

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 Schulze³
Jeffrey R Brook⁴
Dany Doiron⁵
Eric E Smith⁶
Alan R Moody⁷
Dipika Desai³
Michael Brauer⁸
Matthias G Friedrich⁹
Shrikant I Bangdiwala^{1,3}
Dena Zeraatkar¹⁰
Douglas Lee¹¹
Sonia S Anand^{1,2,3}
Russell J de Souza^{1,2,3}

¹Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

²Department of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

³Population Health Research Institute, Hamilton, ON, Canada

⁴Occupational and Environmental Health Division, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

⁵Research Institute of McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Canada

⁶Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta

⁷Department of Medical Imaging, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

⁸School of Population and Public Health, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

⁹Department of Medicine and Diagnostic Radiology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

¹⁰Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

¹¹Programming 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

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 (NO₂), ozone (O₃), 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 mm³, quintile 1: 908.8 mm³; *p-trend* =0.05), but this was not robust in region-stratified analysis. Higher NO₂ was associated with lower CWV (quintile 5: 889.5 mm³, quintile 1: 918.6 mm³; *p-*

trend <.0001). Higher O₃ was associated with higher CWV (quintile 5: 925.4 mm³, quintile 1: 899.7 mm³; *p-trend* =0.02). NO₂ emerged as a consistent effect modifier of both PM_{2.5} and O₃.

Conclusion: In a cohort of generally healthy adults living in Canada, a country with relatively low levels of air pollution, exposure to NO₂ was negatively associated, and O₃ 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.

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 (O₃).⁹ Fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) is fine inhalable particles ≤2.5 µm in aerodynamic diameter. Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) is mainly associated with road traffic and other forms of combustion and is a precursor to O₃.^{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.*, atherosclerosis, 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 triggering 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 O₃ was associated with increased progression of carotid

intima-media thickness (cIMT), while PM_{2.5}, NO₂, and NO_x were not associated with cIMT change.^{5,11} Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) can accurately assess the presence of subclinical cerebrovascular atherosclerosis¹⁷ 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}, NO₂, and O₃ 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.

Assessment of air pollution exposure

The three major air pollutants of interest in this study are PM_{2.5}, NO₂, and O₃. The development of these exposure datasets has been documented elsewhere^{20,21,22,23} and they have been used in multiple Canadian epidemiological studies²⁴, 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 (SO₂), NO₂, ammonia (NH₄), 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 ($R^2 = 0.70$).

NO₂ 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 NO₂ concentrations in parts per billion (ppb) were estimated for each postal code location using a national land use regression (LUR) model for the year 2006²¹ at 100 m resolution and adjusted for prior and subsequent years using long-term air quality monitoring station data. The LUR NO₂ model included road length, 2005-2011 satellite NO₂ estimates, area of industrial land use within 2 km, and summer rainfall as predictors of regional NO₂ variation.²¹ Deterministic gradients were used to model local scale variation related to roads (i.e., traffic).²¹ The final NO₂ 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.

O₃ is a photochemically produced oxidant gas that results from the reaction between sunlight and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) 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 O₃ 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 (mm³) (left, right, and combined) within a 32-mm vessel length centred on each carotid bifurcation (to include distal common and proximal internal

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 $\leq 20\%$ of postal codes fell within a CMA/CA.

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 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ increment for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, 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.

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 mm³ (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 µg/m³ (2.0), ranging from the lowest [3.2 µg/m³ (0.5)] in parts of the Calgary, Alberta, region to the highest [8.6 µg/m³ (1.5)] in London, Ontario; for NO₂ 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 O₃ was 24.6 ppb (4.0), ranging from lowest [16.9 ppb (3.0)] in

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 mm³, quintile 1: 908.8 mm³; *p-trend* = 0.05) which was not robust to further adjustment i.e., co-pollutant model. CWV was lower across quintiles of NO₂ (Model 4; quintile 5: 889.5 mm³, quintile 1: 918.6 mm³; *p-trend* < 0.0001) in all models including those with co-pollutant adjustment, but was higher across quintiles of O₃ (quintile 5: 925.4mm³, quintile 1: 899.7; *p-trend* = 0.02), which was blunted after NO₂ 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 NO₂ was [r=0.39; p<.0001], between PM_{2.5} and O₃ was [r=0.16; p<.0001], and between NO₂ and O₃ 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 NO₂ in the co-pollutant model, a 5 µg/m³ higher PM_{2.5} concentration was associated with 24.98 mm³ higher CWV (95% CI 3.43-46.52; p=0.023). A 5 ppb higher NO₂ concentration was associated with 21.2 mm³ lower CWV (95% CI -27.7--14.7; p<0.0001) within Ontario (n=3161), but with a

100.6 mm³ higher CWV (95% CI 24.99-176.2; p=0.009) in Nova Scotia (n=586). A 3 ppb increase in O₃ was associated with 9.66 mm³ (95% CI 1.69-17.63; p=0.018) and 11.01 mm³ (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 NO₂ ($p=0.014$ for interaction). There was no evidence of interaction between PM_{2.5} and O₃. Furthermore, the effect of NO₂ on CWV differed according to both the exposure levels of PM_{2.5} ($p=0.024$ for interaction) and O₃ ($p<0.0001$ for interaction). The effect of O₃ on CWV depended on NO₂ levels ($p=0.0006$ for interaction). Thus, NO₂ emerged as a consistent effect modifier of both PM_{2.5} and O₃ (**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 NO₂, increased MRI-measured CWV for O₃, and for a trend towards decreased MRI-measured CWV for PM_{2.5}. While findings for NO₂ and O₃ 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. NO₂ consistently modified the effects of PM_{2.5} and O₃ 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

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 O₃ and NO₂. 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 O₃ 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 O₃ 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 O₃ 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 O₃, which may have direct effects or indirect effects changing

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 NO₂, 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 NO₂ 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 NO₂ 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, NO₂ 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 NO₂ with CWV; and Halifax was the city with the lowest levels of NO₂ of the five Canadian cities. Of note, the ratio of O₃/NO₂ 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.

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}, NO₂, and O₃ 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.

Conclusion

Our data indicate that in healthy adults living in clean or only mildly polluted environments, exposure to NO₂ is negatively associated, and O₃ 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 NO₂ in atherosclerosis is complex and requires further investigation, as do combinations of exposure to O₃, PM_{2.5} and NO₂.

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/Biometrics Programmers 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](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02220582). Registered 20 August 2014—Retrospectively registered, <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02220582>.

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.

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

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, Zaitseva 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

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.0b013e3181d8e1
32. Perez L, Wolf K, Hennig F, et al. Air Pollution and Atherosclerosis: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of Four European 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

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/m² | 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.

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) | | | | | | | |
| 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

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)




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

*p<0.05




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

Table S1: Association of carotid wall volume (mm³) 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 |
| NO₂ | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| O₃ | | | | | | |
| 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 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 (mm³) 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 |
| NO₂ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| O₃ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 µg/m³ increase for PM_{2.5}, 5 ppb increase for NO₂, and 3 ppb increase for O₃, from a linear mixed model with centre modelled as a random intercept of region-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 walkability categories. Model 5 further adjusted for co-pollutants.

Table S3: Association of carotid wall volume (mm³) with O₃ 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 NO₂ (0.88 - 8.10 ppb) N=1590 | | Mid NO₂ (8.12 - 15.5 ppb) N=2327 | | High NO₂ (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 O₃, 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.

Table S4: Association of carotid wall volume (mm³) with PM_{2.5} within co-pollutant exposure tertiles

| | Overall N=6536 | | Low O₃ 14.2 - 22.9 ppb N=2051 | | Mid O₃ 23.0 - 26.3 ppb N=2422 | | High O₃ 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 NO₂ (0.88 - 8.10 ppb) N=1590 | | Mid NO₂ (8.12 - 15.5 ppb) N=2327 | | High NO₂ (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 µg/m³ 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.

Table S5: Association of carotid wall volume (mm³) with NO₂ within co-pollutant exposure tertiles

| | Overall N=6536 | | Low O₃ 14.2 - 22.9 ppb N=2051 | | Mid O₃ 23.0 - 26.3 ppb N=2422 | | High O₃ 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 NO₂ 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.

Table S6: Association of carotid wall volume (mm³) 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 |
| NO₂ | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| O₃ | | | | | | |
| 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.

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

