

Windows of Susceptibility to Air Pollution During and Surrounding Pregnancy in Relation to Longitudinal Maternal Measures of Adiposity and Lipid Profiles

Sandra India Aldana¹; Danielle Demateis²; Damaskini Valvi¹; Allan C. Just³; Iván Gutiérrez-Avila¹; Guadalupe Estrada-Gutierrez⁴; Martha María Téllez Rojo⁵; Robert O. Wright¹; Andrea A. Baccarelli⁶; Haotian Wu⁷; Kayleigh P. Keller²; Ander Wilson²; Elena Colicino¹

¹Department of Environmental Medicine and Climate Science, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

²Department of Statistics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

³Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

⁴Department of Immunobiochemistry, Research Division, National Institute of Perinatology, Mexico City, Mexico.

⁵Center for Nutrition and Health Research, National Institute of Public Health, Cuernavaca, Morelos, Mexico.

⁶Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA.

⁷Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

*Corresponding author:

Sandra India Aldana, MPH, MPhil, PhD
Postdoctoral Fellow
Department of Environmental Medicine and Climate Science
Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
17 E 102 St, Floor 3
New York, NY 10029
Email: sandra.india-aldana@mssm.edu

Abstract

Pregnancy is a critical window for long-term metabolic programming of fetal effects stemming from airborne particulate matter $\leq 2.5\mu\text{m}$ ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$) exposure. Yet, little is known about long-term metabolic effects of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure during and surrounding pregnancy in mothers. We assessed potential critical windows of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure during and surrounding pregnancy with maternal adiposity and lipid measures later in life. We included 517 pregnant women from the PROGRESS cohort with adiposity [body mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC), % body fat] and lipids [total cholesterol, high-density-lipoprotein (HDL), low-density-lipoprotein (LDL)] measured repeatedly at 4, 6 and 8 years post-delivery. Monthly average $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure was estimated at each participant's address using a validated spatiotemporal model. We employed distributed lag interaction models (DLIMs) adjusting for socio-demographics and clinical covariates. We found that a $1\ \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ increase in $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure throughout mid-/late-pregnancy was associated with higher WC at 6-years post-delivery, peaking at 6 months of gestation: 0.04 cm (95%CI: 0.01, 0.06). We also identified critical windows of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure during and surrounding pregnancy associated with higher LDL and lower HDL both measured at 4 years post-delivery with peaks at pre-conception for LDL [0.17 mg/dL (95%CI: 0.00, 0.34)] and at the 11th month after conception for HDL [-0.07 mg/dL (95%CI: -0.11, -0.02)]. Stratified analyses by fetal sex indicated stronger associations with adiposity measures in mothers carrying a male, whereas stronger associations were observed with lipids in mothers carrying a female fetus. Stratified analyses also indicated potential stronger deleterious lagged effects in women with folic acid intake lower than 600mcg/day during pregnancy.

Keywords

Critical windows; pregnancy; maternal health; air pollution; adiposity; lipids

1 1. Introduction

2
3 Obesity and dyslipidemia are key cardiometabolic risk factors and conditions that predispose
4 individuals to increased risk of stroke, disability, and mortality.^{1,2} These conditions have
5 increased in North America at an alarming rate throughout the past decades³⁻¹⁰ and are
6 particularly more prevalent among Hispanics.^{11,12} In Mexican adults, dyslipidemias are the most
7 prevalent risk factor for cardiovascular diseases,¹³ including hypoalphalipoproteinemia, also
8 known as low high-density lipoprotein (HDL), and high low-density lipoprotein (LDL), with an
9 estimated prevalence of ~55%. Excess adiposity and low HDL predispose individuals to
10 increased metabolic syndrome, a condition on the rise in Mexico, where it is estimated to affect
11 56% of the adult population.⁶ Importantly, metabolic disease-related morbidities and mortality
12 affect women more than men in Mexico.¹⁰ According to the 2018-2019 ENSANUT National
13 Health Nutrition Survey there are substantial higher rates of generalized and abdominal obesity
14 in Mexican adult women compared to men,¹⁴ with a peak prevalence in women of 40.2% for
15 generalized obesity and 88% for abdominal obesity.

16
17 Airborne particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 microns or smaller (PM_{2.5}) is a
18 ubiquitous exposure in urban, industrial, and rural environments.^{15,16} PM_{2.5} exposure can have
19 endocrine-disrupting effects¹⁷⁻²⁰ and is considered an emerging risk factor for obesity and
20 adverse metabolic outcomes.²¹⁻²³ Experimental studies in animals and epidemiological research
21 in humans have demonstrated that PM_{2.5} exposure may promote weight gain and adipose tissue
22 expansion, and alter lipid metabolism.²⁴⁻²⁹ Mechanisms by which PM_{2.5} could influence
23 metabolic diseases include hormonal alteration, increased inflammation, oxidative stress, and
24 reactive oxygen species-induced endothelial dysfunction.³⁰⁻³⁴ Furthermore, PM_{2.5} exposure
25 during pregnancy has been suggested to be a critical exposure window for a wide variety of
26 health-related outcomes in both birthing-mothers and children.³⁵⁻⁴⁰ However, most of the

27 literature examining critical PM_{2.5} exposure windows during pregnancy has primarily focused on
28 children's health, largely missing potential long-term effects in mothers.⁴¹ Pregnancy constitutes
29 a major period of physiological changes⁴² including pro-inflammatory processes⁴³⁻⁴⁵ and weight
30 gain.^{46,47} The numerous physiological changes occurring during pregnancy may lead to potential
31 lingering chronic diseases and metabolic effects.⁴⁸⁻⁵² Research on pregnancy as a window of
32 susceptibility to environmental exposures in mothers is scarce⁴¹ and overlook a potential period
33 in which metabolic conditions may worsen or can effectively be prevented or treated.

34
35 To date, no study has evaluated how PM_{2.5} exposure during and surrounding gestation may
36 affect maternal obesity and dyslipidemia in the years following delivery. Therefore, we assessed
37 potential critical windows of PM_{2.5} exposure during and surrounding pregnancy with later
38 changes in markers for anthropometry and lipids in the years following delivery in women from
39 the Mexican Programming Research in Obesity, Growth, Environment and Social Stressors
40 (PROGRESS) study. To achieve this, we employ the novel distributed lag models with
41 interaction to identify critical windows of PM_{2.5} exposure for maternal health endpoints
42 repeatedly measured over post-delivery follow-up visits.⁵³ Furthermore, given that maternal
43 metabolic health and associated mechanisms are considered sex-dimorphic⁵⁴ and that folic acid
44 (FA) may attenuate adverse health effects from air pollutants,⁵⁵ we also hypothesized potential
45 effect modification by fetal sex and FA.

46

47 **2. Material and Methods**

48

49 2.1 Study Population

50 The PROGRESS study enrolled 948 mother-children pairs between 2007-2011 that were
51 followed for over a decade.⁵⁶ Healthy pregnant women, affiliated with the Mexican Social
52 Security Institute, were recruited during the 2nd trimester of pregnancy (12-20 gestational

53 weeks). Any pregnant woman, ≥ 18 years old and living in Mexico City, with no intention of
54 changing address location for at least three years, were eligible for enrollment. Medical
55 exclusion criteria included history of infertility, heart or renal diseases, diabetes, psychosis or
56 use of anti-epilepsy drugs, use of steroids, consumption of one or more alcoholic drinks per day,
57 or drug addiction. All women enrolled in the study agreed to sign a consent form in Spanish.
58 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the participating institutions: the
59 Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai and the “Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública” in
60 Mexico.

61

62 2.2 Ambient PM_{2.5} Exposure at Participants’ Addresses

63 Daily PM_{2.5} predictions with a 1×1-km spatial resolution came from our machine-learning models
64 developed for the Mexico City Metropolitan Area. Our models employed extreme gradient
65 boosting (XGBoost) and inverse-distance weighting (IDW), incorporating satellite-based aerosol
66 optical depth data from NASA’s Terra and Aqua satellites, meteorological information, and land-
67 use variables (**Methods S1**).⁵⁷ To limit the daily exposure variability and facilitate the
68 interpretation of long-term maternal health effects from PM_{2.5}, we averaged the daily PM_{2.5}
69 exposures into monthly ambient PM_{2.5} exposure concentrations. We then focused on exposure
70 surrounding pregnancy: pre-conception (approximately one and two months prior to the last
71 menstrual period, LMP), during pregnancy (months 0-9 after LMP), and up to one year after
72 childbirth (months 10-22 after LMP). We examine exposure time up to one year beyond birth as
73 we hypothesize that lingering immediate effects from pregnancy or giving birth could make
74 women more susceptible to environmental exposures.

75

76 2.3 Outcomes

77 Repeated anthropometric and lipid measures were collected at three follow-up visits 4, 6 and 8
78 years post-delivery (corresponding to approximately 48, 72, and 96 months after childbirth).

79 Maternal anthropometric measures (weight, height, waist circumference, and body fat) were
80 collected using standardized protocols.⁵⁸⁻⁶⁰ We calculated body mass index (BMI) based on
81 measured height (collected using a Seca 206 roller tape) and weight (collected by a trained
82 physician). Medical staff measured body fat using InBody 270 or InBody 370 Body Composition
83 Analyzers during each monitoring visit. WC was measured using a Seca tape (model 201)
84 above the iliac crest.⁶⁰ Total cholesterol and high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol were
85 measured by enzymatic photometric assays on a Response 910 automated analyzer (DiaSys
86 Diagnostic Systems, Holzheim, Germany) in fasting plasma collected from participants at all
87 post-delivery visits. Low-density lipoprotein (LDL) concentration was derived using the
88 Friedewald equation.⁶¹

89

90 2.4 Additional Variables

91 Information on socio-demographic factors (age, marital status, socio-economic status) was self-
92 reported at recruitment during the 2nd trimester of pregnancy. PROGRESS also collected
93 lifestyle information at baseline and across follow-up visits: smoking, alcohol intake, medications
94 (**Methods S2**), and parity. Self-reported information on multiple pregnancies throughout the
95 follow-up was also monitored and documented in PROGRESS. Pregnancy start date was
96 defined as the LMP, which was used as a proxy of the month of conception in this study. We
97 used a standard physical assessment of gestational age (Capurro method)⁶² when gestational
98 age differed by more than three weeks from that assigned by the LMP (~4% of participants in
99 the cohort). We estimated pre-pregnancy BMI in accordance to previous published methods
100 using the height at recruitment and the LMP reported weight.^{58,63} We assessed socio-economic
101 status (SES) using the previously validated Mexican Association of Market and Public Opinion
102 Research Agencies (Spanish acronym AMAI) index used in Mexico.⁶⁴ The AMAI index is an
103 individual-level variable that considered a total of 13 factors including the education of the head
104 of household, number of appliances in the household, car ownership, and so forth. The index

105 denotes six categories that were eventually collapsed into three levels of SES: lower (AMAI
106 categories D and E), medium (AMAI categories C and D+), and higher (AMAI categories A, B,
107 and C+). Our SES measures are relative as the cohort was predominantly low SES. Information
108 on the sex of the child and self-reported FA supplementation intake during pregnancy (at
109 trimesters 2 and 3) were also obtained.

110
111

112 2. 5 Statistical Analyses

113 A total of n=806 women had monthly PM_{2.5} exposure from two months prior to LMP through
114 month 22 after LMP and no missing information on pre-pregnancy BMI, age, or meteorological
115 season (**Figure S1**). Missing monthly exposure data during the time period of interest
116 (accounting for <0.3% of the total monthly air pollution data in the cohort) were imputed using
117 time series weighted moving averages.⁶⁵ Women with at least one cardiometabolic marker
118 measured at any follow-up visit were eligible for inclusion resulting in an analytic sample size of
119 n=517.

120

121 To evaluate the potential critical windows of PM_{2.5} exposure over 25 months in later onset of
122 cardiometabolic conditions (i.e. higher adiposity and cholesterol levels) at the 4, 6, and 8-year
123 post-delivery visits, we implemented distributed lag interaction models (DLIMs).⁵³ The DLIM
124 estimates a linear exposure-time-response function that varies continuously by time after
125 delivery and by outcome assessment time (**Methods S3**). We compared three possible models
126 for how the exposure effect varies across outcome time using a bootstrap likelihood ratio test:
127 no modification, linear modification (i.e. linear scaling of the linear exposure effect across
128 outcome times), or complex non-linear modification across outcome times. In all models, we
129 adjusted for a core set of covariates based on their associations with both the exposure and
130 outcomes or based on their clinical relevance as previously identified (**Figure S2**): age at

131 parturition (continuous),⁶⁶ pre-pregnancy BMI (continuous),⁶⁷ socio-economic status (lower,
132 medium, higher),⁶⁸ smoking during pregnancy (any passive or active smoking reported during
133 pregnancy),^{69,70} marital status (single, separated or divorced vs. married or living with a
134 partner),^{71,72} parity at baseline (1st pregnancy, 2nd pregnancy, and 3rd or more pregnancies at
135 recruitment),^{73,74} season (dry-cold/November to February, dry-warm/March and April, rainy/May
136 to October),^{75,76} medications to treat cardiometabolic diseases⁷⁷ (self-report of a drug treatment
137 for abnormal levels of either glucose, triglycerides, high-density lipoprotein (HDL), or blood
138 pressure vs. lack thereof), alcohol intake (yes/no),⁷⁸ follow-up visit (stage), and follow-up time in
139 months squared to allow for a non-linear effect. Given that lifestyle variables such as alcohol
140 intake, medications, and pregnancy history could change over time, we updated the models with
141 information on lifestyle data at each follow-up stage (at 4, 6, and 8 years post-delivery) as time-
142 varying covariates.

143
144 We performed sensitivity analyses by fitting DLIMs 1) without pre-pregnancy BMI as covariate,
145 2) controlling for time-varying 1-year average PM_{2.5} exposure prior to visit, and 3) without time-
146 varying pregnancy as covariate, generating plots that are smoothed to allow for comparison of
147 sensitivity analyses to our main analyses. Additional analyses were also conducted stratifying
148 by important factors during pregnancy based on prior clinical relevance and/or previous
149 research in PROGRESS. Given the shifting sex-steroid hormone concentrations during
150 pregnancy dependent on fetal sex^{79,80} and the protective interaction effects of FA with air
151 pollutant mixtures and metabolic health in PROGRESS women,⁸¹ we conducted stratified
152 analyses by 1) fetal sex (mothers carrying a male vs. a female fetus) and by 2) FA intake using
153 the average recommended FA supplementation for pregnant women according to clinical
154 guidelines (600 mcg/day).⁸² All statistical analyses were conducted using R software (version
155 4.3.0) with package *dlim* (version 0.1.0).

156

157 **3. Results**

158
159 Women were exposed on average to a PM_{2.5} concentration of 22.8 µg/m³ (standard deviation
160 (SD): 1.5; interquartile range (IQR): 2.21) across the 25-month span from 2 month pre-
161 conception up to 1-year post-partum (**Table 1; Figure S3**). Women were slightly overweight
162 prior to pregnancy (nearly ~60% were either overweight or obese) with a mean (SD) BMI of 26.5
163 (4.1) kg/m² and were on average (SD) 29 (5.6) years old at the time of parturition. The majority
164 of women had low socio-economic status (53%), reported previous pregnancies at baseline
165 prior to index pregnancy (61%), were married or lived with a partner at the time of recruitment
166 (81%), and did not smoke nor were exposed to passive (2nd-hand) smoke during pregnancy
167 (63%). Participants were followed for nearly a decade after parturition and attended up to three
168 follow-up examination visits at approximately 4 years [mean (min, max): 57 months (48, 80)], 6
169 years [mean (min, max): 80 months (71, 115)], and 8 years post-delivery [mean (min, max): 115
170 months (97, 142)].

171
172 Using DLIMs, we found evidence of non-linear modification of the exposure-time-response
173 function across outcome times for all outcomes using the bootstrap likelihood ratio test (rejected
174 null of linear modification versus the alternative of non-linear modification). We estimated critical
175 windows of exposure surrounding pregnancy during which PM_{2.5} exposure was linked with
176 several anthropometric measures and lipid levels (**Tables S1-S6**), although these associations
177 were not identified as statistically significant for all cardiometabolic markers examined.
178 Pregnancy PM_{2.5} exposure was associated with changes in several metabolic health measures
179 up to the 6-year post-delivery visit (**Figures 1-2**). A 1-µg/m³ increase in PM_{2.5} exposure
180 throughout the 2nd and 3rd trimesters of pregnancy (gestational months: 4-8 after LMP) was
181 associated with an increase in WC levels at the 6-year post-delivery visit (**Figure 1**). The peak
182 effect was at 6 months of gestation which showed an increase of 0.04 cm in WC (95% CI: 0.01,

183 0.06) per $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ (**Figure 1; Table S2**). A suggestive late pregnancy window of
184 susceptibility to $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure was identified in relation to WC levels at the 4-year post-delivery
185 visit [gestational month 9 after LMP: $\beta = 0.03$ (95% CI: -0.01, 0.06)]. In addition, we identified
186 alterations in BMI at the 8-year post-delivery visit in association with a peri-conception window
187 of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure (during pre-conception and early-pregnancy period) (**Figure 1; Table S1**).
188 These negative $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ -BMI associations were not sustained in the sensitivity (**Figure S4**) and in
189 the female-stratified (**Figure S8**) analyses, and can be driven by the over-adjustment with pre-
190 pregnancy BMI. There was no evidence of associations in relation to percent body fat.

191
192 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure surrounding pregnancy was associated with a dysregulation of several lipid
193 levels at the 4-year post-delivery visit, but not thereafter (**Figure 2**). We observed a susceptible
194 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure window from the 2nd trimester of pregnancy and up to the early post-partum
195 period (critical window between months 6 and 18 after LMP) on high-density lipoprotein (HDL)
196 cholesterol 4 years post-delivery (**Table S5**). The peak effect at the 11th month after LMP was
197 associated with a 0.07 mg/dL decrease in HDL (95% CI: -0.11, -0.02) per $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ increase in
198 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$. In addition, we observed associations between increased $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure throughout
199 preconception, pregnancy, and the post-partum period (2 months prior to and up to month 17
200 after LMP) and higher low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol at the 4-year post-delivery visit.
201 The largest associations occurred during pre-conception (2 months prior to conception) which
202 led to an increase of 0.17 mg/dL in LDL (95% CI: 0.00, 0.34) per $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (**Table S6**). While
203 no critical windows of susceptibility to $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ were observed with respect to total cholesterol, the
204 overall trend was positive in directionality between the pre-conception and pregnancy $\text{PM}_{2.5}$
205 exposure periods with cholesterol levels at the 4-year post-delivery visit that attenuated over
206 time.

207

208 Compared to main results, sensitivity analyses that did not control for pre-pregnancy BMI
209 showed consistent windows of susceptibility to PM_{2.5} exposure across health outcomes and
210 across follow-up visits (**Figures S4-S5**). Also, no notable differences were observed in
211 sensitivity models that controlled for time-varying 1-year PM_{2.5} exposures average prior to
212 follow-up visits (**Figures S6-S7**), or without time-varying pregnancies as covariate (**Figures S8-**
213 **S9**). Stratified analyses by fetal sex indicated stronger effects positive in directionality on
214 anthropometric markers in pregnant mothers carrying a male fetus compared to mothers
215 carrying a female fetus (**Figures S10-S12**), particularly for WC (**Figure S11**). On the other
216 hand, stratified analyses by fetal sex showed more persistent effects from PM_{2.5} exposures
217 during pregnancy on lipids over time in pregnant mothers carrying a female fetus (**Figures S13-**
218 **S15**). For instance, windows of susceptibility to PM_{2.5} on higher levels of LDL were sustained
219 throughout all follow-up visits in pregnant mothers carrying a female fetus whereas the
220 associations disappeared over time in those carrying a male fetus (**Figure S15**). Interestingly,
221 stratified analyses by FA intake showed more prominent deleterious effects in the low FA intake
222 group as compared to the high FA intake group (**Figures S16-S21**). This is apparent for all
223 anthropometric outcomes but particularly for WC and body fat where women with lower FA
224 intake levels during pregnancy had lagged PM_{2.5}-induced increased levels of adiposity as
225 compared to women with higher FA intake levels (**Figures S17-S18**). Similarly, it is notable that
226 windows of susceptibility to PM_{2.5} on higher LDL and lower HDL cholesterol were stronger in
227 women with lower FA intake levels than in their counterparts (**Figures S20-S21**).

228

229 **4. Discussion**

230

231 This is the first study assessing long-term alterations of maternal adiposity and lipid measures
232 stemming from PM_{2.5} exposures occurring during and surrounding the time of pregnancy (peri-
233 pregnancy). Several maternal biomarkers assessed at the 4- and 6-year post-delivery visits

234 showed potentially deleterious associations from PM_{2.5} exposures during the period surrounding
235 pregnancy. Long-term adverse associations induced by pregnancy PM_{2.5} exposure were
236 particularly observed for WC (at the 6 year post-delivery visit) and for lipids (at the 4 year post-
237 delivery visit). Critical PM_{2.5} exposure windows were identified during mid and late pregnancy for
238 WC, whereas for lipid outcomes sensitive windows were prominent throughout all pregnancy
239 and during the first post-partum months. Stratified analyses by fetal sex indicated potential
240 stronger deleterious effects with anthropometric measures that were more prominent in mothers
241 carrying a male fetus, whereas PM_{2.5} associations with lipid biomarkers were stronger in
242 mothers carrying a female fetus. Stratified analyses indicated also potential stronger deleterious
243 effects in women with lower FA intake during pregnancy.

244
245 In this study, we showed that PM_{2.5} exposures during and surrounding pregnancy could
246 exacerbate potential physiological changes occurring during gestation and we also showed that
247 those associations can last up to 6 years post-delivery. Pregnancy induces physiological
248 changes that uniquely affect maternal metabolism influencing post-partum weight retention.^{83,84}
249 Weight gain can be sustained after delivery through weight retention triggered by pro-
250 inflammatory processes starting during conception.⁸⁵⁻⁸⁷ For instance, during gestation major
251 changes in lipid and glucose homeostasis ensure an adequate supply of energy to the
252 developing fetus.^{88,89} These changes could promote body fat accumulation,^{90,91} changes in leptin
253 hormone levels,⁹² increased glucose production,⁹³ which in turn, can lead to increased risk of
254 developing gestational diabetes⁹⁴ and subsequent type-2 diabetes or cardiovascular diseases
255 later in life.^{49,50} Increased adiposity has been previously observed in adults exposed to PM_{2.5}.⁹⁵⁻

256 ⁹⁷

257
258 PM_{2.5} exposures during mid-pregnancy altered cholesterol levels up to the 4-year post-delivery
259 visit. Our findings showed that pregnancy and early post-partum PM_{2.5} exposure increased

260 levels of LDL and decreased levels of HDL. These PM_{2.5}-associated increases in LDL levels or
261 decreases in HDL levels in women having undergone pregnancy were consistent with previous
262 literature in non-pregnant adults.^{28,98} Higher LDL and lower HDL cholesterol levels have been
263 shown to predispose women to higher risk of cardiovascular events later in life.^{99-101,102,103}
264 Currently, there is a scarcity of studies examining lipid levels in pregnant women that also
265 examine critical periods of susceptibility to PM_{2.5} but one lipidomic study indicated that PM_{2.5}
266 during the 2nd trimester can exacerbate adverse birth outcomes in women with hyperlipidemia
267 through increased inflammation.¹⁰⁴

268

269 Our findings also suggested that pregnancy PM_{2.5} exposures are associated with adiposity and
270 adverse lipid alterations up to 6 years post-delivery but not at 8 years in our sample. It is
271 possible that PM_{2.5} exposures during and surrounding pregnancy may still have lingering
272 deleterious effects at later stages in life but subsequent exposures could also be inflicting
273 adverse effects and drown out the signal of more distant exposure such as those occurring in
274 pregnancy years prior. Moreover, future studies with longer follow-up time are needed to
275 elucidate whether protracted effects from pregnancy PM_{2.5} exposure go beyond 6 years post-
276 delivery. To evaluate the potential influence of concurrent PM_{2.5} exposures, we adjusted for
277 average PM_{2.5} exposures throughout a 1-year span prior to each examination visit as a time-
278 varying variable in sensitivity analyses, which did not change the results of primary analyses.
279 Although differences in associations over time may reflect women's lifestyle changes and/or
280 weight changes after giving birth, we controlled for several time-varying lifestyle variables in
281 analyses. In addition, we did not observe clear patterns of associations between lagged PM_{2.5}
282 exposures throughout pregnancy and anthropometric markers other than WC, suggesting that
283 protracted PM_{2.5} exposures may have later effects on abdominal adiposity but perhaps not on
284 generalized adiposity in birthing people, which is in line with the absence of associations with
285 total body fat in our study.

286

287 We also observed potential diverging effects by fetal sex in our study. Critical windows of
288 susceptibility to pregnancy PM_{2.5} exposure may be sex-dimorphic due to different circulating
289 levels of sex-steroid hormones during pregnancy^{79,80} that may exacerbate or alter effects from
290 air pollution. Our findings are consistent with previous literature indicating that carrying a male
291 fetus is accompanied with a higher risk of poor cardiovascular health for the mother resulting in
292 pregnancy complications and/or adverse health.⁵⁴ Moreover, our results indicated also a
293 suggestive protective role of FA against protracted effects from PM_{2.5} exposure. These results
294 are consistent with prior findings in PROGRESS mothers showing beneficial effects of higher
295 FA intake levels (above 600 mcg/day) during pregnancy in the associations of air pollutant
296 mixtures and risk of liver injury.⁸¹ In addition to cardiometabolic outcomes, FA has been shown
297 in prior literature to attenuate the risk of adverse birth outcomes induced by airborne particulate
298 matter during pregnancy.⁵⁵ However, these hypotheses suggested in stratified analyses warrant
299 further exploration and need to be formally tested with new methods accommodating for
300 distributed lag models that can handle multiple modifying factors.

301

302 We also recognize potential limitations in our study. First, estimates for months 7 through 9 after
303 LMP refer to a population at the 3rd trimester of gestation but also encompasses a small fraction
304 of women (n=55; ~11%) with early-term pregnancies (baby born before the 37th week of
305 pregnancy). Second, our study intended to focus specifically in the most relevant epidemics of
306 generalized and abdominal adiposity in the Mexican population, as well as its top major
307 dyslipidemias: hypoalphalipoproteinemia and hypercholesterolemia. However, other markers of
308 metabolic syndrome such as blood pressure and diabetes-markers may be of interest to explore
309 in future studies. We also acknowledge potential measurement error from self-reported
310 covariates and underreport of compromising lifestyle information during pregnancy such as
311 alcohol intake and smoking.^{105,106} While we acknowledge that measurement errors of the

312 exposure modeling can introduce some degree of exposure misclassification, we believe that
313 our overall approach— including the use of validated models, cross-validation, and conservative
314 monthly exposure averaging— reduces these errors and enhances the reliability of the
315 estimates. We also used the first day of the LMP as a proxy for conception, which can be prone
316 to biological error.^{107,108} However, we do not expect a substantial change in the interpretation as
317 it was conducted in monthly intervals, thus minimizing the biological error, and we used a
318 validated approach to identify LMP when gestational age differed by more than three weeks to
319 LMP (**Methods S2**).⁶² In addition, due to the poor analytical performance of LDL-C analysis
320 methods,^{109,110} no direct LDL measurement in blood was performed in our study. Although a
321 comprehensive adjustment of covariates was implemented, unmeasured confounding biasing
322 results could also still be present as this is an observational study. Given that it is an
323 observational study, we recognize that we cannot directly establish a causal relationship
324 between critical windows to PM_{2.5} exposure on maternal lipids and waist circumference and that
325 instead we are examining associations. Similarly, we did not measure other concurrent
326 environmental exposures that could be correlated with PM_{2.5} driving the associations. Also, our
327 effect estimates are small and results should be interpreted with caution. Last, although this
328 study in Mexican women may not be generalizable to other populations, using a relatively
329 homogenous sample increases the internal validity of our results.

330

331 Our study also benefits from several strengths. To our knowledge, this is the first study
332 assessing the long-term cardiometabolic effects of pregnancy PM_{2.5} exposure in a Hispanic
333 population and using a comprehensive panel of anthropometric and lipids. Our study also uses
334 state-of-the-art methods to characterize daily PM_{2.5} air pollution data. We also used a novel
335 application of a recently developed statistical model to simultaneously estimate critical windows
336 of exposure in a trajectory analysis with repeated outcome assessment and a continuous time
337 component. This has the advantage to reduce bias using the DLM framework¹¹¹ while pooling

338 strength and gaining power from repeated outcome assessments. We also leveraged a
339 population of pregnant women from Central Mexico exposed to high PM_{2.5} levels that could be
340 more susceptible to developing cardiometabolic diseases. In Mexico, the prevalence of
341 overweight and obesity reached 39% in 2018 with mid-life adults, and women in particular,
342 having the highest rates.¹¹² Our study also highlights that in Mexico City average PM_{2.5} levels
343 are 4-5 times the WHO recommended annual average levels (5 µg/m³),¹¹³ making these findings
344 of interest to help drive policy change, and particularly in view of the UN Sustainable
345 Development Goals aiming to prevent non-communicable diseases in lower-middle-income
346 countries.¹¹⁴ Additional studies should be conducted in pregnant women with more than eight
347 years of follow-up, using multi-pollutant protracted exposures, directly measuring LDL via
348 centrifugation or homogenous assays,^{109,115} leveraging different populations outside Mexico,
349 and evaluating high-order interactions with effect modifiers. Our study provides a framework for
350 assessing windows of susceptibility with trajectory outcomes that can be replicated in such
351 future studies.

352

353 **5. Conclusion**

354

355 Pregnancy itself may constitute a critical window to PM_{2.5} exposure for dysregulated long-term
356 maternal metabolic health after delivery. Pregnant women could largely benefit from policies
357 targeting reduction to air pollution exposure.

358

359

360 **6. Data Sharing**

361 Data is only available upon reasonable request from the authors.

362

363 **7. Funding**

364 This project was supported by NIEHS grant R01ES032242 (PI: Colicino, Wu); R01ES034521
365 (PI: Colicino, Jusko).

366

367 **8. Acknowledgements**

368 The work involved in this study was also supported by UL1TR004419 (PI: Wright),
369 P30ES023515 (PI: Wright), R01ES029943 (PI: Kioumourtzoglou, Weisskopf), R01ES033688
370 (PI: Valvi), R21ES035148 (PI: Valvi).

371

372 **9. Author Contributions**

373 E.C., A.W.: Conceptualization; S.I.A., D.D.: Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation; E.C.,
374 H.W., A.A.B.: Funding acquisition; S.I.A., D.D.: Software, Visualization; S.I.A., D.D., E.C., A.W.,
375 K.K.: Methodology; S.I.A.: Roles/Writing—original draft; D.D., D.V., A.C.J., I.G.A., G.E.,
376 M.M.T.R., R.O.W., A.A.B., H.W., K.P.K., A.W., E.C.: Writing—review & editing.

Table 1. Main Participant Characteristics in PROGRESS (n=517) ^a

Variables	Mean (SD) [Range]; n (%)
<u>Exposure</u>	
Average Pregnancy PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³) ^b	22.8 (1.5) [15.9, 27.7]
<u>Fixed Covariates</u>	
Age at parturition (years)	28.1 (5.6) [18.0, 44.0]
Pre-pregnancy BMI ^c	26.5 (4.1) [18.4, 43.5]
Obese (BMI≥30)	96 (19%)
Overweight (BMI≥25 & <30)	214 (41%)
Normal (BMI≥18.5 & <25)	205 (40%)
Underweight (BMI<18.5)	2 (0.4%)
AMAI SES Index ^d	
Lower	272 (53%)
Medium	190 (37%)
Higher	55 (11%)
Passive or Active Smoking during Pregnancy	
No Smoking during Pregnancy	324 (63%)
Smoking during Pregnancy	193 (37%)
Marital Status at Baseline	
Married or Living With Partner	417 (81%)
Single, Separated or Divorced	100 (19%)
Parity at Baseline	
First Pregnancy	200 (39%)
Second Pregnancy	181 (35%)
Three or More Pregnancies	136 (26%)
Meteorologic Season at Last Menstrual Period	
Dry/Cold	158 (31%)
Dry/Warm	105 (20%)
Rainy	254 (49%)
<u>Time-Varying Covariates</u>	
Cardiometabolic Medications by Year ~4 ^e	
Yes	14 (2.7%)
No/Unknown	503 (97.3%)
Cardiometabolic Medications by Year ~6 ^e	
Yes	20 (3.9%)
No/Unknown	497 (96.1%)
Cardiometabolic Medications by Year ~8 ^e	
Yes	37 (7.2%)
No/Unknown	480 (92.8%)
Alcohol Intake by Year ~4 ^f	
Yes	59 (11%)
No	458 (89%)
Alcohol Intake by Year ~6 ^f	
Yes	53 (10%)
No	464 (90%)
Alcohol Intake by Year ~8 ^f	

Yes	55 (11%)
No	462 (89%)
Multiple Pregnancies by Year ~4 ^g	
Yes	131 (25%)
No	386 (75%)
Multiple Pregnancies by Year ~6 ^g	
Yes	158 (31%)
No	359 (69%)
Multiple Pregnancies by Year ~8 ^g	
Yes	197 (38%)
No	320 (62%)
Follow-Up Month '48' (Visit at Year ~4) ^h	56.7 (6.5) [48.0, 80.0]
Follow-Up Month '72' (Visit at Year ~6) ^h	80.0 (6.8) [71.0, 115.0]
Follow-Up Month '96' (Visit at Year ~8) ^h	115.3 (8.1) [97.0, 142.0]

Effect Modifiers

Fetal Sex	
Male	267 (52%)
Female	250 (48%)
FA Intake (mcg/day) ⁱ	
<600 mcg/day	97 (22%)
≥600 mcg/day	339 (78%)

^a Mean (SD) [Range]; n (%). Data shown has PM_{2.5} exposure information available and with at least one measurement of the outcome across follow-up visits.

^b From 2 months before last menstrual period (LMP) to month 22 after LMP.

^c Estimated from self-reported height at recruitment (trimester 2) and the LMP reported weight obtained from a linear mixed-effects model.

^d Household socio-economic status index.

^e Any cardiometabolic medication self-reported cumulatively at month 48 follow-up visit, prior to or at the 72 month follow-up visit, and prior to or at the 96 month follow-up visit, respectively.

^f Any alcohol intake self-reported during pregnancy, at each respective follow-up stage (48, 72, or 96 months), or report of previous alcohol intake (ever drinking) before pregnancy.

^g Self-reported additional pregnancy or pregnancies by each respective follow-up stage (48, 72, or 96 months) after index pregnancy (parturition).

^h Continuous time component included as effect modifier in analyses. Missing participants across visits were n=62 at year ~4, n=51 at year ~6, and n=16 at year ~8.

ⁱ Average FA intake during pregnancy (average of trimesters 2 and 3). n=81 participants with missing information and not included in stratified analyses.

Table 2. Participant Cardiometabolic Outcomes at each Follow-up Visit ^a

	48 Months (~4 Years) Mean (SD) [Range]	72 Months (~6 Years) Mean (SD) [Range]	96 Months (~8 Years) Mean (SD) [Range]
<i><u>Anthropometric Measures</u></i>			
Body Mass Index (BMI in kg/m ²)	27.5 (4.9) [16.4, 45.4] n=455	28.0 (5.1) [17.9, 49.6] n=426	29.1 (5.2) [16.1, 53.7] n=503
Waist Circumference (WC in cm)	94.2 (12.2) [63.6, 133.3] n=440	92.6 (11.9) [61.1, 132.6] n=453	95.3 (13.0) [62.9, 167.6] n=492
Body Fat (%)	38.1 (6.6) [16.3, 53.9] n=439	38.4 (7.0) [3.0, 54.7] n=451	40.4 (6.2) [19.9, 54.3] n=493
<i><u>Cholesterol Levels</u></i>			
Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)	185.2 (39.5) [98.0, 441.0] n=447	179.8 (32.9) [74.0, 407.0] n=462	179.1 (34.1) [91.0, 322.0] n=499
High-Density Lipoprotein (HDL in mg/dL)	51.3 (12.1) [29.5, 163.0] n=447	48.6 (11.9) [10.5, 135.4] n=462	47.2 (11.0) [21.0, 93.0] n=499
Low-Density Lipoprotein (LDL in mg/dL)	108.5 (33.9) [17.3, 308.2] n=447	103.6 (27.9) [22.1, 261.6] n=462	104.7 (29.0) [10.8, 226.5] n=499

^a Data shown has PM_{2.5} exposure information available and was restricted to observations with at least one of the outcomes of interest at each stage.

Figure 1. Estimates of the association (blue dots) and 95% confidence interval (95% CI) (grey whiskers) between monthly $PM_{2.5}$ exposure and anthropometric measures Body Mass Index (BMI), Waist Circumference (WC), body fat percentage at 48, 72, and 96 months (~4, 6, 8 years) after delivery using distributed lag interaction models (DLIMs) with penalization and non-linear modification. Negative and positive values on the x-axis indicate months before and after last menstrual period (LMP), respectively. Month 0 indicates the LMP month (month 0). Models were adjusted for age, pre-pregnancy BMI, socio-economic status, smoking during pregnancy, marital status, parity at enrollment, meteorological season, cardiometabolic medications, alcohol intake, multiple pregnancies throughout follow-up, stage, and follow-up time in months squared to allow for a non-linear effect. Sample sizes for analyses with BMI were $n=516$ and sample sizes for analyses with WC and body fat were $n=515$.

Figure 2. Estimates of the association (blue dots) and 95% confidence interval (95% CI) (grey whiskers) between monthly $PM_{2.5}$ exposure and total cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein (HDL), low-density lipoprotein (LDL) at 48, 72, and 96 months (~4, 6, and 8 years) after delivery using distributed lag interaction models (DLIMs) with penalization and non-linear modification. Negative and positive values on the x-axis indicate months before and after last menstrual period (LMP), respectively. Month 0 indicates the LMP month (month 0). Models were adjusted for age, pre-pregnancy BMI, socio-economic status, smoking during pregnancy, marital status, parity at enrollment, meteorological season, cardiometabolic medications, alcohol intake, multiple pregnancies throughout follow-up, stage, and follow-up time in months squared to allow for a non-linear effect. Sample sizes for analyses with total cholesterol, HDL, and LDL were $n=517$.

References

1. Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA Guideline on the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. Sep 10 2019;140(11):e563-e595. doi:10.1161/cir.0000000000000677
2. Grundy SM, Stone NJ, Bailey AL, et al. 2018 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA Guideline on the Management of Blood Cholesterol: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2019/06/25/ 2019;73(24):3168-3209. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2018.11.002>
3. Roth GA, Mensah GA, Johnson CO, et al. Global Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases and Risk Factors, 1990-2019: Update From the GBD 2019 Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Dec 22 2020;76(25):2982-3021. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2020.11.010
4. O'Hearn M, Lauren BN, Wong JB, Kim DD, Mozaffarian D. Trends and Disparities in Cardiometabolic Health Among U.S. Adults, 1999-2018. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jul 12 2022;80(2):138-151. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2022.04.046
5. Miranda JJ, Barrientos-Gutiérrez T, Corvalan C, et al. Understanding the rise of cardiometabolic diseases in low- and middle-income countries. *Nature Medicine*. 2019/11/01 2019;25(11):1667-1679. doi:10.1038/s41591-019-0644-7
6. Rojas-Martínez R, Aguilar-Salinas CA, Romero-Martínez M, Castro-Porras L, Gómez-Velasco D, Mehta R. Trends in the prevalence of metabolic syndrome and its components in Mexican adults, 2006-2018. *Salud Publica Mex*. Nov 5 2021;63(6, Nov-Dic):713-724. doi:10.21149/12835
7. Marquezine GF, Oliveira CM, Pereira AC, Krieger JE, Mill JG. Metabolic syndrome determinants in an urban population from Brazil: social class and gender-specific interaction. *Int J Cardiol*. Sep 26 2008;129(2):259-65. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2007.07.097
8. Florez H, Silva E, Fernández V, et al. Prevalence and risk factors associated with the metabolic syndrome and dyslipidemia in White, Black, Amerindian and Mixed Hispanics in Zulia State, Venezuela. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. Jul 2005;69(1):63-77. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2004.11.018
9. GBD 2019 Diabetes in the Americas Collaborators. Burden of diabetes and hyperglycaemia in adults in the Americas, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. Sep 2022;10(9):655-667. doi:10.1016/s2213-8587(22)00186-3
10. Castro-Porras LV, Rojas-Martínez R, Aguilar-Salinas CA, Bello-Chavolla OY, Becerril-Gutierrez C, Escamilla-Nuñez C. Trends and age-period-cohort effects on hypertension mortality rates from 1998 to 2018 in Mexico. *Sci Rep*. Sep 2 2021;11(1):17553. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-96175-0
11. Javed Z, Maqsood MH, Amin Z, Nasir K. Race and Ethnicity and Cardiometabolic Risk Profile: Disparities Across Income and Health Insurance in a National Sample of US Adults. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*. 2022;28(Supplement 1):S91-S100. doi:10.1097/phh.0000000000001441
12. Heiss G, Snyder ML, Teng Y, et al. Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome Among Hispanics/Latinos of Diverse Background: The Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Diabetes Care*. 2014;37(8):2391-2399. doi:10.2337/dc13-2505
13. Hernández-Alcaraz C, Aguilar-Salinas CA, Mendoza-Herrera K, et al. Dyslipidemia prevalence, awareness, treatment and control in Mexico: results of the Ensanut 2012. *Salud Publica Mex*. Mar-Apr 2020;62(2):137-146. Prevalencia de dislipidemias, diagnóstico previo, tratamiento y control: resultados de la Ensanut 2012. doi:10.21149/10520
14. Barquera S, Hernández-Barrera L, Trejo-Valdivia B, Shamah T, Campos-Nonato I, Rivera-Dommarco J. Obesity in Mexico, prevalence and trends in adults. Ensanut 2018-19. *salud pública de méxico*. 2020;62(6):682-692.
15. Tseng C-Y. Characteristics of Atmospheric PM_{2.5} in a Densely Populated City with Multi-Emission Sources. *Aerosol and Air Quality Research*. 2016;16(9):2145-2158. doi:10.4209/aaqr.2016.06.0269
16. Kim KH, Kabir E, Kabir S. A review on the human health impact of airborne particulate matter. *Environ Int*. Jan 2015;74:136-43. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.10.005
17. Li Z, Tang Y, Song X, Lazar L, Li Z, Zhao J. Impact of ambient PM_{2.5} on adverse birth outcome and potential molecular mechanism. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf*. Mar 2019;169:248-254. doi:10.1016/j.ecoenv.2018.10.109
18. Nieuwenhuijsen MJ, Basagaña X, Davvand P, et al. Air pollution and human fertility rates. *Environ Int*. Sep 2014;70:9-14. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.05.005
19. Carré J, Gatimel N, Moreau J, Parinaud J, Léandri R. Does air pollution play a role in infertility?: a systematic review. *Environ Health*. Jul 28 2017;16(1):82. doi:10.1186/s12940-017-0291-8

20. Saleem A, Awan T, Akhtar MF. A comprehensive review on endocrine toxicity of gaseous components and particulate matter in smog. Review. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*. 2024-January-30 2024;15doi:10.3389/fendo.2024.1294205
21. Kim JS, Chen Z, Alderete TL, et al. Associations of air pollution, obesity and cardiometabolic health in young adults: The Meta-AIR study. *Environ Int*. Dec 2019;133(Pt A):105180. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2019.105180
22. Furlong MA, Klimentidis YC. Associations of air pollution with obesity and body fat percentage, and modification by polygenic risk score for BMI in the UK Biobank. *Environ Res*. Jun 2020;185:109364. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.109364
23. Luo H, Zhang Q, Yu K, Meng X, Kan H, Chen R. Long-term exposure to ambient air pollution is a risk factor for trajectory of cardiometabolic multimorbidity: A prospective study in the UK Biobank. *EBioMedicine*. Oct 2022;84:104282. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.104282
24. Xu X, Yavar Z, Verdin M, et al. Effect of early particulate air pollution exposure on obesity in mice: role of p47phox. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. Dec 2010;30(12):2518-27. doi:10.1161/ATVBAHA.110.215350
25. Sun Q, Yue P, DeLuca JA, et al. Ambient air pollution exaggerates adipose inflammation and insulin resistance in a mouse model of diet-induced obesity. *Circulation*. Feb 3 2009;119(4):538-46. doi:CIRCULATIONAHA.108.799015 [pii] 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.108.799015
26. Wallwork RS, Colicino E, Zhong J, et al. Ambient Fine Particulate Matter, Outdoor Temperature, and Risk of Metabolic Syndrome. *Am J Epidemiol*. Jan 1 2017;185(1):30-39. doi:10.1093/aje/kww157
27. Dabass A, Talbott EO, Venkat A, et al. Association of exposure to particulate matter (PM2.5) air pollution and biomarkers of cardiovascular disease risk in adult NHANES participants (2001-2008). *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. May 2016;219(3):301-10. doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2015.12.002
28. Yitshak Sade M, Kloog I, Liberty IF, Schwartz J, Novack V. The Association Between Air Pollution Exposure and Glucose and Lipids Levels. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. Jun 2016;101(6):2460-7. doi:10.1210/jc.2016-1378
29. Tamayo-Ortiz M, Téllez-Rojo MM, Rothenberg SJ, et al. Exposure to PM2.5 and Obesity Prevalence in the Greater Mexico City Area. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(5):2301.
30. Colicino E, Ferrari F, Cowell W, et al. Non-linear and non-additive associations between the pregnancy metabolome and birthweight. *Environment International*. 2021/11/01/ 2021;156:106750. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106750>
31. Colicino E, Cowell W, Foppa Pedretti N, et al. Maternal steroids during pregnancy and their associations with ambient air pollution and temperature during preconception and early gestational periods. *Environment International*. 2022/07/01/ 2022;165:107320. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2022.107320>
32. Gangwar RS, Bevan GH, Palanivel R, Das L, Rajagopalan S. Oxidative stress pathways of air pollution mediated toxicity: Recent insights. *Redox Biol*. Jul 2020;34:101545. doi:10.1016/j.redox.2020.101545
33. Rao X, Zhong J, Brook RD, Rajagopalan S. Effect of Particulate Matter Air Pollution on Cardiovascular Oxidative Stress Pathways. *Antioxid Redox Signal*. Mar 20 2018;28(9):797-818. doi:10.1089/ars.2017.7394
34. Incalza MA, D'Oria R, Natalicchio A, Perrini S, Laviola L, Giorgino F. Oxidative stress and reactive oxygen species in endothelial dysfunction associated with cardiovascular and metabolic diseases. *Vascul Pharmacol*. Jan 2018;100:1-19. doi:10.1016/j.vph.2017.05.005
35. Sun M, Yan W, Fang K, et al. The correlation between PM(2.5) exposure and hypertensive disorders in pregnancy: A Meta-analysis. *Sci Total Environ*. Feb 10 2020;703:134985. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.134985
36. Hu H, Ha S, Xu X. Ozone and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy in Florida: Identifying critical windows of exposure. *Environ Res*. Feb 2017;153:120-125. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2016.12.002
37. Lu C, Zhang W, Zheng X, Sun J, Chen L, Deng Q. Combined effects of ambient air pollution and home environmental factors on low birth weight. *Chemosphere*. Feb 2020;240:124836. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.124836
38. Chen Q, Ren Z, Liu Y, et al. The Association between Preterm Birth and Ambient Air Pollution Exposure in Shiyuan, China, 2015-2017. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Apr 19 2021;18(8)doi:10.3390/ijerph18084326
39. Patterson WB, Glasson J, Naik N, et al. Prenatal exposure to ambient air pollutants and early infant growth and adiposity in the Southern California Mother's Milk Study. *Environ Health*. Jun 5 2021;20(1):67. doi:10.1186/s12940-021-00753-8
40. McGuinn LA, Bellinger DC, Colicino E, et al. Prenatal PM(2.5) exposure and behavioral development in children from Mexico City. *Neurotoxicology*. Dec 2020;81:109-115. doi:10.1016/j.neuro.2020.09.036

41. Warin M, Moore V, Zivkovic T, Davies M. Telescoping the origins of obesity to women's bodies: how gender inequalities are being squeezed out of Barker's hypothesis. *Annals of human biology*. Jul 2011;38(4):453-60. doi:10.3109/03014460.2011.591829
42. Varshavsky J, Smith A, Wang A, et al. Heightened susceptibility: A review of how pregnancy and chemical exposures influence maternal health. *Reprod Toxicol*. Mar 2020;92:14-56. doi:10.1016/j.reprotox.2019.04.004
43. Kalagiri RR, Carder T, Choudhury S, et al. Inflammation in Complicated Pregnancy and Its Outcome. *Am J Perinatol*. Dec 2016;33(14):1337-1356. doi:10.1055/s-0036-1582397
44. Kamity R, Sharma S, Hanna N. MicroRNA-Mediated Control of Inflammation and Tolerance in Pregnancy. *Front Immunol*. 2019;10:718. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2019.00718
45. Tenório MB, Ferreira RC, Moura FA, Bueno NB, de Oliveira ACM, Goulart MOF. Cross-Talk between Oxidative Stress and Inflammation in Preeclampsia. *Oxid Med Cell Longev*. 2019;2019:8238727. doi:10.1155/2019/8238727
46. Dalfra MG, Burlina S, Lapolla A. Weight gain during pregnancy: A narrative review on the recent evidences. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. Jun 2022;188:109913. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2022.109913
47. Wang LJ, Fan DZ, Guo HX, Chen BS, Liu ZP. Weight gain during pregnancy and placenta morphology: a prospective cohort study. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci*. Mar 2022;26(6):1978-1983. doi:10.26355/eurrev_202203_28346
48. Committee to Reexamine IOM Pregnancy Weight Guidelines, ed. *Weight Gain During Pregnancy: Reexamining the Guidelines*. Institute of Medicine and National Research Council; 2009. Rasmussen KM, Yaktine AL, eds.
49. Rich-Edwards JW, McElrath TF, Karumanchi SA, Seely EW. Breathing life into the lifecourse approach: pregnancy history and cardiovascular disease in women. *Hypertension*. Sep 2010;56(3):331-4. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.110.156810
50. Kaaja RJ, Greer IA. Manifestations of chronic disease during pregnancy. *JAMA*. Dec 7 2005;294(21):2751-7. doi:10.1001/jama.294.21.2751
51. Lee KK, E AR, Lee AJ, et al. 115 Maternal Obesity during Pregnancy and Premature Cardiovascular Mortality in Later Life. *Heart*. Jun 2014;100 Suppl 3:A65-6. doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2014-306118.115
52. Ross LE, McLean LM. Anxiety disorders during pregnancy and the postpartum period: A systematic review. *The Journal of clinical psychiatry*. Aug 2006;67(8):1285-98.
53. Demateis D, Keller KP, Rojas-Rueda D, Kioumourtzoglou M-A, Wilson A. Penalized distributed lag interaction model: Air pollution, birth weight, and neighborhood vulnerability. *Environmetrics*. 2024;35(4):e2843. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2843>
54. Broere-Brown ZA, Adank MC, Benschop L, et al. Fetal sex and maternal pregnancy outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Biology of Sex Differences*. 2020/05/11 2020;11(1):26. doi:10.1186/s13293-020-00299-3
55. Li Q, Wang Y-Y, Guo Y, et al. Folic Acid Supplementation and the Association between Maternal Airborne Particulate Matter Exposure and Preterm Delivery: A National Birth Cohort Study in China. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2020;128(12):127010. doi:doi:10.1289/EHP6386
56. Braun JM, Wright RJ, Just AC, et al. Relationships between lead biomarkers and diurnal salivary cortisol indices in pregnant women from Mexico City: a cross-sectional study. *Environ Health*. Jun 10 2014;13(1):50. doi:10.1186/1476-069x-13-50
57. Gutiérrez-Avila I, Arfer KB, Carrión D, et al. Prediction of daily mean and one-hour maximum PM2.5 concentrations and applications in Central Mexico using satellite-based machine-learning models. *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology*. 2022/09/10 2022;doi:10.1038/s41370-022-00471-4
58. Soria-Contreras DC, Trejo-Valdivia B, Cantoral A, et al. Patterns of Weight Change One Year after Delivery Are Associated with Cardiometabolic Risk Factors at Six Years Postpartum in Mexican Women. *Nutrients*. Jan 7 2020;12(1)doi:10.3390/nu12010170
59. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention NCFHS. NHANES 2019-2020 Procedure Manuals. 2024. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/continuousnhanes/manuals.aspx?BeginYear=2019>
60. Ostchega Y SR, Sarafrazi Isfahani N, Zhang G, Hughes JP, Miller I. . Waist circumference measurement methodology study: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2016. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat. 2024. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr_02/sr02_182-508.pdf
61. Friedewald WT, Levy RI, Fredrickson DS. Estimation of the concentration of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol in plasma, without use of the preparative ultracentrifuge. *Clin Chem*. Jun 1972;18(6):499-502.
62. Capurro H, Konichezky S, Fonseca D, Caldeyro-Barcia R. A simplified method for diagnosis of gestational age in the newborn infant. *The Journal of Pediatrics*. 1978;93(1):120-122. doi:10.1016/S0022-3476(78)80621-0

63. Thomas DM, Oken E, Rifas-Shiman SL, et al. Do Women Know Their Prepregnancy Weight? *Obesity*. 2019;27(7):1161-1167. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/oby.22502>
64. AV C. The AMAL system of classifying households by socio-economic level: ESOMAR. 2002;
65. Bartz-Beielstein SMA. imputeTS: Time Series Missing Value Imputation in R. *The R Journal*. 2017;9(1):207-218. doi:10.32614/RJ-2017-009
66. Schummers L, Hutcheon JA, Hacker MR, et al. Absolute risks of obstetric outcomes by maternal age at first birth: a population-based cohort. *Epidemiology*. May 2018;29(3):379-387. doi:10.1097/ede.0000000000000818
67. Wang X, Karvonen-Gutierrez CA, Gold EB, et al. Longitudinal Associations of Air Pollution With Body Size and Composition in Midlife Women: The Study of Women's Health Across the Nation. *Diabetes Care*. Nov 1 2022;45(11):2577-2584. doi:10.2337/dc22-0963
68. Chi GC, Hajat A, Bird CE, et al. Individual and Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and the Association between Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease. *Environ Health Perspect*. Dec 2016;124(12):1840-1847. doi:10.1289/ehp199
69. Patel K, Hargreaves MK, Liu J, et al. Relationship between smoking and obesity among women. *Am J Health Behav*. Sep 2011;35(5):627-36. doi:10.5993/ajhb.35.5.11
70. Fu M, Martínez-Sánchez JM, Galán I, et al. Variability in the correlation between nicotine and PM2.5 as airborne markers of second-hand smoke exposure. *Environ Res*. Nov 2013;127:49-55. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2013.09.003
71. Wickrama KAS, O'Neal CW, Nepl TK. Midlife Family Economic Hardship and Later Life Cardiometabolic Health: The Protective Role of Marital Integration. *Gerontologist*. Sep 17 2019;59(5):892-901. doi:10.1093/geront/gny047
72. Stokes JE, Barooah A. Dyadic Loneliness and Changes to HbA1c Among Older US Couples: The Role of Marital Support as Stress Buffer. *J Aging Health*. Oct 2021;33(9):698-708. doi:10.1177/08982643211006498
73. Li W, Ruan W, Lu Z, Wang D. Parity and risk of maternal cardiovascular disease: A dose-response meta-analysis of cohort studies. *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology*. 2020;26(6):592-602. doi:10.1177/2047487318818265
74. Mahalingaiah S, Hart JE, Laden F, et al. Adult air pollution exposure and risk of infertility in the Nurses' Health Study II. *Hum Reprod*. Mar 2016;31(3):638-47. doi:10.1093/humrep/dev330
75. Zhang L, An J, Liu M, et al. Spatiotemporal variations and influencing factors of PM(2.5) concentrations in Beijing, China. *Environ Pollut*. Jul 2020;262:114276. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114276
76. Blauw LL, Aziz NA, Tannemaat MR, et al. Diabetes incidence and glucose intolerance prevalence increase with higher outdoor temperature. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*. 2017;5(1):e000317. doi:10.1136/bmjdr-2016-000317
77. Nesti L, Natali A. Metformin effects on the heart and the cardiovascular system: A review of experimental and clinical data. *Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases*. 2017;27(8):657-669. doi:10.1016/j.numecd.2017.04.009
78. Molenaar EA, Massaro JM, Jacques PF, et al. Association of lifestyle factors with abdominal subcutaneous and visceral adiposity: the Framingham Heart Study. *Diabetes Care*. Mar 2009;32(3):505-10. doi:10.2337/dc08-1382
79. Clifton VL. Review: Sex and the Human Placenta: Mediating Differential Strategies of Fetal Growth and Survival. *Placenta*. 2010/03/01/ 2010;31:S33-S39. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.placenta.2009.11.010>
80. Morisset A-S, Dubé M-C, Drolet R, et al. Androgens in the maternal and fetal circulation: association with insulin resistance. *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine*. 2013/03/01 2013;26(5):513-519. doi:10.3109/14767058.2012.735725
81. India-Aldana S, Midya V, Betanzos-Robledo L, et al. Metabolism-Disrupting Chemical Mixtures during Pregnancy, Folic Acid Supplementation, and Liver Injury in Mother-Child Pairs. *medRxiv*. 2024:2024.06.13.24308903. doi:10.1101/2024.06.13.24308903
82. National Institutes of Health Office of Dietary Supplements. Folate. 2024. <https://ods.od.nih.gov/factsheets/Folate-HealthProfessional/>
83. Ramlakhan KP, Johnson MR, Roos-Hesselink JW. Pregnancy and cardiovascular disease. *Nature Reviews Cardiology*. 2020/11/01 2020;17(11):718-731. doi:10.1038/s41569-020-0390-z
84. Rong K, Yu K, Han X, et al. Pre-pregnancy BMI, gestational weight gain and postpartum weight retention: a meta-analysis of observational studies. *Public Health Nutr*. Aug 2015;18(12):2172-82. doi:10.1017/s1368980014002523
85. Basu S, Haghiaç M, Surace P, et al. Pregravid obesity associates with increased maternal endotoxemia and metabolic inflammation. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. Mar 2011;19(3):476-82. doi:10.1038/oby.2010.215
86. Egger G, Dixon J. Should obesity be the main game? Or do we need an environmental makeover to combat the inflammatory and chronic disease epidemics? *Obes Rev*. Mar 2009;10(2):237-49. doi:10.1111/j.1467-789X.2008.00542.x

87. Watanabe Y, Nagai Y, Takatsu K. Activation and regulation of the pattern recognition receptors in obesity-induced adipose tissue inflammation and insulin resistance. *Nutrients*. Sep 23 2013;5(9):3757-78. doi:10.3390/nu5093757
88. Butte NF. Carbohydrate and lipid metabolism in pregnancy: normal compared with gestational diabetes mellitus. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2000;71(5):1256S-1261S. doi:10.1093/ajcn/71.5.1256s
89. Grimes SB, Wild R. Effect of Pregnancy on Lipid Metabolism and Lipoprotein Levels. In: Feingold KR, Anawalt B, Boyce A, et al, eds. *Endotext*. MDText.com, Inc.
- Copyright © 2000-2022, MDText.com, Inc.; 2000.
90. Bosaeus M, Andersson-Hall U, Andersson L, Karlsson T, Ellegård L, Holmäng A. Body Composition During Pregnancy: Longitudinal Changes and Method Comparisons. *Reprod Sci*. Jul 2020;27(7):1477-1489. doi:10.1007/s43032-020-00141-6
91. To WW, Wong MW. Body fat composition and weight changes during pregnancy and 6-8 months post-partum in primiparous and multiparous women. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol*. Feb 2009;49(1):34-8. doi:10.1111/j.1479-828X.2008.00933.x
92. Sattar N, Greer IA, Pirwani I, Gibson J, Wallace AM. Leptin levels in pregnancy: marker for fat accumulation and mobilization? *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. Mar 1998;77(3):278-83.
93. Bochkur Dratver MA, Arenas J, Thaweethai T, et al. Longitudinal changes in glucose during pregnancy in women with gestational diabetes risk factors. *Diabetologia*. Mar 2022;65(3):541-551. doi:10.1007/s00125-021-05622-0
94. Di Cianni G, Miccoli R, Volpe L, Lencioni C, Del Prato S. Intermediate metabolism in normal pregnancy and in gestational diabetes. *Diabetes/metabolism research and reviews*. Jul-Aug 2003;19(4):259-70. doi:10.1002/dmrr.390
95. Bowe B, Gibson AK, Xie Y, et al. Ambient Fine Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Risk of Weight Gain and Obesity in United States Veterans: An Observational Cohort Study. *Environ Health Perspect*. Apr 2021;129(4):47003. doi:10.1289/ehp7944
96. Zhang N, Wang L, Zhang M, Nazroo J. Air quality and obesity at older ages in China: The role of duration, severity and pollutants. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(12):e0226279. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0226279
97. Li X, Wang M, Song Y, et al. Obesity and the relation between joint exposure to ambient air pollutants and incident type 2 diabetes: A cohort study in UK Biobank. *PLoS Med*. Aug 2021;18(8):e1003767. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003767
98. Yeatts K, Svendsen E, Creason J, et al. Coarse particulate matter (PM_{2.5-10}) affects heart rate variability, blood lipids, and circulating eosinophils in adults with asthma. *Environ Health Perspect*. May 2007;115(5):709-14. doi:10.1289/ehp.9499
99. Wilkins JT, Ning H, Stone NJ, et al. Coronary heart disease risks associated with high levels of HDL cholesterol. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Mar 13 2014;3(2):e000519. doi:10.1161/jaha.113.000519
100. Bittner V. Lipoprotein abnormalities related to women's health. *Am J Cardiol*. Oct 17 2002;90(8a):77i-84i. doi:10.1016/s0002-9149(02)02637-1
101. Kaze AD, Santhanam P, Musani SK, Ahima R, Echouffo-Tcheugui JB. Metabolic Dyslipidemia and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Findings From the Look AHEAD Study. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Apr 6 2021;10(7):e016947. doi:10.1161/jaha.120.016947
102. Duncan MS, Vasan RS, Xanthakis V. Trajectories of Blood Lipid Concentrations Over the Adult Life Course and Risk of Cardiovascular Disease and All-Cause Mortality: Observations From the Framingham Study Over 35 Years. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Jun 4 2019;8(11):e011433. doi:10.1161/jaha.118.011433
103. Fernandez ML, Jones JJ, Ackerman D, et al. Low HDL cholesterol is associated with increased atherogenic lipoproteins and insulin resistance in women classified with metabolic syndrome. *Nutr Res Pract*. Dec 2010;4(6):492-8. doi:10.4162/nrp.2010.4.6.492
104. Zhang J, Chen G, Liang S, et al. PM_{2.5} exposure exaggerates the risk of adverse birth outcomes in pregnant women with pre-existing hyperlipidemia: Modulation role of adipokines and lipidome. *Sci Total Environ*. Sep 15 2021;787:147604. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147604
105. Ernhart CB, Morrow-Tlucak M, Sokol RJ, Martier S. Underreporting of alcohol use in pregnancy. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. Aug 1988;12(4):506-11. doi:10.1111/j.1530-0277.1988.tb00233.x
106. Shipton D, Tappin DM, Vadiveloo T, Crossley JA, Aitken DA, Chalmers J. Reliability of self reported smoking status by pregnant women for estimating smoking prevalence: a retrospective, cross sectional study. *Bmj*. Oct 29 2009;339:b4347. doi:10.1136/bmj.b4347

107. Nakling J, Buhaug H, Backe B. The biologic error in gestational length related to the use of the first day of last menstrual period as a proxy for the start of pregnancy. *Early Hum Dev.* Oct 2005;81(10):833-9. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2005.06.004
108. Baskett TF, Nagele F. Naegele's rule: a reappraisal. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology.* 2000;107(11):1433-1435. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0528.2000.tb11661.x>
109. Miller WG, Myers GL, Sakurabayashi I, et al. Seven direct methods for measuring HDL and LDL cholesterol compared with ultracentrifugation reference measurement procedures. *Clin Chem.* Jun 2010;56(6):977-86. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2009.142810
110. Langlois MR, Chapman MJ, Cobbaert C, et al. Quantifying Atherogenic Lipoproteins: Current and Future Challenges in the Era of Personalized Medicine and Very Low Concentrations of LDL Cholesterol. A Consensus Statement from EAS and EFLM. *Clin Chem.* Jul 2018;64(7):1006-1033. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2018.287037
111. Wilson A, Chiu Y-HM, Hsu H-HL, Wright RO, Wright RJ, Coull BA. Potential for Bias When Estimating Critical Windows for Air Pollution in Children's Health. *American Journal of Epidemiology.* 2017;186(11):1281-1289. doi:10.1093/aje/kwx184
112. Barquera S, Hernández-Barrera L, Trejo-Valdivia B, Shamah T, Campos-Nonato I, Rivera-Dommarco J. [Obesity in Mexico, prevalence and trends in adults. Ensanut 2018-19.]. *Salud Publica Mex.* Nov-Dec 2020;62(6):682-692. Obesidad en México, prevalencia y tendencias en adultos. Ensanut 2018-19. doi:10.21149/11630
113. World Health Organization (WHO). What are the WHO Air quality guidelines? Accessed 5/22/2023, <https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/what-are-the-who-air-quality-guidelines>
114. Nugent R, Bertram MY, Jan S, et al. Investing in non-communicable disease prevention and management to advance the Sustainable Development Goals. *Lancet.* May 19 2018;391(10134):2029-2035. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(18)30667-6
115. Nauck M, Warnick GR, Rifai N. Methods for measurement of LDL-cholesterol: a critical assessment of direct measurement by homogeneous assays versus calculation. *Clin Chem.* Feb 2002;48(2):236-54.



