CLINICAL STUDY



OPEN ACCESS OPEN ACCESS

Joint impacts of air pollution and healthy lifestyles on kidney function decline: insights from a nationwide cohort study

Leying Zhao^{a*} (1), Cong Zhao^{a*} (1), Zhen Wang^a, Zhenjie Chen^a, Huijuan Zheng^a, Sinan Ai^b, Jiayin Tao^c, Danting Li^a, Weiwei Sun^a and Yaoxian Wang^{a,d}

^aDepartment of Nephrology and Endocrinology, Dongzhimen Hospital, Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China; ^bChina-Japan Friendship Hospital, Beijing, China; ^cZhejiang Provincial Hospital of Chinese Medicine, Hangzhou, China; ^dHenan University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Zhengzhou, China

ABSTRACT

Long-term exposure to ambient air pollution is a recognized environmental risk factor for chronic kidney disease (CKD), but its dynamic effects on kidney function remain incompletely understood. This nationwide longitudinal study included 5,306 participants from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) to examine associations between five major air pollutants (PM1, PM25, PM10, NO2, and O3) and kidney function decline, measured by the annual slope of estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR). Air pollutant exposures were assessed both as continuous variables and dichotomized by median levels. Higher exposure to PM₁, PM₂₅, PM₁₀, and NO₂ was consistently associated with faster eGFR decline. In fully adjusted models, each $1 \mu q/m^3$ increase in PM_{2.5} corresponded to a steeper decline in eGFR ($\beta = -0.02$; 95% CI: -0.03 to -0.02), while participants in high PM_{2.5} areas had an annual decline of -0.51 mL/min/1.73 m² (95% CI: -0.72 to -0.31). O₃ showed a significant association only in binary models. Weighted quantile sum regression identified $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_1 as dominant contributors. A favorable lifestyle markedly mitigated pollution-related decline; under high PM_1 exposure, eGFR declined by -0.69 (95% CI: -1.06 to -0.33) in those with favorable lifestyles versus -2.20 (95% CI: -2.65 to -1.75) in those with unfavorable lifestyles. These findings were robust across multiple sensitivity analyses. These findings emphasize the adverse impact of long-term air pollution exposure on kidney function and suggest that healthy lifestyle behaviors may offer significant protective benefits.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 21 February 2025 Revised 19 April 2025 Accepted 13 May 2025

KEYWORDS

Chronic kidney disease; eGFR slope; air pollution; healthy lifestyle; longitudinal cohort; environmental health

GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT



1. Introduction

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a progressive, irreversible condition that compromises kidney function and affects over 10% of the global population, impacting more than 800 million individuals [1]. It is among the leading causes of death

worldwide. With an aging population and increasing life expectancy, the prevalence of CKD continues to grow [2]. This condition not only poses significant threats to individual health but also imposes substantial economic and resource burdens on global healthcare systems [3]. While traditional risk factors, such as diabetes and hypertension [4], have been

CONTACT Weiwei Sun 🔊 sunweitcm@163.com; Yaoxian Wang 🐼 201903001@bucm.edu.cn 🗈 Department of Nephrology and Endocrinology, Dongzhimen Hospital, Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing 100700, China

Both authors contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.

Supplemental data for this article can be accessed online at https://doi.org/10.1080/0886022X.2025.2508295.

²⁰²⁵ The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

extensively studied, the contribution of environmental risk factors to the onset and progression of CKD has received comparatively less attention [5].

Emerging evidence suggests that environmental pollutants, including fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}) and nitrogen oxides (NO_2), significantly elevate the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases [6–8] and may also contribute to kidney function decline through mechanisms such as oxidative stress and chronic inflammation [9,10]. However, most existing research has focused on isolated health outcomes associated with air pollution, leaving the dynamic relationship between air pollution exposure and kidney function insufficiently explored.

The present study focuses on five key ambient air pollutants: PM_1 , $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , NO_2 , and ozone (O_3). These pollutants originate from various anthropogenic activities, including fossil fuel combustion, industrial processes, vehicular emissions, and photochemical reactions. Their small aerodynamic diameters and chemical reactivity enable them to penetrate deep into the respiratory tract and enter systemic circulation, where they may exert widespread biological effects. Table 1 provides an overview of their definitions, principal sources, and known or potential health impacts.

Simultaneously, healthy lifestyles have gained growing attention for their protective roles in preventing and

 Table 1. Characteristics, major sources, and known or potential health effects of selected ambient air pollutants included in this study.

Pollutant	Definition	Major sources	Known or potential health effects
PM ₁	Particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter ≤1µm	Ultrafine particles from combustion engines, industrial emissions, secondary aerosol formation [11,12]	Penetrates deep into alveoli; associated with systemic inflammation, cardiovascular and renal damage [13–16]
PM _{2.5}	Particulate matter with diameter ≤2.5 μm	Traffic emissions, coal and biomass burning, industrial combustion [17]	Linked to oxidative stress, atherosclerosis, lung function decline, and CKD progression [18–20]
PM ₁₀	Particulate matter with diameter ≤10μm	Road dust, construction, agricultural activities, fossil fuel combustion [21.22]	Causes airway irritation, asthma exacerbation, and potential renal impact [23–25]
NO ₂	Reactive nitrogen oxide gas formed during high-temperature combustion	Vehicular emissions, power plants, gas stoves, and heaters [26]	Triggers respiratory inflammation, impairs vascular function, linked to CKD risk [27–29]
03	Secondary pollutant formed by photochemical reactions between NOx and VOCs in sunlight	Results from interaction of NOx and VOCs [30–32]	Induces oxidative stress, affects pulmonary and cardiovascular systems [33–35]

managing chronic diseases. Healthy behaviors, such as avoiding smoking, maintaining a balanced diet, engaging in regular physical activity, and sustaining a healthy weight, are known to improve cardiovascular and metabolic health and may also mitigate the adverse health effects of environmental risk factors [36–38]. Although previous studies have highlighted the protective effects of healthy lifestyles on various chronic conditions, limited research has explored whether these behaviors can offset the detrimental effects of air pollution on kidney function.

This study leverages nationally representative data from China and adopts a longitudinal design to investigate the association between long-term exposure to air pollution and kidney function decline, while assessing the potential modifying role of healthy lifestyle behaviors. By systematically analyzing both the individual and combined effects of five major air pollutants, this research aims to clarify the dynamic effects of air pollution on renal health and to explore whether healthy behaviors offer protective benefits. Findings from this study may inform targeted prevention strategies, support evidence-based environmental health policy, and guide population-level interventions to mitigate the burden of CKD.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study population

This study utilized data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) [39]. Initiated by Peking University in 2011, CHARLS is a nationwide longitudinal study tracking the health and aging of Chinese adults aged 45 and older. The study employed a stratified multistage probability sampling method, covering 28 provinces in China and enrolling 17,708 participants. Participants underwent standardized interviews, physical examinations, and biomarker testing, providing comprehensive data on sociodemographic factors, lifestyles, and health metrics. Follow-ups were conducted biennially from the baseline survey onward. The CHARLS datasets can be downloaded at http://charls.pku.edu.cn/en. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Biomedical Ethics Committee of Peking University (IRB00001052-11014 and IRB00001052-11015). All participants provided written informed consent before participation, in accordance with the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki.

This study utilized CHARLS data collected across three waves: wave 1 (2011–2012), wave 2 (2013–2014), and wave 3 (2015–2016). However, only wave 1 and wave 3 included biomarker data necessary for calculating estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR). Inclusion criteria were: (1) age \geq 45 years and (2) availability of complete data for calculating kidney function (creatinine and cystatin C). Exclusion criteria included: (1) missing community location data, (2) death or loss to follow-up, (3) age <45 years, (4) incomplete data on cystatin C or creatinine, and (5) community relocation during follow-up. Ultimately, 5306 participants met the criteria for analysis.

2.2. Environmental exposure measurement

Air pollution exposure data were sourced from the China High Air Pollution (CHAP) dataset (https://weijing-rs.github.io/ product.html), recognized for its high resolution and reliability. The dataset integrates satellite remote sensing, artificial intelligence, ground observations, atmospheric reanalysis, and model simulations to capture the spatiotemporal heterogeneity of air pollution [40,41]. The pollutants analyzed included PM₁, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, and O₃ at a spatial resolution of 1 km × 1 km, and NO₂ at a resolution of 10 km × 10 km. Mean pollutant concentrations from the baseline to the final follow-up were calculated and matched with county-level geocodes corresponding to participants' residential addresses to estimate long-term exposure. Figure 1 displays the geographic distribution of participants alongside the average pollutant concentrations recorded from 2011 to 2016.

2.3. Healthy lifestyle measurement

A healthy lifestyle score was developed based on the American Heart Association's 'Life's Essential 8' framework and supporting studies [42,43]. This score included nine modifiable health risk factors: smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, BMI, lipids, blood glucose, blood pressure, sleep, and social participation. Smoking was scored as follows: 100 points for never smoking, 75 points for cessation \geq 5 years, 50 points for cessation <5 years, and 0 points for current smokers. Alcohol consumption was deemed healthy if daily intake

was ≤ 28 g for men or ≤ 14 g for women, receiving 100 points. Physical activity was assessed by calculating the total weekly time spent on moderate and vigorous exercise, with vigorous activity weighted double. Participants engaging in ≥150 min of activity per week received 100 points, with scores decreasing for lower levels of activity. BMI was scored as 100 for the ideal range (<25 kg/m²), with lower scores assigned for deviations. Other health factors were similarly scored using established clinical thresholds. Missing data were imputed using the mice package (version 3.16.0). To compute the composite healthy lifestyle score, each indicator was weighted using standardized regression coefficients (β values) derived from generalized linear models (GLMs) evaluating their associations with eGFR slope changes [44]. Final scores were categorized into three groups: unhealthy (0-59), intermediate (60-79), and healthy (80-100).

2.4. Outcome assessment

The primary outcome of this study was the eGFR slope, defined as the annual rate of decline in eGFR, which served as a measure of changes in kidney function. In the main analysis, eGFR values were calculated using the CKD-EPI_{cr-cys} equation [45]. The eGFR slope was calculated by taking the difference between eGFR measurements from wave 1 (2011–2012) and wave 3 (2015–2016), divided by the time interval in years between the two waves. This value reflects the annual rate of kidney function change over an approximate 4-year period.



Figure 1. Spatial distribution of ambient air pollutants and study participants across China. Geographical distribution maps of ambient air pollutants and participant enrollment locations across China. NO₂: nitrogen dioxide; O₃: ozone; PM₁: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than 1 μ m; PM_{2.5}: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 μ m; PM₁₀: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter < 10 μ m.

2.5. Covariates

Covariates included sociodemographic characteristics (sex, age, education level, urban or rural residence, and region), lifestyle factors, and health-related variables [46]. Sociodemographic data were obtained through standardized interviews conducted by trained interviewers. Indoor air pollution exposure was assessed based on the type of heating and cooking fuels used (solid vs. clean fuels). Health-related variables were collected through blood tests and structured questionnaires. In addition to lifestyle-related biomarkers, blood urea nitrogen (BUN) and serum uric acid (UA) were incorporated as key health indicators. All covariates were gathered at baseline to ensure they accurately represented potential confounding effects throughout the study period.

2.6. Statistical analyses

To comprehensively assess the relationship between air pollution exposure and kidney function decline, we first analyzed air pollutant concentrations as continuous variables in the primary regression models. For interpretability and subgroup comparisons, particularly in stratified analyses involving lifestyle categories, we additionally categorized exposure levels into two groups using the median as a cutoff: Q1 (low exposure) and Q2 (high exposure). Descriptive statistics were used to analyze baseline characteristics across the overall population and lifestyle-specific groups. Generalized linear models with a Gaussian distribution and identity link function were employed to assess the associations between individual air pollutants and the continuous outcome variable - the annual eGFR slope. Stratified analyses assessed the effects of lifestyle categories (unfavorable, intermediate, favorable) and pollutant exposure subgroups (low, high) on eGFR decline rates, adjusting for potential confounders. These adjustments were made incrementally, with models including sociodemographic characteristics (model 1), indoor air pollution (model 2), and additional health variables such as BUN, UA, and kidney disease status (model 3).

Restricted cubic splines (RCSs) with three knots (10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles) were employed to explore the concentration-response (C–R) relationships between air pollutants and eGFR decline rates. Subgroup analyses stratified by sex, age, education level, residence, lifestyle, CKD status, and eGFR classification were conducted to investigate potential interactive effects.

The 'mediation' R package was utilized to determine whether the relationship between air pollution exposure and eGFR decline was mediated by lifestyle categories, with 10,000 bootstraps applied. The interaction between air pollution and lifestyle was further examined using weighted quantile sum (WQS) regression [47], implemented with the 'gWQS' package (version 3.0.5), and quantile g-computation [48], performed with the 'qgcomp' package (version 2.15.2). These models evaluated the combined effects of multi-pollutant exposures on eGFR decline rates. The WQS index (ranging from 0 to 1) quantified the relative

contribution of each pollutant to the combined effect, while quantile g-computation addressed limitations of the uniform directionality assumption inherent in WQS models. To ensure robustness, two sets of sensitivity analyses were conducted. First, we recalculated eGFR using the CKD-EPlcr and CKD-EPlcys equations [49]. Second, we applied linear mixed-effects models using the '*lme4*' package (version 1.1-37), treating eGFR as the dependent variable and incorporating both time (years since baseline) and pollutant-by-time interaction terms. Random intercepts were included for individual participants to account for within-subject correlation. All statistical analyses were performed using R software (version 4.4.2) (R Project for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), with a two-sided p < .05 considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Baseline characteristics

Table 2 summarizes the baseline characteristics of CHARLS participants. Among the 5306 participants, the mean age (\pm SD) was 59.99 \pm 9.27 years, with 53.81% female and 46.19% male. Lifestyle categorization revealed that 813 participants had an unfavorable lifestyle, 2877 had an intermediate lifestyle, and 1616 had a favorable lifestyle. Participants with a favorable lifestyle were generally younger, more likely to be female, better educated, and more often resided in rural areas. Smoking and alcohol consumption were disproportionately common among participants with an unfavorable lifestyle. Key health and behavioral factors, including physical activity, sleep duration, social participation, non-HDL cholesterol, BMI, diabetes prevalence, and blood pressure, were lowest in the favorable lifestyle group. Although the prevalence of kidney disease did not vary across lifestyle categories, BUN and UA levels were lowest among participants with a favorable lifestyle. The average exposure levels of the air pollutants PM₁, PM₂₅, PM₁₀, NO₂, and O₃ were 32.03 \pm 10.18, 57.61 \pm 18.89, 97.64 \pm 33.40, 30.50 \pm 9.90, and 84.76 \pm 6.59 $\mu g/$ m³, respectively. As shown in Table 2, there were no statistically significant differences in outdoor (PM₁, PM₂₅, PM₁₀, NO₂, and O₃) or indoor (solid fuel use for cooking or heating) air pollution exposure across the different lifestyle subgroups (all p > .05).

3.2. Association between air pollution exposure, lifestyle, and eGFR slope

Generalized linear regression analyses were conducted to evaluate the associations between air pollution exposure and the annual eGFR slope. Results from both continuous exposure models and median-dichotomized models (high vs. low exposure) are detailed in Table 3.

In models using air pollutant concentrations as continuous variables, significant inverse associations were observed for PM₁ (β = -0.04, 95% CI: -0.05, -0.03), PM_{2.5} (β = -0.02, 95% CI: -0.03, -0.02), PM₁₀ (β = -0.01, 95% CI: -0.02, -0.01),

Table 2. Baseline characteristic of the enrolled participants according to different lifestyle categories.

	Total ($n = 5306$)	Unfavorable ($n = 817$)	Intermediate ($n = 2778$)	Favorable ($n = 1711$)	p Value
Age, years	59.99 ± 9.27	61.30 ± 8.81	60.50 ± 9.29	58.55 ± 9.26	<.0001
Sex					<.01
Female	2855 (53.81)	412 (50.43)	1474 (53.06)	969 (56.63)	
Male	2451 (46.19)	405 (49.57)	1304 (46.94)	742 (43.37)	
Education					<.0001
Above high school	390 (7.36)	45 (5.52)	182 (6.56)	163 (9.53)	
Below high school	4911 (92.64)	770 (94.48)	2594 (93.44)	1547 (90.47)	
Residence					<.0001
Rural	3499 (65.94)	489 (59.85)	1837 (66.13)	1173 (68.56)	
Urban	1807 (34.06)	328 (40.15)	941 (33.87)	538 (31.44)	
South/north					.25
North	2484 (46.81)	385 (47.12)	1272 (45.79)	827 (48.33)	
South	2822 (53.19)	432 (52.88)	1506 (54.21)	884 (51.67)	
Nationality	2022 (00117)	102 (02100)			.95
Han	4937 (93.06)	762 (93.38)	2580 (92.87)	1595 (93.22)	120
Others	298 (5.62)	43 (5 27)	159 (5.72)	96 (5.61)	
NA	70 (1 32)	11 (1 35)	39 (1.40)	20 (1 17)	
Solid fuel use for	3000 (58 50)	466 (57 11)	1606 (58 04)	1018 (59.92)	30
cooking	5050 (50.50)	400 (37:11)	1000 (58.04)	1010 (55.52)	.52
Solid fuel use for	3053 (62.27)	112 (50 11)	1638 (63 11)	973 (61 70)	10
heating	3033 (02.27)	442 (39.41)	1058 (05.44)	975 (01.70)	.12
Kidney disease	294 (5.60)	48 (5.96)	149 (5.42)	97 (5.72)	.82
BUN, mg/dL	15.81 ± 4.48	16.22 ± 4.58	15.87 ± 4.45	15.50 ± 4.45	<.001
UA, mg/dL	4.43 ± 1.25	4.78 ± 1.39	4.47 ± 1.22	4.18 ± 1.17	<.0001
Smoking	2058 (38.88)	406 (49.82)	1122 (40.51)	530 (31.03)	<.0001
BMI, kg/m ²	23.56 ± 3.86	25.50 ± 4.14	23.71 ± 3.94	22.39 ± 3.12	<.0001
Non-HDL, mg/dL	142.39 ± 38.60	189.83 ± 38.40	146.13 ± 30.76	113.68 ± 21.43	<.0001
DM	801 (15.10)	309 (37.82)	366 (13.17)	126 (7.36)	<.0001
Pre-DM	1174 (22.15)	262 (32.15)	665 (23.96)	247 (14.44)	<.0001
HbA1c. %	5.27 ± 0.81	5.91 ± 1.46	5.21 ± 0.61	5.05 ± 0.41	<.0001
SBP. mmHa	131.03 + 21.84	146.01 + 20.10	133.63 + 21.73	119.69 + 16.56	< .0001
DBP mmHa	75.63 + 12.18	83 18 + 11 84	76.81 + 11.99	70.11 + 10.02	< 0001
Nighttime sleep	634 + 190	6.08 ± 2.08	621 ± 196	6.69 ± 1.65	< 0001
duration, hour	0.54 ± 1.50	0.00 ± 2.00	0.21 ± 1.90	0.09 ± 1.05	<
Alcohol consumption					<.01
Drink more than once a	1312 (24.79)	221 (27.12)	719 (25.97)	372 (21.77)	
month					
Drink less than once a	388 (7.33)	70 (8.59)	186 (6.72)	132 (7.72)	
month					
Never drink	3593 (67.88)	524 (64.29)	1864 (67.32)	1205 (70.51)	
Social participation	1253 (23.61)	139 (17.01)	591 (21.27)	523 (30.57)	<.0001
(score ≥80)					
Physical activity (score	1414 (26.65)	178 (21.79)	739 (26.60)	497 (29.05)	<.001
Ambient air pollutants					
PM µa/m ³	32 03 + 10 19	32.08 + 10.83	31 81 + 10 13	3235 ± 0.04	22
PM μα/m ³	57.61 ± 18.80	52.00 ± 10.05 58.01 + 20.02	57.01 ± 10.15 57.18 + 18.81	52.55 ± 7.77 58 13 + 18 45	.22
DM μα/m ³	07.01 ± 10.09	97.61 ± 20.02	96.73 ± 33.16	30.13 ± 10.43	.21
$NO \mu q/m^3$	20 50 ± 0 00	37.01 ± 33.09 30.20 ± 10.27	30 33 ± 0 00	30.82 ± 0.75	.00
$10O_2$, μ g/III ⁻	30.30 ± 9.90	30.39 ± 10.27	3U.32 ± 9.00	30.03 ± 9.73	.24
Ο ₃ , μg/III-	04./0 ± 0.09	04.43 ± 0.70	04./3 ± 0.02	04.90 ± 0.4/	.15

and NO₂ (β = -0.03, 95% CI: -0.04, -0.02) in the fully adjusted model (model 3, all p < .0001). O₃ was not significantly associated with eGFR slope as a continuous variable (β = -0.01, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.01, p = .32), which was consistent with the results in other models.

Similar trends were observed in the dichotomized models comparing high (Q2) vs. low (Q1) exposure groups. High exposure to all pollutants, including O_{3^7} was significantly associated with accelerated decline in eGFR. For example, high NO₂ exposure was associated with a significantly eGFR decline ($\beta = -0.93$, 95% Cl: -1.16, -0.71, p < .0001), and for PM_{2.5}, $\beta = -0.51$ (95% Cl: -0.72, -0.31, p < .0001). The consistency of results across both continuous and categorical models strengthens the validity of the observed associations. Covariate adjustments in models 1 to 3 had little impact on the direction or statistical significance of the associations.

Comparable trends were observed for NO₂, PM₁, PM₁₀, and O₃, with high exposure to each pollutant significantly associated with an accelerated eGFR decline (p < .0001). However, the analysis did not find evidence for a mediating effect of lifestyle on the relationship between air pollution and eGFR decline (Supplementary Material, Fig. S2).

3.3. Lifestyle-stratified analysis

Figure 2 depicts the joint effects of lifestyle categories (favorable, intermediate, unfavorable) and air pollution exposure levels (Q1: low exposure vs. Q2: high exposure) on the annual eGFR slope (Supplementary Material, Table S1). The fully adjusted model (model 3) revealed significantly accelerated eGFR decline rates among participants in the high pollution exposure group (Q2) compared to those in the low exposure

Table 3. Association between air pollutant and eGFR slope.

	PM ₁		PM _{2.5}		PM ₁₀		NO ₂		O ₃	
	Continuous	p Value	Continuous	p Value	Continuous	p Value	Continuous	p Value	Continuous	p Value
Crude model	-0.03 (-0.04,	<.0001	-0.01 (-0.02,	<.0001	-0.01 (-0.01,	<.001	-0.02 (-0.03,	<.0001	0.00 (-0.02,	.85
	-0.02)		-0.01)		0.00)		-0.01)		0.01)	
Model 1	-0.04 (-0.05,	<.0001	-0.02 (-0.03,	<.0001	-0.01 (-0.02,	<.0001	-0.04 (-0.05,	<.0001	-0.01 (-0.03,	.11
	-0.03)		-0.02)		-0.01)		-0.03)		0.00)	
Model 2	-0.04 (-0.05,	<.0001	-0.02 (-0.03,	<.0001	-0.01 (-0.02,	<.0001	-0.03 (-0.04,	<.0001	-0.01 (-0.03,	.24
	-0.03)		-0.02)		-0.01)		-0.02)		0.01)	
Model 3	-0.04 (-0.05,	<.0001	-0.02 (-0.03,	<.0001	-0.01 (-0.02,	<.0001	-0.03 (-0.04,	<.0001	-0.01 (-0.02,	.32
	-0.03)		-0.02)		-0.01)		-0.02)		0.01)	
	Q2 vs. Q1	p Value	Q2 vs. Q1	p Value	Q2 vs. Q1	р	Q2 vs. Q1	р	Q2 vs. Q1	р
Crude model	-0.68 (-0.87,	<.0001	-0.49 (-0.69,	<.0001	-0.53 (-0.73,	<.0001	-0.66 (-0.85,	<.0001	-0.24 (-0.44,	.02
	-0.49)		-0.30)		-0.34)		-0.46)		-0.05)	
Model 1	-0.81 (-1.01,	<.0001	-0.55 (-0.75,	<.0001	-0.78 (-0.99,	<.0001	-0.92 (-1.13,	<.0001	-0.49 (-0.70,	<.0001
	-0.60)		-0.35)		-0.57)		-0.70)		-0.27)	
Model 2	-0.81 (-1.02,	<.0001	-0.54 (-0.75,	<.0001	-0.82 (-1.04,	<.0001	-0.96 (-1.18,	<.0001	-0.52 (-0.75,	<.0001
	-0.60)		-0.34)		-0.60)		-0.74)		-0.30)	
Model 3	-0.79 (-1.00,	<.0001	-0.51 (-0.72,	<.0001	-0.78 (-1.01,	<.0001	-0.93 (-1.16,	<.0001	-0.51 (-0.74,	<.0001
	-0.57)		-0.31)		-0.56)		-0.71)		-0.28)	

Low exposure (Q1) was used as the reference group. Model 1: sex, age, education, residence, and south/north. Model 2: sex, age, education, residence, south/north, solid fuel use for cooking, solid fuel use for heating. Model 3: sex, age, education, residence, south/north, solid fuel use for cooking, solid fuel use for heating. BUN, UA, and kidney disease status.



Figure 2. Combined effects of lifestyle and air pollutant exposure on eGFR slope. Joint effects of lifestyle categories (favorable, intermediate, unfavorable) and air pollution exposure levels (Q1: low exposure; Q2: high exposure) on eGFR slope, with a favorable lifestyle as the reference group. All tests for trend were statistically significant (p < .001). Model adjusted for sex, age, education, residence, south/north, solid fuel use for cooking, solid fuel use for heating, BUN, UA, and kidney disease status. CI: confidence interval; NO₂: nitrogen dioxide; O₃: ozone; PM₁: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than $1 \mu m$; PM₂₅: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter < $10 \mu m$.

group (Q1) across all pollutants and lifestyle categories. Lifestyle demonstrated a critical moderating influence on these associations. The annual eGFR decline rate was highest in the unfavorable lifestyle group under all exposure conditions, followed by the intermediate lifestyle group, whereas a favorable lifestyle substantially mitigated the adverse effects of air pollution on kidney function. For example, under high PM₁ exposure (Q2), the eGFR decline rate in the favorable lifestyle group was -0.69 (95% Cl: -1.06, -0.33, p < .001), which was significantly lower than the rates observed in the intermediate lifestyle group (-1.03, 95% Cl: -1.35, -0.71, p < .0001) and the unfavorable lifestyle group ($\beta = -2.20$, 95% Cl: -2.65, -1.75, p < .0001). This pattern was consistent across other pollutants (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, NO₂, and O₃). For instance, under high NO₂ exposure, the eGFR decline rates for the favorable, intermediate, and unfavorable lifestyle groups were -1.01 (95% Cl: -1.38, -0.64, p < .0001), -1.27 (95% Cl: -1.60, -0.93, p < .0001), and -2.44 (95% Cl: -2.91, -1.98, p < .0001), respectively.

3.4. C-R relationships

The C–R relationships between air pollution exposure and the annual eGFR slope are depicted in Figure 3. Significant linear relationships were observed for PM_{10} , O_3 , and $PM_{2.5}$ with the annual eGFR slope, as indicated by the analysis (*p*-nonlinear >.05). In contrast, the C–R curves for NO₂ and PM_1 exhibited statistically significant nonlinear relationships (*p*-nonlinear <.05), suggesting potential threshold effects at specific exposure levels. These nonlinear relationships indicate that the effects of air pollutants on kidney function may vary depending on exposure intensity, suggesting potential threshold effects at specific exposure levels.

3.5. Subgroup analysis

The results of subgroup analyses are summarized in Figure 4. No significant interactions were observed across age groups, sexes, education levels, or geographic regions (*p*-interaction >.05). However, urban residence amplified the impact of PM₁, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ exposure on eGFR decline. Except for NO₂ and O₃, improvements in lifestyle significantly mitigated the adverse effects of air pollution on kidney function. Analysis

of CKD subgroups revealed that as kidney function declined, higher air pollution exposure was associated with steeper eGFR decline rates, although only some results reached statistical significance.

3.6. Combined air pollution exposure and eGFR decline

Spearman's rank correlation analysis revealed strong correlations among PM₁, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ concentrations ($\rho > 0.8$; Figure 5(A)), while NO₂ and O₃ were relatively independent from the other pollutants. Based on the WQS regression model, PM₁ and PM_{2.5} contributed the most to the combined effect of air pollution on the annual eGFR slope, with PM_{2.5} accounting for the highest proportion (87.3%; Figure 5(B)). The WQS index curve demonstrated a negative linear relationship between air pollution mixtures and eGFR decline rates (Figure 5(C)). Each quartile increase in air pollution mixture exposure was significantly associated with an accelerated annual eGFR decline ($\beta = -0.33$, 95% CI: -0.45, -0.22, p = 1.7e-8).

Consistent findings were observed in the quantile g-computation analysis (Figure 5(D)), which further emphasized the roles of PM₁ and PM_{2.5} as the primary drivers of the negative effects, whereas NO₂ contributed the most to positive overall effects. Combined exposure to air pollution mixtures was significantly associated with an accelerated eGFR decline ($\beta = -0.25$, 95% CI: -0.42, -0.09, p = .003).

3.7. Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analyses using eGFR values calculated with the CKD-EPI_{cr} and CKD-EPI_{cys} formulas to compute the annual eGFR slope yielded findings consistent with the primary analysis (Supplementary Material, Tables S2–S3). Subgroup analyses exploring potential interactions between air pollution and lifestyle showed trends consistent with the main findings, although some results did not reach statistical significance (Supplementary Material, Figures S3–S4).



Figure 3. Concentration–response associations of five air pollutants with eGFR slope. Dashed area represents the 95% confidence interval (CI). Model adjusted for sex, age, education, residence, south/north, solid fuel use for cooking, solid fuel use for heating, BUN, UA, and kidney disease status. NO₂: nitrogen dioxide; O₃: ozone; PM₁: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than 1 μ m; PM_{2.5}: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter < 10 μ m.

Subgroups	PM1	Q1/Q2			Р	P for interaction	PM2.5	Q1/Q2		Р	P for interaction	PM10	Q1/Q2			Р	P for interaction
Age			1			0.284			1		0.898				1		0.586
under 65	-0.687(-0.934,-0.440)	I+I -		< 0.0001		-0.499(-	0.744,-0.253)	101	< 0.0001		-0.806(-	1.066,-0.546	6) 🖂	• ·	< 0.0001	
above 65	-0.981(-1.360,-0.603)			< 0.0001		-0.541(-	0.915,-0.167)		0.005		-0.712(-	1.108,-0.315	5) ⊢	•	< 0.001	
Sex			i			0.226			i		0.262				i		0.579
male	-0.94(-	1.238,-0.642)			< 0.0001		-0.657(-	0.953,-0.361)	I-0-1	< 0.0001		-0.894(-	1.205,-0.582	2) ⊢•	н	< 0.0001	
female	-0.632(-0.919,-0.345)	1.01		< 0.0001		-0.384(-	0.668,-0.100)	1.0-I)	0.008		-0.675(-	0.978,-0.372	2) ⊩	•	< 0.0001	
Education			1			0.791			i.		0.643				1		0.349
below high school	-0.78(-	0.9950.564)	101		< 0.0001		-0.508(-	0.7210.295)	101	< 0.0001		-0.76(-0	.9860.534)	. In	•	< 0.0001	
above high school	-0.827(-1.5470.107)			0.024		-0.672(-	1.392.0.047)		0.067		-1.08(-1	.8670.294)			0.007	
Residence		,	1			0.009		. ,	1		< 0.001		. ,				< 0.0001
rural	-0.56(-	0.8100.309)			< 0.0001		-0.25(-0	4990.002)	1.	0.048		-0.423(-	0.6880.158	3)	1.	0.002	
urban	-1.247(-1.614 -0.880)	H+H 1		< 0.0001		-1.074(-	1.435 -0.713)	H+1 1	< 0.0001		-1.514(-	1.893 -1.135	5) H•H		<0.0001	
South/north						0.761		,			0.629			,	1		< 0.0001
sourth	-0 7720	-1 070 -0 475)	1.0		<0.0001		-0.571(-	0 867 -0 276)	1.001	<0.001		-1 22(-1	529 -0.911)			<0.0001	
north	-0.844(-1 141 -0 547)	1.0.1		<0.0001		-0.459(-	0 754 -0 163)	Let I	0.002		-0.188/-	0 501 0 125)		1-0-1	0.239	
Lifestyle group	0.011	,	1		4010001	0.022	01100(0.101, 0.100)	1	0.002	0.033	01100(0.001,01120)		1	01200	0.008
intermediate & favorable	-0.689/	_0 906 _0 472)			<0.0001	0.0LL	-0.423(-	0.637 -0.208)		<0.001	0.000	_0.679/_	0 907 -0 450	n) =		<0.0001	0.000
unfavorable	-0.003(-1.971 -0.641)			<0.0001		-0.423(-	1 567 -0.246)		0.001		1.26/ 1	006 0 725)	″ . .		<0.0001	
CKD	-1.200(-1.0/1,-0.041)			<0.0001	0.521	-0.850(-	1.507,-0.540)		0.002	0.519	-1.50(-1	.990,-0.725)		· •	0.0001	0.475
DOD CKD	0.77(0.078 0.560)			-0.0001	0.531	0 507(0.712 0.201)		-0.0001	0.010	0.756(0.074 0.529	2) 14		-0.0001	0.475
CKD	-0.77(-	0.978,-0.302)			<0.0001		-0.507(-	1.075.0.201)		<0.0001		-0.750(-	0.574,-0.000	n - •	• · ·	<0.0001	
CRD	-1.10(-	2.343,-0.018)			0.047	0.500	-0.827(-	1.975,0.321)		0.157	0.400	-1.200(-	2.545,-0.027		i i	0.045	0.470
eGFR group	0.045				0.0004	0.528	0.055/	0.000 0.074		0.014	0.496	0.00/ 0	004 0.005			0.0004	0.472
G1	-0.645(-0.931,-0.360)	1.4		<0.0001		-0.355(-	0.638,-0.071)	1.00	0.014		-0.63(-0	.924,-0.335)	P	•	<0.0001	
G2	-0.717(-0.991,-0.444)	1		<0.0001		-0.47(-0	.740,-0.200)	1.001	<0.001		-0.629(-	0.923,-0.335	o) 🖡	•	<0.0001	
G3-G4	-1.18(-	2.343,-0.018)			0.047		-0.827(-	1.975,0.321)		0.157		-1.286(-	2.545,-0.027	° <u>—</u>	_	0.045	
			-1 Ó	i i					-1 Ó	i				-1	ıò	1	
Subgroups	NO2	01/02			Р	P for interaction	02 0	1/02		в	D for interaction						
aungroups					•	i ioi interaotion	03 0	a 1/042		F	F for interaction						
Age	1102	anaz				0.633	03 0	a 1/022	1	r	0.455						
Age under 65	-0.858(-1.123,-0.594)		H 0 -1	<0.0001	0.633	-0.547(-	0.813,-0.281)	I € !	<0.0001	0.455						
Age under 65 above 65	-0.858(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657)			<0.0001	0.633	-0.547(-	0.813,-0.281)	⊕ -●-	<0.0001 0.026	0.455						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex	-0.858(-1.051(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657)			<0.0001 <0.0001	0.633	-0.547(- -0.47(-0	0.813,-0.281)		<0.0001 0.026	0.455						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657)			<0.0001 <0.0001	0.633	-0.547(- -0.47(-0	0.813,-0.281) 0.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012)	Hel Hel	<0.0001 0.026 0.042	0.455						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(-	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(-	0.813,-0.281) 0.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378)		 <0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 	0.455						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(-	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(-	0.813,-0.281) 9.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001	0.455 0.097 0.521						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below bich school	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(-	(-1.123,-0.594) (-1.444,-0.657) (-1.276,-0.642) (1.193,-0.586) (-1.122,-0.665)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(-	0.813,-0.281) 0.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744 -0.279)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001	0.455 0.097 0.521						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above bich school	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(-	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435 0.106)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 0.091	0.455 0.097 0.521						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school Besidence	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546)	F		<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.001	0.633	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.665(-	0.813,-0.281) 0.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 0.091	0.455 0.097 0.521						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school Residence	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-0.774)	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546)	Ŀ		<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.001	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.665(-	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914 -0.353)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 0.091	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education Below high school above high school Residence rural unden	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-0.774(-1.15/	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.499)	Ŀ		<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.665(- -0.634(- -0.285(-	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658,0.087)		 <0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0011 <0.0011 <0.0011 <0.0001 	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school Residence rural unban Southforeth	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-0.774(-1.15(-	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.499) 1.515,-0.784)	F		<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.684(- -0.665(- -0.634(- -0.285(-	0.813,-0.281) 0.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 0.091 <0.0001 0.133	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school above high school Residence rural urban Southynorth courth	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.893(-1.296(-0.774(-1.15(-	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.499) 1.515,-0.784)	F		<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26 0.26	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.665(- -0.634(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) 1.250,0.390)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 0.091 <0.0001 0.133 0.695	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school Residence rural urban South/north south	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-0.774(-1.15(- -1.091(0.77(1)	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.499) 1.515,-0.784) -1.403,-0.780)	F		 <0.0001 	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26 0.26	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.665(- -0.665(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 1.294(0.813,-0.281) .883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) .260,0.390) 1.564, 0.924)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 0.091 <0.0001 0.133 0.695 c0.0001	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school above high school rural urban south/north sourth north	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-0.774(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.499) 1.515,-0.784) -1.403,-0.780) .011,-0.388)	F		 <0.0001 	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26 0.144	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.665(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(-	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) 1.260,0.390) 1.594,-0.994)		 <0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.091 <0.0001 <0.091 <0.0001 <0.133 0.695 <0.0001 	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school Residence rural urban South/north sourth north Lifestyle group	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.893(-1.296(-1.296(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1	-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.499) 1.515,-0.784) -1.403,-0.780) 0.011,-0.388)	F		 <0.0001 	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26 0.26 0.144 0.063	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.684(- -0.685(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(-	0.813,-0.281) .883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) 1.260,0.390) 1.594,-0.994)		 <0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school above high school Residence rural urban South/north sourth north Lifestyle group intermediate & favorable	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.893(-1.296(-1.296(-1.15(- -1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1 -0.881(-0.2021)	-1.1230.594) -1.4440.657) -1.2760.642) 1.1930.586) -1.1220.665) -2.0470.546) -1.0490.499) 1.5150.784) -1.4030.780) .0110.388) -1.1110.651)	F		 <0.0001 	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26 0.144 0.063	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.665(- -0.634(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(- -0.534(- -0.534(- -0.534(-))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	0.813,-0.281) 0.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) 1.260,0.390) 1.594,-0.295) 7.64,-0.295)		 <0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school above high school Residence rural urban South/north South/north intermediate & favorable unfavorable Corp	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.893(-1.296(-0.774(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1 -0.881(-1.223(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) 1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -1.049,-0.499) 1.515,-0.784) -1.403,-0.780) 0.011,-0.388) -1.111,-0.651) -1.876,-0.570)	F		<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26 0.144 0.063	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.684(- -0.684(- -0.684(- -0.685(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(- -0.53(-0 -0.549(-	0.813,-0.281) .883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.108) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) 1.594,-0.394) 1.594,-0.394) 1.764,-0.295) 1.217,0.120)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 0.091 0.091 0.0001 0.133 0.695 <0.0001 0.108	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school Residence rural urban South/north sourth north Lifestyle group intermediate & favorable unfavorable CKD	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.893(-1.296(-0.774(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1) -0.881(-1.223(-1.123, -0.594) -1.444, -0.6677 -1.276, -0.6427 1.193, -0.6869 -2.047, -0.5469 -2.047, -0.5469 1.515, -0.784) -1.403, -0.7809 0.011, -0.3889 -1.111, -0.6511 -1.876, -0.5701			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26 0.26 0.144 0.063 0.007	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.665(- -0.634(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(- -0.549(- -0.549(- -0.549(-	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.376) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658,0.087) 1.260,0.390) 1.594,-0.994) 1.594,-0.994) 1.594,-0.295) 1.217,0.120)		<	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389 0.044						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school above high school above high school Residence rural urban Suth/north South/north Lifestyle group intermediate & favorable unfavorable CKD non CKD	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89() -0.893(-1.296(-0.774(-1.15() -1.091(-0.7(-1) -0.881(-1.223(-0.853(-0.853())	-1.123,-0.594) -1.44,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) -1.193,-0.586) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.498) 1.515,-0.784) -1.403,-0.780) 0.011,-0.388) -1.111,-0.651) -1.876,-0.570) -1.074,-0.632)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.862 0.262 0.26 0.144 0.063 0.007	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.684(- -0.634(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(- -0.53(-0 -0.549(- -0.549(- -0.465(- -0.465(-)	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.794,-0.279) 1.435,0.106 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.067) 1.594,-0.394) 1.764,-0.295) 1.217,0.120) 0.659,-0.241) 0.657,0.0241)		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 0.091 <0.0001 0.133 0.695 <0.0001 0.108 <0.0001 0.108	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389 0.044						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school Residence rural urban South/north South/north South/north ELifestyle group intermediate & favorable unfavorable CKD cKD cKD cKD	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-1.296(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1 -0.881(-1.223(-0.853(-2.079(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.6577 -1.276-0.6427 -1.276-0.6427 -1.122,-0.6657 -2.047,-0.5469 -1.049,-0.4999 -1.515,-0.7841 -1.403,-0.7801 0.011,-0.3889 -1.111,-0.6511 -1.478,-0.5700 -1.074,-0.6322 -3.288,-0.8700	-		<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.662 0.262 0.26 0.144 0.063 0.007	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.685(- -0.285(- -0.285(- -0.539(- -0.549(- -0.549(- -1.262(-	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0166 0.914,-0.353) 0.658,0.087) 1.594,-0.994) 1.764,-0.295) 1.217,0.120) 0.690,-0.241) 2.557,0.033)		 <0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.0001 <0.056 	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389 0.044						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school above high school above high school Residence rural urban South/north South/north Lifestyle group intermediate & favorable unfavorable CKD non CKD CKD eGFR group	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.893(-1.296(-1.296(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1) -0.881(-1.223(-0.853(-2.079(-1.123,-0.594) -1.44,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) -1.122,-0.665) -2.047,-0.546) -1.192,-0.686) -1.049,-0.499) 1.515,-0.784) -1.403,-0.780) 0.11,-0.388) -1.117,-0.6570) -1.074,-0.632) -3.288,-0.870)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.662 0.262 0.26 0.144 0.063 0.007	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.684(- -0.685(- -0.634(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(- -0.549(- -0.549(- -0.549(- -0.465(- -0.465(- -0.465(- -0.465(- -0.465(- -0.465(-))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	0.813,-0.281) 1.883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.379 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) 1.260,0.390) 1.594,-0.994) 1.270,0120) 0.690,-0.241) 2.557,0.033) 0.690,-0.241)		 <0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.695 <0.0001 <0.695 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0066 <0.0056 	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389 0.044 0.09						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education Below high school above high school above high school Residence rural urban South/north South/north South/north ILifestyle group intermediate & favorable unfavorable CKD non CKD CKD eGFR group G1	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.893(-1.296(-1.296(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1) -0.881(-1.223(-0.853(-2.079(-0.657(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.444,-0.657) -1.4276,-0.642) -1.122,-0.666) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.499) 1.515,-0.764) -1.403,-0.760) 0.11,-0.388) -1.4111,-0.651) -1.4111,-0.632) -3.288,-0.870) -0.957,-0.358)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.662 0.262 0.26 0.144 0.063 0.007 0.007	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.665(- -0.634(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(- -0.534)(- -0.549(-).549(- -0.549(-).549(-	0.813,-0.281) .883,-0.057) 0.865,-0.012) 0.699,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658,0.087) 1.594,-0.994) 1.594,-0.994) 1.594,-0.994) 0.690,-0.241) 2.557,0.033) 0.788,-0.190) 0.784,-0.190) 0.784,-0.190		 <0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.0001 <0.056 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.005 	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389 0.044 0.09						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school above high school above high school rural urban South/north sourth north Lifestyle group intermediate & favorable unfavorable CKD non CKD CKD eGFR group G1 G2 an o c i	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.893(-1.296(-1.296(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.7(-1) -0.881(-1.223(-0.853(-2.079(-0.657(-0.657(-1.123,-0.594) -1.444,-0.657) -1.276,-0.642) -1.122,-0.665) -1.132,-0.566) -2.047,-0.546) -1.049,-0.4999 1.515,-0.784) -1.403,-0.780) -1.014,-0.651) -1.714,-0.6570) -1.074,-0.632) -3.2828,-0.870) -0.957,-0.358) -1.001,-0.488)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.662 0.262 0.26 0.144 0.063 0.007 0.007	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.684(- -0.685(- -0.634(- -0.285(- 0.065(-0 -1.294(- -0.53(-0 -0.549(- -0.465(- -1.262(- -0.494(- -0.217(- -0.494(- -0.217(-))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	0.813,-0.281) .883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.990,-0.378) 0.744,-0.279) 1.435,0.106) 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) 1.280,0.390) 1.594,-0.394) 1.594,-0.994) 0.690,-0.241) 2.557,0.033) 0.798,-0.190) 0.516,0.081)		<	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389 0.044 0.09						
Age under 65 above 65 Sex male female Education below high school above high school above rural urban school above high school above rural urban school above high school above rural urban school above high school above rural urban school above for above for aroup G1 G2 G3-G4	-0.858(-1.051(-0.959(-0.89(- -0.089(- -1.296(-1.15(- -1.091(-0.774(-1.15(- -0.774(-0.881(-1.223(-0.853(-2.079(-0.785(-2.079(-1.123, -0.594) -1.44, -0.657) -1.276, -0.642) 1.193, -0.586) -1.049, -0.499) 1.515, -0.784) -1.403, -0.780) 0.11, -0.388) -1.111, -0.651) -1.478, -0.570) -1.074, -0.632) -3.288, -0.870) -0.957, -0.358) -3.288, -0.870)			<0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001 <0.0001	0.633 0.662 0.262 0.26 0.144 0.063 0.007 0.007	-0.547(- -0.47(-0 -0.338(- -0.684(- -0.684(- -0.511(- -0.685(- -0.634(- -0.285(- -0.285(- -0.549(- -0.549(- -1.262(- -0.494(- -0.217(- -1.262(-	0.813,-0.281) .883,-0.057) 0.665,-0.012) 0.794,-0.279) 1.435,0.106 0.914,-0.353) 0.658, 0.087) 1.594,-0.994) 1.594,-0.994) 1.764,-0.295) 1.217,0.120) 0.690,-0.241) 2.557,0.033) 0.758,0.190) 0.754,-0.190) 0.754,0.190		<0.0001 0.026 0.042 <0.0001 0.033 0.695 <0.0001 0.108 <0.0001 0.108 <0.0001 0.153 0.056	0.455 0.097 0.521 0.067 < 0.0001 0.389 0.044 0.09						

Figure 4. Subgroup analyses of air pollutants with eGFR slope. Forest plot illustrating subgroup analyses of the association between air pollutant exposure and eGFR slope, using low exposure (Q1) as the reference group. Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is defined as an eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m². Model adjusted for sex, age, education, residence, south/north, solid fuel use for cooking, solid fuel use for heating, BUN, UA, and kidney disease status. Cl: confidence interval; NO₂: nitrogen dioxide; O₃: ozone; PM₁: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than 1 µm; PM_{2.5}: particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter < 10 µm.

Additionally, linear mixed-effects model analyses accounting for repeated eGFR measurements produced results highly consistent with those of the primary analysis (Table 4). For most pollutants (PM_1 , $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , and NO_2), both the continuous exposure models and the median-dichotomized comparisons (higher vs. lower exposure groups) showed statistically significant associations with eGFR decline in the expected directions. Notably, for O_3 , the continuous exposure model yielded a non-significant association, whereas the categorical comparison revealed a significant association – a pattern consistent with the primary eGFR slope-based analysis. These findings further validate the robustness of our conclusions across different modeling approaches.

4. Discussion

This nationwide cohort study examined the relationship between air pollution exposure and changes in kidney function, measured as the eGFR slope, while exploring the protective role of healthy lifestyles. We found that high concentrations of air pollutants, such as PM₁, PM_{2.5}, NO₂, and PM₁₀, significantly accelerated eGFR decline. Importantly, adopting healthy lifestyle behaviors consistently mitigated these adverse effects, demonstrating their robust and independent benefits across various pollution levels.

Our findings align with prior evidence that high air pollution exposure is strongly associated with accelerated eGFR decline, reaffirming air pollution as a significant risk factor for kidney health [27,50,51]. Unlike previous studies focusing on static outcomes [52,53], such as CKD incidence or baseline eGFR, this study utilized the annual eGFR slope as a dynamic measure, offering a deeper understanding of the progressive impact of air pollution.

The effects of O_3 on kidney function remain less clear. While some studies suggest a negative association between O_3 levels and eGFR [54], others propose potential protective effects at low concentrations for CKD management [55]. Our RCS analysis identified a nonlinear relationship between O_3 exposure and eGFR decline, suggesting threshold effects. This complexity may be influenced by geographical and meteorological factors affecting O_3 distribution, such as long-range transport of O_3 precursors [56]. Broader geographical studies are needed to resolve these inconsistencies.

This study also evaluated the combined effects of multiple pollutants, addressing a critical gap in the literature. Using quantile g-computation and WQS regression models, we identified



Figure 5. Combined effects of air pollution mixtures on eGFR slope. (A) Correlation analysis of air pollutants; (B) contribution of individual pollutants to the combined effects of air pollution on eGFR slope based on the WQS regression model; (C) relationship between air pollution mixtures and eGFR slope as modeled by the WQS index; (D) results of the quantile g-computation analysis.

Pollutant	Exposure type	β (95% Cl)	p Value
PM ₁	Continuous	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.02)	2.87e-07
PM ₁	Q2 vs. Q1	-0.66 (-0.86, -0.46)	1.66e-10
PM _{2.5}	Continuous	-0.01 (-0.02, -0.01)	1.23e-06
PM _{2.5}	Q2 vs. Q1	-0.48 (-0.68, -0.27)	3.8e-06
PM_{10}	Continuous	0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)	2.17e-03
PM ₁₀	Q2 vs. Q1	-0.52 (-0.72, -0.32)	3.94e-07
NO ₂	Continuous	-0.02 (-0.03, -0.01)	2.45e-03
NO ₂	Q2 vs. Q1	-0.67 (-0.87, -0.47)	8.21e-11
03	Continuous	0 (-0.01, 0.02)	.85
03	Q2 vs. Q1	-0.25 (-0.45, -0.05)	.01

 Table 4. Associations between air pollutants and eGFR decline based on linear mixed-effects models.

Low exposure (Q1) was used as the reference group. Sex, age, education, residence, south/north, solid fuel use for cooking, solid fuel use for heating, BUN, UA, and kidney disease status.

fine particulate matter (PM_1 and $PM_{2,5}$) as the primary contributors to the adverse effects of combined air pollution exposure on eGFR decline, with $PM_{2,5}$ accounting for the largest proportion. While the biological mechanisms remain incompletely understood, $PM_{2,5}$ is known to induce oxidative stress [57], mitochondrial dysfunction, and inflammation, which can lead to kidney damage [58,59]. The specific mechanisms through which PM_1 affects kidney function warrant further investigation.

A key finding of this study is the protective role of healthy lifestyles in mitigating the adverse impact of air pollution on kidney function. Using a comprehensive lifestyle scoring system based on the 'Life's Essential 8' framework, we assessed modifiable factors, including smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, weight management, and social participation [60]. This multidimensional approach offers a more nuanced evaluation of lifestyle compared to single-factor assessments. Consistent with prior research [61-63], our findings demonstrate that healthy lifestyles significantly reduce the risks of CKD onset, progression, and related adverse outcomes. Moreover, this study extends existing evidence by showing that healthy lifestyles can attenuate eGFR decline across all levels of air pollution exposure. These protective effects, independent of pollutant concentrations, highlight the importance of promoting healthy behaviors, especially in highly polluted environments. Likely mechanisms include reductions in oxidative stress and chronic inflammation [64,65], as well as improved regulation of blood pressure, glucose, and lipid levels [66-70].

Stratified analyses revealed no significant interactions between air pollution and demographic factors, such as sex, age, or education. However, urban populations were more susceptible to the harmful effects of fine particulate matter [71], likely due to dietary differences. Urban residents consume more protein-rich and processed foods [72,73], which are independently associated with CKD risk [74,75] through mechanisms involving oxidative stress and mitochondrial dysfunction [76]. Furthermore, antioxidant-rich diets in rural populations may offer additional protection against the metabolic impact of $PM_{2.5}$ exposure [77,78]. Populations in northern regions were particularly affected by O_3 exposure, potentially due to winter heating practices that exacerbate air pollution [79].

CKD patients were found to be particularly vulnerable to air pollution, with steeper eGFR declines observed in association with NO₂ and O₃ exposure [52,53]. Interestingly, the eGFR decline plateaued in CKD stages G3–G4, consistent with prior studies suggesting that advanced CKD stages are less affected by air pollution [80]. This plateau may be attributed to the protective effects of medical treatments, such as angiotensin receptor blockers, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, and statins, which reduce oxidative stress and mitigate pollutant-related damage [81–83]. However, the lack of medication data in the CHARLS dataset limited further exploration of this hypothesis.

While this study provides valuable insights, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the absence of detailed residential address data restricted individual-level air pollution exposure assessments, potentially introducing estimation bias. Second, the reliance on self-reported questionnaires for constructing lifestyle scores may have introduced reporting bias. Third, the lack of data on dietary patterns and medication use limited the comprehensiveness of the findings. Fourth, mortality information during the 2015-2016 follow-up wave was unavailable, preventing us from distinguishing between participants lost to follow-up due to death and those who disengaged for other reasons. This limitation may have introduced survivor bias, as individuals with higher exposure levels and poorer health may have been underrepresented in the final analytic sample. Future studies should incorporate precise exposure assessments, such as personal air pollution monitoring devices, and include data on dietary and medication variables. Such efforts will enhance our understanding of the mechanisms underlying air pollution's impact on kidney health and inform targeted prevention strategies.

5. Conclusions

This study provides robust evidence of the detrimental effects of air pollution on kidney function and highlights the independent protective role of healthy lifestyles. Promoting healthy behaviors represents an effective strategy to slow kidney function decline, particularly in high-pollution environments. These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions and public health policies to address the growing burden of air pollution on kidney health.

Acknowledgements

We extend our sincere gratitude to the China Center for Economic Research, National Development Research Institute, Peking University, for providing access to the CHARLS data, and to the National Earth System Science Data Sharing Platform for supplying air pollution data. We are deeply thankful to all participants and researchers involved in this project. This research was made possible through the collaborative spirit, intellectual generosity, and invaluable contributions of everyone who dedicated their time, expertise, and resources. We are profoundly appreciative of their support.

Author contributions

CRediT: Leying Zhao: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing; Cong Zhao: Conceptualization, Data curation, Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing; Zhen Wang: Formal analysis, Visualization, Writing - original draft; Zhenjie Chen: Data curation, Methodology, Writing - original draft; Huijuan Zheng: Investigation, Validation, Writing - original draft; Sinan Ai: Investigation, Methodology, Writing - original draft; Jiayin Tao: Data curation, Software, Writing - original draft; Danting Li: Data curation, Validation, Writing - original draft; Weiwei Sun: Conceptualization, Data curation, Project administration, Validation, Writing - original draft, Writing review & editing; Yaoxian Wang: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing.

Ethical approval

This study was approved by the Biomedical Ethics Review Committee of Peking University (IRB00001052-11014 and IRB00001052-11015).

Consent form

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This study was supported by the State Administration ofTraditional Chinese Medicine (Grant No. zyyzdxk-2023260)andBeijingUniversityofChineseMedicine's-2022-Basic-Research-BusinessFeeDisclosureLeading Project (Grant No. 2022-JYB-JBZR-038).

ORCID

Leying Zhao () http://orcid.org/0009-0007-5188-3770 Cong Zhao () http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2354-425X

Data availability statement

The data can be accessed from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) (http://charls.pku. edu.cn/) with application.

References

- Jager KJ, Kovesdy C, Langham R, et al. A single number for advocacy and communication-worldwide more than 850 million individuals have kidney diseases. Kidney Int. 2019;96(5):1048–1050. doi: 10.1016/j.kint.2019.07.012.
- [2] Chesnaye NC, Ortiz A, Zoccali C, et al. The impact of population ageing on the burden of chronic kidney disease. Nat Rev Nephrol. 2024;20(9):569–585. doi: 10.1038/ s41581-024-00863-9.
- [3] GBD 2013 Mortality and Causes of Death Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sex specific all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 240 causes of death, 1990–2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. Lancet. 2015;385(9963):117–171. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61682-2.
- [4] Scurt FG, Ganz MJ, Herzog C, et al. Association of metabolic syndrome and chronic kidney disease. Obes Rev. 2024;25(1):e13649. doi: 10.1111/obr.13649.
- [5] Liang KH, Colombijn JMT, Verhaar MC, et al. The general external exposome and the development or progression of chronic kidney disease: a systematic review and meta-analyses. Environ Pollut. 2024;358:124509. doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2024.124509.
- [6] Jiao A, Headon K, Han T, et al. Associations between short-term exposure to wildfire particulate matter and respiratory outcomes: a systematic review. Sci Total Environ. 2023;2023:168134. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.168134.
- [7] Ljungman PLS, Li W, Rice MB, et al. Long- and short-term air pollution exposure and measures of arterial stiffness in the Framingham Heart Study. Environ Int. 2018;121(Pt 1):139–147. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2018.08.060.
- [8] Luo H, Zhang Q, Meng X, et al. Air pollution and cardiac arrest: a more significant intermediate role of COPD than cardiac events. Environ Sci Technol. 2024;58(18):7782– 7790. doi: 10.1021/acs.est.4c00083.
- [9] Li W, Dorans KS, Wilker EH, et al. Short-term exposure to ambient air pollution and biomarkers of systemic inflammation: the Framingham Heart Study. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol. 2017;37(9):1793–1800. doi: 10.1161/ ATVBAHA.117.309799.
- [10] Lao XQ, Bo Y, Chen D, et al. Environmental pollution to kidney disease: an updated review of current knowledge and future directions. Kidney Int. 2024;106(2):214– 225. doi: 10.1016/j.kint.2024.04.021.
- [11] Yin D, Zhao S, Yu Y, et al. Gradient variations of formation mechanisms and sources of PM₁ at the steep slope from western SiChuan Basin to Eastern Tibetan Plateau. Atmos Res. 2024;312:107755. doi: 10.1016/j.atmosres.2024.107755.
- [12] Bari MA, Kindzierski WB, Wallace LA, et al. Indoor and outdoor levels and sources of submicron particles (PM₁) at homes in Edmonton, Canada. Environ Sci Technol. 2015;49(11):6419–6429. doi: 10.1021/acs.est.5b01173.
- [13] Filep Á, Fodor GH, Kun-Szabó F, et al. Exposure to urban PM₁ in rats: development of bronchial inflammation and airway hyperresponsiveness. Respir Res. 2016;17(1):26. doi: 10.1186/s12931-016-0332-9.
- [14] Cigánková H, Mikuška P, Hegrová J, et al. Comparison of oxidative potential of PM₁ and PM_{2.5} urban aerosol and bioaccessibility of associated elements in three simulat-

ed lung fluids. Sci Total Environ. 2021;800:149502. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149502.

- [15] Hassanvand MS, Naddafi K, Kashani H, et al. Short-term effects of particle size fractions on circulating biomarkers of inflammation in a panel of elderly subjects and healthy young adults. Environ Pollut. 2017;223:695–704. doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2017.02.005.
- [16] Baheti B, Chen G, Ding Z, et al. Residential greenness alleviated the adverse associations of long-term exposure to ambient PM₁ with cardiac conduction abnormalities in rural adults. Environ Res. 2023;237(Pt 1):116862. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2023.116862.
- [17] Liu H, Wang Q, Wei P, et al. The impacts of regional transport on anthropogenic source contributions of PM_{2.5} in a basin city, China. Sci Total Environ. 2024;917:170038. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.170038.
- [18] Hou T, Zhu L, Wang Y, et al. Oxidative stress is the pivot for PM_{2.5}-induced lung injury. Food Chem Toxicol. 2024;184:114362. doi: 10.1016/j.fct.2023.114362.
- [19] Kazemi Z, Yunesian M, Hassanvand MS, et al. Hidden health effects and economic burden of stroke and coronary heart disease attributed to ambient air pollution (PM_{2.5}) in Tehran, Iran: evidence from an assessment and forecast up to 2030. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf. 2024;286:117158. doi: 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2024.117158.
- [20] Xu W, Wang S, Jiang L, et al. The influence of PM_{2.5} exposure on kidney diseases. Hum Exp Toxicol. 2022;41:9603271211069982. doi: 10.1177/0960327 1211069982.
- [21] Zeb B, Ditta A, Alam K, et al. Wintertime investigation of PM₁₀ concentrations, sources, and relationship with different meteorological parameters. Sci Rep. 2024;14(1):154. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-49714-w.
- [22] Zhang X, Gui K, Zhao H, et al. Real-time mapping of gapless 24-hour surface PM₁₀ in China. Natl Sci Rev. 2025;12(2):nwae446.
- [23] Hüls A, Vanker A, Gray D, et al. Genetic susceptibility to asthma increases the vulnerability to indoor air pollution. Eur Respir J. 2020;55(3):1901831. doi: 10.1183/ 13993003.01831-2019.
- [24] Maesano CN, Morel G, Matynia A, et al. Impacts on human mortality due to reductions in PM₁₀ concentrations through different traffic scenarios in Paris, France. Sci Total Environ. 2020;698:134257. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.134257.
- [25] Yi J, Kim SH, Lee H, et al. Air quality and kidney health: assessing the effects of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, and NO₂ on renal function in primary glomerulonephritis. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf. 2024;281:116593. doi: 10.1016/j.ecoenv. 2024.116593.
- [26] Dong Z, Li X, Su F, et al. Molecular-scale investigation on the composition, sources and secondary generation of organic aerosols in polluted central China. J Clean Prod. 2024;434:139830. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2023. 139830.
- [27] Bowe B, Xie Y, Li T, et al. Associations of ambient coarse particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, and carbon monoxide with the risk of kidney disease: a cohort study. Lancet Planet Health. 2017;1(7):e267–e276. doi: 10.1016/ S2542-5196(17)30117-1.
- [28] Shin HH, Owen JG, Mitchell KM, et al. Regional differences in acute hospitalization risk associated with NO₂

by cause, season, age, sex, and trend: an ecological time series study in Canada. BMC Public Health. 2025;25(1):1217. doi: 10.1186/s12889-025-22339-6.

- [29] Zhang J, Lim Y-H, So R, et al. Long-term exposure to ambient air pollution and lower respiratory tract infection in adults: Danish nationwide evidence. Ann Am Thorac Soc. 2025. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202501-087OC.
- [30] Zhang Y, Yang X, Lin X, et al. Characteristics of ozone pollution and VOCs source analysis in the northern cities of Zhejiang, China. Atmos Pollut Res. 2025;16(4):102429. doi: 10.1016/j.apr.2025.102429.
- [31] Li P, Yang Y, Wang H, et al. Source attribution of near-surface ozone trends in the United States during 1995–2019. Atmos Chem Phys. 2023;23(9):5403–5417. doi: 10.5194/acp-23-5403-2023.
- [32] Wang M, Ma J, Tao C, et al. Regional source contributions to summertime ozone in the Yangtze River Delta. Atmos Environ. 2024;338:120822. doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2024.120822.
- [33] Corteselli EM, Gold A, Surratt J, et al. Supplementation with omega-3 fatty acids potentiates oxidative stress in human airway epithelial cells exposed to ozone. Environ Res. 2020;187:109627. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2020.109627.
- [34] Holm SM, Balmes JR. Systematic review of ozone effects on human lung function, 2013 through 2020. Chest. 2022;161(1):190–201. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2021.07.2170.
- [35] Gong X, Sun F, Wei L, et al. Association of ozone and temperature with ischemic heart disease mortality risk: mediation and interaction analyses. Environ Sci Technol. 2024;58(46):20378–20388. doi: 10.1021/acs.est.4c05899.
- [36] Kong X, Huang R, Geng R, et al. Associations of ambient air pollution and lifestyle with the risk of NAFLD: a population-based cohort study. BMC Public Health. 2024;24(1):2354. doi: 10.1186/s12889-024-19761-7.
- [37] Liang H, Zhou X, Zhu Y, et al. Association of outdoor air pollution, lifestyle, genetic factors with the risk of lung cancer: a prospective cohort study. Environ Res. 2023;218:114996. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2022.114996.
- [38] Zhu Y, Pan Z, Jing D, et al. Association of air pollution, genetic risk, and lifestyle with incident adult-onset asthma: a prospective cohort study. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf. 2023;257:114922. doi: 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2023.114922.
- [39] Zhao Y, Hu Y, Smith JP, et al. Cohort profile: the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS). Int J Epidemiol. 2014;43(1):61–68. doi: 10.1093/ije/dys203.
- [40] He L, Wei J, Wang Y, et al. Marked impacts of pollution mitigation on crop yields in China. Earth's Future. 2022;10(11):e2022EF002936.
- [41] Wei J, Li Z, Li K, et al. Full-coverage mapping and spatiotemporal variations of ground-level ozone (O_3) pollution from 2013 to 2020 across China. Rem Sens Environ. 2022;270:112775. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2021.112775.
- [42] Guo H, Wang S, Peng H, et al. Life's essential 8 and cardiovascular diseases progression among adults in the United Kingdom. Metabolism. 2025;162:156031. doi: 10.1016/j.metabol.2024.156031.
- [43] Lloyd-Jones DM, Allen NB, Anderson CAM, et al. Life's Essential 8: updating and enhancing the American Heart Association's construct of cardiovascular health: a presidential advisory from the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2022;146(5):e18–e43. doi: 10.1161/CIR.00000000001078.

- [44] Xie H, Li J, Zhu X, et al. Association between healthy lifestyle and the occurrence of cardiometabolic multimorbidity in hypertensive patients: a prospective cohort study of UK Biobank. Cardiovasc Diabetol. 2022;21(1):199. doi: 10.1186/s12933-022-01632-3.
- [45] Inker LA, Schmid CH, Tighiouart H, et al. Estimating glomerular filtration rate from serum creatinine and cystatin C. N Engl J Med. 2012;367(1):20–29. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1114248.
- [46] Chen R, Yang C, Guo Y, et al. Association between ambient PM₁ and the prevalence of chronic kidney disease in China: a nationwide study. J Hazard Mater. 2024;468:133827. doi: 10.1016/j.jhazmat.2024.133827.
- [47] Carrico C, Gennings C, Wheeler DC, et al. Characterization of weighted quantile sum regression for highly correlated data in a risk analysis setting. J Agric Biol Environ Stat. 2015;20(1):100–120. doi: 10.1007/s13253-014-0180-3.
- [48] Keil AP, Buckley JP, O'Brien KM, et al. A quantile-based g-computation approach to addressing the effects of exposure mixtures. Environ Health Perspect. 2020;128(4):47004. doi: 10.1289/EHP5838.
- [49] Inker LA, Eneanya ND, Coresh J, et al. New creatinineand cystatin C-based equations to estimate GFR without race. N Engl J Med. 2021;385(19):1737–1749. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2102953.
- [50] Rasking L, Vanbrabant K, Bové H, et al. Adverse effects of fine particulate matter on human kidney functioning: a systematic review. Environ Health. 2022;21(1):24. doi: 10.1186/s12940-021-00827-7.
- [51] Zhang F, Liu Y, Yang C, et al. Associations of long-term exposure to ambient sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, ozone, and benzene with risk of incident chronic kidney disease in the UK. Environ Res Lett. 2024;19(3):034012. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ad2676.
- [52] Mehta AJ, Zanobetti A, Bind M-AC, et al. Long-term exposure to ambient fine particulate matter and renal function in older men: the Veterans Administration Normative Aging Study. Environ Health Perspect. 2016;124(9):1353–1360. doi: 10.1289/ehp.1510269.
- [53] Kuźma Ł, Małyszko J, Bachórzewska-Gajewska H, et al. Exposure to air pollution and renal function. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):11419. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-91000-0.
- [54] Dillon D, Ward-Caviness C, Kshirsagar AV, et al. Associations between long-term exposure to air pollution and kidney function utilizing electronic healthcare records: a cross-sectional study. Environ Health. 2024;23(1):43. doi: 10.1186/s12940-024-01080-4.
- [55] Yu G, Bai Z, Chen Z, et al. The NLRP3 inflammasome is a potential target of ozone therapy aiming to ease chronic renal inflammation in chronic kidney disease. Int Immunopharmacol. 2017;43:203–209. doi: 10.1016/j. intimp.2016.12.022.
- [56] Achebak H, Garatachea R, Pay MT, et al. Geographic sources of ozone air pollution and mortality burden in Europe. Nat Med. 2024;30(6):1732–1738. doi: 10.1038/ s41591-024-02976-x.
- [57] Li W, Wilker EH, Dorans KS, et al. Short-term exposure to air pollution and biomarkers of oxidative stress: the Framingham Heart Study. J Am Heart Assoc. 2016;5(5):e002742. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.115.002742.
- [58] Hou T, Jiang Y, Zhang J, et al. Kidney injury evoked by fine particulate matter: risk factor, causation, mechanism

and intervention study. Adv Sci. 2024;11(43):e2403222. doi: 10.1002/advs.202403222.

- [59] Peng S, Lu T, Liu Y, et al. Short-term exposure to fine particulate matter and its constituents may affect renal function via oxidative stress: a longitudinal panel study. Chemosphere. 2022;293:133570. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2022.133570.
- [60] Slaven A, Hsu J, Schelling JR, et al. Social support in older adults with CKD: a report from the CRIC (Chronic Renal Insufficiency Cohort) Study. Kidney Med. 2021;3(5):776–784.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.xkme.2021.04.025.
- [61] Okada R, Tsushita K, Wakai K, et al. Healthy lifestyle reduces incidence of trace/positive proteinuria and rapid kidney function decline after 2 years: from the Japan Ningen Dock study. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2021;36(6):1039–1048. doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfaa224.
- [62] Michishita R, Matsuda T, Kawakami S, et al. The association between changes in lifestyle behaviors and the incidence of chronic kidney disease (CKD) in middle-aged and older men. J Epidemiol. 2017;27(8):389–397. doi: 10.1016/j.je.2016.08.013.
- [63] Ricardo AC, Anderson CA, Yang W, et al. Healthy lifestyle and risk of kidney disease progression, atherosclerotic events, and death in CKD: findings from the Chronic Renal Insufficiency Cohort (CRIC) Study. Am J Kidney Dis. 2015;65(3):412–424. doi: 10.1053/j. ajkd.2014.09.016.
- [64] Quetglas-Llabrés MM, Monserrat-Mesquida M, Bouzas C, et al. Effects of a two-year lifestyle intervention on intrahepatic fat reduction and renal health: mitigation of inflammation and oxidative stress, a randomized trial. Antioxidants. 2024;13(7):754. doi: 10.3390/antiox13070754.
- [65] Sotos-Prieto M, Bhupathiraju SN, Falcon LM, et al. Association between a Healthy Lifestyle Score and inflammatory markers among Puerto Rican adults. Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis. 2016;26(3):178–184. doi: 10.1016/j. numecd.2015.12.004.
- [66] Valenzuela PL, Carrera-Bastos P, Gálvez BG, et al. Lifestyle interventions for the prevention and treatment of hypertension. Nat Rev Cardiol. 2021;18(4):251–275. doi: 10.1038/s41569-020-00437-9.
- [67] Dudum R, Juraschek SP, Appel LJ. Dose-dependent effects of lifestyle interventions on blood lipid levels: results from the PREMIER trial. Patient Educ Couns. 2019;102(10):1882–1891. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2019.05.005.
- [68] Shibusawa R, Yamada E, Okada S, et al. The impact of short-term professional continuous glucose monitoring on glycemic control via lifestyle improvement. Diabetes Technol Ther. 2018;20(9):628–631. doi: 10.1089/dia. 2018.0164.
- [69] Knobel P, Just AC, Colicino E, et al. The association of air pollution exposure with glucose and lipid levels: the role of an extreme air pollution event alongside 2 decades of moderate exposure. Am J Epidemiol. 2024;193(1):87–95. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwad173.

- [70] An R, Ji M, Yan H, et al. Impact of ambient air pollution on obesity: a systematic review. Int J Obes. 2018;42(6):1112–1126. doi: 10.1038/s41366-018-0089-y.
- [71] Yang C, Wang W, Wang Y, et al. Ambient ozone pollution and prevalence of chronic kidney disease: a nationwide study based on the China National Survey of Chronic Kidney Disease. Chemosphere. 2022;306:135603. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2022.135603.
- [72] McCloskey ML, Tarazona-Meza CE, Jones-Smith JC, et al. Disparities in dietary intake and physical activity patterns across the urbanization divide in the Peruvian Andes. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2017;14(1):90. doi: 10.1186/s12966-017-0545-4.
- [73] Vasto S, Buscemi S, Barera A, et al. Mediterranean diet and healthy ageing: a Sicilian perspective. Gerontology. 2014;60(6):508–518. doi: 10.1159/000363060.
- [74] Liu Y, Kuczmarski MF, Miller ER, et al. Dietary habits and risk of kidney function decline in an urban population. J Ren Nutr. 2017;27(1):16–25. doi: 10.1053/j.jrn.2016.08.007.
- [75] Cai Q, Dekker LH, Bakker SJL, et al. Intraregional differences in renal function in the Northern Netherlands: the Lifelines Cohort Study. PLOS One. 2019;14(10):e0223908. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0223908.
- [76] Lin J, Hu FB, Curhan GC. Associations of diet with albuminuria and kidney function decline. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2010;5(5):836–843. doi: 10.2215/CJN.08001109.
- [77] Healy DR, Kårlund A, Mikkonen S, et al. Associations of low levels of air pollution with cardiometabolic outcomes and the role of diet quality in individuals with obesity. Environ Res. 2024;242:117637. doi: 10.1016/j. envres.2023.117637.
- [78] Lim CC, Hayes RB, Ahn J, et al. Mediterranean diet and the association between air pollution and cardiovascular disease mortality risk. Circulation. 2019;139(15):1766– 1775. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.118.035742.
- [79] Liu F, Qu F, Zhang H, et al. The effect and burden modification of heating on adult asthma hospitalizations in Shijiazhuang: a time-series analysis. Respir Res. 2019;20(1):122. doi: 10.1186/s12931-019-1092-0.
- [80] Chung C-Y, Wu S-Y, Chiu H-H, et al. Associations of air pollutant concentrations with longitudinal kidney function changes in patients with chronic kidney disease. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):9609. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-36682-4.
- [81] Ghelfi E, Wellenius GA, Lawrence J, et al. Cardiac oxidative stress and dysfunction by fine concentrated ambient particles (CAPs) are mediated by angiotensin-II. Inhal Toxicol. 2010;22(11):963–972. doi: 10.3109/08958378.2010.503322.
- [82] Miller MR. The cardiovascular effects of air pollution: prevention and reversal by pharmacological agents. Pharmacol Ther. 2022;232:107996. doi: 10.1016/j. pharmthera.2021.107996.
- [83] Ostro B, Malig B, Broadwin R, et al. Chronic PM_{2.5} exposure and inflammation: determining sensitive subgroups in mid-life women. Environ Res. 2014;132:168–175. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2014.03.042.