

Supplementary Material S2

Containing detailed results of the analyses with 53 sex/gender covariates in the INGER KORA FIT complete case sample (N = 1,687)

Article: " Do multiple sex/gender-dimensions play a role in the association of green space and self-rated health? Model-based recursive partitioning results from the KORA INGER study"

Lisa Dandolo, Klaus Telkmann, Christina Hartig, Sophie Horstmann, Sara Pedron, Lars Schwettmann, Peter Selsam, Alexandra Schneider, Gabriele Bolte on behalf of the INGER Study Group

1. Access to high quality public green spaces (subjectively measured)




Figure 1: Access to high quality public green space - health association in the INGER KORA FIT complete case sample. Red bars show the number of participants rating their health as bad, and the turquoise bars the number of participants rating their health as good. Bar plots for participants with access to lower quality public green spaces or no access to green spaces are shown on the left side of the figure and bar plots for participants with access to high quality public green spaces on the right side of the figure. The raw odds ratio for the association between the access to high quality public green spaces and self-rated health was 1.69 [CI 1.30, 2.22].




Figure 2: Distribution of propensity scores amongst the exposed and non-exposed




Figure 3: Balance Diagnostics for the “access to high quality public green space” exposure measure showing absolute standardized mean differences before (unadjusted - red line with squares) and after (adjusted – blue line with triangles) weighting. Differences in the adjusted sample were below 0.1 (dotted vertical line) indicating good covariate balance.




Figure 4: Generalized linear model tree for the “access to high quality public green space” exposure measure. Each terminal node in the bottom row contains a plot of the relationship between exposure and self-rated health. Red lines correspond to parameter estimates (intercept and exposure coefficient) obtained by weighted logistic regressions.

Quality of public greenspaces: Estimates and CIs

Node	Intercept			Quality of public greenspaces		
	Estimate	Lower_CI	Upper_CI	Estimate	Lower_CI	Upper_CI
1	3.0882702	2.7079265	3.522035	1.2937770	0.9660106	1.732754
2	5.2804307	4.3991447	6.338266	1.1963651	0.7991781	1.790952
3	7.8195212	6.1722594	9.906407	1.0520782	0.6711407	1.649235
4	3.5219073	2.3491813	5.280066	1.2880671	0.4708190	3.523895
5	10.4456076	7.7504178	14.078043	0.9004663	0.5370401	1.509831
6	1.9305128	1.4114337	2.640492	1.1244334	0.4347486	2.908234
7	1.1402072	0.9186535	1.415193	1.3473594	0.8365671	2.170032
8	1.2630679	0.9863958	1.617343	1.6690548	0.9336779	2.983624
9	0.9068198	0.6546018	1.256217	1.4183541	0.6306395	3.189982
10	2.0002197	1.3389221	2.988134	2.0404729	0.8796677	4.733071
11	0.8096886	0.5125817	1.279007	0.8284684	0.3193748	2.149073

Table 1: Parameter estimates and corresponding upper and lower bounds of the 95% confidence intervals obtained by weighted logistic regressions on exponential scale for each node of the tree depicted in Figure 4 for the “access to high quality public green space” exposure measure. Node 1 is the root node and contains the whole dataset. Terminal nodes are shown in bold.

Quality pf public greenspaces: Risk differences

Node	RD	Lower_CI	Upper_CI	P0	P1
1	0.0444234	0.0067142	0.0836084	0.7553978	0.7998212
2	0.0225627	-0.0186891	0.0635710	0.8407753	0.8633380
3	0.0050043	-0.0314182	0.0393768	0.8866152	0.8916195
4	0.0405246	-0.0894624	0.1671668	0.7788544	0.8193789
5	-0.0087294	-0.0440025	0.0264269	0.9126302	0.9039008
6	0.0258527	-0.1347544	0.1924830	0.6587628	0.6846155
7	0.0729645	-0.0213450	0.1644289	0.5327555	0.6057200
8	0.1201411	0.0167173	0.2244131	0.5581220	0.6782631
9	0.0870247	-0.0694006	0.2504782	0.4755666	0.5625913
10	0.1365125	0.0095449	0.2530105	0.6666911	0.8032036
11	-0.0459339	-0.2286693	0.1478315	0.4474188	0.4014848

Table 2: Estimates of risk differences (RD) between exposed and non-exposed along. Confidence intervals are based on 2000 bootstrap samples. P0 and P1 are estimates of the probabilities of good self-rated health among the exposed and non-exposed respectively, i.e. $P0 = \mathbb{P}[Y | E = 0]$ and $P1 = \mathbb{P}[Y | E = 1]$. Node 1 is the root node and contains the whole dataset. Terminal nodes are depicted in bold.

2. Greenness in the residential environment (subjectively measured)




Figure 5: Greenness in the residential environment - health association in the INGER KORA FIT complete case sample. Red bars show the number of participants rating their health as bad, and the turquoise bars the number of participants rating their health as good. Bar plots for participants with a less green self-rated residential environment are shown on the left side of the figure and bar plots for participants with a very green self-rated residential environment on the right side of the figure. The raw odds ratio for the association between the greenness in the residential environment and self-rated health was 1.49 [CI 1.14, 1.94].




Figure 6: Distribution of propensity scores amongst the exposed and non-exposed




Figure 7: Balance Diagnostics for the “greenness in the residential environment” exposure measure showing absolute standardized mean differences before (unadjusted - red line with squares) and after (adjusted – blue line with triangles) weighting. Differences in the adjusted sample were below 0.1 (dotted vertical line) indicating good covariate balance.




Figure 8: Generalized linear model tree for exposure „greenness in the residential environment“. Each terminal node in the bottom row contains a plot of the relationship between exposure and self-rated health. Red lines correspond to parameter estimates (intercept and exposure coefficient) obtained by weighted logistic regressions.

Greenness in the residential environment: Estimates and CIs

Node	Intercept			Greenness		
	Estimate	Lower_CI	Upper_CI	Estimate	Lower_CI	Upper_CI
1	2.9184173	2.1668345	3.930692	1.1707530	0.8447860	1.622497
2	4.7398795	3.1777853	7.069848	1.2434874	0.8010212	1.930362
3	7.4134341	4.4151978	12.447688	1.0979207	0.6235597	1.933143
4	3.8798448	1.8805700	8.004592	1.0863218	0.4647517	2.539195
5	9.4367068	4.6196679	19.276588	1.0548692	0.4920415	2.261494
6	1.6016244	0.8021346	3.197968	1.3756140	0.6350623	2.979729
7	0.5292375	0.2092512	1.338546	2.6260092	0.9190524	7.503298
8	6.7623249	2.4688776	18.522197	0.5034300	0.1617423	1.566948
9	1.0902299	0.6587659	1.804285	1.1258824	0.6499852	1.950215
10	2.1319644	1.0863837	4.183855	1.1847127	0.5583811	2.513596
11	0.6298120	0.2902597	1.366580	0.9995628	0.4320869	2.312326

Table 3: Parameter estimates and corresponding upper and lower bounds of the 95% confidence intervals obtained by weighted logistic regressions on exponential scale for each node of the tree depicted in Figure 8 for the “greenness in the residential environment” exposure measure. Node 1 is the root node and contains the whole dataset. Terminal nodes are shown in bold.

Greenness in the residential environment: Risk differences

Node	RD	Lower_CI	Upper_CI	P0	P1
1	0.0287940	-0.0228620	0.0790896	0.7447949	0.7735890
2	0.0291656	-0.0196465	0.0829179	0.8257803	0.8549459
3	0.0094407	-0.0369142	0.0576459	0.8811425	0.8905832
4	0.0131612	-0.0917281	0.1339642	0.7950755	0.8082366
5	0.0045289	-0.0430484	0.0644906	0.9041843	0.9087132
6	0.0721891	-0.0732981	0.2210576	0.6156248	0.6878138
7	0.2354725	0.0269685	0.4203913	0.3460794	0.5815519
8	-0.0982205	-0.2128091	0.0341968	0.8711726	0.7729521
9	0.0294766	-0.0812240	0.1393396	0.5215837	0.5510603
10	0.0356621	-0.0898856	0.1704971	0.6807116	0.7163736
11	-0.0001037	-0.1531978	0.1645945	0.3864323	0.3863286

Table 4: Estimates of risk differences (RD) between exposed and non-exposed along. Confidence intervals are based on 2000 bootstrap samples. P0 and P1 are estimates of the probabilities of good self-rated health among the exposed and non-exposed respectively, i.e. $P0 = \mathbb{P}[Y | E = 0]$ and $P1 = \mathbb{P}[Y | E = 1]$. Node 1 is the root node and contains the whole dataset. Terminal nodes are depicted in bold.

3. Greenness within a 300 m buffer around the residential address (objectively measured)




Figure 9: Greenness within a 300 m buffer around the residential address - health association in the INGER KORA FIT complete case sample. The red density plot shows the distribution of the NDVI data for participants rating their health as bad, and the turquoise density plot shows the distribution of the NDVI data for participants rating their health as good. The raw odds ratio for the association between the greenness within a 300 m buffer around the residential address and self-rated health was 1.12 [CI 0.99, 1.28].




Figure 10: Balance Diagnostics for the “greenness within a 300 m buffer around the residential address” exposure measure showing absolute treatment-covariate correlations before (unadjusted - red line with squares) and after (adjusted – blue line with triangles) weighting.




Figure 11: Generalized linear model tree for exposure „greenness within a 300 m buffer around the residential address “. Each terminal node in the bottom row contains a conditional density plot of the relationship between exposure and self-rated health. Red lines correspond to probability curves obtained by weighted logistic regressions.

NDVI 300: Estimates and CIs

Node	Intercept			NDVI_300		
	Estimate	Lower_CI	Upper_CI,	Estimate	Lower_CI	Upper_CI
1	1.9110016	0.7937145	4.6010589	1.1118837	0.9205231	1.343025
2	6.3259410	1.8588731	21.5278433	0.9726843	0.7465261	1.267356
3	16.1285398	3.1106321	83.6260246	0.8544828	0.6000970	1.216705
4	1.6000534	0.1563446	16.3751752	1.1584458	0.6936929	1.934569
5	39.8108506	4.2615593	371.9070212	0.7466813	0.4653432	1.198111
6	0.5919274	0.0729210	4.8049000	1.3083505	0.8320126	2.057398
7	0.4167328	0.1094528	1.5866767	1.2267624	0.9214754	1.633192
8	0.1444908	0.0247384	0.8439339	1.6991483	1.1735985	2.460045
9	1.7171818	0.1640195	17.9778256	0.7886579	0.4706421	1.321559

Table 5: Parameter estimates and corresponding upper and lower bounds of the 95% confidence intervals obtained by weighted logistic regressions on exponential scale for each node of the tree depicted in Figure 11 for the “greenness within a 300 m buffer around the residential address” exposure measure. Node 1 is the root node and contains the whole dataset. Terminal nodes are shown in bold.

4. Greenness within a 1000 m buffer around the residential address (objectively measured)




Figure 12: Greenness within a 1000 m buffer around the residential address - health association in the INGER KORA FIT complete case sample. The red density plot shows the distribution of the NDVI data for participants rating their health as bad, and the turquoise density plot shows the distribution of the NDVI data for participants rating their health as good. The raw odds ratio for the association between the greenness within a 1000 m buffer around the residential address and self-rated health was 1.10 [CI 0.97, 1.24].




Figure 13: Balance Diagnostics for the “greenness within a 1000 m buffer around the residential address” exposure measure showing absolute treatment-covariate correlations before (unadjusted - red line with squares) and after (adjusted – blue line with triangles) weighting.




Figure 14: Generalized linear model tree for exposure „greenness within a 1000 m buffer around the residential address “. Each terminal node in the bottom row contains a conditional density plot of the relationship between exposure and self-rated health. Red lines correspond to probability curves obtained by weighted logistic regressions.

NDVI 1000: Estimates and CIs

Node	Intercept			NDVI_1000		
	Estimate	Lower_CI	Upper_CI	Estimate	Lower_CI	Upper_CI
1	2.8339770	1.2351180	6.502557	1.0337675	0.8771189	1.218393
2	6.2570338	2.2012920	17.785224	0.9854623	0.7971759	1.218220
3	0.3440159	0.0559427	2.115501	1.4739890	1.0238966	2.121936
4	20.4679812	6.0837892	68.861403	0.8253408	0.6420324	1.060986
5	7.5719503	0.6383613	89.815021	0.8965460	0.5325713	1.509272
6	32.3756098	7.6746129	136.577586	0.7800649	0.5802464	1.048695
7	0.6927906	0.1674241	2.866725	1.1043760	0.8362757	1.458426
8	0.8471528	0.1761582	4.073996	1.1770139	0.8660622	1.599610
9	0.6421285	0.0490135	8.412562	0.9859935	0.5932240	1.638813

Table 6: Parameter estimates and corresponding upper and lower bounds of the 95% confidence intervals obtained by weighted logistic regressions on exponential scale for each node of the tree depicted in Figure 14 for the “greenness within a 1000 m buffer around the residential address” exposure measure. Node 1 is the root node and contains the whole dataset. Terminal nodes are shown in bold.

Exposure	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Greenness in the residential environment	1.0036511	0.3977332	0.2389875	4.919798
Access to high quality public greenspaces	0.9993762	0.2880386	0.4854441	4.898806
NDVI 300m	0.9164820	0.5600256	0.1068782	3.867423
NDVI 1000m	0.8805736	0.7167889	0.1645488	5.223350

Table 7: Descriptive statistics of the stabilized inverse probability weights. A mean far from 1 and very extreme values indicate violations of the positivity assumption (see Cole and Hernán 2008).