medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Ambient Air Pollution and Subclinical Cardiovascular Disease Measured by Magnetic Resonance Imaging in the Canadian Alliance for Healthy Hearts and Minds Study

Sandi M Azab[1,2]
Karleen M Schulze[3]
Jeffrey R Brook[4]
Dany Doiron[5]
Eric E Smith[6]
Alan R Moody[7]
Dipika Desai[3]
Michael Brauer[8]
Matthias G Friedrich[9]
Shrikant I Bangdiwala[1,3]
Dena Zeraatkar[10]
Douglas Lee[11]
Sonia S Anand[1,2,3]
Russell J de Souza[1,2,3]

[1]Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada
[2]Department of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada
[3]Population Health Research Institute, Hamilton, ON, Canada
[4]Occupational and Environmental Health Division, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
[5]Research Institute of McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Canada
[6] Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta
[7]Department of Medical Imaging, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario
[8]School of Population and Public Health, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
[9]Department of Medicine and Diagnostic Radiology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
[10]Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
[11]Programming and Biostatistics, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Address for Correspondence:

Russell de Souza, Sc.D., R.D.
Associate Professor, Population Genomics Program
Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact
1200 Main St. West
MDCL, Room 3210
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
L8N 3Z5
Phone (905) 525-9140 x. 22109
desouzrj@mcmaster.ca

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Long-term exposure to air pollution, even at levels below regulatory standards, has been associated with higher risk of cardiovascular-related mortality. Less is known about the association of air pollution and initial development of CVD in low-exposure settings in generally healthy human populations.

Objective: In the Canadian Alliance for Healthy Hearts and Minds Cohort Study (CAHHM), we aimed to investigate the association between low-level exposure to key air pollutants and subclinical carotid atherosclerosis in adults without known clinical CVD. To date, the association of ambient air pollution and atherosclerosis measured by magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has not been studied.

Methods: We studied 6,645 Canadian adults recruited between 2014-2018 from the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia, for whom average long-term exposures to nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), ozone (O_3), and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) were estimated for five years prior to the start of CAHHM recruitment, and who underwent MRI to assess carotid vessel wall volume (CWV). Linear mixed models were used to quantify associations between each air pollutant and CWV adjusting for individual-level and community-level risk factors for CVD. Secondary analyses included region-specific stratification and modeling the effect of one pollutant on CWV within low, medium, and high levels of a second pollutant to test for interactions.

Results: Higher $PM_{2.5}$ was nominally associated with lower CWV (quintile 5: 893.3 mm^3, quintile 1: 908.8 mm^3; *p-trend* =0.05), but this was not robust in region-stratified analysis. Higher NO_2 was associated with lower CWV (quintile 5: 889.5 mm^3, quintile 1: 918.6 mm^3; *p-*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

trend <.0001). Higher O_3 was associated with higher CWV (quintile 5: 925.4 mm^3, quintile 1: 899.7 mm^3; *p-trend* =0.02). NO_2 emerged as a consistent effect modifier of both $PM_{2.5}$ and O_3.

Conclusion: In a cohort of generally healthy adults living in Canada, a country with relatively low levels of air pollution, exposure to NO_2 was negatively associated, and O_3 was positively associated with CWV as a measure of subclinical atherosclerosis by MRI, while associations to $PM_{2.5}$ were inconsistent. The reasons for these associations warrant further study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a leading cause of mortality in Canada and worldwide, and traditional risk factors include smoking, abdominal obesity, diabetes, hypertension, and dyslipidemia.[1,2,3] An extensive body of literature describes the adverse effects of air pollution on cardiovascular health.[4,5,6,7,8] It is therefore of paramount importance to ascertain the role of air pollution on early CVD indicators, such as preclinical cardiac and vascular dysfunction.

Major pollutants include particulate matter (PM) and gaseous air pollutants such as nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and ozone (O_3).[9] Fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) is fine inhalable particles ≤2.5 μm in aerodynamic diameter. Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) is mainly associated with road traffic and other forms of combustion and is a precursor to O_3.[10,11] A recent systematic review and meta-analysis including 353 studies of long-term exposure to traffic-related air pollution (TRAP) assessed the overall confidence in the evidence for its association with all-cause, circulatory, and ischemic heart disease (IHD) mortality as high, with non-fatal IHD and diabetes as moderate, and with coronary events as low.[12]

Studying subclinical markers of cardiovascular dysfunction, *e.g.*, atherosclersis, is an important step in advancing our understanding of how air pollution impacts vascular health - in addition to its established effects on traditional cardiovascular risk factors,[13] *e.g.*, insulin resistance, hypertension, and obesity.[14,15] The association of air pollution with early CVD development/initiation may be mediated through chronic effects on atherosclerosis progression, or possibly by trigerring acute cardiovascular events.[16]

Imaging of the carotid arteries is a noninvasive biomarker of subclinical atherosclerosis for early prediction of IHD risk in healthy individuals without CVD.[11] In the Multiethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA), outdoor O_3 was associated with increased progression of carotid

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

intima-media thickness (cIMT), while $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, and NO_X were not associated with cIMT change.[5,11] Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) can accurately assess the presence of subclinical cerebrovascular atherosclerosis[17] by measuring carotid vessel wall volume (CWV) i.e. the entire circumference of the wall. MRI-determined CWV, compared to ultrasound-measured cIMT, includes the adventitia, which is the source of vasa vasorum that further proliferates with arterial wall thickening.[18] Thus, CWV may be a more sensitive measure of early plaque.[18] To date, the association of ambient air pollution and MRI-captured CWV has not been studied. In the Canadian Alliance for Healthy Hearts and Minds Cohort Study (CAHHM)[19] of generally healthy adults, we sought to investigate the associations between exposure to $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, and O_3 in a low-level setting, and MRI-measured carotid atherosclerosis as a major CVD pathway.

Methods

Study design and participants

The design and methods of the CAHHM prospective cohort study have been previously described.[19] Briefly, participants were recruited in 2014-2018 from the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia in mostly urban locations.[19] The cohort includes 8,258 adults from across Canada, of whom > 80% were participants in ongoing prospective cohort studies and phenotyped for CVD risk factors. MRI scans of the brain, heart, carotid artery, and abdomen were performed at enrollment, and 7973 participants completed a standard carotid MRI scan. Adults with known history of CVD, incomplete data on the non-lab based cardiovascular risk score, or incomplete air pollutants values were excluded for the presented analyses, leaving a final sample size of 6645 participants (**Figure S1**).

The study was approved by the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (HiREB # 13-255), and all participants provided written informed consent.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Assessment of air pollution exposure

The three major air pollutants of interest in this study are $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, and O_3. The development of these exposure datasets has been documented elsewhere[20,21,22,23] and they have been used in multiple Canadian epidemiological studies[24], including the recent Mortality-Air Pollution Associations in Low Exposure Environments (MAPLE) study.[25] Briefly, annual average exposures for the five years prior to the start of CAHHM recruitment (2008-2012), data distributed by the Canadian Urban Environmental Health Research Consortium (CANUE)[26] (www.canue.ca), were linked to CAHHM using the six-character residential postal code of participants at the time of recruitment. The average exposure over the five years prior to recruitment is considered to be representative of long-term spatial air pollution exposure gradients and relevant for investigating subclinical CVD, which manifests over a long period of time.[27]

Key emission sources for $PM_{2.5}$ are industry, wildfire smoke, space heating, residential wood heating, cooking, agriculture and vehicle traffic. A significant fraction of $PM_{2.5}$ is a result of atmospheric chemistry, forming from a range of gaseous precursors such as sulphur dioxide (SO_2), NO_2, ammonia (NH_4), and volatile and semivolatile organic compounds. Yearly averages of $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations prior to baseline assessment were estimated across a 1x1 kilometer grid covering North America using NASA MODIS, MISR, and SeaWIFS satellite instruments, with aerosol vertical profiles and scattering properties simulated by the GEOS-Chem chemical transport model.[20] To adjust for any residual bias in the satellite-derived $PM_{2.5}$ estimates, a geographically weighted regression (GWR) incorporating ground-based observations was then applied.[20] Good agreement was found with cross-validated surface observations across North-America ($R^2 = 0.70$).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

NO_2 is considered an indicator of TRAP, which is a complex mixture of gases and particles, including ultrafine particles (diameter of 0.1 µm or less). Annual average NO_2 concentrations in parts per billion (ppb) were estimated for each postal code location using a national land use regression (LUR) model for the year 2006[21] at 100 m resolution and adjusted for prior and subsequent years using long-term air quality monitoring station data. The LUR NO_2 model included road length, 2005-2011 satellite NO_2 estimates, area of industrial land use within 2 km, and summer rainfall as predictors of regional NO_2 variation.[21] Deterministic gradients were used to model local scale variation related to roads (i.e., traffic).[21] The final NO_2 model showed good performance, explaining 73% of the variation in measurements from national air pollution surveillance (NAPS) monitoring data with a root mean square error (RMSE) of 2.9 ppb.

O_3 is a photochemically produced oxidant gas that results from the reaction between sunlight and nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) emitted from various natural sources and human activities such as fossil fuel combustion and wood combustion. Annual mean concentrations of O_3 exposure at 10-15 km resolution were estimated using the GEM-MACH (Global Environmental Multi-scale - Modelling Air Quality and Chemistry) air quality forecast model combined with observations from monitoring networks.[22,23,28]

Subclinical MRI outcomes

Details of the CAHHM MRI protocol have been previously published.[19] The protocol used validated standard techniques to collect information on morphology, function and tissue characteristics. Briefly, participants underwent a short non-contrast enhanced scan using a 1.5 or 3.0 Tesla magnet. Each of the centres underwent a validated test scan for quality assurance. Carotid artery vessel wall volume (mm^3) (left, right, and combined) within a 32-mm vessel length centred on each carotid bifurcation (to include distal common and proximal internal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

carotid arteries) was measured by subtracting lumen volume from total vessel volume. We used the maximum of either the left or right CWV as the measure of atherosclerosis in this study.

The INTERHEART risk score

The non-laboratory-based INTERHEART risk score is a validated tool developed to estimate a person's MI risk based on a compilation of risk factors.[29] These include age, sex, smoking, second-hand smoke exposure, diabetes, high blood pressure, and family history of MI, waist-to-hip ratio (WHR); home or work social stress, depression, simple dietary questions, and physical activity.[2] The score ranges from 0 to 48 and is categorized into low- (a score of 9 or lower), moderate- (a score of 10 to 15), or high- (a score of 16 or higher) risk categories and is significantly associated with diagnosed CVD, and also the presence of subclinical cerebrovascular disease without known clinical CVD.[17,29]

Definitions

Neighbourhood walkability: Participants residential postal codes were linked to the Canadian Active Living Environments Index (Can-ALE) categorical variable that characterizes the favourability/friendliness of active living (i.e. walkability) potential of neighbourhoods in census metropolitan areas (CMA) on a scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high) based on intersection density, dwelling density, and points of interest measures available for the year 2016. An environment with a very high walkability tends to be densely populated and has very connected street patterns and a variety of walking destinations. More information on Can-ALE is available at: http://canue.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/CanALE_UserGuide.pdf.

Rural/urban residence: Status was defined as "urban" if 21% or more postal codes within the participant's forward sortation area (FSA) fell within a CMA or a census agglomeration (CA), and "rural" if ≤ 20% of postal codes fell within a CMA/CA.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Statistical analysis

The distribution of continuous variables are presented as means with standard deviation, and categorical variables are presented as counts and percentages. The association of air pollutants with CWV was assessed using two approaches. First, air pollutant values were placed into quintiles, and we assessed the difference in CWV between quintiles of exposure, and the trend across quintiles. Second, we assessed the association between the continuous measure of air pollutant exposure with CWV, expressed as a 5 $\mu g/m^3$ increment for $PM_{2.5}$, a 5 ppb increment for NO_2, and a 3 ppb increment for O_3, as previously reported for relevant air pollutant concentrations in developed countries.[11,12]

The associations were explored using 5 linear mixed models (GLMM), each with random intercepts representing the effect of recruitment centre. This random intercept was also a good proxy for region of the country because most participants resided in major cities. The following fixed covariates were included in each model: (1) none ("unadjusted model"); (2) participant's age, sex, and ethnicity ("basic model"); (3) further adjusted for contributing individual-level factors *i.e.*, the INTERHEART risk score and education ("lifestyle model"); **(4) further adjusted for community-level factors i.e. walkability (our a priori "primary model")** and (5) model further adjusted for co-pollutants within two-pollutant models at a time ("co-pollutant model"). In sensitivity analysis, model 4 additionally adjusted for material factor score and social factor score that together capture neighborhood socioeconomic status. A complete case analysis was employed because missing data on covariates was low (1.6% for education and 0.08% for Can-ALE index). CWV is presented as adjusted least square means (95% CI) with the p-value for trend across quintiles of exposures calculated using linear contrasts. A 2-sided $p < 0.05$ was considered nominally significant with no adjustment for multiple testing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

In secondary analyses, a region-specific stratified analysis was conducted to consider inter-region variability. Here, we included only participants with urban residence and studied the pollutant-CWV associations for urban Canada overall and for each of the 5 regions/provinces separately. Estimates of the change in CWV (95% CI) for the specified unit change in continuous pollutant measures were presented with the same fixed covariates of models 1-5. To investigate interactions between the pollutants, we modeled the effect of one pollutant on CWV within low, medium, and high levels of a second pollutant with the same fixed covariates of models 1-4 and tested the statistical significance of the interaction term of the two pollutants. All analyses were completed using SAS software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc).

Results

Participant characteristics

Of the 6645 participants enrolled in this study, 3253 (48.9%) were from Ontario, 1575 (23.7%) from Quebec, 744 (11.2%) from British Columbia, 671 (10.1%) from Nova Scotia, and 402 (6.0%) from Alberta. For all regions, over 92% of the cohort's postal codes were in urban areas. The mean age of participants at enrolment was 57.6 years (SD = 8.8) and 54.8% of participants were women. The mean CWV of participants was 900.1 mm^3 (165.1) at the time of the MRI scan. Demographic, anthropometric, and lifestyle characteristics of the study participants are found in **Tables 1 and 2**. The mean (SD) 5-year pollutant concentrations immediately preceding enrolment for $PM_{2.5}$ was 6.9 $\mu g/m^3$ (2.0), ranging from the lowest [3.2 $\mu g/m^3$ (0.5)] in parts of the Calgary, Alberta, region to the highest [8.6 $\mu g/m^3$ (1.5)] in London, Ontario; for NO_2 was 12.9 ppb (5.9), ranging from lowest [4.1 ppb (1.2)] in Halifax, Nova Scotia to highest [17.0 ppb (3.9)] in Toronto, Ontario; and for O_3 was 24.6 ppb (4.0), ranging from lowest [16.9 ppb (3.0)] in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Vancouver, British Columbia to highest [30.4 ppb (1.2)] in London, Ontario, as presented in **Table 3**.

Long-term pollutant exposure and MRI-measured CWV - Primary analysis

Associations of 5-year pollutant exposures with subclinical atherosclerosis as measured by CWV are presented in **Figure 1** and **Table S1**. An inverse association of $PM_{2.5}$ quintile with CWV was observed (Model 4; quintile 5: 893.3 mm^3, quintile 1: 908.8 mm^3; *p-trend* = 0.05) which was not robust to further adjustment i.e., co-pollutant model. CWV was lower across quintiles of NO_2 (Model 4; quintile 5: 889.5 mm^3, quintile 1: 918.6 mm^3; *p-trend* < 0.0001) in all models including those with co-pollutant adjustment, but was higher across quintiles of O_3 (quintile 5: 925.4mm^3, quintile 1: 899.7*; p-trend* = 0.02), which was blunted after NO_2 but not $PM_{2.5}$ adjustment. These results remained consistent in the sensitivity analysis (Table S6). Of note, Pearson correlation between $PM_{2.5}$ and NO_2 was [r=0.39; p<.0001], between $PM_{2.5}$ and O_3 was [r=0.16; p<.0001], and between NO_2 and O_3 was [r=-0.23; p<.0001].

Region-specific association of air pollutants and CWV

In a secondary region-stratified analysis across urban Canada (n=6282), overall trends observed in the primary analysis for the three pollutants were replicated using continuous measures for the air pollutants (**Figure 2** and **Table S2**). The associations between $PM_{2.5}$ and CWV was not statistically significant in urban Canada and varied across provinces. Within Ontario, after adjustment for neighbourhood walkability in the primary model (Model 4, table 5) the negative association between $PM_{2.5}$ and CWV was no longer seen. Only when further adjusting for NO_2 in the co-pollutant model, a 5 $\mu g/m^3$ higher $PM_{2.5}$ concentration was associated with 24.98 mm^3 higher CWV (95% CI 3.43-46.52; p=0.023). A 5 ppb higher NO_2 concentration was associated with 21.2 mm^3 lower CWV (95% CI -27.7--14.7; p<0.0001) within Ontario (n=3161), but with a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

100.6 mm^3 higher CWV (95% CI 24.99-176.2; p=0.009) in Nova Scotia (n=586). A 3 ppb increase in O_3 was associated with 9.66 mm^3 (95% CI 1.69-17.63; p=0.018) and 11.01 mm^3 (95% CI 0.56-21.47; p=0.039) higher CWV in Ontario and Quebec (n=1466), respectively; the two regions with largest sample size.

Effect of co-pollutant interactions on CWV

Across the primary models summarized in **Figure 3** for testing the effect of one pollutant on CWV within low, medium, and high levels of a second pollutant, the effect of $PM_{2.5}$ on CWV depended on the level of exposure to NO_2 (*p=0.014* for interaction). There was no evidence of interaction between $PM_{2.5}$ and O_3. Furthermore, the effect of NO_2 on CWV differed according to both the exposure levels of $PM_{2.5}$ (*p=0.024* for interaction) and O_3 (*p<0.0001* for interaction). The effect of O_3 on CWV depended on NO_2 levels (*p=0.0006* for interaction). Thus, NO_2 emerged as a consistent effect modifier of both $PM_{2.5}$ and O_3 (**Tables S3-S5**).

Discussion

In this prospective cohort study among 6,645 Canadian adults and using spatially resolved pollutant concentrations, long-term exposure to air pollution was consistently associated with decreased MRI-measured CWV for NO_2, increased MRI-measured CWV for O_3, and for a trend towards decreased MRI-mesured CWV for $PM_{2.5}$. While findings for NO_2 and O_3 were robust to some extent in secondary analyses, results for $PM_{2.5}$ were not. Effects beyond adjusting for the INTERHEART risk score suggest that air pollution is possibly also acting through other pathways than the traditional cardiovascular risk factors captured in the score *e.g.*, diabetes and hypertension. NO_2 consistently modified the effects of $PM_{2.5}$ and O_3 on CWV.

There is limited evidence that direct biological measures of early CVD are influenced by exposure to air pollution at low levels. However, the MAPLE study reports associations between

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

nonaccidental mortality and cardiovascular-related mortality and long-term exposure to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ levels, including at concentrations below national air quality standards.[25] The evidence is moderate to strong for overall TRAP and CVD mortality, but is moderate at best for CVD morbidity *i.e.*, the effect of air pollution on traditional cardiovascular risk factors.[12,30] Our results show an inconsistent association between $PM_{2.5}$ and a state-of-the-art surrogate marker for subclinical atherosclerosis across Canada, consistent with previous findings of the Multicultural Community Health Assessment Trial (M-CHAT) study between TRAP and progression of carotid artery atherosclerosis in Vancouver, BC.[16] Though the negative association between $PM_{2.5}$ and CWV is of borderline significance, it is small in magnitude compared with the associations seen with O_3 and NO_2. This suggests that $PM_{2.5}$ may be affecting CV risk through pathways other than atherosclerosis formation or rather by affecting plaque stability. Therefore, if there is an increased risk with exposure to $PM_{2.5}$, it is operating through other intermediary pathways such as release of proinflammatory mediators, autonomic nervous system perturbations, and translocation of particle constituents into the blood.[31] Interestingly, neighbourhood walkability was shown to modify the effects of $PM_{2.5}$ in the main analysis, in Ontario in the region-specific analysis, and within the high O_3 category in the co-pollutant interaction analysis; a variable that has been scarcely captured in previous literature.

Our findings on the detrimental effect of chronic ambient O_3 exposure on subclinical atherosclerosis are robust across regions and co-pollutant analysis. This is congruent with what the MESA study had previously reported on progression of IMT of the common carotid artery and new carotid plaque formation with outdoor O_3 exposure in six U.S. city regions.[11] One underlying biochemical pathway might be through the formation of reactive oxygen species (due to the strong oxidizing action of O_3, which may have direct effects or indirect effects changing

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

the oxidizing potential of ambient $PM_{2.5}$) that further give rise to increased oxidative stress and persistent systemic inflammation.[11]

The weak yet significant inverse association of NO_2, largely an indicator of TRAP and/or combustion pollution in general, with CWV in our study is unexpected and needs careful evaluation. There is insufficient collective evidence in the literature linking NO_2 or TRAP with preclinical atherosclerosis in healthy adults specifically. A recent assessment and meta-analysis concluded that the evidence of an association between TRAP and cardiovascular morbidity is low to moderate.[12] In fact, MESA-Air and the European Study of Cohorts for Air Pollution Effects (ESCAPE) studies did not find a relationship between NO_2 and IMT.[5,32] However, in a study of a high cardiovascular risk population (2227 patients mean age of 62.9 years) in London, Ontario, NO_2 exposure was associated with cumulative plaque burden as captured by carotid total plaque area (TPA) using two-dimensional ultrasound.[33]

Importantly, our secondary analysis across Canada's urban regions offers insight into possible regional variation in the effects of air pollution on CV health. Only in Nova Scotia (predominantly in Halifax) did we observe a positive association of NO_2 with CWV; and Halifax was the city with the lowest levels of NO_2 of the five Canadian cities. Of note, the ratio of O_3/NO_2 in Halifax is 5.3 which is much higher than the values of 1.8-1.9 observed in the other four cities/regions and in the cohort overall. Thus, our study emphasizes the need for further investigation of different exposures in combination.[8] It also emphasizes the value of adjusting for novel neighbourhood characteristics such as active living environment, to examine effect modification and help further investigate region variability. Neighbourhood factors that might modify the association between air pollution and CWV include poverty/affluence, overcrowding, living in apartment buildings, commuting, and proximity to roads.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Strengths and Limitations

Our study has obtained unique health measurements of subclinical cardiovascular markers using MRI on nearly 6600 Canadians along with individual-level information on environmental factors and lifestyle known to influence cardiometabolic outcomes. While IMT has been criticized as an accurate marker of atherosclerosis with sensitivity limitations of the ultrasound methodology,[33] our study uses MRI-characterized CWV to assess atherosclerosis. Moreover, compared to MESA which reported on cIMT progression in 3392 participants with low-exposure levels, our study is well-powered. Finally, the cohort's diverse geographic coverage across Canada offers an exposure gradient in ambient $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, and O_3 that parallels what has previously been explored by the national Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort (CanCHEC).[25] Several limitations are important to mention. First, individual-level exposures were estimated based on residence address. While this is common in epidemiological air pollution studies, exposure inaccuracy is inevitable due to the fact that participants' time spent away from residence and residential history were not taken into account in estimating long-term exposure to air pollutants. Second, the 5-year pollutant exposure period was fixed for all participants (2008-2012) regardless of when an individual's enrolment occurred in the 2014-2018 window. This exposure window was not consistently 5-years prior to enrolment for all study participants. However, studies have demonstrated temporal stability in the spatial patterns of air pollutants over 10 years.[34] Because of the small number of events in our cohort (n=155), we were not powered to look at intraplaque hemorrhage. Lastly, our results are based on cross-sectional data therefore causality remains uncertain.

<u>Conclusion</u>

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Our data indicate that in healthy adults living in clean or only mildly polluted environments, exposure to NO_2 is negatively associated, and O_3 is positively associated with CWV as a measure of subclinical atherosclerosis. While we also observed associations to $PM_{2.5}$, these were not consistent across regions. Especially the role of NO_2 in atherosclerosis is complex and requires further investigation, as do combinations of exposure to O_3, $PM_{2.5}$ and NO_2.

Acknowledgements

Steering Committee of Canadian Alliance of Healthy Hearts and Minds: S.S. Anand (Chair)*, M.G. Friedrich(Co-Chair), Douglas S. Lee (Co-Chair), P Awadalla (Ontario Health Study), T. Dummer (BC Generations Project), J. Vena (Alberta's Tomorrow Project), P. Broët (CARTaGENE), J. Hicks (Atlantic PATH), J-C. Tardif (MHI Biobank), K. Teo, S. Yusuf (PURE-Central), B-M. Knoppers (Ethics, Legal and Social Issues).
Project Office Staff at Population Health Research Institute(PHRI): D. Desai, S. Zafar
Statistics/BiometricsProgrammers Team at PHRI: K. Schulze, S. Bangdiwala
Cohort Operations Research Personnel: K McDonald (Ontario Health Study), N. Noisel (CARTaGENE), J. Chu (BC Generations Project), J. Hicks (Atlantic PATH), H. Whelan (Alberta's Tomorrow Project), S. Rangarajan (PURE), D. Busseuil (MHI Biobank)

Site Investigators and Staff: (112) J. Leipsic, S. Lear, V. de Jong; (306) M. Noseworthy, K. Teo, E. Ramezani, N. Konyer; (402) P. Poirier, A-S. Bourlaud, E. Larose, K. Bibeau;(512) J. Leipsic, S. Lear, V. de Jong; (609) E. Smith, R. Frayne, A. Charlton, R Sekhon; (703) A. Moody, V. Thayalasuthan; (704) A.Kripalani, G Leung; (706) M. Noseworthy, S. Anand, R. de Souza, N. Konyer, S. Zafar; (707) G. Paraga,L. Reid; (714) A.J. Dick, F. Ahmad; (799) D. Kelton, H. Shah; (801) F. Marcotte, H. Poiffaut; (802) M.G. Friedrich, J. Lebel; (817) E. Larose, K. Bibeau; (913) R. Miller, L. Parker, D. Thompson, J. Hicks; (1001) J-C. Tardif, H.Poiffaut; (1103) J. Tu, K. Chan, A. Moody, V. Thayalasuthan;

MRI Working Group and Core Lab Investigators/Staff:
Chair: M.G. Friedrich; **Brain Core Lab**: E.E. Smith; **Carotid Core Lab:** A. Moody, V. Thayalasuthan; **Abdomen:** E. Larose, K. Bibeau,
Cardiac: F. Marcotte, F. Henriques
Contextual Working Group: R. de Souza, S. Anand, G. Booth, J. Brook, D. Corsi, L. Gauvin, S. Lear, F. Razak, S.V. Subramanian, J. Tu.
CAHHM Founding Advisory Group: Jean Rouleau, Pierre Boyle, Caroline Wong, Eldon Smith

ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT02220582. Registered 20 August 2014—Retrospectively registered, https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02220582.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Sources of Funding

CAHHM was funded by the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer (CPAC), Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada (HSF-Canada), and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). Financial contributions were also received from the Population Health Research Institute and CIHR Foundation Grant no. FDN-143255 to S.S.A.; FDN-143313 to J.V.T.; FDN 154317 to E.E.S and Project Grant no. P12—175346 to R.J.dS. In-kind contributions from A.R.M. and S.E.B. from Sunnybrook Hospital, Toronto for MRI reading costs, and Bayer AG for provision of IV contrast. The Canadian Partnership for Tomorrow's Health is funded by the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer and Health Canada, BC Cancer, Genome Quebec, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire (CHU) Sainte-Justine, Dalhousie University, Ontario Institute for Cancer Research, Alberta Health, Alberta Cancer Foundation, and Alberta Health Services. The PURE Study was funded by multiple sources**.** The Montreal Heart Institute Biobank is funded by Mr André Desmarais and Mrs France Chrétien-Desmarais and the Montreal Heart Institute Foundation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

References:

1. Joseph P, Leong D, McKee M, et al. Reducing the Global Burden of Cardiovascular Disease, Part 1. :18.

2. Yusuf S, Hawken S, Ôunpuu S, et al. Effect of potentially modifiable risk factors associated with myocardial infarction in 52 countries (the INTERHEART study): case-control study. 2004;364:16.

3. Mente A, Yusuf S, Islam S, et al. Metabolic Syndrome and Risk of Acute Myocardial Infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2010;55(21):2390-2398. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2009.12.053

4. Bhatnagar A. Environmental Determinants of Cardiovascular Disease. *Circ Res*. 2017;121(2):162-180. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.306458

5. Kaufman JD, Adar SD, Barr RG, et al. Association between air pollution and coronary artery calcification within six metropolitan areas in the USA (the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis and Air Pollution): a longitudinal cohort study. *The Lancet*. 2016;388(10045):696-704. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00378-0

6. Hystad P, Larkin A, Rangarajan S, et al. Associations of outdoor fine particulate air pollution and cardiovascular disease in 157 436 individuals from 21 high-income, middle-income, and low-income countries (PURE): a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2020;4(6):e235-e245. doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30103-0

7. Shah AS, Langrish JP, Nair H, et al. Global association of air pollution and heart failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2013;382(9897):1039-1048. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60898-3

8. Chen R, Jiang Y, Hu J, et al. Hourly Air Pollutants and Acute Coronary Syndrome Onset In 1.29 Million Patients. :34.

9. Brauer M, Freedman G, Frostad J, et al. Ambient Air Pollution Exposure Estimation for the Global Burden of Disease 2013. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2016;50(1):79-88. doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b03709

10. Cooper MJ, Martin RV, McLinden CA, Brook JR. Inferring ground-level nitrogen dioxide concentrations at fine spatial resolution applied to the TROPOMI satellite instrument. *Environ Res Lett*. 2020;15(10):104013. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aba3a5

11. Wang M, Sampson PD, Sheppard LE, Stein JH, Vedal S, Kaufman JD. 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):057001. doi:10.1289/EHP3325

12. Boogaard H, Patton AP, Atkinson RW, et al. Long-term exposure to traffic-related air pollution and selected health outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ Int*. 2022;164:107262. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2022.107262

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

13. Chen H, Burnett RT, Kwong JC, et al. Spatial Association Between Ambient Fine Particulate Matter and Incident Hypertension. *Circulation*. 2014;129(5):562-569. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.113.003532

14. Strak M, Janssen N, Beelen R, et al. Associations between lifestyle and air pollution exposure: Potential for confounding in large administrative data cohorts. *Environ Res*. 2017;156:364-373. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.03.050

15. An R, Ji M, Yan H, Guan C. Impact of ambient air pollution on obesity: a systematic review. *Int J Obes*. 2018;42(6):1112-1126. doi:10.1038/s41366-018-0089-y

16. Gan WQ, Allen RW, Brauer M, Davies HW, Mancini GBJ, Lear SA. Long-term exposure to traffic-related air pollution and progression of carotid artery atherosclerosis: a prospective cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2014;4(4):e004743. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004743

17. Anand SS, Tu JV, Desai D, et al. Cardiovascular risk scoring and magnetic resonance imaging detected subclinical cerebrovascular disease. *Eur Heart J - Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2020;21(6):692-700. doi:10.1093/ehjci/jez226

18. Zhang Y, Guallar E, Qiao Y, Wasserman BA. Is Carotid Intima-Media Thickness as Predictive as Other Noninvasive Techniques for the Detection of Coronary Artery Disease? *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 2014;34(7):1341-1345. doi:10.1161/ATVBAHA.113.302075

19. on behalf of the CAHHM Study Investigators, Anand SS, Tu JV, et al. Rationale, design, and methods for Canadian alliance for healthy hearts and minds cohort study (CAHHM) – a Pan Canadian cohort study. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16(1):650. doi:10.1186/s12889-016-3310-8

20. van Donkelaar A, Martin RV, Li C, Burnett RT. Regional Estimates of Chemical Composition of Fine Particulate Matter Using a Combined Geoscience-Statistical Method with Information from Satellites, Models, and Monitors. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2019;53(5):2595-2611. doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b06392

21. Hystad P, Setton E, Cervantes A, et al. Creating National Air Pollution Models for Population Exposure Assessment in Canada. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2011;119(8):1123-1129. doi:10.1289/ehp.1002976

22. Robichaud A, Ménard R. *Multi-Year Objective Analyses of Warm Season Ground-Level Ozone and PM_{2.5} over North America Using Real-Time Observations and Canadian Operational Air Quality Models*. Aerosols/Atmospheric Modelling/Troposphere/Chemistry (chemical composition and reactions); 2013. doi:10.5194/acpd-13-13967-2013

23. Robichaud A, Ménard R, Zaïtseva Y, Anselmo D. Multi-pollutant surface objective analyses and mapping of air quality health index over North America. *Air Qual Atmosphere Health*. 2016;9(7):743-759. doi:10.1007/s11869-015-0385-9

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

24. Bourbeau J, Doiron D, Biswas S, et al. Ambient Air Pollution and Dysanapsis: Associations with Lung Function and COPD in the CanCOLD Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. Published online April 5, 2022:rccm.202106-1439OC. doi:10.1164/rccm.202106-1439OC

25. Brauer M, Brook JR, Christidis T. Mortality–Air Pollution Associations in Low-Exposure Environments (MAPLE): Phase 1. :110.

26. CANUE – The Canadian Urban Environmental Health Research Consortium, Brook JR, Setton EM, Seed E, Shooshtari M, Doiron D. The Canadian Urban Environmental Health Research Consortium – a protocol for building a national environmental exposure data platform for integrated analyses of urban form and health. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(1):114. doi:10.1186/s12889-017-5001-5

27. Lusis AJ. Atherosclerosis. *Nature*. 2000;407(6801):233-241. doi:10.1038/35025203

28. Environment and Climate Change Canada, *CHRONOS_Ground-Level_O3_NA_2002.nc to CHRONOS_Ground-Level_O3_NA_2009.nc inclusive*. 2017, Air Quality Research Division: Toronto, Canada.

29. McGorrian C, Yusuf S, Islam S, et al. Estimating modifiable coronary heart disease risk in multiple regions of the world: the INTERHEART Modifiable Risk Score. *Eur Heart J*. 2011;32(5):581-589. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehq448

30. Stafoggia M, Oftedal B, Chen J, et al. 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. doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00277-1

31. Brook RD, Rajagopalan S, Pope CA, et al. Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease: An Update to the Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2010;121(21):2331-2378. doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181dbece1

32. Perez L, Wolf K, Hennig F, et al. Air Pollution and Atherosclerosis: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of FourEuropean Cohort Studies in the ESCAPE Study. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2015;123(6):597-605. doi:10.1289/ehp.1307711

33. Johnson M, Brook JR, Brook RD, et al. Traffic□Related Air Pollution and Carotid Plaque Burden in a Canadian City With Low□Level Ambient Pollution. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2020;9(7):e013400. doi:10.1161/JAHA.119.013400

34. Wang R, Henderson SB, Sbihi H, Allen RW, Brauer M. Temporal stability of land use regression models for traffic-related air pollution. *Atmos Environ*. 2013;64:312-319. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.09.056

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Anthropometric characteristics of the study population by region of Canada

			Region of Canada				
	N	**Overall**	**BC**	**AB**	**ON**	**PQ**	**NS**
Number of participants	6645	6645	744	402	3253	1575	671
Women, n (%)	6645	3718 (56.0)	408 (54.8)	197 (49.0)	1948 (59.9)	811 (51.5)	354 (52.8)
Age, y	6645	57.6 (8.8)	56.8 (8.8)	53.3 (8.8)	57.5 (9.0)	58.6 (7.8)	59.0 (9.3)
Weight, kg	6645	76.3 (16.5)	72.5 (15.9)	80.7 (17.5)	75.7 (16.5)	77.4 (16.4)	78.1 (15.4)
Height, cm	6645	168.5 (9.4)	167.5 (9.6)	173.2 (10.1)	168.3 (9.1)	167.6 (9.3)	169.4 (9.2)
Body Mass Index, mean (SD), kg/m^2	6645	26.8 (4.9)	25.7 (4.4)	26.8 (4.9)	26.6 (4.9)	27.5 (5.0)	27.2 (4.8)
<25 (Normal), n (%)	6645	2657 (40.0)	352 (47.3)	163 (40.5)	1366 (42.0)	535 (34.0)	241 (35.9)
25-29 (Overweight), n (%)	6645	2536 (38.2)	285 (38.3)	150 (37.3)	1193 (36.7)	647 (41.1)	261 (38.9)
30+ (Obese), n (%)	6645	1452 (21.9)	107 (14.4)	89 (22.1)	694 (21.3)	393 (25.0)	169 (25.2)
Percent Body Fat, %	6624	30.6 (9.2)	28.9 (8.4)	29.9 (9.1)	30.9 (9.4)	31.3 (8.8)	30.0 (9.6)
Waist, cm	6645	88.6 (13.7)	84.3 (12.8)	91.0 (13.9)	87.5 (13.6)	90.3 (14.0)	93.0 (12.5)
Hip, cm	6645	101.3 (10.7)	99.2 (9.2)	103.6 (10.3)	100.4 (11.5)	102.3 (9.7)	104.7 (9.2)
Waist to hip ratio	6645	0.87 (0.08)	0.85 (0.09)	0.88 (0.08)	0.87 (0.08)	0.88 (0.09)	0.89 (0.08)
Waist circumference obese, n (%)	6645	1924 (29.0)	118 (15.9)	130 (32.3)	917 (28.2)	492 (31.2)	267 (39.8)
Blood Pressure							
Systolic, mmHg	6645	129 (17)	126 (17)	127 (14)	128 (17)	131 (16)	133 (16)
Diastolic, mmHg	6645	80 (10)	80 (10)	85 (9)	78 (10)	80 (9)	80 (10)
Heart rate, beats/minute	6644	70.4 (11.0)	69.4 (11.0)	70.5 (11.0)	71.1 (11.1)	69.7 (10.7)	69.6 (10.6)
MRI-measured Outcomes							
Carotid wall volume, mm^3	6645	900.1 (165.1)	897.9 (170.5)	889.9 (170.5)	906.0 (163.2)	893.2 (155.8)	896.2 (184.3)

Presented data are means (SD) unless otherwise indicated.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Demographics & Lifestyle characteristics of the study population by region of Canada

			Region of Canada				
	N	**Overall**	**BC**	**AB**	**ON**	**PQ**	**NS**
Number of participants	6645	6645	744	402	3253	1575	671
Women	6645	3718 (56.0)	408 (54.8)	197 (49.0)	1948 (59.9)	811 (51.5)	354 (52.8)
Age, mean (SD), y	6645	57.6 (8.8)	56.8 (8.8)	53.3 (8.8)	57.5 (9.0)	58.6 (7.8)	59.0 (9.3)
Self-reported ethnicity							
East & South East Asian	6645	894 (13.5)	282 (37.9)	14 (3.5)	585 (18.0)	8 (0.5)	5 (0.7)
South Asian	6645	223 (3.4)	67 (9.0)	3 (0.7)	148 (4.5)	1 (0.1)	4 (0.6)
White	6645	5387 (81.1)	364 (48.9)	381 (94.8)	2449 (75.3)	1545 (98.1)	648 (96.6)
Other[a]	6645	141 (2.1)	31 (4.2)	4 (1.0)	71 (2.2)	21 (1.3)	14 (2.1)
Highest Education Attained							
High school or less	6541	842 (12.9)	100 (13.5)	44 (10.9)	344 (10.6)	290 (18.4)	64 (10.9)
College or Trade	6541	2107 (32.2)	255 (34.5)	117 (29.1)	891 (27.5)	671 (42.6)	173 (29.4)
University Degree	6541	3592 (54.9)	385 (52.0)	241 (60.0)	2001 (61.8)	613 (38.9)	352 (59.8)
Smoke status							
Current	6645	352 (5.3)	29 (3.9)	18 (4.5)	156 (4.8)	119 (7.6)	30 (4.5)
Former	6645	2241 (33.7)	178 (23.9)	132 (32.8)	971 (29.8)	732 (46.5)	228 (34.0)
Never	6645	4052 (61.0)	537 (72.2)	252 (62.7)	2126 (65.4)	724 (46.0)	413 (61.5)
Living with partner/married	6537	4938 (75.5)	567 (76.6)	314 (78.1)	2431 (75.2)	1141 (72.4)	485 (82.5)
Employment							
Full or part time	6534	4624 (70.8)	554 (74.7)	324 (80.6)	2208 (68.2)	1124 (71.5)	414 (71.4)
Retired	6534	1436 (22.0)	143 (19.3)	41 (10.2)	727 (22.5)	385 (24.5)	140 (24.1)
No paid work	6534	474 (7.3)	45 (6.1)	37 (9.2)	302 (9.3)	64 (4.1)	26 (4.5)
Individual Social disadvantage score							
Social disadvantage Index, mean (SD)	6121	1.2 (1.3)	1.2 (1.3)	0.8 (1.1)	1.2 (1.3)	1.4 (1.3)	1.1 (1.3)
Low disadvantage	6121	3677 (60.1)	435 (63.0)	283 (73.7)	1758 (59.1)	858 (56.9)	343 (61.0)
Moderate disadvantage	6121	2072 (33.9)	209 (30.3)	92 (24.0)	1031 (34.6)	542 (35.9)	198 (35.2)
High disadvantage	6121	372 (6.1)	46 (6.7)	9 (2.3)	187 (6.3)	109 (7.2)	21 (3.7)
INTERHEART risk score mean(SD)	6645	10.0 (5.7)	9.2 (5.5)	9.6 (5.7)	10.1 (5.7)	10.3 (5.8)	10.2 (5.6)
Low	6645	3392 (51.0)	418 (56.2)	217 (54.0)	1645 (50.6)	785 (49.8)	327 (48.7)
Moderate	6645	2123 (31.9)	223 (30.0)	121 (30.1)	1069 (32.9)	491 (31.2)	219 (32.6)
High	6645	1130 (17.0)	103 (13.8)	64 (15.9)	539 (16.6)	299 (19.0)	125 (18.6)

Presented data are n (%) unless otherwise specified. [a] Includes Blacks, Indigenous, Mixed and unknown ethnicity

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Environmental characteristics of the study population by region of Canada

			Region of Canada				
	N	**Overall**	**BC**	**AB**	**ON**	**PQ**	**NS**
Number of participants	6645	6645	744	402	3253	1575	671
Urban postal code	6645	6390 (96.2)	686 (92.2)	389 (96.8)	3179 (97.7)	1468 (93.2)	668 (99.6)
Neighbourhood Deprivation							
Material factor score	6447	-0.017 (0.041)	-0.013 (0.039)	-0.040 (0.035)	-0.016 (0.043)	-0.008 (0.039)	-0.027 (0.03
Social factor score	6447	0.001 (0.041)	-0.006 (0.036)	-0.008 (0.044)	-0.005 (0.042)	0.017 (0.036)	0.008 (0.03
Walkability Measures							
ALE Index	6640	1.806 (4.501)	1.535 (3.661)	0.810 (1.854)	2.618 (5.610)	1.172 (2.976)	0.255 (1.76
ALE Index Class, n (%)							
Class 1: very low	6640	772 (11.6)	81 (10.9)	40 (10.0)	300 (9.2)	232 (14.7)	119 (17.7)
Class 2	6640	1917 (28.9)	176 (23.7)	193 (48.0)	820 (25.2)	472 (30.0)	256 (38.2)
Class 3	6640	2014 (30.3)	249 (33.6)	146 (36.3)	1079 (33.2)	326 (20.7)	214 (31.9)
Class 4	6640	1182 (17.8)	166 (22.4)	12 (3.0)	611 (18.8)	311 (19.8)	82 (12.2)
Class 5: very high	6640	755 (11.4)	70 (9.4)	11 (2.7)	442 (13.6)	232 (14.7)	0 (0.0)
Linked Air Quality Measures							
$PM_{2.5}$, ug/m^3, over 2008-2012	6645	6.9 (2.0)	6.7 (1.4)	3.2 (0.5)	8.2 (1.5)	6.0 (1.5)	5.2 (1.1)
NO_2, ppb, over 2008-2012	6645	12.9 (5.9)	15.2 (4.8)	12.8 (3.5)	14.1 (5.3)	13.0 (5.8)	4.1 (1.2)
O_3, ppb, over 2008-2012	6645	24.6 (4.0)	17.8 (4.3)	23.4 (2.1)	27.1 (2.6)	23.9 (2.4)	22.3 (1.3)

Presented data are means (SD) unless otherwise indicated. CMA: census metropolitan area; ALE: active living environment



Figure 1: Associations of 5-year pollutant exposures with subclinical atherosclerosis as measured by carotid wall volume (CWV)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.



Figure 2: Region-specific association of air pollutants and carotid wall volume (CWV) across urban Canada

*p<0.05

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.



Figure 3: Effect of copollutant interactions on carotid wall volume (CWV)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table S1: Association of carotid wall volume (mm^3) with pollutants exposure

Pollutant	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	p-trend
$PM_{2.5}$						
Quintile range	1.8 – 5.0 ug/m^3	5.0 – 6.0 ug/m^3	6.0 – 7.8 ug/m^3	7.8 – 8.9 ug/m^3	8.9 – 11.2 ug/m^3	
Model 1	910.5 (889.4, 931.6)	910.6 (889.4, 931.8)	902.8 (881.9, 923.6)	903.0 (882.0, 924.1)	895.1 (873.7, 916.5)	0.05
Model 2	912.6 (888.6, 936.6)	910.0 (886.0, 934.1)	901.8 (878.0, 925.5)	899.1 (875.1, 923.0)	890.4 (866.2, 914.6)	0.002
Model 3	912.6 (889.0, 936.2)	909.9 (886.1, 933.6)	901.6 (878.1, 925.0)	899.1 (875.4, 922.7)	890.2 (866.3, 914.0)	0.002
Model 4	908.8 (885.4, 932.2)	907.8 (884.5, 931.1)	900.3 (877.3, 923.3)	900.3 (877.1, 923.5)	893.3 (869.7, 916.9)	0.05
Model 5: Model4 +NO_2	905.9 (882.0, 929.7)	905.1 (881.3, 928.8)	897.1 (873.6, 920.6)	904.2 (880.5, 927.9)	897.7 (873.6, 921.8)	0.39
Model 5: Model4+O_3	908.5 (888.1, 928.9)	909.5 (889.2, 929.9)	904.6 (884.5, 924.7)	907.4 (886.8, 927.9)	899.9 (879.0, 920.7)	0.33
NO_2						
Quintile range	0.9 – 5.5 ppb	5.5 – 9.3 ppb	9.4 – 14.0 ppb	14.1 – 17.9 ppb	17.9 – 33.9 ppb	
Model 1	919.2 (896.5, 941.9)	927.2 (906.3, 948.0)	897.4 (877.3, 917.6)	899.8 (879.8, 919.9)	890.7 (870.4, 911.0)	<.0001
Model 2	918.3 (894.1, 942.6)	929.9 (907.1, 952.7)	895.7 (873.4, 917.9)	894.5 (872.3, 916.8)	890.6 (868.2, 913.0)	<.0001
Model 3	918.5 (894.4, 942.6)	929.6 (906.9, 952.2)	895.4 (873.3, 917.5)	894.6 (872.5, 916.6)	890.9 (868.7, 913.1)	<.0001
Model 4	918.6 (893.0, 944.2)	931.7 (908.9, 954.6)	896.6 (874.5, 918.7)	893.9 (871.9, 916.0)	889.5 (867.0, 911.9)	<.0001
Model 5: Model4+O_3	915.6 (891.1, 940.0)	931.0 (909.6, 952.3)	898.5 (877.8, 919.1)	898.2 (877.1, 919.2)	894.1 (872.6, 915.7)	0.004
Model 5: Model4+$PM_{2.5}$	918.2 (892.1, 944.2)	931.5 (908.5, 954.6)	896.5 (874.3, 918.8)	894.0 (871.7, 916.2)	889.5 (866.9, 912.1)	<0.001
O_3						
Quintile range	14.2 – 22.0 ppb	22.1 – 24.4 ppb	24.4 – 25.7 ppb	25.7 – 28.0 ppb	28.0 – 37.1 ppb	
Model 1	901.5 (882.9, 920.2)	898.0 (879.1, 916.9)	906.2 (887.6, 924.7)	901.0 (882.0, 920.0)	924.6 (905.2, 944.1)	0.02
Model 2	898.5 (878.8, 918.2)	896.9 (877.0, 916.7)	902.8 (883.1, 922.4)	898.7 (878.7, 918.7)	929.0 (908.7, 949.3)	0.001
Model 3	898.3 (878.9, 917.7)	896.7 (877.2, 916.3)	903.2 (883.8, 922.6)	898.8 (879.1, 918.6)	928.8 (908.7, 948.9)	0.001
Model 4	899.7 (879.7, 919.7)	897.2 (877.2, 917.2)	901.9 (882.0, 921.9)	897.4 (877.0, 917.7)	925.4 (903.9, 946.9)	0.02
Model 5: Model4+NO_2	903.1 (881.2, 925.1)	898.4 (876.5, 920.3)	902.0 (880.2, 923.9)	893.9 (871.6, 916.2)	916.7 (892.9, 940.4)	0.34
Model 5: Model4+$PM_{2.5}$	899.7 (879.4, 920.0)	897.1 (876.9, 917.4)	901.8 (881.6, 922.0)	897.2 (876.6, 917.8)	925.0 (903.1, 946.9)	0.02

Presented data are adjusted least square means (95% CI) from a linear mixed model with centre modelled as a random intercept. Model 1, unadjusted. Model 2, adjusted for age, sex, and ethnicity. Model 3 further adjusted for for the INTERHEART risk score and education. Primary model 4 further adjusted for walkability categories. Model 5 further adjusted for co-pollutants. P-trend from linear contrasts. For all models, N=6536.

Table S2: Association of carotid wall volume (mm^3) with pollutants exposure across urban Canada

	Urban Canada (6282)		BC (n=680)		AB (n=389)		ON (n=3161)		PQ (n=1466)		NS (N=586)	
	Effect (95% CI)	***p*-**	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p*-**	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p*-**	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p*-**	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p*-**	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p*-**
$PM_{2.5}$												
Model 1	-6.10 (-21.0,8.84)	0.42	13.63 (-39.6,66.84)	0.62	35.08 (-150,220)	0.71	-18.3 (-37.3,0.79)	0.060	-1.41 (-29.9,27.10)	0.92	-0.77 (-71.9,70.33)	0.98
Model 2	-10.7 (-24.5,3.09)	0.13	8.66 (-38.8,56.10)	0.72	21.43 (-148,191)	0.80	-21.6 (-39.3,-3.94)	0.016	-8.98 (-33.2,15.20)	0.47	4.15 (-60.9,69.15)	0.90
Model 3	-11.0 (-24.8,2.79)	0.12	17.10 (-30.5,64.67)	0.48	12.33 (-159,184)	0.89	-22.0 (-39.8,-4.33)	0.015	-9.40 (-34.1,15.31)	0.46	0.28 (-65.2,65.75)	0.99
Model 4	-2.83 (-17.8,12.14)	0.71	26.77 (-24.1,77.64)	0.30	-37.0 (-223,148.6)	0.70	1.80 (-18.8,22.42)	0.86	-19.2 (-40.5,2.21)	0.079	26.69 (-53.6,107.0)	0.51
Model 5:+NO_2	3.70 (-11.6,18.97)	0.63	50.10 (-7.93,108.1)	0.09	-88.5 (-286,109.2)	0.38	24.98 (3.43,46.52)	0.023	-18.9 (-40.3,2.45)	0.082	11.27 (-69.5,92.07)	0.78
Model 5:+O_3	3.07 (-12.1,18.21)	0.70	32.75 (-22.1,87.64)	0.24	-75.4 (-277,126.4)	0.46	4.79 (-16.0,25.54)	0.65	-1.13 (-30.3,28.06)	0.94	23.73 (-57.7,105.2)	0.57
NO_2												
Model 1	-10.1 (-14.4,-5.81)	<.0001	-11.3 (-27.7,5.17)	0.18	-20.6 (-46.4,5.08)	0.12	-20.1 (-25.7,-14.5)	<.0001	7.84 (0.71,14.98)	0.031	42.14 (-22.2,106.5)	0.19
Model 2	-11.1 (-15.0,-7.12)	<.0001	-8.86 (-23.8,6.10)	0.25	-18.4 (-42.2,5.31)	0.13	-21.5 (-26.7,-16.4)	<.0001	6.83 (0.52,13.14)	0.034	57.13 (-1.64,115.9)	0.05
Model 3	-10.8 (-14.8,-6.85)	<.0001	-9.20 (-24.1,5.72)	0.23	-16.3 (-40.2,7.68)	0.18	-21.4 (-26.5,-16.2)	<.0001	7.53 (1.07,14.00)	0.022	51.46 (-8.58,111.5)	0.09
Model 4	-11.3 (-16.3,-6.24)	<.0001	-7.65 (-23.7,8.43)	0.35	-18.4 (-47.7,10.8)	0.22	-21.2 (-27.7,-14.7)	<.0001	5.81 (-4.67,16.29)	0.28	100.6 (24.99,176.2)	0.00
Model 5:+O_3	-8.98 (-14.5,-3.50)	0.0013	-9.27 (-27.8,9.23)	0.33	-18.5 (-54.7,17.7)	0.32	-22.3 (-29.6,-14.9)	<.0001	7.99 (-2.65,18.62)	0.14	101.0 (25.38,176.7)	0.00
Model 5:+$PM_{2.5}$	-11.5 (-16.6,-6.38)	<.0001	-15.3 (-33.7,3.00)	0.10	-23.3 (-54.5,7.93)	0.14	-23.7 (-30.5,-16.8)	<.0001	5.43 (-5.01,15.88)	0.31	99.03 (22.52,175.5)	0.01
O_3												
Model 1	8.17 (3.34,13.01)	0.0009	5.57 (-6.87,18.01)	0.38	8.65 (-18.1,35.41)	0.53	11.75 (4.76,18.74)	0.0010	1.98 (-8.30,12.26)	0.71	3.05 (-31.4,37.48)	0.86
Model 2	10.84 (6.34,15.35)	<.0001	4.58 (-6.96,16.13)	0.44	11.84 (-12.6,36.3)	0.34	15.90 (9.47,22.32)	<.0001	3.38 (-5.82,12.57)	0.47	-2.13 (-33.8,29.59)	0.90
Model 3	10.66 (6.14,15.18)	<.0001	3.98 (-7.52,15.49)	0.50	9.79 (-14.8,34.40)	0.43	15.65 (9.15,22.14)	<.0001	3.49 (-5.81,12.79)	0.46	-2.83 (-34.6,28.99)	0.86
Model 4	9.37 (4.30,14.45)	0.0003	0.92 (-11.4,13.19)	0.88	10.38 (-17.9,38.7)	0.47	9.66 (1.69,17.63)	0.0176	11.01 (0.56,21.47)	0.039	-9.44 (-43.9,24.98)	0.59
Model 5:+NO_2	5.71 (0.14,11.28)	0.0447	-2.53 (-16.6,11.57)	0.72	-0.14 (-35.1,34.9)	0.99	-2.87 (-11.8,6.06)	0.5284	12.62 (1.94,23.31)	0.021	-10.3 (-44.6,23.93)	0.55
Model 5:+$PM_{2.5}$	9.57 (4.41,14.74)	0.0003	3.88 (-9.35,17.11)	0.57	14.91 (-15.9,45.7)	0.34	9.87 (1.85,17.90)	0.0159	10.96 (-0.52,22.45)	0.061	-7.78 (-42.7,27.13)	0.66

Presented data are adjusted estimates (95% CI) per 5 $\mu g/m^3$ increase for $PM_{2.5}$, 5 ppb increase for NO_2, and 3 ppb increase for O_3, from a linear mixed model with centre modelled as a random intercept of regio- stratified analysis. Model 1, unadjusted. Model 2, adjusted for age, sex, and ethnicity. Model 3 further adjusted for for the INTERHEART risk score and education. Primary model 4 further adjusted for walkabili categories. Model 5 further adjusted for co-pollutants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table S3: Association of carotid wall volume (mm^3) with O_3 within co-pollutant exposure tertiles

	Overall N=6536		**Low $PM_{2.5}$ (1.78 - 5.64 µg/m³) N=2040**		**Mid $PM_{2.5}$ 5.65 - 8.18 µg/m³N=1972**		**High $PM_{2.5}$ 8.18 - 11.2 µg/m³ N=2524**	
	Effect (95% CI)	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***
Model 1	7.80 (3.46,12.14)	0.0004	6.63 (-1.40,14.67)	0.1055	8.32 (1.00,15.64)	0.0259	8.18 (0.24,16.13)	0.0436
Model 2	10.24 (6.22,14.26)	<.0001	10.90 (5.31,16.49)	0.0001	5.82 (-1.91,13.54)	0.1399	13.66 (6.27,21.06)	0.0003
Model 3	10.16 (6.13,14.20)	<.0001	10.77 (4.86,16.69)	0.0004	5.80 (-1.95,13.55)	0.1424	12.55 (5.12,19.98)	0.0009
Model 4	9.14 (4.45,13.83)	0.0001	9.62 (0.91,18.33)	0.0304	4.67 (-3.72,13.06)	0.2747	12.38 (4.45,20.32)	0.0022
			Low NO_2 (0.88 - 8.10 ppb) N=1590		**Mid NO_2 (8.12 - 15.5 ppb) N=2327**		**High NO_2 (15.5 - 38.7 ppb) N=2619**	
			Effect (95% CI)	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***
Model 1			9.61 (-1.92,21.13)	0.1022	0.79 (-6.88,8.46)	0.8394	-4.19 (-15.1,6.69)	0.4503
Model 2			9.90 (-1.17,20.96)	0.0796	4.73 (-2.39,11.85)	0.1930	-5.04 (-15.5,5.38)	0.3430
Model 3			10.59 (-0.46,21.65)	0.0603	4.87 (-2.25,11.98)	0.1802	-5.29 (-15.7,5.09)	0.3177
Model 4			10.20 (-1.30,21.69)	0.0821	5.71 (-1.60,13.02)	0.1260	-4.76 (-15.2,5.67)	0.3711

Presented data are adjusted CWV estimates (95% CI) per, 3 ppb increase for O_3, from a linear mixed model with centre modelled as a random intercept of regio-stratified analysis. Model 1, unadjusted. Model 2, adjusted for age, sex, and ethnicity. Model 3 further adjusted for the INTERHEART risk score and education. Primary model 4 further adjusted for walkability categories.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table S4: Association of carotid wall volume (mm^3) with $PM_{2.5}$ within co-pollutant exposure tertiles

	Overall N=6536		**Low O_3 14.2 - 22.9 ppb N=2051**		**Mid O_3 23.0 - 26.3 ppb N=2422**		**High O_3 26.3 - 39.1 ppb N=2063**	
	Effect (95% CI)	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***
Model 1	-10.6 (-25.0,3.68)	0.1453	4.02 (-14.0,21.99)	0.6610	-6.91 (-42.1,28.26)	0.7000	-18.6 (-38.6,1.42)	0.0686
Model 2	-15.7 (-28.9,-2.47)	0.0200	-2.16 (-27.2,22.89)	0.8660	-18.6 (-51.5,14.16)	0.2651	-18.8 (-37.3,-0.29)	0.0466
Model 3	-15.9 (-29.1,-2.72)	0.0181	-0.77 (-25.9,24.33)	0.9523	-19.5 (-52.1,13.06)	0.2400	-18.9 (-37.4,-0.31)	0.0463
Model 4	-7.94 (-22.5,6.67)	0.2866	4.05 (-21.7,29.84)	0.7578	-24.0 (-57.7,9.59)	0.1611	8.08 (-14.0,30.13)	0.4726
			Low NO_2 (0.88 - 8.10 ppb) N=1590		**Mid NO_2 (8.12 - 15.5 ppb) N=2327**		**High NO_2 (15.5 - 38.7 ppb) N=2619**	
			Effect (95% CI)	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***
Model 1			23.25 (-10.7,57.20)	0.1793	-0.68 (-22.4,20.99)	0.9509	29.84 (-6.65,66.33)	0.1090
Model 2			13.02 (-18.2,44.21)	0.4130	-0.79 (-21.1,19.52)	0.9390	27.56 (-7.60,62.73)	0.1244
Model 3			12.38 (-19.0,43.73)	0.4388	-1.43 (-21.8,18.91)	0.8901	28.87 (-6.12,63.86)	0.1058
Model 4			18.12 (-16.0,52.25)	0.2980	-3.65 (-24.9,17.60)	0.7363	28.66 (-6.63,63.95)	0.1113

Presented data are adjusted CWV estimates (95% CI) per 5 $\mu g/m^3$ increase for $PM_{2.5}$ from a linear mixed model with centre modelled as a random intercept of regio-stratified analysis. Model 1, unadjusted. Model 2, adjusted for age, sex, and ethnicity. Model 3 further adjusted for the INTERHEART risk score and education. Primary model 4 further adjusted for walkability categories.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table S5: Association of carotid wall volume (mm^3) with NO_2 within co-pollutant exposure tertiles

	Overall N=6536		**Low O_3 14.2 - 22.9 ppb N=2051**		**Mid O_3 23.0 - 26.3 ppb N=2422**		**High O_3 26.3 - 39.1 ppb N=2063**	
	Effect (95% CI)	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***
Model 1	-9.53 (-13.6,-5.42)	<.0001	0.03 (-4.64,4.69)	0.9902	-5.51 (-14.1,3.08)	0.2084	-25.7 (-33.1,-18.4)	<.0001
Model 2	-10.5 (-14.2,-6.73)	<.0001	7.43 (-0.50,15.37)	0.0663	-6.67 (-14.6,1.23)	0.0978	-26.3 (-33.1,-19.5)	<.0001
Model 3	-10.3 (-14.1,-6.55)	<.0001	7.45 (-0.50,15.39)	0.0661	-5.87 (-13.7,2.00)	0.1436	-26.6 (-33.4,-19.8)	<.0001
Model 4	-11.1 (-16.0,-6.15)	<.0001	5.82 (-3.61,15.25)	0.2263	-9.00 (-17.7,-0.32)	0.0421	-27.3 (-37.4,-17.3)	<.0001
			Low $PM_{2.5}$ (1.78 - 5.64 µg/m³) N=2040		**Mid $PM_{2.5}$ 5.65 - 8.18 µg/m³N=1972**		**High $PM_{2.5}$ 8.18 - 11.2 µg/m³ N=2524**	
			Effect (95% CI)	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***	**Effect (95% CI)**	***p-***
Model 1			-4.29 (-13.0,4.43)	0.3347	-12.5 (-22.1,-2.86)	0.0111	-15.0 (-22.4,-7.63)	<.0001
Model 2			-5.92 (-14.0,2.12)	0.1490	-9.87 (-19.1,-0.61)	0.0368	-16.1 (-22.9,-9.38)	<.0001
Model 3			-6.32 (-14.4,1.79)	0.1268	-9.82 (-19.1,-0.50)	0.0390	-15.2 (-22.0,-8.41)	<.0001
Model 4			-6.01 (-16.9,4.91)	0.2806	-10.2 (-20.8,0.31)	0.0571	-16.6 (-24.2,-8.94)	<.0001

Presented data are adjusted CWV estimates (95% CI) per 5 ppb increase for NO_2 from a linear mixed model with centre modelled as a random intercept of regio-stratified analysis. Model 1, unadjusted. Model 2, adjusted for age, sex, and ethnicity. Model 3 further adjusted for the INTERHEART risk score and education. Primary model 4 further adjusted for walkability categories.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table S6: Association of carotid wall volume (mm^3) with pollutant exposure adjusting for neighbourhood socioeconomic status

Pollutant	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	p-trend
$PM_{2.5}$						
Quintile range	1.8 – 5.0 ug/m^3	5.0 – 6.0 ug/m^3	6.0 – 7.8 ug/m^3	7.8 – 8.9 ug/m^3	8.9 – 11.2 ug/m^3	
Model 1	911.0 (890.7, 931.3)	911.4 (891.0, 931.9)	903.7 (883.6, 923.8)	902.3 (882.0, 922.6)	895.3 (874.7, 916.0)	0.04
Model 2	912.8 (889.6, 936.0)	910.0 (886.8, 933.3)	902.2 (879.2, 925.2)	897.8 (874.6, 921.1)	890.4 (866.9, 913.8)	0.001
Model 3	912.8 (889.9, 935.7)	909.9 (886.8, 932.9)	902.0 (879.3, 924.8)	897.8 (874.9, 920.8)	890.1 (866.9, 913.3)	0.001
Model 4	909.2 (886.1, 932.3)	907.3 (884.3, 930.3)	900.4 (877.7, 923.1)	898.3 (875.4, 921.2)	892.3 (868.9, 915.7)	0.03
Model 5: Model4+ NO_2	906.3 (882.7, 929.8)	904.5 (881.1, 928.0)	897.3 (874.1, 920.4)	902.0 (878.6, 925.3)	896.7 (872.8, 920.5)	0.29
Model 5: Model4 + O_3	908.8 (888.7, 929.0)	909.0 (888.9, 929.0)	904.4 (884.6, 924.2)	905.0 (884.8, 925.3)	898.7 (878.0, 919.5)	0.24
NO_2						
Quintile range	0.9 – 5.5 ppb	5.5 – 9.3 ppb	9.4 – 14.0 ppb	14.1 – 17.9 ppb	17.9 – 33.9 ppb	
Model 1	920.8 (898.8, 942.8)	926.8 (906.7, 947.0)	897.3 (877.9, 916.7)	900.1 (880.8, 919.5)	890.9 (871.3, 910.4)	<.0001
Model 2	919.9 (896.3, 943.5)	928.8 (906.7, 950.9)	895.1 (873.5, 916.6)	893.9 (872.4, 915.5)	890.2 (868.5, 911.9)	<.0001
Model 3	920.1 (896.6, 943.6)	928.5 (906.5, 950.5)	894.8 (873.4, 916.3)	893.9 (872.5, 915.3)	890.5 (869.0, 912.1)	<.0001
Model 4	919.5 (894.2, 944.8)	930.3 (907.9, 952.8)	896.2 (874.6, 917.8)	892.8 (871.2, 914.4)	888.7 (866.7, 910.7)	<.0001
Model 5: Model4+O_3	916.7 (892.5, 940.9)	929.6 (908.6, 950.6)	897.9 (877.6, 918.1)	896.9 (876.1, 917.6)	893.2 (872.0, 914.4)	0.003
Model 5: Model4+$PM_{2.5}$	918.4 (892.5, 944.3)	929.8 (906.9, 952.7)	895.9 (873.9, 918.0)	892.9 (870.8, 914.9)	888.9 (866.5, 911.3)	<0.001
O_3						
Quintile range	14.2 – 22.0 ppb	22.1 – 24.4 ppb	24.4 – 25.7 ppb	25.7 – 28.0 ppb	28.0 – 37.1 ppb	
Model 1	902.3 (884.4, 920.1)	898.3 (880.2, 916.4)	906.6 (888.7, 924.4)	899.8 (881.5, 918.0)	925.9 (907.2, 944.6)	0.02
Model 2	898.6 (879.7, 917.5)	896.8 (877.7, 915.9)	902.6 (883.7, 921.4)	897.2 (878.0, 916.4)	929.6 (910.1, 949.2)	0.001
Model 3	898.4 (879.7, 917.1)	896.7 (877.9, 915.5)	903.0 (884.4, 921.6)	897.4 (878.4, 916.4)	929.5 (910.1, 948.9)	0.001
Model 4	899.9 (880.3, 919.5)	897.1 (877.6, 916.7)	901.6 (882.0, 921.1)	895.2 (875.2, 915.1)	924.5 (903.3, 945.6)	0.03
Model 5: Model4+NO_2	903.3 (881.6, 925.0)	898.4 (876.9, 920.0)	901.8 (880.2, 923.3)	891.4 (869.4, 913.4)	915.3 (891.7, 938.9)	0.48
Model 5: Model4+$PM_{2.5}$	899.9 (879.7, 920.1)	897.1 (876.9, 917.2)	901.2 (881.0, 921.4)	894.7 (874.1, 915.3)	923.3 (901.4, 945.3)	0.05

Presented data are adjusted least square means (95% CI) from a linear mixed model with centre modelled as a random intercept. Model 1, unadjusted. Model 2, adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity. Model 3 further adjusted IHRS & education. Model 4 further adjusted for community level: walkability categories, material factor score & social factor score. Model 5 further adjusted for co-pollutants. P-trend from linear contrasts. For all models, N=6,340.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279358; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Figure S1: Flow chart for Air pollution and MRI markers in CAHHM