

A Causal Exposure Response Function with Local Adjustment for Confounding: A study of the health effects of long-term exposure to low levels of fine particulate matter

Georgia Papadogeorgou^{1*} and Francesca Dominici²

¹Department of Statistical Science, Duke University, Durham NC 27710

²Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston MA 02115

Abstract

In the last two decades, ambient levels of air pollution have declined substantially. Yet, as mandated by the Clean Air Act, we must continue to address the following question: is exposure to levels of air pollution that are well below the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) harmful to human health? Furthermore, the highly contentious nature surrounding environmental regulations necessitates casting this question within a causal inference framework.

Several parametric and semi-parametric regression modeling approaches have been used to estimate the exposure-response (ER) curve relating long-term exposure to air pollution and various health outcomes. However, most of these approaches are not formulated in the context of a potential outcome framework for causal inference, adjust for the same set of potential confounders across all levels of exposure, and do not account for model uncertainty regarding covariate selection and the shape of the ER. In this paper, we introduce a Bayesian framework for the estimation of a causal ER curve called LERCA (Local Exposure Response Confounding Adjustment). LERCA allows for: a) different confounders *and* different strength of confounding at the different exposure levels; and b) model uncertainty regarding confounders' selection and the shape of the ER. Also, LERCA provides a principled way of assessing the observed covariates' confounding importance at different exposure levels, providing environmental researchers with important information regarding the set of variables to measure and adjust for in regression models.

Using simulation studies, we show that state of the art approaches perform poorly in estimating the ER curve in the presence of local confounding. Lastly, LERCA is used on a large data set which includes health, weather, demographic, and pollution information for 5,362 zip codes and for the years of 2011-2013. An R package is available at <https://github.com/gpapadog/LERCA>.

keywords: air pollution, cardiovascular hospitalizations, exposure response function, local confounding, low exposure levels, particulate matter

1 Introduction

The Clean Air Act, one of the most comprehensive and expensive air quality regulations in the world, requires that we routinely address the following question: is exposure to levels of air pollution, even below the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), harmful to human health? As mandated by the Clean Air Act, if the peer reviewed literature reports consistent evidence of air pollution health effects, then the NAAQS must be lowered, even at the cost of hundreds of million of dollars. With the next review of the NAAQS for fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) scheduled to be completed by the end of the year 2020, the determination of whether exposure levels of PM_{2.5} well below the NAAQS is harmful to human health is subject to unprecedented level of scrutiny. More recently, because of the highly contentious nature surrounding air pollution regulations and the lowering of the NAAQS particularly, there is an increasing pressure to cast this question within a causal inference framework [Zigler and Dominici, 2014]. The methods development in this paper is motivated by the need to address this critically important question, by developing an approach that flexibly estimates an exposure response curve while reliably eliminating confounding bias especially *at low levels* of exposure.

*Funding for this work was provided by National Institutes of Health R01 ES024332, USEPA 83587201-0, and Health Effects Institute 4953-RFA14-3/16-4.

The literature on the harmful effects of air pollution is very extensive (see, for example, Dominici et al. [2002], Eftim et al. [2008], Zeger et al. [2008], Zanobetti and Schwartz [2007], Crouse et al. [2015, 2016], Di et al. [2017a,b], Berger et al. [2017], Makar et al. [2018], Lim et al. [2018]). However, significant substantive and methodological gaps remain, especially in the context of estimating health effects at very low levels. Environmental research studying the health effects of exposure to low air pollution levels has either examined the relationship in the subset of the sample with exposure below a pre-specified threshold [Lee et al., 2016, Shi et al., 2016, Di et al., 2017a,b, Schwartz et al., 2017, Makar et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2018, Schwartz et al., 2018], or has employed regression approaches for ER estimation across the observed exposure range [Daniels et al., 2000, Dominici et al., 2002, Schwartz et al., 2002, Bell et al., 2006, Hart et al., 2015, Thurston et al., 2016, Jerrett et al., 2017, Weichenthal et al., 2017, Lim et al., 2018]. In either case, confounding adjustment in air pollution studies is most-often performed using either a pre-specified set of covariates, or a set of covariates which is decided upon using an ad-hoc variable selection procedure. Such procedure is often based on the statistical significance of covariates’ coefficients in an outcome regression, or the change in the exposure’s coefficient in an outcome model including and excluding sets of covariates [Devries et al., 2016, Pinaut et al., 2016, Garcia et al., 2016, Weichenthal et al., 2017].

Generally, regression and semi-parametric modeling approaches for ER estimation such as generalized linear models or generalized additive models [Hastie and Tibshirani, 1986, Daniels et al., 2004, Shaddick et al., 2008, Shi et al., 2016, Dominici et al., 2002] make the following assumptions: 1) the set of potential confounders that are included into the regression model among a potentially large set of available covariates is specified a priori; 2) uncertainty arising from the variable selection techniques is not accounted for; 3) the same potential confounders with constant confounding strength are considered when estimating the health effects across all exposure levels (we refer to this as *global confounding adjustment*); and 4) the shape of the ER function is modelled as a spline, a polynomial, or linear with a threshold.

Even though ER estimation in air pollution research has mostly remained outside the potential outcome framework, there has been substantial work in ER estimation within the causal inference literature. Hirano and Imbens [2004] introduced the generalized propensity score (GPS) in order to adjust for confounding when estimating the effects of a continuous exposure. Flores et al. [2012] estimated a causal ER function employing a weighted locally linear regression with weights defined based on the GPS. Recently, Kennedy et al. [2017] introduced a doubly robust approach for estimating the causal ER function using flexible machine learning tools.

These approaches are very promising and manifest the growing interest in principled causal inference methods for continuous exposures. However, none of the existing approaches explicitly accommodates that in ER estimation, and in contrast to binary treatments, confounding *might differ across levels of the exposure*. In fact, even though some of the approaches could be altered to allow for different set of confounders or different confounding strength across exposure levels, current implementations of causal methodology for ER estimation has assumed global confounding of pre-selected covariates. Furthermore, it is unclear how these approaches perform in the case of confounding that varies across exposure levels. To address this, confounding adjustment and confounder selection need to be meaningfully extended in the case of a continuous exposure to provide useful scientific guidance with regard to covariates’ confounding importance *at different exposure levels*.

In our exploratory analyses (§2), we report that the relationship between exposure to PM_{2.5} and the rate of hospitalization for cardiovascular diseases might be confounded by a *different set of covariates* at the low exposure levels versus at the high exposure levels, or by covariates with *different confounding strength*. We refer to this phenomenon as *local confounding*. We argue that –especially in the context of estimating causal effects at low levels of exposure– local confounding adjustment is deemed necessary.

To target local confounding, if exposure levels with different confounding were known, one could adopt a separate model at each level and adjust for *all* measured variables using one of the approaches described above. However, even if the number of covariates and local sample size rendered such approach computationally feasible, including unnecessary confounders in the regression model could lead to inefficient estimation of causal effects, especially at very low levels of exposure where data are sparse. Data driven methods to select the minimum necessary set of covariates to be included into an outcome model for estimation of causal effects of binary treatments have been proposed [Luna et al., 2011, Wang et al., 2012, Wilson and Reich, 2014], but to our knowledge, they have not been extended in the context of ER estimation with local confounding adjustment.

The goal of this paper is to overcome the challenges described above by introducing a Bayesian framework for the estimation of a causal ER curve called LERCA (Local Exposure Response Confounding Adjustment). We cast our approach within a causal inference framework by introducing the concept of *experiment configuration* $\bar{s} = (s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{K+1})$, where $[s_{k-1}, s_k)$ denotes a specific range of exposure values. We use the term *experiment* to mimic the hypothetical assignment of a unit to exposure value within $[s_{k-1}, s_k)$. Within each experiment, i.e. *locally* in the exposure range $[s_{k-1}, s_k)$, we assume that: 1) the ER is linear; 2) the potential confounders of the

ER relationship are unknown but observed; and 3) the strength of the local confounding is also unknown. Across experiments, we require that the ER is continuous at the points \bar{s} . Importantly, the *experiment configuration* \bar{s} is itself unknown and it will be estimated from the data.

Our work contributes to various components in the literature. First, we contribute to the estimation of causal effects of continuous treatments by extending our understanding of confounding in these settings. Second, our work has connections to the literature on Bayesian free-knot splines [Denison et al., 1998, Dimatteo et al., 2001]. Here, the location of the knots (in our case, the experiment configuration) is informed by both the ER fit, and the necessity for local confounding adjustment. Lastly, our work contributes to the highly controversial and politically charged issue of estimating the causal effects of exposure to low levels of air pollution on public health.

Even though our motivation and focus is the effects of air pollution, the statistical challenges related to ER estimation at low exposure levels are common across many fields, such as toxicology [Scholze et al., 2001], and clinical trials [Babb et al., 1998]. In fact, the methodology presented in this paper can be used to evaluate regulatory settings of potential harmful substances, and can be routinely used to assess health effects of low level exposures. Such applications include the effects of lead [Chiodo et al., 2004, Jusko et al., 2008], environmental contaminants [Van Der Oost et al., 2003], radiation [National Research Council, 2006, Fazel et al., 2009], and pesticides [Mackenzie Ross et al., 2010, Androutopoulos et al., 2012].

In §2 we introduce our motivating data set and we illustrate the potential threat of local confounding in our study. In §3, we introduce the notation and assumptions, on which LERCA in §4 is based. In §5 we show through simulations that both off-the-shelf and state of the art approaches for ER estimation perform poorly when local confounding is present, and we compare LERCA to alternatives in the presence of global confounding. Finally, in §6, we use LERCA to estimate the causal ER function of long term exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ on log cardiovascular hospitalization rates in the Medicare population of 5,362 zip codes. Limitations and potential extensions are discussed in §7.

2 Data description and illustration of local confounding

In this section we illustrate that, for the study of the health effects of $PM_{2.5}$, there might exist a different set of confounders at the low and the high exposure levels, or that confounders might have different confounding strength depending on the exposure level. Our methods development is motivated to overcome this particular challenge.

We start by briefly describing our data set which is a collection of linked data from many sources. The unit of the observation is the zip code i , with sample size $N = 5,362$. For each zip code, we calculate: 1) the outcome Y_i defined as log hospitalization rate for cardiovascular diseases (codes ICD-9 390 to 459) among Medicare beneficiaries residing in zip code i in the year 2013; and 2) the exposure X_i defined as the average of daily levels of $PM_{2.5}$ for the years 2011 and 2012 recorded by EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) monitors within a 6 mile radius of zip code i 's centroid. The values of X_i range from 2.7 to $18.3\mu g/m^3$ (see Figure 1). We also acquired information on several potential confounders, denoted by C_{ij} for $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and $p = 27$, capturing socio-economic, demographic, climate, and risk factor information for zip code i . Appendix A includes information regarding zip codes' descriptive statistics (including data source), and a detailed description of data linkage (EPA monitors, Medicare, others).




Figure 1: Average levels of $PM_{2.5}$ for the years 2011-2012 for each zip code i included into the analysis.

In the case of binary treatments, the presence of confounding variables is partially evaluated by checking covariate balance between the treated and control groups. For continuous exposures, there is no direct counterpart to covariate balance, and exploratory analysis for the presence of confounding is often based on regressing each covariate on the exposure, separately [Imai and Van Dyk, 2004]. Similarly to covariate balance for binary treatments, such analysis reflects whether a covariate is predictive of the exposure.

In order to illustrate the potential presence of local confounding in our data we considered two subsets of zip codes: 1) zip codes with low exposure ($3 - 8\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; 816 observations); and 2) zip codes with high exposure ($12 - 13\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; 324 observations). Within each exposure level *separately*, and for each covariate, we considered a linear regression of the exposure on the covariate. Figure 2 shows the p -value of the covariates in the p regression models, and for the two exposure levels. A small p -value indicates that the covariate is predictive of the exposure within that level.

We see that some variables such as population density (Population/SQM) and the percentage of the population with less than a high school education (% Below HS) are predictive of the exposure in both low and high exposure levels. However, other variables, such as the median household value (in logarithm - House Value), are only predictive of the exposure at the high exposure levels. The opposite is true for variables such as the percentage of population that is white (% White). Some variables are predictive of the exposure at both exposure levels, but at different degrees (for example, the zip code’s median household income). Such initial investigation indicates that different variables might act as predictors of the exposure at different exposure levels.

In Appendix B, we consider a similar exploratory analysis to investigate which covariates are predictors of the outcome at the low and high exposure levels separately. Combining the results presented there to the ones in Figure 2, there is evidence that the variables that confound the ER relationship might differ across levels of the exposure leading to *local confounding*. For example, the zip code median household value (House Value) is predictive of the exposure and the outcome at the high exposure levels, but is not predictive of the exposure at the low levels. Additionally, there is indication that the percentage of the population with less than a high school degree (% Below HS) is a confounder at the low levels, whereas the same variable is not predictive of the outcome at the high exposure levels. Further, in Appendix B we borrow from the literature on binary treatments, and we present an alternative approach to assess local confounding which resulted in similar conclusions.




Figure 2: p -values for regression the exposure on each covariate, separately. Models are fit separately at the low (blue: $3 - 8\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and high (red: $12 - 13\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) exposure levels.

3 Causal ER, the experiment configuration, and the local ignorability assumption

We follow the potential outcome framework [Neyman, 1923, Rubin, 1974, Hirano and Imbens, 2004], and under the stable unit value of treatment assumptions (SUTVA; no interference, no hidden versions of the treatment [Rubin, 1980]), we use $Y_i(x)$ to denote the potential outcome for observation i at exposure $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is the interval including all possible exposure values. Then, $\{Y_i(x), x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is unit i 's ER curve, and $\{\bar{Y}(x) = E[Y_i(x)], x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is the population average ER curve. Assuming $\bar{Y}(x)$ is differentiable as a function of x , we define the instantaneous causal effect

$$\Delta(x) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{Y}(x+h) - \bar{Y}(x)}{h}.$$

A $\Delta(x) \neq 0$ implies that variation in the exposure in a neighborhood of x has a causal effect on the expected outcome. We also define the population average causal effect of an exposure shift from x to $x + \delta$, as $CE_\delta(x) = \bar{Y}(x + \delta) - \bar{Y}(x) = \int_x^{x+\delta} \Delta(t)dt$. Assuming consistency of the potential outcomes, the observed outcome Y_i is equal to the potential outcome at the observed exposure $Y_i(X_i)$.

Under the weak ignorability assumption [Hirano and Imbens, 2004] stating that the treatment is as if randomized conditional on observed covariates, $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(x) | \mathbf{C}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and every subject in the population can experience any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\bar{Y}(x), x \in \mathcal{X}$ is identifiable using the observed data. Then, a minimal confounding adjustment set $\mathbf{C}^* \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ is a set of covariates which satisfies $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(x) | \mathbf{C}^*$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, but $X \not\perp\!\!\!\perp Y(x) | \mathbf{C}^{**}$ for any \mathbf{C}^{**} strict subset of \mathbf{C}^* [Luna et al., 2011, Wang et al., 2012, Vansteelandt et al., 2012].

In this paper, we are interested in addressing the possibility that the minimal sufficient adjustment set \mathbf{C}^* varies across exposure levels. We formalize this by introducing the *experiment configuration*. Let K denote a fixed positive integer, $\min = \inf \mathcal{X}$ and $\max = \sup \mathcal{X}$ the minimum and maximum values of the exposure range \mathcal{X} , and $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = (s_0 = \min, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_K, s_{K+1} = \max)$ a known partition of the exposure range in $K + 1$ experiments $g_k = [s_{k-1}, s_k), k = 1, 2, \dots, K + 1$. We use \mathbf{s} to denote the internal points of the experiment configuration (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_K) . In Figure 3, a hypothetical exposure response function is plotted where $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ defines a total of 4 experiments ($K = 3$). Then, \mathbf{C}_k^* is a minimal sufficient adjustment set in experiment k if it satisfies

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(x) | \mathbf{C}_k^*, \text{ for all } x \in g_k, \tag{1}$$

and (1) does not hold for any strict subset of \mathbf{C}_k^* . The sets \mathbf{C}_k^* can be overlapping (or even identical) if the same variable is necessary for confounding adjustment in more than one experiment. Therefore, given $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$, model selection could allow for the identification and adjustment for a different set of confounders at different exposure levels.

4 ER estimation in the presence of local confounding

Motivated by the evidence of local confounding for the effect of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ on cardiovascular hospitalizations discussed in §2, we introduce LERCA: Local Exposure Response Confounding Adjustment. We do so for a fixed experiment configuration in §4.1 in order to build intuition and ease illustration. LERCA with unknown \mathbf{s} is presented in §4.2. The choice of K for the unknown experiment configuration is discussed in §4.4.




Figure 3: Hypothetical ER curve. The exposure range is partitioned by $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ in 4 experiments.

4.1 Known experiment configuration

Assume for now a known experiment configuration \mathbf{s} . Then, locally, that is for $x \in g_k = [s_{k-1}, s_k]$, we assume the following pair of exposure and outcome models:

$$\begin{aligned} p(x|\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c}, x \in g_k) &= \phi(x; \delta_{k0}^X + \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{kj}^X \delta_{kj}^X c_j, \sigma_{k,X}^2) \\ p(y|X = x, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c}, x \in g_k) &= \phi(y; \delta_{k0}^Y + \beta_k(x - s_{k-1}) + \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{kj}^Y \delta_{kj}^Y c_j, \sigma_{k,Y}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\phi(\cdot; \mu, \sigma^2)$ denotes the normal density with mean μ and variance σ^2 , and $\alpha_{kj}^X \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates that covariate C_j is included into the exposure model of the k^{th} experiment ($\alpha_{kj}^X = 1$), or not ($\alpha_{kj}^X = 0$). The parameter α_{kj}^Y has the same interpretation, but for the outcome model. The parameter β_k denotes the instantaneous change in the expected outcome associated with a local variation in exposure for $x \in g_k$, adjusted for the C_j s that have $\alpha_{kj}^Y = 1$. Note that all parameters depend on which covariates are included in the corresponding model, but for notational simplicity we do not explicitly state this dependence. Model (2) allows for a different set of variables and variables' coefficients at the different experiments. If the minimal confounding adjustment set for experiment k is included in the outcome model and the mean functional form is correctly specified, β_k is an unbiased estimator of the instantaneous effect $\Delta(x)$, for $x \in g_k$.

In §4.1.3 we discuss how the prior distribution on the inclusion indicators is chosen to target confounding adjustment. In §4.1.4, we discuss prior specification for outcome model coefficients that ensures borrowing of information across experiments and ER continuity across the exposure range. But first we address two questions that naturally arise from the specification of model (2). First, we clarify the connection between LERCA and a model that specifies the ER relationship using linear splines in §4.1.1. Then, in §4.1.2, we discuss how LERCA compares to a model that is fit separately within each experiment g_k .

4.1.1 Connection to linear splines

In the outcome specification of model (2), the term $\beta_k(x - s_{k-1})$ in the mean functional could be substituted by $\beta_k x$ and $-\beta_k s_{k-1}$ could be absorbed in the intercept. However, specifying the model as to include $\beta_k(x - s_{k-1})$ demonstrates the connection between model (2) and a model where the ER relationship is specified using linear splines with knots s_k . Furthermore, such specification significantly simplifies prior elicitation to ensure ER continuity (see §4.1.4), and posterior sampling satisfying the continuity condition (see Appendix E).

Even though the outcome model in (2) resembles a linear splines model with knots \mathbf{s} , there is a *key* distinction between the two models. In model (2), different experiments g_k are allowed to have a different slope for the exposure (β_k), a different set of outcome predictors (covariates for which $\alpha_{kj}^Y = 1$), or the same set of predictors but with different strength (δ_{kj}^Y). Therefore, points \mathbf{s} in model (2) represent a change in the slope or a change in the outcome model covariate adjustment. On the other hand, a model that uses splines for the exposure-response relationship only allows β_k to vary with k . In this sense, a splines model is a sub-case of model (2), that for α_{kj}^Y and δ_{kj}^Y constant across k .

The assumption of local linearity (linear effect of the exposure on the outcome within each experiment) can lead to global non-linearity, and can be easily relaxed using higher order splines, as discussed in §7. However, for our study of the health effects of air pollution at low exposure levels, previous research indicates that the relationship between air pollution and cardiovascular outcomes is linear [Thurston et al., 2016, Lim et al., 2018] or supra-linear [Crouse et al., 2015, Pinault et al., 2017], situations that our model can adjust to.

4.1.2 Connection to a separate model across experiments

A natural question that arises from the LERCA model specification in (2), is how LERCA compares to fitting a separate outcome model within each experiment g_k . Doing so would still allow for different confounders and different confounding strength at different exposure levels.

However, a separate model within each experiment would not borrow any information across exposure levels, and could lead to an estimated ER that is not continuous at the points of the experiment configuration \mathbf{s} . In LERCA, as we discuss in §4.1.4, we borrow information across exposure levels by ensuring that the estimated ER is continuous everywhere, including the points \mathbf{s} . If higher order polynomials are used within each experiment, LERCA, similarly to splines, could be easily altered to accommodate higher order smoothness across the exposure range.

4.1.3 Prior distribution on inclusion indicators for confounding adjustment

We build upon the work by Wang et al. [2012, 2015] to assign an informative prior on covariates' local inclusion indicators $(\alpha_{kj}^X, \alpha_{kj}^Y)$. This prior choice ensures that model averaging assigns high posterior weights to outcome models including a minimal confounding adjustment set separately for each exposure range, and specifies

$$\frac{P(\alpha_{kj}^Y = 1 | \alpha_{kj}^X = 1)}{P(\alpha_{kj}^Y = 0 | \alpha_{kj}^X = 1)} = \omega \text{ where } \omega > 1, \text{ iid } \forall j, k. \quad (3)$$

By specifying (3), a variable C_j is assigned high prior probability to be included into the outcome model if it is also included in the exposure model ($x \in g_k$ & $\alpha_{kj}^X = 1$). Wang et al. [2012] and Antonelli et al. [2017b] show that, for binary treatments, this informative prior leads to outcome models that include the minimal set of true confounders with higher posterior weights than model selection approaches that are based solely on the outcome model. In our context, this experiment-specific prior specification ensures that, locally, covariates in the minimal set C_k^* are included in the outcome model of experiment k with high posterior probability.

4.1.4 Prior distribution on outcome model intercepts and coefficients of exposure to ensure ER continuity

If the covariates C_j are centered, continuity of the estimated ER function can be ensured by assuming a point-mass recursive prior on the outcome model intercepts $\delta_{k0}^Y, k \geq 2$. That is,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow s_k^+} E[Y|X = x] = \lim_{x \rightarrow s_k^-} E[Y|X = x] \iff \delta_{k0}^Y = \delta_{(k-1)0}^Y + \beta_{k-1}(s_k - s_{k-1}). \quad (4)$$

In other words, conditional on \mathbf{s} , the outcome model intercept of experiment $k \geq 2$ is a deterministic function of the outcome model intercept of the first experiment δ_{10}^Y , and the slopes $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{k-1}$. These parameters are assigned independent non-informative normal prior distributions.

4.1.5 Prior distributions of the remaining coefficients

Prior distributions on the remaining regression coefficients (exposure model coefficients, outcome model covariates' coefficients) and variance terms are chosen such that they lead to known forms of the full conditional posterior distributions to simplify sampling. We assume independent non-informative Inverse Gamma prior distributions on $\sigma_{k,X}^2, \sigma_{k,Y}^2$. Non-informative normal prior is chosen for the exposure model intercepts δ_{k0}^X . Conditional on the inclusion indicators, the prior on the regression coefficient δ_{kj}^Y is a point mass at 0, or a non-informative normal distribution when α_{kj}^Y is equal to 0 or 1 accordingly. Similarly for the exposure model covariates' coefficients δ_{kj}^X . Details on the prior specifications can be found in Appendix D.

4.2 Unknown experiment configuration

For a fixed experiment configuration $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$, each experiment is treated separately in terms of confounder *selection and strength* of the confounding adjustment. However, the configuration itself is a key component of the fitted exposure response curve, and fixing it a priori could lead to bias and uncertainty underestimation. Instead, we assume that, a priori, the locations of the experiment configuration \mathbf{s} are distributed as the even-numbered order statistics of $2K+1$ samples from a uniform distribution on the interval (s_0, s_{K+1}) . This prior choice of \mathbf{s} discourages specifications of \mathbf{s} that include values that are too close to each other [Green, 1995]. The prior is augmented by indicators that consecutive points s_k, s_{k+1} cannot be closer than some distance d_k . Conditional on \mathbf{s} , we follow the model specification and prior distributions described in §4.1.

4.3 MCMC scheme and convergence diagnostics

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods are used to acquire samples from the posterior distribution, on which inference of quantities of interest is based. A detailed description of the MCMC scheme including computational challenges and contributions can be found in Appendix E. In the same section, we discuss MCMC convergence diagnostics based on the potential scale reduction factor (PSR; Gelman and Rubin [1992]) for quantities that do not directly depend on the experiment configuration.

4.4 Number of points in the experiment configuration

As presented previously, LERCA requires the specification of the number of points K in the experiment configuration. Since the number of parameters grows with K , possible values for K could be bounded by considering the maximum number of coefficients we are willing to entertain.

Cross validation methods to choose values of tuning parameters are often infeasible in the Bayesian framework due to time and computational resources constraints. In a comprehensive review, [Gelman et al. \[2014\]](#) discusses methods of estimating the expected out of sample prediction error for Bayesian methods. The widely-applicable information criterion (WAIC; [Watanabe \[2010\]](#)) provides an estimate of the out-of-sample prediction error based on one MCMC run. It is defined as $WAIC = -2(\text{lppd} - p_{WAIC})$, where lppd and p_{WAIC} denote the log point-wise posterior predictive density and the penalty:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{lppd} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log E_{\text{post}} p(x_i, y_i | \theta) \\ p_{WAIC} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{var}_{\text{post}}(\log p(x_i, y_i | \theta)).\end{aligned}$$

Here, θ denotes the full vector of parameters, and E_{post} , var_{post} denote the posterior mean and variance.

We use the WAIC to choose the number of points in the experiment configuration K . Specifically, LERCA is fit *once* for different values of K , and K is chosen as the value that minimizes the estimate of the WAIC.

5 Simulation Studies

The main goal of our simulation study is to illustrate that local confounding is an important issue that both commonly-used and flexible approaches for ER estimation fail to adjust for and they return biased results. The results from our simulation study indicate that methodological development to accommodate local confounding is necessary in order to correctly estimated the causal effect of a continuous exposure.

Additionally, in §5.4 we discuss results from a simulation study under a generative model *without* local confounding. In this case, traditional approaches and global confounding adjustment suffice for ER estimation, and the question is how comparably LERCA performs. The approaches we considered are:

1. Generalized Additive Model (GAM): Regressing the outcome Y on flexible functions of the exposure X and all potential confounders (4 degrees of freedom for each predictor).
2. Spline Model (SPLINE): Additive spline estimator described in [Bia et al. \[2014\]](#). The generalized propensity score (gps) is modelled as a linear regression on all covariates. The ER function is estimated using additive spline bases of the exposure and gps.
3. The Hirano and Imbens estimator [[Hirano and Imbens, 2004](#)] (HI-GPS): ER estimation is obtained by fitting an outcome regression model including quadratic terms for both the exposure and the gps, and the exposure-gps interaction. The gps is estimated as in SPLINE.
4. Inverse Probability Weighting estimator (IPW): The generalized propensity score is used to weigh observations in an outcome regression model that includes linear and quadratic terms of exposure. The gps is estimated as in SPLINE.
5. The doubly-robust approach of [Kennedy et al. \[2017\]](#) (KENNEDY): The gps and outcome models are estimated using the Super Learner algorithm [[Van Der Laan et al., 2007](#)] combining the sample mean, linear regression with and without two-way interactions, generalized additive models, multivariate adaptive regression splines, and random forests. Based on the gps and outcome model estimates, the pseudo-outcome is calculated and is regressed on the exposure using kernel smoothing. This approach is chosen to represent state-of-the-art methods in ER estimation that are based on flexible, machine-learning and non-parametric approaches.

5.1 Data generation with local confounding

We generate data with exposure values which range from 0 to 10 and are uniformly distributed over the exposure range. We consider a uniformly distributed exposure to ensure that methods' performance is solely affected by the presence of local confounding, and not by the presence of limited sample size at some exposure levels. We

consider a quadratic ER, and true experiment configuration $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = (0, 2, 4, 7, 10)$. Table 1 summarizes which of the 8 potential confounders are predictive of the exposure and/or the outcome within each experiment (correlations and regression coefficients are summarized in Table C.1). Note that in this data generating mechanism the minimal set of confounders vary across the four experiments. We simulate 400 data sets of 800 observations each. Details on the data generating mechanism are in Appendix F.

5.2 Fitting the methods

The different methods are fit using the `gam` and `causaldrf` R packages [Hastie, 2017, Schafer, 2015], and the code available on Kennedy et al. [2017]. For every simulated data set, LERCA was fit for $K \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, and for each data set the results shown correspond to the K that minimized the WAIC.

Using each method, we estimate the population average ER curve $\bar{Y}(x)$ over an equally spaced grid of points on the interval $(0, 10)$ denoted by \mathcal{G} , and compare the root mean squared error (rMSE) as a function of x . Finally, we also assess whether LERCA can recover the correct experiment configuration, identify the true confounders within each experiment, and choose the true value for K .

5.3 Simulation Results

Figure 4 shows the estimated ER curves using the alternative methods. In Figure 5 we summarize the LERCA results including the estimated ER, experiment configuration and outcome model inclusion indicators of covariates C_1, C_4 as a function of exposure $x \in (0, 10)$. We choose C_1 and C_4 because, in this data generating mechanism, C_1 is a confounder in experiment 1 ($x < 2$), and C_4 is a confounder in experiment 2 only ($2 < x < 4$). Grey lines correspond to results for individual data sets, whereas black solid lines correspond to averages across simulated data sets.

In Figure 4 it is evident that the alternative methods return biased results, especially at very low or very high levels of the exposure. Indeed, we found that root MSE of LERCA was consistently lower than the alternative methods at low exposure levels (Figure C.1). These results indicate that neither commonly-used nor flexible approaches utilizing machine learning tools appropriately accommodate local confounding adjustment for ER estimation.

As showed in Figure 5, even though the true ER is quadratic and LERCA is formulated as piece-wise linear, LERCA is able to identify the correct shape of the exposure-response function. We find that using WAIC to choose the value of K led to choosing the correct value of $K = 3$ 40% of the times, and $K = 2$ 58% of the times indicating that WAIC tends to over-penalize large values of K . Regardless, the correct points of the experiment configuration $\mathbf{s} = \{2, 4, 7\}$ are identified and are located at the modes of the posterior distribution (second panel in Figure 5). By examining the posterior inclusion probabilities of C_1, C_4 , we observe that instrumental variables (e.g., C_1 in experiments 2 and 3) are often included in the outcome model. However, LERCA includes the minimal confounding set within each experiment with very high probability. On average (across the points in the exposure range and across all the simulated data sets) the minimal confounding set was included in the adjustment set 99% of the times (ranging from 89-100% across simulated data sets), indicating that the variables necessary for confounding adjustment are almost always included in the adjustment set. Lastly, the point-wise 95% and 50% credible intervals cover the true mean ER values 84% and 39% of the times accordingly. The observed under-coverage is largely due to the underestimation of K .

Table 1: Representation of which covariates are predictive of the exposure and / or the outcome within each experiment (denoted by a \checkmark). Covariates with \checkmark in both models within the same experiment are local confounders.

Experiment	Model	C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	C_5	C_6	C_7	C_8
1	$X \mathcal{C}$	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark					
	$Y X, \mathcal{C}$	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark					
2	$X \mathcal{C}$	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark				
	$Y X, \mathcal{C}$		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark				
3	$X \mathcal{C}$	\checkmark		\checkmark		\checkmark			
	$Y X, \mathcal{C}$		\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark			
4	$X \mathcal{C}$		\checkmark			\checkmark	\checkmark		
	$Y X, \mathcal{C}$		\checkmark	\checkmark			\checkmark		




Figure 4: The true mean ER function (dashed line), estimated ER functions from each simulated data set (gray), and the mean of the estimated ER functions (solid lines) using all alternative methods.




Figure 5: LERCA results. (Left) Mean ER estimates. (Center) Posterior distribution of the experiment configuration \mathbf{s} . (Right) Outcome model posterior inclusion probability of C_1 and C_4 . Gray lines correspond to simulated data sets separately, and black solid lines correspond to averages across data sets.

5.4 Simulation results in the absence of local confounding

The previous generative scenario compared methods’ performance in the presence of local confounding. In Appendix C.2, LERCA is compared to the alternative methods in the more traditional setting of global confounding, that is, in the setting more favorable to the other methods. In this context, LERCA with $K = 3$ (fixed) performed similarly in terms of root MSE compared to GAM and Kennedy’s doubly-robust estimator, but better than the remaining alternative methods. These results indicate that LERCA offers a protection against bias arising from local confounding, without sacrificing efficiency when local confounding is not present.

6 Estimating the effect of long-term exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ on zip code cardiovascular hospitalization rates

In this section, LERCA is used to estimate the causal relationship between the average exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ for the years 2011-2012 and the cardiovascular hospitalization rates in 2013, using the data set introduced in §2. The full set of zip code level covariates are described in Table A.1. We fit LERCA for $K \in \{2, 3, \dots, 6\}$ and we report the results for $K = 3$ which corresponds to the model with the lowest WAIC.

Figure 6 shows the posterior mean and the 95% credible intervals of the ER, and the posterior mean and 95% credible interval of β_k as a function of the exposure. Positive values of β_k imply that an increase in $PM_{2.5}$ exposure lead to an increase in hospitalization rates. Figure 6 also shows the posterior distribution of the experiment configuration, and the empirical distribution of $PM_{2.5}$. Examining the 95% credible intervals for β_k , there is evidence that an increase in exposure at the low levels (exposures $\leq 9.9\mu g/m^3$) leads to an increase in log hospitalization rates. However, 95% credible intervals for $x \geq 9.9\mu g/m^3$ include zero. These results indicate that there is no exposure threshold for the effect of $PM_{2.5}$ on cardiovascular outcomes, which means that reductions in $PM_{2.5}$




Figure 6: Top: Mean ER curve of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure (x-axis) and log all-cause cardiovascular hospitalizations (y-axis) –solid line– with 95% pointwise credible intervals. The rug of points shows the distribution of observed $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ values. Bottom: The posterior mean and 95% credible interval of the β coefficient as a function of exposure. The rug of points shows the posterior distribution for \mathbf{s} for $K = 3$.

would lead to further health improvements, even at the low exposure levels. Note that the current NAAQS for long term exposure to $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ is equal to $12\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. These results are consistent with other epidemiological studies which have found that the strength of the association between long term exposure to $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ on health outcomes is larger at low exposure levels [Dominici et al., 2002, Shi et al., 2016, Di et al., 2017b]. Lastly, the posterior distribution of \mathbf{s} , shows that observations below $8\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and over $11.5\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ are always grouped together.

6.1 Variability of the covariates’ posterior inclusion across exposure levels

We examined the variability of covariates’ inclusion in the exposure and outcome models across exposure values, to investigate whether local confounding was present. We did so by checking the covariates’ posterior inclusion probabilities in the exposure and the outcome models as a function of the exposure. Figure 7 shows the posterior inclusion probabilities of three covariates as a function of the exposure providing a measure of the covariates’ confounding importance across the exposure range.

The posterior inclusion probabilities vary substantially at different exposure levels indicating that local confounding is likely to be present. In Figure 2 the exploratory analysis showed that the zip code median household value (`House Value`) was predictive of both the exposure and the outcome at the high exposure levels, but only of the outcome at the low levels. The LERCA results in Figure 7 lead to the same conclusion. Similarly, the posterior inclusion probability for the variable representing the zip code’s percentage of the population with less than a high school education (`% Below HS`) indicates that this variable is an important confounder only at the low levels, in accordance to the exploratory analysis. LERCA returns a similar conclusion about the variable representing population density (`Population/SQM`), which is in disagreement with the analysis in §2 which showed that population density was predictive of both the exposure and outcome at both low and high exposure levels. Comparisons between the results in Figure 2 and the outcome model posterior inclusion probabilities were performed for all variables. LERCA tends to include in the outcome model a smaller number of variables than what one might have assumed based on the exploratory analysis. This is, somewhat, expected since LERCA considers the confounding importance of all variables simultaneously.




Figure 7: Posterior inclusion probability of zip code population percentage with less than a high school education, population density, and median house value in the exposure and outcome model as a function of the exposure.

6.2 Variability of the covariates' posterior inclusion within the low experiment

With the focus of our study being the evaluation of the causal effect of $PM_{2.5}$ at the low exposure levels, we studied the interpretation of β_1 (in experiment 1) across MCMC samples. Since the interpretation of β_1 as a causal effect requires that a sufficient adjustment set is included in the outcome model, we examined the variability of the covariates' outcome model inclusion indicators across iterations of the MCMC.

Across MCMC samples, 174 combinations of the covariates were included in the outcome model (out of the 2^{27} possible ones). Even though this is a large number of potential models, 51% of the posterior weight was given to the model with the following 9 covariates: the zip code's median house value and percentage of the population with at most a high school education, as measured in the 2000 Census and its extrapolation between 2000 and 2013, the population rate that has been a smoker at some point in their lives, the zip code's population density, the average dew point, the average age of Medicare beneficiaries and the percentage of them that are women. We refer to this model as *Model 1*. The model with the second highest posterior probability included the same covariates except for smoking rate, and accounted to 7% of the MCMC samples. Therefore, there is evidence that Model 1 outperformed the rest in confounding adjustment at low exposure levels.

In order to evaluate the impact of model averaging on our final estimates, we compared the posterior distribution of β_1 across all MCMC samples to its distribution based on the MCMC samples for which Model 1 was chosen. Across all samples, β_1 was estimated to be equal to 0.035 with 95% credible interval 0.012 – 0.06, and posterior probability that it is greater than 0 equal to 99.7%. Among posterior samples for which Model 1 was chosen, β_1 was estimated to be 0.034 with 95% credible interval 0.011 – 0.056 and posterior probability that β_1 is greater than 0 also equal to 99.7%. The consistency of the Model 1 estimates and the model averaged estimates is an indication that model averaging, in this situation, did not lead to averaging over incompatible models.

7 Discussion

We have introduced an innovative Bayesian approach for flexible estimation of the ER curve in observational studies that has the following important features: 1) it casts the formulation of the ER within a potential outcome framework, and mimics several randomized experiments across exposure levels; 2) it uses the data to inform the experiment configuration; and given the current experiment configuration 3) allows for the possibility which is a reality in our study (Figure 2 and Figure 7) that different sets of covariates are confounders at different exposure levels; 4) allows for varying confounding effect across levels of the exposure; 5) performs local covariate selection to increase efficiency; 6) propagates model uncertainty for the experiment configuration and covariate selection in the posterior inference on the whole ER curve; and finally, 7) provides important scientific guidance related to which covariates are confounders at different exposure levels.

Although non-parametric and varying coefficient approaches [Hastie and Tibshirani, 1993] for ER estimation could, in theory, allow for differential confounding across different exposure levels, none of the existing methods for ER estimation explicitly accommodates local confounding, nor provides guidance for which covariates are confounders of the effect of interest at different levels of the exposure. Furthermore, the use of non-parametric methods to estimate a generalized propensity score or model the outcome of interest could prove unfruitful in situations where most of the available data are over a specific range of the exposure variable, the number of potential confounders is large, and interest lies in the estimation of causal effects for change in the exposure in the

tails of the exposure distribution. In such situations, LERCA provides a way to model the outcome acknowledging that the exposure-response relationship might be confounded by different covariates at different exposure levels. Lastly, it is worth noting that LERCA shall not be seen as a direct competitor to the approach by [Kennedy et al. \[2017\]](#). In fact, since the Super Learner algorithm combines different approaches for modeling the outcome, LERCA could be incorporated in the algorithm as an approach that allows for the presence of local confounding.

The main contribution of this paper is in addressing the issue of local confounding in ER estimation, and in providing evidence of covariates’ confounding importance at different exposure levels. In doing so, LERCA is based on several modeling decisions that can be easily altered, such as local linearity in the exposure and outcome models, and the prior specification of covariates’ inclusion indicators for confounding adjustment.

First, within each experiment and thus locally within a narrow exposure range, LERCA assumes linearity for both the outcome and the exposure model. Local linearity could be relaxed by using higher order polynomials. In simulation studies, LERCA recovers the true non-linear shape when the true ER is quadratic. An interesting line of research is to explore LERCA’s robustness in violations of local linearity, and its extensions to more flexible specifications.

Second, the informative prior on the inclusion indicators could lead to the inclusion of instrumental variables in the outcome model, which will not lead to bias, but will decrease the efficiency of our estimators. In the study of air pollution, strong instrumental variables are not expected to be present. Alternative strategies for local confounder selection can be accommodated here, extending, for example, work by [Wilson and Reich \[2014\]](#), [Cefalu et al. \[2017\]](#) and [Antonelli et al. \[2018\]](#). Further work could evaluate the performance of different approaches to model selection (via prior specifications or penalization techniques) for different confounding scenarios.

A Data details

We constructed counts corresponding to the cardiovascular-specific (CVD) number of hospitalizations for Medicare enrollees aged at least 65 years during 2013 for a total of 35,373 zip codes across the continental US. Hospitalization rates were based on the total number of personal years for Medicare enrollees for a zip code on a given year. CVD hospitalizations were considered on the basis of primary diagnosis according to International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) codes (ICD-9 390 to 459). The analysis was restricted to the continental US leading to 34,897 zip codes with hospitalization information.


Population demographic information was acquired using the 2000 Census with information on over 400 variables, although a lot of them are highly correlated. We further used linearly extrapolated Census variables for 2013. Census information is provided at a ZCTA level, and we use a crosswalk to map ZCTA to zip code. Weather information including temperature, relative humidity and dew point is acquired from the NOAA-ASOS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration-Automated Surface Observing System) website, and is linked to zip codes within 150 kilometers.

Lastly, zip code $PM_{2.5}$ exposure is assigned using the US EPA monitoring sites. By EPA recommendations, monitoring sites with less than 67% of scheduled measurements observed are excluded. For every monitor, the average of the 2011-2012 average annual value of $PM_{2.5}$ is calculated, and the monitor is linked to *all* zip codes with centroids within 6 miles. Then, the zip code exposure is set equal to the average over all linked monitors. Since monitoring sites are preferentially located near populated areas or points of interest, many zip codes in remote areas are not linked to any monitor and are therefore dropped from the final data set.


Figure [A.1](#) shows maps of zip code centroids before linkage to EPA monitoring sites, as well as maintained zip code centroids after 3 different linkage procedures corresponding to different specifications of the linkage distance, as well as whether a monitor can be linked to more than one zip code. We visualize how linkage can affect the final data set:

- **Distance:** As the distance of allowed linked zip codes and monitors increases, we expect that more zip codes will be linked to at least one monitor. However, $PM_{2.5}$ values in areas where monitors are located at long distances might suffer more from measurement error.
- **Number of links:** Allowing a monitor to be linked to multiple zip codes increases the number of zip codes with $PM_{2.5}$ information. However, this can lead to adjacent zip codes with very similar or identical $PM_{2.5}$ measurements.


Linkage (b) in Figure [A.1](#) corresponds to the linkage procedure we used to create our data set. Table [A.1](#) includes the descriptive statistics and data source for the zip code covariates included in our analysis.




(a) All zip codes in Medicare.



(b) Zip codes with PM monitor within 6 miles.
Linkage not unique.



(c) Zip codes with PM monitor within 6 miles.
Unique linkage.



(d) Zip codes with PM monitor within 60 miles.
Linkage not unique.

Figure A.1: (a) All zip codes with available Medicare information. (b) Zip codes with available exposure information after performing linkage within 6 miles and monitors are allowed to be linked to more than one zip code. (c) Zip codes with available exposure information after performing linkage within 6 miles where each monitor is only linked to up to one zip code. (d) Zip codes with available exposure information after linkage with monitors within 60 miles and every monitor can be linked to more than one zip code.

Table A.1: Available demographic and weather information

Source	Name	Description	Mean	SD
2000 Census	% White	Percentage of White Population	0.71	0.25
	% Hisp	Percentage of Hispanic Population	0.12	0.18
	% HS	Percentage of population that attended high school	0.27	0.10
	% Poor	Percentage of impoverished population	0.14	0.11
	% Female	Percentage of female population	0.51	0.04
	% Moved in 5	Percentage of population that has lived in the area for less than 5 years	0.50	0.12
	Avg Commute	Mean Travel Time to Work	24.22	5.92
	Population/SQM	Population per square mile (logarithm)	7.53	1.52
	Total Population	Total population (logarithm)	9.71	1.12
	Low Occupied	Indicator. “=1” if the percent of occupied population is at most 90%.	0.211	0.408
	High Occupied	Indicator. “=1” if the percent of occupied population is over 95%.	0.416	0.493
	Low Hispanic	Indicator. “=1” if the percent of Hispanic population is at most 0.02%	0.317	0.465
	High Hispanic	Indicator. “=1” if the percent of Hispanic population is over 20%	0.197	0.398
Census Extrapolation	% Below HS	Population percent with less than high school education (above age of 65)	23.24	14.85
	% Own Households	Percentage of occupied housing units in 2013	0.58	0.2
	Low Poverty	Indicator. “=1” if the percent of the population below the poverty line in 2013 is at most 5%	0.196	0.397
	High Poverty	Indicator. “=1” if the percent of the population below the poverty line in 2013 is over 15%	0.244	0.429
Census combination*	House Value	Median value of owner occupied housing (USD) (logarithm)	12.65	0.63
	Household Income	Median household income (USD) (logarithm)	11.40	0.42
BRFSS	BMI	Average BMI in 2013	27.65	1.32
	Smoking Rate	Ever smoke rate (2013)	0.45	0.06
Weather	Avg Temp	Average temperature (F)	55.35	7.47
	Avg Dew Point	Average Dew Point (F)	44.09	7.50
	Avg Humidity	Average Relative Humidity (%)	70.41	8.34
Medicare	Avg Age	Average Medicare Age	74.89	1.66
	Female Rate	Percentage of Female Beneficiaries	0.55	0.06
	Dual Rate	Percentage of Dual Eligible Beneficiaries	0.22	0.15

*The 2000 Census is combined with the 2013 extrapolated values by taking each covariate’s mean value across= the two years.

B Additional analyses investigating the presence of local confounding

B.1 Investigating the covariates' predictive ability of the outcome at the low and high exposure levels

In §2, we explored the possibility that different covariates are predictive of the exposure within different exposure levels. Here, we perform a similar analysis to investigate whether different variables act as predictors of the outcome at the low and the high exposure levels separately.

Considering still the two sets of zip codes: zip codes at the low exposure levels ($3 - 8\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and zip codes at the high exposure levels ($12 - 13\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), we fit regressions of the outcome on the covariates, for each covariate and each exposure level separately. Figure B.1 shows the covariates' p -value in those regressions. Again, we see that different variables act as predictors of the outcome at the two exposure levels. For example, a zip code's median house value (in logarithm – `House Value`) is an outcome predictor at both low and high exposure levels, whereas the percentage of the population with less than high school education (`% Below HS`) was an outcome predictor only at the low levels.

B.2 An alternative way in investigating the presence of local confounding

In §2 (and Appendix B.1) we investigated the presence of local confounding by checking the p -value of the covariates in a model for the exposure (outcome), for each covariate and in each exposure level separately. Here, we consider an alternative way to check for the potential of local confounding, borrowing from the literature on binary treatments.

For each of the two subsets of zip codes (low levels: $3 - 8\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, high levels: $12 - 13\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), we introduce T_{i1} and T_{i2} defined as follows:

1. $T_{i1} = 0$ if $3 < X_i \leq 7$, low exposure within the low exposure subset,
2. $T_{i1} = 1$ if $7 < X_i \leq 8$, high exposure within the low exposure subset,
3. $T_{i2} = 0$ if $12 < X_i \leq 12.5$, low exposure within the high exposure subset, and
4. $T_{i2} = 1$ if $12.5 < X_i \leq 13$, high exposure within the high exposure subset.

In other words, we introduce two binary treatment indicators T_{i1} and T_{i2} , one in the low and the other in the high exposure group. Separately for these two subsets of zip codes, and for each covariate C_{ij} , we calculate the




Figure B.1: Covariates' p -values from regressing the outcome on each covariate separately. A separate regression is fit at the low and the high exposure levels.

absolute standardized difference of means (ASDM). The ASDM is used in causal inference with binary treatments to identify covariates that are imbalanced and might confound the relationship of interest.

Figure B.2 shows ASDM when comparing zip codes with $T_{i1} = 1$ versus $T_{i1} = 0$ (blue triangles for the low exposure group) and when comparing zip codes with $T_{i2} = 1$ versus $T_{i2} = 0$ (red circles for the high exposure




Figure B.2: Absolute standardized difference of means (ASDM) of each potential confounder. The ASDM is calculated separately for two subsets of zip codes, the ones at low exposure (blue) and the ones at high exposure (red). Covariates are ordered with respect to ASDM values for the zip codes at low exposure.




Figure B.3: Absolute standardized difference of means (ASDM) of each potential confounder using a discretized version of the outcome as the group indicator. The ASDM is calculated separately for the low (blue, $3 - 8\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and the high (red, $12 - 13\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) exposure levels. This plot explores the covariates' ability in predicting the outcome at the different exposure levels.

group), separately. Again, visual inspection of Figure B.2 indicates that different variables are imbalanced at the low versus the high exposure levels. The results from this exploratory analysis are similar to those in §2. For example, median house value (**House Value**) is highly imbalanced when considering zip codes at higher exposure values, whereas is not when considering zip codes at lower levels, and the opposite is true for the proportion of the population that is white (**% White**).

We further investigate the covariates’ predicting ability of the outcome and the low and at the high exposure levels. For the same two groups of zip codes: the zip codes with exposures between $3 - 8\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, and the zip codes with exposures between $12 - 13\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, we define a binary indicator T_{i3} , where T_{i3} is equal to 0 if zip code i ’s outcome is below a cutoff value, and T_{i3} is equal to 1 otherwise. For a cutoff value we take the median outcome among all zip codes. Based on T_{i3} and in each exposure groups separately, we calculate the ASDM of each covariate. The ASDM is depicted in Figure B.3 and indicates which covariates are predictors of the (discretized) outcome at the two exposure levels.

We again find that a zip code’s median house value was an outcome predictor at both low and high exposure levels, whereas the percentage of the population with less than high school education was an outcome predictor only at the low levels. Combining these results to the ones from Figure B.2, there is again evidence that the variables that confound the ER relationship might differ across levels of the exposure.

C Additional simulation results

C.1 Simulations in the presence of *local* confounding

Table C.1 shows the correlation of the covariates with the exposure and the coefficients of the covariates in the outcome model for the data simulating scenario with local confounding: different confounders at different levels of the exposure.

Figure C.1 shows the the root MSE (rMSE) as a function of the exposure value $x \in (0, 10)$. LERCA has the

Table C.1: Correlation between the covariates and exposure, and outcome coefficients in each experiment, for scenarios with local confounding.

	Covariate - Exposure				Covariate - Outcome			
	$x \in g_1$	$x \in g_2$	$x \in g_3$	$x \in g_4$	$x \in g_1$	$x \in g_2$	$x \in g_3$	$x \in g_4$
C_1	0.423	0.525	0.402	0	0.641	0	0	0
C_2	0.524	0.572	0	0.503	0.962	0.919	0.593	0.651
C_3	0.522	0	0.447	0	0.646	0.643	0.616	0.58
C_4	0	0.528	0	0	0	0.633	0	0
C_5	0	0	0.533	0.539	0	0	0.658	0
C_6	0	0	0	0.509	0	0	0	0.52
C_7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C_8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0




Figure C.1: Mean Root MSE as a function of the exposure $x \in (0, 10)$.

lowest rMSE at the low exposure levels followed by GAM. Root MSE across most methods seems to be comparable for the middle exposure values, and GAM performs slightly better than LERCA at high levels.

C.2 Simulations in the presence of *global* confounding

Briefly, data are generated with covariates C_1, C_2, C_3 as predictors of exposure and C_2, C_3, C_4 as predictors of the outcome and the adjusted R-squared of the true exposure and outcome models was 0.73 and 0.94 accordingly. Table C.2 shows the correlation of covariates with the exposure and the outcome model coefficients in the data simulating scenario with global confounding (same confounders with constant confounding strength across exposure levels) and true quadratic ER. Figure C.2 shows the estimated ER for each data set and the average estimated ER based on LERCA and alternative methods. In Figure C.3, the root MSE for all methods is plotted as a function of the exposure $x \in (0, 10)$.

Table C.2: Correlation between the covariates and exposure, and outcome coefficients in each experiment, for the scenario with global confounding.

	C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	C_5	C_6	C_7	C_8
Exposure	0.423	0.524	0.522	0	0	0	0	0
Outcome	0	0.812	0.93	0.82	0	0	0	0




Figure C.2: Simulation results in the presence of global confounding. Grey lines correspond to estimated ER for each simulated data set, solid lines correspond to the mean ER over all simulated data sets, and the dashed line corresponds to the true ER.




Figure C.3: Root MSE of all methods in the presence of global confounding as a function of the exposure $x \in (0, 10)$.

D Prior specifications for regression parameters and experiment configuration

D.1 Regression coefficients and residual variance

Prior independences of all parameters are expressed in the following representation

$$\begin{aligned}
& p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^X, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^Y, \boldsymbol{\delta}^X, \beta_k, \boldsymbol{\delta}^Y, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_X^2, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Y^2) \\
&= p(\delta_{10}^Y) \prod_{k=1}^{K+1} \left\{ \left[\prod_{j=1}^p p(\alpha_{kj}^X, \alpha_{kj}^Y) p(\delta_{kj}^X | \alpha_{kj}^X) p(\delta_{kj}^Y | \alpha_{kj}^Y) \right] p(\delta_{k0}^X) p(\beta_k) p(\sigma_{k,X}^2) p(\sigma_{k,Y}^2) \right\} \\
&\quad \times \prod_{k=2}^K I\left(\delta_{k0}^Y = \delta_{(k-1)0}^Y + \beta_{k-1}(s_k - s_{k-1})\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

We assume non-informative normal priors on β_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, K + 1$, and δ_{10}^Y . The prior distribution on the regression coefficients for the covariates is a mixture of non-informative normal distribution and point-mass at 0. Non-informative inverse gamma prior distributions are assumed on $\sigma_{k,X}^2, \sigma_{k,Y}^2$. Specifically

- $\beta_k \sim N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$, $\delta_{10}^Y \sim N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$.
- $\delta_{kj}^X | \alpha_{kj}^X \sim \alpha_{kj}^X N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2) + (1 - \alpha_{kj}^X) \mathbb{1}_0(\delta_{kj}^X)$, where $\mathbb{1}_0(\delta_{kj}^X)$ is a point-mass distribution at 0. Similarly for $\delta_{kj}^Y | \alpha_{kj}^Y$.
- $\sigma_{k,X}^2 \sim IG(a_0, b_0)$, and similarly for $\sigma_{k,Y}^2$.

The hyper-parameters $\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, a_0, b_0$ can be chosen differently for different variables.

D.2 Experiment configuration

The prior on the points $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_K)$ defining the experiment configuration is set as the even ordered statistics of $(2K + 1)$ samples from a uniform distribution over the observed exposure range. Compared to a uniform prior distribution on \mathbf{s} , this choice of a prior discourages the existence of points s_i, s_j in the experiment configuration that are very close to each other.

Let K and the exposure range (s_0, s_{K+1}) be fixed. Let $Z_i \sim U(s_0, s_{K+1})$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2K + 1$ and denote the even ordered statistics as $W_j = Z_{(2j)}, j = 1, 2, \dots, K$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_K}(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_K) = \\
& f_{W_1}(w_1) f_{W_2|W_1}(w_2|w_1) \dots f_{W_K|W_1, W_2, \dots, W_{K-1}}(w_K|w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{K-1})
\end{aligned}$$

Since W_1 is the 2^{nd} order statistic of $2K + 1$ samples from $U(s_0, s_{K+1})$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{W_1}(w_1) &= \frac{(2K+1)!}{(2K-1)!} \frac{1}{s_{K+1} - s_0} \frac{w_1 - s_0}{s_{K+1} - s_0} \left(1 - \frac{w_1 - s_0}{s_{K+1} - s_0}\right)^{2K-1} \\
&= \frac{(2K+1)!}{(2K-1)!} (s_{K+1} - s_0)^{-(2K+1)} (w_1 - s_0)(s_{K+1} - w_1)^{2K-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Given $W_1 = w_1$, W_2 acts like the second order statistic of $2K - 1$ uniform samples from a uniform distribution over (w_1, s_{K+1}) . Therefore, we similarly get that

$$f_{W_2|W_1}(w_2|w_1) = \frac{(2K-1)!}{(2K-3)!} (s_{K+1} - w_1)^{-(2K-1)} (w_2 - w_1)(s_{K+1} - w_2)^{2K-3}.$$

Iteratively, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_K}(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_K) = \\
& (2K+1)! (s_{K+1} - s_0)^{-(2K+1)} (w_1 - s_0)(w_2 - w_1) \dots (w_K - w_{K-1})(s_{K+1} - w_K).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the prior distribution on \mathbf{s} with minimum distance of consecutive points s_k, s_{k+1} being d_k is defined as

$$f_{\mathbf{s}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_K) \propto \prod_{k=0}^K (s_{k+1} - s_k) \mathbb{1}(s_{k+1} - s_k > d_k) \tag{D.2}$$

E Sampling from the posterior distribution

The parameters included in the model are: \mathbf{s} (the exposure values in the experiment configuration), $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^X, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^Y$ (the vectors of length p including the covariates' inclusion indicators in the exposure and the outcome model for each experiment), $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^{K+1}$ (coefficients of exposure in the outcome model), $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^Y$ (intercepts and coefficients of the covariates in the exposure and outcome model of each experiment), $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_X^2 = \{\sigma_{k,X}^2\}_{k=1}^{K+1}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Y^2 = \{\sigma_{k,Y}^2\}_{k=1}^{K+1}$ (residual variance of the exposure and outcome within each experiment).

E.1 Likelihood factorization

We start by noting that the data likelihood (conditional on all parameters) factorizes to components for different experiments and the exposure and outcome models. If \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} denote the vectors of outcomes and exposures for all units in the sample, and $\mathbf{Y}^k, \mathbf{X}^k$ denote the vectors of outcomes and exposures in experiment k , then

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^X, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_X^2, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Y^2, \mathbf{C}) = \\ \prod_{k=1}^{K+1} \prod_{i \in g_k} p_k(Y_i | X_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y, \beta_k, \sigma_{k,Y}^2, \mathbf{C}_i) p_k(X_i | \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^X, \sigma_{k,X}^2, \mathbf{C}_i) = \\ \prod_{k=1}^{K+1} \left[p_k(\mathbf{Y}^k | \mathbf{X}^k, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y, \beta_k, \sigma_{k,Y}^2, \mathbf{C}^k) p_k(\mathbf{X}^k | \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^X, \sigma_{k,X}^2, \mathbf{C}^k) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.1})$$

where we denote $p_k(\cdot_1 | \cdot_2)$ as the density of \cdot_1 conditional on \cdot_2 in experiment k and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y$ includes the intercept δ_{k0}^Y .

Next, we note that if we consider the marginal likelihood integrating out 1) exposure model regression coefficients including the intercept, 2) outcome model covariates' regression coefficients, and 3) all variance terms, then the likelihood still factorizes in a similar manner. In fact¹:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^X, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \delta_{10}^Y, \mathbf{C}) \\ = \int P(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^X, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \delta_{10}^Y, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_X^2, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Y^2, \mathbf{C}) \times \\ p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^Y, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_X^2, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Y^2 | \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^X, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^Y) d(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^Y, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_X^2, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Y^2) \\ = \prod_{k=1}^{K+1} \int p_k(\mathbf{Y}^k | \mathbf{X}^k, \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \delta_{10}^Y, \sigma_{k,Y}^2, \mathbf{C}^k) p_k(\mathbf{X}^k | \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^X, \sigma_{k,X}^2, \mathbf{C}^k) \times \\ p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y, \sigma_{k,X}^2, \sigma_{k,Y}^2 | \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^X, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^Y) d(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y, \sigma_{k,X}^2, \sigma_{k,Y}^2) \\ = \prod_{k=1}^{K+1} \int p_k(\mathbf{Y}^k | \mathbf{X}^k, \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \delta_{10}^Y, \sigma_{k,Y}^2, \mathbf{C}^k) p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y, \sigma_{k,Y}^2 | \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^Y) d(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y, \sigma_{k,Y}^2) \\ \int p_k(\mathbf{X}^k | \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^X, \sigma_{k,X}^2) p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^X, \sigma_{k,X}^2 | \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^X) d(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^X, \sigma_{k,X}^2) \\ = \prod_{k=1}^{K+1} p_k(\mathbf{Y}^k | \mathbf{X}^k, \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^Y, \delta_{k0}^Y, \beta_k, \mathbf{C}^k) p_k(\mathbf{X}^k | \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^X, \mathbf{C}^k) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.2})$$

where the second equation holds from the factorization of the likelihood (when $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k^Y$ does not include the intercepts we need to condition on δ_{10}^Y and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$) and the assumed prior independences.

E.2 Sampling all model parameters using MCMC

E.2.1 Sampling the regression coefficients and residual variance terms

The factorization of the full data likelihood over experiments and exposure/outcome models and the choice of the prior distributions lead to full conditional posterior distributions of coefficients $\delta_{k0}^X, \delta_{kj}^X, \delta_{kj}^Y$, and variance terms $\sigma_{k,X}^2, \sigma_{k,Y}^2$ of known forms. The variance terms and exposure model intercepts have inverse Gamma and normal

¹In the following, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^X$ includes the exposure model intercepts, but $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^Y$ includes only the coefficients of the covariates.

full conditional posterior distributions accordingly, whereas the distributions of $\delta_{kj}^X, \delta_{kj}^Y$ are either point mass at 0 or normal, based on whether the corresponding α is 0 or 1.

We update coefficients δ_{kj}^X for which $\alpha_{kj}^X = 0$ separately from the ones with $\alpha_{kj}^X = 1$. Parameters δ_{kj}^X for which $\alpha_{kj}^X = 0$ are set to 0. Let j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{N_x} be the indices such that $\alpha_{kj_l} = 1, l = 1, 2, \dots, N_x$. Then,

$$(\delta_{k0}^X, \delta_{kj_1}^X, \delta_{kj_2}^X, \dots, \delta_{kj_{N_x}}^X)^T | \text{Data}, \bullet \sim MVN_{N_x+1}(\mu_X, \Sigma_X),$$

$$\text{where } \Sigma_X = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_{k,X}^2} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{V}} + \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} I_{N_x+1} \right)^{-1} \text{ and } \mu_X = \Sigma_X \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_{k,X}^2} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T \mathbf{X}^k + \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} \tilde{\mu}_0 \right)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{C}_{j_1}^k, \mathbf{C}_{j_2}^k, \dots, \mathbf{C}_{j_{N_x}}^k)$ is the design matrix of data in experiment k based on the included covariates, and $\tilde{\mu}_0$ is a vector of length $N_x + 1$ of repeated values μ_0 . (Update of the coefficients δ_{kj}^Y is performed conditional on δ_{k0}^Y, β_k and is similar to the updates of the coefficients in the exposure model and therefore omitted.)

The full conditional distribution of the variance term $\sigma_{k,X}^2$ is also of known form

$$\sigma_{k,X}^2 | \text{Data}, \bullet \sim IG(a_X, b_X),$$

$$\text{where } a_X = a_0 + \frac{n_k}{2}, \quad b_X = b_0 + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{X}^k - \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\delta}_k^X)^T (\mathbf{X}^k - \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\delta}_k^X),$$

where n_k is the number of observations in experiment k , and $\mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{C}^k)$. (The full conditional posterior distribution of $\sigma_{k,Y}^2$ is very similar and is therefore omitted.)

It is worth noting that centering the covariates C_j allows the outcome model intercepts δ_{k0} to depend solely on δ_{10}, β_k and \mathbf{s} , and not on δ_{kj}^Y . This simplifies the form of the full conditional distribution for many coefficients. Since $\delta_{k0}^Y, k \geq 2$ is a deterministic function of $\delta_{10}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{k-1}$, and the points s_0, s_1, \dots, s_k , the full conditional posterior distribution of δ_{10} depends on data across all experiments, and that of β_k on data from experiment k and onwards. Since the data likelihood in all experiments is normal and we have assumed normal prior distributions, the full conditional posterior distributions are also normal. After each update, intercepts $\delta_{k0}^Y, k \geq 2$ need to be updated from (4) to ensure ER continuity.

The parameter δ_{10}^Y is included in the mean structure of the outcome model for all experiments. Its full conditional posterior distribution is $\delta_{10}^Y | \text{Data}, \bullet \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ where

$$\sigma^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \frac{n_k}{\sigma_{k,Y}^2} \right)^{-1}$$

and

$$\mu = \sigma^2 \left[\frac{\mu_0}{\sigma_0^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \frac{1}{\sigma_{k,Y}^2} \sum_{i \in g_k} \left(y_i - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \beta_l (s_l - s_{l-1}) - \beta_k (x_i - s_{k-1}) - \sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{kj}^Y C_{ij} \right) \right],$$

where $\sum_a^b = 0$ if $b < a$. Similarly, the full conditional posterior distribution of β_k uses data from experiments $k, k+1, \dots, K+1$, and is $\beta_k | \text{Data}, \bullet \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ where

$$\sigma^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_{k,Y}^2} \sum_{i \in g_k} (x_i - s_{k-1})^2 + (s_k - s_{k-1})^2 \sum_{l=k+1}^{K+1} \frac{n_l}{\sigma_{l,Y}^2} \right)^{-1}$$

and

$$\mu = \sigma^2 \left(\frac{\mu_0}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_{k,Y}^2} \sum_{i \in g_k} (x_i - s_{k-1}) (y_i - \delta_{k0}^Y - \sum_j \delta_{kj}^Y C_{ij}) + \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \frac{1}{\sigma_{l,Y}^2} \sum_{i \in g_l} (s_k - s_{k-1}) (y_i - \delta_{k0}^Y - \sum_{e=k+1}^{l-1} \beta_e (s_e - s_{e-1}) - \beta_l (x_i - s_{l-1}) - \sum_j \delta_{lj}^Y C_{ij}) \right).$$

E.2.2 Sampling the experiment configuration and inclusion indicators

The experiment configuration and inclusion indicators can be updated separately, or simultaneously. We first describe the separate update of \mathbf{s} and (α^X, α^Y) , and afterwards we will discuss why occasional simultaneous sampling was deemed necessary. One of the three moves (separate, jump over, jump within) depicted in Figure E.1 is performed at every iteration with probability 0.8, 0.1, and 0.1 accordingly.

(separate) The experiment configuration and inclusion indicators are updated separately and conditionally on each other. For the update of the experiment configuration \mathbf{s} , a Metropolis-Hastings step is used [Metropolis et al., 1953, Hastings, 1970] based on the full conditional likelihood (E.1). k is chosen uniformly over $\{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ and $s^* \sim U(s_{k-1}, s_{k+1})$ is drawn as shown in Figure E.1(b). Alternatively, s^* could be sampled from a truncated normal distribution centered at s_k . If s^* violates $s_{k+1} - s^* \geq d_k$ or $s^* - s_{k-1} \geq d_{k-1}$, the move is automatically rejected.

Otherwise, the move $\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}^* = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{k-1}, s^*, s_{k+1}, \dots, s_K)$ is proposed with all other parameters (excluding $\tilde{\beta}$) fixed to their current values. Proposing new values of $\tilde{\beta}$ is necessary to ensure that the ER is continuous at the proposed state. All coefficients but β_k, β_{k+1} are fixed to their current values, and new values for β_k, β_{k+1} are proposed such that the intercepts of the adjacent experiments are also fixed. If $s^* < s_k$, the proposed value β_{k+1}^* is sampled from a uniform distribution between the values β_{k+1} (current state) and

$$\tilde{\beta}_{k+1} = (s_{k+1} - s^*)^{-1} (\delta_{(k+2)0}^Y - \delta_{k0}^Y - \beta_k (s^* - s_{k-1})),$$

where $\tilde{\beta}_{k+1}$ is the slope that would connect the value of the ER at point s_{k+1} with the value of the ER at point s^* at the current state. Figure E.2 shows the the limits of the proposed ER. Based on the sampled value for β_{k+1}^* , the proposed value for β_k is

$$\beta_k^* = (s^* - s_{k-1})^{-1} (\delta_{(k+2)0}^Y - \delta_{k0}^Y - \beta_{k+1}^* (s_{k+1} - s^*)).$$

Similarly for $s^* > s_k$ by sampling β_k^* from a uniform that has similar properties.

Since the likelihood factorizes as shown in (E.1) the likelihood ratio of the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance probability includes terms only for experiments $k, k+1$. The prior ratio includes terms for the experiment configuration distribution in (D.2), and the prior for β_k, β_{k+1} . If a uniform distribution is used to sample s^* , the proposal for the cutoffs is symmetric, and the proposal ratio corresponds to the proposal ratio for coefficients β_k, β_{k+1} . This is equal to $|\beta_{k+1} - \tilde{\beta}_{k+1}| / |\beta_k^* - \tilde{\beta}_k^*|$, where β_k^* is the proposed value and $\tilde{\beta}_k^*$ is the one boundary of the proposal distribution for β_k in the reverse move.

After we accept or reject the move $\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}^*$, we update the inclusion indicators based on their full conditional. Let A^* be all parameters but $\alpha_{kj}^X, \alpha_{kj}^Y$ and δ_{kj}^Y . For $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$

$$p(\alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha | \text{Data}, A^*, \alpha_{kj}^X) = \frac{p(\delta_{kj}^Y = 0, \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha | \text{Data}, A^*, \alpha_{kj}^X)}{p(\delta_{kj}^Y = 0 | \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha, \text{Data}, A^*, \alpha_{kj}^X)}$$




Figure E.1: Proposed state for the separate, jump within and jump over moves are depicted schematically for a hypothetical experiment configuration with $K = 3$. In all proposed states, new slopes are proposed to ensure continuity of the ER. (a) The current state of the MCMC. s_3 is chosen to be updated. (b) A new point s^* is proposed within (s_2, s_4) with the corresponding α parameters constant. (c) Simultaneous move of the experiment configuration and the corresponding α 's within (s_2, s_4) . (d) The proposed point s^* is located outside the interval (s_2, s_4) and new α 's are proposed for the experiment that was split (s_0, s_1) , and the experiments that were combined (s_2, s_4) .




Figure E.2: Values of β_k, β_{k+1} for the separate move are proposed such that the estimated ER are within the limits shown in dashed green lines. The black solid line correspond to the current state of the ER.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{p(\text{Data}, A^* | \delta_{kj}^Y = 0, \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha, \alpha_{kj}^X) p(\delta_{kj}^Y = 0, \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha | \alpha_{kj}^X)}{p(\text{Data}, A^* | \alpha_{kj}^X) p(\delta_{kj}^Y = 0 | \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha, \text{Data}, A^*, \alpha_{kj}^X)} \\
&\propto \frac{p(\delta_{kj}^Y = 0 | \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha, \alpha_{kj}^X) p(\alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha | \alpha_{kj}^X)}{p(\delta_{kj}^Y = 0 | \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha, \text{Data}, A^*, \alpha_{kj}^X)} \\
&= \frac{p(\delta_{kj}^Y = 0 | \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha) p(\alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha | \alpha_{kj}^X)}{p(\delta_{kj}^Y = 0 | \alpha_{kj}^Y = \alpha, \text{Data}, A^*)}, \quad \alpha \in \{0, 1\}, \tag{E.3}
\end{aligned}$$

where the numerator consists of the product of two prior probabilities, and the denominator consists of the posterior probability that $\delta_{kj}^Y = 0$. This has been seen previously in a different context [Antonelli et al., 2017a], and consists a computational improvement over previous implementations of this prior distribution that utilized the MC³ algorithm [Madigan et al., 1995, Wang et al., 2012].

However, sampling the inclusion indicators and experiment configuration separately can lead to slow convergence. For example, consider our simulation scenario where the true experiment configuration is (2, 4, 7), and starting values randomly set to (0.5, 2, 7). Based on the separate move, point s_1 is always proposed to be updated between $s_0, s_2 = 2$, which can lead to slow mixing. The jump over and jump within moves are meant to alleviate such issues.

In order to avoid the need of proposing values for the covariates' coefficients and variance terms in the update of the experiment configuration through a simultaneous move, these parameters are integrated out from the data likelihood. Integrating all other parameters out allows us to perform sampling of the experiment configuration without heavy fine tuning of proposal distributions. In both situations, sampling of $\mathbf{s}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^X, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^Y, \underline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is performed using the marginalized likelihood (E.2):

$$p(\mathbf{s}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^X, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^Y, \underline{\boldsymbol{\beta}} | \text{Data}, \delta_{10}^Y) \propto p(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{s}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^X, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^Y, \underline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \delta_{10}^Y, \mathbf{C}) p(\mathbf{s}) p(\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^X, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^Y) p(\underline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}).$$

Note that all likelihoods in (E.2) are marginal densities of linear regression models over the regression coefficients and variance terms with Normal-Inverse Gamma priors. Raftery et al. [1997] provided closed form calculations of this marginal likelihood. However, this calculation requires the inversion of a matrix with dimension equal to the number of observations, and is computationally intensive. Since the marginal likelihood is only used in the calculation of Bayes factors, we approximate the Bayes factors when necessary using the BIC [Raftery, 1995].

(jump over) This move is designed to alleviate the MCMC issue described above by proposing a simultaneous move of $(\mathbf{s}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^X, \underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^Y, \underline{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ is again chosen uniformly, but now a new location of the experiment configuration s^* is generated uniformly over $(s_0, s_{K+1}) \setminus [s_{k-1}, s_{k+1}]$ (necessarily not between s_k, s_{k+1}). The move $\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}^* = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{k-1}, s_{k+1}, \dots, s_{j-1}, s^*, s_j, \dots, s_K)$ proposes a combination of experiments $k, k+1$ and a split in some randomly chosen experiment j . For example, in Figure E.1(d), the proposed move splits the first experiment (s_0, s_1) in two $(s_0, s^*), (s^*, s_1)$, and combines the experiments $(s_2, s_3), (s_3, s_4)$.

The inclusion indicators of the unchanged experiments remain to their current values, but new values need to be proposed for the combined or split experiments. The assignment of proposed values for the inclusion indicators

is probabilistic based on their current values, encouraging the inclusion of a covariate in the proposed state to resemble that of the current state. For example, in Figure E.1(d) α_1^*, α_2^* should resemble α_1 , and similarly for α_4^* . In this example, covariates are included in experiment 4 with very low, mediocre and very high probability if none, one or both of the original experiments include it. The values chosen for these probabilities were (0.01, 0.5, 0.99) accordingly. Similarly, a variable is proposed to be included in the model of experiments 1 and 2 with low and high probability if the variable was included in the initial model or not. The values chosen were (0.2, 0.95).

Values for β are proposed to ensure that the proposed state corresponds to a continuous ER. Unchanged experiments remain the same. Experiments are combined by connecting the edges of the two linear segments, and values of the split experiments are proposed using a normal perturbation of the current value with variance σ_{tune}^2 . Figure E.1(d) shows proposed states of the ER.

The move is accepted or rejected with probability equal to the product of the following:

1. The likelihood ratio for split and combined experiments approximated using the BIC for the exposure model and the outcome model (regressing $\mathbf{Y}^k - (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{X}^k - s_{k-1}\mathbf{1})(\delta_{k0}^Y, \beta_k)^T$ on \mathbf{C}^k without an intercept).
2. The prior ratio for the experiment configuration (D.2), the inclusion indicators (3), and the coefficients β_k for the combined and split experiments.
3. The proposal ratio for \mathbf{s} , β_k and (α^X, α^Y)

$$\frac{(s_{K+1} - s_0) - (s_j - s_{j-1})}{(s_{K+1} - s_0) - (s_{k+1} - s_{k-1})} \exp\left\{\frac{u^2 - u^{*2}}{2\sigma_{tune}^2}\right\} \prod_{\substack{l \in \{0,1,2\} \\ m \in \{0,1\}}} (p_{lm}^c)^{n_{ml}^s - n_{lm}^c} \prod_{\substack{l \in \{0,1\} \\ m \in \{0,1,2\}}} (p_{lm}^s)^{n_{ml}^c - n_{lm}^s},$$

where p_{lm}^c is the probability of proposing $\alpha = m \in \{0, 1\}$ in the combined experiment when $l \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ of the two initial experiments had $\alpha = 1$, p_{lm}^s is the probability of proposing $\alpha = 1$ in $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ of the two experiments when the initial experiment chosen to be split had $\alpha = l \in \{0, 1\}$, and n_{lm}^c , n_{lm}^s is the number of times that each event occurred when moving from the current to the proposed state. Lastly, u is the difference of the slope for the experiment that was split from the slope of the first split experiment in the proposed state, and u^* is the difference of the slope in the first of the experiment that is combined from the slope of the combined experiment in the proposed state.

(jump within) This move is similar to the “jump over” but maintaining the ordering of the locations in \mathbf{s} . $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ is again chosen uniformly, and a new value s^* is proposed within the interval (s_{k-1}, s_{k+1}) . New values for the coefficients β_k, β_{k+1} are proposed as in the separate move. New values of the inclusion indicators are also proposed for the experiments $k, k+1$. In fact, C_j is proposed to be included in the outcome model of an experiment with high probability if both current models include it, mediocre probability if only one of the models include it, and low probability if none of the models include it. Similarly for the inclusion indicators of the exposure model. The acceptance probability of this move is similar to the one described above, and is omitted here. Figure E.1(c) depicts random draws for proposed ER states.

E.3 MCMC convergence

Due to the update of the experiment configuration, commonly used convergence diagnostics such as trace plots are not appropriate since parameters (e.g., β_k) may correspond to a different range of exposure values at different iterations. Therefore, convergence must be examined in the context of quantities that are detached from the experiment configuration.

One quantity that we use for convergence inspection is the mean exposure response curve calculated over a set of exposure values within the exposure range. Such a set might be an equally spaced grid of points over the interval (s_0, s_{K+1}) , denoted by \mathcal{G} . For each value $x \in \mathcal{G}$ and MCMC iteration t , identify the experiment $k = k_t(x)$ that x belongs to. Then, for observation i calculate the expected response at value x , by defining $\tilde{w}_i(x) = (1, x, C_{i1}, \dots, C_{ip})^T$ and calculating $\hat{Y}_{it}(x) = \tilde{w}_i(x)^T \gamma_{kt}$ where γ_{kt} is the posterior sample of $(\delta_{k0}^Y, \beta_k, \delta_{k1}^Y, \dots, \delta_{kp}^Y)^T$ in iteration t . Finally, the t -posterior sample of the mean response at point $x \in \mathcal{G}$ is the average of the expected responses over the individuals in the sample $\hat{Y}_t(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{Y}_{it}(x)$.

Convergence could be examined by visual inspection of trace plots of $\hat{Y}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}$. Based on multiple chains of the MCMC, we calculate the potential scale reduction factor (PSR) for the mean response at every point $x \in \mathcal{G}$ [Gelman and Rubin, 1992]. We consider that the MCMC has converged if $|\text{PSR} - 1| < c$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}$. An alternative quantity based on which MCMC convergence can be examined is $\hat{\Delta}(x) = \beta_{k_t(x)}$.

F Simulating data with differential confounding at different exposure levels

In simulation studies, data are most often simulated in the following order: covariates C_1, C_2, \dots, C_p , exposure X given a subset of C_1, C_2, \dots, C_p , and outcome Y given X and a potentially different subset of C_1, C_2, \dots, C_p . Data with differential confounding at different exposure levels could imply, in its most generality, that the exposure X is generated with different predicting variables at different exposure levels. Generating data with such structure is complicated since the actual X values define the exposure level that an observation belongs to, and the exposure level in which an observation belongs to defines the set of predictors. For that reason, instead of following the $\mathbf{C}, X|\mathbf{C}$ approach to data simulation, we generate the exposure values X first, and \mathbf{C} is generated conditional on X , ensuring that the target experiment-specific mean and variance of X, \mathbf{C} , and correlation of all variables remain the same, as if the data were generated with the typical $\mathbf{C}, X|\mathbf{C}$ order. Generating the outcome with different predictors at different exposure levels is straightforward by including terms of the form $\delta_j^* C_j I(X \geq s_k)$, or by using a separate outcome model within each experiment. In all situations, one should ensure that data are generated in such a way that the true ER is continuous.

F.1 The “target” data generating mechanism

Given K, \mathbf{s} , we would like the exposure X to be generated such as $E(X)$ and $Var(X)$ are controllable quantities, since they are closely related to the exposure range of each experiment, and we would like to ensure that simulation results are not driven by the inherit variability in X . Furthermore, we would like to ensure that $Var(C_j)$ is approximately the same across experiments and across covariates, such that the the magnitude of δ_{kj}^Y has similar interpretation in terms of correlation.

As discussed above, data (X, \mathbf{C}) are usually generated in the order \mathbf{C} followed by $X|\mathbf{C}$, using a model for which $E(X|\mathbf{C}) = \delta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^p \delta_j C_j$. Instead of setting target values for δ_j , we set target correlations $Cor(X, C_j)$ and calculate the δ_j 's that correspond to these correlations. (The reverse is also possible but requires ensuring that that $Var(X) \geq \sum_{j=1}^p \delta_j^2 Var(C_j)$.) We require that $E(C_j|X = x)$ is continuous in x to ensure that the joint distribution (X, C_j) is realistic, and does not have “jumps” at the points of the experiment configuration.

Based on the above, the following represent target (controllable) quantities of our data generation:

- $Var(X), E(X)$ are fixed,
- Within each experiment C_j are independent random variables with known variance,
- $Cor(C_j, X)$ are fixed and δ_j can be calculated, using $Cor(X, C_j) = \delta_j \sqrt{\frac{Var(C_j)}{Var(X)}}$,
- The function $E(C_j|X = x)$ is continuous in x .

Ensuring that $E(C_j|X = x)$ is continuous in x across experiments is performed in the following way: Given $Var(X)$, a model for $\mathbf{C}|X$ that gives rise to data with the target $Var(C_j), Cor(X, C_j)$ is considered. The variance-covariance targets do not impose any restrictions on the model intercept. For the first experiment, the intercept can be chosen arbitrarily, and for the subsequent experiments intercepts are chosen to ensure that $\lim_{t \rightarrow x^-} E(C_j|X = t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x^+} E(C_j|X = t)$ at all points x .

F.2 Generating the data set maintaining target quantities

As discussed in Appendix F.1, $Cor(X, C_j), Var(C_j)$, and $Var(X)$ are considered known, from which we can derive $Cov(X, C_j)$. We generate data with the following order:

1. X is generated from a distribution with mean $E(X)$, and variance $Var(X)$. In our simulations X is uniform over the exposure range.
2. Taking advantage of the laws of the multivariate normal distribution we generate

$$\mathbf{C}|X \sim MVN_p(\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}), \text{ where}$$

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = E(\mathbf{C}) + \frac{Cov(\mathbf{C}, X)}{Var(X)}(X - EX), \text{ and}$$

$$\bar{\Sigma} = V(\mathbf{C}) - \frac{1}{\text{Var}(X)} \text{Cov}(\mathbf{C}, X) \text{Cov}(\mathbf{C}, X)^T,$$

where $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{C}, X) = (\text{Cov}(C_1, X), \text{Cov}(C_2, X), \dots, \text{Cov}(C_p, X))^T$, and $V(\mathbf{C})$ is a diagonal $p \times p$ matrix with entries $\text{Var}(C_j), j = 1, 2, \dots, p$.

3. The marginal means of each variable C_j within each experiment is calculated by ensuring that the function $E(C_j|X = x)$ which corresponds to the j^{th} entry of the vector $\bar{\mu}$ is continuous at the points of experiment change.
4. Covariates C_j are subtracted their overall mean.

A simple linear regression form is used to generate the outcome within each experiment. In experiment k , the outcome is generated from $Y|X, \mathbf{C} \sim N(\xi_{k0} + \xi_{k1}\phi(X) + \sum_{j=1}^p \xi_{k(j+1)}C_j, \sigma_{k,Y}^2)$, where $\phi(\cdot)$ is a continuous function, and the residual variance $\sigma_{k,Y}^2$ is set equal across k . We ensure that the true ER function $E(Y|X)$ is continuous in X by appropriately setting the intercept values ξ_{k0} . The intercept in experiment 1 is decided, and for each experiment onwards we set ξ_{k0} such that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow s_k^-} E[Y|X = x] = \lim_{x \rightarrow s_k^+} E[Y|X = x] \iff \xi_{(k+1)0} = \xi_{k0} + (\xi_{k1} - \xi_{(k+1)1})\phi(s_k).$$

References

- Vasilis P. Androutsopoulos, Antonio F. Hernandez, Jyrki Liesivuori, and Aristidis M. Tsatsakis. A mechanistic overview of health associated effects of low levels of organochlorine and organophosphorous pesticides. *Toxicology*, 307:89–94, 2012.
- Joseph Antonelli, Maitreyi Mazumdar, David Bellinger, David C Christiani, Robert Wright, and Brent A Coull. Bayesian variable selection for multi-dimensional semiparametric regression models. 2017a.
- Joseph Antonelli, Corwin Zigler, and Francesca Dominici. Guided Bayesian imputation to adjust for confounding when combining heterogeneous data sources in comparative effectiveness research. *Biostatistics*, 18(3):553–568, 2017b.
- Joseph Antonelli, Giovanni Parmigiani, and Francesca Dominici. High-dimensional confounding adjustment using continuous spike and slab priors. *Bayesian Analysis*, 2018.
- James Babb, André Rogatko, and Shelemyahu Zacks. Cancer phase I clinical trials: efficient dose escalation with overdose control. *Statistics in Medicine*, 17(10):1103–20, 1998.
- Michelle L Bell, Roger D Peng, and Francesca Dominici. The exposure-response curve for ozone and risk of mortality and the adequacy of current ozone regulations. *Environmental health perspectives*, 114(4):532–6, apr 2006.
- Rebecca E. Berger, Ramya Ramaswami, Caren G. Solomon, and Jeffrey M. Drazen. Air Pollution Still Kills. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 376(26):2591–2592, 2017.
- Michela Bia, Carlos A. Flores, Alfonso Flores-Lagunes, and Alessandra Mattei. A Stata package for the application of semiparametric estimators of doseresponse functions. *The Stata Journal*, 14(3):580–604, 2014.
- Matthew Cefalu, Francesca Dominici, Nils Arvold, and Giovanni Parmigiani. Model averaged double robust estimation. *Biometrics*, 73(2):410–421, 2017.
- Lisa M Chiodo, Sandra W Jacobson, and Joseph L Jacobson. Neurodevelopmental effects of postnatal lead exposure at very low levels. *Neurotoxicology and Teratology*, 26:359–371, 2004.
- Dan L Crouse, Paul A Peters, Perry Hystad, Jeffrey R Brook, Aaron van Donkelaar, Randall V Martin, Paul J Villeneuve, Michael Jerrett, Mark S Goldberg, C Arden Pope, Michael Brauer, Robert D Brook, Alain Robichaud, Richard Menard, Richard T Burnett, and Richard T. Burnett. Ambient PM_{2.5}, O₃, and NO₂ Exposures and Associations with Mortality over 16 Years of Follow-Up in the Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort (CanCHEC). *Environmental health perspectives*, 123(11):1180–6, nov 2015. ISSN 1552-9924. doi: 10.1289/ehp.1409276.

- Dan L Crouse, Sajeev Philip, Aaron Van Donkelaar, Randall V Martin, Barry Jessiman, Paul A Peters, Scott Weichenthal, Jeffrey R Brook, Bryan Hubbell, and Richard T Burnett. A New Method to Jointly Estimate the Mortality Risk of Long-Term Exposure to Fine Particulate Matter and its Components. *Nature Publishing Group*, (November 2015):1–10, 2016. doi: 10.1038/srep18916.
- Michael J. Daniels, Francesca Dominici, Jonathan M. Samet, and Scott L. Zeger. Estimating Particulate Matter-Mortality Dose-Response Curves and Threshold Levels: An Analysis of Daily Time-Series for the 20 Largest US Cities. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 152(5):397–406, 2000.
- Michael J Daniels, Francesca Dominici, Scott L Zeger, and Jonathan M Samet. The National Morbidity, Mortality, and Air Pollution Study. Part III: PM10 concentration-response curves and thresholds for the 20 largest US cities. *Research report (Health Effects Institute)*, (94 Pt 3):1–21; discussion 23–30, may 2004.
- D G T Denison, B K Mallick, and A F M Smith. Automatic Bayesian curve fitting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 60(2):333–350, 1998.
- Rebecca Devries, David Kriebel, and Susan Sama. Low level air pollution and exacerbation of existing copd: a case crossover analysis. *Environmental Health*, 15(98):1–11, 2016. ISSN 1476-069X. doi: 10.1186/s12940-016-0179-z.
- Qian Di, Lingzhen Dai, Yun Wang, Antonella Zanobetti, Christine Choirat, Joel D Schwartz, and Francesca Dominici. Association of Short-Term Exposure to Air Pollution with Mortality in Older Adults. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 318(24):2446–2456, 2017a. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.17923.Association.
- Qian Di, Yan Wang, Antonella Zabonetti, Yun Wang, Petros Koutrakis, Christine Choirat, Francesca Dominici, and Joel D Schwartz. Air Pollution and Mortality in the Medicare Population. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 376(26):2513–2522, 2017b. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1702747.Air.
- Ilaria Dimatteo, Christopher R Genovese, and Robert E Kass. Bayesian curve-fitting with free-knot splines. *Biometrika*, 88(4):1055–1071, 2001.
- Francesca Dominici, Michael Daniels, Scott L Zeger, and Jonathan M Samet. Air Pollution and Mortality: Estimating Regional and National Dose-Response Relationships. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(457):100–111, 2002.
- Sorina E. Eftim, Jonathan M. Samet, Holly Janes, Aidan McDermott, and Francesca Dominici. Fine Particulate Matter and Mortality: A Comparison of the Six Cities and American Cancer Society Cohorts With a Medicare Cohort. *Epidemiology*, 19(2):209–216, mar 2008.
- Reza Fazel, Harlan M. Krumholz, Yongfei Wang, Joseph S. Ross, Jersey Chen, Henry H. Ting, Nilay D. Shah, Khurram Nasir, Andrew J. Einstein, and Brahmajee K. Nallamothu. Exposure to Low-Dose Ionizing Radiation from Medical Imaging Procedures. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 361(9):849–857, aug 2009.
- Carlos A Flores, Alfonso Flores-Lagunes, and Arturo Gonzalez. Estimating the effects of length of exposure to instruction in a training program: the case of job corps. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 94(1):153–171, 2012.
- Cynthia A Garcia, Poh-sin Yap, Hye-youn Park, and Barbara L Weller. Association of long-term PM2.5 exposure with mortality using different air pollution exposure models: impacts in rural and urban California. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research*, 26(2):145–157, 2016. ISSN 0960-3123. doi: 10.1080/09603123.2015.1061113.
- Andrew Gelman and Donald B. Rubin. Inference from Iterative Simulation Using Multiple Sequences. *Statistical Science*, 7(4):457–511, 1992.
- Andrew Gelman, Jessica Hwang, and Aki Vehtari. Understanding predictive information criteria for Bayesian models. *Statistics and Computing*, 24(6):997–1016, nov 2014.
- P J Green. Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo computation and Bayesian model determination. *Biometrika*, 82:711–732, 1995.

- Jaime E Hart, Xiaomei Liao, Biling Hong, Robin C Puett, Jeff D Yanosky, Helen Suh, Marianthi-anna Kioumourt-zoglou, Donna Spiegelman, and Francine Laden. The association of long-term exposure to PM 2.5 on all-cause mortality in the Nurses' Health Study and the impact of measurement-error correction. *Environmental health*, 14(38):1–9, 2015. doi: 10.1186/s12940-015-0027-6.
- Trevor Hastie. gam: Generalized Additive Models, 2017.
- Trevor Hastie and Robert Tibshirani. Generalized Additive Models. *Statistical Science*, 1(3):297–318, 1986.
- Trevor Hastie and Robert Tibshirani. Varying-Coefficient Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 55(4):757–796, 1993.
- W K Hastings. Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, 57(1), 1970. doi: 10.1093/biomet/57.1.97/284580.
- Keisuke Hirano and Guido W Imbens. The Propensity Score with Continuous Treatments *. 2004.
- Kosuke Imai and David A Van Dyk. Causal Inference With General Treatment Regimes: Generalizing the Propensity Score. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(467):854–866, 2004. doi: 10.1198/016214504000001187.
- Michael Jerrett, Michelle C Turner, Bernardo S Beckerman, C Arden Pope Iii, and Aaron Van Donkelaar. Comparing the Health Effects of Ambient Particulate Matter Estimated Using Ground-Based versus Remote Sensing Exposure Estimates. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 125(4):552–559, 2017.
- Todd A Jusko, Charles R Henderson, Bruce P Lanphear, Deborah A Cory-Slechta, Patrick J Parsons, and Richard L. Canfield. Blood Lead Concentrations < 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dL}$ and Child Intelligence at 6 Years of Age. *Environmental health perspectives*, 116(2):243–8, feb 2008.
- Edward H. Kennedy, Zongming Ma, Matthew D. McHugh, and Dylan S. Small. Non-parametric methods for doubly robust estimation of continuous treatment effects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(4):1229–1245, sep 2017.
- Mihye Lee, Petros Koutrakis, Brent A Coull, Itai Kloog, and Joel D. Schwartz. Acute effect of fine particulate matter on mortality in three southeastern states 20072011. *Journal of Exposure Science and Environmental Epidemiology*, 26(2):173–179, 2016. doi: 10.1038/jes.2015.47.Acute.
- Chris C Lim, Richard B Hayes, Jiyoung Ahn, Yongzhao Shao, Debra T Silverman, Rena R Jones, Cynthia Garcia, and George D Thurston. Association between long-term exposure to ambient air pollution and diabetes mortality in the US. *Environmental Research*, 165(February):330–336, 2018. ISSN 0013-9351. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2018.04.011.
- Xavier De Luna, Ingeborg Waernbaum, and Thomas S. Richardson. Covariate selection for the nonparametric estimation of an average treatment effect. *Biometrika*, 98(4):861–875, 2011.
- Sarah Jane Mackenzie Ross, Chris Ray Brewin, Helen Valerie Curran, Clement Eugene Furlong, Kelly Michelle Abraham-Smith, and Virginia Harrison. Neuropsychological and psychiatric functioning in sheep farmers exposed to low levels of organophosphate pesticides. *Neurotoxicology and teratology*, 32(4):452–9, 2010.
- David Madigan, Jeremy York, and Denis Allard. Bayesian Graphical Models for Discrete Data. *International Statistical Review*, 63(2):215–232, 1995. ISSN 03067734. doi: 10.2307/1403615.
- Maggie Makar, Joseph Antonelli, Qian Di, David Cutler, and Joel Schwartz. Estimating the Causal Effect of Fine Particulate Matter Levels on Death and Hospitalization: Are Levels Below the Safety Standards Harmful? *Epidemiology*, 28(5):627–634, 2018. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000690.Estimating.
- Nicholas Metropolis, Arianna W Rosenbluth, Marshall N Rosenbluth, Augusta H Teller, and Edward Teller. Equation of State Calculations by Fast Computing Machines. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 21(6):1087–1092, 1953. doi: 10.1063/1.439486.
- National Research Council. *Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation: BEIR VII Phase 2*. The National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., mar 2006.

- Jerzy Neyman. On the Application of Probability Theory to Agricultural Experiments. Essay on Principles. Section 9. *Statistical Science*, 5(4):465–480, 1923.
- Lauren Pinault, Michael Tjepkema, Daniel L. Crouse, Scott Weichenthal, Aaron van Donkelaar, Randall V. Martin, Michael Brauer, Hong Chen, and Richard T. Burnett. Risk estimates of mortality attributed to low concentrations of ambient fine particulate matter in the Canadian community health survey cohort. *Environmental Health*, 15(1):18, dec 2016. ISSN 1476-069X. doi: 10.1186/s12940-016-0111-6.
- Lauren L. Pinault, Scott Weichenthal, Daniel L. Crouse, Michael Brauer, Anders Erickson, Aaron van Donkelaar, Randall V. Martin, Perry Hystad, Hong Chen, Philippe Finès, Jeffrey R. Brook, Michael Tjepkema, and Richard T. Burnett. Associations between fine particulate matter and mortality in the 2001 Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort. *Environmental Research*, 159:406–415, nov 2017. ISSN 0013-9351. doi: 10.1016/J.ENVRES.2017.08.037.
- Adrian E. Raftery. Bayesian Model Selection in Social Research. *Sociological Methodology*, 25:111–163, 1995.
- Adrian E Raftery, David Madigan, and J Hoeting. Bayesian model averaging for linear regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 92(437):179–191, 1997. ISSN 0162-1459. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1997.10473615.
- Donald B. Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(5):688–701, 1974.
- Donald B Rubin. Randomization Analysis of Experimental Data: The Fisher Randomization Test Comment. *Source Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 75(371):591–593, 1980.
- Joseph Schafer. *causaldrf: Tools for Estimating Causal Dose Response Functions*, 2015.
- Martin Scholze, Wolfgang Boedeker, Michael Faust, Thomas Backhaus, Rolf Altenburger, and L Horst. A general best-fit method for concentration-response curves and the estimation of low-effect concentrations. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 20(2):448–457, 2001.
- Joel Schwartz, Francine Laden, and Antonella Zanobetti. The Concentration-Response Relation between PM_{2.5} and Daily Deaths. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 110(10):1025–1029, 2002.
- Joel Schwartz, Marie-abele Bind, and Petros Koutrakis. Estimating Causal Effects of Local Air Pollution on Daily Deaths: Effect of Low Levels. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 125(1):23–29, 2017.
- Joel Schwartz, Kelvin Fong, and Antonella Zanobetti. A National Multicity Analysis of the Causal Effect of Local Pollution , NO₂ , and PM_{2.5} on Mortality. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 126(2):1–10, 2018.
- Gavin Shaddick, Duncan Lee, James V. Zidek, and Ruth Salway. Estimating exposure response functions using ambient pollution concentrations. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2(4):1249–1270, 2008.
- Liuhua Shi, Antonella Zanobetti, Itai Kloog, Brent A Coull, Petros Koutrakis, Steven J Melly, and Joel D Schwartz. Low-Concentration PM_{2.5} and Mortality: Estimating Acute and Chronic Effects in a Population-Based Study. *Environmental health perspectives*, 124(1):46–52, jan 2016.
- George D. Thurston, Jiyoung Ahn, Kevin R. Cromar, Yongzhao Shao, Harmony R. Reynolds, Michael Jerrett, Chris C. Lim, Ryan Shanley, Yikyung Park, and Richard B. Hayes. Ambient Particulate Matter Air Pollution Exposure and Mortality in the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Cohort. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 124:484–90, sep 2016. ISSN 0091-6765. doi: 10.1289/ehp.1509676.
- Mark J Van Der Laan, Eric C Polley, and Alan E Hubbard. Super Learner. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 6(1), 2007.
- Ron Van Der Oost, Jonny Beyer, and Nico P E Vermeulen. Fish bioaccumulation and biomarkers in environmental risk assessment: a review. *Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 13:57–149, 2003.
- Stijn Vansteelandt, Maarten Bekaert, and Gerda Claeskens. On model selection and model misspecification in causal inference. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 21(1):7–30, 2012.

- Chi Wang, Giovanni Parmigiani, and Francesca Dominici. Bayesian Effect Estimation Accounting for Adjustment Uncertainty. *Biometrics*, 68(3):661–671, 2012.
- Chi Wang, Francesca Dominici, Giovanni Parmigiani, and Corwin Matthew Zigler. Accounting for uncertainty in confounder and effect modifier selection when estimating average causal effects in generalized linear models. *Biometrics*, 71(3):654–665, 2015.
- Yan Wang, Liuhua Shi, Mihye Lee, Pengfei Liu, Qian Di, Antonella Zanonetti, and Joel D. Schwartz. Long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} and mortality among older adults in the Southeastern US. *Epidemiology*, 28(2):207–214, 2018. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000614.Long-term.
- Sumio Watanabe. Asymptotic Equivalence of Bayes Cross Validation and Widely Applicable Information Criterion in Singular Learning Theory. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:3571–3594, 2010.
- Scott Weichenthal, Ryan Kulka, Eric Lavigne, David Van Rijswijk, Michael Brauer, Paul J Villeneuve, Dave Stieb, Lawrence Joseph, and Rick T Burnett. Biomass Burning as a Source of Ambient Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Acute Myocardial Infarction. *Epidemiology*, 28(3):329–337, 2017. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000636.
- Ander Wilson and Brian J. Reich. Confounder selection via penalized credible regions. *Biometrics*, 70(4):852–861, 2014.
- Antonella Zanobetti and Joel Schwartz. Particulate air pollution, progression, and survival after myocardial infarction. *Environmental health perspectives*, 115(5):769–75, may 2007.
- Scott L Zeger, Francesca Dominici, Aidan McDermott, and Jonathan M Samet. Mortality in the Medicare population and chronic exposure to fine particulate air pollution in urban centers (2000-2005). *Environmental health perspectives*, 116(12):1614–9, dec 2008.
- Corwin M. Zigler and Francesca Dominici. Point: Clarifying Policy Evidence With Potential-Outcomes Thinking-Beyond Exposure-Response Estimation in Air Pollution Epidemiology. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 180(12):1133–1140, 2014.