EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF BIOMEDICAL AND PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES
http://www.ejbps.com

ISSN 2349-8870
Volume: 6
Issue: 9
84-92
Year: 2019

# ENVIRONMENTAL DATA ASSESSMENT FOR USE IN PUBLIC HEALTH SURVEILLANCE

***K. Shailaja and L. Devi**

*Faculty, Dept. of Hindi, Faculty, Dept. of Computers, Sir C R Reddy College (Autonomous), ELURU, India.

***Corresponding Author: K. Shailaja**
Faculty, Dept. of Hindi, Faculty, Dept. of Computers, Sir C R Reddy College (Autonomous), ELURU, India.

**Article Received on 08/06/2019** **Article Revised on 28/06/2019** **Article Accepted on 18/07/2019**

**ABSTRACT**
Surveillance is critical for improving population health. Public health surveillance systems generate information that drives action, and the data must be of sufficient quality and with a resolution and timeliness that matches objectives. In the context of scientific advances in public health surveillance, changing health care and public health environments, and rapidly evolving technologies, the aim of this article is to review public health surveillance systems. We consider their current use to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the public health system, the role of system stakeholders, the analysis and interpretation of surveillance data, approaches to system monitoring and evaluation, and opportunities for future advances in terms of increased scientific rigor, outcomes-focused research, and health informatics.

**KEYWORDS:** *Surveillance evaluation, surveillance indicators, surveillance objectives, surveillance system monitoring.*

## INTRODUCTION

Public health surveillance, and by extension the systems used to enable surveillance, is central to the practice of modern public health. Public health surveillance contributes data and information to assess and characterize the burden and distribution of adverse health events, prioritize public health actions, monitor the impact of control measures, and identify emerging health conditions that may have a significant impact upon population health. The core role of surveillance systems within public health practice, and their concomitant capacity to greatly influence the efficiency and effectiveness of the public health system, has stimulated research to strengthen the scientific basis of public health surveillance.

In the context of scientific advances in public health surveillance, changing health care and public health environments, and rapidly evolving technologies, the aim of this article is to review public health surveillance systems, including their current role, recent advances, and opportunities for future advances. This review is divided into three sections. In the first two sections, we review the contemporary use and evaluation of surveillance systems in public health practice and highlight some notable recent advances in their use and evaluation through case studies and other examples. In the third section, we discuss some promising opportunities for advancing surveillance systems in the future and highlight notable research activities.

### The Use of Surveillance Systems

The Concept of a Surveillance System Surveillance, a core function of public health practice, is defined as "the ongoing, systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of health data essential to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of public health practice, closely integrated with the timely dissemination of this information to those who need to know" and act upon that information. A surveillance system, in turn, is a collection of processes and components that enable public health practitioners to conduct surveillance. Surveillance processes include data collection, data quality monitoring, data management, and data analysis, interpretation of analytical results, information dissemination, and application of the information to public health programs. The enabling components of surveillance systems may include laboratory diagnostics to detect or confirm health conditions; information technologies to support the surveillance processes of data collection, analysis, and dissemination; clinician consultation and reporting; clinician, public health, and laboratory worker education and training; legislation, regulations, and policies that support the conduct of surveillance; systems and directories for disseminating alerts, bulletins, clinical guidelines, and prevention recommendations; program administration and management; and human factors (e.g., multi sector communications and relationships). Ultimately, public health surveillance systems should produce information to guide public health decisions in many areas, including

disease prevention, prevention program planning and management, health promotion, quality improvement, and resource allocation (WHO 2006).

**Using Surveillance Systems to Meet Public Health Objectives**

From a societal perspective, public health surveillance systems should increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the public health system, which is a primary determinant of population health. A surveillance system affects population health by capturing data and generating information that public health practitioners and stakeholders can use to improve the quality of their decisions and the effectiveness of their actions. From the perspective of the public health system, surveillance systems support all three essential functions of public health—assurance, assessment, and policy development. For a specific surveillance system, however, the objectives should be defined more precisely (Table 1). These objectives should be tailored to the outcomes under surveillance, the intended uses of the information generated by the system, and the level (e.g., local, regional, national) of the public health system at which the surveillance system is functioning. The processes and components of a public health surveillance system should in turn be aligned with the objectives of the surveillance system to ensure that valid information can be derived and applied to practice, to promote operational efficiency, and to ensure that the activities are within the legal or regulatory mandate of the public health system.

**Table 1: Surveillance objectives and examples of surveillance system data use by surveillance objective.**

| Surveillance Objective | Surveillance System | Surveillance Method |
|---|---|---|
| Guide immediate action for cases of public health importance (e.g., initiating investigations or interventions) | Acute flaccid paralysis (AFP) surveillance | Monitoring of AFP (a clinical syndrome with several potential etiologies, including poliovirus) as reportable condition in countries not reporting confirmed polio cases Etiology of AFP cases is determined via testing of stool specimens |
| Measure the burden of a disease (or other health-related event) and monitor trends over time, including changes in incidence and the identification of high-risk populations | State-based child body mass index (BMI) surveillance systems | Collection of child height and weight data, typically in a school-based setting at least every two years |
| Support early detection and response to outbreaks or new or emerging health concerns | Gonococcal Isolate Surveillance Project | Sentinel surveillance system to monitor trends in antimicrobial susceptibilities of Neisseria gonorrhoeae strains among men with gonococcal urethritis attending 1 of 27 sexually transmitted disease clinics in the United States |
| Guide the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs to prevent and control disease, injury, disability, or exposure to environmental hazards | Post-licensure Rapid Immunization Safety Monitoring (PRISM) program, the immunization safety monitoring component of US Food and Drug Administration's Mini-Sentinel project | Monitoring of three million people who received H1N1 vaccine by linking data from private health plans and public immunization registries; analysis of data to identify time-invariant confounders (e.g., chronic illness) and rare outcomes (comparison of current and historical data) |
| Provide reassurance during periods of perceived increased risk that incidence of a health condition is not increasing. | Syndromic surveillance system monitoring over-the-counter (OTC) pharmacy sales | Monitoring of OTC antidiarrheal medication sales to identify unusual sales patterns; monitoring of pharmacy sales promotions for these products to aid interpretation of sales data |
| Evaluate public policy | Active Bacterial Core Surveillance System, a component of CDC Emerging Infections Program | Population-based, active surveillance network in ten geographically and racially diverse jurisdictions comprising up to 12% of the US population |
| Detect changes in health practices and the effects of these changes. | Swedish Strategic Programmed Against Antibiotic Resistance | Repeated national point-prevalence surveys of antimicrobial use in Swedish hospitals [monitored treatments for predefined diagnostic groups, defined daily dose (a measure of antibiotic pressure), and reason for antimicrobial use (i.e., prophylaxis, community-acquired infection, hospital-acquired infection)] |

Explicitly documented objectives for the surveillance system are also important for planning the system, evaluating system performance, and enabling continuous improvement of data and system quality. Surveillance objectives and budget should determine the number and type of data variables to be collected (e.g., demographic

or behavioral data variables), including the required level of resolution of the data, the population under surveillance, the required timeliness of information for effective action or response, the frequency of data analysis and interpretation, and the resources required to support the surveillance system. Similarly, surveillance objectives should influence decisions about data collection, management, analysis, integration, dissemination, security, and privacy. It is best to identify inconsistencies between the objectives (and their implications for system design and performance) and resources at the planning stage so that one or the other can be adjusted accordingly.

Ultimately, a public health surveillance system's objectives indicate how the data are intended to be used for public health action. The reason for collecting, analyzing and disseminating information on a disease is to control that disease. Collection and analysis should not be allowed to consume resources if action does not follow. Appropriate action, therefore, becomes the ultimate goal and the final assessment of the earlier steps of a surveillance system.

Surveillance data have been used to guide a range of public health actions. Table 1 presents examples of surveillance data use by surveillance system objective to illustrate the range of public health actions that can be informed by public health surveillance data.

**The Expanding Use of Surveillance Systems**

The initial focus of public health surveillance principles and practices was on infectious diseases, but today public health surveillance systems are used to monitor and forecast a broad range of health determinants (e.g., risk behaviors, health care services, and socioeconomic factors) and outcomes relevant to infectious diseases, injuries, chronic diseases, mental health, and occupational and environmental health. The case studies on the Major League Baseball Health and Injury Tracking System (MLB HITS) and active transportation surveillance are examples of surveillance systems focused on noninfectious diseases. In particular, in the case of the MLB HITS, two non–public health entities, an industry (MLB) and its worker association, established a surveillance system to identify and monitor work-related injuries and associated risk factors and to assure the effectiveness of the intervention.

Beyond the monitoring of individual risk factors and outcomes, surveillance systems have also been developed recently to monitor the presence, emergence, or evolution of infectious agents in the environment. For example, a recent surveillance evaluation sought to determine if bioaerosol sampling methods are suitable for routine surveillance for viruses in environments that facilitate aerosolization. Investigators compared bioaerosol sampling in swine farms to concurrent animal, environmental, and human sample testing to detect novel influenza viruses. These data supported the identification of novel influenza viruses and of climatic factors and animal husbandry practices that may increase the risk of human exposure to aerosolized influenza A in agricultural settings.

The use of surveillance systems has also expanded in relation to communicable diseases, for example to monitor the impact of vaccination programs on viral evolution in order to inform vaccine design and maintain vaccine effectiveness. One such example is the New Vaccine Surveillance Network, which monitors the etiology of acute gastroenteritis in the United States and has documented the decline in Group A rotavirus–associated gastroenteritis incidence among children following reinitiating of rotavirus immunization in the country. The Network continues to monitor the genotypic variation in the rotavirus strains circulating in the United States and has noted a major shift in the predominant genotype prevalence in the years 2008–2013. Data from surveillance systems are also used increasingly to forecast or predict future trends in disease distribution. Early identification of the timing and intensity of the annual seasonal epidemic of influenza is useful to inform public health planning and response. To determine if reasonably accurate forecasts can be made during flu season, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) organized a challenge to predict the 2013–2014 United States influenza seasons. Findings indicated that flu forecasting can yield reasonably accurate estimates of the start, peak, and intensity of the influenza season. Although forecasting may be technically feasible, more work is needed to improve its accuracy so that policy makers (Thacker and Stroup 1994) can use these predictions to guide prevention and control efforts.

Many public health agencies have also chosen to actively monitor health communications and news media—especially during a public health (California Policy Research Centre 2004a) emergency—both to refine the public health response and to inform decisions about the creation, alteration, or refinement of health or risk communication messages. Recognition that public health law and policy influence community health has led some organizations to establish surveillance systems to monitor the impact of public health laws and policies on communities, environments, and individuals. Longitudinal surveillance data used to examine the impact of laws and policies on community health are distinguished from the legislative tracking systems that are commonly utilized to monitor policy interest and activity. Law and policy tracking over time and across jurisdictions can help policy makers, advocates, and researchers understand what the laws are on a particular topic and can provide them with data to evaluate their impact.

This increasing breadth of application of public health surveillance systems raises many issues, including the engagement of a broader set of stakeholders in

surveillance activities and the need to adapt existing analytical methods to new objectives and data sources. In the following two sections, we consider these two issues.

**The Importance of Stakeholder Engagement in Surveillance Systems**

Public health organizations often conduct surveillance under a legal mandate, but to maintain the public's trust, they must conduct surveillance in a manner that is responsible and of sufficient quality to inform population health improvement. The substantial public and private sector investment in surveillance also demands that the data collected by surveillance systems be used and that stakeholders perceive the system to be useful. Stakeholders may contribute data or resources to a surveillance effort, act upon the information generated, or use surveillance information to advocate for prevention and control efforts to improve population health. Typical stakeholders include public health practitioners, health care providers, policy makers, and members of affected communities, academia, professional *associations* (Goldberg et al. 2003; Pope and Dockery 2006), private industry, and not-for-profit advocacy organizations. Engaging with a variety of system stakeholders during system planning, design, implementation, and evaluation encourages broad-based ownership of the surveillance activity and allows the economic, social, and cultural factors that influence prevention and control to be identified and addressed, increasing the likelihood that the information generated by the system will be useful.

For surveillance systems to achieve their greatest impact, it is necessary to identify system stakeholders, understand their roles (e.g., contributing data or advocating for assistance to those affected by the health outcome under surveillance), and engage them throughout the surveillance process. Prior to the initiation of surveillance, the stakeholder input, such as the information sought for decision making, may inform the definition of system objectives. When the surveillance system is active, stakeholders can help interpret the reported data based on their knowledge of the health outcome or the environment in which the data are collected. They may also respond to the information generated by the surveillance system and recommend and influence surveillance system evaluation to ensure the system is meeting its objectives.

Increasingly, the general public can be considered a partner in the surveillance process, as novel data streams "whose content is initiated directly by the user (patient) themselves" are investigated and integrated into traditional public health surveillance. Widespread availability of these novel data streams has led to the investigation of new surveillance methods—e.g., natural language processing and monitoring of Twitter posts to augment traditional influenza surveillance or prediction of dengue incidence using search query surveillance and new surveillance data sources, such as restaurant reservation and review logs or over-the-counter pharmacy sales. These novel methods and data sources require validation (e.g., comparison to existing surveillance data) and prospective evaluation to determine if they add value to established surveillance systems. As noted, "the dynamics of information spread are inherently different from the dynamics of disease spread" and the influence of changing user behavior on participatory surveillance and digital health surveillance must be further evaluated.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data in Surveillance Systems**

The analysis of public health surveillance data is typically performed to detect the presence (or absence) of signals (i.e., unusual patterns in the reported data by person, place, and time compared to historical data) that may prompt a public health investigation or other actions. Surveillance data analysis may also be performed to identify the association (or lack thereof) between reported health outcomes and patient or population characteristics to understand the local epidemiology of the condition under surveillance and to determine effective prevention or control measures. Because they are collected and monitored over time, surveillance data can support the detection of trends in reported data by person, place, and time and the identification of changes in disease incidence compared to historical data.

Surveillance data analysis and interpretation should directly support the surveillance system objectives and be performed in alignment with surveillance system processes. The content and structure of a valid surveillance system should be defined and monitored to ensure that quality data are received and available for analysis. For example, surveillance data quality review should be initiated as data arrive and conducted at each data update. Similarly, standard analytic routines should be specified prior to receipt of surveillance data and performed at each major data update. In addition, it is useful to anticipate the types and magnitude of signals or surveillance measure values that may be generated by the surveillance system, both to evaluate the system (e.g., by simulating expected signals and determining the capacity of the system to detect those signals) and to define and implement public health action(s) in response to the population health metrics generated by the analysis of the data. Ad hoc analyses may be conducted in response to novel questions or stakeholder requests.

The available data, together with the system objectives, help to define the analysis options. Traditionally, researchers have used straightforward methods due to limitations in the data (e.g., quantity, resolution, volume) and to a lack of evidence supporting the use of more sophisticated methods. Over the last three decades, the amount of data available has expanded greatly, computing power and storage capacity have increased exponentially, and surveillance objectives have evolved

to address a wider set of considerations and more immediate threats. All these factors have pushed innovation in the development and evaluation of analytical methods in surveillance.

In particular, the objective of rapid outbreak detection has prompted the examination of a wide range of detection methods and the comparison of these methods against one another using different types of data and outbreaks. This work has contributed some qualitative insights, including the observation that no single detection approach is likely to be optimal for all surveillance applications, and that it may be possible to identify methods that are better suited to one particular application. Another recent trend has been toward the integration of data from multiple sources into a single analysis. Whereas traditional surveillance analyses have tended to focus on a single time series of case counts or rates, the increasing availability of data from clinical systems and other sources has provided the opportunity to consider additional covariates within each record and to integrate data on risk factors and multiple outcomes into a single analysis. Another strategy for integrating data from multiple sources has been to develop decision rules or policies based on the pattern of alerts observed across data streams. Data integration also poses a challenge in chronic disease surveillance, where, given the multi factorial causation and complex progression of most chronic conditions, surveillance systems tend to follow multiple indicators (Gosselin and Furgal 2002). concurrently. One strategy that is being explored to support the effective use of such information draws on the concept of evidence-based public health and presents indicators in the context of existing evidence to help users appreciate patterns in the data and identify actions that are likely to improve population health.

**Monitoring and Evaluation of Surveillance Systems**

Performance monitoring and the evaluation of surveillance systems are complementary processes conducted by public health practitioners and other surveillance system stakeholders. Surveillance system performance is monitored through the ongoing assessment of surveillance processes, such as by following the completeness and timeliness of data collection and reporting. Evaluation focuses on whether the system is meeting its objectives and making effective use of its resources. Both monitoring and evaluation can identify opportunities for surveillance system performance improvement, and both provide information on performance to aid the interpretation of data. Historically, greater attention has been given to evaluation, but monitoring is of increasing interest given the growth in automation and data-intensive systems.

**Routine Monitoring of Public Health Surveillance Systems**

The monitoring of a surveillance system can be defined as the routine process of data collection and the measurement of surveillance program or process changes over time using previously agreed-upon plans, schedules, and indicators. Discrepancies between actual and planned system performance are identified via routine monitoring, and corrective actions are taken—akin to quality improvement approaches intended to systematically improve the performance of any system. A routine monitoring perspective recognizes that surveillance system performance indicators are not static: They are often reformulated based on evaluation findings. Similarly, surveillance monitoring data might indicate where more comprehensive evaluation is needed.

Surveillance system performance indicators are defined to specify some aspect of, or a change in, a process, outcome, or activity and to identify sources of variation that, if not addressed, may cause changes in the quality of the information generated by the system or in the system's performance. Well-defined surveillance indicators are specific in nature, measureable, relevant for the setting in which the system operates, and obtainable in a timely manner. Indicators may be of different types, e.g., they may focus on process, outcome, or output. Indicators should have a defined target and be operationalized using a protocol or algorithm that indicates thresholds for alerting or response. It is useful to define the recommended actions to take in response to the indicator data and accompanying protocols to allow the identification of and response to the causes of missed indicator targets.

Routine monitoring of surveillance system indicators yields information to assess the current performance of the surveillance system and provides early warning of potential system deviations. Analysis of performance monitoring data allows public health organizations to set goals for system performance improvement. Perhaps the most important use of surveillance monitoring data is to aid the interpretation of the data generated by the surveillance system. Surveillance indicators can also be used to set priorities for the surveillance system [e.g., to identify the attributes (timeliness, representativeness, sensitivity, etc.) of greatest importance for the health outcomes under surveillance and for the objectives of the system] or to identify actions that should be undertaken to enhance quality, performance, or impact. Routine monitoring of surveillance systems' performance is increasingly recognized as an essential surveillance process, particularly for highly automated systems that receive data in real time.

**Evaluation of Public Health Surveillance Systems**

A number of factors may indicate that it is time to formally evaluate a surveillance system using a specific study design to assess key surveillance attributes [e.g., sensitivity, positive predictive value, and representativeness (Table 2)] that influence the relevance, effectiveness, and impact of the surveillance system. For example, routine monitoring of surveillance system performance indicators may identify trends that

should be explored more thoroughly to identify improvements that can enable the system to better meet its objectives and achieve its desired performance. Unexpected performance, such as a community gastrointestinal disease (WHO 2006) outbreak that is missed by a food borne disease surveillance system, may stimulate an evaluation. Discrepancies in the information generated by different surveillance systems may also cause health department staff to initiate an evaluation to determine the reason for the discordance. Evaluation allows the system's sponsor and stakeholders to determine if the system is generating data that can be used to address its objectives; to make effective use of fiscal, personnel, and technology resources; to meet the needs of stakeholders; and to maintain the system's public health relevance given changing health care practices, hazards, disease epidemiology, or information needs.

**Table 2: Public health surveillance system attributes and their measurement.**

| Attribute | Measurement Considerations |
|---|---|
| Acceptability | May be indicated by the participation rate of data providers, completeness of case report data, timeliness or frequency of data reporting, or responsiveness to requests for supplemental information on reported health events. Acceptability can be influenced by the time and effort required to complete and submit surveillance reports or by perceptions of the benefits derived from participation in the surveillance system |
| Cost-effectiveness | Assessment of surveillance resources typically focuses on direct costs. Because of the complexity of surveillance and response processes, it is usually difficult to define indirect costs. For some infectious disease surveillance systems, investigators have modeled the expected future costs of strategies for continued vaccination, surveillance, and other public health activities |
| Data quality | Can be measured as the proportion of data intended to be collected that was actually collected (completeness) and the proportion of data entries that correctly reflect the true value of the data collected (validity). Includes proportion of unknown, invalid, and missing values for reported data elements. Validity may be estimated by the proportion of errors in surveillance system data compared to analogous data from one of the system's data sources. |
| Predictive value positive (PVP) | Cases reported to the system must be investigated to determine if they represent true or confirmed cases of the health event under surveillance. Low PVP may be addressed by case definition revision, request of additional data, or staff training to increase reporting accuracy. For event-based surveillance, criteria denoting a real outbreak should be defined and the outcomes of investigations of potential outbreaks identified by the system should be monitored and characterized per outbreak definition criteria. |
| Representativeness | Representativeness is assessed by comparing the reported cases or events to all actual cases/events. Information on all cases/events is seldom available, but surveillance data representativeness can be described in terms of geographic coverage, demographic distribution, and clinical manifestation of the health conditions under surveillance that were reported to the surveillance system. For example, is there uneven distribution of reported cases/events based on our understanding of the epidemiology of the health condition in the population under surveillance? |
| Security | Case detection sensitivity can be measured by the number of cases reported to the surveillance system divided by the number of cases in the population under surveillance. Outbreak detection sensitivity may be estimated retrospectively (e.g., were outbreak cases reported to the system? Was the temporal or spatial association of the cases noted prior to outbreak recognition from some other data source?) or prospectively (e.g., is an observed increase in case reports indicative of an outbreak requiring response?). Simulated or authentic data may be used to determine the characteristics of outbreaks that can be identified by the system (e.g., some absolute number of cases in time and space) or statistically derived thresholds (e.g., based on standard deviations). Sensitivity of the case definition depends on (a) the health condition under surveillance; (b) our knowledge of the epidemiology of the condition; (c) our ability to describe the condition based on clinical signs and symptoms, laboratory criteria, or epidemiological criteria; and (d ) the availability of relevant data elements in the surveillance system's data sources. |

Table 2 summarizes the definition of the attributes used to evaluate a surveillance system and the methods employed to measure them. Some attributes are more important for selected surveillance purposes and health outcomes than others. The reason for this may be obvious when one considers concurrently the objectives and attributes of a system. For example, rapid outbreak detection is often a stated objective for systems

monitoring communicable diseases: Timely and representative population-based health-related data are required to avoid missing outbreaks of public health importance and to ensure rapid public health action.

Therefore, surveillance system evaluation is typically driven by the assessment of specific attributes (Table 2); however, if such an evaluation is pursued in a reductionist manner (i.e., by assessing system attributes independent of one another), key insights into the surveillance system process and information may be missed. In other words, the attributes of public health surveillance systems are related to one another; strengthening one system attribute could adversely affect another attribute of a higher priority. For example, data quality, although critical, need only be good enough to meet the objectives of the system. The Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists recommend that "because no data are perfect and perfecting data can be costly, matching data quality to its use is imperative". Data of poor quality make the system less acceptable and potentially less representative of the population under surveillance:

Efforts to improve sensitivity, positive predictive value, representativeness, timeliness, and stability can increase the cost of a surveillance system, although savings in efficiency through use of information technology (e.g., electronic reporting) might offset some of these costs. As sensitivity and positive predictive value approach 100%, a system is more likely to be representative of the population with the event under surveillance. However, as sensitivity increases, predictive value positive might decrease.

## CONCLUSION

Surveillance and the systems that enable surveillance have been the focus of applied research in public health for decades; in recent years, however, there has been an increasing interest in surveillance methods in the context of changing public health objectives and emerging opportunities for data access and computing. Surveillance systems are now applied broadly across many areas beyond infectious diseases and this increasing breadth of application, along with the associated methodological demands (e.g., rapid signal detection, data integration), is driving innovation and contributing to the scientific basis of public health surveillance. Scholars have emphasized the importance of evaluating key attributes of surveillance systems for decades; today, they increasingly recognize the routine monitoring of key system processes and outcomes as needed to aid data interpretation, ensure quality, and guide focused evaluation activities.

Future improvements to surveillance systems must be driven by public health objectives and should be evaluated rigorously to determine their effects and, ideally, costs. We encourage public health surveillance practitioners to focus on opportunities to apply the data in new ways (as reflected in the system's objectives); to embrace the possibilities that informatics offers to enhance data quality and system efficiency and effectiveness; to incorporate routine monitoring of system performance; and to apply sound study designs to evaluate the effect of innovations on the outcomes of interest. This renewed approach to surveillance systems will be instrumental in improving public health practice and enhancing community health.

## REFERENCES

1. Briggs D. Linkage Methods for Environment and Health Analysis: General Guidelines: A Report of the Health and Environment Analysis for Decision-Making (HEADLAMP) Project. Geneva: World Health Organisation Office of Global and Integrated Environmental Health; 1996. [Google Scholar]
2. California Policy Research Centre, University of California. Strategies for Establishing an Environmental Health Surveillance System in California. A Report of the SB702 Expert Working Group. 2004a. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.catracking.com/sub/sb702.htm>.
3. California Policy Research Centre, University of California. Strategies for Establishing an Environmental Health Surveillance System in California. A Report of the SB702 Expert Working Group. 2004b. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.catracking.com/sub/nl.htm>.
4. Centers for Disease Prevention and Control (CDC) Background. National Environmental Public Health Tracking Program. 2006a. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.cdc.gov/NCEH/Tracking/background.htm>.
5. Centers for Disease Prevention and Control (CDC) Using Indicators for Environmental Public Health Surveillance. Environmental Public Health Indicators Project. 2006b. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/indicators/use.htm>.
6. Centers for Disease Prevention and Control (CDC) CDC's National Environmental Public Health Tracking Program: National Network Implementation Plan. 2006c. Version 1. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/tracking/pdfs/nnip.pdf>.
7. Comité d'éthique de santé publique du Québec. Avis du Comité d'éthique de santé publique. Projet de Plan commun de surveillance de l'état de santé de la population et de ses déterminants 2004–2007. 2004. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://msssa4.msss.gouv.qc.ca/fr/sujets/ethiqSP.nsf/0/35570c61afcd975685256ead00636ccc/$FILE/AVIS_PCS.pdf>.
8. Corvalan C.F., Kjellstrom T., Smith K.R. Health, Environment and Sustainable Development: Identifying Links and Indicators to Promote Action. Epidemiology, 1999; 10(5): 656–60. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

9. Coyle D., Stieb D., Burnett R.T., Decivita P., Krewski D., Yue C., Thu M.J. Impact of Particulate Air Pollution on Quality-Adjusted Life Expectancy in Canada. Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health Part A., 2003; 66(16–19): 1847–63. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Environmental Health Investigations Branch (EHIB) Oakland: California Department of Health Services; 2002. California Environmental Health Indicators. [Google Scholar]
11. Eyles J., Furgal C. Indicators in Environmental Health: Identifying and Selecting Common Sets. Canadian Journal of Public Health, 2002; 93(5): S62–66. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
12. Federal/Provincial/Territorial Committee on Health; Environment, Tracking/Surveillance Task Group. Toronto: Author; 2006. Concept Paper: Strengthening Health and Environment Tracking/Surveillance in Canada. Background Document for the Health and Environment Tracking and Surveillance Workshop. [Google Scholar]
13. Goldberg M.S., Burnett R.T., Stieb D. A Review of Time–Series Studies Used to Evaluate the Short-Term Effects of Air Pollution on Human Health. Reviews on Environmental Health, 2003; 18(4): 269–303. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Gosselin P., Furgal C.M. Challenges and Directions for Environmental Public Health Indicators and Surveillance. Canadian Journal of Public Health, 2002; 93(5): S5. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. Health Canada. Biomonitoring of Environmental Chemicals in the Canadian Health Measures Survey. Environmental and Workplace Health. 2006a. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ewh-semt/contaminants/health-measures-sante_e.html>.
16. Health Canada. Tracking/Surveillance Task Group Committee on Health and the Environment. Ottawa: Author; 2006b. Case Example of Health and Environment Tracking and Surveillance. Air Quality Monitoring, Health Surveillance, and an Air-Health Indicator. [Google Scholar]
17. Health Canada; Healthy Environments and Consumer Safety Branch (HECSB) Surveillance Working Group; Centre for Surveillance Coordination. Inventory of Federal/Provincial/Territorial Environmental and Occupational Health Data Sources and Surveillance Activities. 2004. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www2.itssti.hc-sc.gc.ca/clf/hecsinventory.nsf/Home?OpenForm&lang=E>.
18. Institut national de santé publique du Québec; Ministère de la santé et des services sociaux du Québec; l'Institut de la statistique du Québec. Le Santé environnementale sous surveillance. Portrait de santé du Québec et de ses régions 2006: les analyses, 2006; 24–32. 1.4. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.inspq.qc.ca/pdf/publications/546-PortraitSante2006_Analyses.pdf>.
19. Kyle A.D., Woodruff T.J., Axelrad D.A. Integrated Assessment of Environment and Health: America's Children and the Environment. Environmental Health Perspectives, 2006; 114(3): 447–52. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. Lebret E., Briggs D., van Reeuwijk H., Fischer P., Smallbone K., Harssema H., Kriz B., Gorynski P., Elliot P. Small Area Variations in Ambient $NO_2$Concentrations in Four European Areas. Atmospheric Environment, 2000; 34: 177–89. [Google Scholar]
21. Mather F.J., Ellis White L., Langlois E.C., Shorter C.F., Swalm C.M., Shaffer J.G., Hartley W.R. Statistical Methods for Linking Health, Exposure and Hazards. Environmental Health Perspectives, 2004; 112(14): 1440–45. [PMC free article][PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. McGeehin M.A., Qualters J.R., Niskar A.S. National Environmental Health Tracking Program: Bridging the Information Gap. Environmental Health Perspectives, 2004; 112(14): 1409–13. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. Ministère de la santé et services sociaux du Québec (MSSS) Québec Public Health Program 2003–2012. 2003. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://publications.msss.gouv.qc.ca/acrobat/f/documentation/2003/03-216-02A.pdf>.
24. Ontario Medical Association (OMA) The Illness Costs of Air Pollution. 2005–2026 Health and Economic Damage Estimates. 2005. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.oma.org/Health/smog/report/ICAP2005_Report.pdf>.
25. Perkel C. Well of Lies: The Walkerton Water Tragedy. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart; 2002. [Google Scholar]
26. Pew Environmental Health Commission. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health, Department of Health Policy and Management; 2000. America's Environmental Health Gap: Why the Country Needs a Nationwide Health Tracking Network. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://healthyamericans.org/reports/files/healthgap.pdf>. [Google Scholar]
27. Pope C.A., Dockery D.W. Health Effects of Fine Particulate Air Pollution: Lines That Connect. Journal of the Air and Waste Management Association, 2006; 56(6): 709–43. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
28. Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC); Office of Public Health Practice, Health Surveillance Coordination Committee. Health Surveillance Coordination. 2005. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/php-psp/surveillance_e.html>.
29. Smith RL. Invited Commentary: Timescale-Dependent Mortality Effects of Air

Pollution. American Journal of Epidemiology, 2003; 157(12): 1066–1070. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

30. Teutsch S.M. Considerations in Planning a Surveillance System. In: Teutsch S.M., Churchill R.E., editors. Principles and Practice of Public Health Surveillance. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000; 17–29. [Google Scholar]
31. Thacker S.B., Stroup D.F. Future Directions of Comprehensive Public Health Surveillance and Health Information Systems in the United States. American Journal of Epidemiology, 1994; 140: 1–15. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
32. Thacker S.B., Stroup D.F., Parrish G., Anderson H.A. Surveillance in Environmental Public Health: Issues, Systems and Sources. American Journal of Public Health, 1996; 86: 633–38. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
33. Toronto Public Health. Air Pollution Burden of Illness from Traffic: Problems and Solutions. 2007. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.toronto.ca/health/hphe/pdf/air_pollution_burden.pdf>.
34. World Health Organisation (WHO) Preventing Disease through Healthy Environments: Towards an Estimate of the Environmental Burden of Disease. 2006. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://www.who.int/quantifying_ehimpacts/publications/preventingdisease/en/index.html>.
35. World Health Organisation (WHO) Regional Office for Europe; European Centre for Environment and Health. Development of Environment and Health Indicators for the European Union Countries (ECOEHIS). Final Report. 2004. Retrieved December 11, 2008. < http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_projects/2002/monitoring/fp_monitoring_2002_frep_01_en.pdf>.