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Abstract

Objective: to investigate possible associations between daily counts of school-age asthma-medical contacts (and controls) and daily measures of pollution in Scotland. Study design: retrospective case-control study. Methods: daily counts and daily measures were obtained from 01/01/1999 to 31/12/2004. Autoregressive models using a Poisson distribution were undertaken on three groups: cases (school age-asthmatics), controls (cases and controls were matched by age, gender, primary care practice) and on the excess of daily counts for cases over controls. Twenty-one pollutant measures were investigated. These included minimum, mean and maximum daily measures of NO, NO\textsubscript{2}, NOD, PM\textsubscript{10}, O\textsubscript{3}, CO, SO\textsubscript{2}. Exposures were delayed by seven days to investigate any lagged effects with daily counts. Covariates include day of the week, bank holiday and season. The effects of each pollutant exposure were investigated using an F-test. Results: five pollutant exposures were associated with the daily counts for cases; six exposures were associated with daily counts for controls and eight exposures were associated with the daily excess of cases over controls. NO\textsubscript{2} Mean was the most statistically significant exposure for cases and the excess whilst SO\textsubscript{2} Maximum was the most statistically significant exposure for controls. Estimates were most significant after a delay (from exposure) of five (cases), four (controls) and current (excess) day(s) (lagged effect).
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1 Introduction

The prevalence of asthma (a chronic condition that affects the airways [1]) has increased substantially over the past five decades (1955–2004) [2]. The
observed increase in the asthma prevalence is not solely the result of improved diagnosis [3] or due to any change in the genetic susceptibility [4]. It is most likely to be the consequence of the apparent changes in lifestyle and environmental quality [5].

A large number of studies have investigated the association between pollutant exposures and childhood asthma resulting in medical contact [6–31]. The studies offer substantial evidence in support of an association between pollutant exposures (for example, Nitrogen Dioxide, Sulphur Dioxide, Ozone, Particulate Matter and Carbon Monoxide) in relation to childhood asthma resulting in medical contact. A number of the studies also report delayed associations from exposure to the event of medical contact [7, 8, 19].

From a UK perspective, a weakness from literature includes the fact that few studies were set within the UK - as pollutant measures vary vastly according to different settings, it is difficult to apply findings from research set in different locations. Another limitation of the literature is that the majority of the studies analyse hospital data which tend to capture the most severe cases of asthma. One additional constraint is that a number of studies suggest that there are a number of (indirect) effects from school return on childhood asthma [32–34] yet few studies solely use school-age children as their sample of interest. Therefore we aim using data at general practice (primary care) level to investigate possible associations between daily counts of school-age asthma-medical contacts (and controls) and daily measures of pollution in Scotland. We shall also investigate any delayed effect from exposure to pollutant measures on daily counts of medical contact.

2 Methods

2.1 Data

2.1.1 Clinical data
Data were sourced from the General Practice Research Database (GPRD). Ethics approval to use the data was obtained via the GPRD. The sample consisted age, gender and practice matched cases and controls. The sample included children aged five to sixteen years of age. Cases were defined as patients with a medical diagnosis of asthma. Controls were selected with no medical record of asthma. We also investigated the excess (difference between cases and controls) as a third group in our investigation.

Daily counts were captured from the 01/01/1999 to 31/12/2004. The 29th of February from any leap year was omitted from analysis. Also, Christmas Day and New Year’s Day were omitted from the analysis as daily counts on these days were extremely low thus may biased results. Three additional outlying (residuals < 4 or > -4) dates were also omitted from the analysis (after investigation it seemed on these dates there was retrospective data entry). These dates were 04/02/2002; 27/11/2002 and 26/09/2003.

Daily counts comprised of a number of medical contacts: Acute Visits - house calls made by the General Practitioner (GP); Casualty Contacts – attendance to
an Accident and Emergency department; Emergency Consultations – Open surgery or emergency appointments by the GP in normal working hours; Out of Hours Contacts – Out of Hours defined from 6.30pm to 8am during weekdays, weekends and bank holidays. These medical contacts are not mutually exclusive. All medical contacts bar Casualty counts were GP related medical contacts. All Counts that encapsulate all groups of medical contact are reported in this investigation.

2.1.2 Environmental data
Data for environmental exposures were obtained from the National Air Archive for the location of Aberdeen, Scotland. Daily minimum (lowest measure on the day), mean and maximum (highest measure on the day) measures were obtained from the 01/01/1999 to 31/12/2004. We obtained measures on the following pollutants: Nitric Oxide (NO), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), Nitrogen Oxides of Dioxide (NOD), Sulphur Dioxide (SO₂), Particulate Matter 10 (PM₁₀), Ozone (O₃) and Carbon Monoxide (CO). NO₂, NO, NOD, O₃ and SO₂ were measured in ugm⁻³, CO was measured in mgm⁻³ and PM₁₀ was measured in ugm⁻³ (GRAV-EV).

2.2 Statistical analysis
Analyses of the data were completed in STATA 11 and Microsoft Excel 2007. We investigated whether environmental exposures have an effect on the number of asthmatic episodes (alternative hypothesis) in comparison to whether environmental exposures had no effect on the number of asthmatic episodes (null hypothesis). Autoregressive models using a log-linear Poisson distribution [35] were implemented. Autocorrelation present with a seven day lag due to a day of the week influence on daily counts. Therefore, we fitted an autoregressive term seven to allow for seventh order autocorrelation.

The null model included day of the week (Monday to Saturday), bank holiday and four sinusoidal terms to account for season. The alternative model included all the covariates used in the null model together with each pollutant variable in turn. Each pollutant variable were analysed separately with its seven lagged terms. We tested the fit of the alternative model (including the environmental variables) against the null model using an F-test of the change in deviance [36].

The P-value for the F-test statistic was calculated using the FDIST function in Excel. Statistical significance of each model was set at 5%.

In addition to investigating the fit of the overall model, using the pollutant point estimates corresponding P-values, we assessed the most significant lag day (need not be statistically significant) and the distribution of the P-values.

3 Results
A total of 8726 age, gender and practiced matched cases and controls were included.

Table 1 illustrates the results from the comparison of the alternative against the null model. For cases, in comparison to the null model, five models including
Table 1: F-test P-values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th></th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th></th>
<th>Excess</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO Minimum</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂ Minimum</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>*0.02</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>*0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOD Minimum</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>*0.03</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>*0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂ Minimum</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>*0.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀ Minimum</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>*0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃ Minimum</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO Minimum</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>*0.04</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO Mean</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂ Mean</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>**0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>**0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOD Mean</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>*0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂ Mean</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>*0.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀ Mean</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>*0.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>*0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃ Mean</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO Mean</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO Maximum</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>*0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂ Maximum</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>*0.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>*0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOD Maximum</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>*0.02</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>*0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂ Maximum</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>**0.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀ Maximum</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃ Maximum</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO Maximum</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Most significant P-value out of 21 triggers
* Statistically significant model

Pollutant variables lagged by seven days was observed to have an improved fit that was statistically significant. For controls, six models and for the excess between cases and controls, eight models were found to have an improved fit to the data that was statistically significant.

Table 1 also indicates the pollutant variables with the smallest P-values. Among all pollutant measures investigated, for cases and the excess of cases over controls, the model including mean measures of NO₂ was that most statistically significant model. For controls, the model including maximum measures of SO₂ was the most statistically significant model.

Figure 1 illustrates frequency distributions of the F-test P-values from all models including pollutant variables. A uniformed distribution with a mean (p) value of 0.5 or higher infers that pollutant triggers have no association on the daily count of medical contacts. A positive distribution infers that pollutant
triggers have a positive association with daily counts of medical contact and negative distributions suggest the opposite. Figure 1 demonstrates positive distributions for all three groups investigated though the severity of the skewness varies. The strongest association from pollutants is observed on the excess between cases and controls (Figure 1c). Figure 1a shows that cases have the weakest positive distribution. In comparison to controls (Figure 1b) that have a stronger positive distribution, it appears that pollutant exposures have a stronger association with the controls group rather than asthmatics.

Figure 1: F-test P-value histograms a. Cases, b. Controls, c. Excess.

To illustrate whether there is a delayed (lagged) effect from environmental exposures, Figure 2 demonstrates the frequency of most significant point estimates among the lag day (0 to 7) per environmental variable. The most significant lag day was lag day five, lag day four and current day for cases, controls and the excess respectively.

Figure 3 illustrates the point estimate P-values histograms. The pollutant point estimate P-values from each group is fairly uniformly distributed. Once more, for cases and the excess, the mean P-value is higher than 0.5 inferring no association from exposure to pollutants and daily counts of medical contact.
Figure 2: Number of the most significant point-estimates per pollutant variable by lag day a) Cases, b) Controls and c) Excess.

- **a. Cases**: Mean = 5535, Std Dev = 26629, N = 168
- **b. Controls**: Mean = 473, Std Dev = 27885, N = 168
- **c. Excess**: Mean = 5442, Std Dev = 2792, N = 168

Figure 3: Point estimate P-value histograms a. Cases, b. Controls, c. Excess.
4 Discussion

4.1 Summary of results

The overall model P-values suggest that a number of pollutant exposures are linked to daily counts of medical contact. Yet, these results infer a stronger association on controls rather than asthmatics. Results from the point-estimates P-values show that there is a delayed effect from exposure to pollutant measures and daily counts of medical contact in cases and controls but not in the excess. Results are not constant within this investigation; the uniformed distribution of the point-estimates P-values (from the pollutants only) demonstrates no association/effect from pollutant measures on daily counts of medical contact.

4.2 Strengths and weakness of the investigation

We have been able to illustrate the relationship over time between pollutant exposures and daily counts of medical contact using a large sample of age, gender and practiced matched cases and controls. However, a weakness on this investigation is that we applied small area pollutant measures to a large area population outcome. Thus we are assuming that pollutant measures in one area are typical of the whole country which is often not the case. Another weakness that relates to the first limitation is that we have not been able to control for factors that mitigate pollutant exposure such as the role of wind in the dispersion of pollution and pollutant sources. In effect, we have not been able to account for the spatial characteristics of pollution.

5 Conclusion

This study provides evidence to link certain pollutant exposures to the daily number of unscheduled medical contacts made by school-age asthmatics, controls and the excess between cases and controls. Literature illustrates that asthma places a heavy burden on the individual, carers and also places profound demand on health services.

At the moment, due to the weaknesses of this investigation, caution must be applied to the interpretation of these results. We have found some evidence to suggest a link between particular pollutant exposures and daily counts of medical contact in cases, controls and the excess between. However, these results were not constant throughout our investigation. Nevertheless, findings from this research can aid in the construction of preventive strategies to reduce number of asthmatic attacks.
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