Table S1. Meta-regression of age and IR biomarkers exposure to air pollutants.

Pollutants and IR	0/ -1	0E9/ CI	CE	1	p-value	
biomarkers	% change	95%CI	SE	z-value		
PM _{2.5} and HOMA-IR	0.0378	(-0.6293, 0.7048)	0.3403	0.1110	0.9116	
PM _{2.5} and glucose	0.0088	(-0.0259, 0.0435)	0.0177	0.4957	0.6201	
PM _{2.5} and insulin	0.3130	(-0.5472, 1.1733)	0.4389	0.7132	0.4757	
PM _{2.5} and HbA1c	0.1069	(-0.1006, 0.3145	0.1059	1.0097	0.3126	
PM _{2.5} and leptin	1.8871	(-1.6166, 5.3908	1.7876	1.0556	0.2911	
NO ₂ and HOMA-IR	0.5132	(-0.6013, 1.6277	0.5686	0.9026	0.3668	
NO2 and glucose	0.0356	(-0.0084, 0.0795	0.0224	1.5864	0.1126	
NO ₂ and insulin	0.6673	(-0.8950, 2.2296	0.7971	0.8371	0.4025	
PM ₁₀ and HOMA-IR	0.1624	(-0.6078, 0.9326	0.3930	0.4133	0.6794	

SE (Standard error): The standard error of a statistic (usually an estimate of a parameter) is the standard deviation of its sampling distribution or an estimate of that standard deviation.

Table S2. Specifics of quality score of the included studies.

	2 w 20 021 of comes of quanty score of the metataca statutes.									
		Thiering et al. (2013)	Wolf et al. (2016)	Thiering et al. (2016)	Madhlouma et al. (2017)	Alderete et al. (2017)	Li et al. (2018)			
NO	OS quality score	7	7	6	7	6	8			
Selection										
1)	Representativeness of the exposed cohort									
a)	truly representative of the average (describe) in the community									
b)	somewhat representative of the average in the community	b	b	С	С	С	b			
c)	selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers									
d)	no description of the derivation of the cohort									
2)	Selection of the non-exposed cohort	b	a	b	2	2	2			
a)	drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort	U	а	U	a	a	a			

b)) drawn from a different source									
c)	no description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort									
3)	Ascertainment of exposure									
a)	secure record (eg surgical records)									
b)	structured interview	a	a	a	a	a	a			
c)	written self-report									
d)	no description									
4)	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of									
st	udy	2	b		2		a			
a)	yes	a	U	a	a	a				
b)	no									
C	Comparability									
1)	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis						b			
a)	study controls for (select the most important factor)	b	b	b	b	b				
b)	study controls for any additional factor (This criteria could be	D	U							
	modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)									
O	Outcome									
1)	Assessment of outcome									
a)	independent blind assessment									
b)	record linkage	a	a	a	a	a	a			
c)	self-report									
d)	no description									
2)	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur									
a)	yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest)	a	a	a	a	a	a			
b)	no									

3)	Adequacy of follow up of cohorts						
a)	complete follow up - all subjects accounted for						
b)	subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number						
	lost - > % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description	h	b	b	b	d	b
	provided of those lost)	D	D				
c)	follow up rate <% (select an adequate %) and no description of						
	those lost						
d)	no statement						