

Autism spectrum disorder and air pollution: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Frédéric Dutheil, Aurélie Comptour, Roxane Morlon, Martial Mermillod, Bruno Pereira, Julien S. Baker, Morteza Charkhabi, Maëlys Clinchamps, Nicolas Bourdel

▶ To cite this version:

Frédéric Dutheil, Aurélie Comptour, Roxane Morlon, Martial Mermillod, Bruno Pereira, et al.. Autism spectrum disorder and air pollution: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Environmental Pollution, 2021, 278, pp.116856. 10.1016/j.envpol.2021.116856 . hal-03403803

HAL Id: hal-03403803 https://hal.science/hal-03403803v1

Submitted on 15 Mar 2023 $\,$

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1	Autism spectrum disorder and air pollution:
2	a systematic review and meta-analysis
3 4	Frédéric Dutheil ^{1*†} , Aurélie Comptour ^{2†} , Roxane Morlon ³ , Martial Mermillod ⁴ , Bruno
5	Pereira ⁵ , Julien S Baker ⁶ , Morteza Charkhabi ⁷ , Maëlys Clinchamps ⁸ , Nicolas Bourdel ⁹
6	
7 8	¹ Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, LaPSCo, Physiological and Psychosocial Stress, University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, CHU Clermont-Ferrand, Occupational and
9	Environmental Medicine, WittyFit, Clermont-Ferrand, France
10	² INSERM, CIC 1405 CRECHE Unit, University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, CHU
11	Clermont-Ferrand, Gynecological Surgery, Clermont-Ferrand, France
12	³ Université Clermont Auvergne, Faculty of Medicine, Occupational and Environmental
13	Medicine, Clermont-Ferrand, France
14	⁴ Univ. Grenoble Alpes, LPNC, Grenoble, France & CNRS, LPNC, Grenoble, France
15	³ University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, CHU Clermont-Ferrand, Biostatistics, Clermont-
16	Ferrand, France
17	^o Hong Kong Baptist University, Physical Education and Health, Centre for Health and
18	Exercise Science Research, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong
19	[*] National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia.
20	^o Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, LaPSCo, Physiological and Psychosocial Stress,
21	University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, CHU Clermont-Ferrand, Occupational and
22	Environmental Medicine, Clermont-Ferrand, France
23	⁹ Université Clermont Auvergne, UMR 6602, Pascal Institute, Endoscopy and Computer
24	Vision Group, University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, CHU Clermont-Ferrand,
25	Gynecological Surgery, Clermont-Ferrand, France
26	Contributed equally to this work
27	
28	*Corresponding author: Frédéric Dutheil, Occupational and Environmental Medicine, CHU
29	Clermont-Ferrand, France. 58, Rue Montalembert, 63003 Clermont Ferrand, Tel: +33 6 88 22
30	48 48, Fax: +33 4 73 27 46 49, <u>fdutheil@chu-clermontferrand.fr</u>
31	Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

32 Abstract

33 Despite the widely-known effects of air pollution, pollutants exposure surrounding pregnancy and the risk for autism spectrum disorder (ASD) in newborns remains controversial. The 34 35 purpose of our study was to carry out a systematic review and meta-analyses of the risk of ASD in newborns following air pollution exposure during the perinatal period (preconception 36 to second year of life). The PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase and ScienceDirect databases 37 38 were searched for articles, published up to July 2020, with the keywords "air pollution" and "autism". Three models were used for each meta-analysis: a global model based on all risks 39 listed in included articles, a pessimistic model based on less favorable data only, and an 40 41 optimistic model based on the most favorable data only. 28 studies corresponding to a total of 758 997 newborns were included (47190 ASD and 703980 controls). Maternal exposure to all 42 pollutants was associated with an increased risk of ASD in newborns by 3.9 % using the 43 global model and by 12.3% using the optimistic model, while the pessimistic model found no 44 change. Each increase of $5\mu g/m^3$ in particulate matter <2.5 μ m (PM2.5) was associated with 45 46 an increased risk of ASD in newborns, regardless of the model used (global +7%, pessimistic +5%, optimistic +15%). This risk increased during preconception (global +17%), during 47 pregnancy (global +5%, and optimistic +16%), and during the postnatal period (global +11%) 48 49 and optimistic +16%). Evidence levels were poor for other pollutants (PM10, NOx, O3, metals, solvents, styrene, PAHs, pesticides). PM2.5 was associated with a greater risk than 50 PM10 (coefficient 0.20, 95CI -0.02 to 0.42), NOx (0.29, 0.08 to 0.50) or solvents (0.24, 0.04 51 to 0.44). All models revealed that exposure to pollutants, notably PM2.5 during pregnancy, 52 was associated with an increased risk of ASD in newborns. Pregnancy and postnatal periods 53 54 seem to be the most at-risk periods.

55

57 Capsule: air pollution surrounding pregnancy increases the risk of ASD in newborns.

58

59 Introduction

Air pollution is a major public health ¹ and economic ² issue. associated with increased risk of 60 mortality² and morbidity in multiple diseases, such as cancer³, inflammatory⁴, neurological⁵ 61 and respiratory and cardiometabolic diseases $^{6-8}$. Despite the considerable number of studies 62 demonstrating the adverse health effects of air pollution, exposure to ambient air pollution 63 surrounding pregnancy and the risk for Autism Spectrum disorder (ASD) in newborns 64 remains controversial 9-12. Genetic and environmental factors specifically during perinatal 65 periods (preconception, pregnancy (first, second, third trimester), postnatal until 2nd year of 66 life) have been found to increase risk of pathology and malformation in children ^{13–15}. Air 67 pollution is composed of a wide range of pollutants such as particulate matter (PM), nitrogen 68 oxide (NOx), volatile organic compounds, pesticides, ozone (O3) and metals ^{16,17}. Though 69 few studies have focused on pregnancy and risk of ASD, air pollutants such as PM (PM10, 70 with an aerodynamic diameter $< 10 \,\mu\text{m}$), appear to have the highest levels of toxicity ^{18,19}. 71 Among PM10²⁰, PM2.5 which have an even smaller aerodynamic diameter $\leq 2.5 \ \mu m$ are 72 particularly harmful, penetrating more rapidly, easily and deeply into the organism ^{18,19}. 73 Despite a recent article ²¹, no meta-analysis to date has provided an overview or comparison 74 of the effects of classes of air pollutants ²², or the effects of sociodemographic risk factors 75 such as parental ages, gender of newborns, or smoking ²³⁻²⁵. In addition, there are no 76 published guidelines as yet on how to manage different data relating to a same risk within an 77 included article (e.g. crude odds ratio, or adjusted on different covariables) ²² and no meta-78 analysis presented both risks quantified either as continuous (per increment of air pollutants) 79 or as categorical variables (high versus low exposure). 80

We hypothesized that there was an increased risk of developing ASD associated with air pollution during pregnancy. This meta-analysis focused on the association between children with ASD and exposure to air pollutants during the perinatal period (from preconception to the second year of life) and involved three models for each meta-analysis by air pollutant; a global model using all risks listed in included articles, a pessimistic model using less favorable data only, and an optimistic model using the most favorable data only. We also investigated related sociodemographic influences.

88

89 Methods

90 Literature search

We reviewed all studies reporting an association between air pollutants and ASD. The 91 92 PubMed, Cochrane Library, ScienceDirect and Embase databases were searched for all original articles published up to July 2020, using the keywords "air pollution" and "autism" or 93 synonyms (see Appendix 1 for detailed search strategy). Inclusion criteria included articles 94 95 written in English or French, and that described our primary outcome variable i.e. the association between perinatal exposure to ambient air pollution and risk of ASD. The 96 perinatal period included the preconception period to the second year of life. Studies were 97 98 required to report risk estimates in the form of odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95CI) or to provide data that allowed OR calculation. In order to identify studies not found 99 100 through our database search strategy, a manually search of new articles was carried out using reference lists from all publications meeting inclusion criteria and systematic reviews. Our 101 search strategy is presented in Figure 1 and Appendix 1. Two authors (AC and FD) separately 102 conducted all literature searches, collated and, reviewed the abstracts based on selection 103 criteria and decided on the suitability of articles for inclusion. When questions arose over 104

article suitability, a third author (NB) reviewed the articles. Having reached a consensus, allincluded articles were reviewed by the three authors.

107

108 **Quality of assessment**

The methodological quality of the studies was further evaluated using the Scottish 109 Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN) model for case control and cohort studies ²⁶. The 110 following 15 items were assessed: appropriate and clearly focused question, selection bias (2 111 items), performance bias (1 item), attrition bias (2 items), detection bias (6 items), confusion 112 bias (1 item), presence of confidence intervals, and general level of evidence (Figure 2). 113 Similar items were used to evaluate case control studies (Figure 2). We also used the 114 Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS) model ²⁷ with the following 9 items: 115 selection bias (4 items), comparability bias (2 items) and outcome bias (3 items) 116 (Supplementary Figure 1). Each item was assigned a judgment of "Yes" (+), "No" (-), "Can't 117 say" (?), or "Not applicable" (NA), with the exception of item 2.1 (to minimize risk of bias or 118 confounding) and the final item concerning evidence level of the SIGN checklist, which was 119 assigned "0", "+", or "++". Any disagreements over suitability were discussed with a third 120 author (BP) and a consensus reached. Assessment of article quality was carried out for the 121 two checklists by two authors (AC and FD). 122

123

124 Data analysis

The following data from articles were recorded: title, name of first author, journal and year of publication, main objective, time of exposure to air pollution (perinatal period, full pregnancy or during, first, second and/or third trimester of pregnancy and postnatal period), type and concentration of pollutants, crude and/or adjusted OR and lower and upper limits, and population characteristics (number of participants per study, parental mean age at birth,gender of newborns, level of parental education, smoking).

131

132 Statistical considerations

Statistical analysis was conducted using Stata software (version 15, StataCorp, College 133 Station, US)^{28–33}. Characteristics of pollutant exposure, of individuals or other variables were 134 reported for each study as mean ± standard-deviation (SD) and number (%) for continuous 135 and categorical variables respectively (Table 1). When data could be pooled, we conducted 136 random effects meta-analyses (DerSimonian and Laird approach)³⁴ on the risk (OR) of ASD 137 138 in newborns following air pollutants exposure, centered at one. Particular attention was paid to the type of statistics retrieved from the included articles (OR or other risk measurements). 139 Air pollutants exposure were quantified either as a continuous (per increment of air 140 141 pollutants) or as categorical variables (high versus low exposure). For the highest level of proof, we first normalised all OR for a standardized increment in pollutant concentration (for 142 example per 5 μ g/m³ increase in PM2.5). We took into account the original increment of the 143 pollutant and we assumed a linear exposure outcome relationship ³⁵ using the following 144 equation: OR standardized = e^{1} [Ln(OR original) * 10 / (Increment original)]³⁶. When air 145 pollutant levels were expressed in parts per billion (ppb), we transformed those levels in 146 $\mu g/m^3$ (for example NO₂: 1 ppb = 1.88 $\mu g/m^3$; O₃: 1ppb = 2 $\mu g/m^3$)³⁷ The effects expressed as 147 interquartile (or quintile, or percentile differences) were converted into effects per 148 concentration unit increase with the previous equation (³⁶ Meta-analyses were computed by 149 type of air pollutants (PM2.5, PM10, NOx, O₃, metals, solvents, styrene, polycyclic aromatic 150 hydrocarbons (PAHs), pesticides), periconceptional periods, and pregnancy trimester where 151 sufficient data were available. For each meta-analysis, three models were used (a global 152 model of all risks listed in the included articles, a pessimistic model using less favorable data 153

only, and an optimistic model using the most favorable data only). Finally, we computed the 154 aforementioned meta-analyses categorical using OR based on categorical exposure (high 155 versus low exposure). For air pollutants that were the most reported, we also computed 156 sensitivity analyses depending on the methods to measure air pollutants. Heterogeneity 157 between studies was evaluated through forest plots, and their confidence intervals (CI), and I-158 squared (I^2) – varying from 0 to 100%. Heterogeneity is considered low for $I^2 < 25\%$, modest 159 for $25 < I^2 < 50\%$, and high for $I^2 > 50\%$. For example, a significant heterogeneity may be due to 160 the variability between the characteristics of the studies, such as the exposure to air pollutants 161 (type of air pollutants), periconceptional periods (preconception, pregnancy, postnatal), 162 pregnancy trimester (first, second, third), characteristics of individuals (age of mothers and 163 fathers, smoking, gender of newborns, etc). To ensure the robustness of our results, we 164 conducted sensitivity analysis by searching for potential publication bias through funnel plots 165 166 (metafunnels) of aforementioned meta-analyses. Then, we reperformed meta-analyses without the studies that were not evenly distributed around the funnel base ³⁸. When sample size 167 allowed, meta-regressions were performed to investigate the relationship between risk of ASD 168 169 in newborns following air pollutant exposure and putative variables such as type of air pollutant, periconceptional period, pregnancy trimester and population characteristics. Results 170 were expressed as regression coefficients and 95% CI. 171

172

173 **Results**

An initial search identified 913 possible articles for inclusion (Figure 1). Following
application of selection criteria and removal of duplicates 28 articles were selected ^{9–12,17,39–61}
(Table 1), all of which were written in English.

177

178 Quality of articles

Use of the SIGN model, notably revealed selection and attrition bias in included studies. Most studies had a high level of evidence. Detailed characteristics of methodological quality assessment for each included study are provided in Figure 2. Overall, for the SIGN model, most studies were shown to have a high level of evidence but performed, with lowest performance found response rate. The NOS model was also used to analyse the quality of included articles (Supplementary Figure 1).



186 Aims of included studies, study designs, and settings

All studies shared a similar objective i.e. the association of exposure to air pollution (PMs, 187 NOx, O3, metals, PAHs, solvents, pesticides) during the perinatal period and the development 188 of ASD. Six studies described a cohort study design ^{11,12,40,41,56,58} using a historical birth/child 189 cohort. The 22 remaining studies ^{9,10,17,39,42–54,57,59–61} described case control studies. Most 190 191 studies assessed exposure over several consecutive years with the exception of four studies which analyzed data from one year ^{10,40,42,50,60}. *Countries of exposure* included North America 192 for 20 studies (U.S ^{17,39-44,46,48-53,56,57,59-61}, Canada ¹²), Europe for 5 studies (Denmark ⁴⁷, 193 Sweden ^{9,10,58} and other European countries ¹¹), and Asia for 3 studies (Iran ⁵⁵, Israel ⁴⁵, China 194 ⁵⁴). 195

196

197 **Population**

Sample size for children with ASD ranged from 124 ⁵⁴ to 15 387 ⁴⁵. Population size for controls (children without ASD) ranged from 156 ⁵² to 130 949 ¹². In total 751 170 individuals (47190 ASD and 703980 controls) were included in this meta-analysis.

Age of mothers at birth was expressed as a mean value in 11 articles $^{9-12,45-50,56}$, ranging from 202 29.5 ± 5.0 47 to 34.0 ± 4.0 years old 46 for mothers of ASD (mean age 31.6, 95CI 28.3 to 203 34.9), and 28.5 ± 6.0 50 to 33.7 ± 3.7 46 years for mothers of controls (mean age 31.7, 95CI 204 28.6 to 34.7). Twelve articles reported different classes of age ^{17,39,42-44,51,54,55,57-60}, precluding
205 further analyses. Five articles did not mention age of mothers (37,48,49,57,60).

Age of fathers at birth was not reported in most (19/28) articles $^{9,11,12,17,40-44,48,51-54,56-59,61}$. Three articles expressed age of fathers at birth as classes 39,55,60 , and six as mean values $^{10,45-}$ 47,49,50 , ranging from 32.2 ± 6.1 47 to 36.8 ± 5.3 years 46 for fathers of ASD (mean age 33.9, 95CI 28.6 to 39.4), and 31.4 ± 6.6 50 to 33.7 ± 5.6 49 years for fathers of controls (mean age 33.9, 95CI 29.3 to 38.7).

Gender: All articles except two ^{53,61} reported child with ASD gender, ranging from 29% ⁵¹ to
87% ⁵². Seven articles did not report child without ASD gender ^{17,40–42,52,53,61}. 77% (95CI 73 to
81%) of children with ASD and 60% (95CI 55 to 65%) of children without ASD were boys.

214

215 Characteristics of air pollutant exposure

Types of pollutants analyzed in these articles included PM2.5 in 13 studies 11,12,39,44,46,47,49,52,54,56,57,59,61 , PM10 in 12 studies $^{9-11,39,43,47,52,54-56,59,61}$, NOx in 12 studies $^{9-12,39,45,47,52,56,58,59,61}$, O3 in 7 studies 39,44,52,56,57,59,61 , metals in 7 studies $^{17,40-42,48,50,60}$, solvents in 5 studies 17,42,50,55,60 , styrene in 3 studies 17,42,50 , PAHs in 3 studies 17,42,50 , and pesticides in 3 studies 17,42,50 .

Type of exposure included a general outdoor exposure in 19 studies ^{11,12,17,40–43,45–}
 ^{48,52,53,56,57,59,61}, in cities or regions of high human density in ten studies ^{9,10,39,44,49,50,54,55,58,60},
 with one study focusing on distance from homes to freeway and major roads ⁵¹.

Perinatal periods of exposure: 6 studies analyzed exposure to air pollutants during
 preconception ^{41–43,46,49,57}, 25 during pregnancy ^{9–12,17,39–41,43–47,49–53,55–61}, 9 during the postnatal
 period ^{9,10,43,46,48,49,54,56,57} and 5 during the two first years of life ^{44,45,47,52,61}.

Quantification of exposure: Most studies ^{9,11,12,17,39,40,43,45,47,48,50,54,55,57-59} assessed exposure
 to pollutants first by geocoding birth certificate residential addresses, followed by use of

different models (NATA for National-scale air toxics assessment ^{17,40,48,50}; LUR model for
 Land Use Regression ^{12,39,55}; CALINE4 line source air quality dispersion model ^{53,61}) to
 estimate average pollutant concentration at participants' home address at time of birth..

232

233 Meta-analysis by air pollutants

PM 2.5: Each increase of $5\mu g/m^3$ in PM2.5 was associated with an increased risk of ASD in 234 235 newborns, regardless of the model used (global +7%, pessimistic +5%, optimistic +15%). This risk increased during preconception (global +17%), during pregnancy (global +5%, and 236 optimistic +16%), and during the postnatal period (global +11% and optimistic +16%) (Figure 237 3). The risk was increased during the first and third trimesters regardless of the model used 238 (global +7% and +6%, pessimistic +7% and +7%, optimistic +7% and +7%, respectively) 239 240 (Figure 4). Results by periconceptional periods (preconception, pregnancy, postnatal) (Supplementary Figure 2), and by pregnancy trimester (first, second, third) were similar using 241 categorical data (high exposure versus low exposure): the risk of ASD in newborns increased 242 243 regardless of the model used (global +11%, pessimistic +6%, optimistic +16%). Results were also similar (Supplementary Figure 3). 244

PM 10: Each increase of $5\mu g/m^3$ in PM10 was not associated with risk of ASD using the 245 global model (-1%, non-significant), and was associated with a decreased risk of ASD using 246 247 the pessimistic model (-3%), and with an increased risk using the optimistic model (+1%). 248 Meta-analysis by periconception periods was associated with a decreased risk using the pessimistic model for the pregnancy period only (-4%) and with an increased risk using the 249 optimistic model for the postnatal period only (+2%) (Figure 3). There was not enough data to 250 251 perform meta-analysis by trimester using incremental risk (continuous data). Results were 252 also similar by periconceptional periods (preconception, pregnancy, postnatal) (Supplementary Figure 2) using categorical data. Meta-analysis by trimester did not reveal
any significant increase in risk, regardless of the model used (Supplementary Figure 3).

NOx: Each increase of $10\mu g/m^3$ in NOx was associated with an overall increased risk of ASD using the global (+2%) and optimistic models (+5%), as well as during pregnancy period. No significant results were found using the pessimistic model in all periods (Figure 3). Metaanalysis using categorical risks showed similar results (Supplementary Figure 2).

O3: Using categorical risks, overall risk of ASD following O3 exposure increased using the
global (+3%) and optimistic models (+11%). Similarly, exposure during pregnancy led to an
increase in risk, using the global (+3%) and optimistic (+10%) models only (Supplementary
Figure 2).

Metals: Using categorical risks, exposure to metals did not lead to an increase in risk of ASD using the global model but decreased using the pessimistic model, and increased using the optimistic model (Supplementary Figure 2).

The meta-analysis on **solvent**, **styrene**, **PAH**, and **pesticide** exposure was based on a maximum of five studies. Solvent and styrene exposure was found to increase the risk of ASD using both the global and optimistic models, whereas the pessimistic model showed a decreased risk following solvent exposure. Pesticide exposure was associated with a decreased risk using the global and pessimistic model. PAH exposure did not modify the risk of ASD (Supplementary Figure 2).

All individual meta-analysis are compiled in Supplementary Figure 4 for normalized OR (continuous data) and in Supplementary Figure 5 for categorical data (high versus low exposure).

275

276 Overall meta-analysis

Taking into account all air pollutants levels as categorical levels (high versus low exposure), 277 278 maternal exposure to air pollution was associated with an increased risk of ASD in newborns by 3.9 % using the global model (OR = 1.039, 95% CI 1.031 to 1.048, I2=70.9%), and by 279 12.3% using the optimistic model (1.123, 1.098 to 1.147, I2=83.0%), but not to increase when 280 using the pessimistic model (0.975, 0.960 to 0.991, I2=70.4%). Meta-analysis by 281 periconception periods demonstrated an increased risk during preconception with the 282 optimistic model only, an increased risk during pregnancy with both the global and optimistic 283 models, and an increased risk regardless of the model used during the postnatal period. 284

285

286 Metaregressions and sensitivity analyses

Using categorical levels of exposure, PM2.5 tended to lead to greater increased risk of having 287 a child with ASD compared with exposure to PM10 (coefficient 0.20, 95CI -0.02 to 0.42, 288 289 p=0.073), NOx (coefficient 0.29, 95CI 0.08 to 0.50, p=0.006), and solvents (coefficient 0.24, 95CI 0.04 to 0.44, p=0.017). No other differences between air pollutants exposure were noted, 290 291 nor between periconceptional periods or trimesters. Neither parental age or gender of 292 newborns were found to influence the risk of ASD (Figure 5). Due to insufficient data other sociodemographic variables were not analyzed. Results were similar using continuous levels 293 294 of exposure. For PM2.5 and PM10, meta-analysis depending on the methods to measure air 295 pollutants showed similar results.

296

297

298 Discussion

The main findings revealed that air pollution particularly that of PM2.5 during the periconception period was associated with an increased risk of ASD in newborns, in all models used. The level of evidence is poor for other air pollutants. Exposure during pregnancy (first and third trimesters) and postnatal periods may be the most at-risk periods.
The increased risk of ASD following exposure to air pollutants surrounding pregnancy was
not linked with sociodemographic factors.

305

306 Air pollution and risk of ASD in newborns

We demonstrated that global air pollution exposure in the perinatal period is a risk factor for 307 ASD in newborns. Despite a previous meta-analysis ²¹, there is the first to report a risk based 308 309 on consideration of all air pollutants. As, exposures are in general multiple when quantifying risk, it is likely that overall risk is of most interest as reported by other authors 51-53. ASD was 310 311 first described as a disorder in children with problems relating to others, highly sensitive to changes in their environment ⁶². Prevalence of ASD appears to have increases over time ^{63,64} 312 possibly due to a modified definition of ASD, enhanced awareness and improved diagnosis 313 ^{65,66}, but also to a global increase in air pollutants in most megalopolis ^{67,68}. The rigorous and 314 sensitive statistical approach used in this meta-analysis allowed analysis of several included 315 316 studies presenting different data for the same risk (e.g. several models adjusted on different 317 covariables). There are presently no guidelines on how to manage this issue ²². To avoid potential limitations, we created three models for each meta-analysis; a global model based on 318 all risks reported in included articles, a pessimistic model using less favorable risks only 319 (statistically speaking), and an optimistic model using the most favorable risks only. 320 Unsurprisingly, use of optimistic models led to stronger results, but notably, we were unable 321 to demonstrate an increased risk using the pessimistic model based on all air pollutants. 322

323

324 **PM2.5:** a public health issue

Risk of developing ASD in newborns increased using the global and optimistic models only for all air pollutants, with a strong high risk following exposure to PM2.5 whatever the model. Even use of the pessimistic model based on the least favorable data (those with the least

increased risk) revealed a minimum increased risk of 6% (up to 15% using the optimistic 328 329 model). Nearly all individual studies showed that maternal exposure to PM2.5 was associated with increased risk of newborns with ASD ^{39,44,46,47,49,53,54,56,57,59,61}. Thus indicating the high 330 level of evidence concerning the deleterious effects of PM2.5 and related risk of ASD. PM2.5 331 particles appear to be the most dangerous pollutant due to their small size, and high volatility 332 ⁶⁹, able to be transported over longer distances ⁶⁹. They also have a lower sedimentation 333 velocity than other larger particles such as PM10⁶⁹. PM are primarily composed of toxic 334 particles such as PAHs, inorganic particles (sulfate, nitrate, ammonium), or organic carbon 335 metals (copper, iron, nickel) ^{70,71}. As road traffic is one of the primary sources of PM emission 336 ^{19,70,72} and predicted to double over the next twenty years ⁷³, the impact of PM2.5 on health 337 may become a major public health issue ⁷⁴. As diesel is considered to emit more fine PM than 338 gazoline ^{72,75}, it may become a target for future preventive strategy. Levels of evidence are 339 340 poor for the other air pollutants investigated.

341

342 Late pregnancy and early postnatal period: a key developmental periods

Late pregnancy and early postnatal periods were found to be the most at-risk periods for 343 developing ASD following air pollution exposure. These periods are crucial in the 344 development of the infant ¹³, and can influence long-term health outcomes ⁷⁶. Late pregnancy 345 is important for placental function, fetal growth and brain developments and is also the period 346 when maternal and fetal complications can occur, such as gestational diabetes, pre-eclampsia, 347 hypoxia or brain injury ^{77–80}. Our result showing increased risk of ASD during late pregnancy 348 is in accordance with previous meta-analyses ²¹. Similarly, the early postnatal period can also 349 impact health outcomes as has been shown with breastfeeding which may impact a wide 350 range of parameters such as cognition, brain structure, structural development of the heart and 351 lungs, bone health, or atopy ^{81,82}. In comparison with the meta-analysis of Chun et al., we 352

highlighted the detrimental effects of air pollution leading to increased risk of ASD during the postnatal period, being previously analyzed in relation to the prenatal period. Our results show that the most at-risk periods for ASD were early and late pregnancy and the early postnatal period. These results are in accordance with other studies on air pollution that have showed these periods to also be the most at-risk for other birth outcomes such as hypertension, preeclampsia, pre-term birth, or low birthweight ^{83–85}. Both late pregnancy and the early postnatal period appear key phases as regards vulnerability to air pollution ⁴³

360

361 Influence of sociodemographic and other factors

Most often, etiologies of ASD remain unknown. Although, genetic susceptibility has been 362 highlighted as a risk factor ⁸⁶. No included studies in our meta-analysis indicated genetic 363 susceptibility. Two further highlighted risk factors concern parental age and the newborn 364 gender. Several studies have shown that maternal and/or paternal age ^{87,88}, and male gender 365 ^{89,90} were associated with an increased risk of child neurodevelopmental outcomes such as 366 ASD. In our meta-analysis, neither parental age or newborn genders were found to influence 367 risk following exposure to air pollutants. However, our meta-regressions analyzed whether air 368 pollution modifies this risk depending on parental age or newborn genders. Other investigated 369 putative risk factors for ASD include maternal food intake ⁹¹, low birthweight or preterm birth 370 ^{89,92}. As these factors were not assessed in the articles included in our meta-analysis, further 371 analyses were precluded. 372

373

374 Limitations

Our study has some limitations. Despite the large number of studies, some air pollutants were only included in a few studies. Common air pollutants such as PM2.5, PM10, or NOx, were however commonly assessed and as we included a large sample of 395 615 newborns, this

allowed the greater generalizability of our results. Our meta-analysis inherited the limitations 378 of the 28 included studies and was therefore subject to individual bias such as bias of 379 measures of exposure to air pollutants and bias of reporting of ASD. Despite the quality of 380 research reflected in the studies included in our meta-analyses, ASD covers a wide range of 381 severity that was not reported within included articles. Diagnostic method for ASD also 382 differed, limiting quality of data and precluding further analyses, although, most articles used 383 384 National ASD databases thus guaranteeing data accuracy. A further limitation concerns a possible underestimation of our results. Diagnostic evidence of ASD can be underestimated 385 but is unlikely to be overestimated. Similarly, methods for detection or measurement of air 386 387 pollutant exposure differed between studies, thus precluding assessment of dose response effects. In addition despite similarities, population characteristics between studies were not 388 identical. Data were collected in various countries, but excluded developing countries. The 389 majority of studies were conducted in the USA ^{17,39–44,46,48–53,56,57,59–61}, and to a lesser extent in 390 Europe 9-11,47,58. The lack of data from Africa, Asia, and Oceania reduces potential 391 392 generalizability of our results, though. All ethnicities were included. Generalizability of our results may also be lessened due to analysis of single-site studies, even if the majority of 393 included studies were multi-site. As studies differed in their study design, we performed 394 sensitivity analyses allowing demonstration of similar results whatever the design. In our 395 meta-analysis global model, some included studies appeared several times, with different data 396 for the same outcome depending on adjustment models. In the absence of clear consensus and 397 despite having more effect sizes within each meta-analyses when compared with studies 398 included in several highly-regarded published articles published ^{93,94}, the weight of studies 399 may have required ponderation ⁹⁵. This is one of the reasons for use of optimistic and 400 401 pessimistic models when only one data is available for each included article. A further limitation of our meta-analysis concerns included studies using OR adjusted on different 402

403 factors between studies, even if adjusted OR may limit confusion bias. Finally, causality may

404 also be a limitation in retrospective or case-control studies.

405

406 **Conclusion**

Exposure to air pollution, notably PM2.5 during pregnancy was associated with an increased
risk of ASD in newborns regardless of the model used. The level of evidence concerning
other air pollutants is however poor. Exposure during pregnancy and the postnatal period
appear to be the most at-risk periods.

411

412 **References**

- 1. The Lancet, UK air pollution and public health. *Lancet* 389, 1860 (2017).
- 414 2. Dockery, D. W. & Evans, J. S. Tallying the bills of mortality from air pollution. *Lancet*415 389, 1862–1864 (2017).
- 416 3. Chen, G., Wan, X., Yang, G. & Zou, X. Traffic-related air pollution and lung cancer: A
 417 meta-analysis. *Thorac Cancer* 6, 307–318 (2015).
- 4. Møller, P. *et al.* Oxidative stress and inflammation generated DNA damage by exposure
 to air pollution particles. *Mutat Res Rev Mutat Res* 762, 133–166 (2014).
- 420 5. Costa, L. G., Chang, Y.-C. & Cole, T. B. Developmental Neurotoxicity of Traffic-Related
 421 Air Pollution: Focus on Autism. *Curr Environ Health Rep* 4, 156–165 (2017).
- 422 6. Shah, A. S. V. *et al.* Global association of air pollution and heart failure: a systematic
 423 review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 382, 1039–1048 (2013).
- 424 7. Chiaverini, L. Asthma, particulates, and diesel exhaust. *Med Health R I* 85, 140–142
 425 (2002).
- 426 8. Loxham, M., Davies, D. E. & Holgate, S. T. The health effects of fine particulate air pollution. *BMJ* 367, 16609 (2019).
- 428 9. Gong, T. *et al.* Exposure to air pollution from traffic and neurodevelopmental disorders in
 429 Swedish twins. *Twin Res Hum Genet* 17, 553–562 (2014).
- 430 10. Gong, T. *et al.* Perinatal Exposure to Traffic-Related Air Pollution and Autism Spectrum
 431 Disorders. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 125, 119–126 (2017).
- 432 11. Guxens, M. *et al.* Air Pollution Exposure during Pregnancy and Childhood Autistic Traits
 433 in Four European Population-Based Cohort Studies: The ESCAPE Project. *Environ.*
- 434 *Health Perspect.* 124, 133–140 (2016).

- 435 12. Pagalan, L. *et al.* Association of Prenatal Exposure to Air Pollution With Autism
 436 Spectrum Disorder. *JAMA Pediatr* 173, 86–92 (2019).
- 437 13. Georgieff, M. K., Tran, P. V. & Carlson, E. S. Atypical fetal development: Fetal alcohol
 438 syndrome, nutritional deprivation, teratogens and risk for neurodevelopmental disorders
 439 and psychopathology. *Dev Psychopathol* 30, 1063–1086 (2018).
- 440 14. Nypaver, C., Arbour, M. & Niederegger, E. Preconception Care: Improving the Health of
- 441 Women and Families. *Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health* 61, 356–364 (2016).
- 15. Rodier, P. M., Ingram, J. L., Tisdale, B., Nelson, S. & Romano, J. Embryological origin for autism: developmental anomalies of the cranial nerve motor nuclei. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 370, 247–261 (1996).
- 16. Lam, J. *et al.* A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Multiple Airborne Pollutants
 and Autism Spectrum Disorder. *PLoS One* 11, e0161851 (2016).
- 447 17. Kalkbrenner, A. E. *et al.* Air Toxics in Relation to Autism Diagnosis, Phenotype, and
 448 Severity in a U.S. Family-Based Study. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 126, 037004 (2018).
- 18. Oberdörster, G., Oberdörster, E. & Oberdörster, J. Nanotoxicology: an emerging discipline evolving from studies of ultrafine particles. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 113, 823–839 (2005).
- 452 19. de Kok, T. M. C. M., Driece, H. A. L., Hogervorst, J. G. F. & Briedé, J. J. Toxicological assessment of ambient and traffic-related particulate matter: a review of recent studies.
 454 *Mutat. Res.* 613, 103–122 (2006).
- 20. Wilson, W. E. & Suh, H. H. Fine particles and coarse particles: concentration
 relationships relevant to epidemiologic studies. *J Air Waste Manag Assoc* 47, 1238–1249
 (1997).
- 458 21. Chun, H., Leung, C., Wen, S. W., McDonald, J. & Shin, H. H. Maternal exposure to air
 pollution and risk of autism in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ. Pollut.* 256, 113307 (2020).
- 461 22. Dutheil, F. et al. Letter to the Editor: Comment on 'Maternal exposure to air pollution and
- risk of autism in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis'. *Environ. Pollut.* 264,
 114724 (2020).
- 464 23. Kolevzon, A., Gross, R. & Reichenberg, A. Prenatal and Perinatal Risk Factors for
 465 Autism: A Review and Integration of Findings. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 161, 326–333
- 466 (2007).
 - 467 24. Hao, X., Pan, J., Gao, X., Zhang, S. & Li, Y. Gut microbiota on gender bias in autism
 468 spectrum disorder. *Rev Neurosci* (2020) doi:10.1515/revneuro-2020-0042.
 - 469 25. von Ehrenstein, O. S., Cui, X., Yan, Q., Aralis, H. & Ritz, B. Maternal Prenatal Smoking
 470 and Autism Spectrum Disorder in Offspring: a California Statewide Cohort and Sibling
 - 471 Study. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* (2020) doi:10.1093/aje/kwaa182.

- 472 26. Vandenbroucke, J. P. *et al.* Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
 473 Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. *Int J Surg* 12, 1500–1524 (2014).
- 474 27. Stang, A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the
- 475 quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *Eur J Epidemiol* 25, 603–605 (2010).
- 28. Ollier, M., Chamoux, A., Naughton, G., Pereira, B. & Dutheil, F. Chest CT scan screening for lung cancer in asbestos occupational exposure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Chest* 145, 1339–1346 (2014).
- 479 29. Navel, V. *et al.* Efficacy of treatments for Demodex blepharitis: A systematic review and
 480 meta-analysis. *Ocul Surf* 17, 655–669 (2019).
- 30. Lanhers, C. *et al.* Creatine Supplementation and Upper Limb Strength Performance: A
 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med* 47, 163–173 (2017).
- 483 31. Benichou, T. *et al.* Heart rate variability in type 2 diabetes mellitus: A systematic review
 484 and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE* 13, e0195166 (2018).
- 32. Benoist d'Azy, C., Pereira, B., Chiambaretta, F. & Dutheil, F. Oxidative and AntiOxidative Stress Markers in Chronic Glaucoma: A Systematic Review and MetaAnalysis. *PLoS ONE* 11, e0166915 (2016).
- 33. Courtin, R. *et al.* Prevalence of dry eye disease in visual display terminal workers: a
 systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 6, e009675 (2016).
- 490 34. DerSimonian, R. & Laird, N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 7, 177–
 491 188 (1986).
- 492 35. Shah, A. S. V. *et al.* Global association of air pollution and heart failure: a systematic
 493 review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 382, 1039–1048 (2013).
- 36. Orellano, P., Reynoso, J., Quaranta, N., Bardach, A. & Ciapponi, A. Short-term exposure
 to particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and ozone (O3) and allcause and cause-specific mortality: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ Int* 142, 105876 (2020).
- 498 37. Jarvis, D. J., Adamkiewicz, G., Heroux, M.-E., Rapp, R. & Kelly, F. J. *Nitrogen dioxide*.
 499 *WHO Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality: Selected Pollutants* (World Health Organization, 2010).
- 38. Russo, M. W. How to Review a Meta-analysis. *Gastroenterol Hepatol (N Y)* 3, 637–642
 (2007).
- 39. Becerra, T. A., Wilhelm, M., Olsen, J., Cockburn, M. & Ritz, B. Ambient air pollution
 and autism in Los Angeles county, California. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 121, 380–386
 (2013).
- 40. Dickerson, A. S. *et al.* Autism spectrum disorder prevalence and associations with air
 concentrations of lead, mercury, and arsenic. *Environ Monit Assess* 188, 407 (2016).
- 41. Dickerson, A. S. *et al.* Autism spectrum disorder prevalence and proximity to industrial
 facilities releasing arsenic, lead or mercury. *Sci. Total Environ.* 536, 245–251 (2015).

- 42. Kalkbrenner, A. E. *et al.* Perinatal exposure to hazardous air pollutants and autism
 spectrum disorders at age 8. *Epidemiology* 21, 631–641 (2010).
- 43. Kalkbrenner, A. E. *et al.* Particulate matter exposure, prenatal and postnatal windows of
 susceptibility, and autism spectrum disorders. *Epidemiology* 26, 30–42 (2015).
- 44. Kaufman, J. A. *et al.* Ambient ozone and fine particulate matter exposures and autism
 spectrum disorder in metropolitan Cincinnati, Ohio. *Environ. Res.* 171, 218–227 (2019).
- 45. Raz, R. *et al.* Traffic-Related Air Pollution and Autism Spectrum Disorder: A PopulationBased Nested Case-Control Study in Israel. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 187, 717–725 (2018).
- 518 46. Raz, R. et al. Autism spectrum disorder and particulate matter air pollution before, during,
- and after pregnancy: a nested case-control analysis within the Nurses' Health Study II
- 520 Cohort. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 123, 264–270 (2015).
- 521 47. Ritz, B. *et al.* Air pollution and Autism in Denmark. *Environ Epidemiol* 2, (2018).
- 48. Roberts, A. L. et al. Perinatal air pollutant exposures and autism spectrum disorder in the
- children of Nurses' Health Study II participants. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 121, 978–984
 (2013).
- 49. Talbott, E. O. *et al.* Fine particulate matter and the risk of autism spectrum disorder. *Environ. Res.* 140, 414–420 (2015).
- 50. Talbott, E. O. *et al.* Air toxics and the risk of autism spectrum disorder: the results of a
 population based case-control study in southwestern Pennsylvania. *Environ Health* 14, 80
 (2015).
- 530 51. Volk, H. E., Hertz-Picciotto, I., Delwiche, L., Lurmann, F. & McConnell, R. Residential
 proximity to freeways and autism in the CHARGE study. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 119,
 532 873–877 (2011).
- 533 52. Volk, H. E. *et al.* Autism spectrum disorder: interaction of air pollution with the MET
 534 receptor tyrosine kinase gene. *Epidemiology* 25, 44–47 (2014).
- 535 53. Volk, H. E., Lurmann, F., Penfold, B., Hertz-Picciotto, I. & McConnell, R. Traffic-related
 air pollution, particulate matter, and autism. *JAMA Psychiatry* 70, 71–77 (2013).
- 537 54. Chen, G. *et al.* Early life exposure to particulate matter air pollution (PM1, PM2.5 and 538 PM10) and autism in Shanghai, China: A case-control study. *Environ Int* 121, 1121–1127
- 536
 TWTO) and autism in Shanghai, China. A case-control study. Environ int 121, 1121

 539
 (2018).
- 55. Yousefian, F. *et al.* Long-term exposure to ambient air pollution and autism spectrum
 disorder in children: A case-control study in Tehran, Iran. *Sci. Total Environ.* 643, 1216–
 1222 (2018).
- 543 56. Jo, H. *et al.* Sex-specific associations of autism spectrum disorder with residential air
 pollution exposure in a large Southern California pregnancy cohort. *Environ. Pollut.* 254,
 545 113010 (2019).

- 546 57. McGuinn, L. A. *et al.* Early Life Exposure to Air Pollution and Autism Spectrum
 547 Disorder: Findings from a Multisite Case-Control Study. *Epidemiology* 31, 103–114
 548 (2020).
- 549 58. Oudin, A. *et al.* Prenatal exposure to air pollution as a potential risk factor for autism and
 550 ADHD. *Environ Int* 133, 105149 (2019).
- 551 59. Goodrich, A. J. *et al.* Joint effects of prenatal air pollutant exposure and maternal folic
 acid supplementation on risk of autism spectrum disorder. *Autism Res* 11, 69–80 (2018).
- 553 60. Windham, G. C. *et al.* Use of birth certificates to examine maternal occupational 554 exposures and autism spectrum disorders in offspring. *Autism Res* 6, 57–63 (2013).
- 555 61. Kim, D. *et al.* The joint effect of air pollution exposure and copy number variation on risk
 556 for autism. *Autism Res* 10, 1470–1480 (2017).
- 557 62. Kanner, L. Autistic disturbances of affective contact. *Acta Paedopsychiatr* 35, 100–136
 558 (1968).
- 63. Christensen, D. L. *et al.* Prevalence and Characteristics of Autism Spectrum Disorder
 Among Children Aged 8 Years--Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring
 Network, 11 Sites, United States, 2012. *MMWR Surveill Summ* 65, 1–23 (2016).
- 562 64. Zablotsky, B. & Black, L. I. Prevalence of Children Aged 3-17 Years With
 563 Developmental Disabilities, by Urbanicity: United States, 2015-2018. *Natl Health Stat*564 *Report* 1–7 (2020).
- 565 65. Zahorodny, W. *et al.* Increasing autism prevalence in metropolitan New Jersey. *Autism*566 18, 117–126 (2014).
- 567 66. Dawson, G. & Bernier, R. A quarter century of progress on the early detection and
 568 treatment of autism spectrum disorder. *Development and Psychopathology* 25, 1455–1472
 569 (2013).
- 570 67. Bouillon-Minois, J.-B., Lesage, F.-X., Schmidt, J. & Dutheil, F. Coronavirus and
 571 Exceptional Health Situations: The First Disaster With Benefits on Air Pollution. *Disaster*
- 572 *Medicine and Public Health Preparedness* 1–3 (2020) doi:10.1017/dmp.2020.174.
- 573 68. Dutheil, F., Baker, J. S. & Navel, V. COVID-19 and cardiovascular risk: Flying toward a
 574 silent world? *Journal of Clinical Hypertension (Greenwich, Conn.)* (2020)
 575 doi:10.1111/jch.14019.
- 576 69. Yan, G. *et al.* Understanding PM2.5 concentration and removal efficiency variation in
 577 urban forest park-Observation at human breathing height. *PeerJ* 8, e8988 (2020).
- 578 70. Kim, K.-H., Kabir, E. & Kabir, S. A review on the human health impact of airborne
 579 particulate matter. *Environ Int* 74, 136–143 (2015).
- 71. Naimabadi, A. *et al.* Chemical composition of PM10 and its in vitro toxicological impacts
 on lung cells during the Middle Eastern Dust (MED) storms in Ahvaz, Iran. *Environ. Pollut.* 211, 316–324 (2016).
 - 21

- 583 72. Cui, M. *et al.* Chemical composition of PM2.5 from two tunnels with different vehicular
 584 fleet characteristics. *Sci. Total Environ.* 550, 123–132 (2016).
- 585 73. IATA Forecasts Passenger Demand to Double Over 20 Years.
 586 https://www.iata.org/en/pressroom/pr/2016-10-18-02/.
- 74. Cohen, A. J. *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* 389, 1907–1918 (2017).
- 75. Assessment, U. E. N. C. for E. Health Assessment Document For Diesel Engine Exhaust
 (Final 2002). https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/risk/recordisplay.cfm?deid=29060.
- 592 76. Esparza-Aguilar, M., Arroyo, P., Gómez-Verján, J. C. & Martín-Martín, V. Early life
 593 exposure and its association with diseases in adulthood: review of longitudinal studies.
 594 *Boletin Medico Del Hospital Infantil De Mexico* 77, 153–165 (2020).
- 595 77. Dugan, J. A. & Ma-Crawford, J. Managing gestational diabetes. *Journal of the American*596 *Academy of PAs* 32, 21–25 (2019).
- 597 78. Ellery, S. J. *et al.* Antenatal prevention of cerebral palsy and childhood disability: is the
 598 impossible possible? *J Physiol* 596, 5593–5609 (2018).
- 599 79. Schumacher, M., Liere, P. & Ghoumari, A. Progesterone and fetal-neonatal
 neuroprotection. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol* (2020)
 doi:10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2020.09.001.
- 80. Ridder, A., Giorgione, V., Khalil, A. & Thilaganathan, B. Preeclampsia: The Relationship
 between Uterine Artery Blood Flow and Trophoblast Function. *Int J Mol Sci* 20, (2019).
- 604 81. Santiago-Cruz, R. M. et al. [Breastfeeding and infant feeding in the first level of
- attention]. *Revista Medica Del Instituto Mexicano Del Seguro Social* 57, 387–394 (2019).
- 82. Lucas, A. Scientific Evidence for Breastfeeding. *Nestle Nutrition Institute Workshop Series* 90, 1–12 (2019).
- 83. Zhang, M. *et al.* Maternal Exposure to Ambient Particulate Matter ≤2.5 μm During
 Pregnancy and the Risk for High Blood Pressure in Childhood. *Hypertension* 72, 194–201
 (2018).
- 84. Li, C. *et al.* Maternal exposure to air pollution and the risk of low birth weight: A metaanalysis of cohort studies. *Environ. Res.* 190, 109970 (2020).
- 85. Fang, J. *et al.* Prenatal PM2.5 Exposure and the Risk of Adverse Births Outcomes:
 Results from Project ELEFANT. *Environ. Res.* 110232 (2020)
 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.110232.
- 86. Lee, J. *et al.* Genetic Variation and Autism: A Field Synopsis and Systematic MetaAnalysis. *Brain Sci* 10, (2020).
- 618 87. Veldkamp, S. a. M. et al. Parental Age in Relation to Offspring's Neurodevelopment.
- 619 *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology: The Official Journal for the Society*
- 620 of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, American Psychological Association,
- 621 *Division 53* 1–13 (2020) doi:10.1080/15374416.2020.1756298.

- 88. Gao, Y. *et al.* Association of Grandparental and Parental Age at Childbirth With Autism
 Spectrum Disorder in Children. *JAMA network open* 3, e202868 (2020).
- 624 89. Cogley, C., O'Reilly, H., Bramham, J. & Downes, M. A Systematic Review of the Risk
 625 Factors for Autism Spectrum Disorder in Children Born Preterm. *Child Psychiatry and*

626 *Human Development* (2020) doi:10.1007/s10578-020-01071-9.

- 90. Ruigrok, A. N. V. & Lai, M.-C. Sex/gender differences in neurology and psychiatry:
 Autism. *Handb Clin Neurol* 175, 283–297 (2020).
- 91. Zhong, C., Tessing, J., Lee, B. K. & Lyall, K. Maternal Dietary Factors and the Risk of
 Autism Spectrum Disorders: A Systematic Review of Existing Evidence. *Autism Res*(2020) doi:10.1002/aur.2402.
- 632 92. Talmi, Z., Mankuta, D. & Raz, R. Birth weight and autism spectrum disorder: A
 633 population-based nested case-control study. *Autism Research: Official Journal of the*634 *International Society for Autism Research* 13, 655–665 (2020).
- 93. Aldridge, R. W. *et al.* Global patterns of mortality in international migrants: a systematic
 review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 392, 2553–2566 (2018).
- 637 94. Fellmeth, G. *et al.* Health impacts of parental migration on left-behind children and
 638 adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 392, 2567–2582 (2018).
- 639 95. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. https://handbook-5-640 1.cochrane.org/.
- 641
- 642
- 643
- 644

Table 1. Characteristics of studies included in meta-analysis.

As: Arsenic; Ld: Lead; Hg: Mercury; * for median; #: see original articles (Gong 2014: see Figure 2; Kalkbrenner 2010: see Table 2 ; Kalkbrenner 2018: see Table 2)

Study	Country	Study design	Dates of inclusion	Perinatal periods	n ASD/ n total	Air Types	pollutants Mean levels (* for median)	REF used for risk calculation	Concentration for REF of air pollutants	Type of risk	Adjustment of risk	Other variables
Becerra, 2013	USA	Case- control	1995-2006	Pregnancy	7594 / 83229	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NO ² NO O ₃ , CO	-	IQR	PM ₁₀ : 8.3μg/m ³ PM _{2.5} : 4.7μg/m ³ NO ₂ : 10.5ppb NO: 29.7ppb O ₃ :11.5ppb	Odds ratio by IQR increase	Adjusted for maternal age, education, race/ethnicity, maternal place of birth, type of delivery, parity, insurance type, gestational weeks	Maternal place of birth, ethnicity, education, type of delivery, parity, insurance type
Chen, 2018	China	Case- control	2002-2011	Postnatal	124 / 1364	PM ₁ PM _{2.5} PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ : 95.4μg/m ³ PM _{2.5} : 66.2μg/m ³ PM ₁ : 48.8μg/m ³	IQR	PM ₁₀ : 4.9μg/m ³ PM _{2.5} : 3.4μg/m ³ PM ₁ : 4.8μg/m ³	Odds ratio by IQR increase	Adjusted for birth weight; gestational weeks; disease, trauma, and mental health history; maternal age; familial history; parents' marital status, education, smoking, income; parental relationship; parenting	Gender
Dickerson, 2015	USA	Cohort	1992-2000	Pregnancy	2489 / 2489	Metals	-	>50 th centile of industrial facilities	>50 th centile: 46.9km from industry	Relative Risk by 10th centile	Crude and adjusted for ethnicity and maternal education	Gender
Dickerson, 2016	USA	Cohort	2000-2008	Preconception Pregnancy	2489 / 2489	Metals	-	1 st quartile	As:<0.02ng/m ³ Ld::<1.49ng/m ³ Hg:<1.52ng/m ³	Relative Risk by quartile	Crude and adjusted for ethnicity, education, poverty	-
Gong, 2014	Sweden	Case- control	1992-2000	Pregnancy Postnatal	109 / 3051	PM ₁₀ NOx	PM ₁₀ : 3.3- 4.2μg/m ³ NOx: 5.4- 12.7μg/m ³	<5 th percentile	#	Relative Risk for >95 th percentile vs <5 th and by severity of ASD	Crude and adjusted for parity, gender, maternal age, smoking, marital status, education, income, neighborhood deprivation	Birth weight, ethnicity, gestational age, zygosity
Gong, 2017	Sweden	Case- control	1993-2007	Pregnancy Postnatal	5136 / 23373	PM ₁₀ NOx	PM ₁₀ : 4.2- 4.4μg/m ³ NOx: 9.8- 11.0μg/m ³	Arbitrary cut-off	PM ₁₀ : <10μg/m ³ NOx: <20μg/m ³	Odds ratio by 10µg/m ³ increase in PM ₁₀ and 20µg/m ³ in NOx	Crude and adjusted for sex; birth month; sibling order; parents' age, education, employment, income, birth countries; marital status; neighborhood deprivation	Birth weight, congenital malformation, intellectual disability
Goodrich, 2019	USA	Case- control	1997-2008	Pregnancy	346 / 606	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NOx O ₃	-	< median	PM ₁₀ : <22.9 µg/cm ³ PM _{2.5} : <12.4µg/cm ³ NOx: <14.2ppb O ₃ : <33.4µg/cm ³	Odds ratio for > median vs < median	Adjusted for income, year of birth, vitamin A and zinc intake during pregnancy	Maternal age, education, birthplace; child ethnicity, sex; home ownership; preterm delivery; parity; gestational diabetes
Guxens, 2016	Europe (Italy, Spain, Nether- lands, Sweden)	Cohort	1992-2008	Pregnancy	541 / 8079	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NO ₂	*PM ₁₀ : 15- 46µg/m ³ *PM _{2.5} : 8- 22µg/m ³ *NO ₂ : 17- 42µg/m ³ *NO _x : 34- 70µg/m ³	Arbitrary cut-off	*PM ₁₀ : <10μg/m ³ *PM _{2.5} : <5μg/m ³ *NO ₂ : <10μg/m ³ *NO _x : <20μg/m ³	Odds ratio by 10µg/m ³ increase in PM₁₀ and NO2, and 5µg/m ³ in PM₅ and 20µg/m ³ in	Adjusted for maternal education, country of birth, age, body mass index, height, smoking, parity, urbanicity; child's sex, season at birth, age at ASD diagnosis	- 24

										NOx		
Jo, 2019	USA	Cohort	1999-2009	Pregnancy Postnatal	2471 / 246420	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NO ₂ O ₃	PM ₁₀ : 38.1μg/m ³ PM _{2.5} : 17.9μg/m ³ NO ₂ : 25.1ppb O ₃ : 41.6ppb	<5 th percentile	#	Hazard ratio for >95 th vs <5 th percentile	Adjusted for birth year, medical center, maternal age, ethnicity, parity, education, comorbidities; household income, child sex	-
Kalkbrenner, 2010	USA	Case- control	1992-1994 1994-1996	Perinatal	383 / 2829	Metals Solvents Styrene Pesticides PAHs	# (0.00001- 2108 μg/m ³ depending on air pollutants)	<20 th percentile	#	Odds ratio for >80 th percentile vs <20 th	Adjusted for maternal age, education, ethnicity, smoking; marital status; household income; urbanicity	Gender, first born, married
Kalkbrenner, 2015	USA	Case- control	1994- 1996- 1998-2000	Preconception Pregnancy Postnatal	645 / 13079	PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ by groups: 21.8-24.3μg/m ³	Arbitrary cut-off	PM ₁₀ : <10µg/m ³	Odds ratio by 10µg/m ³ increase in PM ₁₀	Adjusted for maternal age, ethnicity, education; household income, urbanization, week of birth	Gender, smoking, married
Kalkbrenner, 2018	USA	Case- control	1994-2007	Pregnancy	1540 / 2017	Metals PAHs Solvents Styrene Pesticides	# (155 pollutants)	<25 th percentile (or (<5 th), and log- transformed	#	Odds ratio for >75 th vs <25 th (or >95 th vs <5 th)	Adjusted for air toxic levels in the family, birth year, education, income, population density	Gender, ethnicity, maternal age, number in siblings
Kaufman, 2019	USA	Case- control	2006-2010	Pregnancy Postnatal	428 / 6420	PM _{2.5} O ₃	РМ _{2.5} : 66.2µg/m ³ O ₃ : 48.8µg/m ³	<5 th percentile and IQR	<5 th percentile: data not shown IQR: PM _{2.5} : 3.5μg/m ³ O ₃ : 16ppb	Odds ratio for >95 th vs <5 th percentile and by IQR increase	Adjusted for year of birth; maternal education, body mass index, birth spacing, month of conception, pollutants	Gender; maternal age, ethnicity, smoking, body mass index; gestational age, birth weight, previous births
Kim, 2017	USA	Case- control	1999-2008	Pregnancy Postnatal	158 / 147	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NO ₂ O ₃	PM ₁₀ : 6.2μg/m ³ PM _{2.5} : 3.7μg/m ³ NO ₂ : 5.7ppb O ₃ : 6.2 ppb	<75 th percentile	data not shown	Odds ratio for >75 th vs <75 th percentile	Adjusted for education, ethnicity, child's sex	-
MCGuinn, 2020	USA	Case- control	2003-2006	Preconception Pregnancy Postnatal	674 / 1529	PM _{2.5} O ₃	PM _{2.5} : 12.7μg/m ³ O ₃ : 35.1ppb	Arbitrary cut-off	PM ₁₀ : <1.6µg/m ³ O ₃ : <6.6 ppb	Odds ratio by 1.6 μg/m ³ in PM _{2.5} and 6.6 ppb in O ₃	Adjusted for maternal age, education, ethnicity, smoking; study site; month and year of birth; exposure time	Gender, preterm
Oudin, 2019	Sweden	Cohort	1999-2009	Pregnancy	768 / 47865	NOx	NOx: 17.7µg/m ³	<1 st quartile and arbitrary cut-off	1 st quartile: <11.3 μg/m ³ Arbitrary cut-off: NOx: 10μg/m ³	Odds ratio by quartile and by 10µg/m ³ in NOx	Adjusted for gender of child; maternal age, parity, smoking, body mass index, education income, country of birth	, -
Pagalan, 2018	Canada	Cohort	2004-2009	Pregnancy	1307 / 132256	PM _{2.5} NO NO ₂	PM _{2.5} : 5.0- 5.7μg/m ³ NO ₂ : 13.5- 16.0μg/m ³ NO: 11.0- 16.0μg/m ³	IQR	PM _{2.5} : 1.5μg/m ³ NO ₂ : 4.8ppb NO ₂ : 10.7ppb	Odds ratio by IQR increase	Crude and adjusted for gender, income, urbanicity, month and year of birth, maternal age, birthplace	Gestational age, multiple birth, parity
Raz, 2015	USA	Case- control	1993	Preconception Pregnancy Postnatal	245 / 1767	PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} : 14.6μg/m ³	IQR	PM _{2.5} : 4.42μg/m ³	Odds ratio by IQR increase	Crude and adjusted for child sex, year and month of birth, parents age, income	Birth weight, education, marital status, prematurity, smoking
Raz, 2017	Israel	Case- control	2005-2009	Pregnancy Postnatal	2098 / 56289	NO ₂	*NO ₂ : 16.7ppb	IQR	NO ₂ : 5.85ppb	Odds ratio by IQR increase	Adjusted for year and month of birth, ethnicity, paternal age, poverty	Birth weight, gestational age, income, population group, multiplicity of birth

Ritz, 2018	Denmark	Case control	1989-2013	Pregnancy Postnatal	15387 / 83526	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NO ₂ SO ₂	-	IQR	PM ₁₀ : 3.80μg/m ³ PM _{2.5} : 3.61μg/m ³ NO ₂ : 11.41μg/m ³ SO ₂ : 2.80μg/m ³	Odds ratio by IQR increase	Crude and adjusted for parental age, birth place, neighborhood employment and housing, maternal smoking, pollutants exposure periods	Gender, birth weight, gestational age
Roberts, 2013	USA	Case- control	1987-2002	Postnatal	325 / 22426	Metals	-	1 st quintile	<1 st quintile: data not shown	Odds ratio by quintile	Adjusted for maternal age, year of birth, parents' education, income, and year	Gender, state of residence at birth, smoking
Talbott, 2015a	USA	Case- control	2005-2009	Preconception Pregnancy Postnatal	211 / 430	PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} : 15μg/m ³	IQR	PM _{2.5} : 2.84µg/m ³	Odds ratio by IQR increase	Crude and adjusted for maternal education, smoking, ethnicity, and age	Year and country of birth, multiple birth, birth weight, preterm birth
Talbott, 2015b	USA	Case- control	2005-2009	Pregnancy	216 / 4971	Metals Solvents PAHs Pesticides	# (30 pollutants)	1 st quartile	<1 st quintile: #	Odds ratio by quartile	Adjusted for maternal age, education, smoking, ethnicity, child's birth year and sex	Country of birth
Volk, 2011	USA	Case- control	1997-2006	Pregnancy	304 / 259	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NOx O ₃	-	Last quartile of distance from freeway	Last quartile: >1.4km from freeway	Odds ratio by quartile	Adjusted for child sex, ethnicity; parents education; maternal age and smoking	Preterm delivery
Volk, 2013	USA	Case- control	1997-2008	Pregnancy Postnatal	279 / 524	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NOx O ₃	-	1 st quartile	1 st quartile: <9.7ppb of global traffic air pollution levels	Odds ratio by quartile	Crude and adjusted for child's sex, ethnicity; parents education; maternal age and smoking	-
Volk, 2014	USA	Case- control	1997-2009	Pregnancy	251 / 156	PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5} NOx O ₃	-	<25 th percentile	PM ₁₀₅ <29.2µg/m ³ PM _{2.5} <16.0µg/m ³ NOx ₅ <17.5ppb O ₃ :<41.8ppb	Odds ratio for >75 th vs <25 th percentile	Adjusted for child's sex, ethnicity; parents education; maternal age and smoking; home ownership	-
Yousefian, 2018	Iran	Case- control	2004-2012	Pregnancy	134 / 388	PM ₁₀ SO ₂ Solvents	PM ₁₀ : 105.1- 107.9μg/m ³ SO ₂ : 22.8- 26.4ppb Solvents: 60.7μg/m ³	per 1-unit increase in pollutants	per 1-unit increase in pollutants	Odds ratio per 1-unit increase in pollutants	Adjusted for maternal age, smoking; parents education; cousin marriage; birth order, gestational age, multiplicity, parents comorbidities	Gender, type of delivery
Windham, 2013	USA	Case- control	1994	Pregnancy	284 / 943	Solvents Pesticides Metals	-	Exposed workers vs non-exposed workers	Non-exposed workers: no concentrations given	Odds ratio exposed versus non- exposed workers	Crude and adjusted for child ethnicity, maternal age and education	Gender; paternal age, education; parity; birth weight; prematurity

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Search Strategy

Figure 2. Methodological quality of included articles using the SIGN checklist

Figure 3. Meta-analysis on risk of autism by air pollutant depending on perinatal periods (preconception, pregnancy and postnatal), using normalized Odds ratio (continuous data - incremental risk).

When available (more than one study), we computed three models for each meta-analysis (a global model using all risks listed in included articles, a pessimistic model using only the less favorable data, and an optimistic model using only the most favorable).

95%CI: 95% confidence intervals. Each meta-analysis is represented in the forest-plot by a dot on a horizontal line, with the corresponding number of articles (n studies (subgroups)) included within the meta-analysis. The white dots represent the odds ratio (OR), and the length of each line around the dots represent its 95% confidence interval (95CI). An overall summary pooled-estimate (result of the meta-analysis of meta-analyses) is represented by a blue lozenge at the end of the graph. The black solid vertical line represents the null estimate (with a value of 1 for OR). Horizontal lines that cross the null vertical line (OR=1) represent non-significant studies.

Figure 4. Meta-analysis on risk of autism for PM2.5 depending on trimester of pregnancy (first, second, third), using normalized Odds ratio (continuous data - incremental risk).

When available (more than one study), we computed three models for each meta-analysis (a global model using all risks listed in included articles, a pessimistic model using only the less favorable data, and an optimistic model using only the most favorable).

95%CI: 95% confidence intervals. Each meta-analysis is represented in the forest-plot by a dot on a horizontal line, with the corresponding number of articles (n studies (subgroups)) included within the meta-analysis. The white dots represent the odds ratio (OR), and the length of each line around the dots represent its 95% confidence interval (95CI). An overall summary pooled-estimate (result of the meta-analysis of meta-analyses) is represented by a blue lozenge at the end of the graph. The black solid vertical line represents the null estimate (with a value of 1 for OR). Horizontal lines that cross the null vertical line (OR=1) represent non-significant studies.

Figure 5. Meta-regressions

95%CI: 95% confidence intervals; t0: baseline; † Dropped because of collinearity.

The effect of each variable on the outcome is represented in the forest-plot by a dot on a horizontal line. The white dots represent the coefficient for each variable, and the length of each line around the dots represent their

95% confidence interval (95CI). The black solid vertical line represents the null estimate (with a value of 0). Horizontal lines that cross the null vertical line are non-significant variables.



								_		Con			_			
				Sele	ction			Asse	xss- nt	toun- ding	Sta ti-	a- 	Over asses	all S-		
				bia	is			bia	IS I	bias	stic	s	men	t		
									<u> </u>				_/			
	propriate and clearly focused question	ection bias (comparable groups)	ection bias (same exclusion criteria in both groups)	ection bias (participation rate of both groups)	ition bias (comparison included/non-included)	equate case definition	ntrols are non-cases ?	ection bias (blind assessments)	ection bias (exposure status is well measured)	ential confounders taken into account	nfidence intervals are provided	minimise the risk of bias or confounders	erall effect is due to the study intervention	sults applicable to the patient group targeted	neral level of evidence	
	App	Sele	Sele	Sele	Attri	Ade	Cor	Det	Det	Pot	Cor	Ton	OVe	Res	Ger	
Becerra 2013	•	•	•	100	+	•	•	NA	•	•	•	++	•	•	++	
Chen 2018	•	•	•	100	•	•	•	NA	+	Ŧ	•	++	•	•	++	
Gong 2014	•	•	•	69	•	•	•	NA	+	?	•	•	•	•	•	
Gong 2017	•	•	•	100	•	•	•	NA	+	•	•	•	•	•	+	
Goodrich 2019	•	•	•	80	•	•	•	NA	+	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Guxens 2016	•	•	•	62	•	•	•	NA	•	•	•	••	•	•	•	
Kalkbrenner 2010	•	•	•	?	?	•	•	NA	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	
Kalkbrenner 2015	•	•	•	93	•	•	•	NA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Kalkbrenner 2018	•	•	•	100	•	•	•	NA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Dick
Kaufman 2019	•	•	•	?	•	•	+	NA	+	•	•	•	•	•	•	Dick
Kim 2017	•	•	•	79	?	•	•	NA	+	•	•	++	•	•	•	Jo 2
MCGuinn 2020	+	+	+	?	?	+	+	NA	+	•	•	++	+	Ŧ	••	Oud
Raz 2015	+	+	+	88	•	+	+	NA	+	Ŧ	+	Ŧ	+	•	•	Pad
Raz 2017	+	•	+	99	+	•	+	NA	+	+	+	+	+	•	+	
Ritz 2018	+	+	+	71	+	•	+	NA	+	Ŧ	+	+	+	•	•	
Roberts 2013	+	Ŧ	Ŧ	84	•	Ŧ	Ŧ	NA	+	Ŧ	+	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	••	
Talbott 2015a	+	+	+	98	+	•	+	NA	+	Ŧ	+	+	+	Ŧ	+	
Talbott 2015b	+	•	+	81	?	+	+	NA	+	•	+	+	+	Ŧ	+	
Volk 2011	+	+	+	100	+	•	+	NA	+	Ŧ	+	Ŧ	+	Ŧ	Ŧ	
Volk 2013	+	•	+	100	+	•	Ŧ	NA	+	Ŧ	+	Ŧ	•	Ŧ	+	-
Volk 2014	+	+	+	63	•	+	+	NA	+	Ŧ	+	+	+	Ŧ	+	
Yousefian 2018	+	+	+	96	?	+	+	NA	+	•	+	+	+	Ŧ	+	
Windham 2012	+	Ŧ	+	?	?	Ŧ	Ŧ	NA	+	+	+	0	+	Ŧ	Ŧ	

Selection bias							Assess- ment bias			1	Con- foun- St ding ti bias sti		ita- Overall i- assess- ics ment		al is- t	-
Selection bias (comparable groups)	Selection bias (participation rate)	Performance bias (use of sensitivity analyses)	Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight)	Attrition bias (comparison included/lost sight)	Outcomes clearly defined	Detection bias (blind assessments)	Detection bias (process measures are comparable)	Detection bias (measure of assessment is reliable)	Detection bias (outcome measures are defined)	Detection bias (exposure level is assessed)	Confusion bias (confounders taken into account)	Confidence intervals are provided	To minimise the risk of bias or confounders	Clear evidence of link between exposure & outcome	Results applicable to the patient group targeted	General level of evidence
NA	Ŧ	+	0	NA	+	NA	NA	+	+	+	+	+	•	+	+	•
NA	+	+	2.7	NA	+	NA	NA	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	?	NA	+	NA	+	+	+	+	Ŧ	+	•	Ŧ	+	••
Ŧ	Ŧ	+	?	?	Ŧ	NA	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	+	+	++	Ŧ	Ŧ	÷
Ŧ	+	+	?	?	+	NA	+	+	+	Ŧ	+	+	++	+	Ŧ	++
	+ + + S Selection bias (comparable groups)	 + + + + + + + Selection bias (comparable groups) Selection bias (participation rate) 	 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + e + + + + e + 	 A total comparable groups) 	 ★ ★	 Election bias (comparable groups) Election bias (comparable groups) Election bias (participation rate) Election bias (participation rate) Election bias (use of sensitivity analyses) Untroposed (use of sensitivity analyses) Untroposed (use of sensitivity analyses) Election bias (% of patients lost sight) Election bias (comparison included/lost sight) Election bias (comparison included/lost sight) 	++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++-<	 F. (+) Selection bias (comparable groups) F. (+) F. (+) Selection bias (participation rate) F. (+) F. (+) Selection bias (participation rate) F. (+) F. (+) Selection bias (% of patients lost sight) S. (-) S. (-) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) S. (-) S. (-) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) S. (-) S. (-) S. (-) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) S. (-) S. (-) S. (-) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) S. (-) S. (-) S. (-) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) S. (-) S. (-) S. (-) Attrition bias (comparison included/lost sight) F. (-) F. (-) S. (All contraction bias (comparable groups) Comparable groups) Selection bias (comparable groups) Selection bias (participation rate) Selection bias (participation rate) Selection bias (se of sensitivity analyses) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) Attrition bias (comparison included/lost sight) Section bias (comparison included/lost sight) Section bias (process measures are comparable) Section bias (process measures are comparable) Detection bias (measure of assessment is reliable) 	 A total comparable groups) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sight) A total comparable group (% of patients lost sis down (% of patients	 A total a section bias (comparable groups) A total a section bias (participation rate) A total a section bias (participation rate) A total a section bias (participation rate) A total a section bias (see of sensitivity analyses) A total a section bias (see of sensitivity analyses) A total a section bias (see of sensitivity analyses) A total a section bias (see of sensitivity analyses) A total a section bias (see of sensitivity analyses) A total a section bias (see of sensitivity analyses) A total a section bias (see of sensitivity analyses) A total a section bias (section bias (section bias (section bias (section bias (process measures are comparable)) A total a section bias (process measures are comparable) A total a section bias (section bias (sec	 A total comparable groups) A total g	 Countaile groups) Selection bias (comparable groups) Selection bias (participation rate) Selection bias (participation rate) Selection bias (participation rate) Substrate the selection bias (word patients lost sight) Substrate the selection bias (% of patients lost sight) Substrate the selection bias (% of patients lost sight) Substrate the selection bias (% of patients lost sight) Substrate the selection bias (% of patients lost sight) Substrate the selection bias (% of patients lost sight) Substrate the selection bias (% of patients lost sight) Substrate the selection bias (patients lost sight) Substrate the selection bias (blind assessments) Substrate the selection bias (blind assessment is reliable) Substrate the selection bias (confounders taken into account) Substrate the selection bias (confounders taken into account) Substrate the selection bias (confounders taken into account) 	 Cou- ten (1) Selection bias (comparable groups) Selection bias (participation rate) Selection bias (participation bias of confounders taken into account) Selection bias (participation bias or conformed bias or c	 Coundation bias (comparable groups) Selection bias (participation rate) Sig is in the participation pias (participation rate) Sig is interparticipation pias (participation pias (Selection bias (comparable groups) Selection bias (participation rate) Selection bias (participation rate) Selection bias (participation rate) Selection bias (participation rate) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) Attrition bias (% of patients lost sight) Sig is is is interval included/lost sight) Sig is is is interval included Sig is is is interval included Sig is is is interval included Sig is is interval included Sig is is interval included Sig is is is interval included Sig is is is interval included Sig is is is interval included Sig is is is is interval includ

Case control studies

Cohort studies

PM2.5 Global model Preconception Pregnancy 3 (9) (36) 12.1 1.17 (1.00 to 1.33) 2.5 PM2.5 (risk per Sµg/m3 increase) Global model Pregnancy Preconception 3 (3) 12.1 1.17 (1.00 to 1.33) 2.5 Overall Outcastal 7 (15) 23.1 1.11 (1.06 to 1.15) 24.5 Preconception 3 (3) 19.5 1.11 (1.06 to 1.16) 0.01 (1.07 to 1.11) 65.0 Optimistic racrease Preconception 3 (3) 19.5 1.04 (0.97 to 1.11) 69.0 Optimistic racrease Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 1.05 (1.00 to 1.41) 100 Presimistic model Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 1.16 (1.11 to 1.21) 11.4 Presimistic model Presimistic model Preconception 3 (3) 55.4 1.90 (0.88 to 1.00) 1.90 (0.28 to 1.02) 23.2 Presimistic model Pregnancy 7 (9) 25.5 0.99 (0.98 to 1.02) 39.7 99 (0.9				n studies	l-squared	Risk using normalized OR	Odds Ratio	Weight
PM2.5 Preconception 3 (9) 12.1 1.17 (1.00 to 1.33) 2.5 PM2.5 Global model Pergnancy 8 (36) 23.4 1.17 (1.00 to 1.13) 2.5 Pmscneption 3 (3) 19.5 1.11 (1.06 to 1.15) 24.5 Verall 10 (62) 30.1 1.17 (0.94 to 1.39) 6.5 Presonstrict Preconception 3 (3) 19.5 1.17 (0.94 to 1.39) 6.5 Model Postnatal 4 (4) 3.3 1.04 (0.97 to 1.11) 69.0 Optimistic model Postnatal 4 (4) 3.3 1.05 (1.00 to 1.11) 100 Presonception 3 (3) 51.4 1.16 (1.06 to 1.52) 50.9 Optimistic model Presonception 1 (2) 1.6 1.16 (1.01 to 1.21) 100 Presonception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Model Postnatal 6 (6) 31.5				(subgroups)	(%)	(continuous data)	(95% CI)	(%)
PM2.5 Global model Pregnancy Postnatal 8 (36) 7 (15) 23.1 → 1.11 (1.06 to 1.15) 24.5 (risk per Sig/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Preconception 3 (3) 19.5 - 1.07 (1.05 to 1.09) 100 Pessimistic (risk per Sig/m3 increase) Preconception 3 (3) 19.5 - 1.07 (0.94 to 1.39) 6.5 Optimistic model Postnatal 4 (4) 3.3 - 1.07 (0.94 to 1.39) 6.5 Optimistic model Postnatal 9 (15) 30.6 - 1.05 (1.00 to 1.11) 100 Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 - - 1.16 (1.06 to 1.26) 50.9 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 - 1.16 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 - - 1.16 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 - - 0.98 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 - 0.98 (0.98 to 1.00) 0.90 (0.88 to 1.04)			Preconception	3 (9)	12.1		1.17 (1.00 to 1.33)	2.5
PM2.5 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) model Pessimistic model Postnatal Postnatal 7 (15) 0 (62) 23.1 30.1 1.11 (1.06 to 1.15) 0.07 (1.05 to 1.09) 24.5 100 Pmssimistic fincrease) Presonception model 3 (3) Postnatal 4 (4) 4 (4) 3.3 3 19.5 1.17 (1.05 to 1.09) 100 100 Overall 9 (15) 30.6 1.07 (0.94 to 1.39) 6.5 0.05 (1.00 to 1.11) 69.0 69.05 Optimistic model Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 1.07 (0.98 to 1.16) 24.5 24.5 Optimistic model Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 1.16 (1.06 to 1.26) 50.9 Optimistic model Postnatal 5 (5) 0.0 1.16 (1.00 to 1.21) 41.4 Overall 9 (16) 36.5 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.02) 1.9 Overall 9 (64) 36.5 0.99 (0.92 to 1.02) 1.9 Preconception 1 (1) 0.0 1.01 (0.09 to 1		Global	Pregnancy	8 (36)	23.4	0	1.05 (1.03 to 1.07)	71.7
PM2.5 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) Overall 10 (62) 30.1 ↓ 1.07 (1.05 to 1.09) 100 Syg/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Perconception 3 (3) 19.5 ↓ 1.07 (0.94 to 1.39) 6.5 Syg/m3 increase) model Postnatal 4 (4) 3.3 ↓ 1.07 (0.98 to 1.16) 24.5 Overall 9 (15) 30.6 ↓ 1.05 (1.00 to 1.11) 100 Optimistic model Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 ↓ 1.05 (1.00 to 1.11) 100 Overall 9 (15) 30.6 ↓ 1.15 (1.00 to 1.12) 41.4 Optimistic model Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 ↓ 1.15 (1.10 to 1.21) 101 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 ↓ ↓ 1.15 (1.00 to 1.11) 1.02 Model Postnatal 6 (29) 32.1 ↓ 1.16 (1.01 to 1.21) 1.16 Model Postnatal 6 (29) 32.1 ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ <t< th=""><th></th><th>model</th><td>Postnatal</td><td>7 (15)</td><td>23.1</td><td></td><td>1.11 (1.06 to 1.15)</td><td>24.5</td></t<>		model	Postnatal	7 (15)	23.1		1.11 (1.06 to 1.15)	24.5
PM10 (risk per 5µg/m3) Preconception 3 (3) 19.5 1.17 (0.94 to 1.39) 6.5 5µg/m3 increase) model Persimistic Pregnancy 8 (8) 42.1 1.04 (0.97 to 1.11) 69.0 6µg/m3 increase) model Postnatal 4 (4) 33.6 1.05 (1.00 to 1.11) 100 7 Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 1.16 (1.01 to 1.26) 50.9 7 Pregnancy 6 (6) 41.6 1.16 (1.01 to 1.21) 41.4 7 Overall 8 (14) 35.8 1.15 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 7 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 9 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.02) 32.9 9 Pregnancy 8 (33 35.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.02) 32.9 9 Pregnancy 7 (9) 45.5 0.99 (0.93 to 1.09) 73.0			Overall	10 (62)	30.1	•	1.07 (1.05 to 1.09)	100
Presimistic Syg/m3 increase) Pregnancy model 8 (8) Pregnancy 4 (2,1) (4 (4) 1.04 (0.97 to 1.11) (0.98 to 1.16) 24.5 Overall 9 (15) 30.6 1.05 (1.00 to 1.11) 100 Optimistic model Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 1.16 (1.11 to 1.21) 100 Overall 8 (14) 35.8 1.16 (1.11 to 1.21) 100 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 1.16 (1.11 to 1.21) 100 Overall 8 (14) 35.8 1.16 (1.11 to 1.21) 100 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 model Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.00) 65.2 Postnatal 9 (64) 36.5 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 70.0 30.9 73.0 Preconception 1 (1) 0 0.96 (0.98 to 1.02) 23.9 Overall 7 (16) 22.6 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 20.5	PM2.5		Preconception	3 (3)	19.5		1.17 (0.94 to 1.39)	6.5
Spg/m3 increase) model Postnatal 4 (4) 3.3 1.07 (0.98 to 1.16) 24.5 Overall 9 (15) 30.6 1.05 (1.00 to 1.11) 100 Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 1.16 (1.00 to 1.26) 50.9 Pregnancy 6 (6) 41.6 1.16 (1.10 to 1.21) 41.4 Overall 8 (14) 35.8 1.16 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 1.16 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 0.99 (0.92 to 1.02) 3.9 Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 (risk per Spg/m3 increase) Pregnancy 7 (9) 45.5 0.99 (0.98 to 1.02) 3.1 Optimistic finded Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.99 (0.98 to 1.02) 3.1 1.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 5	(risk per	Pessimistic	Pregnancy	8 (8)	42.1	+	1.04 (0.97 to 1.11)	69.0
Increase) Overall 9 (15) 30.6 Image: Constraint of the symbolic of	5µg/m3	model	Postnatal	4 (4)	3.3	<u>+</u>	1.07 (0.98 to 1.16)	24.5
PM10 Optimistic model Preconception 3 (3) 51.4 1.20 (0.83 to 1.56) 7.7 Pregnancy 6 (6) 41.6 1.16 (1.06 to 1.26) 50.9 Potinistic model Pregnancy 6 (6) 41.6 1.16 (1.01 to 1.21) 41.4 Verall 8 (14) 35.8 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Presonception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Presonception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Presonception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Presonception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Presonception 1 (1) 0 0.98 (0.97 to 1.00) 100 (risk per Pessimistic model Pregnancy 7 (9) 45.5 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 Overall 7 (16) 22.6 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Presonception	increase)		Overall	9 (15)	30.6		1.05 (1.00 to 1.11)	100
Optimistic model Pregnancy 6 (6) 41.6 1.16 (1.06 to 1.26) 50.9 Model Postnatal 5 (5) 0.0 1.16 (1.11 to 1.21) 41.4 Overall 8 (14) 35.8 1.15 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 Global model Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 1.16 (1.06 to 1.26) 50.9 MOt Global model Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 1.15 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) Preconception 1 (1) 0 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Optimistic rorease) Preconception 1 (1) 0 0.96 (0.88 to 1.00) 3.9 Presonseption 1 (1) 0 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.02 2.31 Model Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 2.31 Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.95 to 1.02) 7.0 1.03 (0.92 to 1.14) 2.2	,		Preconception	3 (3)	51.4	O	1.20 (0.83 to 1.56)	7.7
Model Postnatal 5 (5) 0.0 1.16 (1.11 to 1.21) 41.4 Overall 8 (14) 35.8 1.15 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 1.15 (1.10 to 1.21) 100 Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Model Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.98 (0.97 to 1.00) 65.2 Model Postnatal 6 (29) 32.1 1.01 (0.99 to 1.02) 32.9 Overall 9 (64) 36.5 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 Pessimistic Pregnancy 7 (9) 45.5 0.99 (0.95 to 0.99) 73.0 Model Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 1.03 (0.92 to 1.14) 2.2 Model Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 Model Pregnancy 7 (7) 0.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Verall 7 (17) 0.4 1.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 <th1< th=""><th></th><th>Optimistic</th><td>Pregnancy</td><td>6 (6)</td><td>41.6</td><td></td><td>1.16 (1.06 to 1.26)</td><td>50.9</td></th1<>		Optimistic	Pregnancy	6 (6)	41.6		1.16 (1.06 to 1.26)	50.9
PM10 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) Global model Preconception Postnatal 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 PM10 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 0.98 (0.97 to 1.00) 1.9 Personception 1 (2) 1.6 0.98 (0.97 to 1.00) 1.9 Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 Overall 9 (64) 36.5 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 Presonception 1 (1) 0 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 Presonception 1 (1) 0 0.99 (0.95 to 0.99) 73.0 Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 0.101 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 Postnatal 5 (7) 0.0 0.102 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 Overall 7 (17) 0.4 1.02 (0.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 t		model	Postnatal	5 (5)	0.0		1.16 (1.11 to 1.21)	41.4
PM10 Preconception 1 (2) 1.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 PM10 Global Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.98 (0.97 to 1.00) 65.2 PM10 Presimistic Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.9 PM10 Presimistic Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0.99 (0.92 to 1.05) 1.00 (risk per 5µg/m3 model Postnatal 6 (29) 32.1 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 preconception 1 (1) 0 0.96 (0.94 to 0.99) 73.0 model Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 increase) Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 model Postnatal 5 (7) 0.0 1.03 (0.92 to 1.14) 2.2 model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 firsk per Model Pregnancy <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><td>Overall</td><td>8 (14)</td><td>35.8</td><td></td><td>1.15 (1.10 to 1.21)</td><td>100</td></t<>			Overall	8 (14)	35.8		1.15 (1.10 to 1.21)	100
M010 Global model Pregnancy 8 (33) 35.6 0 0.98 (0.97 to 1.00) 65.2 PM10 Postnatal 6 (29) 32.1 1.01 (0.99 to 1.02) 32.9 Overall 9 (64) 36.5 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 (risk per 5µg/m3 Presonception 1 (1) 0 0.96 (0.94 to 0.99) 73.0 Overall Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 Increase Presonception 1 (1) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 Increase Presonception 1 (1) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 Model Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Optimistic Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 0.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 59.7 Model Overall 7 (17) 0.4 0.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 Vox Model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 23.5 Model Postnatal <th< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>Preconception</th><th>1 (2)</th><th>1.6</th><th></th><th>0.99 (0.92 to 1.05)</th><th>1.9</th></th<>			Preconception	1 (2)	1.6		0.99 (0.92 to 1.05)	1.9
PM10 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) model Postnatal 6 (29) 32.1 1.01 (0.99 to 1.02) 32.9 PM10 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Preconception 1 (1) 0 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 Pressimistic increase) Pregnancy 7 (9) 45.5 0.96 (0.94 to 0.99) 73.0 Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 Postnatal 5 (7) 0.0 1.02 (1.00 to 1.05) 38.1 Overall 7 (17) 0.4 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 NOx fisk per (risk per 10µg/m3 increase) Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 Verall 4 (32) 82.2 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 NOx Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 9.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 NOx Pregna		Global model	Pregnancy	8 (33)	35.6	<u> </u>	0.98 (0.97 to 1.00)	65.2
PM10 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) Overall 9 (64) 36.5 0.99 (0.98 to 1.00) 100 Presninstic 5µg/m3 increase) Pressinistic model Preconception 1 (1) 0 0.96 (0.98 to 1.04) 3.9 Pregnancy 7 (9) 45.5 0.96 (0.94 to 0.99) 73.0 Overall 7 (16) 22.6 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Preconception 1 (1) 0.0 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Optimistic model Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 Postnatal 5 (7) 0.0 - 1.02 (1.00 to 1.05) 38.1 Overall 7 (17) 0.4 1.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 Verall Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Vorall Model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (0.98 to 1.02) 71.8 Postnatal 4 (20) 85.8 - 1.02 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Overall 8 (17) 50.4 - 1.02 (0.97 to			Postnatal	6 (29)	32.1	þ	1.01 (0.99 to 1.02)	32.9
PM10 (risk per 5µg/m3 increase) Preconception 1 (1) 0 0.96 (0.88 to 1.04) 3.9 frisk per 5µg/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Pregnancy 7 (9) 45.5 0.96 (0.94 to 0.99) 73.0 Overall 7 (16) 22.6 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Preconception 1 (1) 0.0 1.03 (0.92 to 1.14) 2.2 Optimistic model Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 Postnatal 5 (7) 0.0 1.02 (1.00 to 1.05) 38.1 Overall 7 (17) 0.4 - 1.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 Verall 9 regnancy 8 (70) 78.0 - 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Postnatal 4 (20) 85.8 - 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Overall 4 (32) 82.2 - 1.02 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Indeel Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 - 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8			Overall	9 (64)	36.5	\	0.99 (0.98 to 1.00)	100
(risk per 5µg/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Pregnancy 7 (9) 45.5 0 0.96 (0.94 to 0.99) 73.0 Sugars model Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 Increase) Overall 7 (16) 22.6 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Pregnancy Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 Optimistic model Pregnancy 7 (17) 0.4 1.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 Pregnancy 7 (17) 0.4 1.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 100 NOx Global model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Postnatal 4 (20) 85.8 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Overall 4 (32) 82.2 1.02 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 1.02 (0.97 to 1.07) 28.2 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 <th>PM10</th> <th></th> <th>Preconception</th> <th>1 (1)</th> <th>0</th> <th></th> <th>0.96 (0.88 to 1.04)</th> <th>3.9</th>	PM10		Preconception	1 (1)	0		0.96 (0.88 to 1.04)	3.9
Sµg/m3 increase) model Postnatal 4 (6) 0.0 0.99 (0.95 to 1.02) 23.1 Overall 7 (16) 22.6 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Presonception 1 (1) 0.0 1.03 (0.92 to 1.14) 2.2 Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 Postnatal 5 (7) 0.0 1.02 (1.00 to 1.05) 38.1 Overall 7 (17) 0.4 1.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 Vox Global model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Postnatal 4 (20) 85.8 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Overall 4 (32) 82.2 1.02 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 1.02 (0.97 to 1.07) 28.2 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (17) 50.4 1.00 (0.98 to 1.02) 71.8 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4	(risk per	Pessimistic model	Pregnancy	7 (9)	45.5	-	0.96 (0.94 to 0.99)	73.0
Increase) Overall 7 (16) 22.6 0.97 (0.95 to 0.99) 100 Presconception 1 (1) 0.0 1.03 (0.92 to 1.14) 2.2 Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 Postnatal 5 (7) 0.0 1.02 (1.00 to 1.05) 38.1 Overall 7 (17) 0.4 1.01 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 VOx Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Postnatal 4 (20) 85.8 - 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Overall 4 (32) 82.2 1.02 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 - 1.02 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 - 1.02 (0.98 to 1.02) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 - 1.02 (0.97 to 1.07) 28.2 Optimistic Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 - 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.	5µg/m3		Postnatal	4 (6)	0.0		0.99 (0.95 to 1.02)	23.1
NOx (risk per loµg/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Pregnancy Pesnatal 1 (1) 5 (7) 0.0 1.03 (0.92 to 1.14) 2.2 NOx (risk per loµg/m3 increase) Global model Pregnancy Pesnatal 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 NOx (risk per loµg/m3 increase) Global model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Pessimistic model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Overall 4 (32) 82.2 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 - 1.02 (0.97 to 1.02) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 - 1.00 (0.98 to 1.02) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 - 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 - 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4	increase)		Overall	7 (16)	22.6	•	0.97 (0.95 to 0.99)	100
Optimistic model Pregnancy 7 (9) 24.8 1.01 (0.98 to 1.03) 59.7 MOx Postnatal 5 (7) 0.0 1.02 (1.00 to 1.05) 38.1 NOx Global model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 NOx Model Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Postnatal 4 (20) 85.8 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Vox Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Increase Pregnancy 8 (17) 50.4 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4	,		Preconception	1 (1)	0.0		1.03 (0.92 to 1.14)	2.2
MOx (risk per 10µg/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Pregnancy Pessimistic model 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.00 to 1.03) 100 Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Postnatal 4 (20) 85.8 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Pregnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Overall 4 (32) 82.2 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Pessimistic model Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Overall 8 (17) 50.4 1.00 (0.98 to 1.02) 100 Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6		Optimistic	Pregnancy	7 (9)	24.8		1.01 (0.98 to 1.03)	59.7
NOx (risk per 10µg/m3 increase) Global model Pregnancy Pergnancy Overall 8 (70) 4 (20) 78.0 85.8 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 NOx (risk per 10µg/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Pregnancy Pergnancy 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Postnatal 4 (20) 85.8 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Pessimistic model Pregnancy Postnatal 8 (12) 48.4 - 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Overall 8 (17) 50.4 - 1.00 (0.98 to 1.02) 100 Pregnancy Postnatal 8 (17) 50.4 - 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 - 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6		model	Postnatal	5 (7)	0.0	-	1.02 (1.00 to 1.05)	38.1
NOx (risk per 10µg/m3 increase) Global model Pregnancy Postnatal 8 (70) 78.0 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 76.5 Postnatal overall 4 (20) 85.8 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Pessimistic nocel Pessimistic model Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (17) 50.4 1.00 (0.98 to 1.02) 100 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6			Overall	7 (17)	0.4	•	1.01 (1.00 to 1.03)	100
NOx (risk per 10µg/m3 increase) Postnatal model 4 (20) 85.8 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Pessimistic norease) Pessimistic model Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Postnatal 4 (5) 55.6 1.02 (0.98 to 1.06) 23.5 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (17) 50.4 1.00 (0.98 to 1.02) 100 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6		Global	Pregnancy	8 (70)	78.0	0	1.02 (1.01 to 1.03)	76.5
NOx (risk per 10µg/m3 increase) Pessimistic model Pregnancy pergnancy overall 8 (12) 48.4 - 1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) 100 Polymistic model Pessimistic model Pregnancy Pestnatal 8 (12) 48.4 - 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (17) 50.4 - 1.00 (0.98 to 1.02) 100 Pessinistic model Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 - 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 - 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6		model	Postnatal	4 (20)	85.8		1.02 (0.98 to 1.06)	23.5
Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 - 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 10µg/m3 increase) model Pregnancy 8 (12) 48.4 - 0.99 (0.97 to 1.02) 71.8 0ptimistic model Pregnancy 8 (17) 50.4 - 1.02 (0.97 to 1.02) 70.4 0ptimistic model Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 - 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 - 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6	NOx	model	Overall	4 (32)	82.2		1.02 (1.01 to 1.03)	100
IOpsimistic increase) Postnatal model 4 (5) 55.6 - 1.02 (0.97 to 1.07) 28.2 Image: Increase in	(risk por	Pessimistic	Pregnancy	8 (12)	48.4		0.99 (0.97 to 1.02)	71.8
Operation 0 (0.98 to 1.02) 100 Increase) Optimistic model Pregnancy Postnatal 8 (17) 50.4 1.00 (0.98 to 1.02) 100 Increase Pregnancy Postnatal 8 (11) 92.3 - 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Increase Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 - 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6	(113K per	model	Postnatal	4 (5)	55.6		1.02 (0.97 to 1.07)	28.2
Optimistic model Pregnancy 8 (11) 92.3 1.04 (1.00 to 1.09) 70.4 Nordel Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6	Tupg/ms	model	Overall	8 (17)	50.4	<u> </u>	1.00 (0.98 to 1.02)	100
model Postnatal 4 (5) 91.3 - 1.07 (0.96 to 1.18) 29.6	increase)	Ontimistic	Pregnancy	8 (11)	92.3		1.04 (1.00 to 1.09)	70.4
		model	Postnatal	4 (5)	91.3	+	1.07 (0.96 to 1.18)	29.6
Overall 8 (16) 93.5		moder	Overall	8 (16)	93.5		1.05 (1.01 to 1.09)	100

0.8 1 1.2 1.4

	n studies	I-squared	Risk using normalized OR	Odds Ratio	Weight
	(subgroups)	(%)	(continuous data)	(95% CI)	(%)
PM2.5					
Global model					
First trimester	4 (6)	0.0	O	1.07 (1.01 to 1.13)	35.4
Second trimester	4 (6)	0.0	C	1.04 (0.99 to 1.10)	34.1
Third trimester	4 (6)	0.0		1.06 (1.00 to 1.13)	30.5
Overall pregnancy	4 (18)	0.0	_	1.06 (1.02 to 1.09)	100
Pessimistic model					
First trimester	3 (3)	0.0		1.07 (1.01 to 1.13)	35.1
Second trimester	3 (3)	0.0		1.04 (0.98 to 1.10)	34.3
Third trimester	3 (3)	0.0	O	1.07 (1.00 to 1.13)	30.6
Overall pregnancy	3 (9)	0.0	_	1.06 (1.02 to 1.10)	100
Optimistic model					
First trimester	3 (3)	0.0	O	1.07 (1.01 to 1.14)	35.2
Second trimester	3 (3)	0.0		1.04 (0.98 to 1.10)	34.3
Third trimester	3 (3)	0.0	O	1.07 (1.00 to 1.13)	30.5
Overall pregnancy	3 (9)	0.0		1.06 (1.02 to 1.10)	100
		0.9	1 1.1		

		Coefficient	p-value
		(95% CI)	(%)
All	1	0.05 (0.40 to 0.00)	0.40
Age of mothers	1	-0.05 (-0.13 to 0.02)	0.16
Sex of newborn male as reference	Ļ	0.03 (-0.19 to 0.23)	0.77
Comparisons between pollutants	1	0.00 (0.00 to 0.10)	0.21
PM2.5 vs PM10		0.20 (-0.02 to 0.42)	0.073
PM2.5 vs NOx		0.29 (0.08 to 0.50)	0.006
PM2.5 vs O3		0.15 (-0.07 to 0.39)	0.19
PM2.5 vs Metals	- ~-	0.16 (-0.04 to 0.36)	0.13
PM2.5 vs Solvents		0.24 (0.04 to 0.44)	0.017
PM10 vs NOx	~-	0.09 (-0.10 to 0.28)	0.37
PM10 vs O3	-	-0.05 (-0.26 to 0.17)	0.67
PM10 vs Metals	}_	-0.05 (-0.23 to 0.14)	0.62
PM10 vs Solvents	ſ	0.04 (-0.14 to 0.22)	0.68
NOX VS 03	I	-0.13 (-0.34 to 0.07)	0.19
NOX vs Metals		-0.13 (-0.29 to 0.03)	0.12
O3 vs Metals	ſ	-0.05(-0.21(0.0.11))	0.56
O3 vs Solvents	k _	0.00 (-0.19 to 0.20)	0.99
Metals vs Solvents		0.08 (-0.07 to 0.24)	0.30
Comparisons between periconceptional periods		0.00 (0.07 10 0.24)	0.20
Preconception vs pregnancy	;	-0.01 (-0.28 to 0.26)	0.95
Preconception vs postnatal	¦ —	0.02 (-0.27 to 0.32)	0.88
Pregnancy vs postnatal	∻ -	0.03 (-0.11 to 0.17)	0.66
PM2.5			
Age of mothers	4 	-0.04 (-0.31 to 0.23)	0.77
Age of fathers	}	0.05 (-0.27 to 0.37)	0.74
Sex of newborn, male as reference	<u>م</u>	0.03 (-0.01 to 0.07)	0.20
Comparisons between periconceptional periods			
Preconception vs pregnancy		0.18 (-0.49 to 0.85)	0.6
Preconception vs postnatal	°	0.02 (-0.72 to 0.76)	0.95
Pregnancy vs postnatal	—	-0.16 (-0.58 to 0.27)	0.47
Comparisons between stages of pregnancy		0.07(0.79 to 0.64)	0.94
First vs second trimester		-0.07 (-0.78 to 0.64)	0.84
Second vs third trimester	·	0.09 (-0.56 to 0.73)	0.70
PM10	0	0.10 (-0.02 10 0.94)	0.00
Age of mothers	<u>+-</u>	-0.11 (-0.48 to 0.26)	0.56
Age of fathers		-0.03 (-0.8 to 0.86)	0.94
Sex of newborn, male as reference	¢	0.01 (-0.02 to 0.04)	0.45
Pregnancy vs postnatal	}_	-0.03 (-0.31 to 0.26)	0.86
NOx			
Age of mothers -	+	-0.10 (-0.43 to 0.23)	0.56
Age of fathers	<u> </u>	-0.08 (-0.76 to 0.60)	0.81
Sex of newborn, male as reference	° L	0.01 (-0.02 to 0.04)	0.53
Pregnancy vs postnatal	*`-	0.15 (-0.10 to 0.41)	0.24
O3		+	
Age of mothers		T incufficient cheerunti	~ ~ ~
Age of fathers	<u></u>		
Comparisons between periconceptional periods	ſ	0.03 (-0.05 10 0.12)	0.44
Preconception vs pregnancy	<u> </u>	0.06 (-1.14 to 1.26)	0.92
Preconception vs postnatal	[0.00 (-1.24 to 1.24)	0.99
Pregnancy vs postnatal	—	-0.06 (-0.47 to 0.34)	0.75
Metals			
Age of mothers	\$-	0.02 (-0.08 to 0.13)	0.63
Age of fathers	<u> </u>	0.28 (-1.41 to 1.97)	0.74
Sex of newborn, male as reference	^	0.01 (0.00 to 0.02)	0.21
Comparisons between periconceptional periods			
Preconception vs pregnancy	 	-0.11 (-0.45 to 0.23)	0.52
Preconception vs postnatal	<u>†</u>	-0.10 (-0.54 to 0.34)	0.66
Pregnancy vs postnatal	ү —	0.01 (-0.32 to 0.34)	0.94
Solvents		1	
Age of fotbors			0.0
Sex of newborn, male as reference		-0.02 (-0.08 to 2.20)	0.3
	1	-0.02 (-0.75 (0 1.42)	0.2
-2	0 2		

The risk of ASD following air pollutants exposure during pregnancy



	n studies	Odds Ratio (95%CI)
	(subgroups)	
PM2.5 (per 5µg/m3 ir	ncrease)	
Global model	10 (62)	
Pessimistic model	9 (15)	—
Optimistic model	8 (14)	→
PM10 (per 5µg/m3 in	crease)	
Global model	9 (64)	◆
Pessimistic model	7 (16)	→
Optimistic model	7 (17)	←
NOx (per 10µg/m3 in	crease)	
Global model	4 (32)	•
Pessimistic model	8 (17)	+
Optimistic model	8 (16)	
	0.8 Decreased ris of ASD	1 1.2 sk Increased risk of ASD