

Reanalysis of noise annoyance functions

Author: Matthias Lochmann Hessisches Landesamt für
Naturschutz, Umwelt und Geologie



Hessisches Landesamt für
Naturschutz, Umwelt und Geologie
Für eine lebenswerte Zukunft

Table of content

1	Scientific Starting Point	3
2	Data wrangling	5
3	Results/Discussion.....	7
4	Bibliography	11

List of figures

Figure 1:	Original Graph of Guski.....	3
Figure 2:	The quadratic fit of the full dataset as provided in the data including the 5%-95% confidence band.....	7
Figure 3:	Included my logistic regression.....	8
Figure 4:	Included my logistic regression, now with linear y-Axis.....	9
Figure 5:	the same as previous figure 3, now each study in its own Graph.....	10

List of tables

Table 1:	Data values of the ERR for road traffic noise of the full data set as stated by (Guski, Schreckenberger, and Schuemer 2017).....	4
Table 2:	The first 10 rows of the input data, each line denoting one dot in the above graph.	5

The analysis an the report was written in RMarkdown. See e.g. Xie (2015) .

1 Scientific Starting Point

In order to estimate the environmental burden of disease of road noise, it is neccessary to calculate the number of highly annoyed persons. The contribution of annoyance to the noise burden amounts to roughly half the total value(Tobollik et al. 2019; Hegewald et al. 2021). As an important proportion of the hessian population is expected to be exposed to road noise in the range of 40 to 50 dB(A) L_{DEN} the behavior of the exposure-response-relation (ERR) for high annoyance is of special interest. Especially the application of health impact assessments of noise mitigation measures, such as a hypothetical uniform reduction of all road noise sources by 3 dB, highlights the problematic aspect of the Guski(Guski, Schreckenber, and Schuemer 2017) as depicted in fig. 1: It is counter-intuitive, that there is a local minimum of annoyance at about 45 dB(A) L_{DEN} . By reducing the exposure in this range by 3 dB, the ERR calculated burden might increase. Does the literature justify this counterintuitive result? In my opinion it does not.




Figure 1: Original Graph of Guski

The ERR used here corresponds to the “WHO full dataset road”, indicated by the black line. The key numbers of the ERR are listed in Tab. 1.

Table 1: Data values of the ERR for road traffic noise of the full data set as stated by (Guski, Schreckenberger, and Schuemer 2017)

LDEN	Full dataset %HA	ratio	comment
40.00	9.00	1.00	negative slope
45.56	7.94	0.88	minimum
51.12	9.00	1.00	initial value
55.00	10.99	1.22	inital value + 2%
60.00	15.08	1.68	94% of population below
70.00	28.37	3.15	
80.00	48.51	5.39	

In the 15 dB-range from 40 to 55 dB, the annoyance value stays more or less constant; in the range of 9 ± 2 %HA. This would mean, the annoyance by road traffic noise in the range 40 to 55 dB is rather high, but quite insensitive to the actual noise level. The annoyance at higher levels is moderately increasing compared to the starting value at 40 dB. All these conclusions seem to contradict intuition. All these mathematical properties (rather high starting point, negative slope, minimum point, little variation over a 15 dB-range, moderate increase with respect to the starting point) distinguish this congregated dataset from all individual study datasets. In my opinion, this difference is due to a meta-analysis method, which does not adequately respect the inter-study systematic differences. I.e. the annoyance at a given level L_0 , of study i , $\%HA_i(L_0)$ probably strongly correlates with the lower end of the examined exposure level range $L_{(Lo,i)}$. An alternative approach to the given meta-analysis could be:

- Choosing an appropriate parametrization for the ERR with reasonable boundary conditions (e.g. polynom of 1st or 2nd degree, no negative slope in the range 40 to 80 dB, ...)
- Fitting the parameters to all individual study data sets separately. Aggregating the fit parameters, weighted with an adequate weight (i.e. $\sqrt{N_i}$, where N is the study size and i the individual study)
- Use the log- (or logit-)transformed y-values and a logistic regression. This would force the functions to have a realistic asymptotic behaviour to low (and high) L_{DEN} -values and still take into account the influence of all studies even out of the repectives studies range.

2 Data wrangling

Rainer Guski provided me his data tables of as Excel list. As a start I read the road noise annoyance them in and reformatted them in a tidy format in the sense of R1.

```
## [1] 1  
## [1] "Tabelle1"
```

The beginning of the input data is listed in table 2.

Table 2: The first 10 rows of the input data, each line denoting one dot in the above graph.

1 For an explanation of tidy data see e.g.: <https://r4ds.had.co.nz/tidy-data.html>

Lden	Location	ProzHA	N
40.0000	Wipptal mainroad face	11.6376 55	1,991
40.0000	Wipptal highway+ main phone	7.33726 7	1,327
40.0000	Inntal mainroad	14.4983 60	1,641
40.0000	Inntal highway	6.17165 5	1,641
40.4847	Switzerland	2.54304 2	2,386
42.6000	France	1.69565 4	701
45.0000	Hyena Heathrow	10.2425 00	600
45.0000	Hyena Berlin	5.26320 0	972
45.0000	Hyena Amsterdam	2.69660 0	898
45.0000	Hyena Stockholm	3.54870 0	1,003

The fitting relies on the R-Package (Bates et al. 2015). More background theory can be found in the online book of Mathias Harrer (Harrer et al. 2021).

```
## Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
## Formula: log(ProzHA) ~ Lden + (Lden | Location)
## Data: HAList
## Weights: sqrt(N)
## REML criterion at convergence: 97.1382
## Random effects:
## Groups Name Std.Dev. Corr
## Location (Intercept) 1.97556
## Lden 0.02377 -0.97
## Residual 1.19367
## Number of obs: 148, groups: Location, 22
## Fixed Effects:
```

```
## (Intercept)    Lden  
## -3.06863    0.08922  
## optimizer (nloptwrap) convergence code: 0 (OK) ; 0 optimizer warnings; 2 lme4 warnings
```

3 Results/Discussion

The result of the global quadratic fit of Guski, as found in the data is plotted in Fig. 2, in fig. 3 including the meta regression an in fig. 5 plotted on a separate facet for each input data set.




Figure 2: The quadratic fit of the full dataset as provided in the data including the 5%-95% confidence band.




Figure 3: Included my logistic regression




Figure 4: Included my logistic regression, now with linear y-Axis.




Figure 5: the same as previous figure 3, now each study in its own Graph.

4 Bibliography

Bates, Douglas, Martin Machler, Ben Bolker, and Steve Walker. 2015. "Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using Lme4" 67. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>.

Guski, Rainer, Dirk Schreckenberg, and Rudolf Schuemer. 2017. "WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review on Environmental Noise and Annoyance." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 14 (12): 1539. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14121539>.

Harrer, Mathias, Pim Cuijpers, Furukawa Toshi A, and David D Ebert. 2021. *Doing Meta-Analysis with R: A Hands-on Guide*. 1st ed. Boca Raton, FL; London: Chapman & Hall/CRC Press. https://bookdown.org/MathiasHarrer/Doing_Meta_Analysis_in_R/.

Hegewald, Janice, Melanie Schubert, Matthias Lochmann, and Andreas Seidler. 2021. "The Burden of Disease Due to Road Traffic Noise in Hesse, Germany." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18 (17): 9337. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18179337>.

Tobollik, Hintzsche, Wothge, Myck, and Plass. 2019. "Burden of Disease Due to Traffic Noise in Germany." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 16 (13): 2304. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16132304>.

Xie, Yihui. 2015. *Dynamic Documents with R and Knitr*. 2nd ed. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman; Hall/CRC. <http://yihui.name/knitr/>.