

1 **Incorporating interactions into structured life course modelling approaches:**
2 **A simulation study and applied example of the role of access to green space**
3 **and socioeconomic position on cardiometabolic health**

4

5 Daniel Major-Smith^{1,2} *, Tadeáš Dvořák², Ahmed Elhakeem^{1,2}, Deborah A. Lawlor^{1,2,3}, Kate Tilling^{1,2,3},
6 Andrew D. A. C. Smith⁴

7 ¹ MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

8 ² Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK

9 ³ Bristol National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre, Bristol, UK

10 ⁴ Mathematics and Statistics Research Group, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

11 * Corresponding author: dan.smith@bristol.ac.uk

12

13 ORCIDs:

14 DM-S: 0000-0001-6467-2023

15 TD: 0000-0002-0423-5259

16 AE: 0000-0001-7637-6360

17 DAL: 0000-0002-6793-2262

18 KT: 0000-0002-1010-8926

19 ADACS: 0000-0001-5452-9901

20

21

Word count: 4,270

22

Tables: 4

23

Figures: 2

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 *Background:* Structured life course modelling approaches (SLCMA) have been developed to
28 understand how exposures across the lifespan relate to later health, but have primarily been
29 restricted to single exposures. As multiple exposures can jointly impact health, here we: i)
30 demonstrate how to extend SLCMA to include exposure interactions; ii) conduct a simulation study
31 investigating the performance of these methods; and iii) apply these methods to explore
32 associations of access to green space, and its interaction with socioeconomic position, with child
33 cardiometabolic health.

34 *Methods:* We used three methods, all based on lasso regression, to select the most plausible life
35 course model: visual inspection, information criteria and cross-validation. The simulation study
36 assessed the ability of these approaches to detect the correct interaction term, while varying
37 parameters which may impact power (e.g., interaction magnitude, sample size, exposure
38 collinearity). Methods were then applied to data from a UK birth cohort.

39 *Results:* There were trade-offs between false negatives and false positives in detecting the true
40 interaction term for different model selection methods. Larger sample size, lower exposure
41 collinearity, centering exposures, continuous outcomes and a larger interaction effect all increased
42 power. In our applied example we found little-to-no association between access to green space, or
43 its interaction with socioeconomic position, and child cardiometabolic outcomes.

44 *Conclusions:* Incorporating interactions between multiple exposures is an important extension to
45 SLCMA. The choice of method depends on the researchers' assessment of the risks of under- vs
46 over-fitting. These results also provide guidance for improving power to detect interactions using
47 these methods.

48

49 *Keywords:* Life course epidemiology, structured life course modelling approach, interaction, lasso,
50 simulation study, green space, cardiometabolic health, ALSPAC.

51

52 *Key messages:*

- 53 • In life course epidemiology, it is important to consider how multiple exposures over the
54 lifespan may jointly influence health.
- 55 • We demonstrate how to extend current structured life course modelling approaches to
56 include interactions between multiple different exposures.
- 57 • A simulation study comparing different methods to detect a true interaction effect found a
58 trade-off between false positives and false negatives, suggesting that the optimal choice of
59 method may depend on the researchers' assessment of this trade-off (e.g., exploratory
60 studies may prefer a greater risk of false positives, while confirmatory studies may prefer to
61 minimise the risk of false positives).
- 62 • We identified key factors that improve power to detect a true interaction effect, namely
63 larger sample sizes, centering exposures, lower exposure collinearity, continuous outcomes
64 and larger interaction effect sizes.
- 65 • We applied these methods in a UK birth cohort (ALSPAC; Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents
66 and Children), finding little-to-no evidence of an association between access to green space
67 and its interaction with socioeconomic position on child BMI, obesity or blood pressure.

68 Introduction

69 Life course epidemiology studies the effects on health of biological, social and environmental
70 exposures during gestation, infancy, adolescence, adulthood, and across generations (Ben-Shlomo &
71 Kuh 2002; Kuh *et al.* 2003). Over the last decade several structured life course modelling approaches
72 (SLCMA; pronounced “slick-mah”) have been developed to help with the challenges of
73 understanding these life course effects (Mishra *et al.* 2009; Smith *et al.* 2015, 2016, 2022; Howe *et*
74 *al.* 2016; Madathil *et al.* 2018; Zhu *et al.* 2021). These approaches have largely focused on how to
75 model the effect of one repeated exposure over the life course on an adult outcome, to distinguish
76 for example between critical or sensitive periods, or cumulative effects. Little attention has been
77 applied to two or more exposures and how these may jointly affect an outcome, despite the
78 definition of life course epidemiology clearly highlighting the importance of multiple exposures
79 jointly influencing health.

80 Here we extend these existing models by demonstrating how to incorporate interactions between
81 multiple exposures in a SLCMA, allowing an exploration of how multiple exposures are associated
82 with an outcome. This paper has three aims: i) describe how to extend existing structured life course
83 models to include interaction terms between multiple exposures; ii) conduct a simulation study
84 exploring how well this approach performs under a range of conditions; and iii) apply this approach
85 in a UK birth cohort.

86

87 Motivating Example

88 Throughout this paper we will use access to green space during pregnancy, infancy and early
89 childhood, and its interaction with family socioeconomic position (SEP), and how these impact later
90 child cardiometabolic outcomes (body mass index [BMI] and blood pressure), as a motivating
91 example. BMI and blood pressure are key risk factors for cardiovascular disease progression
92 (Berenson *et al.* 1998) which often manifest in childhood (Chen & Wang 2008; Singh *et al.* 2008).
93 Understanding the risk factors – and potential interventions – for childhood obesity and
94 hypertension is therefore a major public health concern (World Health Organization 2016). One
95 potential modifiable risk factor is access to green space. Numerous studies have reported
96 associations between access to green space and improved BMI and blood pressure in adults (James
97 *et al.* 2015; Luo *et al.* 2020), although associations in children have been mixed (Bell *et al.* 2008;
98 Wolch *et al.* 2011; Lovasi *et al.* 2013; Markevych *et al.* 2014; Picavet *et al.* 2016; Schalkwijk *et al.*
99 2018; Benjamin-Neelon *et al.* 2019; Bloemsma *et al.* 2019; Abbasi *et al.* 2020; Xiao *et al.* 2020;
100 Warembourg *et al.* 2021; Jia *et al.* 2021; Cadman *et al.* 2022; Dzhambov *et al.* 2022; Luo *et al.* 2022).
101 Interactions between access to green space and SEP on cardiovascular outcomes have received less
102 attention, although some effect modification has been reported in both adults (James *et al.* 2015)
103 and children (Schalkwijk *et al.* 2018). Previous studies have examined green space exposure at one
104 time point, but, to the best of our knowledge, none have adopted a life course approach to identify
105 how the association between green space and child BMI and blood pressure changes over infancy
106 and childhood, or its interaction with SEP.

107 **The Structured Life Course Modelling Approach (SLCMA)**

108 The first step in a SLCMA is to specify and encode potential life course hypotheses, which may either
109 be 'simple' (encoded into one variable) or 'compound' (a combination of two or more encoded
110 variables; (Mishra *et al.* 2009; Smith *et al.* 2015, 2016, 2022)). The selection of hypotheses could be
111 exploratory or confirmatory; here we focus on exploratory analyses. Table 1 describes some
112 common life course hypotheses and their extension to include interactions, and how they can be
113 encoded where the exposures and confounders/covariates are binary variables. We use the term
114 'confounder/covariate' throughout, as the interaction term could include either the exposure and a
115 confounder, or the exposure and an effect-modifier that is not a confounder. Similar encoding
116 applies when the variables are continuous (Smith *et al.* 2016), but we introduce the key concepts
117 here using binary variables.

118

119 *Table 1: Examples of encoding hypotheses for structured life course models where exposure variables are binary and there are two exposure time-points. X_i*
 120 *is an indicator for the exposure at time-point i ; Z indicates the confounder/covariate to be included in the interaction term. Note that as we have decided*
 121 *here that the confounder/covariate Z will be included in all models by default, it appears in all formulae in the ‘model’ column below. Not all possible life*
 122 *course model permutations are displayed here.*

Hypothesis	Model	Encoding	Type	Interpretation
Critical period (i)	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2C_{i1}$	$C_i = X_i$	Simple	Exposure causes outcome only at i th time point
Critical period (i) if $Z = 1$	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2C_{i1}$	$C_{i1} = ZX_i$	Simple	Exposure causes outcome only at i th time point and where confounder/covariate equals ‘1’ (e.g., critical period only if high SEP)
Critical period (i) with interaction	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2C_i + b_3C_{i1}$	$C_i = X_i$ $C_{i1} = ZX_i$	Compound	Interaction between confounder/covariate and exposure at i th time point causes outcome (e.g., critical period differs by confounder/covariate for both levels of exposure).
Accumulation	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2A$	$A = X_1 + X_2$	Simple	Outcome increases linearly with total amount of exposure
Accumulation if $Z = 1$	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2A$	$A = Z(X_1 + X_2)$	Simple	Outcome increases linearly with exposure, but only where confounder/covariate equals ‘1’
Accumulation with interaction	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2A + b_3A$	$A = X_1 + X_2$ $A = Z(X_1 + X_2)$	Compound	Interaction between confounder/covariate and accumulation causes outcome
Sensitive period (i)	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2C_i + b_3A$	$C_i = X_i$ $A = X_1 + X_2$	Compound	Exposure at both time points causes outcome, but more strongly at time i (i.e., accumulation plus critical period i)
Change (increase from 1 to 2)	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2M_{12}^+$	$M_{12}^+ = (1 - X_1)X_2$	Simple	Increase in exposure between time 1 and 2 causes outcome
Change (increase from 1 to 2) if $Z = 1$	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2M_{12}^+$	$M_{12}^+ = Z((1 - X_1)X_2)$	Simple	Increase in exposure between time 1 and 2 causes outcome, but only where confounder/covariate equals ‘1’
Change (increase from 1 to 2) with interaction	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2M_{12}^+ + b_3M_{12}^+$	$M_{12}^+ = (1 - X_1)X_2$ $M_{12}^+ = Z((1 - X_1)X_2)$	Compound	Interaction between confounder/covariate and increase in exposure between time 1 and 2 causes outcome
Change (decrease from 1 to 2)	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2M_{12}^-$	$M_{12}^- = (1 - X_2)X_1$	Simple	Decrease in exposure between time 1 and 2 causes outcome
Change (decrease from 1 to 2) if $Z = 1$	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2M_{12}^-$	$M_{12}^- = Z((1 - X_2)X_1)$	Simple	Decrease in exposure between time 1 and 2 causes outcome, but only where confounder/covariate equals ‘1’
Change (decrease from 1 to 2) with interaction	$Y = b_0 + b_1Z + b_2M_{12}^- + b_3M_{12}^-$	$M_{12}^- = (1 - X_2)X_1$ $M_{12}^- = Z((1 - X_2)X_1)$	Compound	Interaction between confounder/covariate and decrease in exposure between time 1 and 2 causes outcome

123

124 Once these hypotheses have been encoded, these terms are entered into a lasso regression model.
125 Lasso models apply a penalty term (λ) which constrains terms in the model to zero, an
126 approach known as L1-regularisation. The initial λ value is set so that there are no variables in
127 the model; λ is then decreased, allowing variables which explain the highest amount of the
128 variation in the outcome into the model in a cumulative manner (Hastie *et al.* 2015). Previous
129 structured life course approaches (Smith *et al.* 2015, 2016) have used an algorithm for this approach
130 known as Least Angle Regression (LARS; (Efron *et al.* 2004)) which finds the best lasso model as
131 λ decreases. The first model contains the variable with the strongest association with the
132 outcome, with later models containing additional variables added in a stepwise procedure. The
133 choice of hypotheses is then based on an inspection of an ‘elbow plot’ (the proportion of variation
134 explained after new variables are added), a formal lasso covariance hypothesis test as to whether
135 inclusion of another variable improves model fit (Lockhart *et al.* 2014), or both. However, concerns
136 have been raised about this lasso covariance test, especially regarding binary outcomes, and this
137 approach is no longer recommended (Zhu *et al.* 2021).

138 Hence, there is currently no consensus on the optimal method for selecting the best fitting lasso
139 model; we explore three possible approaches below, all of which are based on a standard lasso,
140 rather than the LARS approach. These are:

141 1) Visual inspection. Examining the order in which encoded variables are entered into the
142 model and the variance explained associated with each variable (similar to a LARS elbow
143 plot). While this is a relatively straightforward approach, it is subjective, especially if the
144 choice of best variable(s) is not clear.

145 2) Using a ‘relaxed lasso’ (Hastie *et al.* 2020) approach and comparing model fit using
146 information criteria. After running the lasso model, take all model combinations found by
147 the lasso, run a standard regression model on each (e.g., linear models for continuous
148 outcomes, logistic regression for binary outcomes), and select the best-fitting model based
149 on an information criterion which has a penalty for over-fitting (e.g., AIC [Akaike Information
150 Criterion] or BIC [Bayesian Information Criterion]). Although both assess model fit, the AIC
151 and BIC are calculated differently (Kuha 2004), with the BIC penalising complexity more than
152 the AIC. We will use both the AIC and BIC here, and compare their performance.

153 3) Using a cross-validated lasso approach. Unlike an ordinary lasso which continuously
154 improves model fit as λ reaches 0, at each λ value cross-validated lasso splits
155 the data into k equal portions (here, $k = 10$) and calculates the mean prediction error. The
156 λ value which minimises the prediction error is deemed the ‘optimal’ model for
157 predicting the outcome. We will compare two cross-validated methods for selecting the
158 best-fitting model, one based on the model with the lowest mean prediction error and
159 another selecting the model within 1 standard error of the minimum mean prediction error
160 (which selects a sparser model and may avoid over-fitting; ((Hastie *et al.* 2015), pages 13-
161 14)).

162 Note that the primary aim of this SLCMA as used in the simulation sections of this paper is not in
163 estimation of the coefficients, but rather model selection and understanding the overall impact of
164 the exposure on the outcome throughout the life course. For post-selection inference methods to
165 calculate unbiased effect estimates, confidence intervals and p -values when using SLCMA – known
166 as ‘selective inference’ – see; (Tibshirani *et al.* 2016; Zhu *et al.* 2021; Smith *et al.* 2022). Throughout
167 this paper we focus on lasso approaches using the ‘glmnet’ package in R (Friedman *et al.* 2010).

168

169 **Worked Example**

170 We first demonstrate these methods with a simple simulated dataset based on our motivating
171 example, using BMI as our cardiometabolic outcome (see section S1 of the supplementary
172 information for simulation details; simulated $n = 10,000$; all code is openly-available on GitHub, see
173 the Data Availability section). In this simulation, there is one binary SEP covariate (1 = high SEP),
174 three binary green space exposures (in pregnancy, at age 4, and at age 7; 1 = access to green space),
175 and a continuous BMI outcome. We simulate that SEP causes all three green space exposures (higher
176 SEP = greater access to green space) and the outcome (higher SEP = lower BMI), and is therefore a
177 confounder of the green space-BMI relationship. In this example, we simulate a critical period where
178 most recent access to green space at age 7 has a causal effect on BMI, but only when interacting
179 with SEP, such that lower SEP and access to green space causes a reduction in BMI, but access to
180 green space for those with higher SEP has no impact on BMI. This example is purely illustrative,
181 although these effects may be plausible (James *et al.* 2015; Schalkwijk *et al.* 2018). The life course
182 hypotheses encoded are described in table 2.


183 Figure 1 shows the results of this simulated lasso model. The order in which variables are entered is
184 displayed from left to right, with a measure of model fit (deviance ratio) on the y-axis (for a detailed
185 interpretation of this plot, see the figure 1 legend). The first variable entered in the model was 'crit3'
186 (critical period at time 3/age 7), followed by 'int3' (interaction between SEP and critical period at
187 time 3/age 7), and there appears to be an appreciable increase in model fit associated with both
188 variables before additional variables are added (approx. 1.5% for both variables). As the line is
189 largely horizontal after these two variables have been added, this suggests that the inclusion of
190 additional variables does not noticeably improve model fit. This indicates that critical period at time
191 3/age 7 and its interaction with SEP have the strongest association with the outcome, and that all
192 other variables have a much weaker/null association.

193 Next, we tested these patterns more formally using the relaxed lasso approach. The lowest AIC and
194 BIC values were found for the true model, containing both critical period at time 3/age 7 and its
195 interaction with SEP (in addition to the 'high_sep' confounder/covariate included in all models by
196 default). As with the more subjective visual inspection method, we again reach the conclusion that
197 the compound hypothesis of recent access to green space by SEP interaction is the best model.

198 Finally, we can use cross-validated lasso for model selection. The model within one standard error of
199 the model with the lowest mean-squared error correctly identified critical period at time 3/age 7
200 and its interaction with SEP (in addition to 'high_sep') as the best-fitting model. The cross-validated
201 model with the lowest mean prediction error included both of these variables, in addition to nine
202 other encoded variables (figure S1), indicating overfitting. All three of these methods – except for
203 cross-validated lasso using the model with the minimum mean prediction error – therefore provide
204 broadly consistent results that match the simulated model.

205 *Table 2: Hypotheses encoded in our simulated worked example dataset. The variables in this dataset*
 206 *are: green1 (access to green space at time1/in pregnancy), green2 (access to green space at time*
 207 *2/age 4), green3 (access to green space at time 3/age 7) and high_sep (binary marker for high*
 208 *socioeconomic position). The confounder ‘high_sep’ is included in all models. ‘Simple’ models can be*
 209 *encoded in just one additional variable, while ‘compound’ hypotheses combine two or more*
 210 *additional encoding variables. In this simulated example, the compound hypothesis ‘crit3 + int3’*
 211 *(critical period at time 3/age 7 with an interaction with SEP) is the true model.*

Hypothesis	Encoding	Type
Critical period (1)	crit1 = green1	Simple
Critical period (1) only if high SEP	int1 = high_sep * green1	Simple
Critical period (1) with SEP interaction	crit1 + int1	Compound
Critical period (2)	crit2 = green2	Simple
Critical period (2) only if high SEP	int2 = high_sep * green2	Simple
Critical period (2) with SEP interaction	crit2 + int2	Compound
Critical period (3)	crit3 = green3	Simple
Critical period (3) only if high SEP	int3 = high_sep * green3	Simple
Critical period (3) with SEP interaction	crit3 + int3	Compound
Accumulation	accumulation = green1 + green2 + green3	Simple
Accumulation only if high SEP	int_accum = high_sep * accumulation	Simple
Accumulation with SEP interaction	accumulation + int_accum	Compound
Sensitive period (1)	crit1 + accumulation	Compound
Sensitive period (2)	crit2 + accumulation	Compound
Sensitive period (3)	crit3 + accumulation	Compound
Change (more green space from 1 to 2)	green_inc12 = (1 - green1) * green2	Simple
Change (more green space from 1 to 2) only if high SEP	green_inc12_int = high_sep * green_inc12	Simple
Change (more green space from 1 to 2) with SEP interaction	green_inc12 + green_inc12_int	Compound
Change (less green space from 1 to 2)	green_dec12 = (1 - green2) * green1	Simple
Change (less green space from 1 to 2) only if high SEP	green_dec12_int = high_sep * green_dec12	Simple
Change (less green space from 1 to 2) with SEP interaction	green_dec12 + green_dec12_int	Compound
Change (more green space from 2 to 3)	green_inc23 = (1 - green2) * green3	Simple
Change (more green space from 2 to 3) only if high SEP	green_inc23_int = high_sep * green_inc23	Simple
Change (more green space from 2 to 3) with SEP interaction	green_inc23 + green_inc23_int	Compound
Change (less green space from 2 to 3)	green_dec23 = (1 - green3) * green2	Simple
Change (less green space from 2 to 3) only if high SEP	green_dec23_int = high_sep * green_dec23	Simple
Change (less green space from 2 to 3) with SEP interaction	green_dec23 + green_dec23_int	Compound



212

213 *Figure 1:* Results of the lasso from the simulated worked example. This plot displays the log lambda value on the x-axis (the lasso penalty term which allows
 214 more variables to enter the model) and the absolute deviance ratio of the lasso model associated with each lambda value on the y-axis (as a measure of
 215 model fit). As the variables are added to/removed from the model they appear on the x-axis, moving from left to right (with “(+)” indicating addition, and
 216 “(-)” indicating removal). The covariate/confounder ‘high_sep’ does not appear in this plot as it was constrained to be included in all models by default. This
 217 plot shows that the first encoded variable to enter the model was access to green space at critical period 3/age 7 (‘crit3’). This variable was then associated
 218 with an increase in the deviance ratio by approximately 1.5% until the next encoded variable was added, that of an interaction between critical period
 219 3/age 7 and SEP (‘int3’). After this variable was added, there was another increase in the deviance ratio of approximately 1.5% when the next encoded
 220 variable was added, that of ‘green_dec23_int’ (the interaction term between a decrease in green space between times 2 and 3 and SEP). When this and
 221 subsequent variables were added, the improvements in the deviance ratio were minimal – as indicated by the largely horizontal line by this point –
 222 suggesting that none of these encoded variables were strongly associated with the outcome BMI (for an explanation of all other encoded variables in this
 223 plot, see table 2). These results suggest that the combination of ‘crit3’ and ‘int3’ are the best fit to the data, with all other variables having a much
 224 weaker/null association with the outcome, just as was simulated.

225 **Simulation study**

226 The previous section demonstrated how to extend SLCMA to include multiple exposures and
227 interaction terms. However, the conditions under which these approaches identify the correct
228 interaction term is unknown, especially given known issues of low statistical power for interactions
229 (Brookes *et al.* 2004; Blake & Gangestad 2020). We conducted a formal simulation study (using the
230 ADEMP approach; (Morris *et al.* 2019)) to explore how several factors impact the probability of the
231 SLCMA methods detecting the true interaction term (i.e., the correct SEP-interaction, regardless of
232 other terms in the final model).

233 *Aim:* Assess how often SLCMA identifies the true interaction term, while varying the following
234 factors:

- 235 • Sample size: 1,000 vs 10,000
- 236 • Exposure variables: binary vs continuous (for binary exposures we used the life-course
237 hypotheses encoded in table 2, while for continuous exposures we used the hypotheses
238 encoded in table S1)
- 239 • Centering exposure variables: no vs yes (centering exposures may reduce the collinearity
240 between main effects and interaction terms (Afshartous & Preston 2011; Iacobucci *et al.*
241 2016))
- 242 • Collinearity between exposure variables: low vs high (higher collinearity may make it more
243 difficult for the model to distinguish between different life course hypotheses)
- 244 • Outcome variable: binary vs continuous (analyses with binary outcomes tend to have lower
245 power (Altman & Royston 2006))
- 246 • Size of interaction term: none vs very small vs small vs moderate vs large vs very large
247 (ranked on a relative scale)
- 248 • Life course hypothesis interaction: critical period at time 3 vs accumulation vs change from
249 time 2 to time 3

250 *Data-generating mechanism:* We used the same data-generating mechanism as above to generate
251 all exposures, with SEP as a binary variable. Simulating the outcome BMI depended on the life
252 course hypothesis being assessed, i.e., an interaction between SEP and either critical period at time
253 3, accumulation or change from time 2 to 3. See supplementary information section S2 for additional
254 detail on these simulation parameters and how they were selected.

255 *Estimand:* The target estimand was the inclusion of the correct SEP-interaction term being selected
256 in the final model.

257 *Methods:* We used the relaxed lasso approach (using both AIC and BIC) and cross-validated lasso
258 (using both minimum mean-squared error [MSE] and within 1 standard error of the MSE) for model
259 selection.

260 *Performance measure:* The percentage of simulations (out of 1,000) that selected the true
261 interaction term.

262

263 The results of this simulation study across all simulation parameters, for each SLCMA method,
264 interaction strength, and life course interaction model, are displayed in table 3. As the strength of
265 the interaction increased more models selected the correct interaction term. The relaxed lasso AIC
266 and cross-validated minimum MSE methods were more likely to select the target interaction (even

267 frequently in the ‘no interaction’ scenario), while the relaxed lasso BIC and cross-validated 1SE
268 approaches were less likely to select the interaction, even with larger interaction coefficients (with
269 1SE cross-validation less likely to detect an interaction than relaxed BIC). The relaxed AIC and cross-
270 validated minimum MSE methods are therefore more likely to detect a true interaction term, but at
271 the expense at an increased risk of false positives, while the reverse is true for the relaxed BIC and
272 cross-validated 1SE approaches.

273 Variation between the life course interaction models was also apparent, with critical period
274 interactions more likely to be selected than change interactions, and accumulation interactions least
275 likely to be selected. This is likely due to the accumulation variables having high collinearity with the
276 critical period variables, and therefore having less power to distinguish between these competing
277 hypotheses.

278 This summary masks substantial variation, with methods performing well for some combinations of
279 simulation parameters, and poorly for others. Focusing on the moderate interaction scenario, there
280 is variation in the power to detect the correct interaction term (table 4). Overall, power was much
281 greater with a larger sample size and continuous rather than binary outcomes. For other simulation
282 parameters, differences were either smaller or varied by the life course interaction model. For
283 instance, whether the exposures were binary or continuous made little difference for the critical
284 period model, but power to detect an accumulation interaction was greater with binary exposures,
285 while for the change interaction continuous exposures had greater power. High exposure collinearity
286 greatly reduced the power of the accumulation and change models, while for the critical period
287 models differences in collinearity were more modest. Centering the encoded variables increased
288 power in the accumulation and critical period settings, but not in the change scenario.

289 As it may not be possible to directly compare power between continuous and binary outcomes
290 because the interaction terms are not equivalent, these results are repeated in tables S2 and S3,
291 split by continuous vs binary outcome. Results are qualitatively similar to the combined results
292 reported here.

293 *Table 3:* Summary of overall simulation results for each SLCMA method, each interaction strength,
 294 and each life course interaction model (n simulations = 32; n iterations per simulation = 1,000).
 295 Results show the percent of simulations in which the correct interaction term was selected. Note
 296 that in the rows for interaction strength of ‘None’, technically this is not the ‘correct’ interaction as
 297 no interaction was present (i.e., 15.7% of simulations using the AIC relaxed lasso method included
 298 the interaction term for the critical period at time 3 model, even though no interaction was
 299 simulated). For full details on the simulation parameters, see section S2 of the supplementary
 300 information. SE = Standard error; MSE = Mean-squared error.

Interaction Strength	Life course interaction model	Relaxed lasso – AIC	Relaxed lasso – BIC	Cross-validated lasso – 1 SE of min. MSE	Cross-validated lasso – min. MSE
None	Critical period at time 3	15.7%	2.3%	0.7%	24.3%
	Accumulation	5.1%	0.9%	0.3%	9.9%
	Change from time 2 to 3	21.2%	2.7%	0.2%	33.2%
Very small	Critical period at time 3	25.1%	5.0%	0.0%	32.1%
	Accumulation	5.9%	0.5%	0.0%	14.9%
	Change from time 2 to 3	26.3%	6.8%	0.0%	29.4%
Small	Critical period at time 3	54.5%	27.6%	0.3%	60.5%
	Accumulation	19.2%	7.1%	0.0%	34.7%
	Change from time 2 to 3	46.8%	22.6%	0.3%	46.1%
Moderate	Critical period at time 3	85.3%	65.0%	28.6%	89.4%
	Accumulation	47.6%	30.9%	9.5%	62.7%
	Change from time 2 to 3	73.3%	50.4%	15.5%	70.3%
Large	Critical period at time 3	96.1%	84.8%	61.4%	98.2%
	Accumulation	65.2%	49.3%	35.6%	74.9%
	Change from time 2 to 3	86.1%	66.1%	34.6%	82.4%
Very large	Critical period at time 3	98.8%	93.5%	80.3%	99.4%
	Accumulation	74.1%	63.4%	47.8%	79.9%
	Change from time 2 to 3	92.2%	80.4%	48.9%	88.9%

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313 *Table 4: Summary of simulation results for each SLMCA method and each life course interaction*
 314 *models, under the ‘moderate interaction’ scenario, with results separated by each of the simulation*
 315 *parameters varied (n simulations = 32; n iterations per simulation = 1,000). Results show the percent*
 316 *of simulations in which the correct interaction term was selected (as there were 32 simulations, each*
 317 *row here contains the average over 16 simulations). For full details on the simulation parameters,*
 318 *see section S2 of the supplementary information. SE = Standard error; MSE = Mean-squared error.*

Simulation parameter	Life course interaction model	Relaxed lasso – AIC	Relaxed lasso – BIC	Cross-validated lasso – 1 SE of min. MSE	Cross-validated lasso – min. MSE
<i>Sample size</i>					
1,000	Critical period at time 3	72.0%	33.8%	2.5%	78.8%
	Accumulation	20.9%	4.6%	0.2%	36.6%
	Change from time 2 to 3	56.8%	28.0%	2.5%	53.6%
10,000	Critical period at time 3	98.6%	96.2%	54.7%	100.0%
	Accumulation	74.3%	57.1%	18.8%	88.7%
	Change from time 2 to 3	89.8%	72.8%	28.5%	87.0%
<i>Exposure</i>					
Binary	Critical period at time 3	86.4%	69.6%	34.7%	89.1%
	Accumulation	56.7%	39.5%	16.8%	66.4%
	Change from time 2 to 3	61.5%	35.2%	10.3%	56.3%
Continuous	Critical period at time 3	84.3%	60.4%	22.4%	89.7%
	Accumulation	38.4%	22.3%	2.2%	58.9%
	Change from time 2 to 3	85.0%	65.6%	20.7%	84.4%
<i>Collinearity of exposures</i>					
Low	Critical period at time 3	90.4%	69.5%	30.0%	90.9%
	Accumulation	60.5%	42.4%	6.6%	69.4%
	Change from time 2 to 3	91.0%	75.7%	30.9%	89.8%
High	Critical period at time 3	80.2%	60.5%	27.1%	87.9%
	Accumulation	34.7%	19.4%	12.4%	55.9%
	Change from time 2 to 3	55.6%	25.2%	0.1%	50.9%
<i>Encoded variables centered</i>					
No	Critical period at time 3	87.1%	65.6%	27.6%	89.0%
	Accumulation	38.8%	24.1%	7.7%	57.3%
	Change from time 2 to 3	74.1%	50.8%	15.4%	70.8%
Yes	Critical period at time 3	83.5%	64.4%	29.6%	89.8%
	Accumulation	56.3%	37.7%	11.3%	68.1%
	Change from time 2 to 3	72.4%	50.0%	15.6%	69.8%
<i>Outcome</i>					
Continuous	Critical period at time 3	92.6%	77.1%	42.7%	97.5%
	Accumulation	56.2%	38.6%	17.1%	73.5%
	Change from time 2 to 3	82.4%	59.9%	24.7%	79.8%
Binary	Critical period at time 3	78.0%	52.9%	14.4%	81.2%
	Accumulation	38.9%	23.2%	2.0%	51.8%
	Change from time 2 to 3	64.2%	41.0%	6.4%	60.9%

319 **Applied example in a UK birth cohort**

320 We used data from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) as an illustrative
321 example of how to apply the SLCMA methods detailed above. Our substantive research question
322 concerns the impact of access to green space, and its potential interaction with SEP, on later child
323 BMI (both continuous and a binary of measure of obesity) and blood pressure. We used ‘access to
324 green space’ as our exposure, measured during pregnancy, age 4 and age 7 (this was a binary
325 variable indicating whether there was a green space >5,000 m² within 300 meters of their home).
326 Our outcomes were BMI, overweight/obese, systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood
327 pressure (DBP) measured at age 7. We used parental education as our binary SEP interaction term
328 (coded as ‘O-level or lower’ [lower SEP] vs ‘A-level or higher’ [higher SEP]). Maternal ethnicity, the
329 sex of the child, and the age of child at the time of outcome measurement were included as
330 confounders/covariates (see figure S2 for our hypothesised Directed Acyclic Graph displaying the
331 assumed causal relations between variables). As all exposures were binary, hypotheses were
332 encoded as described in table 2. Additional details of the study population, variable selection and
333 analysis methods can be found in section S3 of the supplementary information.


334 At each of the time points approximately 75% of children had access to a green space (table S4),
335 while variation in this exposure over time was relatively low, with 70% of children having access to a
336 green space at all three time points and 17% having no access at all time points (table S5 and figure
337 S3). Correlations between access to green space for adjacent time-points were high ($r = 0.76$
338 between pregnancy and age 4; $r = 0.86$ between age 4 and age 7). Descriptive statistics for the BMI,
339 obesity and blood pressure outcomes, SEP confounders/interaction variables and the other
340 confounders/covariates can be found in table S6.

341 We first present results where BMI was the outcome. Visual inspection indicated that inclusion of
342 the first variables in the model – an interaction between SEP and critical period at age 4 (‘int2’) and
343 an increase in access to green space between times 2 and 3 (‘green_inc23’) – had little association
344 with the outcome as there was minimal improvement in model fit (figure 2). This was confirmed by
345 both other methods, with the relaxed lasso (AIC and BIC) and cross-validated lasso (minimum MSE
346 and 1SE of MSE), selecting the covariate-only model as the best fit to the data (table S7). Given the
347 rather limited variation in this green space exposure over time, we also explored whether using just
348 two time-points (pregnancy and age 7) would give different results; results were qualitatively similar
349 (figure S4), suggesting that results from the models using all three time-points are robust.

350 Similar results were found for the other three outcomes (table S7). For the binary outcome
351 overweight/obese, all SLMCA methods indicated no association between any of the encoded
352 variables and the outcome (figure S5). SBP was a more complex case, as visual inspection indicated
353 at best a marginal increase in model fit as more encoded variables were added (figure S6), the
354 relaxed BIC and the 1 SE cross-validated lassos suggested no association between any of the
355 encoded variables and the outcome, while the relaxed AIC and minimum MSE cross-validated lassos
356 both selected more complex models with 5 and 11 encoded variables, respectively (table S7). Results
357 of the best-fitting relaxed AIC lasso are discussed in detail in table S8, finding that a decrease in
358 access to green space between pregnancy and age 4, and its interaction with SEP, was associated
359 with SBP, with children from lower SEP backgrounds who had a reduction in green space having
360 lower SBP than everyone else. Results for DBP were similar, with some inconsistency again found
361 between the different methods. Visual inspection hinted at a weak association between a decrease
362 in access to green space between pregnancy and age 4 and DBP (figure S7), relaxed BIC and the 1 SE
363 cross-validated lassos indicated no association between any of the encoded variables and the

364 outcome, while the relaxed AIC and minimum MSE cross-validated lassos both selected a decrease in
365 green space between pregnancy and age 4 in their respective best-fitting models (with this decrease
366 in green space associated with lower DBP; table S7).

367



368

369 *Figure 2:* Plot of the lasso model with binary access to green space >5,000m within 300m of home in pregnancy (time 1), at age 4 (time 2) and at age 7 (time
 370 3) as the exposures, BMI at age 7 as the continuous outcome, and highest parental education as the SEP-interaction term ($n = 6,013$). As the variables are
 371 added to/removed from the model they appear on the x-axis (with “(+)” indicating addition, and “(-)” indicating removal). The covariates/confounders
 372 constrained to be included in all models by default do not appear in this plot (SEP, maternal ethnicity, child sex and child age at outcome measurement).
 373 There appears to be little association between any of the green space hypotheses and the outcome, with model fit (deviance ratio) barely increasing as
 374 variables enter the model. Due to collinearity with the critical period variables, the ‘accumulation’ hypothesis (and hence also its interaction with SEP) was
 375 dropped from this model. See figure 1 for a detailed explanation of how to interpret this plot, and table 2 for information on what each of the encoded
 376 variables mean.

377 Discussion

378 We have demonstrated how to incorporate multiple exposures and their interaction within a SLCMA,
379 and illustrated three methods of interpreting these results (visual inspection, relaxed lasso via
380 information criteria, and cross-validation). In our simulation study, we observed substantial variation
381 between these different methods in their ability to select the true interaction term. Despite greater
382 ability to detect the interaction term, the relaxed AIC and minimum MSE cross-validation suffered
383 from overfitting and produced numerous false positives, even when the true interaction was null. In
384 contrast, the relaxed BIC and 1 SE cross-validation methods generated few false positives, but
385 frequently did not detect the true interaction term, even when the interaction effect was large (this
386 was especially true for 1 SE cross-validation). The choice of approach may therefore depend on the
387 researcher's assessment of the risks of under- vs over-fitting and the specific research question;
388 exploratory studies may prefer false positives over false negatives (i.e., over-fitting; and hence use
389 either the relaxed AIC or minimum MSE cross-validated methods), while confirmatory studies may
390 prefer to be more stringent and have greater evidence for an association (i.e., under-fitting; and
391 hence use either relaxed BIC or 1 SE cross-validated methods). Despite these inconsistencies, if
392 different methods give similar results this bolsters confidence in our conclusions. If these methods
393 provide divergent results, then it may not be possible to provide a definitive answer and this
394 ambiguity should be discussed. Nonetheless, as all these methods use the same lasso procedure, the
395 order in which variables are added to the models will be equivalent, so it should be possible to
396 identify the most likely hypotheses which have the strongest association with the outcome (if any).

397 We also observed considerable variation in the performance of these models to detect the true
398 interaction term given different parameter combinations. Larger sample sizes, centering exposures,
399 and using continuous outcomes may improve the power to detect a true interaction. Models were
400 also more likely to detect an interaction term if collinearity between exposures is lower, and if the
401 interaction effect is larger. These findings may help inform future studies using this methodology,
402 although some of these factors are beyond the researchers' ability to control.

403 In our applied example, we found no consistent association between access to green space and child
404 BMI, obesity, SBP or DBP, let alone specific life course trajectories or interactions with SEP. Although
405 some associations between a reduction in access to green space between pregnancy and age 4 and
406 lower blood pressure were reported (tables S5 and S6), these effects were inconsistent, had small
407 effect sizes, and would appear biological implausible (e.g., a reduction in access to green space being
408 associated with lower blood pressure); it is possible that these were a result largely of random noise,
409 especially given how the methods which selected these more complex models – relaxed AIC and
410 minimum MSE cross-validation – are more prone to over-fitting. To the extent that these findings
411 are causal, this suggests that, in this and potentially similar populations at least, access to green
412 space may not improve child BMI or blood pressure.

413 The applied aspect of this study has several limitations. First, there was lack of variation in exposures
414 over time, which might be expected given that exposures were all based on the child's home address
415 at three close ages (pregnancy, then when aged 4 and 7 years). Nonetheless, if any association
416 between green space and BMI or blood pressure was present, it should have been visible, even if
417 there was not enough power to detect specific life course trajectories or interactions with SEP. While
418 high collinearity between exposures lowers power to detect a true effect, here we have shown that
419 these methods can be applied even in this challenging scenario; in situations where there is more
420 variation in exposures over time these methods should have even greater ability to uncover the
421 correct life course trajectory. Second, the results from our illustrative example could be biased by

422 measurement error and selection bias and may be explained by residual confounding (Hernán &
423 Robins 2020); such biases need to be considered in any SLCMA studies (Smith *et al.* 2016).

424 Throughout this paper we have focused on using a standard lasso for SLMCA, rather than the more
425 commonly-used LARS (Smith *et al.* 2015, 2016, 2022). While both approaches are similar, being
426 based on the lasso, the standard lasso approach may have some benefits, especially when
427 considering interactions, including: i) being easier to implement when constraining some covariates
428 to be in the model by default; ii) permitting binary (and other non-continuous) outcomes; and iii)
429 greater flexibility when reporting the results of the best-fitting model (e.g., being able to include
430 main effects of interactions in the reported model, even if not selected in the best-fitting model).
431 Regardless of the SLCMA approach used – lasso or LARS – it is important to check parameter
432 estimates from the final via selective inference to ensure that all encoded variables are associated
433 with the outcome, given the possibility of variables with little-to-no association with the outcome
434 remaining in the final model. For instance, the best-fitting relaxed lasso model via AIC from the
435 applied ALSPAC example with systolic blood pressure as the outcome selected five encoded
436 variables (table S7), yet in the reported model only two were associated with the outcome (table
437 S8).

438 To improve population health, we need to understand life course trajectories of diseases, and
439 structured life course models are a useful tool for investigating this. We have demonstrated how
440 these structured life course methods can be extended to include interactions between multiple
441 exposures, which should permit a more detailed exploration of how exposures over the life course
442 impact subsequent health. We hope that this paper provides useful guidance for researchers using
443 these methods.

444 **Ethical Approval**

445 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the
446 Local Research Ethics Committees. Informed consent for the use of data collected via questionnaires
447 and clinics was obtained from participants following the recommendations of the ALSPAC Ethics and
448 Law Committee at the time.

449

450 **Author Contributions**

451 DM-S drafted the initial manuscript and conducted analyses. TD and AE curated and prepared the
452 LifeCycle data for analysis. DM-S, ADACS, DAL and KT contributed to the design of the study. All
453 authors critically reviewed and revised the manuscript.

454

455 **Acknowledgements**

456 We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help
457 in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and
458 laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and
459 nurses. This work was carried out using the computational facilities of the Advanced Computing
460 Research Centre, University of Bristol - <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/acrc/>.

461

462 **Funding**

463 The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (Grant ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of
464 Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. A comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the
465 ALSPAC website ([http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-
466 acknowledgements.pdf](http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf)). This work was also supported by the University of Bristol and Medical
467 Research Council (MRC) Integrative Epidemiology Unit (MC_UU_00011/1, MC_UU_00011/3,
468 MC_UU_00011/6, supporting DM-S, DAL and KT), the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and
469 innovation programme under grant agreements No 733206 (LifeCycle; supporting DM-S, DAL, AE,
470 and KT) and No 874739 (LongITools; supporting AE), ERC-advanced grant No 101021566 (supporting
471 DAL and AE) the US National Institutes of Health grant No R01MH113930-01 (supporting ADACS),
472 and the John Templeton Foundation grant ID 61917 (supporting DM-S). This publication is the work
473 of the authors and the views expressed here are those of the authors and not necessarily those of
474 any of the funders listed above. None of the funders influenced the study design, analyses or
475 interpretation of results. Daniel Major-Smith will serve as guarantor for the contents of this paper.

476

477 **Conflicts of Interest**

478 KT has acted as a consultant for the CHDI foundation. DAL acknowledges support from Roche
479 diagnostics and Medtronic Ltd for research unrelated to that presented here. All other authors
480 declare they have no conflict of interest, financial or otherwise.

481

482 **Data Availability**

483 ALSPAC data access is through a system of managed open access. Information about access to
484 ALSPAC data is given on the ALSPAC website (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/access/>).
485 The datasets presented in this article are linked to ALSPAC project number B3930, please quote this
486 project number during your application. Simulation and analysis code is openly-available here:
487 https://github.com/djsmith-90/LifeCycle_GreenSpace_CardioOutcomes.

488

489

490 References

- 491 Abbasi, B., Pourmirzaei, M., Hariri, S., Heshmat, R., Qorbani, M., Dadvand, P., *et al.* (2020). Subjective
492 Proximity to Green Spaces and Blood Pressure in Children and Adolescents: The CASPIAN-V
493 Study. *J. Environ. Public Health*, 2020.
- 494 Afshartous, D. & Preston, R.A. (2011). Key results of interaction models with centering. *J. Stat. Educ.*,
495 19.
- 496 Altman, D.G. & Royston, P. (2006). The cost of dichotomising continuous variables. *Br. Med. J.*, 332,
497 1080.
- 498 Bell, J.F., Wilson, J.S. & Liu, G.C. (2008). Neighborhood Greenness and 2-Year Changes in Body Mass
499 Index of Children and Youth. *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, 35, 547–553.
- 500 Ben-Shlomo, Y. & Kuh, D. (2002). What is a Life Course Approach to Chronic Disease Epidemiology?
501 Conceptual Models in Life Course Epidemiology. *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, 31, 285–293.
- 502 Benjamin-Neelon, S.E., Platt, A., Bacardi-Gascon, M., Armstrong, S., Neelon, B. & Jimenez-Cruz, A.
503 (2019). Greenspace, physical activity, and BMI in children from two cities in northern Mexico.
504 *Prev. Med. Reports*, 14, 100870.
- 505 Berenson, G., Srinivasan, S., Bao, W., Newman III, W., Tracy, R. & Wattigney, W. (1998). Association
506 between multiple cardiovascular risk factors and atherosclerosis in children and young adults.
507 *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 338, 1650–1656.
- 508 Blake, K.R. & Gangestad, S. (2020). On Attenuated Interactions, Measurement Error, and Statistical
509 Power: Guidelines for Social and Personality Psychologists. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, 46,
510 1702–1711.
- 511 Bloemsmas, L.D., Gehring, U., Klompaker, J.O., Hoek, G., Janssen, N.A.H., Lebret, E., *et al.* (2019).
512 Green space, air pollution, traffic noise and cardiometabolic health in adolescents: The PIAMA
513 birth cohort. *Environ. Int.*, 131, 104991.
- 514 Brookes, S.T., Whitely, E., Egger, M., Smith, G.D., Mulheran, P.A. & Peters, T.J. (2004). Subgroup
515 analyses in randomized trials: Risks of subgroup-specific analyses; power and sample size for
516 the interaction test. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.*, 57, 229–236.
- 517 Cadman, T., Elhakeem, A., Vinther, J.L., Avraam, D., Espi, P.C., Calas, L., *et al.* (2022). Associations of
518 maternal education, area deprivation, proximity to greenspace during pregnancy and
519 gestational diabetes with Body Mass Index from early childhood to early adulthood: A proof-of-
520 concept federated analysis in seventeen birth cohorts. *medRxiv*.
- 521 Chen, X. & Wang, Y. (2008). Tracking of blood pressure from childhood to adulthood: A systematic
522 review and meta-regression analysis. *Circulation*, 117, 3171–3180.
- 523 Dzhambov, A.M., Lercher, P., Markevych, I., Browning, M.H.E.M. & Rüdiger, J. (2022). Natural and
524 built environments and blood pressure of Alpine schoolchildren. *Environ. Res.*, 204, 111925.
- 525 Efron, B., Hastie, T., Johnstone, I. & Tibshirani, R. (2004). Least angle regression. *Ann. Stat.*, 32, 407–
526 499.
- 527 Friedman, J., Hastie, T. & Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via
528 Coordinate Descent. *J. Stat. Softw.*, 33, 1–22.
- 529 Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. & Tibshirani, R. (2020). Best Subset, Forward Stepwise or Lasso? Analysis and
530 Recommendations Based on Extensive Comparisons. *Stat. Sci.*, 35, 579–592.

- 531 Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. & Wainwright, M. (2015). *Statistical Learning with Sparsity: The Lasso and*
532 *Generalizations*. CRC Press.
- 533 Hernán, M.A. & Robins, J. (2020). *Causal Inference: What If*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton.
- 534 Howe, L.D., Smith, A.D., Macdonald-Wallis, C., Anderson, E.L., Galobardes, B., Lawlor, D.A., *et al.*
535 (2016). Relationship between mediation analysis and the structured life course approach. *Int. J.*
536 *Epidemiol.*, 45, 1280–1294.
- 537 Iacobucci, D., Schneider, M.J., Popovich, D.L. & Bakamitsos, G.A. (2016). Mean centering helps
538 alleviate “micro” but not “macro” multicollinearity. *Behav. Res. Methods*, 48, 1308–1317.
- 539 James, P., Banay, R.F., Hart, J.E. & Laden, F. (2015). A Review of the Health Benefits of Greenness.
540 *Curr. Epidemiol. Reports*, 2, 131–142.
- 541 Jia, P., Cao, X., Yang, H., Dai, S., He, P., Huang, G., *et al.* (2021). Green space access in the
542 neighbourhood and childhood obesity. *Obes. Rev.*, 22.
- 543 Kuh, D., Ben-Shlomo, Y., Lynch, J., Hallqvist, J. & Power, C. (2003). Life course epidemiology. *J.*
544 *Epidemiol. Community Health*, 57, 778–783.
- 545 Kuha, J. (2004). AIC and BIC: Comparisons of assumptions and performance. *Sociol. Methods Res.*,
546 33, 188–229.
- 547 Lockhart, R., Taylor, J., Tibshirani, R.J. & Tibshirani, R. (2014). A significance test for the lasso. *Ann.*
548 *Stat.*, 42, 413–468.
- 549 Lovasi, G.S., Schwartz-Soicher, O., Quinn, J.W., Berger, D.K., Neckerman, K.M., Jaslow, R., *et al.*
550 (2013). Neighborhood safety and green space as predictors of obesity among preschool
551 children from low-income families in New York City. *Prev. Med. (Baltim.)*, 57, 189–193.
- 552 Luo, Y.N., Huang, W.Z., Liu, X.X., Markevych, I., Bloom, M.S., Zhao, T., *et al.* (2020). Greenspace with
553 overweight and obesity: A systematic review and meta-analysis of epidemiological studies up
554 to 2020. *Obes. Rev.*, 21, 1–28.
- 555 Luo, Y.N., Yang, B.Y., Zou, Z., Markevych, I., Browning, M.H.E.M., Heinrich, J., *et al.* (2022).
556 Associations of greenness surrounding schools with blood pressure and hypertension: A
557 nationwide cross-sectional study of 61,229 children and adolescents in China. *Environ. Res.*,
558 204, 112004.
- 559 Madathil, S., Joseph, L., Hardy, R., Rousseau, M.C. & Nicolau, B. (2018). A Bayesian approach to
560 investigate life course hypotheses involving continuous exposures. *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, 47, 1623–
561 1635.
- 562 Markevych, I., Thiering, E., Fuertes, E., Sugiri, D., Berdel, D., Koletzko, S., *et al.* (2014). A cross-
563 sectional analysis of the effects of residential greenness on blood pressure in 10-year old
564 children: Results from the GINIplus and LISAPLUS studies. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 1–11.
- 565 Mishra, G., Nitsch, D., Black, S., De Stavola, B., Kuh, D. & Hardy, R. (2009). A structured approach to
566 modelling the effects of binary exposure variables over the life course. *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, 38,
567 528–537.
- 568 Morris, T.P., White, I.R. & Crowther, M.J. (2019). Using simulation studies to evaluate statistical
569 methods. *Stat. Med.*, 38, 2074–2102.
- 570 Picavet, H.S.J., Milder, I., Kruize, H., de Vries, S., Hermans, T. & Wendel-Vos, W. (2016). Greener
571 living environment healthier people? Exploring green space, physical activity and health in the
572 Doetinchem Cohort Study. *Prev. Med. (Baltim.)*, 89, 7–14.

- 573 Schalkwijk, A.A.H., Van Der Zwaard, B.C., Nijpels, G., Elders, P.J.M. & Platt, L. (2018). The impact of
574 greenspace and condition of the neighbourhood on child overweight. *Eur. J. Public Health*, 28,
575 88–94.
- 576 Singh, A.S., Mulder, C., Twisk, J.W.R., Van Mechelen, W. & Chinapaw, M.J.M. (2008). Tracking of
577 childhood overweight into adulthood: A systematic review of the literature. *Obes. Rev.*, 9, 474–
578 488.
- 579 Smith, A.D.A.C., Hardy, R., Heron, J., Joinson, C.J., Lawlor, D.A., Macdonald-Wallis, C., *et al.* (2016). A
580 structured approach to hypotheses involving continuous exposures over the life course. *Int. J.*
581 *Epidemiol.*, 45, 1271–1279.
- 582 Smith, A.D.A.C., Heron, J., Mishra, G., Gilthorpe, M.S., Ben-Shlomo, Y. & Tilling, K. (2015). Model
583 Selection of the Effect of Binary Exposures over the Life Course. *Epidemiology*, 26, 719–726.
- 584 Smith, B.J., Smith, A.D.A.C. & Dunn, E.C. (2022). Statistical Modeling of Sensitive Period Effects Using
585 the Structured Life Course Modeling Approach (SLCMA). In: *Sensitive Periods of Brain*
586 *Development and Preventive Interventions* (ed. Andersen, S.L.). Springer, Cham, pp. 215–234.
- 587 Tibshirani, R.J., Taylor, J., Lockhart, R. & Tibshirani, R. (2016). Exact Post-Selection Inference for
588 Sequential Regression Procedures. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 111, 600–620.
- 589 Warembourg, C., Nieuwenhuijsen, M., Ballester, F., de Castro, M., Chatzi, L., Esplugues, A., *et al.*
590 (2021). Urban environment during early-life and blood pressure in young children. *Environ. Int.*,
591 146.
- 592 Wolch, J., Jerrett, M., Reynolds, K., McConnell, R., Chang, R., Dahmann, N., *et al.* (2011). Childhood
593 obesity and proximity to urban parks and recreational resources: A longitudinal cohort study.
594 *Heal. Place*, 17, 207–214.
- 595 World Health Organization. (2016). *Report of the commission on ending childhood obesity*.
- 596 Xiao, X., Yang, B.Y., Hu, L.W., Markevych, I., Bloom, M.S., Dharmage, S.C., *et al.* (2020). Greenness
597 around schools associated with lower risk of hypertension among children: Findings from the
598 Seven Northeastern Cities Study in China. *Environ. Pollut.*, 256, 113422.
- 599 Zhu, Y., Simpkin, A.J., Suderman, M.J., Lussier, A.A., Walton, E., Dunn, E.C., *et al.* (2021). A Structured
600 Approach to Evaluating Life-Course Hypotheses: Moving Beyond Analyses of Exposed Versus
601 Unexposed in the -Omics Context. *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, 190, 1101–1112.
- 602