

Association between Exposure to Noise and Risk of Hypertension: A Meta-Analysis of Observational Epidemiological Studies

Running title: Noise and hypertension

Wenning Fu¹, Chao Wang¹, Qiaoyan Liu¹, Li Zou², Yong Gan¹, Shijiao Yan¹, Fujian Song³, Zhihong Wang^{4*}, Zuxun Lu^{1*}, Shiyi Cao^{1*}

¹School of Public Health, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China

²Department of Neurology, Taihe Hospital, Hubei University of Medicine, China

³Norwich Medical School, Faculty of Medicine and Health Science, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Shenzhen Second People's Hospital, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China

***Corresponding author**

Address: No. 13 Hangkong Road, Wuhan 430030, China

E-mail: Shiyi Cao: caoshiyi@hust.edu.cn

Zuxun Lu: zuxunlu@yahoo.com

Zhihong Wang: 247506385@qq.com

Telephone and fax numbers: +86-027-83693756

Conflicts of Interest and Source of Funding

We declare we have no conflict of interest. This study was supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China.

(2016YXMS215).

Word count:5508

Number of tables:2

Number of figures:6

Abstract

Background and Objective: An increasing amount of original studies suggested that exposure to noise could be associated with the risk of hypertension, but the results remain inconsistent and inconclusive. We aimed to synthesize available epidemiological evidence about the relationship between various types of noise and hypertension, and to explore the potential dose-response relationship between them in an up-to-date meta-analysis.

Methods: We conducted a literature search of PubMed and Embase from these databases' inception through December 2016 to identify observational epidemiological studies examining the association between noise and risk of hypertension. A Random-effects model was used to combine the results of included studies. Dose-response meta-analysis was conducted to examine the potential dose-response relationship.

Results: Thirty-two studies (five cohort studies, one case-control study, and twenty-six cross-section Studies) involving 264,678 participants were eligible for inclusion. Pooled result showed that living or working in environment with noise exposure was significantly associated with increase risk of hypertension (OR 1.62; 95% CI: 1.40 to 1.88). We found no evidence of a curve linear association between noise and risk of hypertension. Dose-response analysis suggested that, for an increment of per 10 dB(A) of noise, the combined odds ratio of hypertension was 1.06 (95% CI: 1.04 to 1.08).

Conclusions: Integrated epidemiological evidence supports the hypothesis that exposure to noise may be a risk factor of hypertension, and there is a positive dose-response association between them.

Keywords: noise, hypertension, dose-response, meta-analysis

Introduction

Hypertension is the most common condition seen in primary care that can lead to renal failure, cardiovascular disease, and death¹⁻². According to the World Health Organization, about 24.8% of the global population are affected by hypertension³. Reducing modifiable risk factors may contribute to the prevention and control of hypertension, which is of considerable public health importance.

Noise pollution has been increasingly investigated as an environmental risk factor for hypertension recently. Some studies suggested that exposure to noise were associated with many health problems, including annoyance⁴, hearing loss⁵, sleep disturbance⁶, type 2 diabetes⁷, and ischemic heart disease⁸. For example, a multi-airport study published in 2013 found that exposure to aircraft noise increased the relative rate of hospitalization for cardiovascular diseases⁹.

Recently, the association between noise exposure and the risk of hypertension has drawn researchers' attention and it was the topic for dozens of epidemiological studies. Although there were several meta-analyses that evaluated the relationship between noise and the risk of hypertension, their results were not comprehensive without considering all types of noises, and many new studies have been recently published.

Taken into consideration of the inconsistent conclusions of existing epidemiological studies and the flaw of previous meta-analyses, we conducted an updated meta-analysis of observational epidemiological studies to evaluate the association between noise and the risk of hypertension.

Materials and Methods

Ethical approval is not required for this systematic review.

Literature search strategy

We conducted this meta-analysis in accordance with the preferred reporting items for systematic

reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) ¹⁰ and the checklist of items in the meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology (MOOSE) ¹¹. We performed a literature search on PubMed and Embase in December 2016. The following keywords were used to identify relevant citations: “noise” in combination with “hypertension” or “blood pressure”. The language was restricted to English. Only human studies were considered. Additionally, reference lists of the retrieved original articles and relevant review articles were also scrutinized to identify further pertinent studies.

Study selection

We included studies according to the following criteria: (1) the study design was cohort, case-control, or cross-sectional; (2) any type of noise was an exposure variable and the outcome was the incidence of hypertension; and (3) the study reported the odds ratio (OR) or relative risk (RR) with the corresponding 95% confidence intervals of hypertension related to noise exposure. Studies providing data on the relationship between noise exposure and the change of blood pressure but not reporting the association of noise with the risk of hypertension were excluded. If there is more than one report from the same study, we only included the one with the most detailed information for both noise exposure and the incidence of hypertension.

Data extraction and quality assessment

Two authors (WF and SC) independently extracted the following information from the included studies: first author, publication year, country (state), study design, sex, age, number of participants, noise type, exposure levels, adjusted OR/RR with 95% CI, and adjusted factors. Disagreements were resolved by discussion with a third author (ZL).

We used the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale to evaluate the quality of cohort studies and case-control studies¹². The scale score is calculated based on the three factors: selection of participants,

comparability of groups, and exposure/outcome ascertainment. This scale awards a maximum of 9 points to a study. Studies scoring 0-3 points, 4-6 points, and 7-9 points were categorized as low, moderate, and high quality of studies, respectively. The assessment tool involving 11 items recommended by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality was applied for cross sectional studies¹³. An item is given '1' point if it was considered in a study, and '0' point if the item was not considered or we were unable to determine whether it was considered in a study. Each study was rated independently by two authors (WF and SC). Discrepancies were resolved by discussion with a third investigator (ZL).

Statistical analyses

We considered OR as the common measure of the association between noise and risk of hypertension. The reported RR was considered approximately as OR. When OR was reported separately by different levels of noise exposure, the highest level of noise exposure was defined as the exposure group. We calculated an overall pooled OR using a random effects model for the main analysis¹⁴. In addition, if the articles included at least three quantitative categories of noise or the results were already reported as OR per 10 dB(A) of noise, they were used in a dose-response meta-analysis, in which the dose-response result was measured by OR of hypertension per 10 dB(A) of noise.

We calculated the natural logarithm of the OR and its variance per 10 dB(A). If a study reported an OR per unit of noise, the natural logarithm of the OR per unit of noise could be directly used.

However, most studies gave a series of grouped dose-specific OR, with one noise exposure group as the referent group. These were transformed into a risk estimate per unit of noise. In addition, a dose value for each noise exposure group was assigned as suggested by¹⁵: The median or mean level of noise within each category was used as the corresponding dose value. When the median or mean per

unit of noise was not available, the midpoint of the upper and lower boundaries was considered the dose of each category. If the highest category was open-ended, the midpoint of the category was set at 1.5 times that of the lower category. When the number of participants were not available, the odds ratios comparing the highest vs. lowest categories of noise were used to obtain a summary estimate. Restricted cubic splines with three knots at percentiles 10%, 50%, and 90% of the distribution were used to evaluate a potential curve linear relationship between noise and risk of hypertension. We calculated the P value for curve linearity or nonlinearity by testing the null hypothesis in which the coefficient of the second spline is equal to 0¹⁶.

We used Q statistic with a significance level at $P < 0.10$ and I^2 statistic to test the heterogeneity. The I^2 statistic measures the percentage of total variation across studies due to heterogeneity rather than chance. It was calculated according to the formula by Higgins¹⁷. The substantial heterogeneity is I^2 value of $\geq 50\%$.

We conducted subgroup analyses to determine the possible influence of some factors such as study design, noise type, state, controlling for age, body mass index, sex, and smoking. The Begg's rank correlation and the Egger's linear regression tests were used to assess potential publication bias¹⁸⁻¹⁹.

Duval and Tweedie's nonparametric trim-and-fill method was used to adjust potential publication bias²⁰. We used STATA statistical software (version 12.0; College Station, TX, USA) to analyze data.

All statistical tests were two-sided with a significance level of 0.05.

Results

Literature search

Figure 1 shows the process of study identification and inclusion. Initially, we retrieved 1346 citations

from the PubMed and 1248 citations from the Embase. After excluding 151 duplicates, we identified 2446 citations. After assessing the eligibility of the 2446 records based on titles and abstracts, we excluded 2193 records. After retrieving and assessing full-text of the remaining 253 articles, we excluded 221 articles, because 191 studied only the relationship between noise and blood pressure and thirty studies did not provide useful data to calculate them. Finally, 32 studies²¹⁻⁵² were included (five cohort studies, one case-control study, and twenty-six cross-sectional studies).

Characteristics of the included studies

Table 1 shows the main characteristics of the 32 studies included in the systematic review. The included studies were published between 1984 and 2016, and included a total of 264,678 participants. Among these, nineteen studies were from the Europe, twelve studies were from Asia, and one study was from the South America. In total, seventeen studies were occupational noise and fifteen were community noise (including seven road noise, six air noise and two were unknown). Two studies were published before 2000 and the other thirty after 2000. In addition, there were five cohort studies, and the quality assessment scores ranged from 6 to 9, with an average score of 7 points. The quality assessment score for one case-control study was 7 points. There were a total of 26 cross-sectional studies, and the scores from our assessment of study quality ranged from 5 to 10, with a mean score of 7.2 points.

Results of meta-analysis

Association between noise and risk of hypertension

Figure 2 shows the results from the random-effects model combining the ORs for hypertension in relation to noise. Twenty-eight studies investigated the relationship between noise and risk of hypertension. Of the 28 studies, twenty-one suggested a positive relationship between noise and the

risk of hypertension, while the others did not. The pooled OR of hypertension for noise was 1.62 (95%CI: 1.40 to 1.88), with substantial heterogeneity across studies ($P = 0.000$, $I^2 = 84.3\%$).

Dose-response analysis

Sixteen studies reported the dose-response analysis of noise and risk of hypertension. As shown in Fig. 3, a curve linear association between per 10 dB(A) of noise and risk of hypertension was not observed ($P = 0.420$). The pooled OR of hypertension for an increment of per 10 dB(A) in noise was 1.06 (95% CI: 1.04 to 1.08; Figure 4). We saw a substantial heterogeneity among studies ($P = 0.000$, $I^2 = 79.4\%$).

Results of subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses

Table 2 shows the results of subgroup analyses. Subgroup analyses by study design, noise type, state or country, **nighttime or daytime noise**, and controlling for **the concomitant effects of air pollution**, age, BMI, sex, smoking were conducted for the increase of hypertension risk, relating to noise exposure, respectively. In general, these subgroup analyses showed no statistically significant difference in results. Every single pooled result of subgroup showed the positive and statistically significant relationship between exposure to noise and the risk of hypertension.

Of note, subgroup analyses by noise type showed that the heterogeneity was mainly from occupational noise: $I^2=88.7\%$ for occupational noise and 12.4%, 69.0%, and 0 % for road, air, or unknown noise, respectively.

To identify the potential influence of single study on the pooled results, any single study was excluded in turn and pooled the results of the remaining included studies. The pooled OR did not materially change, with a range from 1.57 (95% CI: 1.36-1.82) to 1.69 (95%CI: 1.43-2.01).

Publication bias

Visual inspection of the funnel plot indicated substantial asymmetry (Figure 5). The Egger test

indicated evidence of publication bias, but the Begg test did not (Egger, $p=0.000$, Begg, $p=0.12$). We used the trim-and-fill method to evaluate the impact of any potential publication bias, the results showed that two potentially missing studies would be needed to obtain funnel plot symmetry for hypertension (Figure 6). By using the trim-and-fill method, the corrected OR was 1.57 (95% CI: 1.35 to 1.82; random-effects model, $p=0.000$). Therefore, the pooled OR was not substantially changed by the correction for potential publication bias.

Discussion

Noise exposure is a widely existing environment factor around the world and a number of previous studies suggested that noise may affect human being's health. In the study by Munzel (2017), some generalized pathways are possible to explain the potential mechanisms: (1) noise cause perturbation of vegetative nerve or Sympathetic adrenal activation; (2) noise can lead to release of pro-inflammatory mediators and active leukocyte populations; and (3) endothelial dysfunction caused by oxidative stress. Therefore, both reaction chains can initiate physiological stress responses, involving the hypothalamus, the autonomous nervous system with activation of the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis and the sympathetic-adrenal-medulla axis, that may lead to the incidence of hypertension. Meanwhile, noise can increase the psychological stress, which is considered to be an important factor in the formation and development of hypertension. The mechanism of psychological stress leading to hypertension is mainly as follows: psychological stress can lead to excessive activation and unbalanced adjustment of the sympathetic nervous system. Thus, the sympathetic adrenal medulla system, the hypothalamus pituitary adrenal axis system and the renin-angiotensin system are regulated directly or indirectly, which increases the secretion of hormones such as angiotensin, catecholamine

hormones, and aldosterone abnormally regulates. The endothelial system and the immune system, resulting in increased secretion of endothelin-1 and inflammatory factors, raised the amount of vasoconstrictor substance and decreased vasodilator substance, leading to vascular dysfunction. The combined effect is the elevated blood pressure.⁵⁴⁻⁵⁹

This meta-analysis focusing on the association between exposure to noise and the risk of hypertension included 32 observational epidemiological studies involving 264,678 participants²¹⁻⁵². Evidence from these studies suggested that people living or working in noise environment have an increased risk of hypertension by 62% compared with control participants.

Since substantial heterogeneity was found among the included studies, we conducted subgroup analyses by various factors, including study design, noise type, state or country, nighttime or daytime noise, and controlling for the concomitant effects of air pollution, age, BMI, and sex. Our results showed that the association between noise and hypertension risk was similar across subgroups. However, subgroup analyses suggested that type of noise may be the main cause of heterogeneity. For noise from community (road noise, air noise, or unknown type of community noise), no obvious heterogeneity was found. For occupational noise, the heterogeneity was substantial, indicating that different occupation has very different type of noise. Of note, occupational factories have different standard, and different methods were used to control noise, so there is discrepancy in the type of occupational noise. In community, a majority of individuals may spend less daytime at home, and in the evening the noise may be smaller than that during the day.

Of the included studies, 16 articles reported the ORs of hypertension for an increment of per 10 dB(A) of noise or respective ORs for different levels of noise exposure dB(A). Based on these data, we conducted a dose-response analysis and found that the combined OR of hypertension was 1.06

(95% CI: 1.04 to 1.08) for an increment of 10 dB(A) of noise. The present quantitative review supported the positive, statistically significant dose-response relationship between the exposure level of noise and the risk of hypertension. Given the insufficiency of available data, we failed to identify whether the duration of noise exposure changed the risk of hypertension.

There are several strengths in our study. Firstly, sensitivity analysis and consistent results from various subgroup analyses indicated that our findings were reliable and robust, although heterogeneity existed among the included studies. Secondly, not only did we identified the increased hypertension risk of people regularly living or working in noise environment compared with control people, but also the dose-response relationship between exposure level of noise and the risk of hypertension.

Some limitations should be of concern in the present meta-analysis. First, majority of the included studies had a cross-sectional study design, the methodological weakness of which may weak the validity of our results. Secondly, potential confounding factors were adjusted differently in the included studies, as what and how many covariates should be adjusted in data analyses were usually unclear.

In summary, our meta-analysis of observational epidemiological studies with the most up-to-date evidence suggests that noise exposure is significantly associated with an increased risk of hypertension. A positive, statistically significant dose-response relationship is found between the exposure level of noise and the hypertension risk. **Since most of the included studies were of a cross-sectional design with considerable risk of bias, well designed prospective cohort studies with sufficiently long follow up period are needed to confirm our findings.**

Author Contributions: Zuxun Lu, Shiyi Cao and Zhihong Wang had full access to all the data in the

study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Shiyi Cao and Wenning Fu independently extracted the related data information.

Check the related data information again: Chao Wang, Qiaoyan Liu and Li Zou.

Data analysis and writing articles: Shiyi Cao , Wenning Fu and Fujian Song.

Analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Acknowledgement

We thank all the authors of the studies included in our meta-analysis.

Conflicts of Interest and Source of Funding

We declare we have no conflict of interest. This study was supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China.

(2016YXMS215).

References

1. Whelton PK, He J, Appel LJ, Cutler JA, Havas S, Kotchen TA et al. National high blood pressure education program coordinating committee. primary prevention of hypertension: clinical and public health advisory from the national high blood pressure education program. *JAMA* 2002;288:1882-1888.
2. James PA, Oparil S, Carter BL, et al. 2014 Evidence-Based Guideline for the Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults: Report From the Panel Members Appointed to the Eighth Joint National Committee (JNC 8). *JAMA* 2014;311:507-520.
3. WHO World Health Statistics. Geneva, Switzerland 2012. http://www.who.int/gho/publication/world_health_statistics/EN_WHS2012_Full.pdf. Accessed May 27, 2014.
4. H eritier H, Vienneau D, Frei P, Eze IC, Brink M, Probst-Hensch N, et al. The association between road traffic noise exposure, annoyance and health-related quality of life (HRQOL). *International Journal of Environmental Research & Public Health*. 2014; 11:12652-11667.
5. Nelson DI, Nelson RY, Concha- Barrientos M, Fingerhut M. The global burden of occupational noise-induced hearing loss. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*. 2005; 48:446-458.
6. Kawada T. Noise and health--sleep disturbance in adults. *Journal of Occupational Health* 2011;53:413-416.
7. Dzhambov AM. Long-term noise exposure and the risk for type 2 diabetes: A meta-analysis. *Noise & Health*. 2015; 17:23-33..
8. van Kempen EE, Kruize H, Boshuizen HC, Ameling CB, Staatsen BA, de Hollander AE. The association between noise exposure and blood pressure and ischemic heart disease: a meta-analysis. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2002; 110:307-317.
9. Kmietowicz Z. Aircraft noise is linked to raised risk of cardiovascular disease. *Bmj*. 2013; 347:f6082-f..
10. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Journal of Chinese Integrative Medicine*. 2009; 7:889-896.
11. Statement C. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology. 2000.
12. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of non randomised studies in meta-analyses. Ottawa, ON:Ottawa Health Research Institute, 2009.
13. Rostom A, Dub e C, Cranney A, et al. Celiac Disease. Evidence Reports/Technology Assessments. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2004 Sep. Appendix D. Quality Assessment Forms. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK35156/>.
14. Dersimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials*. 1986; 7:177-188..
15. Cao S, Gan Y, Dong X, Liu J, Lu Z. Association of Quantity and Duration of Smoking with Erectile Dysfunction: A Dose-Response Meta- Analysis. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*. 2014; 11:2376-2384.
16. Jr HF, Lee KL, Pollock BG. Regression models in clinical studies: determining relationships between predictors and response. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*. 1988; 80:1198-1202.
17. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *British Medical Journal*. 2003; 327:557-560.
18. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias.

Biometrics. 1995; 50:1088-1101.

19. Egger M. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ. Bmj.* 1997; 315:: 629–634.
20. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and Fill: A Simple Funnel- Plot–Based Method of Testing and Adjusting for Publication Bias in Meta- Analysis. *Biometrics.* 2015; 56:455-463.
21. Belli S, Luciano Sani MD, Giorgina Scarficcia MD, Raffaella Sorrentino MD. Arterial hypertension and noise: A cross-sectional study. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine.* 1984; 6:59–65.
22. Herbold M, Hense HW, Keil U. Effects of road traffic noise on prevalence of hypertension in men: Results of the Luebeck Blood Pressure Study. *Sozial- und Präventivmedizin SPM.* 1989; 34:19-23.
23. Belojevic G, Saric-Tanaskovic M. Prevalence of Arterial Hypertension and Myocardial Infarction in Relation to Subjective Ratings of Traffic Noise Exposure. *Noise & Health.* 2002; 4.
24. Rosenlund M, Berglind N, Pershagen G, Järup L, Bluhm G. Increased prevalence of hypertension in a population exposed to aircraft noise. *Occupational & Environmental Medicine.* 2002; 58:769-773.
25. Souza TCFD, Périssé ARS, Moura M. Noise exposure and hypertension: investigation of a silent relationship. *Bmc Public Health.* 2002; 168:875-882.
26. Inoue M, Laskar MS, Harada N. Cross-sectional study on occupational noise and hypertension in the workplace. *Archives of Environmental Health.* 2005; 60:106-110.
27. Bluhm GL, Berglind N, Nordling E, Rosenlund M. Road traffic noise and hypertension. *Occupational & Environmental Medicine.* 2007; 64:122-126.
28. Eriksson C, Rosenlund M, Pershagen G, Hilding A, Ostenson CG, Bluhm G. Aircraft noise and incidence of hypertension. *Epidemiology.* 2007; 18:716-721.
29. GA B, BD J, Stojanov VJ, VZ S, KZ P. Nighttime road-traffic noise and arterial hypertension in an urban population. *Hypertension Research.* 2008; 31:775-781.
30. Rhee MY, Kim HY, Roh SC, Kim HJ, Kwon HJ. The Effects of Chronic Exposure to Aircraft Noise on the Prevalence of Hypertension. *Hypertension Research Official Journal of the Japanese Society of Hypertension.* 2008; 31:641-647.
31. Barregard L, Bonde E, Öhrström E. Risk of hypertension from exposure to road traffic noise in a population-based sample. *Occupational & Environmental Medicine.* 2009; 66:410-415.
32. Bodin T, Albin M, Ardö J, Stroh E, Östergren PO, Björk J. Road traffic noise and hypertension: results from a cross-sectional public health survey in southern Sweden. *Environmental Health A Global Access Science Source.* 2009; 8:5283-5288.
33. Chang TY, Wang VS, Hwang BF, Yen HY, Lai JS, Liu CS, et al. Effects of co-exposure to noise and mixture of organic solvents on blood pressure. *Journal of Occupational Health.* 2009; 51:332-339.
34. Eriksson C, Bluhm G, Hilding A, Ostenson CG, Pershagen G. Aircraft noise and incidence of hypertension—Gender specific effects. *Environmental Research.* 2010; 110:764-772.
35. Nawaz SK, Hasnain S. Noise induced hypertension and prehypertension in Pakistan. *Bosnian journal of basic medical sciences / Udruženje osnovnih medicinskih znanosti = Association of Basic Medical Sciences.* 2010; 10:239-244.
36. Bendokiene I, Grazuleviciene R, Dedele A. Risk of hypertension related to road traffic noise among reproductive-age women. *Noise & Health.* 2011; 13:371-377.
37. Chang TY, Liu CS, Bao BY, Li SF, Chen TI, Lin YJ. Characterization of road traffic noise exposure and prevalence of hypertension in central Taiwan. *Science of the Total Environment* 2011.

p. 1053-1057.

38. La TG, Coniglione D, Scagliusi A, Scagliosi A, Ciocci G, La TF, et al. [Exposure to noise in the general population and hypertension: results from a pilot case-control study in Rome]. *Annali Di Igiene Medicina Preventiva E Di Comunità*. 2011; 23:209-217.
39. Attarchi M, Dehghan F, Safakhah F, Nojomi M, Mohammadi S. Effect of exposure to occupational noise and shift working on blood pressure in rubber manufacturing company workers. *Industrial Health*. 2012; 50:205-213.
40. Babisch W, Swart W, Houthuijs D, Selander J, Bluhm G, Pershagen G, et al. Exposure modifiers of the relationships of transportation noise with high blood pressure and noise annoyance. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 2012; 132:3788-3808.
41. Chang TY, Liu CS, Young LH, Wang VS, Jian SE, Bao BY. Noise frequency components and the prevalence of hypertension in workers. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2012; 416:89–96.
42. Weinmann T, Ehrenstein V, Kries RV, Nowak D, Radon K. Subjective and objective personal noise exposure and hypertension: an epidemiologic approach. *International Archives of Occupational & Environmental Health*. 2012; 85:363-371.
43. Chang TY, Hwang BF, Liu CS, Chen RY, Wang VS, Bao BY, et al. Occupational noise exposure and incident hypertension in men: a prospective cohort study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2013; 177:818-825.
44. Mirsaeed Attarchi MD, Majid Golabadi MD, Yasser Labbafinejad MD, Saber Mohammadi MD. Combined effects of exposure to occupational noise and mixed organic solvents on blood pressure in car manufacturing company workers †. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*. 2013; 56:243-251.
45. Stokholm ZA, Bonde JP, Christensen KL, Hansen AM, Kolstad HA. Occupational noise exposure and the risk of hypertension. *Stroke; a journal of cerebral circulation*. 2013; 44:3214-3216.
46. Babisch W, Wolf K, Petz M, Heinrich J, Cyrus J, Peters A. Associations between traffic noise, particulate air pollution, hypertension, and isolated systolic hypertension in adults: the KORA study. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2014; 122:492-498.
47. Babisch W, Wölke G, Heinrich J, Straff W. Road traffic noise and hypertension – Accounting for the location of rooms. *Environmental Research*. 2014; 133:380-387.
48. Banerjee D, Das PP, Fouzdar A. Urban Residential Road Traffic Noise and Hypertension: a Cross-Sectional Study of Adult Population. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2014; 91:1144-1157.
49. Chang TY, Beelen R, Li SF, Chen TI, Lin YJ, Bao BY, et al. Road traffic noise frequency and prevalent hypertension in Taichung, Taiwan: A cross-sectional study. *Environmental Health*. 2014; 13:480-496.
50. Rapisarda V, Ledda C, Ferrante M, Fiore M, Cocuzza S, Bracci M, et al. Blood pressure and occupational exposure to noise and lead (Pb): A cross-sectional study. *Toxicology & Industrial Health*. 2015.
51. Evrard AS, Lefèvre M, Champelovier P, Lambert J, Laumon B. Does aircraft noise exposure increase the risk of hypertension in the population living near airports in France? 2016.
52. Liu CS, Young LH, Yu TY, Bao BY, Chang TY. Occupational Noise Frequencies and the Incidence of Hypertension in a Retrospective Cohort Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2016.
53. Münzel T, Sørensen M, Gori T, Schmidt FP, Rao X, Brook FR, et al. Environmental stressors and cardio-metabolic disease: part II-mechanistic insights. *European Heart Journal*. 2016:ehw294.
54. Al'Absi M, Arnett DK. Adrenocortical responses to psychological stress and risk for hypertension.

2000; 54:234-244.

55. Grassi G, Seravalle G, Dell'Oro R, Mancia G. Sympathetic mechanisms, organ damage, and antihypertensive treatment. *Current Hypertension Reports*. 2011; 13:303-308.

56. Schiffrin EL, Thibault G. Plasma endothelin in human essential hypertension. *American Journal of Hypertension*. 1991; 4:303-308.

57. Harwani SC, Chapleau MW, Legge KL, Ballas ZK, Abboud FM. Neurohormonal modulation of the innate immune system is proinflammatory in the prehypertensive spontaneously hypertensive rat, a genetic model of essential hypertension. *Circulation Research*. 2012; 111:1190-1197.

58. Williams JE, Nieto FJ, Sanford CP, Tyroler HA. Effects of an Angry Temperament on Coronary Heart Disease Risk: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2001; 10:230-235.

59. Gilbert JS, Ryan MJ, Lamarca BB, Sedeek M, Murphy SR, Granger JP. Pathophysiology of hypertension during preeclampsia: linking placental ischemia with endothelial dysfunction. *Hypertension*. 2008; 38:541-550.

Table 1 Main characteristics of the included studies involving noise exposure and the risk of hypertension.

Author	Country(state)	Study design	Sex, age	Number of participants	Noise type	Exposure levels[dB(A)]	Adjustment
Belli S	Italy (Europe)	Cross	M. 35-56	940	Occupational	78-105	NR
Herbold M	Germany (Europe)	Cross	M. 30-69	2295	Occupational	NR	NR
Belojevic G	Pancevo (Europe)	Cross	M&F. NR	3622	Community (Road)	53-70	Age, smoking and BMI
Rosenlund M	Sweden (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 19-80	2959	Community (Air)	<72 versus ≥72	Age, sex, smoking and education
Souza TCFD	Brazil (South America)	Cross	M&F. NR	1729	Occupational	≤75 75-85 ≥85	Age, sex and BMI
Inoue M	Japanese (Asia)	Cross	M. 20-59	415	Occupational	75 versus 92	Age, BMI, smoking, alcohol drinking, exercise, diet and family history of hypertension
Bluhm GL	Sweden (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 19-80	667	Community (Road)	≤45 45-50 50-55 >55	Age, type of residence, occupational status ,smoking status and number of cigarettes
Eriksson C	Sweden (Europe)	Cohort	M. 35-56	2754	Community (Air)	50-65 versus >65	Age and BMI
Belojevic GA	Serbia (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 18-96	2503	Community (Road)	>45 versus ≤45	Age, BMI, physical activity, education, family history of hypertension and alcohol consumption

Rhee MY	Korea (Asia)	Cross	M&F. >18	875	Community (Air)	80-89 105-115 114-116	Age, sex, BMI, smoking, alcohol drinking, diabetes and regular exercise
Barregard L	Sweden (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 18-75	1953	Community (Road)	45-50 51-55 56-70	Age, sex, BMI and heredity for hypertension
Bodin T	Sweden (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 18-80	24238	Community (Road)	<45 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 >64	NR
Chang TY	Taiwan (Asia)	Cross	M&F. NR	59	Occupational	50-120	Age, sex, BMI, smoking, regular exercise and family history of hypertension
Eriksson C	Sweden (Europe)	Cohort	M&F. 35-56	4721	Community (Air)	<50 50-54 55-59 ≥60	Age, sex, socioeconomic status, smoking and BMI
Nawaz SK	Pakistan (Asia)	Cross	M. 30-50	389	Occupational	≤80 81-94 ≥95□	Age, weight, BMI, smoking and family history of hypertension
Bendokiene I	Lithuania (Europe)	Cross	M. 20-45	3121	Community (Road)	≤50 51-69 ≥61	Age, social status, marital status, education, alcohol drinking, ethnic, BMI, chronic disease and exposure duration
Chang TY	Taiwan (Asia)	Cross	M&F. NR	820	Community (Road)	<77 versus ≥83	Sex, BMI, smoking, alcohol drinking, tea consumption, coffee consumption, regular exercise and family history of hypertension

La TG	Italian (Europe)	Csae - control	M&F. NR	241	Community (NR)	NR	NR
Attarchi M	Iran (Asia)	Cross	M. 19-55	331	Occupational	72-100	Age, work of duration, BMI, smoking, dietary salt, regular exercise and family history of hypertension
Babisch W	Germany (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 25-74	4166	Occupational (Road)	per 10dB(A)	Age, anti hypertension medication, employment duration, BMI, educational level, cigarette use, alcohol drinking and regular exercise
Chang TY	Taiwan (Asia)	Cross	M&F. 23-58	188	Occupational	≥80 versus <80	Sex, BMI, triglyceride level, BMI, educational level, smoking, working activity, alcohol drinking, regular exercise and family history of hypertension
Weinmann T	Germany (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 8-65	1742	Community (NR)	40-115	NR
Chang TY	Taiwan (Asia)	Cohort	M. NR	578	Occupational	<80 80-85 ≥85	Age, anti hypertension medication, employment duration, BMI, educational level, cigarette use, alcohol drinking and regular exercise

Attarchi M	Iran (Asia)	Cross	M. 20-58	471	Occupational	61-102	Age, work of duration, BMI, smoking, dietary salt, regular exercise, shift working, nature of job and family history of hypertension
Stokholm ZA	Denmark (Europe)	Cohort	M&F. NR	145190	Occupational	<75 75-79 80-84 85-89 90-94 95-99 >100	Age, socioeconomic status, calendar year and employment status
Babisch W	Germany (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 25-74	4166	Occupational (Road)	per 10dB(A)	Age, BMI, other chronic disease
Babisch W	Germany (Europe)	Cross	M&F. 35-74	1770	Occupational (Road)	per 10dB(A)	NR
Banerjee D	India (Asia)	Cross	M&F. 18-80	909	Occupational	<60 60-65 65-70 ≥70	Age, gender, BMI, physical activity, alcohol consumption and professional activity
Chang TY	Taiwan (Asia)	Cross	M. NR	820	Occupational	<47 versus ≥63	Sex, age, BMI, smoking status, alcohol drinking, salt intake, physical activity, family history of hypertension and the total traffic flow rate
Rapisarda V	Italy (Europe)	Cross	M. NR	105	Occupational	NR	NR
Evrard AS	France (Europe)	Cross	M&F. >18	1244	Community (Air)	per 10dB(A)	Age, sex, triglyceride level, the use of hearing-protective

Liu CS	Taiwan (Asia)	Cohort	M&F. NR	1002	Occupational	<75 75-79 ≥80	devices, BMI, smoking, alcohol drinking, regular exercise and family history of hypertension Age, sex, triglyceride level, the use of hearing-protective devices, BMI, smoking, alcohol drinking, regular exercise and family history of hypertension
--------	---------------	--------	---------	------	--------------	---------------------	--

Abbreviation: NR= not reported; BMI=body mass index

Table 2 Results of subgroup analyses about noise and hypertension risk.

Subgroup	Number of studies	OR/RR	95% confidence intervals	P for heterogeneity	I-square(%)
Study design					
Cohort	26	1.088	1.058-1.119	0.000	85.10
Case-control	5	1.203	1.097-1.319	0.086	51.00
Cross	1	2.090	0.993-4.397	—	0.00
Noise type					
Occupational	17	1.080	1.049-1.113	0.000	88.70
Road	7	1.443	1.221-1.682	0.335	12.40
Air	6	1.121	1.048-1.198	0.006	69.60
Unknown	2	1.588	1.150-2.193	0.422	0.00
State					
Europe	19	1.978	1.049-1.107	0.000	59.90
Asia	12	1.58	1.100-2.270	0.000	86.50
South America	1	1.959	1.671-2.297	—	—
Nighttime or daytime noise					
nighttime noise	2	1.344	1.043-1.733	0.145	53.00
daytime noise	9	1.225	1.121-1.339	0.000	89.90
nighttime and daytime noise	21	1.082	1.052-1.113	0.000	76.90
Controlling for the concomitant effects of air pollution					
Yes	3	1.141	1.049-1.241	0.000	87.10
No	29	1.092	1.062-1.123	0.000	82.60
Controlling for age					

Yes	22	1.165	1.113-1.218	0.000	79.20
No	10	1.064	1.030-1.100	0.000	87.50
Controlling for body mass index					
Yes	21	1.174	1.118-1.232	0.000	78.90
No	11	1.067	1.034-1.102	0.000	87.20
Controlling for sex					
Yes	10	1.338	1.198-1.495	0.324	12.90
No	22	1.085	1.056-1.115	0.000	86.800
Controlling for smoking					
Yes	15	1.049	1.275-1.558	0.000	80.00
No	17	1.078	1.048-1.108	0.000	81.70

Figure legends

Figure 1 Flow diagram of identification of relevant observational studies of noise in relation to the risk of hypertension.

Figure 2 Association between exposure to noise and the risk of hypertension in a meta-analysis of observational studies.

Figure 3 Dose-response relationships for the association between noise and risk of hypertension. CI = confidence Interval

Figure 4 Forest plot of the summary odds ratio of hypertension for an increase of per10 dB(A) of noise. CI = confidence interval

Figure 5 Funnel plot with 95% confidence limits

Figure 6 Filled funnel plot of OR from studies that investigated the association between noise and the risk of hypertension