A Bayesian approach to uncover spatio-temporal determinants of heterogeneity in repeated cross-sectional health surveys

Mattia Stival

Department of Economics, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice, 30121, Italy. E-mail: mattia.stival@unive.it Lorenzo Schiavon Department of Economics, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice, 30121, Italy. E-mail: lorenzo.schiavon@unive.it Stefano Campostrini Department of Economics, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice, 30121, Italy. E-mail: stefano.campostrini@unive.it

Summary.

In several countries, including Italy, a prominent approach to population health surveillance involves conducting repeated cross-sectional surveys at short intervals of time. These surveys gather information on the health status of individual respondents, including details on their behaviors, risk factors, and relevant socio-demographic information. While the collected data undoubtedly provides valuable information, modeling such data presents several challenges. For instance, in health risk models, it is essential to consider behavioral information, spatio-temporal dynamics, and disease co-occurrence. In response to these challenges, our work proposes a multivariate spatio-temporal logistic model for chronic disease diagnoses. Predictors are modeled using individual risk factor covariates and a latent individual propensity to the disease. Leveraging a state space formulation of the model, we construct a framework in which spatio-temporal heterogeneity in regression parameters is informed by exogenous spatial information, corresponding to different spatial contextual risk factors that may affect health and the occurrence of chronic diseases in different ways. To explore the utility and the effectiveness of our method, we analyze behavioral and risk factor surveillance data collected in Italy (PASSI), which is well-known as a country characterized by high peculiar administrative, social and territorial diversities reflected on high variability in morbidity among population subgroups.

Keywords: ---

1. Introduction

In the context of health risk factor studies, cross-sectional survey data represents a remarkable source of information and insights (Campostrini and McQueen, 2005). These surveys offer a practical alternative to longitudinal studies, reducing the costs of interviewing the same individuals across several years and avoiding the issue of censoring

and sample size decreasing due to drop-out or death of the participants. On the other hand, cross-sectional surveys provides snapshots of a population at specific moments in time only, disallowing one to study the dynamic of a population, which is a crucial aspect in health monitoring. To face this trade-off, several countries, including Italy, have set health monitoring systems conducting a continuous data collection through a series (typically based on monthly samples) of cross-sectional surveys on the model of US Behavioural Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS, Nelson et al., 2001). BRFSS data are collected by interviewing every year about 400'000 subjects in the US population selected according to a random sample scheme that guarantees local representation. Questions regard health status, administrative information, behaviours and possible risk factors. The data collected are mainly used to produce reports and indicators that describe, at various levels of aggregation, the health and behavioural risks status of the states. While, on itself, considering the answer distribution to each question is potentially of interest to policymakers, understanding the relationships between risk factors and health-related outcomes would provide a better understanding of how targeted policies can affect the well-being of population subgroups.

Despite the wealth of knowledge collected by these systems, the existing literature often overlooks the potential depth and significance of the data, as, for instance, focusing only on an univariate risk or ignoring the spatio-temporal dynamics and the information about habits and behaviours. Therefore, in order to fully tap into the data potential, we introduce a novel methodology to assess the risk of suffer one or multiple chronic diseases based on individual-specific risk factors. Despite the widespread presence of models with similar aims in the existing BRFSS literature (Assaf et al., 2015; Pastore et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2023), our approach introduces several original elements in the statistical specification, aiming to unleash the information included in the data to explain the dynamics of the local populations.

Firstly, in contrast to the existing literature (e.g., Pastore et al., 2023), we rely on a pseudo-panel approach, considering, as a source of temporal dependence, the birth cohort the respondent belong to rather than the year of interview. This approach could reduce the bias of the estimate of the age effect on the disease probability, if we suppose to be in presence of non-stationary cohort effects and under stationary conditions in the sampling survey scheme. Indeed, as illustrated in Figure 1, when we are interested in modelling morbidity curves—i.e. the relation between age and the probability of a certain disease—considering the survey year as time reference could lead to confuse two well-known health risk factors, namely the age and the medical technological progress, since in a specific survey year, elder people are both older, and earlier born.

Secondly, the existing literature often overlooks to account for latent sources of dependence among individuals, which emerge from the dynamic nature of evolving populations. Every person's life journey is shaped by a series of unique historical events, which influence the trajectory of their lives in both time and space. As a result, the influence of individual characteristics is likely to fluctuate depending on the contextual circumstances a person encounters or has encountered. In other words, these effects are closely tied to the latent spatio-temporal risk factors that individuals are exposed to. To address this aspect, we rely on Bayesian framework, a well-established tool in epidemiology (e.g. Dunson, 2001), to incorporate prior knowledge thoughtfully. In particular, we design the



Fig. 1. Illustrative example of the bias one could encounter by defining the morbidity curves under fixed year of survey (dashed line), instead of considering a pseudo-panel approach by fixing the birth cohorts (solid lines).

priors of the regression parameters to vary over time and space depending on continuous latent spatial risk factors. Modelling spatial variation in disease risk through latent spatial risk factor is not new in the field of epidemiology (Kelsall and Wakefield, 2002). However, inspired by the use of additional data on locations (Best et al., 2000; Diggle et al., 2010), we propose to structure these latent processes over further information recovered by exogenous sources or modifiable risk factors. The absence of individual histories in cross-sectional data necessitates the development of suitable methods for inferring causal relationships (Wunsch et al., 2010; Reichenheim and Coutinho, 2010). Consequently, BRFSS literature often focuses primarily on assessing the impact of nonmodifiable individual risk factors, such as age and sex at birth (see, e.g., Assaf et al., 2015; Pastore et al., 2023), ignoring valuable information pertaining to modifiable factors. In the context of health risk analysis, harnessing this information through suitable and sophisticated methods is crucial for obtaining meaningful insights and avoiding potential biases. For instance, let us consider the influence of excessive alcohol consumption on the likelihood of developing chronic diseases. While the medical literature widely recognizes the adverse impact of excessive alcohol consumption on chronic diseases (Shield et al., 2014), simply incorporating current alcohol consumption as a covariate in a health risk model on cross-sectional data may yield misleading estimates. These estimates can inadvertently reflect biases or under-reporting in both health and chronic disease populations (e.g., Boniface et al., 2014; Subbaraman et al., 2020), simply because they might reflect the effects of unobserved components (e.g. social inclusion) that positively correlate with a better health condition and, in the extreme case, they might even reflect the presence of an opposite causal relationship in which unhealthy people are forced not to drink.

As a further element of novelty of our proposal, we include modifiable risk factors,

as behavioral patterns and habits, aggregated over small homogeneous groups in term of geographical location and temporal context to inform the dynamics of the regression coefficients.

Finally, it is crucial to consider the heterogeneity with respect to different health outcomes, specifically the diverse chronic diseases that contribute to an individual's comorbidity profile (Andreella et al., 2023). We propose a multivariate logistic regression specification where we take into account for the impact of both individual and environmental risk factors on the marginal probability of developing specific chronic diseases, and we include a latent comorbidity indicator to capture how these diseases may be further correlated due to an individual's propensity for comorbidity.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the behavioural and risk factor surveillance system data that motivates this study. In Section 3, we present the statistical methodology, while this will be applied to Italian data in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 presents some final remarks.

2. Spatio-temporal heterogeneity in BRFSS Italian PASSI data

This work is motivated by the richness of information included in the data collected by PASSI (Progressi delle Aziende Sanitarie per la Salute in Italia, translated as "Advancements of Local Health Authorities in Italy", https://www.epicentro.iss.it/passi/ en/english). PASSI is a surveillance system that, since 2008, collects sample data on the behavioral and risk factors of the Italian population in the age span of 18 to 69 years (Possenti et al., 2021; Baldissera et al., 2011). Based on the US Behavioural Risk Factor Surveillance, PASSI surveillance system aims to establish a continuously updated and local level database to monitor trends in health issues, risk factors and preventive measures in Italy. Since public health initiatives in Italy are predominantly organized and assessed at the local level, PASSI engages both Regions and local health units directly in the surveillance process, that, supervised by national coordinating group of experts, produce monthly independent cross-sectional samples of the target population. On an yearly basis, information related to about 30'000 respondents are collected. On behalf of local health authorities, data are collected by trained workers through a telephone survey, that ask a set of pre-defined questions with varied nature to the respondents, regarding both their biographical, socio-economical, and health status but also present and past aspects of their habits and lifestyles. Personal data information, such as sex, age, date of the interview, local health authority of belonging, are collected by default, while aspects regarding their socio-economical status, e.g. family status, level of instruction and socio-economical status, are asked during the interview. Information on subject health status are related to their state of well-being and, in particular, whether certain chronic non-communicable diseases have been diagnosed or not at the day of interview (see https://www.epicentro.iss.it/passi/en/english for details on specific questions). The focus of this work will be on whether the diseases considered by Pastore et al. (2023)—namely, diabetes, kidney failure, respiratory diseases (chronic bronchitis, emphysema, respiratory failure), cardiovascular diseases (myocardial infarction, cardiac ischemia or coronary heart disease), tumors (including leukemias and lymphomas)were diagnosed on the respondents. Information regarding the habits and lifestyles of



Fig. 2. Smoothed morbidity curves representing the relation between age and the frequency of diagnosis for the five considered diseases in the PASSI subjects born between 1955 and 1960 and interviewed between 2008 and 2020. Plots in the first row report the curves obtained by grouping by Italian administrative regions (where lighter lines refer to northern regions), while in the second row plots curves are obtained by grouping by cohort (where lighter lines refer to earlier cohorts).

the respondents cover several health-related aspects, such as current dietary habits and alcohol consumption over the past thirty days, smoking behaviors in current and past life, or physical activities pursued during the last 30 days, among others.

Using PASSI dataset, Pastore et al. (2023) propose a national level Bayesian logistic model in which a binary morbidity indicator, describing whether at least one disease were diagnosed for a single subject, is regressed against respondent-specific non-modifiable risk factors, namely, age, sex, educational and socio-economical status. By considering different years of interview, they provide evidence of a morbidity compression in Italy, with respect to risk factors combinations. In a parallel manner, Andreella et al. (2023) propose a composite indicator which weights disease occurrence differently by the perceived health with the weights provided by the global burden of disease (Salomon et al., 2015), and subsequently relates the developed index with the non-modifiable risk factors identified by Pastore et al. (2023).

Both the studies focus on a global view of morbidity and on a national perspective. Thus, they do not yet address the spatial heterogeneity of the specific diseases that is, by nature of Italy, expected. Italy is not only a highly variable territory, ranging from coastal areas, to the highest peaks in Europe, but it is also heterogeneous in terms of population composition, social and economical levels and exposures to spatial risk factors. Thus, if it is reasonable to believe that these aspects influence peoples' health status, it is also reasonable to assume that differences in risk factors are reflected in heterogeneity in the incidence of chronic diseases along the country. Figure 2 reports smoothed morbidity curves representing the relation between age and the frequency of diagnosis, aggregated by Regions (above) and birth cohort (below), respectively. From the figure, not only we can see how at the aggregated level there are differences in terms

of incidence among diseases, but it also shows how incidence varies differently in the spatial (here, regions) and temporal domain (cohorts). The choice of spatial aggregation by region was made for aesthetic purposes, as representation at lower levels (e.g. local heath authorities), does not allow a clear reading of the data, due to the high number of curves to represent. It is worth highlighting that the two representations have different levels of aggregation, so it is recommended to make direct comparisons between the graphs only horizontally, and not between figures above and below.

While it is clear that there is a different degree of heterogeneity in disease incidence, it is less clear how risk factors influence it, and this motivates our work. We distinguish here between modifiable and non-modifiable risk factors, as well as between individual and contextual risk factors. We consider a risk factor to be individual if it regards specific characteristics of the subject. On the opposite, a risk factor is said to be contextual if it pertains the context in which an individual lives. Non modifiable risk factors represent individual or contextual characteristics regarding the past, which are no longer modifiable by the person or that are unchangeable in the short term. On the opposite, modifiable risk factors represent individual or contextual characteristics that can mutate in the short term. We consider the variables included in Pastore et al. (2023), i.e. sex at birth, age, educational and economical status, to be individual and non-modifiable risk factors, together with a dichotomous variable, the smoking status, indicating whether the subject is or has been a smoker in the past. The inclusion of the smoking status as an individual risk factor should be acknowledged as a novelty in the analysis of the PASSI dataset. While the smoking status is in fact modifiable, we categorized it as a non-modifiable risk factor because, given the age range under consideration, it is reasonable to assume that being a smoker reflects information about the individual's history rather than a temporary choice. Although there is epidemiological evidence suggesting the elimination, in the long term, of the smoking effect after quitting (see, e.g., Toll et al., 2014), we treat former smokers as having an equivalent risk to current smokers. This is due to the absence of precise information on both the time of smoking cessation and the time of diagnosis, preventing us from distinguishing individuals who quit smoking after being diagnosed with a disease or former smokers who quit long before the diagnosis. On the other hand, it is reasonable to think that the effect of smoking is anyway negative on health. Thus, by incorporating possible lower-risk subjects into the smoking population stratum, we expect conservative estimates—i.e. not greater than the actual magnitude—for the smoking effects on morbidity, as we anticipate a positive association.

Information regarding physical activity, dietary and alcohol consumption habits should be, in principle, considered as individual but modifiable risk factors, because they represent temporary conditions that, potentially, can vary over the course of a lifetime. In the literature (see, e.g. Smith Jr, 2007), it is well known how these factors positively or negatively influence people health status in the long term. However, questions regarding these aspects only refer to the last 30 days, and cannot be used to provide a long term and accurate picture of people's past, but rather just a snapshot of their daily habits. For this reason, we assume that these aspects can provide, if aggregated, a contextual risk factor informing on local and traditional habits and social behaviours. Although PASSI survey provides rich and useful set of information regarding the habits of the population, it is clear that can not cover all relevant aspects concerning the context in which one person lives. For this reason, we decided to reduce this lack by considering external data sources that, at the aggregated level, could represent a potential risk factors for the individual health. Figure 2 shows three of the contextual risk factors that we included in our analysis, highlighting how, in Italy, there is a large spatial heterogeneity in these aspects. While it is clear why these information could be linked to the health status of the subjects, it is not immediate to understand how. In this regard, Supplementary Material reports a full description of the resources used. On the contrary, the way this information is used is an important part of the proposed modeling approach, detailed in depth in Section 3 of the paper.



Fig. 3. Levels of three possible sources of spatial risk factors in Italy recovered by exogenous data or aggregating modifiable risk factor information available in PASSI dataset. Darker colors indicate higher levels.

3. A multivariate logistic regression with spatio-temporal effects

For a generic subject i $(i = 1, ..., n_s)$, we examine the n_d -variate binary response y_i indicating the presence or absence of n_d possible diseases, with $y_{ij} = 1$ if the disease jhas been diagnosed to the subject i. Additionally, we consider an n_p -variate vector x_i of covariates, representing individual non-modifiable risk factors, with h-th element x_{ih} indicating the value of covariate h in the subject i.

Denoting as $Ber(\pi)$ a Bernoulli random variable with mean π , we specify the logistic model

$$y_{ij} \sim \operatorname{Ber}(\pi_{ij}), \quad \pi_{ij} = \operatorname{logit}^{-1}(\eta_{ij}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = [\eta_{i1}, \dots, \eta_{in_d}]^{\top}$ is a continuous latent random vector

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = B(l_i, c_i) \boldsymbol{x}_i + \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon_i, \quad \epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{\epsilon}^2),$$

with mean $E(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i) = B(l_i, c_i)\boldsymbol{x}_i$ and residual term $\boldsymbol{\gamma}\epsilon_i$. In the above specification, $B(l_i, c_i)$ is a $n_d \times n_p$ coefficient matrix with single elements $\beta_{jh}(l_i, c_i)$, representing the effect of the *h*-th covariate x_{ih} on disease *j*, as a function of the location l_i and cohort c_i to which the subject *i* belongs to, for $l_i \in \{1, 2, ..., n_l\}$ and $c_i \in \{1, 2, ..., n_c\}$. This

construction allows one to relate the impact β_{jh} of a certain individual risk factor to contextual factors in which the subject lives. The scalar ϵ_i captures part of the residual variability for subject *i* and represents a measure of the individual propensity to multimorbidity, which is scaled by the n_d -dimensional vector γ to regulate disease-specific variability and pairwise associations between them. Such a construction, after having taken into account the marginal specification of each disease, is equivalent to the latent trait model structure recently proposed by Andreella et al. (2023) to define an index of multi-morbidity.

Since we expect the effects of covariates to vary according to the context in which an individual lives, we assume the entries of B to be heterogeneous both in time (cohorts) and space (locations). For each scalar coefficient $\beta_{jh}(l_i, c_i)$, we account for temporal dependence by means of a discrete random walk

$$\beta_{jh}(l_i, c_i) = \beta_{jh}(l_i, c_i - 1) + \lambda_{jh}^1 \xi_{jh}^1(l_i, c_i), \tag{1}$$

with initial state $\beta_{jh}(l_i, c_0) = \beta_{jh}^0 + \lambda_{jh}^0 \xi_{jh}^0(l_i)$, where both the shifts $\xi_{jh}^1(l_i, c_i)$ and $\xi_{jh}^0(l_i)$ are location dependent random variables with standard Gaussian distributed marginals. Under this representation, β_{jh}^0 is an unknown scalar parameter for the population mean effect of the earlier cohort c_0 , and represents the historical mean effect; similarly, $\xi_{jh}^0(l_i)$ represents spatial deviations for location l_i , and account for the spatial variability observed at the initial cohort c_0 , with scale $\lambda_{jh}^0 > 0$ accommodating the scale of the impact of covariate h on the disease j; finally, the shift $\xi_{jh}^1(l_i, c_i)$, scaled by the value $\lambda_{jh}^1 > 0$, represents changes in the mean level effect for location l_i between consecutive cohorts, thus representing the latent drivers that lead to different effects in different cohorts.

To account for spatial dependence, we assume that both $\xi_{jh}^0(l_i)$ and $\xi_{jh}^1(l_i, c_i)$ are realizations of zero-mean processes defined over a bidimensional continuous set of locations in \mathbb{R}^2 , with correlation functions \mathcal{C}_{jh}^0 and \mathcal{C}_{jh}^1 , respectively, depending on contextual risks factors. We express \mathcal{C}_{jh}^s ($s \in \{0, 1\}$) as a convex combination of different functions, by considering the covariance between locations l and l' to be

$$\mathcal{C}^{s}_{jh}(l,l') = \sum_{m=1}^{n_f} \omega^s_{jhm} \mathcal{K}_m(l,l'), \qquad (2)$$

where $\omega_{jhm}^s \in (0,1)$ are weights such that $\sum_{m=1}^{n_f} \omega_{jhm}^s = 1$, and $\mathcal{K}_m(l,l')$ are functions depending on external information on the locations and such that $\mathcal{K}_m(l,l) = 1$ and $\mathcal{K}_m(l,l') = \mathcal{K}_m(l',l) \ge 0$. As a general requirement, we ask \mathcal{C}_{jh}^s to be valid covariance functions, for any j, h, s and locations, without necessarily requiring it to \mathcal{K}_m . Although alternative specification for the function \mathcal{K}_m can be considered, in this paper, we employ two types of functions. The first one takes the general form of

$$\mathcal{K}_m(l,l') = \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{R}_r(l)\} \left[\theta_r \,\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{R}_r(l')\} + (1-\theta_r) \,\mathbb{I}(l=l')\right], \quad \theta_r \in (0,1), \tag{3}$$

with $\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{R}_r(l)\}\$ equal to one when the condition $\mathcal{R}_r(l)$ is true, and where the R conditions define a partition of the location set. Such a construction guarantees $\mathcal{K}_m(l,l) = 1$ and

allows one to consider spatial dependence that cannot be described trough a continuous spatial process on \mathbb{R}^2 , as administrative conditions on the locations. For instance, in the PASSI data discussed above, one may consider the partition induced by administrative Italian regions, such that $\mathcal{K}_m(l,l') = \theta_r$ for any couple of locations $l \neq l'$ belonging to the region r. The parameter θ_r represents the proportion of variance explained by the condition \mathcal{R}_r with respect to the location idiosyncratic variance.

The second type of kernel takes the form of

$$\mathcal{K}_m(l,l') = \exp\{-\mathcal{D}_m(l,l')\},\tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_m(l, l')$ is a suitable distance function underlying the definition of a corresponding spatial contextual risk factor. Under this general formulation, it is easy to verify that both $\xi_{jh}^0(l_i)$ and $\xi_{jh}^1(l_i, c_i)$ can be thought as linear combinations of two types of independent processes: the first one correspond to a zero-mean spatial processes with independent Gaussian steps over sets of locations that fulfill conditions \mathcal{R} ; the second one correspond to Gaussian processes with kernels as decreasing function of the distance \mathcal{D}_m , describing a vanishing covariance between locations that differ in terms of contextual risk factors. As a consequence, $\xi_{jh}^0(l_i)$ and $\xi_{jh}^1(l_i, c_i)$ can be interpreted as the results of a linear combination of n_f independent spatial risk factors, weighted by means of $\sqrt{\omega_{jhm}^s}$, so that ω_{jhm}^s represents the importance of the *m*-th factor in determining the marginal variability of ξ_{jh}^s .

As a general comment, our assumption is that similar locations in terms of contextual risk factors are characterized by strong positive association in the deviation or changes of the individual covariate impacts.

4. Application to the chronic diseases in the Italian population

4.1. Data configuration

We applied the model described in Section 3 to the data collected by PASSI system between 2008 and 2020. We focus our study on subjects interviewed when they were in the sensitive age range 51–62 years old, i.e. in which a chronic condition typically starts (Pastore et al., 2023). In accordance with this, we take into account only subjects belonging to the 1955–1960 birth cohorts to have sufficient observations in the entire age span. Data after the COVID outbreak were excluded, coherently with the works by Pastore et al. (2023) and Andreella et al. (2023). While the study of this phenomenon would be certainly interesting from an epidemiological point of view, it is outside the scope of this paper and might require some adjustments to both the comorbidity component and the latent process of the model, as well as to accurately consider changes in the survey's questions. In our study, the response vector y_i includes $n_d = 5$ diseases—namely: diabetes, kidney failure, respiratory diseases, cardiovascular diseases, and tumors. Consistently with Pastore et al. (2023), we consider sex at birth, educational and economical status as three binary covariates. Among the non modifiable risk factors, we also include the scaled age, the smoking status, and an age-sex interaction term. Age is scaled according to (age - 51)/11, where 51 is the minimum age considered and 11 is the age span. The addition of the intercept term leads to $n_p = 7$. In view of the short age range considered, we assume a linear approximation of the age effect on the mean response in logit scale.

In regard to the latent spatial factors, we define $n_f = 4$ kernel structures. The first kernel $\mathcal{K}_1(l,l')$ is structured as in equation (3), where the conditions $\mathcal{R}_r(l)$, with $r = 1, \ldots, 21$, indicate whether location l is included or not in the r-th administrative region. In other terms,

$$\mathcal{K}_1(l,l') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } l = l', \\ \theta_r & \text{if } l \neq l' \text{ and } l, l' \text{ belong to region } r, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As a consequence, the parameter θ_r is a measure of the level of association between locations in region r, while the product $(1 - \theta_r)\omega_{jh1}$ represents the proportion of variance explained by a location idiosyncratic error term. The other three kernels take the form defined in equation (4), and are based on three corresponding distance functions $\mathcal{D}_m(l,l')$ underlying continuous contextual risk factors. Geographical risk is modelled by one factor computed on average altitudes and population densities of the local health authorities. The absolute differences between location average in 2021 of PM10 are used to define the distance underlying an air pollution risk factor. Finally, information collected by the PASSI survey related to possible individual modifiable risk factors namely: alcohol risky consumption, sport activity, and diet habits—are aggregated by location and a synthetic distance measure is computed over them to define a spatial risk in terms of habits. Details on the definition of the three distance matrices are reported in the Supplementary Material. Alternative distances inducing different latent spatial risk factors are worth exploring.

4.2. Prior elicitation

Given the data configuration, we carefully set the prior distributions on the unknown parameters of the model introduced in Section 3.

To model comorbidity, we assume a $\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 = 1$. For identifiability purposes we set on γ_1 a half normal distribution prior to constrain positive γ_1 . The other elements of γ are distributed a priori according to a multivariate standard Gaussian $N_4(0, I_4)$.

Our application data are characterized by only six observed time points c_0, \ldots, c_5 , motivating a simplification of the state space model in equation (1), by setting constant the shift for any cohort $\xi_{jh}^1(l_i, c_i) = \xi_{jh}^1(l_i)$. Hence, trajectories of the state-space coefficients β_{jh} evolve linearly over time according to the model

$$\beta_{jh}(l_i, c_i) = \beta_{jh}^0 + \lambda_{jh}^0 \xi_{jh}^0(l_i) + \lambda_{jh}^1 \xi_{jh}^1(l_i)(c_i - c_0),$$

where $c_0 = 1955$ is the first cohort considered. To avoid overfitting, we propose a sparse representation of the $n_d \times n_p$ matrix B^0 that stores the elements β_{jh}^0 . We specify $B^0 = \Phi_B \Delta_B \Psi_B$, where the generic element δ_{rr} of the min (n_d, n_p) -dimensional diagonal matrices Δ_B is a gamma-distributed random variable Ga (a_{δ}, b_{δ}) with $E(\delta_{rr}) = a_{\delta}/b_{\delta}$ and var $(\delta_{rr}) = a_{\delta}/b_{\delta}^2$. Gamma hyper-parameters $a_{\delta} = 0.3$ and $b_{\delta} = 0.6$ are chosen to favour the shrinkage of the noise such that B^0 can be approximated by a lower-rank matrix. Prior elicitation on B^0 is completed defining independent standard Gaussian priors on the elements ϕ_{rj} and ψ_{ir} of Φ_B and Ψ_B , respectively.

Table 1. Logarithm of the Pseudo Marginal Likelihood (LPML) calculated under three different models. Columns distinguish different specifications of spatio-temporal (ST) dynamic of the coefficient covariance matrix. The performance of our proposal is highlighted in bold.

Complete ST: eq. (2)	Indep. locations: $C_{jh}^s = I$	No ST: $\Lambda^s = 0$
-0.9119	-0.9121	-0.9141

In such an overparameterized settings, it is crucial to impose suitable shrinking priors on the parameters to avoid that the information conveyed by the prior may overwhelm the information brought by the data. For such a reason, we specify a spike and slab prior distribution on the elements of Λ^s , for $s \in \{0, 1\}$. In particular, we set

$$\lambda_{ih} \sim \rho \text{Ga}(2,4) + (1-\rho) \text{Ga}(0.2,4), \quad \rho \sim \text{Be}(3,6),$$

with a gamma Ga(0.2, 4) distributed spike to favour the MCMC mixing. In this prior settings, for disease-covariate combinations where data do not suggest presence of spatiotemporal variability, cohort-location specific coefficients are shrunk toward B^0 . On the other hand, this structure allows the model to learn crucial parameters of C_{jh}^s from the spatio-temporal depending disease-covariate combinations only. For instance, we impose a sufficiently flat beta prior Be(2, 2) on the regional association weights θ_r to learn the function $\mathcal{K}_1(l, l')$ from the data.

To accommodate the sum constraint on the weights $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{jh}$, we specify a sparse Dirichlet prior $\text{Dir}(\boldsymbol{a}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})$, with $\boldsymbol{a}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = (2, 2, 2, 2)^{\top}$.

4.3. Application results

To approximate the posterior distribution, we run a Hamiltonian MCMC for 3000 iterations, discarding the first 1500 iterations. Code implementation has been conducted in STAN and R.

Although the use of a complex hierarchical model may need some cautions, it presents some relevant advantages in terms of fitting data. Indeed, the goodness-of-fit comparison displayed in Table 1 shows highest log Pseudo Marginal likelihood (LPML) under our specification, with higher values indicating a better fit. LPLM can be interpreted in terms of leave-one-out cross validation (Gelfand and Dey, 1994; Chen et al., 2008), providing an evaluation of the model in terms of predictive abilities. Passing from the right to the left of the table, we consider models with an increasing complexity in terms of spatio-temporal dependence structure. More specifically, in the third model, the spatio-temporal variability is neglected by imposing $\Lambda^0 = \Lambda^1 = \mathbf{0}$, so that the regression coefficients between two individuals are equal whether they belong to different cohorts or different locations. In the second model, we let Λ^0 and Λ^1 be free, while we set correlation structures C_{ih}^s equal to identities. In this way, the regression coefficients between two individuals vary according to their cohorts and locations, but random coefficients are not related to exogenous information. Finally, the first column provides the LPML for the proposed model. We highlight an overall improvements when passing from a model that does not account for a spatio-temporal dependence to a model that accounts for it. Furthermore, a spatial structure leveraging on exogenous knowledge seems to lead to an



Fig. 4. Adjacency graph between disease based on a similarity matrix defined as the posterior mean of $\gamma \gamma^{\top}$.

improvement in terms of fitting. The inclusion of the co-morbidity vector helps in better capturing residual variability. Interestingly, all the elements of γ are characterized by posterior distribution concentrated on positive values. This means that if the individual residual ϵ_i is positive (or negative), the residual propensity to multi-diagnoses increases (or decreases) for all the diseases considered, with larger changes in absolute value for cardiovascular diseases and kidney failures, as they are characterized by larger value of γ . Figure 4 reports a graphical representation of the posterior means of $\gamma\gamma^{\top}$, in which the 5 diagnoses considered are connected by an edge whose width represents the value $\gamma_j\gamma_{j'}$, with $j \neq j'$. As a result, this representation allows us to understand how strong is the tendency of the diagnoses to appear (or not appear) together, after controlling for the individual risk factors considered.

In Table 2, we report national effect estimates B^0 . The age effect parameter and its sign varies among diagnoses, an aspect which was not taken into account in other works where a positive age effect has been found when considering a synthetic morbidity index (see, e.g, Pastore et al., 2023). The reason for this behavior can be manifold. On one side, this could reflect the intrinsic heterogeneity of the diseases considered, that are characterized by variability in disease curses and diagnoses. On the other side, differences with respect to existing literature reflects both the use of a multivariate morbidity response approach and that our pseudo-panel perspective potentially reduces the bias induced by the presence of non-stationary changes in age-effects between cohorts, as discussed in Section 1. The interpretation of the other parameters is also relevant from both an epidemiological and a political point of view. For instance, the negative effects of Economical Status (Eco. S.) highlight how the well-off population lives in better health conditions, an aspect which is typically reported in the literature (Marmot, 2005; Minardi et al., 2011). On the opposite, an higher educational level does not always reflect a reduced number of diagnoses in some diseases. Due to the nature of the response data,

110 2010.					
	Diabetes	Kidney fail.	Respiratory fail.	Cardiovascular dis.	Tumors
Intercept	-3.44	-5.23	-2.58	-4.44	-3.11
	(-3.79, -3.14)	(-5.86, -4.62)	(-2.9, -2.3)	(-4.8, -4.08)	(-3.44, -2.89)
Sex	0.44	-0.05	-0.3	0.61	-1.06
	(0.14, 0.75)	(-0.64, 0.52)	(-0.56, 0)	(0.28, 0.93)	(-1.32, -0.8)
Edu. S.	-0.49	-0.69	-0.30	-0.34	0.21
	(-0.65, -0.23)	(-0.97, -0.37)	(-0.43, -0.17)	(-0.68, -0.12)	(0.02, 0.35)
Eco. S.	-0.44	-0.69	-0.53	-0.58	-0.14
	(-0.74, -0.16)	(-1.08, -0.34)	(-0.7, -0.36)	(-0.81, -0.37)	(-0.28, 0.01)
Smoke	0.16	0.22	0.60	0.55	0.26
	(-0.02, 0.32)	(-0.12, 0.79)	(0.2, 0.81)	(0.35, 0.78)	(0.1, 0.4)
Age	0.73	-0.18	-0.52	-0.01	0.42
	(0.02, 1.17)	(-0.82, 0.6)	(-0.85, -0.19)	(-0.44, 0.43)	(-0.29, 0.82)
Age:Sex	0.31	0.60	0.40	0.66	0.57
	(-0.12, 0.70)	(-0.05, 1.25)	(0.05, 0.79)	(0.2, 1.17)	(0.14, 1.00)

Table 2. Mean and 95% credible intervals (in parenthesis) of the posterior distributions of the fixed effect coefficients B^0 . Bold cells indicate coefficients characterized by credible intervals not including the zero.

that represents the occurrence of the diagnosis rather than the occurrence of the disease, the positive effect may reflect an increased awareness of those with higher education with respect to the importance of early diagnosis.





In countries characterized by a degree of local autonomy in the management of health authorities, as is the case in Italy, the ability to focus on local variations aids in identifying characteristic behaviors that are useful for various purposes, including informing policymakers or creating targeted prevention campaigns at regional or local level. The administrative spatial risk factor is estimated in our model as the main driver in explaining local differences, especially for respiratory failure diseases (refer to Figure 10 in

the Supplementary Material). However, the autonomy degrees allowed to local health authorities within each region may differ. The parameter θ displayed in Figure 5 represents a measure of common variability among locations within each region, with respect to the location idiosyncratic variability. The Campania region stands out as the region with the highest internal consistency. On the other extreme, the presence of a particular city as Rome is related to the low level of internal consistency in the Lazio region, in which the territories outside the metropolitan area are characterized mainly as rural.



Fig. 6. Morbidity curves of Venice ASL male high educated and non-smoker population for five diseases. Second row report morbidity curves of wealthy population.

Our spatial model considers a whole set of local factors to help understanding the territorial heterogeneity. This allows one to study differences in random coefficients among different local authorities or focus on specific one of them. In this regards, Figure 6 shows morbidity curves of Venice ASL for male high educated and non-smoker population. Curves displayed are predicted for two different cohorts, where orange curves correspond to the most recent one. Firstly, we note the two cohorts are characterize by similar behaviours, but for an increase in tumor occurrences. This latter phenomenon may be partially due to improvement in early diagnosis in recent years (see, e.g., the Italian Association for Cancer Research website: https://www.airc.it/cancro/informazioni-tumori/cose-il-cancro/numeri-del-cancro), as well as "overdiagnosis" (Welch and Black, 2010).

In addition to this, it is interesting to compare the varying effects in different local health authorities, for each disease and risk factor. Figure 7 reports the odds ratios for diabetes and respiratory failure, derived from the random coefficients of different Italian Health authorities, between people with and without economic difficulties. The figure refers to the first cohort considered (i.e. 1955) and then it should be seen as a representation of local differences accumulated up to 1955 cohort. Values below one indicate the reduction factor in the odds of diagnoses when comparing a well-off person with a person with economic difficulties—all other covariates being equal—indicating that, for



Fig. 7. Posterior 90% credible intervals of the economical status coefficient odds-ratio for 1955 cohort and all local authorities considered. Vertical dashed lines delimit the Italian administrative regions.

the diseases considered, being wealthy reduces the probability of diagnoses overall, as previously highlighted. Interestingly, local variability of the odds ratios (and the relative model coefficients) strongly depends on the disease considered. Diabetes coefficients manifest a strong spatial dependence, where gaps between wealthy and non-wealthy people in diagnosis are more evident in northern regions (left part of the panel) than the southern ones (right). On the contrary, the economical status effects for respiratory failure do not appear to be affected by spatial patterns, with the odds ratios that appear to be all concentrated around 0.60, meaning that economic difficulties affected negatively the diagnosis of this issue approximately in the same way all over Italy. Variability measures of differences across local health units are given by Λ^0 and Λ^1 matrices, that contains scales to inflates (or deflates) the spatial differences among local health units captured by the correlation matrices C_{hj}^s . Table 3 in the Supplementary Material reports the posterior means and the credible intervals for all the parameters in these matrices. It is notable that entries in Λ^0 are generally larger than the respective entries in Λ^1 . This aspect indicates an higher variability between local health units in terms of historical differences, i.e. differences accumulated up to 1955 cohort, with respect to the ones that represent the dynamic evolution of coefficients from cohort to cohort. In fact, low estimates of Λ^1 parameter indicates small to negligible temporal variations among coefficients, excluded the age coefficient for tumors, whose posterior mean results to be much larger than the others. This result reflects on an higher variability among different locations and on an increased occurrence in tumor diagnoses for younger cohorts, as previously discussed for the Venice case.

In view of the recent literature pointing out the shift toward elder ages of the morbidity curves in Italy (Pastore et al., 2023; Demuru and Egidi, 2016), it is worth asking whether a morbidity compression is being highlighted by our estimates. A unique and





Fig. 8. Posterior 90% credible intervals of the predictive odds-ratio between being born in two subsequent cohorts for a 62 years old low-risk subject in our sample, i.e. a wealthy highly educated female non-smoker. Vertical dashed lines delimit the Italian administrative regions. Horizontal line indicates no variations.

unambiguous answer cannot be given, as it involves multiple aspects to consider. First, our flexible specification for multivariate responses highlights how this effect can vary for different combinations of specific segments of local population and diseases. Second, it is crucial to distinguish the different causes of morbidity variations over years. Improvement in population health conditions may be leaded by general changes in individual risk factors, with several of them that can be influenced by policy makers. For instance, coefficient estimates of our model suggest that improvements in educational and economical levels, as well as the reduction of tobacco consumption, would lead to a general compression of morbidity in younger cohorts due to a different stratification of the population. On the other hand, our model also provides the tools to measure the morbidity compression effect due to technological evolution and reduced environmental risk, by estimating possible changes over different cohorts in risk factor coefficients. As shown in Figure 8, the odds morbidity ratio between two 62 years old low risk subjects born in subsequent cohorts strongly depends on the disease considered. While the cardiovascular diseases (central panel) is characterized by a generalized technological end environmental morbidity compression over the entire Italy, the bottom panel shows an

increase over cohorts of tumor morbidity in northern regions and Sardinia for the given subjects. More specifically, Liguria and Emilia Romagna present the Local Health Authorities characterized by the highest increased risk (corresponding to the city areas of Genova, Piacenza, and Parma). In the top panel we notice high spatial heterogeneity in cohort variation of risk effects for kidney failure disease. Supplementary Material reports the effect of positive cohort variation for the remaining diseases.

5. Discussion

In response to the recent surge in demand for health monitoring in the population, this paper introduced a novel methodology for analyzing repeated cross-sectional data, applied specifically to Italian behavioral and risk factor surveillance data (PASSI). A multivariate spatio-temporal logistic model for chronic disease diagnosis was proposed, demonstrating the capability to capture latent local heterogeneity through a dynamic formulation of the regression coefficients. The prior of the covariance structure was informed by exogenous data on local health units and spatially aggregated risk behaviors. Leveraging this additional source of information allowed us to enhance model fitting while retaining the ability to focus on local behaviors, serving various purposes such as informing policymakers or creating targeted prevention campaigns at regional or finer levels. The inclusion of a comorbidity vector in the linear predictor enabled the consideration of individual propensities to disease and the modeling of residual relations among diagnoses. The application to PASSI data illustrated how the advantages of our model specification translated into valuable insights and advice for policymakers and health surveillance systems. For instance, we recovered the local morbidity curves and identified both individual and spatial factor risks. Additionally, comparing varying coefficients enabled the measurement of technological and environmental risk variations among cohorts by diseases. However, the small range of cohorts considered did not permit obtaining definitive results in this sense.

This paper was motivated by the analysis of Italian data spanning from 2008 to 2020 within an age range of 51-62. Despite its undeniable advantages, discussed in Section 1, the pseudo-panel approach necessitates an extensive surveillance period to analyze long-age curve behaviors effectively. In our case, constrained by the limited surveillance period in Italy, the analysis concentrated on 22 thousand respondents, a notably smaller cohort compared to those processed by BRFSS systems in other countries (e.g., the U.S.). Although our model appears promising for analyzing such data, the estimation method required adjustments due to its computational intensity and time demands, taking more than a day to be estimated (considering a Dell machine with 11th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-11800H with 2.30GHz processor). In this regard, variational Bayes approaches may represent an efficient alternative worth exploring, and the development of a suitable online monitoring filter could address the continuous updates of the database. The proposed approach is designed to investigate local behaviors, which necessarily reflect the information gleaned from a small number of respondents, particularly for smaller local health units. To address this challenge, we propose enhancing the estimates by incorporating exogenous information as prior knowledge, such that "similar" local health units behave similarly, a priori. This aspect aligns well with the model

specification within a Bayesian framework. Although our method assigns a posterior weight to the external information used, the selection of relevant prior information is crucial. Our proposal demonstrates improvements in terms of out-of-sample predictions, justifying its application. However, exploring additional exogenous information or alternative methods of incorporating it into the model remains a pertinent aspect for future research, potentially involving collaboration with domain experts.

Aknwoledgement

The authors are very grateful to Andreella A., Bertarelli G., Compagno L., Pastore A., Tonellato S. for their valuable discussions.

Declarations

Funding

This manuscript was developed within the project funded by Next Generation EU - Age-It - Ageing well in an ageing society project (PE0000015), National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP) - PE8 - Mission 4, C2, Intervention 1.3. The views and opinions expressed are only those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Availability of data and material

Data are

Code availability

The ${\sf R}$ and ${\sf Stan}$ code used in this study is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

- Andreella, A., Monasta, L. and Campostrini, S. (2023) A novel comorbidity index in italy based on diseases detected by the surveillance system passi and the global burden of diseases disability weights. *Population Health Metrics*, 21, 18.
- Assaf, S., Campostrini, S., Xu, F. and Gotway Crawford, C. (2015) Analysing Behavioural Risk Factor Surveillance Data by Using Spatially and Temporally Varying Coefficient Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, **179**, 153–175. URL: https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12114.

- Baldissera, S., Campostrini, S., Binkin, N., Minardi, V., Minelli, G., Ferrante, G., Salmaso, S. et al. (2011) Peer reviewed: features and initial assessment of the italian behavioral risk factor surveillance system (passi), 2007-2008. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 8.
- Best, N. G., Ickstadt, K. and Wolpert, R. L. (2000) Spatial poisson regression for health and exposure data measured at disparate resolutions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95, 1076–1088. URL: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/ 10.1080/01621459.2000.10474304.
- Boniface, S., Kneale, J. and Shelton, N. (2014) Drinking pattern is more strongly associated with under-reporting of alcohol consumption than socio-demographic factors: evidence from a mixed-methods study. *BMC public health*, **14**, 1–9.
- Campostrini, S. and McQueen, D. V. (2005) Institutionalization of social and behavioral risk factor surveillance as a learning system. *Sozial-und Präventivmedizin*, **50**, S9–S15.
- Chen, M.-H., Huang, L., Ibrahim, J. G. and Kim, S. (2008) Bayesian variable selection and computation for generalized linear models with conjugate priors. *Bayesian analysis* (Online), 3, 585.
- Demuru, E. and Egidi, V. (2016) Adjusting prospective old-age thresholds by health status: empirical findings and implications. a case study of italy. Vienna Yearbook of Population Research, 14, 131–154.
- Diggle, P. J., Guan, Y., Hart, A. C., Paize, F. and Stanton, M. (2010) Estimating individual-level risk in spatial epidemiology using spatially aggregated information on the population at risk. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **105**, 1394– 1402. URL: https://doi.org/10.1198/jasa.2010.ap09323. PMID: 22798701.
- Dunson, D. B. (2001) Commentary: Practical Advantages of Bayesian Analysis of Epidemiologic Data. American Journal of Epidemiology, 153, 1222–1226. URL: https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/153.12.1222.
- Gelfand, A. E. and Dey, D. K. (1994) Bayesian model choice: asymptotics and exact calculations. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological), 56, 501–514.
- Kelsall, J. and Wakefield, J. (2002) Modeling spatial variation in disease risk: a geostatistical approach. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 97, 692–701.
- Marmot, M. (2005) Social determinants of health inequalities. The lancet, 365, 1099– 1104.
- Minardi, V., Campostrini, S., Carrozzi, G., Minelli, G. and Salmaso, S. (2011) Social determinants effects from the italian risk factor surveillance system passi. *International journal of public health*, 56, 359–366.
- Nelson, D. E., Holtzman, D., Bolen, J., Stanwyck, C. A. and Mack, K. A. (2001) Reliability and validity of measures from the behavioral risk factor surveillance system (brfss). Sozial-und Praventivmedizin, 46, S3–42.

- Pastore, A., Tonellato, S. F., Aliverti, E. and Campostrini, S. (2023) When does morbidity start? an analysis of changes in morbidity between 2013 and 2019 in italy. *Statistical Methods & Applications*, **32**, 577–591.
- Possenti, V., Minardi, V., Contoli, B., Gallo, R., Lana, S., Bertozzi, N., Campostrini, S., Carrozzi, G., Cristofori, M., D'Argenzio, A., De Luca, A., Fateh-Moghadam, P., Ramigni, M., Trinito, M. O., Vasselli, S. and Masocco, M. (2021) The two behavioural risk factor surveillances on the adult and elderly populations as information systems for leveraging data on health-related sustainable development goals in italy. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, **152**, 104443. URL: https://www.sciencedirect. com/science/article/pii/S1386505621000691.
- Reichenheim, M. E. and Coutinho, E. S. (2010) Measures and models for causal inference in cross-sectional studies: arguments for the appropriateness of the prevalence odds ratio and related logistic regression. *BMC medical research methodology*, **10**, 1–12.
- Salomon, J. A., Haagsma, J. A., Davis, A., de Noordhout, C. M., Polinder, S., Havelaar, A. H., Cassini, A., Devleesschauwer, B., Kretzschmar, M., Speybroeck, N. et al. (2015) Disability weights for the global burden of disease 2013 study. *The Lancet Global Health*, **3**, e712–e723.
- Shield, K. D., Parry, C. and Rehm, J. (2014) Chronic diseases and conditions related to alcohol use. Alcohol research: current reviews, 35, 155.
- Smith Jr, S. C. (2007) Multiple risk factors for cardiovascular disease and diabetes mellitus. The American journal of medicine, 120, S3–S11.
- Subbaraman, M. S., Ye, Y., Martinez, P., Mulia, N. and Kerr, W. C. (2020) Improving the validity of the behavioral risk factor surveillance system alcohol measures. *Alcohol: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 44, 892–899. URL: https://onlinelibrary. wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/acer.14301.
- Toll, B. A., Rojewski, A. M., Duncan, L. R., Latimer-Cheung, A. E., Fucito, L. M., Boyer, J. L., O'Malley, S. S., Salovey, P. and Herbst, R. S. (2014) "quitting smoking will benefit your health": the evolution of clinician messaging to encourage tobacco cessation. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 20, 301–309.
- Welch, H. G. and Black, W. C. (2010) Overdiagnosis in cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 102, 605–613.
- Wunsch, G., Russo, F. and Mouchart, M. (2010) Do we necessarily need longitudinal data to infer causal relations? Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique, 106, 5–18.
- Zheng, X., Zhang, X., Jorge, C. and Aye, D. (2023) Model-based community health surveillance via multilevel small area estimation using state behavioral risk factor surveillance system (brfss): a case study in connecticut. Annals of Epidemiology, 78, 74-80. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/ S104727972200312X.

Λ^{0}					
	Diabetes	Kidney fail.	Respiratory fail.	Cardiovascular dis.	Tumors
Intercept	.129	.152	.204	.022	.093
	(.000, .349)	(.000, .582)	(.000, .402)	(.000, .144)	(.000, .321)
Sex	.122	.274	.159	.029	.055
	(.000, .350)	(.000, .763)	(.000, .452)	(.000, .236)	(.000, .278)
Edu S.	.064	.083	.025	.099	.058
	(.000, .332)	(.000, .520)	(.000, .160)	(.000, .459)	(.000, .298)
Eco S.	.191	.197	.034	.052	.028
	(.000, .473)	(.000, .725)	(.000, .205)	(.000, .286)	(.000, .189)
Smoke	.047	.96	.124	.025	.039
	(.000, .237)	(.000, .554)	(.000, .384)	(.000, .193)	(.000, .237)
Age	.156	.380	.143	.038	.245
	(.000, .532)	(.000, 1.041)	(.000, .565)	(.000, .240)	(.000, .602)
Age:Sex	.120	.168	.190	.066	.096
	(.000, .535)	(.000, .817)	(.000, .763)	(.000, .385)	(.000, .488)
. 1					
Λ^{1}					
Λ^1	Diabetes	Kidney fail.	Respiratory fail.	Cardiovascular dis.	Tumors
$\frac{\Lambda^{1}}{\text{Intercept}}$	Diabetes .022	Kidney fail. .042	Respiratory fail. .022	Cardiovascular dis. .028	Tumors .013
Λ^1 Intercept	Diabetes .022 (.000, .105)	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215)	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000, .092)	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100)	Tumors .013 (.000, .065)
$\begin{array}{c} \Lambda^{1} \\ \hline \\ Intercept \\ Sex \end{array}$	Diabetes .022 (.000, .105) .014	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000,.092) .014	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100) .020	Tumors .013 (.000, .065) .009
$\begin{array}{c} \Lambda^{1} \\ \hline \\ Intercept \\ Sex \\ \end{array}$	Diabetes .022 (.000, .105) .014 (.000, .081)	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273)	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000, .092) .014 (.000, .092)	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100) .020 (.000, .097)	$\begin{array}{c} {\rm Tumors} \\ .013 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \end{array}$
A ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S.	Diabetes .022 (.000, .105) .014 (.000, .081) .012	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000, .092) .014 (.000, .092) .006	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100) .020 (.000, .097) .016	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Tumors} \\ .013 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \\ .015 \end{array}$
A ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S.	Diabetes .022 (.000, .105) .014 (.000, .081) .012 (.000, .082)	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038 (.000, .217)	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000, .092) .014 (.000, .092) .006 (.000, .046)	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100) .020 (.000, .097) .016 (.000, .096)	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Tumors} \\ .013 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \\ .015 \\ (.000, .106) \end{array}$
Λ ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S. Eco S.	Diabetes .022 (.000, .105) .014 (.000, .081) .012 (.000, .082) .022	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038 (.000, .217) .036	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000, .092) .014 (.000, .092) .006 (.000, .046) .040	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100) .020 (.000, .097) .016 (.000, .096) .020	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Tumors} \\ .013 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \\ .015 \\ (.000, .106) \\ .009 \end{array}$
Λ ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S. Eco S.	Diabetes .022 (.000, .105) .014 (.000, .081) .012 (.000, .082) .022 (.000, .105)	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038 (.000, .217) .036 (.000, .206)	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000, .092) .014 (.000, .092) .006 (.000, .046) .040 (.000, .177)	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100) .020 (.000, .097) .016 (.000, .096) .020 (.000, .116)	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Tumors} \\ 0.13 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \\ .015 \\ (.000, .106) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .054) \end{array}$
A ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S. Eco S. Smoke	Diabetes .022 (.000, .105) .014 (.000, .081) .012 (.000, .082) .022 (.000, .105) .034	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038 (.000, .217) .036 (.000, .206) .027	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000, .092) .014 (.000, .092) .006 (.000, .046) .040 (.000, .177) .020	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100) .020 (.000, .097) .016 (.000, .096) .020 (.000, .116) .039	$\begin{array}{c} {\rm Tumors} \\ .013 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \\ .015 \\ (.000, .106) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .054) \\ .013 \end{array}$
A ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S. Eco S. Smoke	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Diabetes} \\ 0.22 \\ (.000, .105) \\ .014 \\ (.000, .081) \\ .012 \\ (.000, .082) \\ .022 \\ (.000, .105) \\ .034 \\ (.000, .135) \end{array}$	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038 (.000, .217) .036 (.000, .206) .027 (.000, .162)	Respiratory fail. .022 (.000, .092) .014 (.000, .092) .006 (.000, .046) .040 (.000, .177) .020 (.000, .111)	Cardiovascular dis. .028 (.000, .100) .020 (.000, .097) .016 (.000, .096) .020 (.000, .116) .039 (.000, .147)	$\begin{array}{c} {\rm Tumors} \\ 0.13 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \\ .015 \\ (.000, .106) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .054) \\ .013 \\ (.000, .082) \end{array}$
A ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S. Eco S. Smoke Age	$\begin{array}{r} \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038 (.000, .217) .036 (.000, .206) .027 (.000, .162) .097	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Respiratory fail.}\\ 0.22\\ (.000, .092)\\ .014\\ (.000, .092)\\ .006\\ (.000, .046)\\ .040\\ (.000, .177)\\ .020\\ (.000, .111)\\ .039\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Cardiovascular dis.}\\ 0.028\\ (.000, .100)\\ .020\\ (.000, .097)\\ .016\\ (.000, .096)\\ .020\\ (.000, .116)\\ .039\\ (.000, .147)\\ .016\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Tumors} \\ 0.13 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \\ .015 \\ (.000, .106) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .054) \\ .013 \\ (.000, .082) \\ .153 \end{array}$
A ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S. Eco S. Smoke Age	$\begin{array}{r} \hline \text{Diabetes} \\ 0.22 \\ (.000, .105) \\ .014 \\ (.000, .081) \\ .012 \\ (.000, .082) \\ .022 \\ (.000, .105) \\ .034 \\ (.000, .135) \\ .021 \\ (.000, .125) \end{array}$	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038 (.000, .217) .036 (.000, .206) .027 (.000, .162) .097 (.000, .463)	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Cardiovascular dis.}\\ \begin{tabular}{c} .028\\ (.000, .100)\\ .020\\ (.000, .097)\\ .016\\ (.000, .096)\\ .020\\ (.000, .116)\\ .039\\ (.000, .147)\\ .016\\ (.000, .113)\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} {\rm Tumors} \\ .013 \\ (.000, .065) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .059) \\ .015 \\ (.000, .106) \\ .009 \\ (.000, .054) \\ .013 \\ (.000, .082) \\ .153 \\ (.000, .306) \end{array}$
A ¹ Intercept Sex Edu S. Eco S. Smoke Age Age:Sex	$\begin{array}{r} \text{Diabetes} \\ 0.22 \\ (.000, .105) \\ .014 \\ (.000, .081) \\ .012 \\ (.000, .082) \\ .022 \\ (.000, .105) \\ .034 \\ (.000, .135) \\ .021 \\ (.000, .125) \\ .029 \end{array}$	Kidney fail. .042 (.000, .215) .048 (.000, .273) .038 (.000, .217) .036 (.000, .206) .027 (.000, .162) .097 (.000, .463) .085	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Respiratory fail.}\\ .022\\ (.000, .092)\\ .014\\ (.000, .092)\\ .006\\ (.000, .092)\\ .006\\ (.000, .046)\\ .040\\ (.000, .177)\\ .020\\ (.000, .111)\\ .039\\ (.000, .182)\\ .033\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Cardiovascular dis.}\\ 0.28\\ (.000, .100)\\ .020\\ (.000, .097)\\ .016\\ (.000, .096)\\ .020\\ (.000, .116)\\ .039\\ (.000, .147)\\ .016\\ (.000, .113)\\ .016\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} {\rm Tumors}\\ .013\\ (.000, .065)\\ .009\\ (.000, .059)\\ .015\\ (.000, .106)\\ .009\\ (.000, .054)\\ .013\\ (.000, .082)\\ .153\\ (.000, .306)\\ .018\\ \end{array}$

Table 3. Mean and 95% credible intervals (in parenthesis) of the posterior distributions of the matrices Λ^0 and Λ^1 .

Supplementary Material

Figure 10 displays the covariance contributions of the spatial latent risk factor considered for each disease. It is worth noting how different habits explain a large portion of historical variability (represented by ξ^0 shifts), while different levels of air pollution risk may be related to local differences in changes among cohorts for effects on cardiovascular diseases.



Fig. 9. Posterior 90% credible intervals of the predictive odds-ratio between being born in two subsequent cohorts for a 62 years old low-risk subject in our sample, i.e. a wealthy highly educated female non-smoker. Vertical dashed lines delimit the Italian administrative regions. Horizontal line indicates no variations.



Fig. 10. Posterior mean of the weights ω^0 , on the left panel, and ω^1 , on the right.