RESEARCH ARTICLE



Long-term exposure to ambient air pollutants and increased risk of end-stage renal disease in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and chronic kidney disease: a retrospective cohort study in Beijing, China

Zhi Shang^{1,2,3,4} · Yue-Ming Gao⁵ · Zhen-Ling Deng⁵ · Yue Wang⁵

Received: 18 July 2023 / Accepted: 30 November 2023 / Published online: 20 December 2023 © The Author(s) 2023

Abstract

Limited data have examined the association between air pollution and the risk of end-stage renal disease (ESRD) in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) and chronic kidney disease (CKD). We aimed to investigate whether long-term exposure to air pollutants is related to the development of ESRD among patients with T2DM and CKD. A total of 1,738 patients with T2DM and CKD hospitalized in Peking University Third Hospital from January 1, 2013, to December 31, 2021 were enrolled in this study. The outcome was defined as the occurrence of ESRD. Data on six air pollutants ($PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , CO, NO₂, SO₂ and O₃) from 35 monitoring stations were obtained from the Beijing Municipal Ecological and Environmental Monitoring Center. Long-term exposure to air pollutants during the follow-up period was measured using the ordinary Kriging method. During a mean follow-up of 41 months, 98 patients developed ESRD. Multivariate logistic regression analysis showed that an increase of 10 μ g/m³ in PM_{2.5} (odds ratio [OR] 1.19, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.03–1.36) and PM₁₀ (OR 1.15, 95% CI 1.02–1.30) concentration were positively associated with ESRD. An increase of 1 mg/m³ in CO (2.80, 1.05-7.48) and an increase of 1 µg/m³ in SO₂ (1.06, 1.00-1.13) concentration were also positively associated with ESRD. Apart from O_3 and NO_2 , all the above air pollutants have additional predictive value for ESRD in patients with T2DM and CKD. The results of Bayesian kernel machine regression and the weighted quantile sum regression all showed that PM_{25} was the most important air pollutant. Backward stepwise logistic regression showed that PM_{2.5} was the only pollutant remaining in the prediction model. In patients with T2DM and CKD, long-term exposure to ambient PM2.5, PM10, CO, and SO2 was positively associated with the development of ESRD.

Keywords Type 2 diabetes mellitus \cdot Chronic kidney disease \cdot End-stage renal disease \cdot Air pollution \cdot Long-term exposure \cdot Cohort

Abbreviations

ESRD	End-stage renal disease
T2DM	Type 2 diabetes mellitus

Responsible Editor: Lotfi Aleya

Zhi Shang and Yue-Ming Gao are contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.

Yue Wang bjwangyue@sina.com

- ¹ Department of Cardiology and Institute of Vascular Medicine, Peking University Third Hospital, Beijing 100191, China
- ² State Key Laboratory of Vascular Homeostasis and Remodeling, Peking University, Beijing, China

- ³ NHC Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Molecular Biology and Regulatory Peptides, Peking University, Beijing, China
- ⁴ Beijing Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Receptors Research, Beijing 100191, China
- ⁵ Department of Nephrology, Peking University Third Hospital, 49 Huayuan North Road, Haidian District, Beijing 100191, China

PM	Particulate matter
PM _{2.5}	Particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter
	less than 2.5 µm
PM_{10}	Particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter
	less than 10 μm
NO_2	Nitrogen dioxide
CO	Carbon monoxide
SO_2	Sulfur dioxide
T1DM	Type 1 diabetes mellitus
GDM	Gestational diabetes mellitus
eGFR	Estimated glomerular filtration rate
BMI	Body mass index
RAAS	Renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system
CAD	Coronary artery disease
HF	Heart failure
HGB	Hemoglobin
ALB	Albumin
FBG	Fasting blood glucose
HbA1c	Glycated hemoglobin
TC	Total cholesterol
TG	Triglyceride
HDL-C	High-density lipoprotein cholesterol
LDL-C	Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol
Scr	Serum creatinine
BUN	Blood urea nitrogen
MAP	Mean arterial pressure
SBP	Systolic blood pressure
DBP	Diastolic blood pressure
IQR	Interquartile range
RCS	Restricted cubic spline
ROC	Receiver operating characteristic
AUC	Area under the curve
NDKD	Nondiabetic kidney disease
BKMR	Bayesian kernel machine regression
WQS	Weighted quantile sum
PIP	Posterior inclusion probability

Introduction

Diabetes mellitus (DM) has become a global health problem with many adverse outcomes (Zimmet et al. 2016). Globally, the estimated prevalence of DM in 2021 was 10.5% (536.6 million people), rising to 12.2% (783.2 million) in 2045 (Sun et al. 2022). China has become the country with the largest number of DM patients, of which more than 90% are type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) (Wang et al. 2021). The increasing prevalence of DM aggravates the burden of chronic kidney diseases (CKD) and end-stage renal disease (ESRD) (GBD Chronic Kidney Disease Collaboration 2020). In developed countries, T2DM has become the leading cause of ESRD (Saran et al. 2020). In China, DM has become the second cause of ESRD after glomerulonephritis (Liu 2013).

ESRD is characterized by an irreversible decline in renal function and ultimately requires renal replacement therapy (RRT), including maintenance hemodialysis (HD), peritoneal dialysis (PD), and kidney transplantation, to maintain life. A population-based retrospective study involving over 25 million inhabitants showed that the incidence rate of chronic RRT among people with DM was almost six times higher than among people without DM (Claessen et al. 2021). T2DM-related ESRD not only leads to a reduction in life expectancy (Sattar et al. 2012) and quality of life (Chen et al. 2017) but also brings a heavy economic burden to patients and society (Chen et al. 2020).

Ambient air pollutants are a complex mixture of suspended particulate matters (PMs) and gases, such as PM with an aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 μ m (PM_{2.5}) and less than 10 μ m (PM₁₀), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO_2) , and ozone (O_3) (Shubham et al. 2022). Air pollution has been reported to be associated with chronic respiratory diseases (Annesi-Maesano et al. 2021), cardiovascular diseases (de Bont et al. 2022), stroke (Verhoeven et al. 2021), and cancers (Collatuzzo and Boffetta 2023), which is also a major contributor to global mortality (Cohen et al. 2017). In recent years, a growing body of evidence has shown that increased exposure to ambient air pollutants corresponds to an increased risk of CKD (Bowe et al. 2017, 2018; Lin et al. 2018, 2020a; Blum et al. 2020; Yang et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2020), renal function decline (Bowe et al. 2017, 2018; Wang et al. 2020; Chang et al. 2022), and ESRD (Bowe et al. 2017, 2018; Lin et al. 2020a, b). Air pollutants may cause kidney damage through various mechanisms, such as increasing blood pressure, aggravating oxidative stress and inflammatory responses, causing DNA damage, and inducing abnormal metabolic changes (Shubham et al. 2022).

Most of the evidence has been focused on $PM_{2.5}$ (Bowe et al. 2018; Lin et al. 2018, 2020a, b; Blum et al. 2020) or PM_{10} (Bowe et al. 2017; Yang et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2020), and only a few studies investigate the effect of gaseous pollutants or multi-pollutants exposure on renal function (Bowe et al. 2017; Lin et al. 2018, 2020a; Chang et al. 2022). Furthermore, data regarding the association between multiple air pollutants and the risk of ESRD in patients with T2DM and CKD are lacking. Therefore, the current study aimed to investigate the association between long-term exposure to six types of air pollutants ($PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , CO, NO₂, SO₂, and O₃) and the risk of ESRD in Chinese patients with T2DM and CKD.

Materials and methods

Study population

the study population

We enrolled 15,067 patients diagnosed with diabetes who were hospitalized at Peking University Third Hospital between January 2013 and December 2021 in Beijing, China. After excluding patients with age < 18 or > 80 years, without CKD at baseline, with a follow-up period of fewer than six months, with a diagnosis of type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) or gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), with an estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) $< 30 \text{ mL/min}/1.73 \text{ m}^2$, with a previous medical history of kidney transplantation, and with a permanent residence outside Beijing, a total of 1,738 patients with T2DM and CKD were finally included in this study. CKD was defined as a persistent decline in renal function (eGFR $< 60 \text{ mL/min}/1.73 \text{ m}^2$) and/or the existence of albuminuria (urine protein $\geq 1 + in$ at least two out of three consecutive measurements within half a year) at baseline. 5431

The process for research population enrollment is described in Fig. 1.

Health data and definitions

Clinical data were obtained from Peking University Third Hospital's electronic medical records system. Patients' information, such as basic clinical characteristics, medication history, main complications or comorbidities, important laboratory indicators, and a coordinated residential address, were included in this study. Basic clinical characteristics included age, age of DM onset, DM duration, sex, body mass index (BMI), blood pressure, and smoking status. Medication history included the usage of insulin, renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system (RAAS) inhibitors, or lipid-lowering drugs for treatment. Main complications or comorbidities included a medical history of hypertension, coronary artery disease (CAD), stroke, hyperlipidemia, heart failure (HF), or anemia. Laboratory indicators included hemoglobin (HGB),



serum albumin (ALB), fasting blood glucose (FBG), glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c), total cholesterol (TC), triglyceride (TG), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), serum creatinine (Scr), blood urea nitrogen (BUN), serum uric acid, eGFR, and urinary protein grade (0–4+) at baseline.

The BMI was calculated by dividing body weight in kilograms by height in meters squared and categorized into normal weight (18.5–24 kg/m²), overweight (24–28 kg/m²), and obesity ($\geq 28 \text{ kg/m}^2$) (Zhou 2002). Nonsmokers, current, and former smokers were categorized based on self-reported smoking status. Nonsmokers were people who had never smoked before in their lives. Current smokers were individuals who had smoked on a regular basis in the preceding six months. Former smokers were classified as those who had quit smoking for at least six months (Barry et al. 2012). Hyperlipidemia was confirmed as the usage of lipid-lowering drugs currently, the existence of any self-reported history, or meeting the requirements of any of the following circumstances: serum LDL-C \geq 4.14 mmol/L or TG \geq 2.26 mmol/L or HDL-C < 1.04 mmol/L or TC \geq 6.22 mmol/L (Liu et al. 2018). Anemia was defined by the World Health Organization criteria as HGB levels below 120 g/L in women and 130 g/L in males (Kurella Tamura et al. 2016). Mean arterial pressure (MAP) was estimated by adding 1/3 of pulse pressure (systolic blood pressure [SBP]-diastolic blood pressure [DBP]) to DBP. eGFR was calculated using the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration equation (Levey et al. 2009).

Covariates

In order to increase the credibility of the research results, we adopted the sensitivity analysis method in the multivariate logistic regression analysis. Potential covariates were determined based on clinical experience and the current literature on predictors for renal function progression in patients with T2DM and CKD (Radcliffe et al. 2017). These covariates included sex, age of DM onset, duration of DM, hyperlipidemia, the treatment of lipid-lowering drugs, smoking status, insulin treatment, HF, baseline eGFR, MAP, BMI, anemia, urinary protein, and serum ALB. Each covariate was determined at the time of the first hospitalization of each patient.

Outcome measurements

The outcome was defined as the development of ESRD, including an eGFR of less than 15 mL/min/1.73 m² or the commencement of maintenance HD, PD, or kidney transplantation. The start of observation was defined as the first hospitalization for each patient, and the endpoint was the occurrence of ESRD or the last hospitalization or clinic visit for each patient.

Exposure assessment

The hourly measured ground concentrations of six types of air pollutants from 35 monitoring stations in Beijing since 2013 were obtained from the Beijing Municipal Ecological and Environmental Monitoring Center (http://www.bjmemc. com.cn/), including O_3 in μ g/m³, PM_{2.5} in μ g/m³, PM₁₀ in $\mu g/m^3$, NO₂ in $\mu g/m^3$, SO₂ in $\mu g/m^3$, and CO in mg/m³. The concentration of different air pollutants was converted into the daily maximum 8-h average for O3 and the 24-h average for PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, NO₂, SO₂, and CO. The locations of the air quality monitoring stations and the participant's address (residential address) were geocoded by latitude and longitude. The ordinary Kriging method was applied to interpolate exposure concentrations onto a regular grid (400 m×400 m) across Beijing. After transforming each participant's address (residential address) into longitude and latitude data, using Baidu Map Open Platform (https:// lbs.baidu.com), the long-term exposure of each patient was obtained. Given that the baseline exposure may not completely and accurately represent the exposure of air pollutants over the long-term follow-up, we calculated the annual mean exposure concentrations of these air pollutants between the participant's enrollment and the last follow-up as the long-term exposure of air pollutants.

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables conformed to the normal distribution were expressed as the mean \pm standard deviation, and a *t*-test was used for comparison between the two groups, whereas continuous variables not conformed to normal distribution were presented as median (interquartile range [IQR]) and were compared using Wilcoxon test. Categorical variables were shown as percentages with the chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test for comparison between two groups.

The Bayesian kernel machine regression (BKMR) method and the weighted quantile sum (WQS) regression were used to estimate the overall environmental pollutants (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, SO₂, NO₂, CO, and O₃) on the risk of ESRD. Posterior inclusion probability (PIP) and weight were used to evaluate the importance of air pollutants. Restricted cubic spline (RCS) curves based on logistic regression were used to clarify the relationship between different air pollutants and the risk of ESRD. Univariable logistic regression analysis was performed to investigate the unadjusted association between different air pollutants and ESRD risk. Then, four multivariate logistic regression models were established as follows: model 1, adjusted for sex, age of DM onset, duration of diabetes; model 2, adjusted for variables in model 1 plus hyperlipidemia, the usage of lipid-lowering drugs, smoking status, insulin treatment, and HF; model 3, adjusted for variables in model 2 plus baseline eGFR,

MAP, and BMI; model 4, adjusted for variables in model 3 plus anemia, urinary protein, and serum ALB at baseline. We further conducted subgroup analysis stratified by age (<60 or \geq 60 years), sex (female or male), age of DM onset (<58 or \geq 58 years), BMI (<24 or \geq 24 kg/m²), anemia (yes or no), hyperlipidemia (yes or no), HF (yes or no), the usage of RAAS inhibitors (yes or no), baseline eGFR (<45 or \geq 45 mL/min/1.73 m²), HbA1c (<7 or \geq 7%), and followup time (<60 or \geq 60 months), because these factors have been previously reported to modify the effects of air pollution (Chan et al. 2018; Chang et al. 2022) or to be associated with CKD progression in T2DM patients (Radcliffe et al. 2017; Braunwald 2019).

The correlation coefficient was used to evaluate the correlation between different air pollutants (r > 0.5 was considered to be statistically significant). A backward-stepwise method was used to select the optimal model. The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve and the area under the curve (AUC) were used to evaluate the predictive efficacy of different air pollutants to predict the risk of ESRD, and the Delong test was used to evaluate whether the difference between the two ROC curves was statistically significant. A 12000 bootstrap cohort based on the study population was used for internal validation. All analyses were performed using R (version 4.0.3).

Results

The primary clinical characteristics of the research population

All of the 1,738 patients with T2DM and CKD included in this study were permanent residents of Beijing. The location distributions of these patients and the air quality monitoring stations are depicted in Fig. 2.

The median age of the study population is 67 (59, 74) years. 1,254 (72.15%) of the patients were male and 98 (5.64%) of the patients had outcome events. Notably, compared with patients without outcomes, patients who developed ESRD had an earlier age of DM onset, a larger proportion of female patients, a longer duration of DM, a higher level of blood pressure, a higher prevalence of anemia, lower levels of serum ALB and eGFR, and higher levels of HbA1c, blood lipids, Scr, BUN, and urinary protein. The exposure differences of the five air pollutants between patients with and without outcomes were significant. Individuals who developed ESRD had higher average exposure concentrations of PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, NO₂, and SO₂ during follow-up than those without outcomes. There was no significant difference of O₃ concentration between patients with or without outcomes. Table 1 describes the primary clinical characteristics of the research population.

Association between different air pollutants and the risk of ESRD

The results of the BKMR method showed that the estimated risk of ESRD increased with a simultaneous increase of the six air pollutants, from 25th percentile to 75th percentile after adjusting for sex, age of DM onset, duration of diabetes, hyperlipidemia, using of lipid-lowering drugs, smoking status, insulin treatment, HF, baseline eGFR, MAP, BMI, anemia, urinary protein, and serum ALB, indicating a positive joint effect of pollutant mixtures (Fig. 3A). The WQS regression also showed that the WQS index of overall air pollutants was positively associated with ESRD risk (odds ratio [OR] = 1.46, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.11–1.93). The RCS curve showed a linear relationship between the WQS index and the risk of ESRD (Fig. 3B).

Fig. S1 demonstrated the univariate concentration–response functions and 95% CIs for each pollutant with the other pollutants fixed at the median values. We observed a significantly increasing concentration–response relationship for $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , SO_2 , and CO. A significantly decreasing concentration–response relationship was observed for NO_2 , while O_3 has no significantly relationship with the risk of ESRD. The interactive analysis of BKMR method showed that other environmental pollutants (PM_{10} , SO_2 , CO, and O_3) have different influence towards ESRD when $PM_{2.5}$ and NO_2 were at different level, indicating there was a interactive effect (Fig. S2).

In the dose–response analysis, we used the RCS curves to describe the relationship between six types of air pollutants and ESRD risk. After fully adjusting for covariates, including sex, age of DM onset, duration of diabetes, hyperlipidemia, using of lipid-lowering drugs, smoking, insulin treatment, HF, baseline eGFR, MAP, BMI, anemia, urinary protein, and serum ALB, a positive relationship was found between five types of air pollutants (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, NO₂, and SO₂) and the risk of ESRD, while O₃ showed no significant association (Fig. 4).

In the univariate logistic regression analysis, the most substantial crude effect was found in the association between an increase of 1 mg/m³ in CO during follow-up and the risk of developing ESRD (OR = 3.14, 95% CI 1.03–1.36, P = 0.013), followed by an increase of 10 µg/m³ in PM_{2.5} (OR = 1.20, 95% CI 1.06–1.36, P = 0.004). Other air pollutants (PM₁₀ and SO₂) were also found to have a significantly positive association with ESRD risk, except for O₃ and NO₂. Furthermore, four multivariate adjustment models were established in this study. After fully adjusting for potential confounders, the positive association between PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, and SO₂ and the risk of ESRD remained robust. Details of the univariate and multivariate logistic regression results are presented in Table 2. **Fig. 2** Location distribution of the study population and air quality monitoring stations in Beijing. The solid blue dot represents the location of the patient's residence, and the solid red triangle represents the location of the air quality monitoring station

Air quality minitoring station

Residence of patients



To clarify which environmental pollutant has the most significant impact on ESRD risk, we calculated the posterior inclusion probability (PIP) using BKMR method and weights using WQS regression. In the BKMR model, $PM_{2.5}$ has the highest PIP value (0.688). In the WQS regression, $PM_{2.5}$ also has the highest weight (0.428), indicating that $PM_{2.5}$ has a stronger correlation with ESRD risk among the six types of air pollutants (Fig. S3).

Subgroup analysis

Figure 5 presented the associations between $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , CO, and SO₂ exposure and the risk of ESRD based on age, sex, age of DM onset, anemia, hyperlipidemia, HF, the usage of RAAS inhibitors, baseline eGFR, BMI, HbA1c, and follow-up time. A 10 µg/m³ increment in $PM_{2.5}$ during the follow-up period was associated with higher increased odds of developing ESRD in patients with a lower baseline eGFR (OR 1.32 vs. 1.12, *P* for

interaction < 0.001), a higher BMI (OR 1.27 vs. 1.03, *P* for interaction < 0.001), the usage of RAAS inhibitors (OR 1.23 vs. 1.10, *P* for interaction = 0.038), and a longer follow-up period (OR 1.66 vs. 1.16, *P* for interaction < 0.001), similar results were also found in CO and SO₂. Apart from baseline eGFR, usage of RAAS inhibitors, and follow-up time, a 10 μ g/m³ increment in PM₁₀ during the follow-up period was also found to be associated with a higher increased odds of incident ESRD in patients with an age ≥ 60 years (OR 1.42 vs. 1.15, *P* for interaction = 0.017) and HbA1c < 7% (OR 1.29 vs. 1.11, *P* for interaction = 0.039).

As shown in Fig. 5, It is noteworthy that whether the follow-up time was shorter (< 60 months) or longer (\geq 60 months), exposure to PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, and SO₂ were all positively associated with an increased risk of ESRD. Further analysis found that, regardless of the duration of follow-up, long-term exposure to PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, SO₂, and CO could increase the risk of ESRD (Fig. 6B-E), and

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of the study population

Basic clinical characteristics v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v <th< th=""><th>Characteristics</th><th>Overall $(n = 1,738)$</th><th>Patients with outcomes (n=98)</th><th>Patients without out- comes $(n = 1,640)$</th><th>P-value</th></th<>	Characteristics	Overall $(n = 1,738)$	Patients with outcomes (n=98)	Patients without out- comes $(n = 1,640)$	P-value
Age (pars)67 (9, 74)62 (55, 72)67 (00, 74)<0001Age of DM onset (years)66 (59, 73)61 (53, 71)66 (59, 73)<0001	Basic clinical characteristics				
Age of DM onset (years) 66 (59, 73) 61 (33, 71) 66 (59, 73) 0.001 Age of DM onset category (n, %) 28 (2.6.0%) 284 (15.5%) 56 > S8 years 1.456 (33.3%) 70 (71.4%) 1.386 (84.5%) 0.001 Duration of diabetes category (n, %) 1.157 (66.6%) 44 (44.9%) 1.113 (67.9%) 0.001 Set (malk, %) 1.517 (66.6%) 44 (44.9%) 1.113 (67.9%) 0.001 Duration of diabetes category (n, %) 25.5 (23.6, 27.6) 25.3 (22.9, 27.9) 25.5 (23.7, 27.6) 0.596 Ext category (n, %) 24.728 573 (42.3%) 41 (41.8%) 816 (49.8%) 24.238 24.728 573 (23.5%) 34 (24.7%) 450 (23.4%) 0.000 DBP (marlig) 76 (0.3.9%) 41 (41.8%) 816 (49.8%) 24.23 24.728 573 (23.5%) 41 (0.18,%) 350 (12.6%) 500 (0.000 MAP (marlig) 97 (0.0.101 171 (18.5%) 1201 (0.2.3%) 0.000 MAP (marlig) 97 (0.0.400 170 (18.4%) 12021 (0.2.3%) 0.000 MAP (marlig) <td>Age (years)</td> <td>67 (59, 74)</td> <td>62 (55, 72)</td> <td>67 (60, 74)</td> <td>< 0.001</td>	Age (years)	67 (59, 74)	62 (55, 72)	67 (60, 74)	< 0.001
Age of M onset category (n, %)0011< 58 years	Age of DM onset (years)	66 (59, 73)	61 (53, 71)	66 (59, 73)	< 0.001
\$\[28] years 282 (16.2%) 282 (86.9) 254 (81.5%) \$\[25] years 1.456 (83.8%) 70 (71.4%) 1.386 (84.5%) \$\[25] sears 1.456 (83.8%) 70 (71.4%) 1.198 (73.%) 0.001 Daration of diabetes category (n. %) 54 (55.1%) 527 (32.1%) 0.001 212 months 581 (33.4%) 54 (55.1%) 527 (32.1%) 0.596 BMI category (n. %) - - 232 23.3 (2.9, 7.9) 25 (23.3, 7.6) 0.596 BMI category (n. %) - - 23.4 537 (49.3%) 41 (41.8%) 469 (28.6%) - \$\[24 - 28 573 (21.7%) 23 (23.5%) 355 (12.1.4%) <0.001	Age of DM onset category (n, %)				0.001
≥ 8° years 1,456 (83.8%) 70 (7.4%) 1,386 (84.5%)	<58 years	282 (16.2%)	28 (28.6%)	254 (15.5%)	
Sex (male, %) 1,254 (72.15%) 56 (57.1%) 1,198 (73%) 0.001 Duration of diabetes category (n, %) 1,157 (66.6%) 44 (44.9%) 1,113 (67.9%) ≥ 12 months 581 (33.4%) 54 (55.1%) 527 (32.1%) ≥ 12 months 581 (33.4%) 54 (55.1%) 527 (32.1%) 0.001 ≥ 12 months 551 (36.27.6) 25.3 (22.9.27.9) 255 (23.7.27.6) 0.586 BMI category (n, %)	\geq 58 years	1,456 (83.8%)	70 (71.4%)	1,386 (84.5%)	
Duration of diabetes category (n, %)	Sex (male, %)	1,254 (72.15%)	56 (57.1%)	1,198 (73%)	0.001
<12 months1,157 (66.6%)44 (44.9%)1,113 (67.9%)≥ 12 monthsS81 (33.4%)54 (55.1%)527 (32.1%)BMI (dg/n ²)25.5 (23.6,27.6)0.396BMI (ategory (n, %)2.53 (22.9, 27.9)25.5 (23.7,27.6)<24	Duration of diabetes category $(n, \%)$				< 0.001
≥12 months581 (33.4%)54 (55.1%)527 (32.1%)BMI (kg/m ²)2.5.5 (3.6, 2.7.6)2.5.3 (2.2, 2.7.9)2.5.6 (2.3.7, 2.7.6)0.596BMI (kg/m ²)2.5.5 (3.6, 2.7.6)0.2860.286SMI category (n. %)41 (41.8%)490 (28.5%)2.424 - 28375 (21.7%)2.3 (2.5.5%)355 (21.6%).0.001SBP (mmHg)155 (124, 149)147 (125, 159)155 (124, 148)<0.001	<12 months	1,157 (66.6%)	44 (44.9%)	1,113 (67.9%)	
BMI (kg/m ²) 25, (23, 6, 27, 6) 25, (22, 7, 27, 6) 0,596 BMI cargory (n, %)	\geq 12 months	581 (33.4%)	54 (55.1%)	527 (32.1%)	
BMI category (n, %)0.236<24	BMI (kg/m ²)	25.5 (23.6, 27.6)	25.3 (22.9, 27.9)	25.5 (23.7, 27.6)	0.596
< 24 503 (28.9%) 34 (34.7%) 469 (28.6%) $24 - 28$ 877 (49.3%) 41 (41.8%) 816 (49.8%) ≥ 28 378 (21.7%) 23 (23.5%) 355 (21.6%) SBP (nmHg) 135 (124, 149) 147 (125, 159) 135 (124, 148) <0.001	BMI category (n, %)				0.286
24 − 28 857 (49,3%) 41 (41,8%) 816 (49,8%) ≥ 28 378 (21,7%) 23 (23,5%) 355 (21,6%) SBP (mmHg) 135 (124, 149) 147 (125, 159) 355 (124, 148) <0.001 DAP (mmHg) 78 (70, 84) 81 (75, 500. 78 (70, 84) <0.001 MAP category (n, %) ≥ 100 mmHg 1,062 (61.1%) 47 (41.8%) 1,021 (62.3%) 	<24	503 (28.9%)	34 (34.7%)	469 (28.6%)	
≥ 28378 (21.7%)23 (23.5%)355 (21.6%)SBP (nmHg)135 (124, 149)147 (125, 159)135 (124, 148)<0.001	24 - 28	857 (49.3%)	41 (41.8%)	816 (49.8%)	
SBP (nmHg) 135 (124, 149) 147 (125, 159) 135 (124, 148) <0.001	≥28	378 (21.7%)	23 (23.5%)	355 (21.6%)	
DBP (mmHg) 78 (70, 84) 81 (75, 90) 78 (70, 84) <0.001 MAP (mmHg) 97 (90, 104) 101 (93, 114) 96 (90, 103) <0.001	SBP (mmHg)	135 (124, 149)	147 (125, 159)	135 (124, 148)	< 0.001
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DBP (mmHg)	78 (70, 84)	81 (75, 90)	78 (70, 84)	< 0.001
MAP category (n, %)	MAP (mmHg)	97 (90, 104)	101 (93, 114)	96 (90, 103)	< 0.001
< 100 mmHg	MAP category (n, %)				< 0.001
≥ 100 mHIg 676 (38.9%) 57 (58.2%) 619 (37.7%) Smoking status (n, %) 0.604 Nonsmoker 878 (50.5%) 49 (50%) 829 (50.5%) Former smoker 696 (40.0%) 37 (37.8%) 659 (40.2%) Current smoker 164 (9.4%) 12 (12.2%) 152 (9.3%) Medication history Insulin (n, %) 590 (33.95%) 47 (48%) 543 (33.1%) 0.004 RAAS inhibitors (n, %) 1.027 (59.09%) 73 (74.5%) 954 (58.2%) 0.002 Lipid-lowering drugs 1,027 (57.54%) 68 (69.4%) 1.297 (79.1%) 0.032 Main complications or comorbidities Hypertension (n, %) 1.358 (78.54%) 88 (89.8%) 1.270 (77.4%) 0.006 CAD (n, %) 986 (56.73%) 40 (40.8%) 946 (57.7%) 0.002 Stroke (n, %) 302 (17.38%) 20 (20.4%) 282 (17.2%) 0.498 Hypertipidemia (n, %) 881 (50.69%) 46 (46.9%) 835 (50.9%) 0.509 HF (n, %) 198 (11.3%) 14 (14.3%) 184 (11.2%) 0.445 Anemia (n, %) 529 (30.4%) 50 (51%) 479 (29.2%) <0.001 Laboratory findings HGB (g/L) 134 (121, 145) 120 (106, 136) 134 (122, 146) <0.001 Serum ALB (g/L) 134 (121, 145) 120 (106, 136) 134 (122, 146) <0.001 ALB category (n, %)	<100 mmHg	1,062 (61.1%)	47 (41.8%)	1,021 (62.3%)	
Smoking status (n, %)0.604Nonsmoker878 (50.5%)49 (50%)829 (50.5%)Former smoker696 (40.0%)37 (37.8%)659 (40.2%)Current smoker164 (9.4%)12 (12.2%)152 (9.3%)Medication historyInsulin (n, %)590 (33.95%)47 (48%)543 (33.1%)0.004RAAS inhibitors (n, %)1.027 (59.09%)73 (74.5%)954 (58.2%)0.002Lipid-lowering drugs1.365 (78.54%)68 (69.4%)1.297 (79.1%)0.032Main complications or comorbidities </td <td>>100 mmHg</td> <td>676 (38.9%)</td> <td>57 (58.2%)</td> <td>619 (37.7%)</td> <td></td>	>100 mmHg	676 (38.9%)	57 (58.2%)	619 (37.7%)	
Nonsmoker878 (50.5%)49 (50%)829 (50.5%)Former smoker696 (40.0%)37 (37.8%)659 (40.2%)Current smoker164 (9.4%)12 (12.2%)152 (9.3%)Medication history112 (12.2%)543 (33.1%)0.004RAAS inhibitors (n, %)1.027 (59.09%)73 (74.5%)954 (58.2%)0.002Lipid-lowering drugs1.365 (78.54%)68 (69.4%)1.297 (79.1%)0.032Main complications or comorbiditiesUUUHypertension (n, %)1.358(78.14%)88 (89.8%)1.270 (77.4%)0.006CAD (n, %)986 (56.73%)40 (40.8%)946 (57.7%)0.002Stroke (n, %)302 (17.38%)20 (20.4%)282 (17.2%)0.498Hyperlipidemia (n, %)881 (50.69%)46 (46.9%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF (n, %)198 (11.39%)14 (14.3%)184 (11.2%)0.445Anemia (n, %)529 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001	Smoking status (n, %)				0.604
Former smoker696 (40.0%)37 (37.8%)659 (40.2%)Current smoker164 (9.4%)12 (12.2%)152 (9.3%)Medication history112 (12.2%)152 (9.3%)Medication history1590 (33.95%)47 (48%)543 (33.1%)0.004RAAS inhibitors (n, %)1,027 (59.09%)73 (74.5%)954 (58.2%)0.002Lipid-lowering drugs1.365 (78.54%)68 (69.4%)1.297 (79.1%)0.032Main complications or comorbidities1270 (77.4%)0.006CAD (n, %)1.358(78.14%)88 (89.8%)1.270 (77.4%)0.006CAD (n, %)986 (56.73%)40 (40.8%)946 (57.7%)0.002Stroke (n, %)302 (17.38%)20 (20.4%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF (n, %)881 (50.69%)46 (46.9%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF (n, %)198 (11.39%)14 (14.3%)184 (11.2%)0.445Anemia (n, %)529 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001	Nonsmoker	878 (50.5%)	49 (50%)	829 (50.5%)	
Current smoker164 (9.4%)12 (12.2%)152 (9.3%)Medication history112 (12.2%)152 (9.3%)Insulin (n, %)590 (33.95%)47 (48%)543 (33.1%)0.004RAAS inhibitors (n, %)1,027 (59.09%)73 (74.5%)954 (58.2%)0.002Lipid-lowering drugs1,365 (78.54%)68 (69.4%)1,297 (79.1%)0.032Main complications or comorbidites1188 (89.8%)1,270 (77.4%)0.006CAD (n, %)1,358(78.14%)88 (89.8%)1,270 (77.4%)0.002Stroke (n, %)302 (17.38%)20 (20.4%)282 (17.2%)0.498Hypertnipidemia (n, %)881 (50.69%)46 (46.9%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF (n, %)198 (11.39%)14 (14.3%)184 (11.2%)0.445Anemia (n, %)529 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001Laboratory findingsHGB (g/L)134 (121, 145)120 (106, 136)134 (122, 146)<0.001Serum ALB (g/L)39.9 (36.9, 42.8)36.5 (32.3, 40.2)40.1 (37.2, 42.9)<0.001All category (n, %)<0.001< 30 g/L91 (64.7 (94.8%)79 (80.6%)1.568 (95.6%)FBG (mmol/L)7.1 (5.9, 8.9)7.2 (54, 9.5)7.1 (5.9, 8.9)0.97HbA1c category (n, %)< 7%501 (32.3%)27 (27.6%)534 (32.6%)< 7%501 (32.3%)27 (27.6%)534 (32.6%)<	Former smoker	696 (40.0%)	37 (37.8%)	659 (40.2%)	
Medication historyInsulin (n, %)590 (33.95%)47 (48%)543 (33.1%)0.004RAAS inhibitors (n, %)1,027 (59.09%)73 (74.5%)954 (58.2%)0.002Lipid-lowering drugs1,365 (78.54%)68 (69.4%)1,297 (79.1%)0.032Main complications or comorbidities </td <td>Current smoker</td> <td>164 (9.4%)</td> <td>12 (12.2%)</td> <td>152 (9.3%)</td> <td></td>	Current smoker	164 (9.4%)	12 (12.2%)	152 (9.3%)	
Insulin (n, %)590 (33.95%)47 (48%)543 (33.1%)0.004RAAS inhibitors (n, %)1,027 (59.09%)73 (74.5%)954 (58.2%)0.002Lipid-lowering drugs1,365 (78.54%)68 (69.4%)1,297 (79.1%)0.032 Main complications or comorbidities </td <td>Medication history</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Medication history				
RAAS inhibitors (n, %)1.027 (59.09%)73 (74.5%)944 (58.2%)0.002Lipid-lowering drugs1.365 (78.54%)68 (69.4%)1.297 (79.1%)0.032Main complications or comorbiditiesHypertension (n, %)1.358(78.14%)88 (89.8%)1.270 (77.4%)0.006CAD (n, %)986 (56.73%)40 (40.8%)946 (57.7%)0.002Stroke (n, %)302 (17.38%)20 (20.4%)282 (17.2%)0.498Hyperlipidemia (n, %)881 (50.69%)46 (46.9%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF (n, %)198 (11.39%)14 (14.3%)184 (11.2%)0.445Anemia (n, %)259 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001	Insulin (n. %)	590 (33.95%)	47 (48%)	543 (33.1%)	0.004
Lipid-lowering drugs1,365 (78.54%)68 (69.4%)1,297 (79.1%)0.032Main complications or comorbidities	RAAS inhibitors (n. %)	1.027 (59.09%)	73 (74.5%)	954 (58.2%)	0.002
Hain complications or comorbiditiesHypertension (n, %)1,358(78.14%)88 (89.8%)1,270 (77.4%)0.006CAD (n, %)986 (56.73%)40 (40.8%)946 (57.7%)0.002Stroke (n, %)302 (17.38%)20 (20.4%)282 (17.2%)0.498Hyperlipidemia (n, %)881 (50.69%)46 (46.9%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF (n, %)198 (11.39%)14 (14.3%)184 (11.2%)0.445Anemia (n, %)529 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001	Lipid-lowering drugs	1.365 (78.54%)	68 (69.4%)	1.297 (79.1%)	0.032
Hypertension (n, %)1,358(78.14%)88 (89.8%)1,270 (77.4%)0.006CAD (n, %)986 (56.73%)40 (40.8%)946 (57.7%)0.002Stroke (n, %)302 (17.38%)20 (20.4%)282 (17.2%)0.498Hyperlipidemia (n, %)881 (50.69%)46 (46.9%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF (n, %)198 (11.39%)14 (14.3%)184 (11.2%)0.445Anemia (n, %)529 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001	Main complications or comorbidities	,(,		, (
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Hypertension (n. %)	1.358(78.14%)	88 (89.8%)	1.270 (77.4%)	0.006
Initial (a, b)302 (17.38%)20 (20.4%)282 (17.2%)0.498Hyperlipidemia (n, %)881 (50.69%)46 (46.9%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF (n, %)198 (11.39%)14 (14.3%)184 (11.2%)0.445Anemia (n, %)529 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001	CAD (n. %)	986 (56.73%)	40 (40.8%)	946 (57.7%)	0.002
Hyperlipidemia $(n, \%)$ 881 (50.69%)46 (46.9%)835 (50.9%)0.509HF $(n, \%)$ 198 (11.39%)14 (14.3%)184 (11.2%)0.445Anemia $(n, \%)$ 529 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001	Stroke (n. %)	302 (17.38%)	20 (20.4%)	282 (17.2%)	0.498
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} HF (n, \%) & 198 (11.39\%) & 14 (14.3\%) & 184 (11.2\%) & 0.445 \\ Anemia (n, \%) & 529 (30.4\%) & 50 (51\%) & 479 (29.2\%) & <0.001 \\ \hline \mbox{Laboratory findings} \\ HGB (g/L) & 134 (121, 145) & 120 (106, 136) & 134 (122, 146) & <0.001 \\ Serum ALB (g/L) & 39.9 (36.9, 42.8) & 36.5 (32.3, 40.2) & 40.1 (37.2, 42.9) & <0.001 \\ <30 g/L & 91 (5.2\%) & 19 (19.4\%) & 72 (4.4\%) \\ \geq 30 g/L & 1,647 (94.8\%) & 79 (80.6\%) & 1,568 (95.6\%) \\ FBG (mmol/L) & 7.1 (5.9, 8.9) & 7.2 (5.4, 9.5) & 7.1 (5.9, 8.9) & 0.97 \\ HbA1c (\%) & 7.6 (6.7, 8.9) & 8.0 (6.9, 10.0) & 7.6 (6.7, 8.8) & 0.011 \\ HbA1c category (n, \%) & & & & & & & & \\ <7\% & 561 (32.3\%) & 27 (27.6\%) & 534 (32.6\%) \\ \geq 7\% & 1,177 (67.7\%) & 71 (72.4\%) & 1,106 (67.4\%) \\ TC (nmol/L) & 1.62 (1.18, 2.31) & 1.99 (1.48, 2.62) & 1.61 (1.16, 2.30) & 0.001 \\ \end{array}$	Hyperlipidemia (n. %)	881 (50.69%)	46 (46.9%)	835 (50.9%)	0.509
In (m, 6)100 (116,16)100 (116,16)101 (116,16)0110Anemia (n, %)529 (30.4%)50 (51%)479 (29.2%)<0.001	HF (n. %)	198 (11.39%)	14 (14.3%)	184 (11.2%)	0.445
Laboratory findingsI 34 (121, 145)120 (106, 136)134 (122, 146)<0.001MGB (g/L)39.9 (36.9, 42.8)36.5 (32.3, 40.2)40.1 (37.2, 42.9)<0.001	Anemia (n. %)	529 (30.4%)	50 (51%)	479 (29.2%)	< 0.001
HGB (g/L)134 (121, 145)120 (106, 136)134 (122, 146)<0.001Serum ALB (g/L)39.9 (36.9, 42.8)36.5 (32.3, 40.2)40.1 (37.2, 42.9)<0.001	Laboratory findings			(_,,,)	
Serum ALB (g/L) $39.9 (36.9, 42.8)$ $36.5 (32.3, 40.2)$ $40.1 (37.2, 42.9)$ <0.001 ALB category (n, %) <0.001 $<30 g/L$ 91 (5.2%)19 (19.4%)72 (4.4%) $\geq 30 g/L$ 1,647 (94.8%)79 (80.6%)1,568 (95.6%)FBG (mmol/L)7.1 (5.9, 8.9)7.2 (5.4, 9.5)7.1 (5.9, 8.9)HbA1c (%)7.6 (6.7, 8.9)8.0 (6.9, 10.0)7.6 (6.7, 8.8)HbA1c category (n, %)27 (27.6%)534 (32.6%) $<7\%$ 561 (32.3%)27 (27.6%)534 (32.6%) $\geq 7\%$ 1,177 (67.7%)71 (72.4%)1,106(67.4%)TC (mmol/L)4.11 (3.42, 4.96)4.99 (4.09, 5.57)4.07 (3.40, 4.87)<0.001	HGB (g/L)	134 (121, 145)	120 (106, 136)	134 (122, 146)	< 0.001
ALB category (n, %) </td <td>Serum ALB (g/L)</td> <td>39.9 (36.9, 42.8)</td> <td>36.5 (32.3, 40.2)</td> <td>40.1 (37.2, 42.9)</td> <td>< 0.001</td>	Serum ALB (g/L)	39.9 (36.9, 42.8)	36.5 (32.3, 40.2)	40.1 (37.2, 42.9)	< 0.001
$< 30 \text{ g/L}$ $91 (5.2\%)$ $19 (19.4\%)$ $72 (4.4\%)$ $\geq 30 \text{ g/L}$ $1,647 (94.8\%)$ $79 (80.6\%)$ $1,568 (95.6\%)$ FBG (mmol/L) $7.1 (5.9, 8.9)$ $7.2 (5.4, 9.5)$ $7.1 (5.9, 8.9)$ 0.97 HbA1c (%) $7.6 (6.7, 8.9)$ $8.0 (6.9, 10.0)$ $7.6 (6.7, 8.8)$ 0.011 HbA1c category (n, %) $27 (27.6\%)$ $534 (32.6\%)$ 0.358 $<7\%$ $561 (32.3\%)$ $27 (27.6\%)$ $534 (32.6\%)$ $\geq 7\%$ $1,177 (67.7\%)$ $71 (72.4\%)$ $1,106 (67.4\%)$ TC (mmol/L) $4.11 (3.42, 4.96)$ $4.99 (4.09, 5.57)$ $4.07 (3.40, 4.87)$ <0.001 TG (mmol/L) $1.62 (1.18, 2.31)$ $1.99 (1.48, 2.62)$ $1.61 (1.16, 2.30)$ 0.001	ALB category (n. %)				< 0.001
$\geq 30 \text{ g/L}$ $1,647 (94.8\%)$ $79 (80.6\%)$ $1,568 (95.6\%)$ FBG (mmol/L) $7.1 (5.9, 8.9)$ $7.2 (5.4, 9.5)$ $7.1 (5.9, 8.9)$ 0.97 HbA1c (%) $7.6 (6.7, 8.9)$ $8.0 (6.9, 10.0)$ $7.6 (6.7, 8.8)$ 0.011 HbA1c category (n, %) $<$ 0.358 <7%	< 30 g/L	91 (5.2%)	19 (19.4%)	72 (4.4%)	
FBG (mmol/L)7.1 (5.9, 8.9)7.2 (5.4, 9.5)7.1 (5.9, 8.9) 0.97 HbA1c (%)7.6 (6.7, 8.9)8.0 (6.9, 10.0)7.6 (6.7, 8.8) 0.011 HbA1c category (n, %) -7% $561 (32.3\%)$ $27 (27.6\%)$ $534 (32.6\%)$ $\geq 7\%$ 1,177 (67.7\%)71 (72.4\%)1,106 (67.4\%)TC (mmol/L)4.11 (3.42, 4.96)4.99 (4.09, 5.57) $4.07 (3.40, 4.87)$ <0.001 TG (mmol/L)1.62 (1.18, 2.31)1.99 (1.48, 2.62) $1.61 (1.16, 2.30)$ 0.001	> 30 g/L	1.647 (94.8%)	79 (80.6%)	1.568 (95.6%)	
HD 6 (and L) $(1, (0, (0, 0))$ $(1, (0, (0, 0))$ $(1, (0, (0, 0))$ $(1, (0, (0, 0))$ HbA1c (%)7.6 (6.7, 8.9) $8.0 (6.9, 10.0)$ 7.6 (6.7, 8.8) 0.011 HbA1c category (n, %) $(2, 7\%)$ $561 (32.3\%)$ $27 (27.6\%)$ $534 (32.6\%)$ $\geq 7\%$ $1,177 (67.7\%)$ $71 (72.4\%)$ $1,106 (67.4\%)$ TC (mmol/L) $4.11 (3.42, 4.96)$ $4.99 (4.09, 5.57)$ $4.07 (3.40, 4.87)$ <0.001 TG (mmol/L) $1.62 (1.18, 2.31)$ $1.99 (1.48, 2.62)$ $1.61 (1.16, 2.30)$ 0.001	FBG (mmol/L)	7.1 (5.9, 8.9)	7.2 (5.4, 9.5)	7.1 (5.9, 8.9)	0.97
Hold (0)Hold (0, 0, 0)Hold (0, 0, 0)Hold (0, 0, 0)Hold (1, 0, 0)Hold (1, 0, 0)HbA1c category (n, %) $< 7\%$ $561 (32.3\%)$ $27 (27.6\%)$ $534 (32.6\%)$ $\geq 7\%$ $1,177 (67.7\%)$ $71 (72.4\%)$ $1,106 (67.4\%)$ TC (nmol/L) $4.11 (3.42, 4.96)$ $4.99 (4.09, 5.57)$ $4.07 (3.40, 4.87)$ <0.001 TG (nmol/L) $1.62 (1.18, 2.31)$ $1.99 (1.48, 2.62)$ $1.61 (1.16, 2.30)$ 0.001	HbA1c(%)	7.6 (6.7, 8.9)	80(69,100)	7.6 (6.7, 8.8)	0.011
<7%	HbA1c category $(n \%)$	/// (0//, 0//)		110 (017, 010)	0.358
$ \begin{array}{c} \geq 7\% & 1,177 \ (67.7\%) & 71 \ (72.4\%) & 1,106 \ (67.4\%) \\ TC \ (mmol/L) & 4.11 \ (3.42, 4.96) & 4.99 \ (4.09, 5.57) & 4.07 \ (3.40, 4.87) & <0.001 \\ TG \ (mmol/L) & 1.62 \ (1.18, 2.31) & 1.99 \ (1.48, 2.62) & 1.61 \ (1.16, 2.30) & 0.001 \\ \end{array} $	<7%	561 (32.3%)	27 (27.6%)	534 (32.6%)	0.000
TC (mmol/L) 4.11 (3.42, 4.96) 4.99 (4.09, 5.57) 4.07 (3.40, 4.87) <0.001	>7%	1.177 (67.7%)	71 (72.4%)	1.106(67.4%)	
TG (mmol/L) 1.62 (1.18, 2.31) 1.99 (1.48, 2.62) 1.61 (1.16, 2.30) 0.001	TC (mmol/L)	4.11 (3.42. 4.96)	4.99 (4.09, 5.57)	4.07 (3.40. 4.87)	< 0.001
	TG (mmol/L)	1.62 (1.18, 2.31)	1.99 (1.48, 2.62)	1.61 (1.16. 2.30)	0.001

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics	Overall $(n = 1,738)$	Patients with outcomes (n=98)	Patients without out- comes $(n = 1,640)$	P-value
HDL-C (mmol/L)	0.96 (0.82, 1.12)	0.9 6(0.84, 1.20)	0.96 (0.82, 1.12)	0.630
LDL-C (mmol/L)	2.44 (1.87, 3.08)	2.76 (2.14, 3.46)	2.43 (1.86, 3.04)	0.001
LDL category (n, %)				0.003
<2.6 mmol/L	737 (42.4%)	56 (57.1%)	681 (41.5%)	
\geq 2.6 mmol/L	1,001 (57.6%)	42 (42.9%)	959 (58.5%)	
Scr (µmol/L)	98.0 (90.0, 110.0)	112.0 (99.0, 128.0)	97.0 (90.0, 108.3)	< 0.001
BUN (mmol/L)	6.8 (5.6, 8.2)	8.5 (6.6, 10.4)	6.7 (5.5, 8.1)	< 0.001
Serum uric acid (µmol/L)	381 (324, 445)	387 (331, 467)	381 (323, 444)	0.255
eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m ²)	52.1 (45.0, 57.5)	45.0 (37.7,53.6)	52.3 (45.4, 57.6)	< 0.001
eGFR category (n, %)				< 0.001
Stage 1 (≥90)	56 (3.2%)	2 (2%)	54 (3.3%)	
Stage 2 (60 – 89)	133 (7.7%)	11 (11.2%)	122 (7.4%)	
Stage 3a (45 – 59)	1,113 (64%)	36 (36.7%)	1,077 (65.7%)	
Stage 3b (30 – 44)	436 (25.1%)	49 (50%)	387 (23.6%)	
Urinary protein grade (n, %)				< 0.001
0 - 1 +	1,241 (71.4%)	20 (20.4%)	1,221 (74.5%)	
2+-4+	497 (28.6%)	78 (79.6%)	419 (25.5%)	
$PM_{2.5} (\mu g/m^3)$	49.50 (38.67, 62.36)	55.55 (43.46, 66.02)	49.22 (38.32, 62.01)	0.002
$PM_{10} (\mu g/m^3)$	81.40 (69.17, 94.58)	85.14 (74.34, 97.75)	81.12 (68.80, 94.09)	0.016
$CO (mg/m^3)$	0.81 (0.65, 0.99)	0.88 (0.72, 1.06)	0.80 (0.64, 0.98)	0.005
$NO_2 (\mu g/m^3)$	40.93 (33.25, 47.68)	42.27 (36.02, 49.78)	40.81 (33.15, 47.58)	0.049
$SO_2 (\mu g/m^3)$	5.96 (3.74, 8.93)	7.36 (5.05, 10.20)	5.91 (3.70,8.84)	0.001
$O_3 (\mu g/m^3)$	92.74 (90.26, 94.96)	93.01 (91.57, 94.79)	92.71 (90.18, 94.99)	0.394

Abbreviations: DM: diabetes mellitus; BMI: body mass index; RAAS: renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system; CAD: coronary artery disease; HF: heart failure; SBP: systolic blood pressure; DBP: diastolic blood pressure; MAP: mean arterial pressure; HGB: hemoglobin; ALB: albumin; FBG: fasting blood glucose; HbA1c: glycated hemoglobin; TC: total cholesterol; TG: triglyceride; HDL-C: high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C: low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; Scr: serum creatinine; BUN: blood urea nitrogen; eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate; $PM_{2,5}$: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 µm; PM_{10} : particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than 10 µm; CO: carbon monoxide; NO_2 : nitrogen dioxide; SO₂: sulfur dioxide. O_3 : ozone

the incidence of ESRD gradually increased with the prolongation of follow-up time (Fig. 6A).

Evaluation of the prognostic performance of different air pollutants for ESRD

Since there were strong correlations (r > 0.5) between each of the five air pollutants except O₃ (Fig. 6F), we first evaluated the diagnostic efficacy of each air pollutant separately. Air pollution indicators could significantly improve the predictive performance of the basic clinical model (model 1, including sex, age of DM onset, duration of DM, hyperlipidemia, the treatment of lipid-lowering drugs, smoking status, insulin treatment, HF, baseline eGFR, MAP, BMI, anemia, urinary protein, and serum ALB), except for PM_{2.5} (0.850 *vs.* 0.840, P > 0.05, Fig. 6G). In the bootstrap cohort, air pollution indicators, including PM_{2.5}, can significantly improve the predictive performance of the basic model (Fig. 6H). In order to identify the air pollution with the strongest prognostic efficacy for ESRD and establish the optimal model, we used the backward stepwise method for variable screening, including $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , SO_2 , CO, and variables in model 1. Finally, four indicators were included in the optimal model, with $PM_{2.5}$ being the most effective environmental indicator among all the air pollutants (Fig. 6I).

Discussion

In the current study, we investigated the association between long-term exposure to six types of ambient air pollutants $(PM_{2.5}, PM_{10}, CO, NO_2, SO_2, and O_3)$ and the risk of ESRD in Chinese patients with T2DM and CKD. We confirmed the significant long-term risks of $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , CO, and SO_2 for progression to ESRD. These positive associations remained robust in fully adjusted models, suggesting these associations were independent. Different effects were shown

20

15

Percentage of population (%)



Fig. 3 Overall effects of environmental pollutants including $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , SO_2 , CO, NO_2 , and O_3 . A: The BKMR method showed the estimated change in risk of ESRD when six pollutants were set at particular percentiles (ranging from 25 to 75th) compared to when

all pollutants were all at their 50th percentile; B: RCS curve of WQS index, which was calculated by WQS regression, indicating the overall effort of all the six environmental pollutants



Fig.4 Association between the risk of ESRD and different air pollutants. The solid red line represented OR of the air pollutant across the whole range after fully adjusting for covariates, including sex, age of DM onset, duration of diabetes, hyperlipidemia, using of lipid-low-

ering drugs, smoking status, insulin treatment, HF, baseline eGFR, MAP, BMI, anemia, urinary protein, and serum ALB. The red dot line represents the 95% CI of OR. The frequency distribution of the air pollutant concentration is shown by histograms

1 ml 0 har to her	(_m	CO (per 1 mg/m ⁻)		NU2 (per 10 µg/m ⁻)		su ₂ (per 1 µg/m ⁻)		U ₃ (per 1 µg/m ²)	
ie OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value	OR (95% CI) P-	-value	OR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value
1.16 (1.03–1.30)	0.013	3.14 (1.27–7.78) 0.0	013	1.25 (0.99–1.59) (0.061	1.08 (1.02–1.14)	0.006	1.00 (0.76, 1.31)	0.978
1.15 (1.02–1.29)	0.021	3.05 (1.21–7.67) 0.0	018	1.25 (0.98–1.59) ().066	1.07 (1.01–1.13)	0.013	0.97 (0.73, 1.27)	0.799
1.13 (1.01–1.27)	0.039	2.77 (1.09–7.05) 0.0	033	1.21 (0.95–1.54) (0.120	1.07 (1.01–1.13)	0.024	0.95 (0.72, 1.25)	0.716
1.14 (1.01–1.29)	0.030	2.75 (1.06–7.11) 0.0	037	1.22 (0.96–1.57) (0.109	1.07 (1.01–1.14)	0.022	0.93 (0.71, 1.23)	0.614
1.15 (1.02–1.31)	0.022	2.80 (1.05–7.47) 0.0	040	1.26 (0.98–1.61) (0.073	1.07 (1.00–1.13)	0.040	0.86 (0.65, 1.13)	0.278
le	OR (95% CI) 1.16 (1.03–1.30) 1.15 (1.02–1.29) 1.13 (1.01–1.27) 1.14 (1.01–1.27) 1.15 (1.02–1.31)	OR (95% CI) <i>P</i> -value 1.16 (1.03–1.30) 0.013 1.15 (1.02–1.29) 0.021 1.13 (1.01–1.27) 0.039 1.14 (1.01–1.29) 0.030 1.15 (1.02–1.31) 0.022	OR (95% CI) <i>P</i> -value OR (95% CI) <i>P</i> -value 1.16 (1.03–1.30) 0.013 3.14 (1.27–7.78) 0. 1.15 (1.02–1.29) 0.021 3.05 (1.21–7.67) 0. 1.13 (1.01–1.27) 0.039 2.77 (1.09–7.05) 0. 1.14 (1.01–1.29) 0.030 2.75 (1.06–7.11) 0. 1.15 (1.02–1.31) 0.022 2.80 (1.05–7.47) 0.	OR (95% CI) <i>P</i> -value OR (95% CI) <i>P</i> -value 1.16 (1.03–1.30) 0.013 3.14 (1.27–7.78) 0.013 1.15 (1.02–1.29) 0.021 3.05 (1.21–7.67) 0.018 1.13 (1.01–1.27) 0.033 2.77 (1.09–7.05) 0.033 1.14 (1.01–1.29) 0.030 2.75 (1.06–7.11) 0.037 1.15 (1.02–1.31) 0.022 2.80 (1.05–7.47) 0.040	OR (95% CI) <i>P</i> -value OR (95% CI) <i>P</i> -value OR (95% CI) <i>I</i> 1.16 (1.03-1.30) 0.013 3.14 (1.27-7.78) 0.013 1.25 (0.99-1.59) (7) 1.15 (1.02-1.29) 0.021 3.05 (1.21-7.67) 0.018 1.25 (0.98-1.59) (7) 1.13 (1.01-1.27) 0.039 2.77 (1.09-7.05) 0.033 1.21 (0.95-1.54) (7) 1.14 (1.01-1.29) 0.030 2.75 (1.06-7.11) 0.037 1.22 (0.96-1.57) (7) 1.15 (1.02-1.31) 0.022 2.80 (1.05-7.47) 0.040 1.26 (0.98-1.61) (7)	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	OR (95% CI) P-value OR (95% CI) P-value OR (95% CI) P-value OR (95% CI) 1.16 (1.03-1.30) 0.013 3.14 (1.27-7.78) 0.013 1.25 (0.99-1.59) 0.061 1.08 (1.02-1.14) 1.15 (1.02-1.29) 0.021 3.05 (1.21-7.67) 0.018 1.25 (0.98-1.59) 0.066 1.07 (1.01-1.13) 1.13 (1.01-1.27) 0.039 2.77 (1.09-7.05) 0.033 1.21 (0.95-1.54) 0.107 (1.01-1.13) 1.14 (1.01-1.27) 0.030 2.77 (1.09-7.05) 0.033 1.22 (0.96-1.57) 0.109 1.07 (1.01-1.13) 1.15 (1.02-1.31) 0.022 2.80 (1.05-7.47) 0.040 1.26 (0.96-1.57) 0.109 1.07 (1.01-1.14)	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$

Deringer

Environmental Science and Pollution Research (2024) 31:5429–5443

by different air pollutants when stratified by age, baseline eGFR, BMI, the usage of RAAS inhibitors, HbA1c, and follow-up time. Furthermore, on the basis of the clinical model incorporating traditional predictors (model 1), adding the above four types of air pollutants (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, or SO_2) can significantly improve the predictive efficiency of the model for predicting ESRD. Using BKMR method, WQS regression, and backward stepwise logistic regression, we found that PM_{25} was the most important environmental predictor for ESRD, indicating the importance of incorporating PM_{2.5} exposure into the regular clinical care of patients with T2DM and CKD.

A recent prospective cohort study including 6.628 adult patients with CKD investigated the association between long-term exposure to PM25 and the risk of ESRD and found that the adjusted hazard ratio (95% CI) for progression to ESRD was 1.19 (1.08–1.31) per 7.8 μ g/m³ increment in PM_{25} , which was similar to our results (Lin et al. 2020b). However, this study did not investigate other air pollutants and included the general population with CKD. In our study, apart from PM2.5, we also explored the association between five other types of air pollutants (PM₁₀, CO, NO₂, SO₂, and O₃) and the risk of ESRD and further confirmed the significantly negative impact of long-term exposure to PM₁₀, CO, and SO₂ on renal function. It is noteworthy that our study focused on a specific group of patients with T2DM and CKD, which was reported to have a significantly higher incidence rate of chronic RRT than people without diabetes (Claessen et al. 2021) and also have a higher mortality rate (Alicic et al. 2017). Additionally, at present, there is limited epidemiological evidence of the association between air pollution and ESRD risk in patients with T2DM and CKD. Therefore, our study provided an evidentiary base to incorporate PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, and SO₂ exposure into the regular clinical care of patients with T2DM and CKD.

Given that the baseline exposure to air pollution may not completely and accurately represent the exposure over the long-term follow-up, we used the annual mean exposure concentrations of different air pollutants between the patient's enrollment and the last follow-up, which was similar to several previous studies using ESRD as the endpoint (Bowe et al. 2017, 2018; Lin et al. 2020a). Furthermore, we discussed the impact of the duration of follow-up on the association between air pollution and the risk of ESRD. We found that the negative impact of air pollution on renal function remained significant regardless of the duration of follow-up, and these effects tended to be stronger in those with a relatively long follow-up period, indicating that reducing exposure time is of great significance for delaying ESRD progression in patients with T2DM and CKD.

Moreover, our study investigated the additional predictive value of PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, and SO₂ outperforming the conventional clinical model (model 1) both in the derivation

i.

2.5 µm; PM₁₀: particulate

nitrogen dioxide; SO₂: sulfur dioxide; O₃: ozone. DM: diabetes mellitus; HF: heart failure; eGFR: estimated

CI: confidence interval; ESRD: end-stage renal disease; PM, 5: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than

mass index; ALB: albumin

than 10 µm; CO: carbon monoxide; NO₂:

body

BMI: 1

pressure;

glomerular filtration rate; MAP: mean arterial

matter with an aerodynamic diameter less baseline. Abbreviations: OR: odds ratio;



Fig. 5 The associations between long-term exposure to PM2.5, PM10, CO, and SO2 and ESRD risk in patients with different subgroups

and the internal validation cohort. After using the BKMR method, WQS regression, and the backward stepwise logistic regression to select the variables, $PM_{2.5}$ was found to be the most important environmental pollutant. Previous studies suggested that ambient $PM_{2.5}$ could be a novel environmental risk factor for incident CKD or ESRD (Bowe et al. 2018; Lin et al. 2020a, b; Blum et al. 2020; Yang et al. 2017; Chang et al. 2022; O'Neill et al. 2008; Mehta et al. 2016;

Weaver et al. 2019). However, limited data exist on the association between long-term exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ and ESRD risk in countries or regions with high levels of $PM_{2.5}$, especially in the Chinese mainland, where high levels of $PM_{2.5}$ remain a very severe environmental challenge (Huang et al. 2018). Our research findings may further promote public health efforts to provide greater protection for patients with T2DM and CKD in reducing ESRD risks associated with long-term



Fig. 6 Subgroup analysis of follow-up time and evaluation of prognostic efficacy of different air pollutants. A-E. Subgroup analysis of follow-up time in the association between $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , SO₂, or CO and the risk of developing ESRD; F. Correlation analysis between dif-

ferent air pollutants; G-H. The prognostic performance of different air pollutants for ESRD in the derivation and internal validation cohort. I. The optimal model established by a backward stepwise method based on $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , SO₂, CO, and variables in model 4

exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ and provide evidence to implement more reinforced air quality control of ambient $PM_{2.5}$.

Previous studies indicated that ambient air pollutants might cause renal vascular impairment, mesangial expansion, intraglomerular hypertension, advanced glomerulosclerosis, tubular atrophy, and renal fibrosis, which may contribute to the progression of kidney diseases (Yan et al. 2014; Tavera Busso et al. 2018; Al Suleimani et al. 2017). The mechanisms underlying air pollutants to renal function decline are not entirely clear and may be involved in many aspects. For example, $PM_{2.5}$ can enter the lungs and further pass into the bloodstream, and then penetrate blood-organ barriers and thereby impact distant organs like the kidneys (Chen et al. 2022). Experimental evidence suggested that PM_{2.5} could cause disturbances of renal hemodynamics, exacerbate renal vascular damage, aggravate oxidative stress and inflammation, promote DNA damage, and thereby promote the development of acute kidney injury or CKD (Al Suleimani et al. 2017; Nemmar et al. 2010, 2016). Future studies are still needed to elucidate the mechanisms by which different air pollutants affect renal function.

In this study, we included patients with T2DM and CKD. Notably, air pollution is also a major risk factor for T2DM, a leading driver of CKD. According to an analysis of data from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019, about 20% of the global burden of T2DM can be attributed to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ exposure, which contributes to 13.4% (9.49–17.5) of

deaths and 13.6% (9.73–17.9) of disability-adjusted lifeyears due to T2DM (GBD 2019 Diabetes and Air Pollution Collaborators 2022). A recent study included a cohort of 2,444,157 veterans from the United States and investigated whether DM mediates the association between PM_{2.5} and CKD (Bowe et al. 2020). They found that DM mediates a certain proportion of the positive association between PM_{2.5} and the risk of various kidney outcomes, especially ESRD, suggesting that more precise estimates of the burden of DM and the burden of kidney disease attributable to ambient PM_{2.5} will be considered in future studies.

Notablely, apart from the covariates that we have already adjusted in this study, there are some potential confounding factors, such as genetic factors, diet, and indoor air pollution, which were also previously reported to be associated with renal function decline. Genetic polymorphisms and epigenetic variations were found to determine the individual susceptibility to renal function progression (Tampe and Zeisberg 2014). In addition, genetic risk was also reported to modify the association between air pollutants exposure and CKD (Wang et al. 2022). Healthy diets, such as coffee, dairy, and plant-based foods may lower the risk of CKD, while unhealthy diets, such as sugar-sweetened beverages and red meat, may accelerate renal function decline (van Westing et al. 2020). Moreover, there are several studies exploring the association between indoor air pollution and renal function progression, which have yielded inconsistent results (Singh et al. 2016; Xue et al. 2022; Kanagasabai et al. 2022). In our study, we could not further analyze these confounding factors due to data inavailability. Future studies are needed to further explore the impact of these confounding factors on renal function in patients with T2DM and CKD.

Based on a retrospective cohort in Beijing, China, we first provided an evidentiary base for the positive association between long-term exposure to different air pollutants and the risk of ESRD in Chinese patients with T2DM and CKD. Moreover, we evaluated the additional predictive value for ESRD outperforming the conventional clinical model. However, our study also has several limitations. First, this is a single-center study with a relatively small sample size, which may affect the generalizability of our results to a broader population with T2DM and CKD. Second, this is a retrospective cohort study, which may suffer from bias in report and selection. Research with a prospective design is warranted in future studies. Third, we applied the ordinary Kriging method to estimate exposure from air pollutant concentration of the air quality monitoring station nearest the participant's residential address. We could not fully consider the daily activity trajectory of the subjects due to the limitation of data. Fourth, we were unable to further distinguish patients with diabetic nephropathy and nondiabetic kidney disease (NDKD) due to the lack of renal biopsy data. Future studies are needed to further compare the different effects of air pollution on the progression of diabetic nephropathy and NDKD.

Conclusions

Our study evaluated the long-term effects of ambient $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , NO_2 , CO, SO_2 , and O_3 on ESRD risk in Chinese patients with T2DM and CKD and revealed a significantly positive association between $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , CO, and SO_2 and risk of ESRD. These associations remained robust after multiple adjustments. Besides, these air pollution indicators showed additional predictive value outperforming the conventional clinical model, and $PM_{2.5}$ was found to be the most important environmental pollutant. Therefore, our findings support the independent association between long-term exposure to different air pollutants and the risk of ESRD and provide an evidentiary base to incorporate air pollutant exposure, especially $PM_{2.5}$, into the regular clinical care of patients with T2DM and CKD.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-31346-2.

Acknowledgements The authors wish to thank all the participants involved in this retrospective cohort study.

Authors Contributions All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by Zhi Shang and Yue-Ming Gao. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Zhi Shang and Yue-Ming Gao. Zhen-Ling Deng and Yue Wang commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant number 82070736) and the PRO-Run Fund of the Nephrology Group of CEBM.

Data availability The data of this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Declarations

Ethical approval The research was conducted in line with the Declaration of Helsinki and received full approval from the Ethics Committee of Peking University Third Hospital (IRB00006761-M2023181).

Consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent to publish This article has not been published before and its publication has been approved by all co-authors.

Competing interests The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

- Al Suleimani YM, Al Mahruqi AS, Al Za'abi M, Shalaby A, Ashique M, Nemmar A, Ali BH (2017) Effect of diesel exhaust particles on renal vascular responses in rats with chronic kidney disease. Environ Toxicol 32(2):541–549. https://doi.org/10.1002/tox.22258
- Alicic RZ, Rooney MT, Tuttle KR (2017) Diabetic Kidney Disease: Challenges, Progress, and Possibilities. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol 12(12):2032–2045. https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN.11491116
- Annesi-Maesano I, Forastiere F, Balmes J, Garcia E, Harkema J, Holgate S, Kelly F, Khreis H, Hoffmann B, Maesano CN, McConnell R, Peden D, Pinkerton K, Schikowski T, Thurston G, Van Winkle LS, Carlsten C (2021) The clear and persistent impact of air pollution on chronic respiratory diseases: a call for interventions. Eur Respir J 57(3):2002981. https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003. 02981-2020
- Barry SA, Tammemagi MC, Penek S, Kassan EC, Dorfman CS, Riley TL, Commin J, Taylor KL (2012) Predictors of adverse smoking outcomes in the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 104(21):1647–1659. https:// doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djs398

- Blum MF, Surapaneni A, Stewart JD, Liao D, Yanosky JD, Whitsel EA, Power MC, Grams ME (2020) Particulate Matter and Albuminuria, Glomerular Filtration Rate, and Incident CKD. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol 15(3):311–319. https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN.08350719
- Bowe B, Xie Y, Li T, Yan Y, Xian H, Al-Aly Z (2017) Associations of ambient coarse particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, and carbon monoxide with the risk of kidney disease: a cohort study. Lancet Planet Health 1(7):e267–e276. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(17)30117-1
- Bowe B, Xie Y, Li T, Yan Y, Xian H, Al-Aly Z (2018) Particulate Matter Air Pollution and the Risk of Incident CKD and Progression to ESRD. J Am Soc Nephrol 29(1):218–230. https://doi.org/10. 1681/ASN.2017030253
- Bowe B, Xie Y, Yan Y, Xian H, Al-Aly Z (2020) Diabetes Minimally Mediated the Association Between PM2.5 Air Pollution and Kidney Outcomes. Sci Rep 10(1):4586. https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41598-020-61115-x
- Braunwald E (2019) Diabetes, heart failure, and renal dysfunction: the vicious circles. Prog Cardiovasc Dis 62(4):298–302. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.pcad.2019.07.003
- Chan TC, Zhang Z, Lin BC, Lin C, Deng HB, Chuang YC, Chan JWM, Jiang WK, Tam T, Chang LY, Hoek G, Lau AKH, Lao XQ (2018) Long-term exposure to ambient fine particulate matter and chronic kidney disease: a cohort study. Environ Health Perspect 126(10):107002. https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP33047
- Chang PY, Li YL, Chuang TW, Chen SY, Lin LY, Lin YF, Chiou HY (2022) Exposure to ambient air pollutants with kidney function decline in chronic kidney disease patients. Environ Res 215(Pt 2):114289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.114289
- Chen JY, Wan EYF, Choi EPH, Chan AKC, Chan KHY, Tsang JPY, Lam CLK (2017) The health-related quality of life of Chinese patients on hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis. Patient 10(6):799–808. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40271-017-0256-6
- Chen HY, Kuo S, Su PF, Wu JS, Ou HT (2020) Health care costs associated with macrovascular, microvascular, and metabolic complications of type 2 diabetes across time: estimates from a population-based cohort of more than 0.8 million individuals with up to 15 years of follow-up. Diabetes Care 43(8):1732– 1740. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc20-0072
- Chen H, Oliver BG, Pant A, Olivera A, Poronnik P, Pollock CA, Saad S (2022) Effects of air pollution on human health-mechanistic evidence suggested by in vitro and in vivo modelling. Environ Res 212(Pt C):113378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022. 113378
- Claessen H, Narres M, Kvitkina T, Wilk A, Friedel H, Günster C, Hoffmann F, Koch M, Jandeleit-Dahm K, Icks A (2021) Renal replacement therapy in people with and without diabetes in Germany, 2010–2016: an analysis of more than 25 million inhabitants. Diabetes Care 44(6):1291–1299. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc20-2477
- Cohen AJ, Brauer M, Burnett R, Anderson HR, Frostad J, Estep K, Balakrishnan K, Brunekreef B, Dandona L, Dandona R, Feigin V, Freedman G, Hubbell B, Jobling A, Kan H, Knibbs L, Liu Y, Martin R, Morawska L, Pope CA 3rd, Shin H, Straif K, Shaddick G, Thomas M, van Dingenen R, van Donkelaar A, Vos T, Murray CJL, Forouzanfar MH (2017) 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 389(10082):1907–1918. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30505-6
- Collatuzzo G, Boffetta P (2023) Cancers Attributable to Modifiable Risk Factors: A Road Map for Prevention. Annu Rev Public Health 44:279–300. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publh ealth-052220-124030
- de Bont J, Jaganathan S, Dahlquist M, Persson Å, Stafoggia M, Ljungman P (2022) Ambient air pollution and cardiovascular diseases:

an umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. J Intern Med 291(6):779–800. https://doi.org/10.1111/joim.13467

- GBD 2019 Diabetes and Air Pollution Collaborators (2022) Estimates, trends, and drivers of the global burden of type 2 diabetes attributable to PM2.5 air pollution, 1990–2019: an analysis of data from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet Planet Health 6(7):e586–e600. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(22)00122-X
- GBD Chronic Kidney Disease Collaboration (2020) Global, regional, and national burden of chronic kidney disease, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. Lancet 395(10225):709–733. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30045-3
- Huang J, Pan X, Guo X, Li G (2018) Health impact of China's Air Pollution Prevention and Control Action Plan: an analysis of national air quality monitoring and mortality data. Lancet Planet Health 2(7):e313–e323. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(18)30141-4
- Kanagasabai T, Carter E, Yan L, Chan Q, Elliott P, Ezzati M, Kelly F, Xie G, Yang X, Zhao L, Guo D, Daskalopoulou SS, Wu Y, Baumgartner J (2022) Cross-sectional study of household solid fuel use and renal function in older adults in China. Environ Res 219:115117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.115117
- Kurella Tamura M, Vittinghoff E, Yang J, Go AS, Seliger SL, Kusek JW, Lash J, Cohen DL, Simon J, Batuman V, Ordonez J, Makos G, Yaffe K (2016) Anemia and risk for cognitive decline in chronic kidney disease. BMC Nephrol 17:13. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12882-016-0226-6
- Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, Zhang YL, Castro AF 3rd, Feldman HI, Kusek JW, Eggers P, Van Lente F, Greene T, Coresh J, CKD-EPI (Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration) (2009) A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. Ann Intern Med 150(9):604–612. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-150-9-200905050-00006
- Lin SY, Hsu WH, Lin CL, Lin CC, Lin CH, Wang IK, Hsu CY, Kao CH (2018) Association of Exposure to Fine-Particulate Air Pollution and Acidic Gases with Incidence of Nephrotic Syndrome. Int J Environ Res Public Health 15(12):2860. https://doi.org/10. 3390/ijerph15122860
- Lin SY, Ju SW, Lin CL, Hsu WH, Lin CC, Ting IW, Kao CH (2020a) Air pollutants and subsequent risk of chronic kidney disease and end-stage renal disease: A population-based cohort study. Environ Pollut 261:114154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114154
- Lin YT, Lo YC, Chiang HY, Jung CR, Wang CM, Chan TC, Kuo CC, Hwang BF (2020b) Particulate Air Pollution and Progression to Kidney Failure With Replacement Therapy: An Advanced CKD Registry-Based Cohort Study in Taiwan. Am J Kidney Dis 76(5):645-657.e1. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2020.02.447
- Liu ZH (2013) Nephrology in china. Nat Rev Nephrol 9(9):523–528. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneph.2013.146
- Liu X, Yu S, Mao Z, Li Y, Zhang H, Yang K, Zhang H, Liu R, Qian X, Li L, Bie R, Wang C (2018) Dyslipidemia prevalence, awareness, treatment, control, and risk factors in Chinese rural population: the Henan rural cohort study. Lipids Health Dis 17(1):119. https:// doi.org/10.1186/s12944-018-0768-7
- Mehta AJ, Zanobetti A, Bind MA, Kloog I, Koutrakis P, Sparrow D, Vokonas PS, Schwartz JD (2016) Long-Term Exposure to Ambient Fine Particulate Matter and Renal Function in Older Men: The Veterans Administration Normative Aging Study. Environ Health Perspect 124(9):1353–1360. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1510269
- Nemmar A, Al-Salam S, Zia S, Yasin J, Al Husseni I, Ali BH (2010) Diesel exhaust particles in the lung aggravate experimental acute renal failure. Toxicol Sci 113(1):267–277. https://doi.org/10.1093/ toxsci/kfp222
- Nemmar A, Karaca T, Beegam S, Yuvaraju P, Yasin J, Hamadi NK, Ali BH (2016) Prolonged Pulmonary Exposure to Diesel Exhaust Particles Exacerbates Renal Oxidative Stress, Inflammation and DNA Damage in Mice with Adenine-Induced Chronic Renal

Failure. Cell Physiol Biochem 38(5):1703–1713. https://doi.org/ 10.1159/000443109

- O'Neill MS, Diez-Roux AV, Auchincloss AH, Franklin TG, Jacobs DR Jr, Astor BC, Dvonch JT, Kaufman J (2008) Airborne particulate matter exposure and urinary albumin excretion: the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. Occup Environ Med 65(8):534–540. https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2007.035238
- Radcliffe NJ, Seah JM, Clarke M, MacIsaac RJ, Jerums G, Ekinci EI (2017) Clinical predictive factors in diabetic kidney disease progression. J Diabetes Investig 8(1):6–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/ jdi.12533
- Saran R, Robinson B, Abbott KC, Bragg-Gresham J, Chen X, Gipson D, Gu H, Hirth RA, Hutton D, Jin Y, Kapke A, Kurtz V, Li Y, McCullough K, Modi Z, Morgenstern H, Mukhopadhyay P, Pearson J, Pisoni R, Repeck K, Schaubel DE, Shamraj R, Steffick D, Turf M, Woodside KJ, Xiang J, Yin M, Zhang X, Shahinian V (2020) US Renal Data System 2019 Annual Data Report: epidemiology of kidney disease in the United States. Am J Kidney Dis 75(1 Suppl 1):A6–A7. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2019.09.003
- Sattar A, Argyropoulos C, Weissfeld L, Younas N, Fried L, Kellum JA, Unruh M (2012) All-cause and cause-specific mortality associated with diabetes in prevalent hemodialysis patients. BMC Nephrol 13:130. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2369-13-130
- Shubham S, Kumar M, Sarma DK, Kumawat M, Verma V, Samartha RM, Tiwari RR (2022) Role of air pollution in chronic kidney disease: an update on evidence, mechanisms and mitigation strategies. Int Arch Occup Environ Health 95(5):897–908. https://doi. org/10.1007/s00420-021-01808-6
- Singh A, Kamal R, Mudiam MK, Gupta MK, Satyanarayana GN, Bihari V, Shukla N, Khan AH, Kesavachandran CN (2016) Heat and PAHs emissions in indoor kitchen air and its impact on kidney dysfunctions among kitchen workers in Lucknow, North India. Plos One 11(2):e0148641. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148641
- Sun H, Saeedi P, Karuranga S, Pinkepank M, Ogurtsova K, Duncan BB, Stein C, Basit A, Chan JCN, Mbanya JC, Pavkov ME, Ramachandaran A, Wild SH, James S, Herman WH, Zhang P, Bommer C, Kuo S, Boyko EJ, Magliano DJ (2022) IDF Diabetes Atlas: Global, regional and country-level diabetes prevalence estimates for 2021 and projections for 2045. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 183:109119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2021.109119
- Tampe B, Zeisberg M (2014) Contribution of genetics and epigenetics to progression of kidney fibrosis. Nephrol Dial Transplant 29(Suppl 4):iv72-79. https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gft025
- TaveraBusso I, Mateos AC, Juncos LI, Canals N, Carreras HA (2018) Kidney damage induced by sub-chronic fine particulate matter exposure. Environ Int 121(Pt 1):635–642. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.envint.2018.10.007
- van Westing AC, Küpers LK, Geleijnse JM (2020) Diet and kidney function: a literature review. Curr Hypertens Rep 22(2):14. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s11906-020-1020-1

- Verhoeven JI, Allach Y, Vaartjes ICH, Klijn CJM, de Leeuw FE (2021) Ambient air pollution and the risk of ischaemic and haemorrhagic stroke. Lancet Planet Health 5(8):e542–e552. https://doi.org/10. 1016/S2542-5196(21)00145-5
- Wang W, Wu C, Mu Z, Gu Y, Zheng Y, Ren L, Hu Y, Liang A, Peng L, Zhang L, Li J (2020) Effect of ambient air pollution exposure on renal dysfunction among hospitalized patients in Shanghai, China. Public Health 181:196–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.01.001
- Wang L, Peng W, Zhao Z, Zhang M, Shi Z, Song Z, Zhang X, Li C, Huang Z, Sun X, Wang L, Zhou M, Wu J, Wang Y (2021) Prevalence and treatment of diabetes in China, 2013–2018. JAMA 326(24):2498–2506. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.22208
- Wang J, Li D, Sun Y, Tian Y (2022) Air pollutants, genetic factors, and risk of chronic kidney disease: findings from the UK Biobank. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf 247:114219. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ecoenv.2022.114219
- Weaver AM, Wang Y, Wellenius GA, Young B, Boyle LD, Hickson DA, Diamantidis CJ (2019) Long-term exposure to ambient air pollution and renal function in African Americans: the Jackson Heart Study. J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol 29(4):548–556. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-018-0092-3
- Xue B, Wang B, Lei R, Li Y, Luo B, Yang A, Zhang K (2022) Indoor solid fuel use and renal function among middle-aged and older adults: a national study in rural China. Environ Res 206:112588. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.112588
- Yan YH, Chou CC-K, Wang JS, Tung CL, Li YR, Lo K, Cheng TJ (2014) Subchronic effects of inhaled ambient particulate matter on glucose homeostasis and target organ damage in a type 1 diabetic rat model. Toxicol Appl Pharmacol 281(2):211–220. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.taap.2014.10.005
- Yang YR, Chen YM, Chen SY, Chan CC (2017) Associations between Long-Term Particulate Matter Exposure and Adult Renal Function in the Taipei Metropolis. Environ Health Perspect 125(4):602– 607. https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP302
- Zhou BF (2002) Effect of body mass index on all-cause mortality and incidence of cardiovascular diseases–report for meta-analysis of prospective studies open optimal cut-off points of body mass index in Chinese adults. Biomed Environ Sci 15(3):245–252
- Zimmet P, Alberti KG, Magliano DJ, Bennett PH (2016) Diabetes mellitus statistics on prevalence and mortality: facts and fallacies. Nat Rev Endocrinol 12(10):616–622. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrendo. 2016.105

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.