



**Ambient Ozone Concentrations and the Risk of
Perforated and Nonperforated Appendicitis:
A Multicity Case-Crossover Study**

**Gilaad G Kaplan, Divine Tanyingoh, Elijah Dixon,
Markey Johnson, Amanda J. Wheeler, Robert P. Myers,
Stefania Bertazon, Vineet Saini, Karen Madsen,
Subrata Ghosh, and Paul J Villeneuve**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1206085>

Received: 1 October 2012

Accepted: 30 May 2013

Advance Publication: 11 July 2013

Ambient Ozone Concentrations and the Risk of Perforated and Nonperforated Appendicitis: A Multicity Case-Crossover Study

Gilaad G Kaplan^{1,2}, Divine Tanyingoh^{1,2}, Elijah Dixon^{2,3}, Markey Johnson⁴, Amanda J. Wheeler⁴, Robert P. Myers^{1,2}, Stefania Bertazzon⁵, Vineet Saini,⁶ Karen Madsen⁷, Subrata Ghosh¹, and Paul J Villeneuve^{8,9}

¹Department of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

²Department of Community Health Sciences, Environmental Health Research Group, Institute of Public Health, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

³Department of Surgery, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

⁴Air Health Science Division, Health Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

⁵Department of Geography, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

⁶Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

⁷Department of Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

⁸Population Studies Division, Health Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

⁹Institute of Health: Science, Technology and Policy, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Corresponding Author:

Gilaad Kaplan, MD, MPH, FRCPC

Associate Professor

Departments of Medicine and Community Health Sciences

Division of Gastroenterology

University of Calgary

Teaching Research and Wellness Center

3280 Hospital Drive NW

Calgary, AB T2N 4N1, Canada

Telephone: 403 592 5015

Fax: 403 592 5050

Email: ggkaplan@ucalgary.ca

Short Title: Air pollution and appendicitis

Key words: air pollution, environmental health, risk factors,

Acknowledgements:

We acknowledge Environment Canada for providing the air pollution data from the National Air Pollution Surveillance Network that were analyzed in the study. We acknowledge the Canadian Institute for Health Information for providing the administrative data on appendicitis cases. Dr. Kaplan and Dr. Dixon are supported by New Investigator awards from the Canadian Institute of Health Research and Population Health Investigator awards from Alberta-Innovates Health Solutions. Dr. Myers is supported by a Clinical Investigator award from Alberta-Innovates Health Solutions and a New Investigator award from the Canadian Institute of Health Research.

Source of Funding:

This study was supported by an operating grant from the Canadian Institute of Health Research and funds from Health Canada. The sponsors had no role in the conduct or interpretation of the study. The corresponding author had full access to all data used in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit the paper for publication.

Disclosures:

None of the authors have relevant disclosures to declare.

Abbreviations: CI – confidence interval; IQR - interquartile range; ICD-10-CA - International Classification of Diseases 10th Revision; OR – odds ratio; PM_{2.5} - particulate matter less than 2.5 microns; PPB – parts per billion.

Author Roles:

Gilaad Kaplan – development of study concept, interpretation of data and analysis, writing the manuscript.

Divine Tanyingoh – data analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Robert P Myers – interpretation of data and analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Subrata Ghosh – interpretation of data and analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Markey Johnson – interpretation of data and analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Paul Villeneuve – development of study concept, data analysis, interpretation of data and analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Vineet Saini – interpretation of data and analysis, critical review of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Amanda Wheeler – interpretation of data and analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Stefania Bertazzon - interpretation of data and analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Karen Madsen - interpretation of data and analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Elijah Dixon - interpretation of data and analysis, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

ABSTRACT

Background: Environmental determinants of appendicitis are poorly understood. Past work suggests that air pollution may increase the risk of appendicitis.

Objectives: We investigated whether ambient ground-level ozone concentrations were associated with appendicitis and whether these associations varied between perforated and nonperforated appendicitis.

Methods: This time-stratified case-crossover study was based on 35,811 individuals hospitalized with appendicitis from 2004-2008 in 12 Canadian cities. Data from a national network of fixed-site monitors were used to calculate daily maximum ozone concentrations for each city. Conditional logistic regression was used to estimate city-specific odds ratios (OR) relative to an interquartile range (IQR) increase in ozone adjusted for temperature and relative humidity. A random effects meta-analysis was used to derive a pooled risk estimate. Stratified analyses were used to estimate associations separately for perforated and nonperforated appendicitis.

Results: Overall, a 16 ppb increase in the 7-day cumulative average daily maximum ozone concentration was associated with all appendicitis cases across the 12 cities (pooled OR=1.07; 95% CI: 1.02, 1.13). The association was stronger among patients presenting with perforated appendicitis for the 7-day average (pooled OR=1.22; 95% CI: 1.09, 1.36), when compared to the corresponding estimate for nonperforated appendicitis (7-day average: pooled OR=1.02, 95% CI: 0.95, 1.09). Heterogeneity was not statistically significant across cities for either perforated or nonperforated appendicitis ($p>0.20$).

Conclusions: Our findings suggest that higher levels of ambient ozone exposure may increase the risk of perforated appendicitis.

INTRODUCTION

The lifetime risk of appendicitis is approximately 1 in 15, and appendectomy for appendicitis is amongst the most frequently performed operations in developed nations (Hardin 1999). Perforated appendicitis has a worse prognosis than nonperforated due to increased risks of sepsis and mortality (Hardin 1999). Perforated appendicitis may result from delayed treatment (Bickell et al. 2006), but others have suggested that it may be a distinct phenotype with diverging pathogenesis from nonperforated appendicitis (Andersson 1999; Livingston et al. 2007; Ruber et al. 2010; Ruber et al. 2006). In the United States, appendicitis-related hospitalizations contribute to approximately \$3 billion in hospital charges annually (Davies et al. 2004). Thus, appendicitis is a relatively common disease that imparts a significant burden to patients and to the health care system (Davies et al. 2004).

Despite the health and economic impacts of this disease, the pathogenesis of appendicitis remains largely unknown. Consistent epidemiological features of appendicitis include an elevated risk associated with younger age, male gender, Caucasian race, and during warmer seasons (Addiss et al. 1990; Luckmann and Davis 1991). Additionally, temporal-spatial clustering of appendicitis cases has been reported, which suggests that acute environmental exposures might contribute to the pathogenesis of appendicitis (Andersson et al. 1995).

A decrease in the incidence of appendicitis in developed countries during the latter part of the 20th century (Addiss et al. 1990; Ferris et al. 2010) coincided with the enactment of legislation that led to reductions in the concentrations of several outdoor air pollutants (Chen et al. 2007). This motivated a previous study of short-term changes in air pollution and appendicitis in

Calgary, Alberta, which indicated that the 7-day average concentration of ambient ozone was positively associated with appendicitis (Kaplan et al. 2009). Further, several recent animal studies have shown that air pollution exposure may alter intestinal immunity, increase gut permeability, and influence intestinal microbial composition (Kaplan et al. 2012; Kish et al. 2013; Mutlu et al. 2011). Such effects might predispose certain individuals to develop appendicitis, or might influence the clinical presentation of appendicitis.

To our knowledge, there has been no attempt to replicate our previously reported association between ozone exposure and appendicitis (Kaplan et al. 2009), or to evaluate associations according to appendicitis presentation (i.e. perforated versus nonperforated appendicitis). Therefore, we conducted a multi-city population-based case-crossover study of appendicitis patients to estimate associations between short-term ambient ozone concentrations and appendicitis across multiple Canadian cities. In addition, we examined whether associations varied between perforated and nonperforated appendicitis cases.

METHODS

Study Population

The Discharge Abstract Database, maintained by the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI), was used to identify individuals hospitalized with appendicitis (Lalonde and Taylor 1997). This database includes all inpatient discharges from nine provinces and two territories (Quebec excluded) (Lalonde and Taylor 1997). Patients hospitalized with appendicitis between January 1, 2004 and December 31, 2008 were identified for the following 12 cities: Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Regina, Winnipeg, Windsor, London, Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, and Halifax. These cities were selected because of their large populations and the

availability of appendicitis data and daily ozone monitoring data collected by Environment Canada for > 80% of the study days. Appendicitis patients living outside city boundaries were identified based on their postal code and excluded from the analysis.

An incident case of appendicitis was identified by a diagnostic code for nonperforated appendicitis (International Classification of Diseases 10th Revision coding ICD-10-CA K35.9) or perforated appendicitis (ICD-10-CA K35.0 and K35.1) and a concurrent procedural code for appendectomy (Canadian Classification of Health Interventions: 1.NV.89.DA and 1.NV.89.LA) (CIHI Website 2013). Individuals coded with unspecified or other appendicitis (e.g. chronic or recurrent appendicitis) were excluded. Sensitivity and positive predictive value of ICD-10-CA coding for appendicitis were 94% and 85%, respectively (Kareemi et al. 2012).

Air Pollution Exposure Assessment

Environment Canada's National Air Pollution Surveillance network monitors ambient ozone levels in over 150 stations in 55 cities across Canada. Automated fixed-site continuous monitoring stations collect hourly mean concentration data that are used to calculate daily maximum ozone concentrations. When there were multiple monitors in a given city, ozone concentrations were averaged into a daily value for the city (Sajani et al. 2010). Additionally, daily mean concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}) were determined using data from fixed monitoring sites. Data for daily mean temperature and relative humidity were also provided by Environment Canada.

Study Design

Associations between ambient ozone concentrations and appendicitis were investigated using a time-stratified case crossover study design (Schwartz 2004). This design is an adaptation of the

case-control study in which cases serve as their own controls (Maclure 1991). For each case of appendicitis, air pollution exposure on the “index” day (i.e. the day of appendicitis admission) is compared to exposure on a series of referent days that occur on the same day of the week during the same month and year as the index day. Because all comparisons are within-individuals, confounding by individual-level risk factors is controlled by the design because these factors are not expected to vary within the one-month time frame that includes the index and referent days (e.g. genetics and obesity) (Schwartz 2004; Levy et al. 2001). Selecting referent intervals close in time to the case event also controls for seasonal patterns in disease occurrence. Although there is variation in the number of referent days that occur after or before the case event, over all appendicitis cases, the numbers of referent days before and after case events are comparable and there is no bias resulting from time trends (Janes et al. 2005; Levy et al. 2001; Schwartz 2004).

Statistical Analysis

Associations between ambient ozone concentrations and appendicitis were examined using the one-hour daily maximum ozone concentrations on the same day or on the previous day, and also using the average of one-hour daily maximum ozone concentrations over the 3-, 5-, or 7-days prior to the event day or referent days, not including the event or referent days. The 3-, 5-, and 7-day averages of ozone were previously shown to be associated with appendicitis (Kaplan et al. 2009) and were therefore identified *a priori* as the primary exposures of interest. Conditional logistic regression was used to estimate the odds of appendicitis in relation to an interquartile range (IQR) increase in the daily maximum ozone concentration adjusted for mean temperature and relative humidity on the event or referent day. The IQR (16 ppb) was based on daily one-hour maximum ozone levels throughout the entire study period (January 1, 2004–December 31,

2008) (Table 1). City-specific odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were pooled using a random effects meta-analysis, which is less prone to bias due to heterogeneity. Heterogeneity in OR estimates across the cities was evaluated using Cochran's Q statistic and quantified using I^2 .

We evaluated potential confounding by other air pollutants using two-pollutant models adjusted for NO₂ or PM_{2.5} during the same exposure periods as ozone. Stratified analyses were used to estimate associations between ambient ozone exposure and appendicitis according to age (≤ 20 years, 20 to 39, and ≥ 40 years), sex, season [spring (March-May), summer (June-August), autumn (September-November), and winter (December-February)], and appendicitis phenotype (perforated versus nonperforated). Stratified models were compared using the Cochran Q statistic.

We performed several sensitivity analyses. We excluded observations from Halifax to evaluate the impact of missing ozone data (missing for ~20% of days in Halifax compared with <1% of days for the other 11 cities) on the overall pooled risk estimate. We also conducted a sensitivity analysis that included all cases with a diagnostic code for appendicitis (i.e. not restricted to those with also a procedural code). We also conducted analyses with exposure defined based on 24-hour mean ozone concentrations instead of daily 1-hour maximum concentrations, and analyses of associations with an exposure contrast of 10 ppb instead of 16 ppb (the IQR). In addition we estimated associations adjusting for temperature and humidity during the same exposure periods as ozone, instead of adjusting for temperature and humidity on the event or referent days only.

All statistical analyses were conducted in SAS (version 9.2, SAS, Cary, North Carolina). In all instances, a *P*-value < 0.05 was considered as statistically significant. The study was approved

by the Conjoint Health Research Ethics Board at the University of Calgary who also granted a waiver of consent due to anonymized administrative data. Our study was conducted in accordance with the strengthening of the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement (Vandenbroucke et al. 2007).

RESULTS

A total of 35,811 patients were classified as appendicitis based on the presence of both a diagnostic code for appendicitis and a procedural code for appendectomy in the 12 Canadian cities between 2004 and 2008. The median age at diagnosis was 30 years (IQR=19-45 years), 55% were male, and 31% had perforated appendicitis (Table 1). The median daily maximum ozone concentration for the 12 cities was 33.3 ppb (IQR= 16 ppb).

The 7-day average daily maximum ozone concentration was positively associated with appendicitis in the pooled analysis (OR=1.07; 95% CI: 1.02, 1.13) (Table 2), with little evidence of heterogeneity across the cities (P=0.89) (Supplemental Material, Table S1). Exposure was more strongly associated with perforated appendicitis, with ORs increasing as the time period of exposure increased from 3 to 7 days (3-days OR=1.11; 95% CI: 1.01, 1.23, 5-days OR=1.15; 95% CI: 1.04, 1.27, 7-days OR=1.22; 95% CI: 1.09, 1.36) (Table 2). In contrast, ozone exposure was not associated with nonperforated appendicitis (7-day: OR=1.02; 95% CI: 0.95, 1.09) (Table 2). The ORs for perforated cases were significantly different from corresponding ORs for nonperforated cases for all averaging periods (all $p < 0.05$). Forrest plots for city-specific risk estimates of the 7-day average stratified by perforated and nonperforated appendicitis are presented in Figure 1. The OR for the association between the 7-day average of ozone and perforated appendicitis was above 1 for all cities except for Saskatoon (OR=0.63; 95% CI: 0.31,

1.30). Heterogeneity was not statistically significant for the 7-day average for nonperforated ($P=0.48$) and perforated appendicitis ($P=0.29$) (Supplemental Material, Table S1).

The pooled odds ratio for the 7-day average did not vary significantly (all $p>0.05$) when stratified according to age group, sex, or season (Table 2). Pooled ORs for all appendicitis and perforated appendicitis were comparable to those for the population as a whole when Halifax was excluded (Table 2). Pooled ORs for both outcomes also were similar when adjusted for NO_2 or $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ in two-pollutant models. Our findings did not substantially change when adjusted for temperature and humidity during the same exposure period as ozone (instead of temperature and humidity on the index or referent days) (7-day average for perforated appendicitis: OR=1.19; 95% CI: 1.06, 1.35) or when estimated for 24-hour mean ozone concentrations instead of daily 1-hour maximum concentrations (7-day average for perforated appendicitis: OR=1.18; 95% CI: 1.07, 1.30). Consistent with expectations, associations were weaker when estimated for a 10 ppb increase in daily 1-hour maximum ozone (7-day average for perforated appendicitis: OR= 1.13; 95% CI: 1.05, 1.21) instead of an IQR (16 ppb) increase (Supplemental Material, Table S2).

DISCUSSION

In this multi-city study, short-term exposure to ambient ozone was associated with an increased number of hospital visits for appendicitis. The findings were robust across a number of sensitivity analyses and consistent with a prior single-city study (Kaplan et al. 2009). Associations with ozone were evident for perforated appendicitis, but not nonperforated appendicitis. We estimated an 11% to 22% increase in perforated appendicitis with every 16 ppb increase in daily 1-hour maximum ozone levels when averaged over the previous 3 to 7 days.

While the pooled relative risk estimates were modest in magnitude, our findings are consistent with previously reported associations between ozone and asthma (Villeneuve et al. 2007). This study of nearly 58,000 asthma visits to emergency departments in Edmonton, Alberta demonstrated that an increase of 24 ppb of the 5-day average of ozone exposure was associated with an 8% increase in asthma exacerbations (Villeneuve et al. 2007). Our pooled estimates for associations with all appendicitis were consistent with a previous single-city study for Calgary, Alberta, one of the cities included in the present analysis (Kaplan et al. 2009). Two previous studies found no association between air pollution and appendicitis (McGowan et al. 2002; Ponka and Virtanen 1996). However, McGowan et al conducted a time series analysis and only studied particulate matter (McGowan et al., 2002), whereas the study from Helsinki analyzed the data using Poisson regression modeling and did not evaluate a multi-day cumulative average of exposure of ozone (Ponka and Virtanen 1996).

We did not observe statistically significant departures from homogeneity across the 12 cities studied. However, ozone concentrations were inversely associated with perforated appendicitis in Saskatoon, in contrast with the other 11 cities. Differences among the cities could reflect differences in the temporal or spatial variability of ozone levels for individual cities. NAPS monitoring stations are generally located in areas with air pollution levels that are expected to be representative of background concentrations in a city. Although averaging measurements from multiple fixed monitoring sites into one daily value for the entire city may misclassify exposures at the individual level (Sajani et al. 2010), this potential biases is likely to be low for ozone because ozone levels are spatially homogeneous across a region (Chen et al. 2007). Missing data may have contributed to variability among cities; however, associations were essentially

unchanged when the city of Halifax, where daily ozone levels were missing for ~20% of the study period, was excluded from the analysis.

Our findings were robust across numerous different approaches to analyzing the data. Although appendicitis is more often diagnosed in young individuals (Addiss et al. 1990; Luckmann and Davis 1991) and in males (Addiss et al. 1990; Luckmann and Davis 1991) neither age nor sex appeared to influence associations between ozone and appendicitis in our study population. Ozone levels are lower in winter months (Chen et al. 2007), when people are also less likely to be exposed to ambient ozone because of increased time spent indoors, thus potentially increasing the likelihood of exposure misclassification. Associations were inconsistent when stratified by season. For example, during the summer, perforated appendicitis was negatively associated with exposure on the same day (OR=0.88; 95% CI: 0.79, 0.99), but positively associated with exposure averaged over the 7 previous days (OR=1.21; 95% CI: 1.02, 1.44). However, season-stratified associations should be interpreted cautiously because the sample sizes were reduced and the differences between seasons were not statistically significant. Finally, although air pollutants are often correlated (Chen et al. 2007), estimates from two-pollutant models adjusted for NO₂ or PM_{2.5} were comparable to adjusted estimates, suggesting that associations between ozone and perforated appendicitis were not confounded by these other air pollutants.

Ozone may selectively influence the pathogenesis of perforated as compared to nonperforated appendicitis. While perforated appendicitis may result from a delay in diagnosing appendicitis (Bickell et al. 2006), emerging evidence suggests that perforated appendicitis also may represent a distinct disease phenotype (Andersson 1999; Ruber et al. 2010). For example, perforated appendicitis may have a divergent immunological pathogenesis (e.g. Th-17 predominant) as compared to nonperforated appendicitis (Ruber et al. 2010; Ruber et al. 2006). Ozone exposure

in humans induced a pro-inflammatory systemic response through stimulation of tumor necrosis factor, IL-6, and IL-8 (Bosson et al. 2007; Paulesu et al. 1991; Srebot et al. 2009; Thompson et al. 2010). Additionally, in an animal study, exposure to air pollutants elevated IL-8 and IL-17 in the small and large bowel and altered the intestinal microflora of mice (Kish et al. 2013). Further, increased intestinal permeability in mice exposed to particulate matter appeared to result from increased inflammation, disruption of tight junctions, and death of epithelial cells (Mutlu et al. 2011). Potential effects of air pollution on pro-inflammatory immune responses and on the host microbiome, could contribute to the development of perforated appendicitis.

Alternatively, the differential association of ozone with perforated versus nonperforated appendicitis may be non-causal. Case definitions of appendicitis were based on ICD coding of an administrative database. A validation study comparing ICD coding of appendicitis against pathology proven appendicitis suggested high sensitivity (>90%), but approximately 15% of cases were false positives (e.g. misclassifying incidental appendectomy of a normal appendix as appendicitis) (Kareemi et al. 2012). Non-differential misclassification error of the disease outcome may bias the risk estimates. Cases coded as perforated appendicitis are less likely to be false-positive or false-negative than cases coded as nonperforated appendicitis (Kareemi et al. 2012). Thus, the association between ozone and perforated appendicitis may represent the relationship between ozone and appendicitis when outcome misclassification is minimized. Additional studies of pathology-proven nonperforated and perforated appendicitis cases are needed to confirm that associations with ozone are specific to perforated appendicitis, rather than overall appendicitis.

Several other limitations should be considered. First, ozone exposure was regionally assigned rather being measured at the patient level. Second, the measurement of ozone levels was

restricted to ambient levels that may not represent indoor exposures. Third, multiple comparisons were performed in stratified analyses and thus, some significant findings may have occurred by chance. Fourth, small sample sizes in some of the cities (e.g. Saskatoon) may have led to spurious associations. Fifth, while each person serves as their own control in a case crossover study design, we cannot rule out residual confounding by time varying factors. Fifth, socioeconomic status may influence the development of perforated as compared to nonperforated appendicitis. Recent studies have reported that socioeconomic status was not associated with the risk of perforated appendicitis in large cohorts in the US and Canada. (Lee et al. 2011; Livingston and Fairlie 2012; To and Langer 2010). In addition, access to health care is less influenced by socioeconomic status because of universal health coverage in Canada. Nonetheless, additional studies are necessary to determine whether the association between ozone and perforated appendicitis is modified by socioeconomic status. Finally, ozone may not be a causal factor, but may instead represent a proxy marker of one or more causal exposures. However, associations between ozone and perforated appendicitis were not appreciably altered by adjustment for NO_2 or $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ in two-pollutant models.

CONCLUSIONS

We conducted a multi-city study that used a validated case definition and controlled for potential confounders through the case-crossover study design, adjustment for meteorological effects, and the selection of referent intervals using a time-stratified approach. Our findings suggest that short-term ambient ozone exposure increases the risk of perforated appendicitis. Consequently, air pollution may be a contributing factor to the pathogenesis of appendicitis.

REFERENCES

- Addiss DG, Shaffer N, Fowler BS, Tauxe RV. 1990. The epidemiology of appendicitis and appendectomy in the United States. *Am J Epidemiol* 132(5):910-925.
- Andersson R. 1999. "Can perforating appendicitis be considered a separate disease entity"? *Eur J Surg* 165(5):481-482.
- Andersson R, Hugander A, Thulin A, Nystrom PO, Olaison G. 1995. Clusters of acute appendicitis: further evidence for an infectious aetiology. *Int J Epidemiol* 24(4):829-833.
- Bickell NA, Aufses AH, Jr., Rojas M, Bodian C. 2006. How time affects the risk of rupture in appendicitis. *J Am Coll Surg* 202(3):401-406.
- Bosson J, Pourazar J, Forsberg B, Adelroth E, Sandstrom T, Blomberg A. 2007. Ozone enhances the airway inflammation initiated by diesel exhaust. *Respir Med* 101(6):1140-1146.
- CIHI Website. 2013. <http://www.cihi.ca/CIHI-ext-portal/internet/EN/TabbedContent/standards+and+data+submission/standards/classification+and+coding/cihi010689>. Accessed May 9, 2013.
- Chen TM, Shofer S, Gokhale J, Kuschner WG. 2007. Outdoor air pollution: overview and historical perspective. *Am J Med Sci* 333(4):230-234.
- Davies GM, Dasbach EJ, Teutsch S. 2004. The burden of appendicitis-related hospitalizations in the United States in 1997. *Surg Infect (Larchmt)* 5(2):160-165.
- Ferris M, Kaplan BS, Soon I, Molodecky N, Dixon E, Benchimol E, et al. 2010. The dynamic global incidence of acute appendicitis: A systematic review of international temporal trends. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 105 Suppl 1: S88.
- Hardin DM, Jr. 1999. Acute appendicitis: review and update. *Am Fam Physician* 60(7):2027-2034.
- Janes H, Sheppard L, Lumley T. 2005. Case-crossover analyses of air pollution exposure data: referent selection strategies and their implications for bias. *Epidemiology* 16(6):717-726.
- Kareemi H, Coward S, Proulx M, Tanyingoh D, Quan S, Frolkis A, et al. 2012. Comparing the incidence of perforated and non-perforated appendicitis: A validation and temporal trend study. *Can J Gastroenterol* 26(Suppl A):143A: A212.
- Kaplan GG, Dixon E, Panaccione R, Fong A, Chen L, Szyszkowicz M, et al. 2009. Effect of ambient air pollution on the incidence of appendicitis. *CMAJ* 181(9):591-597.

- Kaplan GG, Szyszkowicz M, Fichna J, Rowe BH, Porada E, Vincent R, et al. 2012. Non-specific abdominal pain and air pollution: a novel association. *PLoS One* 7(10):e47669.
- Kish L, Hotte N, Kaplan GG, Vincent R, Tso R, Ganzle M, et al. 2013. Environmental particulate matter induces murine intestinal inflammatory response and alters the gut microbiome. *PLoS One*. 2013 Apr 24; 8(4): e62220.
- Lalonde AN, Taylor E. 1997. Medical classification systems in Canada: moving toward the year 2000. *CMAJ* 157(11):1561-1565.
- Lee SL, Shekherdimian S, Chiu VY. 2011. Effect of race and socioeconomic status in the treatment of appendicitis in patients with equal health care access. *Arch Surg* 146(2):156-161.
- Levy D, Lumley T, Sheppard L, Kaufman J, Checkoway H. 2001. Referent selection in case-crossover analyses of acute health effects of air pollution. *Epidemiology* 12(2):186-192.
- Livingston EH, Woodward WA, Sarosi GA, Haley RW. 2007. Disconnect between incidence of nonperforated and perforated appendicitis: implications for pathophysiology and management. *Ann Surg* 245(6):886-892.
- Livingston EH, Fairlie RW. 2012. Little effect of insurance status or socioeconomic condition on disparities in minority appendicitis perforation rates. *Arch Surg* 147(1):11-17.
- Luckmann R, Davis P. 1991. The epidemiology of acute appendicitis in California: racial, gender, and seasonal variation. *Epidemiology* 2(5):323-330.
- Maclure M. 1991. The case-crossover design: a method for studying transient effects on the risk of acute events. *Am J Epidemiol* 133(2):144-153.
- McGowan JA, Hider RN, Chacko E, Town GI. 2002. Particulate air pollution and hospital admissions in Christchurch, New Zealand. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 26(1):23-29.
- Mutlu EA, Engen PA, Soberanes S, Urich D, Forsyth CB, Nigdelioglu R, et al. 2011. Particulate matter air pollution causes oxidant-mediated increase in gut permeability in mice. *Part Fibre Toxicol* 8:19.
- Paulesu L, Luzzi E, Bocchi V. 1991. Studies on the biological effects of ozone: 2. Induction of tumor necrosis factor (TNF-alpha) on human leucocytes. *Lymphokine Cytokine Res* 10(5):409-412.
- Ponka A, Virtanen M. 1996. Low-level air pollution and hospital admissions for cardiac and cerebrovascular diseases in Helsinki. *Am J Public Health* 86(9):1273-1280.

- Ruber M, Andersson M, Petersson BF, Olaison G, Andersson RE, Ekerfelt C. 2010. Systemic Th17-like cytokine pattern in gangrenous appendicitis but not in phlegmonous appendicitis. *Surgery* 147(3):366-372.
- Ruber M, Berg A, Ekerfelt C, Olaison G, Andersson RE. 2006. Different cytokine profiles in patients with a history of gangrenous or phlegmonous appendicitis. *Clin Exp Immunol* 143(1):117-124.
- Sajani SZ, Hanninen O, Marchesi S, Lauriola P. 2010. Comparison of different exposure settings in a case-crossover study on air pollution and daily mortality: counterintuitive results. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol*.
- Schwartz J. 2004. The effects of particulate air pollution on daily deaths: a multi-city case crossover analysis. *Occup Environ Med* 61(12):956-961.
- Srebot V, Gianicolo EA, Rainaldi G, Trivella MG, Sicari R. 2009. Ozone and cardiovascular injury. *Cardiovasc Ultrasound* 7:30.
- Thompson AM, Zanobetti A, Silverman F, Schwartz J, Coull B, Urch B, et al. 2010. Baseline repeated measures from controlled human exposure studies: associations between ambient air pollution exposure and the systemic inflammatory biomarkers IL-6 and fibrinogen. *Environ Health Perspect* 118(1):120-124.
- To T, Langer JC. 2010. Does access to care affect outcomes of appendicitis in children?--A population-based cohort study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 10:250.
- Vandenbroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pocock SJ, et al. 2007. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 147(8):W163-194.
- Villeneuve PJ, Chen L, Rowe BH, Coates F. 2007. Outdoor air pollution and emergency department visits for asthma among children and adults: a case-crossover study in northern Alberta, Canada. *Environ Health* 6:40.

Table 1: City-specific characteristics of appendicitis patients and daily ozone levels from 2004 to 2008 in 12 Canadian cities.

Cities	Daily 1-hour maximum ozone, ppb [median (25 th -75 th percentile)]	Daily ozone range, ppb	Number of Monitors per City	Population Size ^a	Appendicitis Cases ^b	Age, yrs Median (IQR)	% Female	% Perforated Appendicitis
Vancouver	29.3 (22.3-35.6)	2.3-75.1	17	578,041	3385	33 (22-48)	47	37
Edmonton	35.6 (28.4-44.6)	5.9-74.0	9	730,372	3155	29 (20-45)	46	35
Calgary	34.7 (27.7-42.0)	6.5-69.7	8	988,193	5299	29 (19-44)	45	31
Saskatoon	30.0 (24.0-38.0)	5.0-64.0	1	202,340	961	27 (19-43)	46	31
Regina	34.5 (28.5-41.0)	6.5-66.0	2	179,246	871	28 (18-44)	45	31
Winnipeg	30.5 (24.0-38.0)	6.0-79.5	2	633,451	2482	28 (18-45)	45	31
Ottawa	34.0 (27.0-42.0)	1.0-86.5	3	812,129	3149	30 (19-45)	46	28
Toronto	35.5 (27.3-46.2)	5.7-96.3	7	2,503,281	9564	31 (20-45)	45	31
London	37.0 (28.0-48.5)	3.0-93.0	1	352,395	1679	28 (17-44)	46	24
Windsor	39.3 (28.0-53.3)	1.5-117.7	3	216,473	868	30 (18-45)	43	29
Hamilton	37.0 (29.0-49.0)	5.0-101.5	2	504,559	2922	30 (17-46)	47	31
Halifax	27.0 (21.0-34.0)	3.0-93.0	2	372,679	1476	30 (19-45)	44	23
Overall	33.3 (26.0-42.0)	1.0-117.7	57	8,073,159	35811	30 (19-45)	46	31

Abbreviations: IQR - interquartile range; ppb - parts per billion

^aBased on 2006 census data (www12.statcan.gc.ca)

^bAppendicitis cases defined by ICD-10-CA diagnostic code for appendicitis and a concurrent procedural code for appendectomy.

Table 2: Stratified analyses of association between daily maximum ozone exposures and appendicitis cases in 12 cities of Canada (2004 - 2008).

Models ^a	N	Cumulative Average Daily Maximum Ozone Concentration (IQR=16 ppb)				
		Same-Day OR (95% CI)	1-Day Lag OR (95% CI)	3-Day Average OR (95% CI)	5-Day Average OR (95% CI)	7-Day Average OR (95% CI)
All Appendicitis	35811	1.00 (0.96, 1.04)	1.03 (1.00, 1.11)	1.03 (0.99, 1.08)	1.04 (0.99, 1.10)	1.07 (1.02, 1.13)
Appendicitis Phenotype						
Nonperforated	24730	1.00 (0.95, 1.06)	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	1.00 (0.94, 1.06)	0.99 (0.92, 1.07)	1.02 (0.95, 1.09)
Perforated	11081	0.98 (0.93, 1.04)	1.07 (1.01, 1.14)	1.11 (1.01, 1.23)	1.15 (1.04, 1.27)	1.22 (1.09, 1.36)
Age						
≤ 20 years	10313	0.93 (0.88, 0.99)	0.97 (0.92, 1.02)	0.96 (0.88, 1.04)	1.00 (0.90, 1.11)	1.06 (0.96, 1.17)
21 - 39 years	13474	1.00 (0.95, 1.05)	1.05 (1.00, 1.10)	1.04 (0.97, 1.11)	1.06 (0.98, 1.14)	1.08 (0.99, 1.18)
≥ 40 years	12024	1.06 (0.97, 1.16)	1.05 (1.00, 1.11)	1.09 (1.01, 1.17)	1.06 (0.98, 1.15)	1.08 (0.99, 1.19)
Sex						
Male	19509	0.99 (0.95, 1.04)	1.03 (0.99, 1.07)	1.03 (0.98, 1.09)	1.04 (0.98, 1.11)	1.05 (0.98, 1.13)
Female	16302	1.00 (0.95, 1.06)	1.02 (0.98, 1.07)	1.03 (0.96, 1.10)	1.05 (0.95, 1.16)	1.11 (1.00, 1.22)
Season (All Appendicitis)						
Spring	8991	0.99 (0.91, 1.07)	1.01 (0.95, 1.07)	0.97 (0.89, 1.06)	0.96 (0.87, 1.06)	0.99 (0.89, 1.11)
Summer	9504	0.96 (0.90, 1.02)	0.99 (0.94, 1.05)	1.02 (0.95, 1.10)	1.07 (0.98, 1.16)	1.08 (0.97, 1.21)
Autumn	9038	0.99 (0.89, 1.10)	1.05 (0.98, 1.12)	1.04 (0.93, 1.16)	1.03 (0.92, 1.16)	1.08 (0.96, 1.22)
Winter	8278	1.06 (0.98, 1.15)	1.08 (1.00, 1.17)	1.11 (1.00, 1.23)	1.07 (0.95, 1.20)	1.10 (0.95, 1.28)
Season (Perforated Appendicitis)						
Spring	2668	1.04 (0.91, 1.18)	1.03 (0.87, 1.22)	1.10 (0.94, 1.29)	1.12 (0.93, 1.34)	1.19 (0.97, 1.46)
Summer	2899	0.88 (0.79, 0.99)	0.99 (0.89, 1.09)	1.01 (0.88, 1.16)	1.12 (0.96, 1.30)	1.21 (1.02, 1.44)
Autumn	2879	0.95 (0.81, 1.11)	1.14 (1.01, 1.28)	1.16 (0.95, 1.42)	1.19 (0.93, 1.51)	1.28 (0.96, 1.71)
Winter	2635	1.05 (0.92, 1.21)	1.13 (0.97, 1.32)	1.13 (0.93, 1.38)	1.09 (0.82, 1.45)	1.09 (0.77, 1.55)
Ozone + Nitrogen Dioxide (All Appendicitis)	34335	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	1.02 (0.99, 1.06)	1.04 (0.99, 1.09)	1.06 (1.01, 1.11)	1.08 (1.02, 1.14)
Ozone + Nitrogen Dioxide (Perforated Appendicitis)	10736	1.01 (0.94, 1.08)	1.07 (1.00, 1.14)	1.13 (1.02, 1.25)	1.15 (1.04, 1.27)	1.17 (1.07, 1.28)
Ozone + PM _{2.5} (All Appendicitis)	34335	1.01 (0.97, 1.04)	1.02 (0.99, 1.06)	1.03 (0.99, 1.08)	1.03 (0.98, 1.09)	1.06 (1.00, 1.13)
Ozone + PM _{2.5} (Perforated Appendicitis)	10736	1.00 (0.94, 1.06)	1.06 (1.00, 1.13)	1.09 (0.99, 1.20)	1.10 (1.00, 1.20)	1.12 (1.02, 1.23)

Models ^a	N	Cumulative Average Daily Maximum Ozone Concentration (IQR=16 ppb)				
		Same-Day OR (95% CI)	1-Day Lag OR (95% CI)	3-Day Average OR (95% CI)	5-Day Average OR (95% CI)	7-Day Average OR (95% CI)
Appendicitis defined only by diagnostic code ^b Halifax Excluded	38902	1.06 (0.94, 1.07)	1.08 (1.02, 1.14)	1.12 (1.02, 1.24)	1.14 (1.04, 1.25)	1.20 (1.08, 1.33)
All Appendicitis	34335	1.01 (0.97, 1.04)	1.03 (1.00, 1.06)	1.04 (1.00, 1.08)	1.05 (1.00, 1.10)	1.08 (1.02, 1.14)
Perforated Appendicitis	10736	0.99 (0.93, 1.05)	1.08 (1.01, 1.15)	1.12 (1.01, 1.25)	1.15 (1.03, 1.29)	1.21 (1.08, 1.35)

OR – odds ratio; CI – confidence interval; PM_{2.5} - particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter

^aConditional logistic regression estimated the odds of appendicitis in association with a 16 ppb increase in the daily maximum ozone concentration adjusted for mean temperature and relative humidity on the same day as admission for appendicitis.

^bOriginal definition includes a diagnostic code for appendicitis and a procedural code for appendectomy.

Figure Legend

Figure 1: Forest Plot for pooled and city-specific odds ratios (95% CI) for a 16ppb increase in the 7-day average daily 1-hour maximum ozone concentration and A) nonperforated or B) perforated appendicitis. Conditional logistic regression estimated the odds of appendicitis in association with a 16 ppb increase in the daily maximum ozone concentration adjusted for mean temperature and relative humidity.




Figure 1

115x47mm (300 x 300 DPI)