

Table S1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION		ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE				
Title		1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT				
Structured summary		2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	1 & 2
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale		3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	2 & 3
Objectives		4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	3
METHODS				
Protocol and registration		5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	3
Eligibility criteria		6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	3
Information sources*		7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	3
Search		8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Supplementary File
Selection of sources of evidence†		9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	Supplementary File
Data charting process‡		10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	4
Data items		11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	4
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§		12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	N/A
Synthesis of results		13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	4

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	4 & 5
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	4 & 5
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	N/A
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	6-12
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	6-12
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	12
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	13-15
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	14
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	14

JB1 = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JB1 guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

Table S2: Data Extraction Form

		Study 1	Study 2	Study [...]
1	Covidence #			
2	Study ID			
3	Title			
4	Reviewer Name			
5	Year of Publication			
6	First Author Name (Last Name, First Name)			
7	What was the location of the study?			
8	If located in the United States, provide the state, county, region, city, etc.			
9	Who is the study population?:			
10	Population Description Details			
11	Age (range / mean $\pm$ SD) Details			
12	Sex / Gender Distribution Details			
13	Sample Size (Total, by subgroup if relevant) Details			
14	Is this a vulnerable population?			
15	Additional notes on vulnerable populations			
16	Describe how PM 2.5 was measured			
17	Describe how anemia was measured			
18	List nutrients assessed and/or reported			
19	How were these nutrients measured?			
20	How were nutrients and/or diet assessed or described?			
21	Did the study measure or report on PROGRESS-Plus factors?:			
	P – Place of residence (urban/rural, region, neighborhood, etc.) Mentioned (Y/N)			
	P – Place of residence (urban/rural, region, neighborhood, etc.) Description / Notes (optional)			
	R – Race/Ethnicity/Cultural identity Mentioned (Y/N)			
	R – Race/Ethnicity/Cultural identity Description / Notes (optional)			
	O – Occupation Mentioned (Y/N)			
	O – Occupation Description / Notes (optional)			
	G – Gender or Sex Mentioned (Y/N)			
	G – Gender or Sex Description / Notes (optional)			
	R – Religion Mentioned (Y/N)			
	R – Religion Description / Notes (optional)			
	E – Education level Mentioned (Y/N)			

		Study 1	Study 2	Study [...]
	E – Education level Description / Notes (optional)			
	S – Socioeconomic status (income, wealth, etc.) Mentioned (Y/N)			
	S – Socioeconomic status (income, wealth, etc.) Description / Notes (optional)			
	S – Social capital or community support Mentioned (Y/N)			
	S – Social capital or community support Description / Notes (optional)			
	Does the study explain how PROGRESS-Plus factors affect exposure to PM 2.5?			
22	If yes, how does it describe the relationship between PROGRESS-Plus factors and PM2.5? (Provide direct quotes)			
23	Does the study explain how PROGRESS-Plus factors affect nutrient access/status?			
24	If yes, how does it describe the relationship between PROGRESS-Plus factors and nutrient access/status? (Provide direct quotes)			
25	Does the study explain how PROGRESS-Plus factors modify the susceptibility to PM 2.5-related anemia?			
26	If yes, how does it describe the relationship between PROGRESS-Plus factors and PM2.5 related anemia?(Provide direct quotes)			
27	What are the findings regarding anemia and air pollution exposure? (Provide a brief summary)			
28	What are the findings regarding how nutrients/diet modify the relationship between PM2.5 and air pollution? (Provide a brief summary)			
29	Did the study provide recommendations for policy, clinical practice, or further research?			
30	If yes, describe the recommendations.			
31	Did the study explicitly mention strengths relevant to your objectives?			
32	If yes, describe the strengths.			
33	Did the study explicitly mention limitations relevant to your objectives?			
34	If yes, describe the limitations.			