were resolved by discussions with a third reviewer (PY).

2.4 Data extraction

Details from each screened-out literatures were extracted and labelled for the purpose of meta-analysis, including (1) the authors with publication year as study labels of reference; (2) basic descriptive information of the study cohort embracing the cohort name, country, follow-up periods, numbers of cases and total participants, population genders and ethnics, exposure metrics, health outcomes, and major confounders; (3) the risk association effects preferably quantified in HR (and also RR/OR as substitute choices) per unit incremental exposure with 95% confidence interval (CI).

2.5 Study quality assessment

All screened-out studies underwent quality evaluation using the Quality Assessment Tool of Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies developed by National Institute of Health (NIH) (https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools), aiming to ensure the studies considered for meta-analysis are adequately reliable. The assessments were cross-validated by two authors (HZS and CL) independently, with the third author (PY) supervising any disagreements. Table S2 listed 14 assessment items assigned with 1 score for each, and the tallied scores were translated into a literature-specific rating of quality. Studies scoring full-mark 14 were categorised to be "Good", while 10-13 as "Fair" and <10 as "Poor".

Besides applying the quality assessment tool to determine which reviewed studies should be included for meta-analysis, checking the epidemiological evidence quality from the included literatures for each cause of mortality was finished through the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) system[21, 22] to yield rating bands ranging across "high", "moderate", "low", and "very low". This grading system by default rated "high-quality" for cohort studies as the starting point of evaluation, and the rate would be downgraded by five limitations as the existence of (1) risk of bias examined by the Quality Assessment Tool (Table S2), (2) imprecision (i.e. studies did not report the central risk estimations with confidence intervals), (3) inconsistency (i.e. the directions of the estimated risks were controversial across studies), (4) indirectness (i.e. studies did not include the desired population, exposure, or health outcomes), and (5) publication bias (i.e. researchers tended to publish studies with positive results); and upgraded by three strengths as reporting (1) exposure-response trend, (2) residual confounding (i.e. adjusting the confounders highlighted the risks), and (3) strong associations. Publication biases were graphically presented by funnel plots,[23]

215 and statistically tested by trim-and-fill method.[24] The review was registered in
216 PROSPERO (CRD42021270637).

2.6 Exposure adjustment

2.6.1 Unit unification

There were two major units used to quantify the surface O_3 concentrations, nmol
mol^{-1} or parts per billion by volume mixing ratio (ppbV) more frequently used by
atmospheric modelling researchers,[17, 18, 25] and milligram per cubic metre by mass
concentration ($\mu g/m^3$) widely used by public health studies.[12] These two units are
interchangeable to each other based on the ideal gas law $PV = nRT$, if the air
temperatures (T) and pressures (P) are given, as presented in eqs 1–4.

$$1\ ppbV\ O_3 = \frac{1 \times 10^{-9}\ mol}{1\ mol}\frac{O_3}{air} \tag{eq. 1}$$

$$1\ mol\ air \Leftrightarrow \frac{RT}{P} \times 1\ mol\ (m^3) = \frac{8.314\ Pa \cdot m^3 \cdot K^{-1} \times T}{P}\ (m^3) \tag{eq. 2}$$

$$1 \times 10^{-9}\ mol\ O_3 \times 47.997 g \cdot mol^{-1} = 47.997 \times 10^{-9} g\ O_3 \tag{eq. 3}$$

$$1\ ppbV\ O_3 = \frac{47.997 \times 10^{-9} g \times 10^6 \mu g \cdot g^{-1}}{8.314\ Pa \cdot m^3 \cdot K^{-1} \times T/P\ m^3}\frac{O_3}{air} = 5.773 \times 10^{-3} \times \frac{P(Pa)}{T(K)}\frac{O_3}{air}\mu g \cdot m^{-3} \tag{eq. 4}$$

Assuming T = 298.65 K (25.5°C) and P = 101.325 kPa, the ppbV-$\mu g/m^3$ conversion
factor could be approximated as 1 ppbV ~ 1.96 $\mu g/m^3$. Though the surface air
temperatures and pressures would vary across seasons, such simplification was still
widely used in previous studies,[15, 26, 27] being of more credibility for long-term surface O_3
studies averaging the surface air temperatures and pressures at longer periods. For
example, even at very low temperature of 270 K, the conversion factor was 2.17, which
corroborated the stability of linear conversion.

2.6.2 Metric unification

Surface O_3, as a secondary photochemistry pollutant involving photolysis of NO_2 to
trigger chains of radical reactions, has concentrations that will vary significantly between

day and night-time, and between warm and cool seasons, as discussed by numbers of
studies.[17, 28-31] Under this circumstance, various daily metrics to quantify the surface O_3
concentrations emerged due to series of considerations, which however brought in more
difficulties to assimilate epidemiological evidences. The previous reviews simply pooled
the reported risk association strengths without adjusting the diverse metrics,[15, 16] which
we thought was a fatal defect requiring improvements.

We therefore designed to update the meta-analysis by unifying the exposure metrics
for pooled O_3 exposure-associated risks. As suggested by the U.S. EPA final report of *Air*
Quality Criteria for Ozone and Other Photochemical Oxidants,[32] linear relationships
were assumed to estimate the cross-metric conversion factors using long-term reliable
observations as the Tropospheric Ozone Assessment Report (TOAR) archive[19] and China
National Environmental Monitoring Centre (CNEMC, http://www.cnemc.cn/en/) in our
review, and correlation matrix was used to validate that the presumptions of linearity
were not violated. Both TOAR and CNEMC sites measured the surface O_3 by means of
the UV absorption technique with strict quality control so as to ensure the comparability
of the records across different countries and regions.[33, 34] We considered 6 complex
metrics for mutual conversion as (1) annual mean of 24-hour daily average (ADA24), (2)
6-month warm season mean of 24-hour daily average (6mDA24), (3) annual mean of
daily maximum 8-hour average (ADMA8), (4) 6-month warm season mean of daily
maximum 8-hour average (6mDMA8), (5) annual mean of daily maximum 1-hour
average (ADMA1), and (6) 6-month warm season mean of daily maximum 1-hour
average (6mDMA1). Long-term averaging-based metric conversion could smooth the
temporal variations resulting from the seasonal and geographical solar radiation
variabilities. The linear conversion factors (k) were mathematically defined by eq 5, to
adjust the original metric into the target one with irreducible regression errors ε.

$C_{Adjusted} = k_{Original \rightarrow Adjusted} \times C_{Original} + \epsilon$ (eq. 5)

2.7 Meta-analysis

We collectively named relative risks (RR) for HR/RR/OR throughout our meta-
analysis. All literature-reported RRs were converted into adjusted incremental risk ratios
with a 10-ppbV O_3-exposure increase by target metric (i.e. 6mDMA8 in this study),
following eq 6 as shown below:

$RR_{Adjusted} = e^{\left(\frac{lnRR_{Original}}{k_{Original \rightarrow Adjusted}}\right)}$ (eq. 6)

where ln is the natural logarithm, $RR_{Original}$ is the originally reported risk estimates
scaled into 10-ppbV incremental exposure, and $k_{Original \rightarrow Adjusted}$ is the conversion factor
for metric unification. Multi-study pooled risks with 95% confidence interval (CI) were
calculated from the adjusted RRs by Hunter-Schmidt random effect meta-regression
estimator to correct the potential errors and biases caused from the diversity of study
population and methodologies.[35]

We applied the Higgins I^2 to quantify the heterogeneity across studies. The Higgins
statistics I^2 is defined as

$$I^2 = \frac{Q - df}{Q} \times 100\%$$ (eq. 6)

where Q is the Cochran's non-parametric heterogeneity statistic assessing whether there
are any cross-study differences in risks based on χ^2 distribution and df is the
corresponding degrees of freedom.[36] Low I^2 values indicate no important heterogeneity
observed and high I^2 values, especially >75%, indicate considerable heterogeneity.

Subgroup analyses were conducted by grouping the selected studies upon the gender,
regions, O_3 exposure metrics, and methodological reliability of individual exposure
assignment; together with the adjustment of ethnicity, body mass index (BMI), smoking
history, lifestyle features, and exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ and NO_2. Subgroups should contain at
least 3 studies. Leave-one-out sensitivity analyses were also accomplished to test the
robustness of synthesised overall risks by meta-analysis. All meta-analyses were
performed in R 4.1.1 with packages *meta*, *metafor*, and *metainf*.

The most widely recognised approach to construct the integrated exposure-response
(IER)[37] relationships required sufficient epidemiological studies to comprehensively
sample the population exposure levels. However, studies on long-term O_3 exposure
health effects were relatively limited, under which circumstance we made methodological
modifications to make better use of the variabilities in exposure levels by statistically
imputing the exposure distributions for each study from the provided statistics (e.g. mean,
standard deviation, and percentiles) for curve fitting as elaborated in Supplementary Text
S1. Supplementary Text S2 described the detailed procedures of exposure distribution
imputations with a demonstration provided in S3, through which high uncertainties were
still observed in the fitted IER curves due to insufficient epidemiological evidences.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Study characters

From the 3 databases during September 2015 till February 2022, a total of 339 studies (77 from MEDLINE, 102 from Embase, and 160 from Web of Science) were searched; and together with 34 additional literatures added manually from the 2 previous systematic reviews,[15, 16] 373 studies underwent duplication censoring, deleting 101 duplicated studies. After detailed scrutinisation for 272 studies, a total of 25 studies concerning long-term O_3 exposure and multi-cause mortalities were finally enrolled for quality evaluation, meta-analysis and further discussions (**Figure 1**).[38-62] **Table 1** summarised the basic information of the 25 included studies sorted by the publication year and surname of the first author.

3.2 Metrics and exposure assignments

Our updated systematic review stressed more on the exposure metrics and methodologies to obtain O_3 exposure, as summarised in **Table 2**. Abbey et al. (1999),[38] Jerrett et al. (2013)[46] and Lipsett et al. (2011)[43] did not state the metric they used clearly, but based on comparisons between the reported surface O_3 concentrations and TOAR observational archives, we reasonably assumed ADA24 for the first study, and ADMA8 for the rest two. Details of the metric matching were given in Supplementary Text (S4). Lipfert et al. (2006)[39] used the highest 95th percentile by hourly resolved O_3 concentrations as the peak exposure metric, which was only used in this one singular study, and hence approximated to DMA1. Krewski et al. (2009)[41] and Smith et al. (2009)[42] were both studies on ACS CPS II, and thus the same exposure assignment methodologies and metrics were assumed as Jerrett et al. (2009).[40] Likewise, Cakmak et al. (2018)[53] and Weichenthal et al. (2017)[52] were assumed to inherit Crouse et al. (2015)[48] as all these 3 studies were on CANCHEC. Warm season was defined as 6 months from April to September in terms of the northern hemisphere by default, but we made no exceptions to 3 studies as Zanobetti et al. (2011)[44] using May to September, and Crouse et al. (2015)[48] and Paul et al. (2020)[57] using May to October, due to limited number of studies searched.

Across all included studies, multiple methods were applied to obtain gap-free surface O_3 concentrations for individual-level exposure assignment. The most basic way was the

nearest neighbour matching between participant residential locations and *in situ*
observation sites, which were more frequently used in earlier studies.[39, 40] A
comparatively more complicated way was statistical spatial interpolation, by inverse
distance weighting[46] or ordinary kriging[41]. Full spatial coverage products, such as
satellite-based remote-sensing[51] and chemistry transport models[56], were used in some
studies by supervised-learning-based data fusion techniques including but not limited to
universal kriging embedded land use regression,[47] Bayesian hierarchical model[50] and
ensemble learning[51] to enhance the spatial extrapolation accuracy, which were evaluated
to be of higher credibility than the basic ones described previously. All basic
interpolation methods using merely the observations were rated as "Low"; applying
chemical transport model simulations without calibration from the observations as
"Moderate"; linearly coupling the observations with simulations as "Good"; and multi-
source data assimilation by means of more sophisticated approaches as "High". To sum
up, 8 studies were rated "High", 5 were "Good", 2 were "Moderate", and 10 were "Low".
Methodological progresses with time were evident as manifested in **Table 2**, prefiguring
an explosion of population-based environmental health studies in the age of big data.

Based on the TOAR and CNEMC *in situ* observations, the cross-metric non-intercept
linear conversion factors were estimated with regression accuracies given in **Figure 2**.
Synthesised from the recent relevant studies, the 6mDMA8 metric was more
recommended to highlight the peak exposure; and therefore, we chose to convert the
originally reported RRs uniformly into the 6mDMA8 scale as standard. The O_3 exposure
levels by the original and unified metric were listed in Supplementary Text S1.
Demonstrations for the conversion interpretation and procedures were presented in
Supplementary Text S5, respectively.

3.3 Meta-analysis results

We conducted meta-analyses for long-term O_3 exposure-associated into 10 categories
of mortalities as (1) all causes (AC), (2) all respiratory diseases (RESP), (3) chronic
obstructive pulmonary diseases and allied conditions (COPD), (4) all cardiovascular
diseases (CVD), (5) all cerebrovascular diseases (CEVD), (6) ischaemic heart disease
(IHD), (7) congestive heart failure (CHF), and (8) lung cancer (LC), with the exposure
metrics adjusted into 6mDMA8.

3.3.1 All-cause mortality

A total of 23 studies were included into O_3 exposure-associated all-cause mortality meta-analysis, pooling the overall risk into RR = 1.014 (95% CI: 1.009–1.019, I^2: 97.8%) with every 10-ppbV incremental exposure by 6mDMA8 as presented in **Figure 3**. Sub-group meta-analysis by originally reported metrics concluded the significances of risks vary across metrics, as high-concentration highlighted metrics like 6mDMA8 were of the highest positive risk (RR = 1.022, 95% CI: 1.014–1.031) while the smoothed metric ADA24 reported negative association (RR = 0.980, 95% CI: 0.960–1.001), as shown in Figure S1. Grouped by study regions, significant discrepancies of the risk pattern was found (Figure S2), as the studies in North America revealed positive associations as RR = 1.019 (95% CI: 1.014–1.024), while researches on European populations showed reversed risks as RR = 0.910 (95% CI: 0.827–1.001), though not significant. The cross-region divergences did not necessarily indicate differences in population vulnerability, as (1) less and younger study population, (2) shorter follow-up durations, and (3) use of smoothed exposure metrics for studies in Europe could all potentially obscure the potential risk associations. Subgroup analysis manifested that high inter-study heterogeneities originated from metric inconsistency, methodological reliability of individual exposure assignment, and population variabilities, as encapsulated in Table S3. The funnel plot was visually symmetrical (Figure S3), and studies reporting risks below the pooled value were even slightly more, indicating no detected severe potential publication biases.

No significant inter-gender differences were observed based on the limited studies reporting gender-specific risk association strengths. Further subgroup analyses were unfeasible due to the lack of reporting in the literature. Alternatively, grouped RRs were estimated based on whether the original researches had adjusted the confounding effects from ethnicity, body mass index (BMI), smoking history, lifestyle features, exposure levels of $PM_{2.5}$ and NO_2, and no inter-group divergences were observed (Table S3).

3.3.2 Respiratory mortality

Meta-analysis for O_3 exposure-associated all respiratory mortality includes 16 studies, pooling which gave the overall RR = 1.025 (95% CI: 1.010–1.040, I^2: 83.9%) for every 10-ppbV incremental O_3 exposure by 6mDMA8 (**Figure 4**). Based on sub-group meta-analysis for different metrics (Figure S4), peak metrics showed more significant increasing risks than ADA24, where most of the heterogeneities were from (I^2 = 87.0%). Cross-metric divergences were generally higher than intra-metric discrepancies. Studies

on North America populations showed better homogeneity in positive risks (RR = 1.029,
95% CI: 1.011–1.047, I^2 = 71.1%, Figure S5) than the European cohorts, pooling from
which the overall risks were congruously insignificant (RR = 0.941, 95% CI: 0.856–
1.036, I^2 = 91.2%). For O_3-COPD mortality association, the pooled RR was 1.056 (95%
CI: 1.029–1.084, I^2 = 94.5%) for 10-ppbV incremental O_3 exposure by 6mDMA8 from 7
studies. No apparent positive publication biases were detected for both respiratory and
COPD mortalities from the funnel plot (Figure S3).

405   3.3.3 Cardiovascular mortality

A total of 15 studies were included to pool the overall O_3 exposure-induced CVD
mortality risks as RR = 1.019 (95% CI: 1.004–1.035, I^2 = 97.7%) for each 10-ppbV
additional O_3 exposure by 6mDMA8 (**Figure 5**). Given the fact that the lower bound of
uncertainty interval was so close to the null hypothesis (i.e. RR = 1), the positive risk
association found in this review could be controversial, and thus would require more
studies to support or refute the finding. Heterogeneities (I^2 > 79.2%) were observed
through all 3 metric-grouped studies as presented in Figure S6. Positive risk associations
were found on 10 North American cohorts (RR = 1.036, 95% CI: 1.019–1.053) while
oppositely for 5 European cohorts (RR = 0.934, 95% CI: 0.865–1.008), as shown in
Figure S7. There was no need to be concerned with the publication bias, and no more
inter-group divergences were spotted except for grouping by exposure assignment
methodological credibility (Table S3). The pooled risk for the congestive heart failure-
induced mortality from 4 studies was RR = 1.074 (95% CI: 1.054–1.093, I^2 = 85.8%)
with every 10-ppbV incremental O_3 exposure by 6mDMA8.

420   3.3.4 Other mortality causes

The other cause-specific mortality risks attributable to long-term O_3 exposure were
not statistically significant (**Figure 6**), as IHD mortality risk pooled from 10 studies was
RR = 1.012 (95% CI: 0.987–1.039, I^2 = 98.7%), CEVD mortality risk pooled from 6
studies was RR = 0.993 (95% CI: 0.979–1.008, I^2 = 80.6%), and LC mortality risk pooled
from 13 studies was RR = 0.966 (95% CI: 0.926–1.007, I^2 = 84.2%). For all 8 studied
mortality causes, we also provided pooled risks by 3 more widely used metrics (i.e.
6mDA24, ADMA8, and ADA24) besides 6mDMA8, as listed in **Table 3** for reference.

3.4 Study assessment

All 25 studies included into our final meta-analysis were rated to be above "Fair" (14 as "Fair" and 11 as "Good") by the Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort Studies, as listed in Table S4. All studies well met 10 out of 14 assessment items, while 9 studies did not sufficiently clarify the participant exclusion criteria; 2 re-analysis study reports did not clearly state the O_3 exposures;[41, 42] 2 studies were of relatively insufficient follow-up durations (e.g. less than 5 years) to observe the outcomes resulting from long-term exposure;[45, 63] and 10 studies were of methodological deficiencies in individual exposure assignment,[38-46, 55] most of which were conducted before 2013 when data assimilation techniques were not maturely developed to fuse observations with other full spatial coverage products such as satellite-based remote sensing and atmospheric mechanistic simulations. The satisfactory assessment results overall indicated inconspicuous risks of bias, laying the reliable foundation for meta-analyses.

Tables S5 displayed GRADE epidemiological evidence assessment results for each mortality cause from all involved corresponding studies. In brief, the overall judgements for all-cause, respiratory, cardiovascular, ischaemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, and lung cancer mortality risks were "High", while the rating for the rest 2 cause-specific mortality risks (COPD and cerebrovascular diseases) were both "Moderate". Inconsistence of the risk directions (i.e. positive or negative associations) was the most common reason for downgrading, except for the CHF-induced mortality. There were 6 studies having reported the O_3-mortality exposure-response trends to support the additional risks, as an assessment upgrading item for the pooled RRs of all-cause, respiratory and cardiovascular mortality. Cakmak et al. (2018) spotted higher RRs after adjusting the confounder compared to the crude values,[53] which gave prominence to the positive risk associations and thus correspondingly upgraded the rating for all-cause, ischaemic heart disease, and lung cancer mortalities. No substantial positive publication biases were found based on the collected evidences.

3.5 Sensitivity analysis

Leave-one-out sensitivity analyses showed stable risk estimates as summarised in Table S6, except for the lung cancer mortality risks after eliminating Kazemiparkouhi et al. (2019), the only study reporting positive risk association,[55] while the rest 11 studies concluded insignificant risks or even protective effects. Since the metric harmonisation in our study was an innovative attempt, we provided both metric-adjusted and unadjusted

crude results for reference as presented in **Table 3**. The crude results were pooled from
the originally reported relative risk values only unified into per 10-ppbV incremental
exposure, without being transformed into any metrics for congruity. Along with the meta-
analyses on all qualified studies, the relative risks were also pooled by keeping only one
latest study with the largest population for each separate cohort, as summarised in Table
S7. Under this circumstance, the pooled unit incremental mortality risks with every 10-
ppbV incremental O_3 exposure by 6mMDA8 metric were RR = 1.008 (95% CI: 1.006–
1.009, I^2 = 82.6%) for all causes, RR = 1.034 (95% CI: 1.017–1.050, I^2 = 81.7%) for all
respiratory diseases, RR = 1.060 (95% CI: 1.040–1.080, I^2 = 90.2%) for COPD, RR =
1.032 (95% CI: 1.010–1.055, I^2 = 98.2%) for all cardiovascular diseases, RR = 1.008
(95% CI: 0.973–1.045, I^2 = 99.2%) for ischaemic heart disease, and RR = 0.966 (95% CI:
0.931–1.002, I^2 = 83.8%) for lung cancer. Studies for mortality risks of cerebrovascular
diseases and congestive heart failure were respectively conducted on different cohorts,
and hence such supplementary analysis was unnecessary.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Improvements as an updated review

This work improves on 2 previous high-quality reviews[15, 16] by covering up-to-date
peer-reviewed studies, and expanding the O_3-exposure associated causes of mortality into
wider range of categories. It is the first systematic review of the association between
long-term O_3 exposure and cause-specific mortality highlighting the issue of inconsistent
use of exposure metrics to our best knowledge. Since tropospheric O_3 is a photochemical
pollutant which largely depends on solar radiation, the surface O_3 concentrations can vary
drastically between day and night, as well as warmer and cooler seasons. We pointed out
that a 10-ppbV increase in annual daily 24-hour average concentration (ADA24) is more
constrained in magnitude than a 10-ppbV increase in warm-season daily 8-hour
maximum average concentration (6mDMA8) owing to the wider variability in the range
of the latter metric. Taking the observations by TOAR and CNEMC *in situ* monitoring
networks during 1990-2019 as an example, the surface O_3 concentrations were 27.6 ± 6.1
(IQR: 24.1–31.0) ppbV by ADA24, while correspondingly 53.1 ± 10.6 (IQR: 47.7–61.4)
ppbV by 6mDMA8, which indicated a 10-ppbV change fell below the IQR by the
6mDMA8, but could exceed the IQR using the ADA24 metric. This was why we believe

adjusting the exposure metrics was necessary for O_3 exposure-attributable health risk
meta-analysis.
We also put forward a feasible approach to mutually convert the O_3 exposure
concentrations and corresponding risk strengths in various metrics by non-intercept linear
projections following the operational suggestions from EPA,[32] but update the linear
conversion factors based on global *in situ* surface O_3 observations during 1990-2019. The
methodological innovation took advantage of multi-dimensional information from the
original studies, which could inspire further observation collections and researches for
corroborations and improvements.

4.2 Metric relevant issues

Although linear coefficients were applied onto the cross-metric conversions,
irreducible noises still existed given the high root mean squared errors (RMSE) as shown
in **Figure 2**, which exposed the limitation of risk strength adjustment into the same
exposure metric by simple linear conversion, as the actual cross-metric relationships
could be way more complicated. However, there was no other way but using the linear
conversion coefficients as surrogates to unify the RRs by different metric reported in
original studies, and thus to avoid uncertainties brought by the conversion of metrics,
using a promissory consistent exposure metric or estimating the unit excess RRs in
multiple metrics would be highly advocated in future long-term O_3-exposure
epidemiology studies.

Such linear conversion of risk associations could be validated by Kazemiparkouhi et
al. (2020),[55] where multiple metrics were applied to estimate the mortality risks. For
COPD mortality, the RR was 1.072 (95% CI: 1.067–1.077) by 6mDMA1 for every 10-
ppbV additional exposure; and after converting into 6mDMA8 metric using the linear
coefficient 0.831 (**Figure 2**), the estimated RR was 1.087 (95% CI: 1.081–1.093), close
to the literature reported 1.084 (95% CI: 1.079–1.089),[55] which justified our linear
conversion method. Converting Cross-metric linear conversions would not change the
risk association direction, but using different exposure metrics when estimating the O_3-
exposure attributable mortality risks could potentially cause discrepancies. For an
instance, Kazemiparkouhi et al. (2020) concluded excess hazards of long-term O_3
exposure on all-cause mortality using 6mDMA1 and 6mDMA8 as quantitative metrics,
but 6mDA24 led to a specious prevention effect (RR = 0.990, 95% CI: 0.988–0.991),
which should be attributed to the existence of a theoretical exposure safety level for O_3
below which no negative health effects should occur. Under this circumstance, lower-
level metrics (e.g. ADA24) by averaging the peak O_3 exposures might obscure the

effective doses above the threshold, and also reduce the signal-to-noise ratios, so that
were of lower credibility in recognising hazardous population exposures than higher-level
metrics (e.g. 6mDMA8).

Data mining techniques were able to realise high-accuracy predictions of surface O_3
concentrations, but errors were never avoidable. Carey et al. (2013) used a basic IDW
spatial interpolation approach to obtain the surface O_3 concentrations where the R^2 were
0.24–0.76,[45] while years later Di et al. (2017) applied an ensemble learning approach,
achieving $R^2 = 0.80$, RMSE = 2.91 ppbV.[51] Carey et al. (2013) reported the IQR of O_3
exposure concentrations as 3.0 ppbV, which was comparable to the RMSE of Di et al.
(2017).[51] Besides, lower R^2 could be accompanied with higher prediction errors, which
might have concealed the highest and lowest quartiles, and led to failures in
distinguishing the population-level exposures. This concern had been reflected in our
subgroup meta-analysis by exposure metrics, that lower-level metrics were more inclined
to report insignificant risks, which also cast sceptics on the reliability of studies covering
narrow exposure variabilities. We therefore are in favour of the Lancet suggestions to use
peak metrics to quantify the long-term O_3 exposure such as 6mDMA8, and also speak
highly of the state-of-the-art data techniques to reduce errors in O_3 concentration
prediction, so as to make a distinction between the high- and low-exposure populations.

4.3 Pathogenesis supports

Atkinson et al. (2016) concluded insignificant pooled risks for long-term O_3
exposure associated all-cause and respiratory mortality,[16] which contradicted our results.
It should mainly be ascribed to the heterogeneity between the more recent studies and
earlier ones. The majority of studies collected in Atkinson et al. (2016) applied primitive
statistical methods (i.e. nearest neighbourhood matching, IDW and ordinary kriging
interpolation) for individual exposure assignment, which might have weakened the
individual-level exposure distinguishment. In addition, some studies using ADA24 as the
exposure metric could have also obscured the significance of associations.[43, 45, 46] In
contrast, studies after 2016 more frequently applied advanced numerical simulation
models and data assimilation techniques to increase the precision of population exposure
assessment; and most of them used 6mDMA8 metric to foreground the high exposures.[50,
52, 53, 55-57] These recent studies stuck out the significant O_3-mortality associations.

From another aspect, pathological mechanisms had been at least partially ascertained
by laboratorial experiments. The inhaled O_3 could constrict the muscles in the airways
leading to shortness of breath, and damage the lining with inflammation.[64] Long-term O_3

exposure could increase the oxidative stress in the cardiovascular system,[65] and cause
progressive thickening of the carotid arteries to restrict cerebral blood supply.[66]
Additionally, strong associations had already been found between short-term O_3 exposure
and a variety of cardiopulmonary symptoms as reported by a number of observational
epidemiological studies,[6] which also supported the long-term exposure effects, as it was
unreasonable to presume no incremental risks by long-term exposure given the verified
significant short-term effects. We thus were inclined to approve of the opinion that long-
term O_3 exposure would increase mortality risks in agreement with GBD report.[20]

To alleviate the population health loss resulting from O_3 exposure, the U.S. EPA
appealed for optimisations in real-time accessibility of air quality index, with which
residents could be able to avoid unnecessary high pollution exposure
(https://www.epa.gov/ground-level-ozone-pollution/health-effects-ozone-pollution).
Appropriate diets and supplements including carotenoids, vitamin D and vitamin E were
recognised to be preventive against air pollution induced respiratory damages, which was
a practical protective measure for the vulnerable.[67]

577 4.4 Concentration-response relationship

Few studies had examined the concentration-response curves between long-term O_3
exposure and mortality, and thus the threshold exposure level (also known as theoretical
minimum risk exposure level, TMREL) below which no adverse health effects would be
assumed to occur was still controversial. For all-cause mortality, Di et al. (2017) reported
a safe exposure level as 30 ppbV by 6mDA24 metric (approximately as 49.9 ppbV by
6mDMA8),[51] while Shi et al. (2022) suggested a lower level as 40 ppbV by 6mDMA8,
both estimated from the Medicare beneficiary cohort.[58] For respiratory mortality, Jerrett
et al. (2009) tested the concentration-response relationships and estimated the threshold
level as 60 ppbV by 6mDMA1 (49.9 ppbV by 6mDMA8),[40] while Lim et al. (2019)
failed to identify a significant threshold level.[56] For cardiovascular mortality, Lim et al.
(2019) showed no apparent health hazards below 45 ppbV by 6mDMA8,[56] and Paul et al.
(2020) prescribed a threshold level around 35 ppbV by 6mDMA8 metric for diabetic
patients.[57] These evidence-based threshold exposure levels were all no higher than the
current standards, as 70 ppbV for daily maximum 8-hour exposure under NAAQS (The
National Ambient Air Quality Standards regulated by the U.S. EPA)[68] and 50 ppbV by
warm-season DMA8 under WHO global air quality guidelines.[69] However, whether the
standard guidelines should be revised to be more strictly would require more further
studies.

To synthesise epidemiological evidences, Burnett et al. (2014) developed an
integrated exposure-response (IER) function-based curve-fitting method to pool the risk
associations from multiple studies.[37] We attempted to construct the IER for long-term O_3
exposure associated mortalities in this review, with statistically reproduced exposure
levels to enhance the curve fitting, as illustrated in Supplementary Texts S1-S3. The
exposure imputing had revealed high reliability, but the high uncertainties of the IER
curves could still not be addressed, which should be attributed to the limited effective
epidemiological evidences. Empirically, this approach would require sufficient studies to
cover a wide range of exposure levels, which had been frequently adopted for particulate
matter exposure researches,[70-72] but seldomly used for O_3-health studies.[20] The main
probable reason might be that the population long-term O_3 exposure levels would not be
as comparably distinguishable to the particulate matters. In addition, a reasonable
prescribed TMREL would be necessary to establish the IER curves,[37] and hence the
indeterminacy of the threshold level could exacerbate the uncertainties in the estimated
concentration-response relationships. Therefore, more relevant studies on long-term O_3
exposure associated risks are urgently appealed for, based on which discussions,
optimisations, or corrections on our enhanced exposure-response curve-fitting
methodologies, are encouraged.

614 4.5 Hierarchical classification of diseases

The causes of mortalities analysed in our study followed hierarchical subordinate
relationships, as the all-cause mortality consisted of cardiovascular diseases, respiratory
diseases, cancer and other causes; chronic obstructive pulmonary disease belonged to
respiratory category; and ischaemic heart disease, stroke, congestive heart failure and
other cerebrovascular diseases all subordinated to cardiovascular symptoms. On this
occasion, estimating all O_3-exposure induced mortalities could follow a bottom-up
scheme by adding up subgroups of diseases. However, for the historical O_3-associated
mortalities, GBD attributed all O_3-associated mortalities onto COPD-induced premature
deaths,[20] which we thought were of spaces for further explorations. Long-term O_3
exposure had shown significant association with excess cardiovascular mortalities, and
thus we should update the mortality estimations in further studies by including CVD
altogether into consideration.

4.6 Application in mortality estimations

The widest applications of the estimated risk association strengths were to project how many people would be affected by long-term ambient O_3 exposure. For example, Malley et al. (2017) estimated 1.23 (95% UI: 0.85–1.62) million respiratory deaths attributable to O_3 exposure in 2010,[73] using the risk strength by Turner et al. (2016) as HR = 1.12 (95% UI: 1.08–1.16).[50] This estimation was much higher than the 2019 GBD report: 0.31 (95% UI: 0.15–0.49) million, as had been highlighted in another recent study,[25] which should be attributed to the use of high HR value among all included studies. We had also found some other studies using one singular HR value for population risk estimations,[17, 74-77] but we would still encourage further relevant studies to consider multi-study pooled RRs, which could effectively reduce the potential biases from a single study. The adaptability of the pooled RRs could be verified from the coverage of exposure levels, as the 25 studies identified in our review had embraced a wide range of exposure concentrations (Supplementary Text S1) to encompass the global surface O_3 variability.[25] On the other hand, the leave-one-out sensitivity analyses (Table S6) had revealed the robustness of the meta-analysis results when including sufficient numbers of studies, which was a circumstantial reflection for the representativeness of the synthesised risk association strengths. The annual GBD reports were also based on the generalisability presumption of the synthesised epidemiological evidences, but cohort-based researches in the unstudied regions are always appealed for to provide more convincing discoveries.

4.7 Limitations

Although the total number of studied participants for risk pooling was adequately high to ensure the statistical power, the cohort-based O_3-health studies were factually rare according to our literature search, and thus long-term follow-up studies are urgently encouraged. Additionally, current literatures seldomly reported grouped RRs, which made meta-analyses by sub-categories (like gender, age, socio-economic status, smoking and alcohol history, etc.) unfeasible. Scarcity of credible evidences also restricted the effects of conventional approaches to construct exposure-response curves, and our methodological innovation would require further relevant studies for substantiation. The cross-metric linear conversion factors were estimated relying on observations from available sites, which however might not be sufficiently representative of the global residential areas, as observational sites in India, Africa, and Latin America were still sparse. With ever-increasing popularisation of the *in situ* monitoring networks, the cross-

661   metric conversion factors might need calibration with more comprehensive observations,
662   so that the pooled RRs should also be updated accordingly.

4.8 Further study suggestions

We suggest that further environmental epidemiology studies, especially long-term O_3
exposure related researches, clearly report i) the methodologies to obtain ambient O_3
concentrations, the spatiotemporal resolution, and prediction accuracy of the database; ii)
the exposure metrics used for risk estimation; and iii) the statistical distribution of the O_3
exposure concentrations. The data-oriented methodologies to accomplish full spatial
coverage ambient air O_3 concentrations for individual-level exposure assignment should
be transparent as the construction credibility of air pollution concentration database
should also be rigorously assessed, which were the foundation of epidemiological follow-
up studies. We would advocate the report of exposure metrics in future O_3-health studies
so as to avoid confusions when comparing the risks with literature and conducting meta-
regression; and according to the recent consensus, warm-season average (6mDMA8)
shall be preferred as epidemiological study metrics.[19] We recommend future studies
estimate risks with multiple O_3 metrics for reference; and describing the statistical
distribution of the O_3 exposure levels is another suggested element to assess the
reliability of risk estimation models, which can also be useful in exposure-response
tendency exploration. We also propose future cohort studies estimate subgroup-specific
RRs which can be conducive to identify the vulnerable populations.

Our review highlights a deficiency existing in current environmental health research
literatures, that studies on long-term O_3 exposure health effects are still rather rare
compared to particulate matter-based studies.[78] Also, the meta-analysis results might be
geographically-biased, since large-scale O_3 exposure health risk studies till 2022 did not
cover Asia, Africa or Latin America regions. However, there are some thriving cohorts
such as the Multi-Country Multi-City (MCC) Collaborative Research Network covering
over 22 countries or regions,[79] and the China Kadoorie Biobank (CKB) enrolling over 0.5
million people,[80] working on environmental exposure projects. We are optimistic that
more research will come out to fill in the literature gap of multi-region population-based
studies.

5. CONCLUSION

Our state-of-the-science systematic review has summarised cohort studies exploring the associations between long-term ambient O_3 exposure and multi-cause mortality risks. Current studies support O_3-exposure attributable additional mortalities caused from all causes, respiratory diseases, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cardiovascular diseases, and congestive heart failure, but no significant mortality risks are found for ischaemic heart diseases, all-type cerebrovascular diseases, and lung cancer. Exposure metrics are crucial for health risk estimations of long-term O_3 exposure and meta-analysis to pool the multi-study risks, for which we develop a linear conversion approach to harmonise the different metrics. Further researches on long-term O_3 observations and exposure-induced mortalities are encouraged to corroborate or contradict our linear conversion factors and meta-analysis results by providing more solid evidences, so as to strengthen the O_3-health literatures.

Competing Interest Statement

All authors declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; and no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Author Contributions

ATA and YG conceived the idea for the review; HZS, CL and PY performed the literature search; HZS and PY conducted statistical analyses; HZS, ATA, YG, PY, SH, JM, HS and LY contributed to discussions; HZS wrote the article; and MW examined the languages. HZS is the guarantor who accepted the full responsibility for the finished article, owned full access to all relevant data, and controlled the decision to publish. The two joint corresponding authors, ATA and YG, attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. The guarantor, HZS, affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported, and no important aspects of the study have been omitted. No ethical approval is needed for a systematic review and meta-analysis.

Acknowledgement

This study is funded by UK Natural Environment Research Council (NERC), UK National Centre for Atmospheric Science (NCAS), Australian Research Council (DP210102076) and Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (APP2000581). HZS, MW, and SH receive funding from Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) via the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Centre for Doctoral Training in Application of Artificial Intelligence to the study of Environmental Risks (AI4ER, EP/S022961/1). ATA acknowledges funding from NERC (NE/P016383/1) and through the Met Office UKRI Clean Air Programme. YG is supported by a Career Development Fellowship of the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (APP1163693). All contents in this study are solely the responsibility of the grantees and do not represent the official views of the supporting agencies.

Data Availability

The surface O_3 observations are archived in the Tropospheric Ozone Assessment
Report (TOAR, https://b2share.fz-juelich.de/communities/TOAR) repository and China
National Environmental Monitoring Centre (CNEMC, http://www.cnemc.cn/en/)
repository, which are accessible to the public. The cohort-based long-term O_3 exposure-
associated cause-specific mortality risks are all available in the main text or
supplementary materials of the selected studies.

Supplementary Information

Further detailed information can be found in the **Supplementary Materials** (PDF)
consisting of 25 pages with 5 sections of texts as "imputation procedures for exposure
distribution" (S1), "enhanced integrated exposure-response curve-fitting" (S2),
"demonstrative procedures of enhanced exposure-response trend curve-fitting" (S3),
"undefined metric imputation" (S4), and "interpretation and procedure of cross-metric
linear conversion" (S5), together with 6 tables and 7 figures to strengthen the results and
discussions presented in the main text. A **PRISMA Checklist** (PDF) was provided to
verify the integrity of this study.

TABLES

Table 1 Summary of cohort characteristics included for meta-analysis.

Study	Cohort	Country	Follow-up Duration	Population Type	Sample Size	Sex	Age	Key Confounding Adjustment	Mortality Causes
Abbey et al. 1999[38]	AHS	USA	1977-1992	Occupational	6,182	FM	27-95	age, sex, BMI, smoking, individual demographic features$^\parallel$, lifestyle features$^\perp$, medical history	AC, RESP, LC
Lipfert et al. 2006[39]	WU-EPRI	USA	1976-1996	General	67,108	M	51 (12)§	age, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, traffic density, NO_2, CO	AC
Jerrett et al. 2009[40]	ACS CPS II	USA	1977-2000	General	448,850	FM		age, sex, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, individual demographic features, lifestyle features, $PM_{2.5}$	AC, RESP, CVD, IHD
Krewski et al. 2009[41]	ACS CPS II	USA	1982-2000	General	488,370	FM	≥ 30		AC, IHD, LC
Smith et al. 2009[42]	ACS CPS II	USA	1982-2000	General	352,242	FM			AC, RESP, CVD
Lipsett et al. 2011[43]	CTS	USA	1998-2005	Occupational	124,614	F	≥ 20	age, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, lifestyle features, medical treatment	AC, RESP, CVD, IHD, CEVD, LC
Zanobetti et al. 2011[44]	Medicare	USA	1985-2006	General	8,894,473	FM	≥ 65	age, sex, ethnicity, medical history	COPD, CHF
Carey et al. 2013[45]	CPRD	UK	2003-2007	General	824,654	FM	40-89	age, sex, BMI, smoking, individual demographic features	AC, RESP, LC
Jerrett et al. 2013[46]	ACS CPS II	USA	1982-2000	General	73,711	FM	57 (11)	age, sex, smoking, individual demographic features, lifestyle features	AC, RESP, CVD, IHD, LC
Bentayeb et al. 2015[47]	GAZEL	France	1989-2013	Occupational	20,327	FM	44 (4)	age, sex, BMI, smoking, individual demographic features, lifestyle features	AC, RESP, CVD
Crouse et al. 2015[48]	CANCHEC	Canada	1991-2006	General	2,521,525	FM	≥ 25	age, sex, individual and area-level demographic features, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2	AC, RESP, COPD, CVD, IHD, CEVD, LC
Tonne et al. 2016[49]	MINAP	UK	2003-2010	MI Survivors*	18,138	FM	68 (14)	age, sex, ethnicity, smoking, medical history, area-level demographic features	AC
Turner et al. 2016[50]	ACS CPS II	USA	1982-2004	General	669,046	FM	≥ 30	age, sex, BMI, smoking, individual and area-level demographic features, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2	AC, RESP, COPD, CVD, CHF, IHD, CEVD
Di et al. 2017[51]	Medicare	USA	2000-2012	General	60,925,443	FM	≥ 65	age, sex, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, individual and area-level demographic features, meteorological features, $PM_{2.5}$	AC
Weichenthal et al. 2017[52]	CANCHEC	Canada	2001-2011	General	2,448,500	FM	25-89	age, sex, ethnicity, individual and area-level demographic features	AC, RESP, CVD
Cakmak et al. 2018[53]	CANCHEC	Canada	1991-2011	General	2,291,250	FM	≥ 25	age, sex, individual demographic features, $PM_{2.5}$	AC, COPD, IHD, LC
Hvidtfeldt et al. 2019[54]	DDCH	Denmark	1993-1997	General	49,596	FM	50-64	age, sex, BMI, smoking, individual and area-level demographic features, noise	AC, RESP, CVD
Kazemiparkouhi et al. 2019[55]	Medicare	USA	2000-2008	General	22,159,190	FM	≥ 65	age, sex, ethnicity, area-level demographic features, $PM_{2.5}$	AC, RESP, COPD, CVD, IHD, CHF, CEVD, LC

Study	Cohort	Country	Follow-up Duration	Population Type	Sample Size	Sex	Age	Key Confounding Adjustment	Mortality Causes
Lim et al. 2019[56]	NIH-AARP	USA	1995-2011	General	548,780	FM	50-71	age, sex, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, individual demographic features, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, daily maximum temperature	AC, RESP, COPD, CVD, IHD, CHF, CEVD, LC
Paul et al. 2020[57]	ONPHEC	Canada	1996-2015	Diabetes	452,590	FM	35-85	age, sex, area-level demographic features	CVD
Shi et al. 2021[58]	Medicare	USA	2001-2017	General	44,684,756	FM	≥ 65	age, sex, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, individual and area-level demographic features, lifestyle features, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, medical history	AC
Strak et al. 2021[59]	ELAPSE	6 countries[†]	1985-2015	General	325,367	FM	49 (13)	age, sex, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, individual and area-level demographic features, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, BC	AC, RESP, COPD, CVD, IHD, CEVD
Yazdi et al. 2021[60]	Medicare	USA	2000-2016	General	44,430,747	FM	≥ 65	age, sex, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, individual and area-level demographic features, lifestyle features, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, medical history	AC
Bauwelinck et al. 2022[61]	BC2001	Belgium	2001-2011	General	5,474,470	FM	≥ 30	age, sex, individual and area-level demographic features, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2	AC, RESP, CVD, LC
Stafoggia et al. 2022[62]	ELAPSE	7 countries[‡]	2000-2017	General	28,153,138	FM	≥ 30	age, sex, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, individual and area-level demographic features, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, BC	AC, RESP, CVD, LC

Cohort abbreviations: AHSMOG, *Adventist Health Study of Smog*; WU-EPRI, *Washington University–Electric Power Research Institute*; ACS CPS, *American Cancer Society Cancer Prevention Study*; CTS, *California Teacher Study*; CPRD, *Clinical Practice Research Datalink*; GAZEL, *GAZ de France and ÉLectricité*; CANCHEC, *Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort*; MINAP, *National Audit of Myocardial Infarction Project*; DDCH, *Danish Diet, Cancer and Health*; NIH-AARP, *National Institute of Health, American Association of Retired Persons*; ONPHEC, *Ontario Population Health and Environment Cohort*; BC2001, *Belgian 2001 Census*.

∥ Demographic features included marital status, education attainment, employment status and occupational class, aboriginal ancestry, visible minority ethnicities, immigrant status and residence location (urban or rural), income level and socioeconomic status (SES), and regional population density. Different studies adjusted various combinations of demographic features.

⊥ Lifestyle features included consumptions of alcohol, dietary fat, vegetables, fruits (dietary fibre), and vitamins, together with physical activity frequency. Different studies adjusted various combinations of lifestyle features.

§ Population ages were reported by mean with standard deviation (in bracket).

* MI, Myocardial Infarction.

† Sweden, Denmark, France, Netherland, Germany and Austria.

‡ Belgium, Denmark, England, Netherland, Norway, Switzerland and Italy.

Table 2 **Data sources and statistical methods of O$_3$ exposure assignment.**
Methodological ratings were based on spatial interpolation and multi-data assimilation approaches. Spatial resolutions, exposure metrics, and levels of incremental risk ratio were also listed.

Study	Data Sources	Methods	Resolution	Rating	Metrics	Level of incremental risk ratio
Abbey et al. 1999[38]	monitoring station observations	IDW interpolation	NR[‖]	Low	ADMA8	12.03 ppbV
Lipfert et al. 2006[39]	monitoring station observations	nearest matching (assumed)[†]	NR	Low	ADMA1	40 ppbV
Jerrett et al. 2009[40]	monitoring station observations	nearest matching (assumed)	NR	Low	6mDMA1	10 ppbV
Krewski et al. 2009[41]	monitoring station observations	ordinary kriging interpolation	NR	Low	6mDMA1	10 ppbV
Smith et al. 2009[42]	monitoring station observations	nearest matching (assumed)	NR	Low	6mDMA1	1 µg/m³
Lipsett et al. 2011[43]	monitoring station observations	IDW interpolation	250 m	Low	ADA24	22.96 ppbV
Zanobetti et al. 2011[44]	monitoring station observations	nearest matching (assumed)	NR	Low	6mDMA8	5 ppbV
Carey et al. 2013[45]	monitoring station observations	interpolation (IDW assumed)	1 km	Low	ADA24	3.0 µg/m³
Jerrett et al. 2013[46]	monitoring station observations	IDW interpolation	NA	Low	ADA24	24.1782 ppbV
Bentayeb et al. 2015[47]	monitoring station observations, model simulation, other auxiliary predictors	universal kriging embedded land use regression	2 km	Good	6mDMA8	12.3 µg/m³
Crouse et al. 2015[48]	monitoring station observations, model simulation	linear data assimilation	21 km	Good	6mDMA8	9.5 ppbV
Tonne et al. 2016[49]	KCLurban air dispersion model simulation	NA	20 m	Moderate	ADA24	5.3 µg/m³
Turner et al. 2016[50]	monitoring station observations, CMAQ model simulation	hierarchical Bayesian space-time data assimilation	12 km	High	ADMA8 6mDMA8	10 ppbV
Di et al. 2017[51]	monitoring station observations, model simulation, satellite remote sensing observations, other auxiliary predictors	ensemble machine learning	1 km	High	6mDMA8	10 ppbV
Weichenthal et al. 2017[52]	monitoring station observations, model simulation	linear data assimilation	21 km	Good	6mDMA8	10.503 ppbV
Cakmak et al. 2018[53]	monitoring station observations, model simulation	linear data assimilation	21 km	Good	6mDMA8	10 ppbV
Hvidtfeldt et al. 2019[54]	AirGIS dispersion model simulation	NA	1 km	Moderate	ADA24	10 µg/m³
Kazemiparkouhi et al. 2019[55]	monitoring station observations	nearest matching (assumed)	6 km	Low	6mDMA1 6mDMA8 6mDA24	10 ppbV
Lim et al. 2019[56]	monitoring station observations, CMAQ model simulation	Bayesian space-time downscaling	12 km	High	6mDMA8	10 ppbV
Paul et al. 2020[57]	monitoring station observations, model simulation	linear data assimilation	21 km	Good	6mDMA8	6.4 ppbV
Shi et al. 2021[58]	monitoring station observations, model simulation, satellite remote sensing observations, other auxiliary predictors	ensemble machine learning	1 km	High	6mDMA8	10 ppbV
Strak et al. 2021[59]	monitoring station observations, model simulation, satellite remote sensing observations, other auxiliary predictors	universal kriging embedded land use regression	100 m	High	6mDMA8	10 µg/m³

Yazdi et al. 2021[60]	monitoring station observations, model simulation, satellite remote sensing observations, other auxiliary predictors	ensemble machine learning	1 km	High	6mDMA8	1 ppbV
Bauwelinck et al. 2022[61]	monitoring station observations, model simulation, satellite remote sensing observations, other auxiliary predictors	land use regression	100 m	High	6mDMA8	10 μg/m^3
Stafoggia et al. 2022[62]	monitoring station observations, model simulation, satellite remote sensing observations, other auxiliary predictors	universal kriging embedded land use regression	100 m	High	6mDMA8	10 μg/m^3

[||] NR, not reported.

[†] The statistical methods were not clearly stated in literatures, and thus the most basic method was assumed. The nearest neighbourhood matching shall be the simplest way to assign spatially sparse observations onto cohort participants, and the inverse distance weighting (IDW) is the simplest spatial interpolation approach.

[‡] NA, not applicable. The chemical transport model simulations were directly used for individual exposure assignment without further statistical processing.

Table 3 Pooled RRs for long-term 10-ppbV incremental O_3-exposure attributable multi-cause mortalities by 4 most widely used metrics and crude risks without metric harmonisation.

Mortality causes	6mDMA8	6mDA24	ADMA8	ADA24	Crude
All causes ($n = 23$)	1.014 (1.009, 1.019)	1.023 (1.014, 1.032)	1.016 (1.010, 1.022)	1.027 (1.017, 1.037)	1.017 (1.011, 1.023)
Respiratory diseases ($n = 16$)	1.025 (1.010, 1.040)	1.042 (1.016, 1.069)	1.029 (1.011, 1.047)	1.049 (1.019, 1.081)	1.031 (1.017, 1.046)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease ($n = 7$)	1.056 (1.029, 1.084)	1.098 (1.050, 1.149)	1.066 (1.034, 1.098)	1.116 (1.058, 1.176)	1.055 (1.032, 1.078)
Cardiovascular diseases ($n = 15$)	1.019 (1.004, 1.035)	1.033 (1.006, 1.061)	1.022 (1.004, 1.041)	1.038 (1.007, 1.071)	1.024 (1.009, 1.038)
Ischaemic heart disease ($n = 10$)	1.012 (0.987, 1.039)	1.021 (0.977, 1.067)	1.014 (0.984, 1.045)	1.024 (0.973, 1.078)	1.017 (0.994, 1.041)
Congestive heart failure ($n = 4$)	1.074 (1.054, 1.093)	1.130 (1.094, 1.168)	1.086 (1.063, 1.110)	1.155 (1.110, 1.198)	1.083 (1.059, 1.107)
Cerebrovascular diseases ($n = 6$)	0.993 (0.979, 1.008)	0.988 (0.964, 1.013)	0.992 (0.976, 1.009)	0.986 (0.958, 1.015)	0.992 (0.979, 1.006)
Lung cancer ($n = 12$)	0.966 (0.926, 1.007)	0.943 (0.878, 1.012)	0.960 (0.915, 1.008)	0.933 (0.859, 1.014)	0.960 (0.909, 1.013)

FIGURES

Figure 1 Schematic flowchart of study assessment and selection processes for literature review and meta-analysis.

Figure 2 Cross-metric linear relationships and conversion accuracies. The cross-metric linear relationships were scaled by Pearson's correlation coefficients. The cross-metric conversion factors with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were estimated by non-intercept linear regression models, accompanied with fitting accuracies quantified by coefficient of determination (R^2) and root mean square error (RMSE) in ppbV. The conversion factors were defined as multiples from the original metric by column into the target harmonised metric by row, e.g. ADMA8 = 1.671 ADA24, R^2 = 0.9736, RMSE = 7.78 ppbV. Note that by non-intercept linear regression, the values of R^2 should no longer be equal to the squared Pearson's linear correlation coefficients. As the cross-metric conversion coefficients were estimated statistically, indirect conversions were not recommended, since regression noises restricted the validity of equation $k_{A \to B} = k_{A \to C} \cdot k_{C \to B}$.

Figure 3 Pooled estimates of all-cause mortality risk associated with every 10-ppbV incremental O₃ exposure by 6mDMA8 metric. Size of the shaded squares in the forest plot represents the weight of each study estimated by random-effect model.

Figure 4 Pooled estimates of respiratory diseases and COPD mortality risks associated with every 10-ppbV incremental O₃ exposure by 6mDMA8 metric.

Study	Cohort	Cases (n/N)	Risk Ratio	RR (95% CI)	Weight
Cardiovascular Diseases					
Jerrett et al. 2009	ACS CPS II	48884/448850		0.980 (0.965, 0.993)	8.2%
Smith et al. 2009	ACS CPS II	-		1.053 (1.014, 1.114)	4.6%
Lipsett et al. 2011	CTS	2919/101784		1.004 (0.991, 1.015)	8.3%
Jerrett et al. 2013	ACS CPS II	8046/73711		1.010 (0.997, 1.022)	8.3%
Bentayeb et al. 2015	GAZEL	165/20327		0.831 (0.397, 1.729)	0.1%
Crouse et al. 2015	CANCHEC	98970/2521525		1.040 (1.025, 1.055)	8.2%
Turner et al. 2016	ACS CPS II	85132/669046		1.026 (1.009, 1.043)	8.0%
Weichenthal et al. 2017	CANCHEC	77000/2448500		1.161 (1.144, 1.178)	8.1%
Hvidtfeldt et al. 2019	DDCH	2319/49596		0.878 (0.817, 0.959)	5.5%
Kazemiparkouhi et al. 2019	Medicare	2333681/22159190		0.997 (0.995, 0.999)	8.6%
Lim et al. 2019	NIH-AARP	39529/548780		1.020 (0.990, 1.030)	8.4%
Paul et al. 2020	ONPHEC	64773/452590		1.105 (1.078, 1.133)	7.3%
Strak et al. 2021	ELAPSE	15542/325367		0.791 (0.734, 0.853)	3.3%
Bauwelinck et al. 2022	BC2001	234549/5474470		1.050 (1.022, 1.076)	7.4%
Stafoggia et al. 2022	ELAPSE	1186101/28153138		0.954 (0.912, 0.996)	5.7%
Random-effect model				**1.019 (1.004, 1.035)**	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97.6\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0009$, $p < 0.01$			0.5 1 2		
Congestive Heart Failure					
Zanobetti et al. 2011	Medicare	865000/1561819		1.124 (1.061, 1.166)	16.9%
Turner et al. 2016	ACS CPS II	18314/669046		1.090 (1.060, 1.130)	17.4%
Kazemiparkouhi et al. 2019	Medicare	158649/22159190		1.072 (1.063, 1.080)	50.1%
Lim et al. 2019	NIH-AARP	6811/548780		1.010 (0.970, 1.050)	15.6%
Random-effect model				**1.074 (1.054, 1.093)**	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 85.8\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0003$, $p < 0.01$			0.9 1 1.1		

Figure 5 Pooled estimates of cardiovascular diseases and congestive heart failure mortality risk associated with every 10-ppbV incremental O_3 exposure by 6mDMA8 metric.

Study	Cohort	Cases (n/N)	Risk Ratio	RR (95% CI)	Weight
Ischaemic Heart Disease					
Jerrett et al. 2009	ACS CPS II	27642/448850		0.968 (0.950, 0.986)	10.6%
Krewski et al. 2009	ACS CPS II	-		1.012 (0.988, 1.024)	11.0%
Lipsett et al. 2011	CTS	1358/101784		1.020 (1.002, 1.040)	10.5%
Jerrett et al. 2013	ACS CPS II	4540/73711		1.021 (1.004, 1.039)	10.7%
Crouse et al. 2015	CANCHEC	63050/2521525		1.065 (1.047, 1.084)	10.7%
Turner et al. 2016	ACS CPS II	45644/669046		0.980 (0.960, 1.000)	10.7%
Cakmak et al. 2018	CANCHEC	72634/2291250		1.120 (1.100, 1.130)	11.1%
Kazemiparkouhi et al. 2019	Medicare	1245041/22159190		0.996 (0.993, 0.999)	11.2%
Lim et al. 2019	NIH-AARP	22327/548780		1.030 (1.000, 1.060)	9.9%
Strak et al. 2021	ELAPSE	7265/325367		0.761 (0.679, 0.851)	3.6%
Random-effect model				**1.012 (0.987, 1.039)**	**100.0%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98.7\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0015$, $p < 0.01$					
Cerebrovascular Diseases					
Lipsett et al. 2011	CTS	728/101784		0.998 (0.971, 1.022)	20.8%
Crouse et al. 2015	CANCHEC	19725/2521525		1.024 (0.993, 1.058)	14.1%
Turner et al. 2016	ACS CPS II	170851/669046		1.020 (0.990, 1.050)	13.7%
Kazemiparkouhi et al. 2019	Medicare	410187/22159190		0.987 (0.982, 0.991)	45.8%
Lim et al. 2019	NIH-AARP	5592/548780		0.920 (0.860, 0.980)	4.7%
Strak et al. 2021	ELAPSE	3740/325367		0.782 (0.673, 0.910)	0.9%
Random-effect model				**0.993 (0.979, 1.008)**	**100.0%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 80.6\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0001$, $p < 0.01$					
Lung Cancer					
Abbey et al. 1999	AHS-M	18/2278		1.705 (0.993, 2.921)	0.6%
Abbey et al. 1999	AHS-F	12/4060		0.829 (0.489, 1.408)	0.6%
Krewski et al. 2009	ACS CPS II	9788/488370		0.988 (0.952, 1.024)	9.7%
Lipsett et al. 2011	CTS	433/101784		0.989 (0.956, 1.022)	9.9%
Carey et al. 2013	CPRD	5273/824654		0.811 (0.699, 0.934)	4.6%
Jerrett et al. 2013	ACS CPS II	1481/73711		0.968 (0.939, 0.998)	10.0%
Crouse et al. 2015	CANCHEC	30545/2521525		0.972 (0.947, 0.997)	10.1%
Turner et al. 2016	ACS CPS II	16432/669046		0.970 (0.940, 1.000)	9.3%
Cakmak et al. 2018	CANCHEC	53220/2291250		1.040 (0.970, 1.120)	8.2%
Kazemiparkouhi et al. 2019	Medicare	350357/22159190		1.016 (1.011, 1.021)	10.5%
Lim et al. 2019	NIH-AARP	13529/548780		0.980 (0.950, 1.000)	9.9%
Bauwelinck et al. 2022	BC2001	52211/5474470		0.927 (0.880, 0.975)	9.1%
Stafoggia et al. 2022	ELAPSE	246509/28153138		0.857 (0.791, 0.929)	7.6%
Random-effect model				**0.966 (0.926, 1.007)**	**100.0%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 84.2\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0044$, $p < 0.01$					

Figure 6 Pooled estimates of ischaemic heart disease, cerebrovascular diseases, lung cancer, ischaemic stroke, and pneumonia mortality risks associated with every 10-ppbV incremental O₃ exposure by 6mDMA8 metric.

REFERENCES

1. Fu, B.; Gasser, T.; Li, B.; Tao, S.; Ciais, P.; Piao, S.; Balkanski, Y.; Li, W.; Yin, T.; Han, L., Short-lived climate forcers have long-term climate impacts via the carbon-climate feedback. *Nat Clim Change* **2020,** *10*, (9), 851-855.

2. Wilson, S. R.; Madronich, S.; Longstreth, J. D.; Solomon, K. R., Interactive effects of changing stratospheric ozone and climate on tropospheric composition and air quality, and the consequences for human and ecosystem health. *Photochem Photobiol Sci* **2019,** *18*, (3), 775-803.

3. Stolarski, R. S., The Antarctic ozone hole. *Sci Am* **1988,** *258*, (1), 30-37.

4. Ghude, S. D.; Jena, C.; Chate, D. M.; Beig, G.; Pfister, G. G.; Kumar, R.; Ramanathan, V., Reductions in India's crop yield due to ozone. *Geophys Res Lett* **2014,** *41*, (15), 5685-5691.

5. Zhang, F.; Zhang, H.; Wu, C.; Zhang, M.; Feng, H.; Li, D.; Zhu, W., Acute effects of ambient air pollution on clinic visits of college students for upper respiratory tract infection in Wuhan, China. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* **2021**, 1-11.

6. Zheng, X.-Y.; Orellano, P.; Lin, H.-L.; Jiang, M.; Guan, W.-J., Short-term exposure to ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and sulphur dioxide and emergency department visits and hospital admissions due to asthma: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ Int* **2021,** *150*, 106435.

7. Liu, Y.; Pan, J.; Fan, C.; Xu, R.; Wang, Y.; Xu, C.; Xie, S.; Zhang, H.; Cui, X.; Peng, Z.; Shi, C.; Zhang, Y.; Sun, H.; Zhou, Y.; Zhang, L., Short-Term Exposure to Ambient Air Pollution and Mortality From Myocardial Infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* **2021,** *77*, (3), 271-281.

8. Zhao, R.; Chen, S.; Wang, W.; Huang, J.; Wang, K.; Liu, L.; Wei, S., The impact of short-term exposure to air pollutants on the onset of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Cardiol* **2017,** *226*, 110-117.

9. Han, C.; Lu, Y.; Cheng, H.; Wang, C.; Chan, P., The impact of long-term exposure to ambient air pollution and second-hand smoke on the onset of Parkinson disease: a review and meta-analysis. *Public Health* **2020,** *179*, 100-110.

10. Li, J.; Huang, J.; Cao, R.; Yin, P.; Wang, L.; Liu, Y.; Pan, X.; Li, G.; Zhou, M., The association between ozone and years of life lost from stroke, 2013-2017: A retrospective regression analysis in 48 major Chinese cities. *J Hazard Mater* **2021,** *405*, 124220.

11. Liu, G.; Sun, B.; Yu, L.; Chen, J.; Han, B.; Li, Y.; Chen, J., The Gender-Based Differences in Vulnerability to Ambient Air Pollution and Cerebrovascular Disease Mortality: Evidences Based on 26781 Deaths. *Glob Heart* **2020,** *15*, (1), 46.

12. Sun, Z.; Yang, L.; Bai, X.; Du, W.; Shen, G.; Fei, J.; Wang, Y.; Chen, A.; Chen, Y.; Zhao, M., Maternal ambient air pollution exposure with spatial-temporal variations and preterm birth risk assessment during 2013-2017 in Zhejiang Province, China. *Environ Int* **2019,** *133*, (Pt B), 105242.

13. Global Burden of Disease Collaborative Network, Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 (GBD 2019) Results. In Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME): Seattle, United States, 2020.

14. Niu, Z.; Liu, F.; Yu, H.; Wu, S.; Xiang, H., Association between exposure to ambient air pollution and hospital admission, incidence, and mortality of stroke: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of more than 23 million participants. *Environ Health Prev Med* **2021,** *26*, (1), 1-14.

15. Huangfu, P.; Atkinson, R., Long-term exposure to NO_2 and O_3 and all-cause and respiratory mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ Int* **2020,** *144*, 105998.

16. Atkinson, R. W.; Butland, B. K.; Dimitroulopoulou, C.; Heal, M. R.; Stedman, J. R.; Carslaw, N.; Jarvis, D.; Heaviside, C.; Vardoulakis, S.; Walton, H.; Anderson, H. R., Long-term exposure to ambient ozone and mortality: a quantitative systematic review and meta-analysis of evidence from cohort studies. *BMJ Open* **2016,** *6*, (2), e009493.

17. Shen, H.; Sun, Z.; Chen, Y.; Russell, A. G.; Hu, Y.; Odman, M. T.; Qian, Y.; Archibald, A. T.; Tao, S., Novel Method for Ozone Isopleth Construction and Diagnosis for the Ozone Control Strategy of Chinese Cities. *Environ Sci Technol* **2021**, *55*, (23), 15625-15636.

18. Sun, Z.; Archibald, A. T., Multi-stage Ensemble-learning-based Model Fusion for Surface Ozone Simulations: A Focus on CMIP6 Models. *Environmental Science and Ecotechnology* **2021**, *8*,100124.

19. Schultz, M. G.; Schroder, S.; Lyapina, O.; Cooper, O. R.; Galbally, I.; Petropavlovskikh, I.; von Schneidemesser, E.; Tanimoto, H.; Elshorbany, Y.; Naja, M.; Seguel, R. J.; Dauert, U.; Eckhardt, P.; Feigenspan, S.; Fiebig, M.; Hjellbrekke, A. G.; Hong, Y. D.; Kjeld, P. C.; Koide, H.; Lear, G.; Tarasick, D.; Ueno, M.; Wallasch, M.; Baumgardner, D.; Chuang, M. T.; Gillett, R.; Lee, M.; Molloy, S.; Moolla, R.; Wang, T.; Sharps, K.; Adame, J. A.; Ancellet, G.; Apadula, F.; Artaxo, P.; Barlasina, M. E.; Bogucka, M.; Bonasoni, P.; Chang, L.; Colomb, A.; Cuevas-Agullo, E.; Cupeiro, M.; Degorska, A.; Ding, A. J.; FrHlich, M.; Frolova, M.; Gadhavi, H.; Gheusi, F.; Gilge, S.; Gonzalez, M. Y.; Gros, V.; Hamad, S. H.; Helmig, D.; Henriques, D.; Hermansen, O.; Holla, R.; Hueber, J.; Im, U.; Jaffe, D. A.; Komala, N.; Kubistin, D.; Lam, K. S.; Laurila, T.; Lee, H.; Levy, I.; Mazzoleni, C.; Mazzoleni, L. R.; McClure-Begley, A.; Mohamad, M.; Murovec, M.; Navarro-Comas, M.; Nicodim, F.; Parrish, D.; Read, K. A.; Reid, N.; Ries, N. R. L.; Saxena, P.; Schwab, J. J.; Scorgie, Y.; Senik, I.; Simmonds, P.; Sinha, V.; Skorokhod, A. I.; Spain, G.; Spangl, W.; Spoor, R.; Springston, S. R.; Steer, K.; Steinbacher, M.; Suharguniyawan, E.; Torre, P.; Trickl, T.; Lin, W. L.; Weller, R.; Xu, X. B.; Xue, L. K.; Ma, Z. Q., Tropospheric Ozone Assessment Report: Database and metrics data of global surface ozone observations. *Elem Sci Anth* **2017**, *5*, 58-83.

20. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), GBD 2019 Cause and Risk Summary: Ambient Ozone Pollution. In IHME, University of Washington: Seattle, USA, 2020.

21. Guyatt, G. H.; Oxman, A. D.; Vist, G. E.; Kunz, R.; Falck-Ytter, Y.; Alonso-Coello, P.; Schunemann, H. J.; Group, G. W., GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* **2008**, *336*, (7650), 924-6.

22. Guyatt, G.; Oxman, A. D.; Akl, E. A.; Kunz, R.; Vist, G.; Brozek, J.; Norris, S.; Falck-Ytter, Y.; Glasziou, P.; DeBeer, H.; Jaeschke, R.; Rind, D.; Meerpohl, J.; Dahm, P.; Schunemann, H. J., GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol* **2011**, *64*, (4), 383-94.

23. Egger, M.; Davey Smith, G.; Schneider, M.; Minder, C., Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* **1997**, *315*, (7109), 629-34.

24. Duval, S.; Tweedie, R., A nonparametric "trim and fill" method of accounting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *J Am Stat Assoc* **2000**, *95*, (449), 89-98.

25. Sun, H. Z.; Shin, Y. M.; Xia, M.; Ke, S.; Yuan, L.; Guo, Y.; Archibald, A. T., Spatial Resolved Surface Ozone with Urban and Rural Differentiation during 1990-2019: A Space-time Bayesian Neural Network Downscaler. *Environ Sci Technol* **2021**.

26. Krupa, S.; McGrath, M. T.; Andersen, C. P.; Booker, F. L.; Burkey, K. O.; Chappelka, A. H.; Chevone, B. I.; Pell, E. J.; Zilinskas, B. A., Ambient Ozone and Plant Health. *Plant Dis* **2001**, *85*, (1), 4-12.

27. Finlayson-Pitts, B.; Pitts Jr, J., Atmospheric chemistry of tropospheric ozone formation: scientific and regulatory implications. *Air & Waste* **1993**, *43*, (8), 1091-1100.

28. Fleming, Z. L.; Doherty, R. M.; Von Schneidemesser, E.; Malley, C. S.; Cooper, O. R.; Pinto, J. P.; Colette, A.; Xu, X.; Simpson, D.; Schultz, M. G.; Lefohn, A. S.; Hamad, S.; Moolla, R.; Solberg, S.; Feng, Z., Tropospheric Ozone Assessment Report: Present-day ozone distribution and trends relevant to human health. *Elem Sci Anth* **2018**, *6*, 12.

29. Griffiths, P. T.; Murray, L. T.; Zeng, G.; Archibald, A. T.; Emmons, L. K.; Galbally, I.; Hassler, B.; Horowitz, L. W.; Keeble, J.; Liu, J.; Moeini, O.; Naik, V.; amp; apos; Connor, F. M.; Shin, Y. M.; Tarasick, D.; Tilmes, S.; Turnock, S. T.; Wild, O.; Young, P. J.; Zanis, P., Tropospheric ozone in CMIP6 Simulations. *Atmos Chem Phys* **2021**, *21*, (5), 4187-4218.

30. Archibald, A. T.; O'Connor, F. M.; Abraham, N. L.; Archer-Nicholls, S.; Chipperfield, M. P.; Dalvi, M.; Folberth, G. A.; Dennison, F.; Dhomse, S. S.; Griffiths, P. T.; Hardacre, C.; Hewitt, A. J.; Hill, R.; Johnson, C. E.; Keeble, J.; Köhler, M. O.; Morgenstern, O.; Mulchay, J. P.; Ordóñez, C.; Pope, R. J.;

Rumbold, S.; Russo, M. R.; Savage, N.; Sellar, A.; Stringer, M.; Turnock, S.; Wild, O.; Zeng, G., Description and evaluation of the UKCA stratosphere-troposphere chemistry scheme (StratTrop vn 1.0) implemented in UKESM1. *Geosci Model Dev* **2019,** *13*, (3), 1223-1266.

31. Tong, L.; Zhang, H.; Yu, J.; He, M.; Xu, N.; Zhang, J.; Qian, F.; Feng, J.; Xiao, H., Characteristics of surface ozone and nitrogen oxides at urban, suburban and rural sites in Ningbo, China. *Atmos Res* **2017,** *187*, 57-68.

32. U.S. EPA *Air Quality Criteria For Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Final Report, 2006)*; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Washington, DC, 2006.

33. Tarasick, D.; Galbally, I. E.; Cooper, O. R.; Schultz, M. G.; Ancellet, G.; Leblanc, T.; Wallington, T. J.; Ziemke, J.; Liu, X.; Steinbacher, M.; Staehelin, J.; Vigouroux, C.; Hannigan, J. W.; Garcia, O.; Foret, G.; Zanis, P.; Weatherhead, E.; Petropavlovskikh, I.; Worden, H.; Osman, M.; Liu, J.; Chang, K. L.; Gaudel, A.; Lin, M. Y.; Granados-Munoz, M.; Thompson, A. M.; Oltmans, S. J.; Cuesta, J.; Dufour, G.; Thouret, V.; Hassler, B.; Trickl, T.; Neu, J. L., Tropospheric Ozone Assessment Report: Tropospheric ozone from 1877 to 2016, observed levels, trends and uncertainties. *Elem Sci Anth* **2019,** *7*, 39.

34. Lu, X.; Hong, J. Y.; Zhang, L.; Cooper, O. R.; Schultz, M. G.; Xu, X. B.; Wang, T.; Gao, M.; Zhao, Y. H.; Zhang, Y. H., Severe Surface Ozone Pollution in China: A Global Perspective. *Environ Sci Technol Lett* **2018,** *5*, (8), 487-494.

35. Hunter, J. E.; Schmidt, F. L., Meta-analysis. In *Advances in educational and psychological testing: Theory and applications*, Springer: 1991; pp 157-183.

36. Higgins, J. P.; Thompson, S. G.; Deeks, J. J.; Altman, D. G., Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* **2003,** *327*, (7414), 557-60.

37. Burnett, R. T.; Pope, C. A., 3rd; Ezzati, M.; Olives, C.; Lim, S. S.; Mehta, S.; Shin, H. H.; Singh, G.; Hubbell, B.; Brauer, M.; Anderson, H. R.; Smith, K. R.; Balmes, J. R.; Bruce, N. G.; Kan, H.; Laden, F.; Pruss-Ustun, A.; Turner, M. C.; Gapstur, S. M.; Diver, W. R.; Cohen, A., An integrated risk function for estimating the global burden of disease attributable to ambient fine particulate matter exposure. *Environ Health Perspect* **2014,** *122*, (4), 397-403.

38. Abbey, D. E.; Nishino, N.; McDonnell, W. F.; Burchette, R. J.; Knutsen, S. F.; Lawrence Beeson, W.; Yang, J. X., Long-term inhalable particles and other air pollutants related to mortality in nonsmokers. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **1999,** *159*, (2), 373-82.

39. Lipfert, F. W.; Wyzga, R. E.; Baty, J. D.; Miller, J. P., Traffic density as a surrogate measure of environmental exposures in studies of air pollution health effects: Long-term mortality in a cohort of US veterans. *Atmos Environ* **2006,** *40*, (1), 154-169.

40. Jerrett, M.; Burnett, R. T.; Pope, C. A., 3rd; Ito, K.; Thurston, G.; Krewski, D.; Shi, Y.; Calle, E.; Thun, M., Long-term ozone exposure and mortality. *N Engl J Med* **2009,** *360*, (11), 1085-95.

41. Krewski, D.; Jerrett, M.; Burnett, R. T.; Ma, R.; Hughes, E.; Shi, Y.; Turner, M. C.; Pope III, C. A.; Thurston, G.; Calle, E. E., *Extended follow-up and spatial analysis of the American Cancer Society study linking particulate air pollution and mortality*. Health Effects Institute Boston, MA: 2009.

42. Smith, K. R.; Jerrett, M.; Anderson, H. R.; Burnett, R. T.; Stone, V.; Derwent, R.; Atkinson, R. W.; Cohen, A.; Shonkoff, S. B.; Krewski, D.; Pope, C. A., 3rd; Thun, M. J.; Thurston, G., Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions: health implications of short-lived greenhouse pollutants. *Lancet* **2009,** *374*, (9707), 2091-2103.

43. Lipsett, M. J.; Ostro, B. D.; Reynolds, P.; Goldberg, D.; Hertz, A.; Jerrett, M.; Smith, D. F.; Garcia, C.; Chang, E. T.; Bernstein, L., Long-term exposure to air pollution and cardiorespiratory disease in the California teachers study cohort. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **2011,** *184*, (7), 828-35.

44. Zanobetti, A.; Schwartz, J., Ozone and survival in four cohorts with potentially predisposing diseases. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **2011,** *184*, (7), 836-41.

45. Carey, I. M.; Atkinson, R. W.; Kent, A. J.; van Staa, T.; Cook, D. G.; Anderson, H. R., Mortality associations with long-term exposure to outdoor air pollution in a national English cohort. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **2013,** *187*, (11), 1226-33.

46. Jerrett, M.; Burnett, R. T.; Beckerman, B. S.; Turner, M. C.; Krewski, D.; Thurston, G.; Martin, R. V.; van Donkelaar, A.; Hughes, E.; Shi, Y.; Gapstur, S. M.; Thun, M. J.; Pope, C. A., 3rd, Spatial analysis of air pollution and mortality in California. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **2013,** *188*, (5), 593-9.

47. Bentayeb, M.; Wagner, V.; Stempfelet, M.; Zins, M.; Goldberg, M.; Pascal, M.; Larrieu, S.; Beaudeau, P.; Cassadou, S.; Eilstein, D., Association between long-term exposure to air pollution and mortality in France: a 25-year follow-up study. *Environ Int* **2015,** *85*, 5-14.

48. Crouse, D. L.; Peters, P. A.; Hystad, P.; Brook, J. R.; van Donkelaar, A.; Martin, R. V.; Villeneuve, P. J.; Jerrett, M.; Goldberg, M. S.; Pope III, C. A., Ambient $PM_{2.5}$, O_3, and NO_2 exposures and associations with mortality over 16 years of follow-up in the Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort (CanCHEC). *Environ Health Perspect* **2015,** *123*, (11), 1180-1186.

49. Tonne, C.; Halonen, J. I.; Beevers, S. D.; Dajnak, D.; Gulliver, J.; Kelly, F. J.; Wilkinson, P.; Anderson, H. R., Long-term traffic air and noise pollution in relation to mortality and hospital readmission among myocardial infarction survivors. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* **2016,** *219*, (1), 72-78.

50. Turner, M. C.; Jerrett, M.; Pope, C. A., 3rd; Krewski, D.; Gapstur, S. M.; Diver, W. R.; Beckerman, B. S.; Marshall, J. D.; Su, J.; Crouse, D. L.; Burnett, R. T., Long-Term Ozone Exposure and Mortality in a Large Prospective Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **2016,** *193*, (10), 1134-42.

51. Di, Q.; Wang, Y.; Zanobetti, A.; Wang, Y.; Koutrakis, P.; Choirat, C.; Dominici, F.; Schwartz, J. D., Air Pollution and Mortality in the Medicare Population. *N Engl J Med* **2017,** *376*, (26), 2513-2522.

52. Weichenthal, S.; Pinault, L. L.; Burnett, R. T., Impact of oxidant gases on the relationship between outdoor fine particulate air pollution and nonaccidental, cardiovascular, and respiratory mortality. *Sci Rep* **2017,** *7*, (1), 1-10.

53. Cakmak, S.; Hebbern, C.; Pinault, L.; Lavigne, E.; Vanos, J.; Crouse, D. L.; Tjepkema, M., Associations between long-term $PM_{2.5}$ and ozone exposure and mortality in the Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort (CANCHEC), by spatial synoptic classification zone. *Environ Int* **2018,** *111*, 200-211.

54. Hvidtfeldt, U. A.; Sorensen, M.; Geels, C.; Ketzel, M.; Khan, J.; Tjonneland, A.; Overvad, K.; Brandt, J.; Raaschou-Nielsen, O., Long-term residential exposure to $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, black carbon, NO_2, and ozone and mortality in a Danish cohort. *Environ Int* **2019,** *123*, 265-272.

55. Kazemiparkouhi, F.; Eum, K. D.; Wang, B.; Manjourides, J.; Suh, H. H., Long-term ozone exposures and cause-specific mortality in a US Medicare cohort. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* **2020,** *30*, (4), 650-658.

56. Lim, C. C.; Hayes, R. B.; Ahn, J.; Shao, Y.; Silverman, D. T.; Jones, R. R.; Garcia, C.; Bell, M. L.; Thurston, G. D., Long-Term Exposure to Ozone and Cause-Specific Mortality Risk in the United States. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **2019,** *200*, (8), 1022-1031.

57. Paul, L. A.; Burnett, R. T.; Kwong, J. C.; Hystad, P.; van Donkelaar, A.; Bai, L.; Goldberg, M. S.; Lavigne, E.; Copes, R.; Martin, R. V., The impact of air pollution on the incidence of diabetes and survival among prevalent diabetes cases. *Environ Int* **2020,** *134*, 105333.

58. Shi, L.; Rosenberg, A.; Wang, Y.; Liu, P.; Danesh Yazdi, M.; Requia, W.; Steenland, K.; Chang, H.; Sarnat, J. A.; Wang, W.; Zhang, K.; Zhao, J.; Schwartz, J., Low-Concentration Air Pollution and Mortality in American Older Adults: A National Cohort Analysis (2001-2017). *Environ Sci Technol* **2021**.

59. Strak, M.; Weinmayr, G.; Rodopoulou, S.; Chen, J.; de Hoogh, K.; Andersen, Z. J.; Atkinson, R.; Bauwelinck, M.; Bekkevold, T.; Bellander, T.; Boutron-Ruault, M. C.; Brandt, J.; Cesaroni, G.; Concin, H.; Fecht, D.; Forastiere, F.; Gulliver, J.; Hertel, O.; Hoffmann, B.; Hvidtfeldt, U. A.; Janssen, N. A. H.; Jockel, K. H.; Jorgensen, J. T.; Ketzel, M.; Klompmaker, J. O.; Lager, A.; Leander, K.; Liu, S.; Ljungman, P.; Magnusson, P. K. E.; Mehta, A. J.; Nagel, G.; Oftedal, B.; Pershagen, G.; Peters, A.; Raaschou-Nielsen, O.; Renzi, M.; Rizzuto, D.; van der Schouw, Y. T.; Schramm, S.; Severi, G.; Sigsgaard, T.; Sorensen, M.; Stafoggia, M.; Tjonneland, A.; Verschuren, W. M. M.; Vienneau, D.; Wolf, K.; Katsouyanni, K.; Brunekreef, B.; Hoek, G.; Samoli, E., Long term exposure to low level air pollution and mortality in eight European cohorts within the ELAPSE project: pooled analysis. *BMJ* **2021,** *374*.

60. Yazdi, M. D.; Wang, Y.; Di, Q.; Requia, W. J.; Wei, Y. G.; Shi, L. H.; Sabath, M. B.; Dominici, F.; Coull, B.; Evans, J. S.; Koutrakis, P.; Schwartz, J. D., Long-term effect of exposure to lower concentrations of air pollution on mortality among US Medicare participants and vulnerable subgroups: a doubly-robust approach. *Lancet Planet Health* **2021**, *5*, (10), E689-E697.

61. Bauwelinck, M.; Chen, J.; de Hoogh, K.; Katsouyanni, K.; Rodopoulou, S.; Samoli, E.; Andersen, Z. J.; Atkinson, R.; Casas, L.; Deboosere, P.; Demoury, C.; Janssen, N.; Klompmaker, J. O.; Lefebvre, W.; Mehta, A. J.; Nawrot, T. S.; Oftedal, B.; Renzi, M.; Stafoggia, M.; Strak, M.; Vandenheede, H.; Vanpoucke, C.; Van Nieuwenhuyse, A.; Vienneau, D.; Brunekreef, B.; Hoek, G., Variability in the association between long-term exposure to ambient air pollution and mortality by exposure assessment method and covariate adjustment: A census-based country-wide cohort study. *Sci Total Environ* **2022**, *804*, 150091.

62. Stafoggia, M.; Oftedal, B.; Chen, J.; Rodopoulou, S.; Renzi, M.; Atkinson, R. W.; Bauwelinck, M.; Klompmaker, J. O.; Mehta, A.; Vienneau, D., Long-term exposure to low ambient air pollution concentrations and mortality among 28 million people: results from seven large European cohorts within the ELAPSE project. *Lancet Planet Health* **2022**, *6*, (1), e9-e18.

63. Hvidtfeldt, U. A.; Geels, C.; Sørensen, M.; Ketzel, M.; Khan, J.; Tjønneland, A.; Christensen, J. H.; Brandt, J.; Raaschou-Nielsen, O., Long-term residential exposure to PM2.5 constituents and mortality in a Danish cohort. *Environ Int* **2019**, *133*, (Pt B), 105268.

64. Holtzman, M. J.; Cunningham, J. H.; Sheller, J. R.; Irsigler, G. B.; Nadel, J. A.; Boushey, H. A., Effect of ozone on bronchial reactivity in atopic and nonatopic subjects. *Am Rev Respir Dis* **1979**, *120*, (5), 1059-67.

65. Kodavanti, U. P.; Schladweiler, M. C.; Ledbetter, A. D.; Watkinson, W. P.; Campen, M. J.; Winsett, D. W.; Richards, J. R.; Crissman, K. M.; Hatch, G. E.; Costa, D. L., The spontaneously hypertensive rat as a model of human cardiovascular disease: Evidence of exacerbated cardiopulmonary injury and oxidative stress from inhaled emission particulate matter. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol* **2000**, *164*, (3), 250-263.

66. Wang, M.; Sampson, P. D.; Sheppard, L. E.; Stein, J. H.; Vedal, S.; Kaufman, J. D., Long-Term Exposure to Ambient Ozone and Progression of Subclinical Arterial Disease: The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis and Air Pollution. *Environ Health Perspect* **2019**, *127*, (5), 57001.

67. Whyand, T.; Hurst, J. R.; Beckles, M.; Caplin, M. E., Pollution and respiratory disease: can diet or supplements help? A review. *Respir Res* **2018**, *19*, (1), 79.

68. EPA *Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) for Particulate Matter*; Washington, D.C., 2019.

69. World Health Organization, *WHO global air quality guidelines: particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10), ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and carbon monoxide: Executive summary*. 2021.

70. Pope III, C. A.; Cohen, A. J.; Burnett, R. T., Cardiovascular disease and fine particulate matter: lessons and limitations of an integrated exposure-response approach. *Circ Res* **2018**, *122*, (12), 1645-1647.

71. Fantke, P.; McKone, T. E.; Tainio, M.; Jolliet, O.; Apte, J. S.; Stylianou, K. S.; Illner, N.; Marshall, J. D.; Choma, E. F.; Evans, J. S., Global effect factors for exposure to fine particulate matter. *Environ Sci Technol* **2019**, *53*, (12), 6855-6868.

72. Yin, P.; Brauer, M.; Cohen, A.; Burnett, R. T.; Liu, J.; Liu, Y.; Liang, R.; Wang, W.; Qi, J.; Wang, L.; Zhou, M., Long-term Fine Particulate Matter Exposure and Nonaccidental and Cause-specific Mortality in a Large National Cohort of Chinese Men. *Environ Health Perspect* **2017**, *125*, (11), 117002.

73. Malley, C. S.; Henze, D. K.; Kuylenstierna, J. C. I.; Vallack, H. W.; Davila, Y.; Anenberg, S. C.; Turner, M. C.; Ashmore, M. R., Updated Global Estimates of Respiratory Mortality in Adults >= 30 Years of Age Attributable to Long-Term Ozone Exposure. *Environ Health Perspect* **2017**, *125*, (8), 087021.

74. Anenberg, S. C.; Horowitz, L. W.; Tong, D. Q.; West, J. J., An estimate of the global burden of anthropogenic ozone and fine particulate matter on premature human mortality using atmospheric modeling. *Environ Health Perspect* **2010**, *118*, (9), 1189-1195.

75. Fann, N.; Lamson, A. D.; Anenberg, S. C.; Wesson, K.; Risley, D.; Hubbell, B. J., Estimating the

national public health burden associated with exposure to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ and ozone. *Risk Anal* **2012,** *32*, (1), 81-95.

76. Silva, R. A.; West, J. J.; Zhang, Y.; Anenberg, S. C.; Lamarque, J.-F.; Shindell, D. T.; Collins, W. J.; Dalsoren, S.; Faluvegi, G.; Folberth, G., Global premature mortality due to anthropogenic outdoor air pollution and the contribution of past climate change. *Environ Res Lett* **2013,** *8*, (3), 034005.

77. West, J. J.; Smith, S. J.; Silva, R. A.; Naik, V.; Zhang, Y.; Adelman, Z.; Fry, M. M.; Anenberg, S.; Horowitz, L. W.; Lamarque, J.-F., Co-benefits of mitigating global greenhouse gas emissions for future air quality and human health. *Nat Clim Change* **2013,** *3*, (10), 885-889.

78. Yu, P.; Guo, S.; Xu, R.; Ye, T.; Li, S.; Sim, M.; Abramson, M. J.; Guo, Y., Cohort studies of long-term exposure to outdoor particulate matter and risks of cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Innovation* **2021**, 100143.

79. Meng, X.; Liu, C.; Chen, R.; Sera, F.; Vicedo-Cabrera, A. M.; Milojevic, A.; Guo, Y.; Tong, S.; Coelho, M.; Saldiva, P. H. N.; Lavigne, E.; Correa, P. M.; Ortega, N. V.; Osorio, S.; Garcia; Kysely, J.; Urban, A.; Orru, H.; Maasikmets, M.; Jaakkola, J. J. K.; Ryti, N.; Huber, V.; Schneider, A.; Katsouyanni, K.; Analitis, A.; Hashizume, M.; Honda, Y.; Ng, C. F. S.; Nunes, B.; Teixeira, J. P.; Holobaca, I. H.; Fratianni, S.; Kim, H.; Tobias, A.; Iniguez, C.; Forsberg, B.; Astrom, C.; Ragettli, M. S.; Guo, Y. L.; Pan, S. C.; Li, S.; Bell, M. L.; Zanobetti, A.; Schwartz, J.; Wu, T.; Gasparrini, A.; Kan, H., Short term associations of ambient nitrogen dioxide with daily total, cardiovascular, and respiratory mortality: multilocation analysis in 398 cities. *BMJ* **2021,** *372*, n534.

80. Yu, K.; Lv, J.; Qiu, G.; Yu, C.; Guo, Y.; Bian, Z.; Yang, L.; Chen, Y.; Wang, C.; Pan, A.; Liang, L.; Hu, F. B.; Chen, Z.; Li, L.; Wu, T.; China Kadoorie Biobank, S., Cooking fuels and risk of all-cause and cardiopulmonary mortality in urban China: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health* **2020,** *8*, (3), e430-e439.