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The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic revealed and exacerbated existing social and economic health disparities, and actionable epidemiologic evidence is needed to identify potential vulnerability factors to help inform targeted responses. In this commentary, methodological challenges and opportunities regarding the links between air pollution and COVID-19 are discussed with a focus on 2 factors: 1) the role of differential exposure to air pollution across populations as an explanation for spatiotemporal variability of the epidemic spread and resultant mortality; and 2) the indirect impacts of interventions to control COVID-19 person-to-person spread treated as natural experiments on air pollution and population health. I first discuss the potential mechanisms between exposure to air pollution and COVID-19 and the opportunity to clearly formulate causal questions of interest through the target trial framework. Then, I discuss challenges regarding the use of quasiexperimental designs that capitalize on the differential timing of COVID-19 policies including the selection of control groups and potential violations of the common shock assumption. Finally, I discuss environmental justice implications of this many-headed beast of a crisis.

Abbreviations: COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; PM$_{2.5}$, particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 μm in aerodynamic diameter; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2.

Editor’s note: The opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the American Journal of Epidemiology.

In the last few months, the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has disrupted our society globally. This novel coronavirus—severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2)—and the disease it causes, COVID-19, revealed and exacerbated existing social and economic compounding disparities in relation to health and health-care access. Growing evidence identified strong disparities across regions and within cities at the neighborhood level as well across socioeconomic status or racial/ethnic groups (1–3). Efforts to contain COVID-19 around the world also resulted in economic downturns creating extraordinary unemployment (4) that will likely worsen an unequal population health burden in the times to come if nothing is done to bolster social safety nets where most needed. In this context, epidemiologic evidence is critically needed to understand and predict the temporal and spatial spread of the disease, evaluate the effectiveness of potential treatments and policies, understand the etiology of the disease, and identify potential vulnerability factors to help inform targeted responses.

Among proposed vulnerability factors in relation to COVID-19, various environmental factors have been proposed, among which outdoor air pollution received particular attention in the last few months. Indeed, there are many relevant epidemiologic research questions regarding the links between air pollution and COVID-19. Two distinct types of epidemiologic research questions were most examined. First were studies of COVID-19 designed to better understand the role of differential exposure to air pollution across populations and explain spatiotemporal variability...
of the epidemic spread and resultant mortality. Indeed, whether individuals living in areas with poor air quality are more likely to both become infected with SARS-CoV-2 and die from COVID-19 remains unknown. Second, studies have investigated the unintended consequences of policies implemented to control the spread of COVID-19. These studies, often analyzed as natural experiments, attempt to demonstrate how local policies might have indirectly affected other diseases in the population through changes in specific sources of air pollution emissions.

In this commentary, I describe some methodological challenges and opportunities regarding these 2 types of questions based on the literature (some peer reviewed, some not yet) that is available to date. I will focus on etiological questions, keeping in mind that methodological challenges regarding availability, exhaustiveness, and validity of data are definitely an underlying issue (5). Finally, I will briefly discuss other related topics, including environmental justice implications of this many-headed beast of a crisis.

CONCEPTUALIZING THE LINKS BETWEEN EXPOSURE TO AIR POLLUTION AND COVID-19

Mechanisms through which acute exposure to air pollutants, such as fine particles, can affect respiratory health are well documented and include pulmonary inflammation that can reduce lung function through bronchoconstriction or an alteration of the pulmonary immune system (6, 7). In parallel, chronic exposure to fine particle pollution notably exacerbates chronic inflammation, with cellular proliferation and extracellular matrix reorganization (8), and also weakens pulmonary immune response (9). Several toxicological studies have described such mechanisms (9, 10) and a vast body of epidemiologic evidence confirms the role of acute and chronic exposure to various air pollutants on respiratory hospital admissions, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (11) or asthma exacerbation (12). Furthermore, several papers reported that exposure to air pollution exacerbates the severity of various respiratory infections (13), such as influenza (14) and possibly another coronavirus infection, SARS (15). A recent study found that chronic exposure to particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 μm in aerodynamic diameter (PM2.5) and ozone increases the risk of acute respiratory distress syndrome among older adults in the US (16).

Based on this background knowledge, it is conceivable that exposure to air pollution might influence the variability in the severity of COVID-19 symptoms or contribute to explaining differential spatiotemporal patterns regarding the spread of the disease. Recent studies have reported that individuals with severe COVID-19 might be more likely to have had preexisting respiratory diseases (17–24). Documenting the impact of air pollution on the severity of COVID-19 could be consequential to informing targeted responses focusing on areas with poor air quality. Yet, while some early reports (peer reviewed or not yet) aimed at investigating such relationships, there are specific methodological considerations that need to be emphasized to ensure that valid and actionable results are produced for policy and health-care decision makers (25).

First, it is important to clearly conceptualize the role of air pollution in relation to COVID-19 in etiological studies with regard to the specific COVID-19 outcome of interest. Hypothesized mechanisms that are highlighted above suggest that exposure to air pollution can be conceived as an effect (measure) modifier where background air pollution levels might influence the effect amplitude of public health mitigation strategies or simply the spatial or temporal variability of the epidemic spread and symptoms severity. Yet, some preliminary studies (17–24) on this topic instead conceptualized air pollution as the main exposure of interest by regressing COVID-19 death rates on chronic air pollution levels while controlling for various time-fixed contextual factors and seasonal trends and interpreting the coefficient of a given measure of chronic exposure to air pollution as a contributor to coronavirus deaths. In this setting, the implicit causal implication of these results can be problematic and ambiguous. Indeed, such results would suggest that if, counterfactually, we were able to intervene and reduce long-term air pollution levels, we would have observed fewer COVID-19 deaths in 2020. Without even mentioning possible residual confounding (e.g., population mobility and density), documenting the potential benefits of long-term actions on air pollution levels on COVID-19 death rates is probably not the type of actionable evidence that is needed during a pandemic and does not directly address the hypotheses formulated in these publications.

In order to document whether targeted responses in areas with poor air quality would be a valuable public health strategy, alternative research questions that consider air pollution to be a modifier of a specific policy might be timely and more appropriate. For example, Lyu et al. (26) recently evaluated the impact of state policies mandating public or community use of face masks or coverings in the United States, exploiting the timing of the enforcement of such policies. They found that 15 states (plus Washington, DC) with such mandates in place between April 8 and May 5 enjoyed a reduction in the COVID-19 daily growth rate overall, while the others did not. It would be relevant, in future studies, to assess to what extent background exposure to air pollution modifies the effectiveness of such interventions; it would align with actionable recommendations about how and where to prioritize prevention efforts. The same rationale applies to other types of treatments or policies, such as testing prioritization (27). Thus, the COVID-19 intervention targeting a given screening or treatment of interest, and exposure to air pollution conceptualized as an effect modifier, informs about the pertinence of prioritizing the intervention of interest according to air pollution levels. Knowledge of the importance of effect modifiers would also help us to better understand the transportability of a particular intervention across regions with differing levels of air pollution. It is also important to reemphasize that effect modification is scale dependent and that for such public health prioritization efforts, the additive scale has been shown to be preferable (28).

Another potential approach to better understand the air pollution link for COVID-19 symptom severity would be
to focus on alternative outcomes, such as spatiotemporal changes in infection fatality rates, instead of counts of COVID-19 cases or deaths. This design would better capture how exposure to air pollutants influences variability in symptom severity or whether the probability of dying from COVID-19 in a given population (with detailed information regarding COVID-19 cases and time in the denominator) is influenced by air pollution levels. Of course, getting accurate statistics and accurate numerators and denominators to estimate population attack or infection fatality rates can be an extremely challenging task (5), but it is hoped that such surveillance data collection will improve with time.

In this context, the target trial framework (29, 30) can be particularly useful when designing a research question regarding the links between exposure to air pollution and COVID-19. The benefits of using the target trial framework to clarify assumptions, causal contrasts, and actionable implications has been demonstrated for other topics (31–34) by clearly specifying the hypothetical manipulation that is intended in the first place. In this pandemic context, with limited available data and time-sensitive actionable evidence (35), dedicating a preliminary phase to clearly identifying the intended hypothetical manipulation, and how targeted actions based on background air pollution levels would maximize potential benefits, might be valuable, and the target trial framework can be a suitable tool.

RESEARCH ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF MITIGATION EFFORTS TO CONTROL COVID-19 PERSON-TO-PERSON SPREAD TREATED AS NATURAL EXPERIMENTS

The current COVID-19 pandemic led to the implementation of exceptional interventions to control person-to-person spread. Schools and industries have been closed, gatherings banned, wearing mask in public spaces enforced, and more than half the world’s population lived under shelter-in-place orders for some time (36). Shelter-in-place orders affect air pollution emissions, providing the opportunity to capitalize on such a natural experiment to potentially better understand COVID-19 transmission dynamics as well as indirect beneficial health impacts associated with such stringent policies.

Such unprecedented interventions affecting both economic activity and human mobility have a substantial impact on traffic-related air pollution (TRAP) emissions, including primary pollutants such as PM$_{2.5}$, particulate matter less than or equal to 10 μm in aerodynamic diameter (PM$_{10}$), or nitrogen dioxide. For example, some preliminary reports observed a downward trend in primary air pollutants as in the United States (37), Europe, China, and other locations (38). However, it has been also shown that such expected decrease in air pollutants is not systematically observed (39), especially for secondary pollutants such as ozone, highlighting the diversity of emission sources and the complexity of atmospheric air pollution formation processes involving transportation dynamics and interactions with meteorological conditions.

Several studies aimed at analyzing how such COVID-19-related policies affected air pollution concentrations and, consequently, population health. Properly inferring that any changes in air pollution and health outcomes (COVID-19-related or not, such as traffic injuries or asthma exacerbation rates) are attributable to a given COVID-19 policy is critical to inform other jurisdictions about which measures to adopt during the pandemic or even to provide evidence about traffic-related measures in a post-COVID-19 era. Yet such a task requires a sound identification strategy, including the choice of appropriate control group(s) as a substitute for the counterfactual trend for the outcome of interest had the policy of interest not been implemented.

Emerging literature in this regard has used various approaches to identify and select control groups, which might have substantial influence on a study’s conclusions. Some studies compared observed values for air pollution measures or a given health outcome during the COVID-19 response period (e.g., March 2020) to the same period 1 year before as the control period. This approach is common to quantify excess mortality or morbidity associated with a natural disaster (40) or other extreme weather events (41). Yet, such a strategy is prone to several potential biases given the numerous possible determinants of year-to-year variability in air pollution and health outcomes. This is particularly true given the complexity of air pollution atmospheric chemistry highlighted above. Other research extended the selection of control groups to other jurisdictions or additional years. For example, Berman et al. (37) defined a COVID-19 period (March 13 to April 21), and a pre-COVID-19 period (January 8 to March 12) that they compared with historical data, averaging years 2017–2019 for each county in California. In the same vein, Chen et al. (42) conducted a health impact assessment in China and calculated differences in daily air pollution concentrations observed during the quarantine period in 2020 with concentrations in the same lunar calendar periods during 2016–2019. Bekbulut et al. (39) adopted a distinct approach and defined a “robust differences” metric comparing a pollutant’s median concentration during a week in 2020 with a distribution of median concentrations observed in the same week over the past 10 years.

Such natural experiments can be used to employ quasi-experimental designs (43) that would capitalize on the differential timing of interventions and/or the type of implemented actions. In this regard, difference-in-differences methods and extensions can be particularly useful to estimate the changes in air pollution or health outcomes attributable to a specific COVID-19-related policy after accounting for some identification assumptions. Such assumptions, including the common trends and common shock, can be easily violated in the context of COVID-19 policies (44). For instance, it might be challenging to identify an appropriate control group that would have a parallel trend for the outcome of interest, given that the timing and intensity of policies are strongly correlated with the spatiotemporal variation of the spread of the disease. Indeed, jurisdictions that might first undertake actions to control COVID-19 person-to-person spread might also suffer from earlier and higher rates, which motivates such policies. Given the known timing of the disease incubation period and lagged effects (45, 46), investigators are likely to initially observe an increase in the counted cases after the implementation of the policy of interest.
This highlights the importance of accounting for both prior trends and lagged expected effects when designing a study to evaluate the health impact of such policies.

It has also been shown that anticipation behaviors might take place, for example, where people took social distancing precautions before any official restrictions were in place (47). Several jurisdictions also implemented various policies at the same time, and local communities or institutions such as universities might have implemented additional nonofficial preventive measures. This could potentially lead to violations of the common shock assumption. Furthermore, some spillover effects are expected where the COVID-19 responses might lead to drastic changes in population mobility (48) or where abatement in traffic emissions could have an impact on other jurisdictions across administrative borders.

Given these potential challenges, it is particularly important to design an appropriate identification strategy and adopt various sensitivity analyses and falsification tests. For example, it would be possible to capitalize on the differential timing of interventions across different cities or counties that share the same national COVID-19 policies. It is also possible to rely on several control groups by using propensity score methods or synthetic control methods, for instance. Recent developments extended the focus of synthetic control methods, including a kernel approach to consider lagged expected effects when designing a study (49) or where abatement in traffic emissions could have an impact on other jurisdictions across administrative borders.

Recent developments extended the focus of synthetic control methods, including a kernel approach to consider lagged outcomes (48) or generalized synthetic control (49) methods that integrate interactive fixed effects models and consider time-varying confounding. Some recent studies have already employed difference-in-differences methods to study the effect of specific policies on COVID-19 infections or deaths (50–53), and such approaches, with all considerations discussed above, would offer interesting opportunities to understand the various impacts associated with COVID-19 policies on air pollution and health.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE IMPLICATIONS OF THE COVID-19 CRISIS

Finally, it is also important to emphasize that exposure to air pollution is not random and might intersect with other social determinants of health. Indeed, differential exposure and susceptibility, where socioeconomic and racial/ethnic minorities bear disproportionate burden from air pollution, are well documented (54–57). Such environmental justice issues are critical and might help explain the reported differential impacts of COVID-19 according to racial/ethnic communities in the United States, for example (1). Documenting such disparities as well as their historical and structural determinants is critical to emphasize and provide evidence to address blatant inequalities during this COVID-19 crisis and the economic recession to come. At the same time, in the United States, some environmental regulations have relaxed air quality standards, justified by the need to mitigate economic impacts following COVID-19 interventions (58). Such policies might have undesirable impacts, especially among vulnerable communities, given well-documented disproportionate exposures to industrial emissions, highlighting environmental injustice concerns.

Health-impact studies that would quantify the potential calamitous implications that can be expected of such deregulation are needed to help prevent an even more unequal spread of the disease.

CONCLUSION

In this commentary, I aimed at discussing methodological challenges and opportunities regarding the links between air pollution and COVID-19, focusing on 2 types of research questions: 1) the role of air pollution as an effect modifier in the spatiotemporal variability in the disease spread and the variability of symptom severity and fatality rates; and 2) the indirect impacts of interventions to control COVID-19 person-to-person spread on air pollution and population health. Of course, other environmental-health study questions are being explored and could also be extremely important for informing prevention efforts. Exposure science studies can help elucidate the transmission of the virus through aerosols, how personal protective equipment use influences personal exposure, the source to receptor pathways, viability of the virus on different surfaces, in different environments, and with different meteorological conditions such as humidity, temperature, and ultraviolet radiation. Occupational health can also provide critical actionable evidence by identifying high-risk workers, given that some workplace conditions (e.g., health-care providers and caregivers; water and wastewater workers; construction workers, and others) might increase severity of health outcomes or interact with other risks such as extreme heat (62). At the same time, other challenges include the capability to manage compound risks regarding extreme weather events such as extreme heat (63). Considering the double jeopardy that some communities might face regarding COVID-19 and the disproportionate burden they face during extreme weather events, as well as conflicts between COVID-19 preventive actions and adaptation strategies to cope with extreme heat, for example (e.g., cooling centers vs. social distancing; wearing masks vs. respiratory distress), pandemic preparedness strategies for climate adaptation are imperative. In this time-sensitive pandemic context, actionable evidence is needed to help inform targeted interventions to help mitigate the spread of diseases while minimizing socioeconomic inequalities and taking into account compound risks in a changing climate, especially given the expected economic recession that is unfolding.
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