Long-term Exposure to Air Pollution and Lipometabolic Disturbance: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Haohao Chen[a], Ye Zhu[b,c], Liuhua Shi[d], Andrew Rosenberg[d], Lixin Tao[e,f], Xingfan Zhou[g], Rui Chen[g]*, Ji Wang[b,c]*

a Eighth Affiliated Hospital, Fuxing Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100038, China

b Department of Toxicology and Sanitary Chemistry, School of Public Health, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100069, P.R. China

c Beijing Key Laboratory of Environmental Toxicology, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100069, P.R. China

d Gangarosa Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta Georgia 30322, United States.

e Department of Epidemiology and Health Statistics, School of Public Health, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100069, China

f Beijing Municipal Key Laboratory of Clinical Epidemiology, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100069, P.R. China

g Beijing Key Laboratory of Occupational Safety and Health, Beijing Municipal Institute of Labour Protection, Beijing Academy of Science and Technology, Beijing 100054, China

* To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Ji Wang, Department of Toxicology and Sanitary Chemistry, School of Public Health, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100069, P.R. China, Tel.: (86) 10-83911776, E-mail:

wangji@ccmu.edu.cn

Rui Chen, Beijing Municipal Institute of Labor Protection, No. 55, Taoranting Road, Xicheng District, Beijing 100054, China. Tel.: (86) 10-63523998, E-mail: chenr@bmilp.com

Abstract

Objectives: To reveal the chronic effects of air pollutants on lipometabolic disturbance via detectable lipoprotein parameters.

Study Design: This is a systematic review and meta-analysis.

Methods: Seven online databases were searched to conduct a meta-analysis of epidemiological studies examining the relationship between air pollution and lipid parameter levels. Subgroup analysis was additionally carried out for each air pollutant studied.

Results: A total of 2,274 records were retrieved, resulting in 10 studies included in the final quantitative meta-analysis, comprising seven studies in Europe and the United States and three studies in mainland China. Using a random-effect model, the results showed that for each 10 μg/m^3 increment in $PM_{2.5}$, TC, LDL-C, and HDL-C levels and metabolic syndrome (MetS) incidence increased by 3.31% (95% CI: 2.29%, 8.91%), 2.34% (95% CI: 1.30%, 3.39%) , -1.57% (95% CI: -1.85%, -1.28%), and 4.33% (95% CI: 2.69%, 5.98%), respectively; for each 10 μg/m^3 increment in PM_{10}, LDL-C, TG, HDL-C levels increased by 5.27% (95% CI: 2.03%, 8.50%), -0.24% (95% CI: -0.95%, -0.47%), and 0.45% (95% CI: -0.57%, 1.47%), respectively; for each 10 μg/m^3 increment in NO_2, TG and HDL-C levels increased by 4.18% (95% CI: 1.12%, 7.23%) and -0.51% (95% CI: -2.61%, 1.58%), respectively. No significant associations were detected for combinations of air pollutants on lipometabolic disturbance.

Conclusion: Increased air pollutant exposure is significantly associated with fluctuation in blood lipid

parameter levels, which can be an indicator of the body's lipometabolic disturbance.

Keywords: meta-analysis, air pollutant, particulate matter, lipid metabolism, metabolic syndrome

1. Introduction

Air pollution is among the greatest environmental risks to global health[1-3]. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that ambient air pollution is responsible for nearly seven million premature deaths worldwide every year[4]. Major components of atmospheric pollution include particulate matter of different diameter sizes, such as $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, UFP (ultrafine particulate matter), and gas compounds such as CO, NO_x, SO_2, O_3, among others. Primarily deriving from fuel combustion, industrial emissions, transportation and ground dust, these pollutants can cause serious harm to the human body[5]. A growing body of evidence demonstrated the links between air pollution and cardiovascular diseases[6-9], respiratory diseases[10-13], and neurological disorders[14-16], among which cardiovascular disease is the leading cause of death in low-income and middle-income countries[17, 18]. Conventionally, hazardous factors for cardiovascular diseases (CVD) have been partly connected with abnormal levels in lipoprotein-lipid parameters, including high density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), low density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), total cholesterol (TC), triglycerides (TG), total cholesterol (TC) and so on, which may indicate lipometabolic disturbance[19, 20]. The co-occurrence of these changing lipid parameters, known as one risk of metabolic syndrome (MetS), may therefore amplify susceptibility to the CVD risks associated with air pollution exposure[21-24].

In recent years, mounting studies have researched the associations between air pollution and lipid profile parameters, adding to evidences that suggests air pollution may contribute to changes in blood lipid parameters[25-29]. However, most previous studies have been limited to single air pollutants. To date,

only one study[25] has been found which offers a synthesis of the links between atmospheric pollutants and lipid parameters, but it only included 3 studies for the quantitative meta-analysis. The aim of our meta-analysis is to provide a more comprehensive and quantitative overview of the literature regarding of the association between various air pollutants, lipid parameters, and MetS morbidity.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Search Strategy

We conducted the study using standard methods deriving from the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PISMA)[30, 31]. Seven electronic databases, including China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Wanfang, Vip, SinoMed, Pubmed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Library, were searched for peer-reviewed articles published from 2000 to March 28, 2020. Keywords searched included: ("Air Pollution" OR "Pollution, Air" OR "Air Quality" OR "Ultrafine Fibers" OR "Airborne Particulate Matter" OR "Particulate Matter, Airborne" OR "Air Pollutants, Particulate" OR "Particulate Air Pollutants" OR "Ambient Particulate Matter" OR "Particulate Matter, Ambient" OR "Ultrafine Particulate Matter" OR "Particulate Matter, Ultrafine" OR "Ultrafine Particles" OR "Particles, Ultrafine" OR "$PM_{2.5}$" OR "PM_{10}" OR "Nitrogen oxides" OR "NO_2" OR "Sulphur dioxide" OR "SO_2" OR "Carbon monoxide" OR "CO" OR "Black carbon") AND ("Cardiovascular Disease" OR "Disease, Cardiovascular" OR "Diseases, Cardiovascular" OR "Metabolic syndrome" OR "MetS" OR "High density lipoprotein" OR "HDL" OR "Low density lipoprotein" OR "LDL" OR "cholesterol" OR " cholesterin" OR "cholesteric" OR "TC" OR "TG" OR "dyslipidemia" OR "Hypertriglyceridemia" OR "Triglycerides" OR "hypercholesterol*", "hypertriglycerid*" OR "HDL-C" OR "LDL-C") AND ("Cohort" OR "Cross-sectional" OR "Case

control” OR “Case-control” OR “Epidemiology OR “Epidemiological”). Additionally, references of included literature and one previously published systematic review were manually retrieved.

2.2 Eligibility Criteria

2.2.1 Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included if: (1) The study includes all population with no age, gender, or race restrictions. (2) The study describes the relationship between air pollutants and metabolic disease/cardiovascular disease. (3) Results quantify changes in lipid parameters, including LDL-C, HDL-C, TC, TG, etc. (4) Cross-sectional studies, cohort studies, or case control studies. (5) The Literature is published in either Chinese or English.

2.2.2 Exclusion Criteria

Studies were excluded if: (1) The research was based on animal experiments or cytological experiments. (2) The study was a meta-analysis or systematic review. (3) The study was a duplicate. (4) Effect estimates were not able to be conversed as percent changes in lipid parameters per 10 $\mu g/m^3$ change in air pollutants. (5) The collected data resulted from an independent study. If inconsistent results have been reported for a given population or period at the time publications were retrieved, older studies were superseded by the most recent publication.

2.3 Literature Screening and Quality Evaluation

Two researchers independently retrieved and screened the literature following the above order and criteria. Upon review, a third researcher was consulted when discrepancies occurred. The methodological quality of each cohort study was evaluated in line with the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale

(NOS) literature quality evaluation tool[32], which includes three aspects of population selection, comparability, and results. A total of 8 items belonging to NOS could be graded by an "*" for each item, and the top score can add up to 9 "*". Cross-sectional studies were assessed by the American Health Care Quality and Research Institute (AHRQ) scale for quality evaluation[33]. An 11-point scale is used to calculate responses of either "Yes", "No", or "Not clear", for a total score of 11. Specifically for quality evaluation in this study, a study was awarded one "*", corresponding to one point, for each NOS item it contained. "yes" was recorded as one point, whereas "no" or "uncertain" was recorded as zero for each component of the AHRQ scale.

2.4 Data extraction and statistical analysis

Information was independently extracted by two researchers based on a pre-set data extraction form which included: author name(s), year of publication, study period, location, population, median age, sample size, experimental design type, exposure time, and contaminants. Divergent interpretations were reconciled by a third researcher.

When the literature data were extracted, the percent changes in lipid parameters per 10 $\mu g/m^3$ change in air pollutants, from original data or conversed data, were directly utilized. As such, the results presented in this meta-analysis are expressed as the percentage change in lipid parameters and MetS incidence for each 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increment in air pollutant. The between-study heterogeneity was conducted on the basis of both the I^2 statistic and Q-test[34]. High heterogeneity was considered if a study was evaluated as $I^2 \geq 50\%$ or the p-value for a Q-test was < 0.01, and pooling effect estimates was conducted by Der Simonian and Laird random effects model. On the contrary, moderate or low heterogeneity was considered if a study was evaluated as $I^2 < 50\%$ or the p-value for a Q-test was $\geq$

0.01, and pooling effect estimates was conducted by Mantel-Haenszel fixed effects model. Stata software version 14.0 was used in this study. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1 Literature Retrieval and Characteristics

A total of 2,274 records were obtained from multiple databases. After duplicates were removed, 1,174 records were screened by checking the titles and abstracts. 1,154 full-text publications were subsequently assessed using the eligibility criteria. As a result, ten records met all criteria and were pooled in the ultimate quantitative meta-analysis[26-29, 35-40]. The detailed study selection process is shown in Fig. 1.

Overall, this study includes a total of ten records comprising eight cohort studies[26, 27, 29, 35-38, 40] and two cross-sectional studies[28, 39]. An exposure time of less than or equal to thirty days was recorded as short-term exposure, whereas an exposure time greater than thirty days was recorded as long-term exposure. Study characteristics and descriptions are summarized in Table 1~2.

3.2 Quality Evaluation

Using the NOS scale to evaluate eight cohort studies, one study was less representative, three studies were less comparable, six mentioned follow-ups, eight mentioned the specific measurement methods from which the results were derived, and six were subject to the integrity of follow-up. Using the AHRQ scale to evaluate two cross-sectional studies, both mentioned the source of data, patient identification time period, follow-up situation, and continuity of the subject. Final scores based on the NOS scale and the AHRQ scale for each respective study are summarized in Table 1.

3.3 Data Extraction and Conversion

The results of the data extraction of the ten records are shown in Table 3. The change of air pollutant concentrations varied from study to study. As such, in order to pool data for further analysis, original data from each study was uniformly converted to the rate of change of each lipid parameter per 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increment change in air pollutant. A complete list of converted results is reported in Table 4.

3.4 Quantitative Meta-analysis

Based on a quantitative comparison of the ten studies included in the analysis, a total of twelve groups were identified to characterize the relationship between air pollutants and lipid parameters, including $PM_{2.5}$/TC; $PM_{2.5}$/HDL-C; $PM_{2.5}$/LDL-C; $PM_{2.5}$/MetS; PM_{10}/TG; PM_{10}/LDL-C; PM_{10}/HDL-C; NO_2/TC; NO_2/TG; NO_2/HDL-C; PM_{10}/HDL-C (diabetic population); PM_{10}/LDL-C(diabetic population).After data conversion, these effect estimates were analyzed using twelve different analyses for each pollutant/outcome group.

3.4.1 $PM_{2.5}$ with TC, HDL-C, LDL-C, and MetS[26, 27, 36, 39]

$PM_{2.5}$ exposure was significantly associated with TC, HDL-C, LDL-C, and MetS. Specifically, for each 10 $\mu g/m^3$ increase in $PM_{2.5}$, TC levels increased by 3.31% (95% CI: -0.0229~0.0891, P=0.046), LDL-C levels increased by 2.34% (95% CI: 0.0130~0.0339, P=0.001), HDL-C levels decreased 1.57% (95% CI: -0.0185~-0.0128, P=0.001), and the MetS increased by 4.33% (95% CI: 0.0269~0.0598, P<0.001) (See Fig. 2).

3.4.2 PM_{10} with TG, HDL-C, and LDL-C[26, 29, 35, 40]

PM_{10} exposure was significantly associated with TG, HDL-C, LDL-C. Specifically, for each 10

μg/m^3 increase in PM_{10}, TG levels increased by 5.27% (95% CI: 0.0203~0.0850, P<0.001), HDL-C levels decreased by 0.24% (95% CI: -0.0095~0.0047, P=0.002), and LDL-C levels increased by 0.45% (95% CI: -0.057~0.0147, P<0.001) (See Fig. 3).

3.4.3 NO_2 with TG, HDL-C, and TC[26, 29, 39]

NO_2 exposure was associated with TG and HDL-C; however, was not significantly associated with TC. Specifically, for each 10 μg/m^3 increase in NO_2, TG levels increased by 4.18% (95% CI: 0.0112~0.0723, P=0.020), and HDL-C levels decreased by 0.51% (95% CI: -0.0261~0.0158, P<0.001). TC levels increased by 1.01% (95% CI: 0.0035~0.0167, P=0.858) (See Fig. 4).

3.4.4 PM_{10} with LDL-C and HDL-C in diabetic population[35, 37]

Three studies included subjects with diabetes mellitus, suggesting differential modification of LDL-C and HDL-C levels associated with PM_{10} exposure. PM_{10} exposure was significantly associated with HDL-C levels, but not with LDL-C levels. For each 10 μg/m^3 increase in PM_{10}, HDL-C levels decreased 0.45% (95% CI: -0.0072~-0.0017, P=0.009), while LDL-C increased by 1.14% (95% CI: 0.0090~0.00138, P=0.265) (See Fig. 5).

4 Discussion

Significant associations were acquired in this study between air pollutants and lipoprotein parameters, although some with evidence of substantial between-study heterogeneity. Particularly in subgroup of $PM_{2.5}$/MetS, the result may add to evidence that MetS may increase susceptibility to cardiovascular morbidity associated with air pollution exposure.

It's reported [25] that LDL-C and TG levels increased by 0.12% (95% CI: 0.0178~0.0206) and 3.14% (95% CI: 0.0136~0.0495) respectively, per 10 μg/m^3 increase in PM_{10}, which is consistent with

our study, although effect estimates were smaller than the current study. They also observed a decrease of 0.45% (95% CI: -0.0265~-0.0181) in HDL-C levels per 10 μg/m^3 increase in NO_2, but no statistically significant changes in TC. When considering the differences between the two studies, such factors as the use of differential inclusion and exclusion criteria for screening may have resulted in more or less robust records for final selection. To the extent that studies focused on associations between air pollutants and lipometabolic disturbance were much less based on the pre-search, the inclusion criteria in our study were broader, while the exclusion criteria were similar to the meta-analysis by Vaio et al.. As a result, our study included an additional study [35] in the subgroup category for studies investigating the relationship between PM_{10} exposures and LDL-C and TG levels. In this study, $PM_{2.5}$ was more significantly associated with multiple lipid parameters compared to PM_{10}, which is consistent with findings by Hazrije et al.[41]; however, they reported a stronger association between myocardial infarction and $PM_{2.5}$ compared to PM_{10}. This may result from the differential characteristics of $PM_{2.5}$ such as smaller diameter size, larger surface area, slower sedimentation rate, and longer retention time in the air compared to PM_{10}.

This paper reported that elevated PM_{10} exposure on the diabetic population was associated with higher HDL-C levels, while not significantly associated with LDL-C levels. This was only partially in accordance with the previous study[42], which reported significant associations between PM_{10} exposure and both HDL-C levels and LDL-C levels. Such discrepancy may be due to differences in the characteristics of the study population. Further, two studies[35, 37] included in this meta-analysis contained subjects with diabetes using data obtained from medical institutions, whereas Wang et al.[42] had the advantage of follow-up throughout the study period, which may have provided a more precise measure of changes in lipid parameters.

The present studies suggest that air pollution may adversely affect lipometabolic balance by promoting LDL oxidation, disrupting the scavenger receptor and LDL receptor body function, or accelerating the accumulation of lipids in plaque[43, 44]. HDL, as a protective factor for lipid metabolic disorders, decreased in levels when exposed to air pollutants[45].

Despite a considerably inclusive search strategy, with few restrictions on study design and population characteristics, our final selection yielded 10 qualified studies for this meta-analysis. We found high between-study heterogeneity in most of the subgroups studied, which, taken together, may attenuate credibility with cumulative evidence. Yet, heterogeneity may be captured by unmeasured variables in some studies that were not reported such as population susceptibility, temperature, lipid-lowering medications, distribution of air pollutants or other potential sources[46, 47].

There are some limitations that should be addressed. First, most of the literature failed to consider whether subjects had taken lipid-lowering drugs or related drugs using history before or during the study period, which may bias results and lead to less positive change in blood lipid parameter levels[48]. Furthermore, evidence suggests that noise intensity can directly impact lipid parameters levels[29, 39, 49-52]. Considering noise has obvious geographical distribution characteristics, i.e., urban residential areas typically have higher levels of noise intensity than rural or remote areas, and that distance between residential areas and main roadways could fluctuate multiple lipid parameters, future analyses should further examine noise intensity as a possible confounding risk factor. Similarly, green spaces near residential areas or workplaces have been shown to influence lipometabolic balance and should additionally be included as a confounding variable[52-54]. Moreover, residential greenness has been shown elsewhere to have a beneficial effect on MetS and diabetes; accordingly, this association could be attenuated after adjustment for air pollution[55, 56]. To quantify air pollution exposure, many studies[27-

[29, 37, 39, 40] use ground-based measurements derived from fixed air quality monitoring sites. While other studies[26, 35, 36, 38] incorporate predictive models estimated from spatiotemporal hybrid modeling. More specifically, models may utilize low-cost GPS on mobile devices to monitor an average individual exposure to air pollutants in real time, over the study period. Such methods greatly increase the accuracy of measurements and may reflect a better estimate of true exposure to air pollutants. Despite the limitations, previous studies inclined to investigate the relationship between blood lipid parameters levels and a single air pollutant. Examining the effects of air pollution exposure one pollutant at a time underestimates the complexity of atmospheric chemical mixing and the multiple pollutant sources implicated in the link between air pollution exposure and adverse health, and more specifically, the nuanced effects of various pollutants on blood lipid parameters.

5 Conclusion

This study found that $PM_{10,}$ $PM_{2.5,}$ and NO_2 were significantly associated with HDL-C, LDL-C, TC, and TG levels, suggesting a link between air pollution and cardiovascular morbidity. Therefore, improving air quality may yield substantial health benefits.

Acknowledgment:

This work was supported by the Scientific Research Project of Beijing Educational Committee (KM201910025023), Open Foundation of Beijing Key Laboratory of Occupational Safety and Health (2019KJ000377), Beijing Academy of Science and Technology - Reform and Development (PY2020HJ34), and HERCULES Exposome Research Centre (P30ES019776).

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Lelieveld J, Evans JS, Fnais M, Giannadaki D, Pozzer A. The contribution of outdoor air pollution sources to premature mortality on a global scale. Nature. 2015; 525:367-71.

2. Cohen AJ, Brauer M, Burnett R, Anderson HR, Frostad J, Estep K, et al. Estimates and 25-year trends of the global burden of disease attributable to ambient air pollution: an analysis of data from the Global Burden of Diseases Study 2015. Lancet. 2017; 389:1907-18.

3. Shi L, Zanobetti A, Kloog I, Coull BA, Koutrakis P, Melly SJ, et al. Low-Concentration PM2.5 and Mortality: Estimating Acute and Chronic Effects in a Population-Based Study. Environ Health Perspect. 2016; 124:46-52.

4. Landrigan PJ, Fuller R, Acosta NJR, Adeyi O, Arnold R, Basu N, et al. The Lancet Commission on pollution and health. The Lancet. 2018; 391:462-512.

5. Cohen AJ, Brauer M, Burnett R, Anderson HR, Frostad J, Estep K, et al. Estimates and 25-year trends of the global burden of disease attributable to ambient air pollution: an analysis of data from the Global Burden of Diseases Study 2015. The Lancet. 2017; 389:1907-18.

6. Akintoye E, Shi L, Obaitan I, Olusunmade M, Wang Y, Newman JD, et al. Association between fine particulate matter exposure and subclinical atherosclerosis: A meta-analysis. Eur J Prev Cardiol. 2016; 23:602-12.

7. Lin Z, Chen R, Jiang Y, Xia Y, Niu Y, Wang C, et al. Cardiovascular Benefits of Fish-Oil Supplementation Against Fine Particulate Air Pollution in China. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019; 73:2076-85.

8. Combes A, Franchineau G. Fine particle environmental pollution and cardiovascular diseases. Metabolism: Clinical and Experimental. 2019; 100.

9. Zheng Q, Liu H, Zhang J, Chen D. The effect of ambient particle matters on hospital admissions for cardiac arrhythmia: A multi-city case-crossover study in China. Environmental Health: A Global Access Science Source. 2018; 17.

10. Zu K, Liu X, Shi L, Tao G, Loftus CT, Lange S, et al. Concentration-response of short-term ozone exposure and hospital admissions for asthma in Texas. Environ Int. 2017; 104:139-45.

11. Schraufnagel DE, Balmes JR, Cowl CT, De Matteis S, Jung SH, Mortimer K, et al. Air Pollution and Noncommunicable Diseases: A Review by the Forum of International Respiratory Societies' Environmental Committee, Part 2: Air Pollution and Organ Systems. Chest. 2019; 155:417-26.

12. Huang HC, Tantoh DM, Hsu SY, Nfor ON, Frank CFL, Lung CC, et al. Association between coarse particulate matter (PM 10-2.5) and nasopharyngeal carcinoma among Taiwanese men. Journal of Investigative Medicine. 2020; 68:419-24.

13. Dagenais GR, Leong DP, Rangarajan S, Lanas F, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Gupta R, et al. Variations in common diseases, hospital admissions, and deaths in middle-aged adults in 21 countries from five continents (PURE): a prospective cohort study. The Lancet. 2020; 395:785-94.

14. Thomson EM. Air Pollution, Stress, and Allostatic Load: Linking Systemic and Central Nervous System Impacts. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2019; 69:597-614.

15. Seelen M, Toro Campos RA, Veldink JH, Visser AE, Hoek G, Brunekreef B, et al. Long-

Term Air Pollution Exposure and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis in Netherlands: A Population-based Case-control Study. Environ Health Perspect. 2017; 125:097023-.

16. Myung W, Lee H, Kim H. Short-term air pollution exposure and emergency department visits for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: A time-stratified case-crossover analysis. Environ Int. 2019; 123:467-75.

17. Yusuf S, Rangarajan S, Teo K, Islam S, Li W, Liu L, et al. Cardiovascular risk and events in 17 low-, middle-, and high-income countries. N Engl J Med. 2014; 371:818-27.

18. Joseph P, Leong D, McKee M, Anand SS, Schwalm JD, Teo K, et al. Reducing the Global Burden of Cardiovascular Disease, Part 1: The Epidemiology and Risk Factors. Circ Res. 2017; 121:677-94.

19. Yamashita S, Masuda D, Matsuzawa Y. Clinical Applications of a Novel Selective PPARα Modulator, Pemafibrate, in Dyslipidemia and Metabolic Diseases. J Atheroscler Thromb. 2019; 26:389-402.

20. Kopin L, Lowenstein C. Dyslipidemia. Ann Intern Med. 2017; 167:Itc81-itc96.

21. Eze IC, Schaffner E, Foraster M, Imboden M, von Eckardstein A, Gerbase MW, et al. Long-Term Exposure to Ambient Air Pollution and Metabolic Syndrome in Adults. PLoS One. 2015; 10:e0130337.

22. Yang BY, Qian ZM, Li S, Fan S, Chen G, Syberg KM, et al. Long-term exposure to ambient air pollution (including PM1) and metabolic syndrome: The 33 Communities Chinese Health Study (33CCHS). Environ Res. 2018; 164:204-11.

23. Tsai S-S, Lin Y-S, Chen S-T, Chu P-H. Metabolic syndrome positively correlates with the risks of atherosclerosis and diabetes in a Chinese population. European Journal of Internal

Medicine. 2018.

24. Dabass A, Talbott EO, Rager JR, Marsh GM, Venkat A, Holguin F, et al. Systemic inflammatory markers associated with cardiovascular disease and acute and chronic exposure to fine particulate matter air pollution (PM2.5) among US NHANES adults with metabolic syndrome. Environ Res. 2018; 161:485-91.

25. Vânia G, Rita R, Matias DC, Baltazar N. Ambient air pollution and lipid profile: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Environ Pollut. 2019; 254.

26. Yang BY, Bloom MS, Markevych I, Qian ZM, Vaughn MG, Cummings-Vaughn LA, et al. Exposure to ambient air pollution and blood lipids in adults: The 33 Communities Chinese Health Study. Environ Int. 2018; 119:485-92.

27. Lee S, Park H, Kim S, Lee E-K, Lee J, Hong YS, et al. Fine particulate matter and incidence of metabolic syndrome in non-CVD patients: A nationwide population-based cohort study. Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2019; 222:533-40.

28. Hou J, Liu X, Tu R, Dong X, Zhai Z, Mao Z, et al. Long-term exposure to ambient air pollution attenuated the association of physical activity with metabolic syndrome in rural Chinese adults: A cross-sectional study. Environ Int. 2020; 136:105459.

29. Cai Y, Hansell AL, Blangiardo M, Burton PR, de Hoogh K, Doiron D, et al. Long-term exposure to road traffic noise, ambient air pollution, and cardiovascular risk factors in the HUNT and lifelines cohorts. Eur Heart J. 2017; 38:2290-6.

30. J PM, E MJ, M BP, Isabelle B, Tammy H, D MC, et al. Mapping of reporting guidance for systematic reviews and meta-analyses generated a comprehensive item bank for future reporting guidelines. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2020; 118.

31. Shamseer L, Moher , D, Clarke , M, Ghersi , D, Liberati , A, Petticrew , M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2016; 354:i4086.

32. Luchini C, Stubbs B, Solmi M, Veronese N. Assessing the quality of studies in meta-analyses: Advantages and limitations of the Newcastle Ottawa Scale. World Journal of Meta-Analysis. 2017; 5:80-4.

33. B BA. The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and the Development of a Learning Health Care System. JAMA internal medicine. 2017; 177.

34. Huedo-Medina TB, Sanchez-Meca J, Marin-Martinez F, Botella J. Assessing heterogeneity in meta-analysis: Q statistic or I2 index? Psychol Methods. 2006; 11:193-206.

35. Yitshak Sade M, Kloog I, Liberty IF, Schwartz J, Novack V. The Association Between Air Pollution Exposure and Glucose and Lipids Levels. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2016; 101:2460-7.

36. Wu XM, Broadwin R, Basu R, Malig B, Ebisu K, Gold EB, et al. Associations between fine particulate matter and changes in lipids/lipoproteins among midlife women. Science of the Total Environment. 2019; 654:1179-86.

37. Wang M, Zheng S, Nie Y, Weng J, Cheng N, Hu X, et al. Association between short-term exposure to air pollution and dyslipidemias among type 2 diabetic patients in Northwest China: A population-based study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2018; 15.

38. Wallwork RS, Colicino E, Zhong J, Kloog I, Coull BA, Vokonas P, et al. Ambient fine particulate matter, outdoor temperature, and risk of met. Am J Epidemiol. 2017; 185:30-9.

39. Sorensen M, Hjortebjerg D, Eriksen KT, Ketzel M, Tjonneland A, Overvad K, et al.

Exposure to long-term air pollution and road traffic noise in relation to cholesterol: A cross-sectional study. Environ Int. 2015; 85:238-43.

40. Shanley RP, Hayes RB, Cromar KR, Ito K, Gordon T, Ahn J. Particulate Air Pollution and Clinical Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factors. Epidemiology. 2016; 27:291-8.

41. Mustafić H, Jabre P, Caussin C, Murad MH, Escolano S, Tafflet M, et al. Main Air Pollutants and Myocardial Infarction: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association. 2012; 307.

42. Minzhen W, Shan Z. Research progress on the effects of atmospheric PM_(2.5) exposure on type 2 diabetes in people. Journal of Environmental and Occupational Medicine. 2018 (In China); 35:137-42.

43. Miller MR. Oxidative stress and the cardiovascular effects of air pollution. Free Radical Biology and Medicine. 2020.

44. Fuertes E, Plaat DAvd, Minelli C. Antioxidant genes and susceptibility to air pollution for respiratory and cardiovascular health. Free Radical Biology and Medicine. 2020.

45. Bell G, Mora S, Greenland P, Tsai M, Gill E, Kaufman JD. Association of Air Pollution Exposures With High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol and Particle Number: The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol. 2017; 37:976-82.

46. Liu M, Xue X, Zhou B, Zhang Y, Sun B, Chen J, et al. Population susceptibility differences and effects of air pollution on cardiovascular mortality: epidemiological evidence from a time-series study. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int. 2019; 26:15943-52.

47. Ward-Caviness CK. A review of gene-by-air pollution interactions for cardiovascular disease, risk factors, and biomarkers. Hum Genet. 2019; 138:547-61.

48. Ho AC, Hee CS. New drugs for treating dyslipidemia: beyond statins. Diabetes & metabolism journal. 2015; 39.

49. Shapovalova VP, Ryzhova TV, Ryzhov VM. Lipid metabolism state under exposure to noise and aluminum dust. Med Tr Prom Ekol. 2010:18-20.

50. Huang Y-K, Hanneke R, Jones RM. Bibliometric analysis of cardiometabolic disorders studies involving NO(2), PM(2.5) and noise exposure. BMC Public Health. 2019; 19:877-.

51. Jørgensen JT, Bräuner EV, Backalarz C, Laursen JE, Pedersen TH, Jensen SS, et al. Long-term exposure to road traffic noise and incidence of diabetes in the danish nurse cohort. Environ Health Perspect. 2019; 127.

52. Klompmaker JO, Janssen NAH, Bloemsma LD, Gehring U, Wijga AH, Brink CV, et al. Associations of combined exposures to surrounding green, air pollution, and road traffic noise with cardiometabolic diseases. Environ Health Perspect. 2019; 127.

53. Yang BY, Markevych I, Heinrich J, Bloom MS, Qian Z, Geiger SD, et al. Residential greenness and blood lipids in urban-dwelling adults: The 33 Communities Chinese Health Study. Environmental Pollution. 2019; 250:14-22.

54. Ji JS, Zhu A, Lv Y, Shi X. Residential greenness and air pollution mortality using the Chinese Longitudinal Healthy Longevity Survey: a longitudinal analysis. The Lancet. 2019; 394:S16.

55. Yang BY, Liu KK, Markevych I, Knibbs LD, Bloom MS, Dharmage SC, et al. Association between residential greenness and metabolic syndrome in Chinese adults. Environ Int. 2020; 135.

56. Thiering E, Markevych I, Brüske I, Fuertes E, Kratzsch J, Sugiri D, et al. Associations of

Residential Long-Term Air Pollution Exposures and Satellite-Derived Greenness with Insulin Resistance in German Adolescents. Environ Health Perspect. 2016; 124:1291-8.

Figure Legend

Fig.1. Flow diagram of study selection process.

Fig.2. Forest plot of $PM_{2.5}$ exposure (per 10 μg/m^3 increase) with changes of TC, HDL-C, LDL levels and MetS morbidity.

Fig.3. Forest plot of PM_{10} exposure (per 10 μg/m^3 increase) with changes of TG, LDL-C, and HDL-C levels.

Fig.4. Forest plot of NO_2 exposure (per 10 μg/m^3 increase) with changes of TC, TG and HDL-C levels.

Fig.5. Forest plot of PM_{10} exposure (per 10 μg/m^3 increase) with changes of HDL-C and LDL-C levels in diabetic population.

Table 1 General characteristics of ten included studies

Author	Published year	Study period	Location	Study population	Sample size	Study design	Exposure duration	Follow-up	NOS score	AHRQ score
Yang et al.	2018	2006～2008	Chian, Liaoning province	Adults, 18～74y	15477	cohort	Long-term	3y	8	
Lee et al.	2019	2002～2013	Korea, Seoul	Adults	119998	cohort	Long-term	4y	6	
Rachel et al.	2016	1993～2011	USA, New York	Adults, 70y	587	cohort	Long-term	10y	8	
Wang et al.	2018	2011～2015	China, Ganshu province	Adults, 60y	3912	cohort	Long-term	4y	7	
Wu et al.	2018	1999～2005	USA	Adults, 42～52y	2289	cohort	Long-term	7y	7	
Maayan et al.	2016	2003～2012	Israel	Adults, 60y	73117	cohort	Long-term	10y	7	
Hou et al.	2020	2015～2017	China, Henan province	Adults, 18～79y	39089	cross-sectional	Long-term	2y		10
Shanley et al.	2016	1988～1994	USA	Adults, 41y	11623	cohort	Long-term	3y	8	
Cai et al.	2017	2006～2013	Norseland	Adults, >20y	144082	cohort	Long-term	3y	9	
Mette et al.	2015	1993～1997	Denmark, Copenhagen	Adults, 50～64y	39863	cross-sectional	Long-term	5y		9

Abbreviation: y indicates years

Table 2 Description of pollutants, outcomes, measures, and adjustment covariates in included studies

Author	Pollutants	Outcomes	Measure of Exposure Assessment	Measure of Outcome Assessment	Measure of Association Assessment	Adjustment Covariates
Yang et al.	PM_1, $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, SO_2, NO_2, O_3	TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C, hypercholesterolemia, hypertriglyceridemia, hypoalphaliproteinemia, hyperbetalipoproteinemia	PM_1, $PM_{2.5}$: air monitoring station, satellite remote sensing. PM_{10}, SO_2, NO_2, O_3: 11 air monitoring stations	Peripheral venous blood samples using a Hitachi Autoanalyzer	Two-stage binary logistic regression models	Age, sex, nationality, household annual income, highest education attainment, current smoking, alcohol drinking, regular exercise, controlled diet with low calories and low fat, sugar consumption, family history, height, weight, BMI
Lee et al.	$PM_{2.5}$	Metabolic syndrome: waist-based obesity, hypertension,	Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ)	Health examination and clinical data:	The Andersen and Gill (AG) model	Fixed covariates: sex, occupation. Time-varying covariates: age, BMI, income level, smoking, drinking habit, walking status, statins usages, antiplatelet

		hypertriglyceridemia, low HDL-C, diabetes		venous blood Fasting samples		therapy, temperature, humidity
Rachel et al.	$PM_{2.5}$	Metabolic syndrome: waist-based obesity, hypertension, hypertriglyceridemia, low HDL-C, diabetes	Validated spatiotemporal hybrid model	Fasting blood glucose, lipid levels, systolic blood pressure	Cox proportional hazards modeling	Time-dependent variables: age, dark fish consumption, alcohol consumption, smoking status, physical activity, education levels, lipid-lowering, antihypertensive, diabetes medications, temperature
Wang et al.	PM_{10}, NO_2, SO_2	TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C	Local environmental monitoring center	Biochemical examinations	Multiple linear regression analyses	Age, sex, BMI, smoking status, drinking status, education level, work type, marital status, hypertension, seasonality
Wu et al.	$PM_{2.5}$, CO, NO_2, SO_2, O_3	HDL-C, LDL-C, TC, TG, Lp(a), lipoprotein A1(LpA1), ApoA1, ApoB	U.S. EPA's Air Data website	Blood samples	Linear mixed -effects regression models	Race/ethnicity, educational attainment, smoking status, alcohol use, physical activity, hormone uses, surgeries, chronic health conditions, BMI, sex
Maayan et al.	PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$	LDL-C, HDL-C, triglycerides, HbA1c	Hybrid satellite-based modeling	Blood tests	Mixed models with random intercept	Age, gender, socioeconomic status, BMI, smoking status, diabetes status, antidiabetic medications, temperature, humidity
Hou et al.	$PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, PM_1, NO_2	Metabolic syndrome: waist-based obesity, hypertension, hypertriglyceridemia, low HDL-C, diabetes	China Atmosphere Watch Network, China National Environmental Monitoring Center	Fasting blood glucose, lipid levels, systolic blood pressure	Generalized linear models	Age, gender, education level, marital status, average monthly income, smoking, drinking status, high-fat diet, fruit and vegetables intake, family history of T2DM and hypertension
Shanley et al.	PM_{10}	TG, TC, LDL-C, HDL-C	U.S. EPA air quality system monitoring network	Blood samples	Generalized linear regression	Sex, race, smoking status, BMI, socioeconomic status, educational attainment, marital status, alcohol consumption, smoking status
Cai et al.	NO_2, PM_{10}	TC, TG, HDL-C	European harmonized Land Use Regression	Blood samples	Multivariate linear regression	Age, sex, educational attainment, season of blood draw, employment, alcohol consumption, drinking status, noise, pack-year
Mette et al.	$PM_{2.5}$, NO_2	TC	The Danish AirGIS dispersion modeling system	Blood samples	Generalized linear regression	Age, sex, school attendances, BMI, smoking status and intensity, intake of alcohol, saturated fat, fruit and vegetables, traffic noise, physical activity, waist

circumferences

Abbreviation: TC indicates total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; HTG, hypertriglyceridemia; LDL-C, low density liporotein; HDL-C, high density lipoprotein; MetS, metabolic syndrome.

Table 3 Data extractions from included 10 studies

Author	Pollutant/ incremnet (μg/m^3)	% change in outcome (95% CI) per pollutant increment and morbidity in MetS					
		TC	TG	HTG	LDL-C	HDL-C	MetS
Yang et al.	$PM_{2.5}$/10	1.1(0.8, 1.4) *	1.1(0.4, 1.8) *	1.07(0.95, 1.19)	2.9(2.4, 3.5) *	-1.1(-1.4, -0.8) *	/
	PM_{10}/ 10	-0.2(-0.5, 0.1)	4.7(3.6, 5.9) *	1.14(1.01, 1.29*	-0.9(-1.3, -0.4) *	-0.2(-0.7, 0.2)	/
	NO_2/ 7.4	0.7(0.0, 1.4) *	6.0(3.5, 8.6) *	1.21(0.76, 1.90)	-0.1(-0.7, 0.5)	-1.6(-2.3, -1.0) *	/
Lee et al.	$PM_{2.5}$/10	/	/	1.47(1.42, 1.51)	/	-1.63(-1.69, -1.56) *	1.07(1.03, 1.11) *
Rachel et al.	$PM_{2.5}$/1	/	/	1.14(1.00, 1.32) *	/	-0.98(-1.13, -0.85)	1.27(1.06, 1.52) *
Wang et al.	PM_{10}/10	0.45(0.08, 0.82) *	-0.01(-1.01, 1.00)	/	0.83(0.21, 1.45) *	0.29(0.10, 0.49) *	/
	NO_2/10	1.16(-1.06, 3.43)	5.58(-0.62, 12.16)	/	39.01(31.43, 47.03) *	-3.55(-6.40, -0.61) *	/
Wu et al.	$PM_{2.5}$/3	0.5(-0.1, 1.1)	/	/	1.1(-0.2, 2.3)	-0.7(-1.4, -0.1) *	/
Maayan et al.	$PM_{2.5}$/7 (normal)	/	/	0.28(-0.03, 0.59)	1.28(1.03, 1.52) *	-1.29(-1.43, -1.15) *	/
	$PM_{2.5}$/7 (diabetes)	/	/	0.41(0.09, 0.74) *	1.54(1.26, 1.83) *	-1.31(-1.47, -1.16) *	/
	PM_{10}/20 (normal)	/	/	0.16(-0.12, 0.45)	2.28(2.05, 2.50) *	-1.13(-1.26, -0.99) *	/
	PM_{10}/20 (diabetes)	/	/	0.31(0.02, 0.61)	2.37(2.11, 2.63) *	-1.13(-1.27, -0.99) *	/
Hou et al.	$PM_{2.5}$/5	/	/	/	/	/	1.42(1.36, 1.49) *
	PM_{10}/5	/	/	/	/	/	1.23(1.20, 1.25) *
	NO_2/5	/	/	/	/	/	1.41(1.36, 1.45) *
Shanley et al.	PM_{10}/11.1	1.43(1.21, 1.66) *	2.42(1.09, 3.76) *	/	1.18(0.81, 1.56) *	0.18(-0.32, 0.68) *	/
Cai et al.	PM_{10}/2	/	1.9(1.4, 2.4) *	/	/	0.04(-0.2, 0.3)	/
	NO_2/7.4	/	2.1(1.6, 2.7) *	/	/	0.4(0.1, 0.7) *	/

Mette et al.	$PM_{2.5}$/1	0.70(0.12, 1.28) *	/	/	/	/	/
	NO_2/6.7	0.72(0.11, 1.34) *	/	/	/	/	/

Abbreviation: TC indicates total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; HTG, hypertriglyceridemia; LDL-C, low density liporotein; HDL-C, high density lipoprotein; MetS, metabolic syndrome.

* means statiscally significant association ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4 Data grouped by pollutants and data conversion

Pollutant/Outcome	Author	% change in outcome (95%CI) per Pollutant increment	% change in outcome (95%CI) per 10μg/m^3 Pollutant increment
$PM_{2.5}$/TC	Yang et al.	1.1(0.8, 1.4) / 10μg/m^3	1.1(0.8, 1.4)
	Mette et al.	0.70(0.12, 1.28) / 1μg/m^3	7.0(1.2, 12.8)
$PM_{2.5}$/HDL-C	Yang et al.	-1.1(-1.4, -0.8) / 10μg/m^3	-1.1(-1.4, -0.8)
	Wu et al.	-0.7(-1.4, -0.1) / 3μg/m^3	-2.33(-4.67, -0.33)
	Maayan et al.	-1.29(-1.43, -1.15) / 7μg/m^3	-1.84(-2.04, -1.64)
	Lee et al.	-1.63(-1.69, -1.56) / 10μg/m^3	-1.63(-1.69, -1.56)
$PM_{2.5}$/LDL-C	Yang et al.	2.9(2.4, 3.5) / 10μg/m^3	2.9(2.4, 3.5)
	Maayan et al.	1.28(1.03, 1.52) /7 μg/m^3	1.83(1.47, 2.17)
$PM_{2.5}$/MetS	Lee et al.	1.07(1.03, 1.11) /10μg/m^3	1.07(1.03, 1.11)
	Hou et al.	1.42(1.36, 1.49) /5μg/m^3	2.85(2.72, 2.98)
	Rachel et al.	1.27(1.06, 1.52) / 1μg/m^3	12.7(10.6, 15.2)
PM_{10}/TG	Yang et al.	4.7(3.6, 5.9) / 10μg/m^3	4.7(3.6, 5.9)
	Shanley et al.	2.42(1.09, 3.76) / 11.1μg/m^3	2.18(0.98, 3.39)
	Cai et al.	1.9(1.4, 2.4) / 2μg/m^3	9.5(7.0, 12.0)
PM_{10}/LDL-C	Yang et al.	-0.9(-1.3, -0.4) / 10μg/m^3	-0.9(-1.3, -0.4)
	Maayan et al.	2.28(2.05, 2.50) / 20 μg/m^3	1.14(1.01, 1.25)
	Shanley et al.	1.18(0.81, 1.56) / 11.1μg/m^3	1.06(0.73, 1.41)
PM_{10}/HDL-C	Maayan et al.	-1.13(-1.26, -0.99) / 20μg/m^3	-0.57(-0.63, -0.49)

	Shanley et al.	0.18(-0.32, 0.68) / 11.1μg/m^3	0.16(-0.29, 0.61)
NO_2/TC	Yang et al.	0.7(0.0, 1.4) / 7.4 μg/m^3	0.95(0.00, 1.89)
	Mette et al.	0.72(0.11, 1.34) / 6.7μg/m^3	1.07(0.16, 2.00)
NO_2/TG	Yang et al.	6.0(3.5, 8.6) / 10μg/m^3	6.0(3.5, 8.6)
	Cai et al.	2.1(1.6, 2.7) / 7.4μg/m^3	2.84(2.16, 3.65)
NO_2/HDL-C	Yang et al.	-1.6(-2.3, -1.0) / 10μg/m^3	-1.6(-2.3, -1.0)
	Cai et al.	0.4(0.1, 0.7) / 7.4μg/m^3	0.54(0.14, 0.95)
PM_{10}/HDL-C (diabetic population)	Wang et al.	-0.29(-0.10, -0.49) / 10μg/m^3	-0.29(-0.10, -0.49)
	Maayan et al.	-1.13(-1.27, -0.99) / 20μg/m^3	-0.57(-0.64, -0.49)
PM_{10}/LDL-C (diabetic population)	Wang et al.	0.83(0.21, 1.45) / 10μg/m^3	0.83(0.21, 1.45)
	Maayan et al.	2.37(2.11, 2.63) / 20μg/m^3	1.19(1.06, 1.32)


Records identified through database searching（n=2274）
Records after duplicates removed (n=1714)
Duplicate records (n=560)
Records title/abstract screened (n=1154)
Records not addressing the research question and excluded based on title/ abstract screening (n=661)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n=493)
Full-text articles excluded (n=483)
1. Animal experiment (n=242)
2. Other exposures/outcomes (n=122)
3. Indoor pollution (n=107)
4. Methodological articles (n=12)
Articles included in meta-analysis (n=10)

Figure 1


Study ID
% change (95% CI)
% Weight
PM2.5/TC
Yang et al. 2018
1.10 (0.80, 1.40)
62.54
Mette et al. 2015
7.00 (1.20, 12.80)
37.46
Subtotal (I-squared = 74.8%, p = 0.046)
3.31 (-2.29, 8.91)
100.00
.
PM2.5/HDL-C
Yang et al. 2018
-1.10 (-1.40, -0.80)
27.30
Wu et al. 2018
-2.33 (-4.67, -0.33)
1.66
Maayan et al. 2016
-1.84 (-2.04, -1.64)
32.77
Lee et al. 2019
-1.63 (-1.69, -1.56)
38.26
Subtotal (I-squared = 82.0%, p = 0.001)
-1.57 (-1.85, -1.28)
100.00
.
PM2.5/LDL-C
Yang et al. 2018
2.90 (2.40, 3.50)
47.95
Maayan et al. 2016
1.83 (1.47, 2.17)
52.05
Subtotal (I-squared = 90.3%, p = 0.001)
2.34 (1.30, 3.39)
100.00
.
PM2.5/MetS
Lee et al. 2019
1.07 (1.03, 1.11)
38.99
Hou et al. 2020
2.85 (2.72, 2.98)
38.90
Rachel et al. 2016
12.70 (10.60, 15.20)
22.11
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.7%, p = 0.000)
4.33 (2.69, 5.98)
100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis
-5
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16

Figure 2


Study ID
% change (95% CI)
% Weight
PM10/TG
Yang et al. 2018
4.70 (3.60, 5.90)
35.05
Shanley et al. 2016
2.18 (0.95, 3.39)
34.86
Cai et al. 2017
9.50 (7.00, 12.00)
30.09
Subtotal (I-squared = 93.0%, p = 0.000)
5.27 (2.03, 8.50)
100.00
PM10/LDL-C
Yang et al. 2018
-0.90 (-1.30, -0.40)
32.37
Maayan et al. 2016
1.14 (1.01, 1.25)
34.37
Shanley et al. 2016
1.06 (0.73, 1.41)
33.26
Subtotal (I-squared = 97.3%, p = 0.000)
0.45 (-0.57, 1.47)
100.00
PM10/HDL-C
Maayan et al. 2016
-0.57 (-0.63, -0.49)
54.83
Shanley et al. 2016
0.16 (-0.29, 0.61)
45.17
Subtotal (I-squared = 89.9%, p = 0.002)
-0.24 (-0.95, 0.47)
100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis
-2
0
2
4
6
8
10
12

Figure 3


Study ID
% change (95% CI)
% Weight
NO2/TC
Yang et al. 2018
0.95 (0.00, 1.89)
48.66
Mette et al. 2015
1.07 (0.16, 2.00)
51.34
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.858)
1.01 (0.35, 1.67)
100.00
.
NO2/TG
Yang et al. 2018
6.00 (3.50, 8.60)
42.25
Cai et al. 2017
2.84 (2.16, 3.65)
57.75
Subtotal (I-squared = 81.6%, p = 0.020)
4.18 (1.12, 7.23)
100.00
.
NO2/HDL-C
Yang et al. 2018
-1.60 (-2.30, -1.00)
49.27
Cai et al. 2017
0.54 (0.14, 0.95)
50.73
Subtotal (I-squared = 96.7%, p = 0.000)
-0.51 (-2.61, 1.58)
100.00
.
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis
-4
-2
0
2
4
6
8
10

Figure 4


Study ID
% change (95% CI)
% Weight
PM10/HDL-C*
Wang et al. 2018
-0.29 (-0.49, -0.10)
44.62
Maayan et al. 2016
-0.57 (-0.64, -0.49)
55.38
Subtotal (I-squared = 85.5%, p = 0.009)
-0.45 (-0.72, -0.17)
100.00
PM10/LDL-C*
Wang et al. 2018
0.83 (0.21, 1.45)
13.09
Maayan et al. 2016
1.19 (1.06, 1.32)
86.91
Subtotal (I-squared = 19.4%, p = 0.265)
1.14 (0.90, 1.38)
100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis
-1
-.5
0
.5
1
1.5
2

Figure 5


Pubmed
EMBASE
the Cochrane Library
CNKI
Wanfang
Vip
SinoMed
Search seven online databases
Identification records (n=2274)
Screening records (n=1154)
Eligibility articles (n=493)
Included studies (n=10)
% change in outcome (95% CI) per 10 μg/m3 pollutant increment
Pollutants
PM2.5
PM10
NO2
TC
3.31 (2.29, 8.91)
/
/
TG
/
5.27 (2.03, 8.50)
4.18 (1.12, 7.23)
LDL-C
2.34 (1.30, 3.39)
0.45 (-0.57, 1.47)
/
HDL-C
-1.57 (-1.85, -1.28)
-0.24 (-0.95, -0.47)
-0.51 (-2.61, 1.58)
MetS
4.33 (2.69, 5.98)
/
/