Gender Differences In The Impact Of Metabolic Syndrome Components On Mortality In Older People: A Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis

Giuseppe Sergi, Marta Dianin, Anna Bertocco, Bruno Micael Zanforlini, Chiara Curreri, Mattia Mazzochin, Leon A. Simons, Enzo Manzato, Caterina Trevisan

PII: S0939-4753(20)30157-5

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2020.04.034

Reference: NUMECD 2299

To appear in: Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases

Received Date: 24 October 2019

Revised Date: 20 April 2020

Accepted Date: 29 April 2020

Please cite this article as: Sergi G, Dianin M, Bertocco A, Zanforlini BM, Curreri C, Mazzochin M, Simons LA, Manzato E, Trevisan C, Gender Differences In The Impact Of Metabolic Syndrome Components On Mortality In Older People: A Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis, *Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2020.04.034.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2020 Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of The Italian Diabetes Society, the Italian Society for the Study of Atherosclerosis, the Italian Society of Human Nutrition and the Department of Clinical Medicine and Surgery, Federico II University.



	Journal Pre-proof
1	GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPACT OF METABOLIC SYNDROME COMPONENTS ON
2	MORTALITY IN OLDER PEOPLE: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS
3	Running head: metabolic syndrome components and mortality in older people
4	
5	Giuseppe Sergi <sup>1</sup> , Marta Dianin <sup>1*</sup> , Anna Bertocco <sup>1*</sup> , Bruno Micael Zanforlini <sup>1</sup> , Chiara Curreri <sup>1</sup> , Mattia
6	Mazzochin <sup>1</sup> , Leon A Simons <sup>2</sup> , Enzo Manzato <sup>1,3</sup> , Caterina Trevisan <sup>1</sup>
7	
8	<sup>1</sup> Department of Medicine (DIMED), Geriatrics Division, University of Padova, Italy.
9	<sup>2</sup> UNSW Sydney, St Vincent's Hospital, Sydney, Australia
10	<sup>3</sup> Institute of Neuroscience, National Research Council, Padova, Italy
11	*These Authors contributed equally to the work.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	Corresponding author:
18	Caterina Trevisan
19	Department of Medicine - DIMED, Geriatrics Division, University of Padova,
20	Via Giustiniani 2, 35128 Padova, Italy
21	Email: caterina.trevisan.5@phd.unipd.it
22	
23	
24	

# 1 ABSTRACT

Background and Aims: The influence of metabolic syndrome (MetS) on mortality may be influenced by
age- and gender-related changes affecting the impact of individual MetS components. We investigated
gender differences in the association between MetS components and mortality in community-dwelling older
adults.

Methods and Results: Prospective studies were identified through a systematic literature review up to June 6 7 2019. Random-effect meta-analyses were run to estimate the pooled relative risk(RR) and 95% confidence 8 intervals(95%CI) of all-cause and cardiovascular (CV) mortality associated with the presence of MetS 9 components (abdominal obesity, high triglycerides, low HDL cholesterol, high fasting glycemia, and high 10 blood pressure) in older men and women. Meta-analyses considering all-cause (103,859 individuals, 48,830 men, 55,029 women; 10 studies) and CV mortality (94,965 individuals, 44,699 men, 50,266 women; 8 11 studies) did not reveal any significant association for abdominal obesity and high triglycerides in either 12 gender. Low HDL was associated with increased all-cause (RR=1.16,95%CI:1.02-1.32) and CV mortality 13 (RR=1.34, 95%CI:1.03-1.74) among women, while weaker results were found for men. High fasting 14 glycemia was associated with higher all-cause mortality in older women (RR=1.35, 95%CI:1.22-1.50) more 15 16 than in older men (RR=1.21, 95%CI:1.13-1.30), and CV mortality only in the former (RR=1.36, 17 95%CI:1.04-1.78). Elevated blood pressure was associated with increased all-cause mortality (RR=1.16, 95% CI:1.03-1.32) and showed marginal significant results for CV death only among women. 18

Conclusions: The impact of MetS components on mortality in older people present some gender differences,
with low HDL cholesterol, hyperglycemia, and elevated blood pressure being more strongly associated to
all-cause and CV mortality in women.

22

23

24

Keywords: metabolic syndrome components; all-cause mortality; cardiovascular mortality; sex; older
 people.

3

# 4 INTRODUCTION

Metabolic Syndrome (MetS) is a clinical condition characterized by a complex cluster of metabolic 5 dysfunctions. Although MetS has been variously defined in recent decades, it has been most commonly 6 7 considered as the presence of at least three components among: large waist circumference, high triglyceride 8 levels, low HDL cholesterol, elevated blood pressure, and high fasting glycemia [1]. As estimated by the 9 International Diabetes Federation (IDF), around one out of four individuals worldwide are affected by MetS, with possible differences according to the age, gender and ethnic origin of the population under study [2,3]. 10 11 The most unifying hypothesis for MetS pathophysiology is that it involves the mechanisms of insulin resistance, mild chronic inflammation, and neuroendocrine activation, which may be triggered concurrently 12 by an increase in visceral adiposity [3-5]. Hence, environmental and lifestyle factors leading to excess 13 weight play an extremely important role in the development of MetS [6], although even individuals with 14 15 normal weight can present with MetS [7] and are therefore equally exposed to an increased risk of accumulating additional cardiovascular (CV) and metabolic dysfunctions [8]. 16

While MetS has been largely associated with higher all-cause and CV mortality in adult age, mixed results 17 18 have emerged from studies on older populations, where MetS is even more prevalent [9,10]. In light of this 19 discrepancy, the relationship between MetS and mortality could be more deeply explored by analyzing how 20 the impact of each single component changes with aging. Changes in the effects of MetS components on 21 mortality in advanced age may be due to differences in the extent of their pathological actions, but also to the 22 inappropriateness for older populations of the threshold levels commonly used to define the syndrome [11– 23 13]. Gender is a further issue. Although the prevalence of MetS and its components is generally higher in men than in women of adult age, after menopause such differences tend to disappear or even to reverse [11]. 24 25 This is likely due to specific biological connotates linked to each sex (e.g., hormonal changes), as well as to gender-related factors (e.g. risk behaviors) leading to a steeper increase in the prevalence of MetS in women, 26 27 who present more frequently with visceral obesity and low HDL cholesterol, while elevated blood pressure,

hypertriglyceridemia, and hyperglycemia seem to be the major contributors to MetS in men [11]. Sex/gender may also play a role in the impact of MetS on CV risk [14], which increases *per se* in women after menopause. Previous studies have shown that MetS is more strongly associated with CV risk in women than in men, although the difference seems to be mostly driven by an increased risk of hyperglycemia, so it is still unclear whether the impact of individual MetS components on health-related outcomes is subject to gender differences [11,15].

In light of the above considerations, we carried out a systematic review and meta-analysis of the current literature with the aim of summarizing the impact of individual MetS components on mortality in older men and women. Our hypothesis was that the individual components for MetS determined by the standard cutoffs are poorly associated with mortality in the older population, and that the relationship is subject to gender differences.

12

### 13 METHODS

This work has been done in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (see Appendix 1 for the checklist).

## 16 Literature search

A systematic review of the literature was performed through the PubMed, Web of Science, and CINHAL 17 electronic databases from inception to June 5, 2019. The reference lists of articles selected, previous 18 19 systematic reviews of the topic, [16] and relevant websites (e.g., Google Scholar, EBSCO Open Dissertation) 20 were also manually screened to identify potentially eligible studies, including doctoral and masters theses. 21 No geographical or language restrictions were applied. We designed a search strategy for each electronic 22 database, which included, in accordance with PICOS criteria, the following research themes: metabolic 23 syndrome components (exposures), all-cause or CV mortality (outcomes), older people (study population) (Appendix 2). The comparison groups were people presenting with vs without the various metabolic 24 syndrome components. In our study design, we applied a specific filter to narrow our search to longitudinal 25 26 studies.

# 27 Study selection

1 The studies were selected on the basis of the following inclusion criteria:

2 - Population: community-based studies in which at least 60% of participants were aged 65 years or over were
3 included.

Exposure and comparison: studies that compared individuals who presented with and did not present with
the individual MetS components (i.e., abdominal obesity, hypertriglyceridemia, low HDL-C, high fasting
glucose, and high blood pressure) were included.

Outcome: studies that examined all-cause mortality or CV mortality reporting either the number of deaths
during the follow-up or the estimates for the risk of death were included.

9 Since we aimed to evaluate gender differences in the associations between each MetS component and 10 mortality, we excluded studies that did not report results for each component, and that did not present 11 separate analyses for men and women. Studies carried out in hospitals or nursing homes were also excluded, 12 as were studies that involved only individuals affected by particular diseases (e.g., diabetes, chronic 13 pulmonary diseases, etc.).

To identify eligible studies, a first selection by title and abstract was carried out independently by two researchers (MD and AB), who included longitudinal studies that involved community-dwelling older people and investigated the association between MetS and mortality. In a second step, two independent reviewers (MD and CT) reviewed the full texts of these studies, and selected papers based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria described above. Any disagreements during the study selection process were discussed between researchers until reaching consensus, and, if necessary, a third independent reviewer (GS) was involved.

# 21 Quality assessment

The quality of the selected studies was assessed independently by two researchers (MD and CT) using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS) for cohort studies [17]. Scores on the NOS scale range from 0 to 9, the higher scores indicating better quality. In the present work, a study with a score  $\geq$ 7 was considered high quality (for details on the NOS criteria, see Supplementary Table S1) [18].

# 26 Data extraction

Two independent researchers (MD and CT) extracted data from the full texts of each of the studies on a 1 structured Excel form. We extracted the following data from each study: the first author's last name, 2 3 publication year, study cohort and country, MetS definition and criteria with possible modifications, 4 outcome, risk estimate, and adjustments for covariates. Where available, we extracted additional information stratified by sex on: sample size, follow-up interval, age, and prevalence of MetS. For each MetS component, 5 we extracted data on the number of all-cause and CV deaths over the study period, and, if available, the 6 7 relative risk (RR) or the hazard ratio (HR), with 95% confidence interval (95%CI) [19]. In case of 8 availability of only raw data, we computed a crude RR. Where multiple options were available in the same 9 study, we prioritized the most adjusted risk estimate and the longest follow-up interval. Where several studies used the same study cohort, we included the most recent or the one with the most complete data 10 relevant to the aims of our work. Where MetS components were defined according to different criteria, we 11 used data conforming to the most common definition in the main analysis, while other cutoffs were 12 considered in sensitivity analyses. Finally, the authors of the studies were contacted by email when 13 additional information or clarifications were needed or to request unpublished data. 14

# 15 Statistical analysis

16 The associations between the pooled RRs with 95% CIs of all-cause and CV mortality and the presence of each MetS component in older men and women were estimated from a random-effects meta-analysis. 17 Random-effects models were chosen because of the expected heterogeneity in the observational studies 18 19 included in our work. The presence of statistical heterogeneity among studies was tested by using the Chi-20 squared test (setting statistical significance at a p-value < 0.10), and its extent was evaluated with the Isquared ( $I^2$ ) statistic [20]. In accordance with previous studies, we used  $I^2$  values of <25% to define low 21 22 heterogeneity, 25-75% for moderate heterogeneity, and >75% for high heterogeneity. The presence of 23 publication bias was evaluated for each analysis using the Egger regression test, and was graphically illustrated using funnel plots [21]. 24

As subgroup analyses, we performed random-effects meta-analyses to compare results by MetS criteria (only for abdominal obesity and high fasting glycemia components), study location, MetS prevalence, length of the follow-up, and adjustment for confounders. Where different studies defined the same MetS component

according to different criteria, we took the most frequently used criterion for our main analysis (i.e., the
National Cholesterol Education Program [NCEP] Adult Treatment Panel III [ATP III] criteria), and the other
criteria for our sensitivity analysis. Finally, we performed a leave-one-out sensitivity analysis to evaluate the
impact of each study on the size of the overall effect [22]. Analyses were performed using the *epitools* (to
compute crude RR) and *metaphor* [23] packages in R (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
Austria) [24].

# 7 RESULTS

8 Of the 4503 records identified from the literature search, 167 were eligible at the title-abstract selection, and 9 12 studies were ultimately included in our meta-analysis (a flow-chart of the study selection process is given in Supplementary Figure S1). Six studies evaluated both all-cause and CV mortality, four only all-cause 10 mortality, and two only CV mortality. The main features of the selected works are shown in Table 1. The 11 mean or median age of participants in most of the studies was over 70 years, and the median length of the 12 13 follow-up interval was 9 years (range 4-16 years). Regarding location, six studies were conducted in Europe [25–30], three in Asia [31–33], two in the USA [9,34], and one in Australia [35]. The majority of the studies 14 (n=5) used NCEP ATP III criteria to define MetS [25–27,30,34], two used the revised NCEP ATP III (R-15 NCEP) [9,33], two the International Diabetes Federation (IDF) definition [28,29], two the American Heart 16 17 Association and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (AHA/NHLBI) criteria [32,35], and one the HC2009 criteria [31]. Two studies presented data referring to more than one MetS definition [25,29]. Based 18 on these criteria, we found that the median prevalence of MetS was 29.5% in men, and 48.3% in women. 19 20 Figures 1-5 illustrate the sex-specific results of the meta-analyses of each MetS component and all-cause 21 mortality (103,859 individuals [48,830 men, 55,029 women]), and CV mortality (94,965 individuals [44,699 men, and 50,266 women]). The pooled estimates obtained after stratifying studies by adjustment for potential 22 confounders are presented in Table 2. The results for each MetS criterion in older men and women are 23 described in the following paragraphs. 24

Abdominal obesity. Overall, the presence of abdominal obesity was not significantly associated with either all-cause or CV mortality, in both men and women (Figure 1). The between-studies heterogeneity was moderate in the analysis of all-cause mortality in men (Q-test: P = 0.02,  $I^2 = 60.7\%$ ), and low for CV

mortality (Q-test: P = 0.18,  $I^2 = 11.4\%$ ), but was not estimable for women. The Egger regression test showed 1 there to be no publication bias (P > 0.05 for all analyses; Supplementary Figures S2-S3). No significant 2 3 differences were observed between studies presenting unadjusted vs. adjusted results (Table 2). Our subgroup analyses (Supplementary Table S2) showed a significant inverse association between high waist 4 circumference and all-cause mortality when the component was defined based on ethnic-specific criteria (P 5 for heterogeneity = 0.02). The leave-one-out analysis (Supplementary Table S3-S4) revealed that the Simons 6 7 study potentially attenuated the indirect association between abdominal obesity and all-cause mortality in 8 men [35], while no relevant differences were observed when excluding studies whose risk estimates were adjusted for BMI [25,30]. 9

10 High triglyceride levels. A marginal significant association between high triglyceride levels and reduced all-cause mortality was observed in older women, while no significant results were found considering CV 11 12 mortality for both genders, and all-cause mortality for older men (Figure 2). The between-studies heterogeneity was low (Q-test: P = 0.34,  $I^2 = 2.5\%$ ) for men for CV mortality, but moderate for the other 13 analyses. No publication bias emerged at the Egger regression test (P > 0.05 for all analyses; Supplementary 14 Figure S2). The non-significant association between hypertriglyceridemia and mortality did not substantially 15 change at our subgroup analyses (Table 2, Supplementary Table S5), while the leave-one-out analyses 16 suggested that the Simons [35] and Wen [32] studies potentially attenuated the indirect association between 17 18 high triglycerides and all-cause death in women (Supplementary Table S3-S4).

19 Low HDL cholesterol. Low levels of HDL-C increased both all-cause (RR = 1.16, 95% CI: 1.02-1.32) and 20 CV mortality (RR = 1.34, 95% CI: 1.03-1.74) among women, while similar but weaker results were found 21 for men, with marginal significant estimates for CV mortality (Figure 3). The between-studies heterogeneity 22 was moderate for all analyses, and there was no evidence of publication bias (Supplementary Figures S2-S3). 23 Our subgroup analyses (Supplementary Table S6) showed that in the studies with longer follow-up there 24 were stronger associations between low HDL-C and all-cause mortality in both genders (P for heterogeneity 25 <0.05), and CV mortality among women (P for heterogeneity <0.001). Similarly, as shown in Table 2, the association between low HDL-C and increased all-cause and CV mortality seemed to be accentuated when 26 considering studies with adjusted results in both genders, especially in men (P for heterogeneity < 0.05). The 27

leave-one-out analyses (Supplementary Table S3-S4) revealed that the Kuk [9] Salminen [28] and Zambon
[30] studies potentially attenuated the pooled results on the association between HDL-C and CV mortality in
men. A similar effect was observed in the female gender for the studies of Kuk [9], Sun [31] and Wang [29],
while the work of Yen [33] tended to strengthen the direct association between HDL-C and CV mortality.

5 High fasting glycemia. Our pooled results showed that high fasting glycemia was associated with increased all-cause mortality in older men (RR = 1.21, 95% CI: 1.13-1.30), and more markedly in older women (RR = 6 1.35, 95% CI: 1.22-1.50) (Figure 4). The findings were similar for CV mortality only among women (RR = 7 8 1.36, 95% CI: 1.04-1.78). Between-studies heterogeneity was moderate for all analyses, except CV mortality 9 in men (non-estimable). Possible publication bias emerged only among studies on high fasting glycemia and CV mortality in women (P = 0.03, Supplementary Figure S2). Our subgroup analyses (Supplementary Table 10 11 S7) revealed a stronger association between a high fasting glycemia level  $\geq 6.1$  mM and CV mortality in 12 women (P for heterogeneity = 0.05). Moreover, in studies conducted in Asia or Australia there was an 13 increased risk of all-cause mortality among women (P for heterogeneity = 0.09), and among men in studies with longer follow-up intervals (P for heterogeneity = 0.05). No substantial differences were observed, 14 instead, when comparing studies that presented unadjusted vs. adjusted results (Table 2). At the leave-one-15 16 out analysis, the Salminen [28], Wen [32] and Yen [33] studies seemed to attenuate the association between high fasting glycemia and CV mortality among women. No substantial differences where seen after 17 18 excluding the study of Maggi [26], whose results were adjusted for fasting insulin levels (Supplementary Table S3-S4). 19

20 Elevated blood pressure. The presence of high blood pressure was associated with increased all-cause mortality (RR = 1.16, 95% CI: 1.03-1.32), and showed a marginal significant relationship with CV mortality 21 22 (RR = 1.39, 95% CI: 1.00-1.94) in women, but not in men (Figure 5). Between-studies heterogeneity was moderate in the analyses on women, but high in those on males. No publication bias emerged from the Egger 23 24 regression test (P > 0.05 for all analyses; Supplementary Figure S2). No significant differences emerged 25 when comparing studies by confounders' adjustment, although the direct association between elevated blood pressure and all-cause and CV mortality seemed to be more marked in adjusted models for men (Table 2). In 26 the other subgroup analyses (Supplementary Table S8), European study populations seemed to weaken the 27

association between high blood pressure and all-cause mortality in men (*P* for heterogeneity = 0.05), and CV
mortality in both men (*P* for heterogeneity = 0.003) and women (*P* for heterogeneity = 0.02). Instead, studies
with longer follow-up reported stronger associations between high blood pressure and all-cause mortality
among women (*P* for heterogeneity <0.001). The leave-one-out analysis showed that the Wang [29] study</li>
potentially attenuated the results on CV mortality among women (Supplementary Table S3-S4).

# 6 **DISCUSSION**

Our systematic review and meta-analysis suggest that the impact of MetS components on all-cause and CV
mortality changes with advancing age and presents some differences between men and women.

9 Abdominal obesity. Abdominal obesity has been suggested as playing an important role in MetS and has been largely associated with a higher risk of mortality in young and adult individuals. However, the results 10 11 regarding its impact on mortality in advanced age have been mixed [31,33,36–38]. Interestingly, the pooled results of our meta-analysis did not show any significant association between abdominal obesity and all-12 cause or CV mortality. Among the studies we assessed, only Simons et al., who used BMI instead of waist 13 circumference, reported a direct association between obesity and all-cause mortality in older men [35], while 14 15 Kuk and colleagues even found the opposite [9]. These findings raise several issues. First of all, in older populations waist circumference is not always indicative of visceral obesity due to possible age-related 16 reductions in stature and changes in body composition [39], which could lead to misclassification bias and 17 may skew the association between abdominal obesity and mortality. On the other hand, the use of BMI as a 18 19 proxy for abdominal obesity in older age could also be problematic because it does not provide information 20 on body composition, and older adults with reduced muscle mass and high adiposity could still have a 21 normal BMI [40]. Secondly, our results may be influenced by selective survival, since the individuals who 22 are more vulnerable to the adverse effects of obesity on health could have died at a younger age, while the 23 survivors may represent the most resilient overweight/obese older population [16]. Previous studies have shown that mortality increases only with a marked excess of weight, while overweight or grade 1 obesity 24 carried a similar or even lower risk of all-cause death compared with normal weight [36-38,41]. Although 25 the survival advantage linked to modest excess weight is still unclear, it has been suggested that it is less 26

likely to be associated with the presence of chronic diseases, but, instead, may increase the resilience of older
 individuals [16,34].

3 High triglyceride levels. Our pooled results did not show any strong significant association between high triglycerides levels and all-cause or CV mortality in older men and women. However, mixed results emerged 4 when we evaluated individual studies. In some cases, hypertriglyceridemia even seemed to be associated 5 with a lower risk of CV [31] or all-cause mortality in only one gender (male [9,31] or female [28,31,34]). 6 7 and in another case in both men and women [33]. Conversely, only Forti et al. found that hypertriglyceridemia increased all-cause mortality in older men [25], confirming previous findings [42]. 8 Similarly to what we found for abdominal obesity, the lack of strong associations between 9 hypertriglyceridemia and mortality in older people could be due to selective survival, since individuals with 10 higher CV risk associated with elevated triglycerides could have died earlier, while the more resilient adults 11 reached older age. Moreover, higher triglycerides in the elderly could reflect better nutritional status, and low 12 levels could be sign of illness or frailty [25]. 13

Low HDL cholesterol. As well known, HDL cholesterol has antioxidant and anti-inflammatory actions that 14 15 may prevent the onset or slow the progression of atherosclerosis and related diseases [43,44]. In agreement with some studies [45], but conflicting with others [34], our meta-analysis confirms a low HDL-C level as a 16 significant risk factor of mortality in older people [46]. This effect was more marked for women, and when 17 18 we considered the CV mortality in studies with shorter follow-up intervals. As suggested by previous works, 19 the observed gender differences could be due to the changes in sex hormones occurring after menopause, which alter lipid metabolism and increase the prognostic value of lipid alterations in women more than in 20 men [47-49]. In addition, as mentioned for other MetS component, an aspect to consider is selective 21 22 survival, since men with worse CV prognosis linked to unhealthy lipid profiles could have died at an earlier 23 age.

High fasting glycaemia. Our results highlight gender differences in the role of hyperglycemia as a risk factor of mortality. In particular, high fasting glycemia was associated with increased all-cause mortality by 21% in older men, and by 35% in older women, while the risk of CV death was significantly higher (+36%) only in women. The greater predictive values of elevated glycemia and high blood pressure compared with MetS itself in advanced age was already reported in the Cardiovascular Health Study (CHS) [34]. This

finding may be related to the substantial role of insulin resistance in promoting chronic inflammation and 1 atherosclerosis, which overall increase CV risk [50-53]. In the older population of the CHS, the association 2 3 with mortality was tested with the most commonly used cutoff levels of fasting glycaemia -5.6 and 6.1 mM - and, in line with previous works [34], we found that higher thresholds could be better predictors of 4 mortality in advanced age. This issue needs to be further corroborated in the future, as well as the potential 5 6 differential impact on mortality of prediabetes vs. overt diabetes. As far as gender differences on the 7 association of elevated fasting glycaemia with mortality are concerned, we observed stronger results in older women, especially regarding CV mortality. These findings corroborate previous meta-analyses, which 8 showed that the relative risk of CV diseases and stroke associated with hyperglycemia was higher in women 9 than in men [52,54–57]. Although the higher CV risk profile of diabetic women could play a role in 10 explaining these disparities, the results were unchanged after adjustment for other CV risk factors, 11 suggesting that other mechanisms may be involved [56,57]. Among these, variations in sex hormones, a 12 longer period in the pre-diabetes stage, and delayed diagnosis and treatment of CV could contribute to the 13 observed gender differences, but this needs further clarification [54,56–58]. 14

15 Elevated blood pressure. The pooled results of our meta-analysis suggest that high blood pressure may be associated with an increased risk of all-cause and CV mortality only in older women. Similar results were 16 17 found in the CHS, with women showing a higher mortality risk linked to this MetS component than men, 18 after adjusting for sociodemographic, lifestyle, and other cardio-metabolic factors. However, mixed findings 19 have emerged from other studies, although only a few of them focused extensively on older people. Despite similar increases in systolic blood pressure were associated with greater CVD risk in women than in men 20 [59–62], no differences emerged for CV mortality [62] or other outcomes, such as ischemic heart diseases or 21 stroke [63]. Our results support a stronger impact of elevated blood pressure on mortality among older 22 23 women, and this could be due both to sex-specific (e.g., hormonal changes after menopause) and gender-24 specific (e.g., risk behaviors, disparities in the management of the disease) aspects, which will deserve future investigations [64]. A further issue to be considered when interpreting our results is the possible selective 25 survival of those men less vulnerable to the adverse effects of hypertension in young and adult age, when 26 27 women's CV risk is lower due to the action of estrogens. Finally, it should be considered that older people 28 are susceptible not only to high but also to low blood pressure. Studies suggest that the relationship between

blood pressure and mortality in advanced age seems to be J-shaped with a nadir around 100 mmHg [28,59],
confirming that in older people low blood pressure could be a marker of frailty and health deterioration. This
may have influenced our results since the additional risk of death due to low blood pressure seems to be
more marked in older men than in women, and could therefore have offset the mortality risk due to elevated
blood pressure [59].

6

7 Potential limitations of our work include the relatively small number of studies, and the heterogeneity among them, especially due to ethnic-related factors, use of different MetS criteria and residual confounding on the 8 studied associations. Moreover, as reported when discussing the single MetS criteria, potential 9 misclassification and selective survival biases need to be taken into account in the interpretation of our 10 findings. In particular, both the duration of exposure to the cardio-metabolic components of MetS, and the 11 interference of therapeutic actions (that could have changed over time) on the presence of such conditions 12 are substantial factors that may have influenced the observed associations. On the other hand, the use of 13 random-effect meta-analysis and the sensitivity and subgroup analyses performed support our main findings, 14 15 and the gender-specific focus on the association between single MetS criteria and mortality might represent a source of novelty of our work. 16

17

### 18 CONCLUSIONS

19 Our systematic review and meta-analysis suggest that the influence of individual MetS components on all-20 cause and CV mortality differs in older people compared with young or middle-age adults, and presents some gender-specific features. While low HDL cholesterol, hyperglycemia, and hypertension also seem to 21 predict mortality in the elderly, especially among women, the associations of both abdominal obesity and 22 23 high triglyceride levels with mortality seem to weaken in advanced age. These findings support the need to 24 use a personalized approach when evaluating metabolic health of older people in the clinical practice. Such 25 approach should prefer the assessment of single MetS components rather than the overall syndrome and should account for age- and gender-related aspects that could modify the impact of single MetS components 26 on individuals' prognosis. 27

28

1	I
	I
-	

# 2 AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 3 We thank the authors of the studies included in our work, who shared unpublished data or other
- 4 relevant information.
- 5 Competing Interests: none.
- 6 **Founding source:** none.
- 7
- 8

# 9 **REFERENCES**

- 10 [1] Alberti KGMM, Zimmet P, Shaw J, IDF Epidemiology Task Force Consensus Group. The metabolic
- 11 syndrome--a new worldwide definition. Lancet (London, England) 2005;366:1059–62.
- 12 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67402-8.
- 13 [2] Nolan PB, Carrick-Ranson G, Stinear JW, Reading SA, Dalleck LC. Prevalence of metabolic
- 14 syndrome and metabolic syndrome components in young adults: A pooled analysis. Prev Med

15 Reports 2017;7:211–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2017.07.004.

- 16 [3] Rochlani Y, Pothineni NV, Kovelamudi S, Mehta JL. Metabolic syndrome: Pathophysiology,
- 17 management, and modulation by natural compounds. Ther Adv Cardiovasc Dis 2017;11:215–25.
- 18 https://doi.org/10.1177/1753944717711379.
- 19 [4] Aganović I, Dušek T. Pathophysiology of Metabolic Syndrome. EJIFCC 2007;18:3–6.
- 20 [5] Cho DH, Kim MN, Joo HJ, Shim WJ, Lim DS, Park SM. Visceral obesity, but not central obesity, is
- 21 associated with cardiac remodeling in subjects with suspected metabolic syndrome. Nutr Metab
- 22 Cardiovasc Dis 2019;29:360–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2019.01.007.
- Zhu S, St-Onge M-P, Heshka S, Heymsfield SB. Lifestyle behaviors associated with lower risk of
  having the metabolic syndrome. Metabolism 2004;53:1503–11.
- 25 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.METABOL.2004.04.017.
- 26 [7] Eckel RH, Grundy SM, Zimmet PZ. The metabolic syndrome. Lancet 2005;52:365: 1415–28.
- 27 https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agx075.

1	[8]	Cornier MA, Dabelea D, Hernandez TL, Lindstrom RC, Steig AJ, Stob NR, et al. The metabolic
2		syndrome. Endocr Rev 2008;29:777-822. https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2008-0024.
3	[9]	Kuk JL, Ardern CI. Age and Sex Differences in the Clustering of Metabolic Syndrome Factors.
4		Diabetes Care 2010;33:2457-61. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc10-0942.
5	[10]	Devers MC, Campbell S, Simmons D. Influence of age on the prevalence and components of the
6		metabolic syndrome and the association with cardiovascular disease. BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care
7		2016;4:1-7. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjdrc-2016-000195.
8	[11]	Pucci G, Alcidi R, Tap L, Battista F, Mattace-Raso F, Schillaci G. Sex- and gender-related
9		prevalence, cardiovascular risk and therapeutic approach in metabolic syndrome: A review of the
10		literature. Pharmacol Res 2017;120:34-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PHRS.2017.03.008.
11	[12]	Winter JE, MacInnis RJ, Wattanapenpaiboon N, Nowson CA. BMI and all-cause mortality in older
12		adults: A meta-analysis. Am J Clin Nutr 2014;99:875–90. https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.113.068122.
13	[13]	Sergi G, Perissinotto E, Pisent C, Buja A, Maggi S, Coin A, et al. An adequate threshold for body
14		mass index to detect underweight condition in elderly persons: The Italian Longitudinal Study on
15		Aging (ILSA). Journals Gerontol - Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci 2005;60:866-71.
16		https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/60.7.866.
17	[14]	Nicolini E, Martegani G, Maresca AM, Marchesi C, Dentali F, Lazzarini A, et al. Left ventricular
18		remodeling in patients with metabolic syndrome: Influence of gender. Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis
19		2013;23:771–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2012.04.009.
20	[15]	Barrett Connor EL, Cohn BA, Wingard DL, Edelstein SL. Why Is Diabetes Mellitus a Stronger Risk
21		Factor for Fatal Ischemic Heart Disease in Women Than in Men? The Rancho Bernardo Study.
22		JAMA J Am Med Assoc 1991;265:627-31. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1991.03460050081025.
23	[16]	Ju S-YY, Lee J-YY, Kim D-HH. Association of metabolic syndrome and its components with all-
24		cause and cardiovascular mortality in the elderly. Medicine (Baltimore) 2017;96:e8491.
25		https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000008491.
26	[17]	Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale

- 27 (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses n.d.
- 28 http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiology/oxford.asp (accessed October 1, 2019).

- [18] Wong MC, Chan C, Cheung W, Fung D, Liang M, Huang JL, et al. Association between investigator measured body-mass index and colorectal adenoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis of
- 3 168,201 subjects. Eur J Epidemiol 2018;33:15–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-017-0336-x.
- 4 [19] D'Agostino RB, Lee M □L, Belanger AJ, Cupples LA, Anderson K, Kannel WB. Relation of pooled
  5 logistic regression to time dependent cox regression analysis: The Framingham Heart Study. Stat Med
  6 1990;9:1501–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4780091214.
- 7 [20] Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med 2002;21:1539–
  8 58. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186.
- 9 [21] Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple,

10 graphical test. BMJ 1997;315:629–34. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629.

- [22] Viechtbauer W, Cheung MW-L. Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis. Res Synth
   Methods 2010;1:112–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.11.
- 13 [23] Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. J Stat Softw 2010;36:1–
  48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v036.i03.
- 15 [24] R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna A. R Development Core Team (2008). R: A
- 16 language and environment for statistical computing. n.d. http://www.r-project.org.
- Forti P, Pirazzoli GL, Maltoni B, Bianchi G, Magalotti D, Muscari A, et al. Metabolic syndrome and
  all-cause mortality in older men and women. Eur J Clin Invest 2012;42:1000–9.
- 19 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2362.2012.02688.x.
- 20 [26] Maggi S, Noale M, Gallina P, Bianchi D, Marzari C, Limongi F, et al. Metabolic syndrome, diabetes,
- 21 and cardiovascular disease in an elderly Caucasian cohort: the Italian Longitudinal Study on Aging. J
- 22 Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2006;61:505–10. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/61.5.505.
- 23 [27] Öhrvik J, Hedberg PP, Jonason T, Lönnberg I, Nilsson GG, Ohrvik J, et al. Factor analysis of the
- 24 individual components of the metabolic syndrome among elderly identifies two factors with different
- 25 survival patterns A population-based study. Metab Syndr Relat Disord 2009;7:171–8.
- 26 https://doi.org/10.1089/met.2008.0028.
- 27 [28] Salminen M, Kuoppamaki M, Vahlberg T, Raiha I, Irjala K, Kivela SL. The metabolic syndrome
- 28 defined by modified International Diabetes Federation criteria and mortality: a 9-year follow-up of

		Journal Pre-proof
1		the aged in Finland. Diabetes Metab 2010;36:437-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabet.2010.05.002.
2	[29]	Wang J, Ruotsalainen S, Moilanen L, Lepisto P, Laakso M, Kuusisto J, et al. The metabolic
3		syndrome predicts cardiovascular mortality: a 13-year follow-up study in elderly non-diabetic Finns.
4		Eur Heart J 2007;28:857-64. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/eh1524.
5	[30]	Zambon S, Zanoni S, Romanato G, MC C, Noale M, Sartori L, et al. Metabolic syndrome and all-
6		cause and cardiovascular mortality in an Italian elderly population: the Progetto Veneto Anziani
7		(Pro.V.A.) Study. Diabetes Care 2009;32:153–9. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc08-1256.
8	[31]	Sun D-L, Wang J-H, Jiang B, Li L-S, Li L-S, Wu L, et al. Metabolic syndrome vs. its components for
9		prediction of cardiovascular mortality: A cohort study in Chinese elderly adults. J Geriatr Cardiol
10		2012;9:123–9. https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1263.2012.01172.
11	[32]	Wen CJ, Lee YS, Lin WY, Huang HL, Yao CA, Sung PK, et al. The metabolic syndrome increases
12		cardiovascular mortality in Taiwanese elderly. Eur J Clin Invest 2008;38:469–75.
13		https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2362.2008.01965.x.
14	[33]	Yen Y-F, Hu H-Y, Lin I-F, Lai Y-J, Su VY-F, Pan S-W, et al. Associations of Metabolic Syndrome
15		and its Components With Mortality in the Elderly: A Cohort Study of 73,547 Taiwanese Adults.
16		Medicine (Baltimore) 2015;94:e956. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000000956.
17	[34]	Mozaffarian D, Kamineni A, Prineas RJ, Siscovick DS, Mozzaffarian D, Kamineni A, et al.
18		Metabolic syndrome and mortality in older adults: the Cardiovascular Health Study. Arch Intern Med
19		2008;168:969-78. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.168.9.969.
20	[35]	Simons LA, Simons J, Friedlander Y, McCallum J. Does a diagnosis of the metabolic syndrome
21		provide additional prediction of cardiovascular disease and total mortality in the elderly? The Dubbo
22		Study. Med J Aust 2007;186:400-3. https://doi.org/10.5694/j.1326-5377.2007.tb00972.x.
23	[36]	Flegal KM, Kit BK, Orpana H. Association of all-cause mortality with overweight and obesity using
24		standard body mass index categories: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA 2019;309:71-82.
25		https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2012.113905.
26	[37]	Perissinotto E, Pisent C, Sergi G, Grigoletto F, Enzi G. Anthropometric measurements in the elderly:
27		age and gender differences. Br J Nutr 2002;87:177-86. https://doi.org/10.1079/bjn2001487.
28	[38]	Lee JSW, Auyeung TW, Kwok T, Li M, Leung J, Woo J. Survival benefit of abdominal adiposity: a

		Journal Pre-proof
1		6-year follow-up study with Dual X-ray absorptiometry in 3,978 older adults. Age (Omaha)
2		2012;34:597-608. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11357-011-9272-y.
3	[39]	Heim N, Snijder MB, Heymans MW, Deeg DJH, Seidell JC, Visser M. Optimal cutoff values for
4		high-risk waist circumference in older adults based on related health outcomes. Am J Epidemiol
5		2011;174:479-89. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwr093.
6	[40]	Barceló A, Gregg EW, Pastor-Valero M, Robles SC. Waist circumference, BMI and the prevalence of
7		self-reported diabetes among the elderly of the United States and six cities of Latin America and the
8		Caribbean. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 2007;78:418–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2007.06.008.
9	[41]	Dong SY, Wang ML, Li ZB, Dong Z, Liu YQ, Lu RJ, et al. Obesity, weight change, and mortality in
10		older adults with metabolic abnormalities. Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis 2018;28:749-55.
11		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2018.04.011.
12	[42]	Welin, L; Eriksson, H; Larsson, B; Ohlson, LO; Svärdsudd, K; Tibblin GW, L. Triglycerides, a major
13		coronary risk factor in elderly men. A study of men born in 1913. Eur Heart J 1991:700-4.
14		https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/12.6.700.
15	[43]	Volpato S, Leveille SG, Corti MC, Harris TB, Guralnik JM. The value of serum albumin and high-
16		density lipoprotein cholesterol in defining mortality risk in older persons with low serum cholesterol.
17		J Am Geriatr Soc 2001;49:1142–7. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1532-5415.2001.49229.x.
18	[44]	Eckel RH. Mechanisms of the components of the metabolic syndrome that predispose to diabetes and
19		atherosclerotic CVD. Proc Nutr Soc 2007;66:82–95. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0029665107005320.
20	[45]	Prospective Studies Collaboration, Lewington S, Whitlock G, Clarke R, Sherliker P, Emberson J, et
21		al. Blood cholesterol and vascular mortality by age, sex, and blood pressure: a meta-analysis of
22		individual data from 61 prospective studies with 55 000 vascular deaths. Lancet 2007;370:1829–39.
23		https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61778-4.
24	[46]	Weverling-Rijnsburger AWE, Jonkers IJAM, Van Exel E, Gussekloo J, Westendorp RGJ. High-
25		density vs low-density lipoprotein cholesterol as the risk factor for coronary artery disease and stroke
26		in old age. Arch Intern Med 2003;163:1549-54. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.163.13.1549.
27	[47]	El Khoudary SR, Hutchins PM, Matthews KA, Brooks MM, Orchard TJ, Ronsein GE, et al.
28		Cholesterol efflux capacity and subclasses of HDL particles in healthy women transitioning through

		Journal 110-proor
1		menopause. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2016;101:3419-28. https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2016-2144.
2	[48]	Cooney MT, Dudina A, De Bacquer D, Wilhelmsen L, Sans S, Menotti A, et al. HDL cholesterol
3		protects against cardiovascular disease in both genders, at all ages and at all levels of risk.
4		Atherosclerosis 2009;206:611-6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2009.02.041.
5	[49]	Mazza A, Tikhonoff V, Schiavon L, Casiglia E. Triglycerides + high-density-lipoprotein-cholesterol
6		dyslipidaemia, a coronary risk factor in elderly women: The CArdiovascular STudy in the ELderly.
7		Intern Med J 2005;35:604–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1445-5994.2005.00940.x.
8	[50]	Ruge T, Lockton JA, Renstrom F, Lystig T, Sukonina V, Svensson MK, et al. Acute
9		hyperinsulinemia raises plasma interleukin-6 in both nondiabetic and type 2 diabetes mellitus
10		subjects, and this effect is inversely associated with body mass index. Metabolism 2009;58:860-6.
11		https://doi.org/10.1016/J.METABOL.2009.02.010.
12	[51]	Nigro J, Osman N, Dart AM, Little PJ. Insulin Resistance and Atherosclerosis. Endocr Rev
13		2006;27:242-59. https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2005-0007.
14	[52]	Barrett-Connor E, Giardina E, Gitt A, Gudat U, Steinberg H, Tschoepe D. Women and Heart Disease:
15		The Role of Diabetes and Hyperglycemia. Arch Intern Med 2004;164:934–42.
16		https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.164.9.934.
17	[53]	Zanoli L, Di Pino A, Terranova V, Di Marca S, Pisano M, Di Quattro R, et al. Inflammation and
18		ventricular-vascular coupling in hypertensive patients with metabolic syndrome. Nutr Metab
19		Cardiovasc Dis 2018;28:1222–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2018.08.003.
20	[54]	Levitan EB, Song Y, Ford ES, Liu S. Is nondiabetic hyperglycemia a risk factor for cardiovascular
21		disease? A meta-analysis of prospective studies. Arch Intern Med 2004;164:2147-55.
22		https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.164.19.2147.
23	[55]	Ohkuma T, Komorita Y, Peters SAE, Woodward M. Diabetes as a risk factor for heart failure in
24		women and men: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 47 cohorts including 12 million
25		individuals. Diabetologia 2019;62:1550-60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-019-4926-x.
26	[56]	Peters SAE, Huxley RR, Woodward M. Diabetes as risk factor for incident coronary heart disease in
27		women compared with men: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 64 cohorts including 858,507
28		individuals and 28,203 coronary events. Diabetologia 2014;57:1542-51.

		Journal Pre-proof
1		https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-014-3260-6.
2	[57]	Peters SAE, Huxley RR, Woodward M. Diabetes as a risk factor for stroke in women compared with
3		men: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 64 cohorts, including 775,385 individuals and 12,539
4		strokes. Lancet 2014;383:1973-80. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60040-4.
5	[58]	Regensteiner JG, Golden S, Huebschmann AG, Barrett-Connor E, Chang AY, Chyun D, et al. Sex
6		Differences in the Cardiovascular Consequences of Diabetes Mellitus. Circulation 2015;132:2424-
7		47. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.00000000000343.
8	[59]	Yi SW, Mok Y, Ohrr H, Yi JJ, Yun YD, Park J, et al. Low systolic blood pressure and vascular
9		mortality among more than 1 Million Korean adults. Circulation 2016;133:2381-90.
10		https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.020752.
11	[60]	Roush GC, Fagard RH, Salles GF, Pierdomenico SD, Reboldi G, Verdecchia P, et al. Prognostic
12		impact of sex-ambulatory blood pressure interactions in 10 cohorts of 17 312 patients diagnosed with
13		hypertension: systematic review and meta-analysis. J Hypertens 2015;33:212-20.
14		https://doi.org/10.1097/HJH.000000000000435.
15	[61]	Boggia J, Thijs L, Hansen TW, Li Y, Kikuya M, Björklund-Bodegård K, et al. Ambulatory blood
16		pressure monitoring in 9357 subjects from 11 populations highlights missed opportunities for
17		cardiovascular prevention in women. Hypertens (Dallas, Tex 1979) 2011;57:397-405.
18		https://doi.org/10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.110.156828.
19	[62]	Wei Y-C, George NI, Chang C-W, Hicks KA. Assessing Sex Differences in the Risk of
20		Cardiovascular Disease and Mortality per Increment in Systolic Blood Pressure: A Systematic
21		Review and Meta-Analysis of Follow-Up Studies in the United States. PLoS One 2017;12:e0170218.
22		https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0170218.
23	[63]	Peters SAE, Huxley RR, Woodward M. Comparison of the Sex-Specific Associations Between

- 24 Systolic Blood Pressure and the Risk of Cardiovascular Disease. Stroke 2013;44:2394–401.
- 25 https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.113.001624.
- [64] Doumas M, Papademetriou V, Faselis C, Kokkinos P. Gender differences in hypertension: Myths and
   reality. Curr Hypertens Rep 2013;15:321–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11906-013-0359-y.

28

Journal Prevention

Author, year	Cohort (Country)	Sample size	Age	Follow-up (years)	MetS criteria	MetS prevalence	Outcomes [n deaths]	Adjustment factors
Kuk, 2010 [9]	NHANES III (US)	700 (M) 779 (F)	73.0±0.3 (M) 74.1±0.3 (F)	10.5 (M) 11.7 (F)	R-NCEP	55.5 (M) 54.7 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=1027] CV mortality [n=518]	None
Forti, 2012 [25]	CSBA and PS studies (Italy)	917 (M) 1043(F)	73.2±5.9 (M) 74.0±6.4 (F)	6.5	NCEP	22.4 (M) 33.3 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=372]	Age, education, cohort, smoking status, alcohol intake, sedentary lifestyle, BMI, pre-existing major diseases, use of statins, total cholesterol, serum CRP and IL-7
Maggi, 2006 [26]	ILSA (Italy)	1169 (M) 1493 (F)	71.6±4.9 (M) 72.2±6.1 (F)	4	NCEP	25.9 (M) 55.2 (F)	CV mortality <sup>a</sup> [n=203]	Age, smoking status, fasting insulin levels, fibrinogen
Ohrvik, 2009 [27]	Population-based study (Sweden)	197 (M) 203 (F)	75	9 (M) 10.3 (F)	NCEP	24.2 (M) 36.9 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=228]	None
Salminen, 2010 [28]	Population-based study (Finland)	533 (M) 727 (F)	≥64	9	IDF (BMI≥30 was used instead of WC)	17.0 (M) 21 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=422] CV mortality <sup>b</sup> [n=181]	Age, current smoking, frequency of exercise, CVD, LDL cholesterol, other MetS components
Wang, 2007 [29]	Population-based study (Finland)	377 (M) 648 (F)	65-75	13.5	IDF		CV mortality <sup>a</sup> [n=250]	Age, history of MI or stroke, current smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, total cholesterol
Zambon, 2009 [30]	Pro.V.A. study (Italy)	1174 (M) 1736 (F)	≥65	4.4	NCEP	25.6 (M) 48.1 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=632] CV mortality <sup>a</sup> [n=230]	Age, smoking, physical activity, BMI, LDL cholesterol, MetS. For all-cause mortality, model adjusted also for major diseases and albumin.
Sun, 2012 [31]	Population-based study (China)	994 (M) 541 (F)	61.1±5.6 (M) 59.6±4.4 (F)	15.1	HC2009	28.0 (M) 48.4 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=414] CV mortality <sup>c</sup> [n=153]	Age, marital status, education, occupation, current smoking, current drinking, LDL-C.
Wen, 2008 [32]	Population-based study (Taiwan)	5761 (M) 4786 (F)	70.2±4.4 (M) 70±4.5 (F)	8	AHA/NHLBI	45.6 (M) 54.4 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=1312] CV mortality <sup>a</sup> [n=300]	Age, smoking, total cholesterol, eGFR
Yen, 2015 [33]	Population-based study (Taiwan)	33991 (M) 39556 (F)	≥65	4	R-NCEP	40.5 (M) 59.5 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=2944] CV mortality <sup>d</sup> [n=704]	Age, marital status, education, smoking, alcohol consumption, regular exercise, renal function status, hyperuricemia, hypoalbuminemia, anemia, platelet count, liver function
Mozaffarian, 2008 [34]	Cardiovascular Health Study (US)	1665 (M) 2593 (F)	73.0±5.1 (M) 73.0±5.2 (F)	15	NCEP	31.0 (M) 38.0 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=2116]	Age, race, education, smoking status, smoking history, physical activity, alcohol use, and each of the other MetS criteria
Simons, 2007 [35]	Dubbo study (Australia)	1233 (M) 1572 (F)	68.6±6.7 (M) 69.6±7.3 (F)	16	AHA/NHLBI (BMI≥29.3 instead of WC)	31.0 (M) 34.0 (F)	All-cause mortality [n=1387]	Age, smoking habits, alcohol consumption, total cholesterol, prior CHD, PEF (all criteria are included in the model)

# Table 1. Characteristics of the 12 studies included in the systematic review and meta-analysis

*Notes.* CV mortality refers to: <sup>a</sup> ICD-9 codes 390-459; <sup>b</sup> ICD-10 codes I10-I15, I20-I25, I50, I60-I66, I69, I71, I74; <sup>c</sup> ICD-9 codes 390-398.9, 401.0-429.9, 430.0-438.9; <sup>d</sup> ICD-9 codes 390-459, ICD-10 codes I00-I99. *Abbreviations*: AHA/NHLBI, American Heart Association/the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; BMI, body mass index; CHD, coronary heart disease; CRP, C-reactive protein; CVD, cardiovascular disease; F, female; HC2009, Harmonized Criteria of 2009; ICD, International Classification of Diseases; IDF, International Diabetes Federation; IL-7, Interleukin 7; LDL-C, low density-lipoprotein cholesterol; MetS, metabolic syndrome; M, male; MI, myocardial infarction; NCEP, National Cholesterol Education Program; R-NCEP, Revised National Cholesterol Education Program; PEF, peak expiratory flow; WC, waist circumference.

		A	ll-cause me	ortality				Cardi	ovascular mortality	
	N	Men		Womer	1	N	Men		Womer	1
MetS component	studies	RR (95%CI)	<i>P</i> -value	RR (95%CI)	<i>P</i> -value	studies	RR (95%CI)	<i>P</i> -value	RR (95%CI)	<i>P</i> -value
Abdominal obesity										
Unadjusted models	2	0.83 (0.64-1.08)	0.26	0.91 (0.76-1.10)	0.57	Ð	0.83 (0.61-1.13)	0.29	0.96 (0.69-1.34)	0.70
Adjusted models	8	0.98 (0.87-1.10)		0.97 (0.90-1.04)		7	1.00 (0.86-1.17)		0.89 (0.76-1.05)	
High triglyceride levels					02					
Unadjusted models	2	0.83 (0.66-1.16)	0.45	0.91 (0.67-1.23)	0.00	1	0.86 (0.62-1.19)	0.66	0.78 (0.41-1.49)	0.71
Adjusted models	8	0.98 (0.84-1.13)	0.45	0.89 (0.78-1.02)	0.90	7	0.93 (0.79-1.11)	0.00	0.89 (0.67-1.18)	0.71
Low HDL cholesterol				<u></u>						
Unadjusted models	2	0.93 (0.80-1.08)	0.04	1.08 (0.77-1.52)	0.66	1	0.94 (0.73-1.22)	0.02	1.08 (0.53-2.21)	0.52
Adjusted models	8	1.11 (1.04-1.19)	0.04	1.18 (1.01-1.37)	0.66	7	1.33 (1.16-1.54)	0.02	1.39 (1.03-1.88)	0.53
High fasting glycemia										
Unadjusted models	2	1.17 (0.97-1.41)	0.70	1.39 (1.04-1.86)	0.92	1	1.05 (0.82-1.34)	0.79	1.30 (0.58-2.93)	0.97
Adjusted models	8	1.22 (1.12-1.32)	0.70	1.34 (1.18-1.53)	0.85	7	1.01 (0.88-1.15)	0.78	1.40 (1.00-1.96)	0.87
Elevated blood pressur	e									
Unadjusted models	2	0.89 (0.57-1.37)	0.27	1.34 (0.93-1.95)	0.41	1	1.09 (0.39-3.03)	0.74	1.82 (0.71-4.69)	0.55
Adjusted models	8	1.16 (0.96-1.40)	0.27	1.14 (0.99-1.31)	0.41	7	1.32 (0.87-2.00)	0.74	1.33 (0.90-1.96)	0.55

Table 2. Pooled Relative Risk of mortality according to the presence of MetS criteria considering studies stratified by adjustment for potential confounders

Abbreviations: RR, relative risk; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval.

# Figure 1. Association between the presence of abdominal obesity and all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in older men and women

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval.

Figure 2. Association between the presence of high triglyceride levels and all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in older men and women

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval.

Figure 3. Association between the presence of low HDL cholesterol and all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in older men and women

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval.

Figure 4. Association between the presence of high fasting glycemia and all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in older men and women

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval.

Figure 5. Association between the presence of elevated blood pressure and all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in older men and women

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval.

Author(s) and Year		Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]	
Forti, 2012		5.37%	1.09 [0.73, 1.63]	
Kuk, 2010		13.56%	0.79 [0.67, 0.93]	
Mozaffarian, 2008	H <b>-</b>	14.28%	0.96 [0.83, 1.12]	
Ohrvík, 2009	·	3.46%	1.04 [0.61, 1.77]	
Salminen, 2010	·	5.77%	1.10 [0.75, 1.61]	
Simons, 2007		12.19%	1.30 [1.07, 1.57]	
Sun, 2012		9.20%	1.00 [0.77, 1.30]	
Wen, 2008		13.90%	0.85 [0.73, 0.99]	
Yen, 2015	H	16.60%	0.87 [0.78, 0.97]	
Zambon, 2009	·•	5.67%	0.88 [0.60, 1.30]	
Overall (I-squared = 60.7%	p = 0.02)	100.00% 7 2.5	0.95 [0.86, 1.06]	
Overall (I-squared = 60.7% Author(s) and Year	p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% Cl]	
Overall (I-squared = 60.7% Author(s) and Year Forii, 2012	p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight 2.83%	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% CI] 1.43 [0.96, 2.14]	
Overall (I-squared = 60.7% Author(s) and Year Forth, 2012 Kuk, 2010	p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight 2.83% 11.32%	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% CI] 1.43 [0.96, 2.14] 0.89 [0.73, 1.09]	
Overall (I-squared = 60.7% Author(s) and Year Forti, 2012 Kuš, 2010 Mozaffariar, 2008	, p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight 2.83% 11.32% 28.81%	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% CI] 1.43 [0.96, 2.14] 0.89 [0.73, 1.09] 0.95 [0.84, 1.08]	
Overall ()-squared = 60.7% Author(9) and Year Fortl, 2012 Kuk, 2010 Mozaffarian, 2008 Ohrvik, 2009	, p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight 2.83% 11.32% 28.81% 1.76%	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% CI] 1.43 [0.96, 2.14] 0.89 [0.73, 1.09] 0.95 [0.84, 1.08] 1.06 [0.64, 1.76]	
Overall (1-squared = 60.7% Author(s) and Year Forti, 2012 Kuš, 2010 Mozaffarian, 2008 Ohrvik, 2009 Saiminen, 2010	p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight 2.83% 11.32% 28.81% 1.76% 3.54%	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% CI] 1.43 [0.96, 2.14] 0.89 [0.73, 1.09] 0.55 [0.84, 1.08] 1.06 [0.64, 1.76] 0.88 [0.61, 1.26]	
Overall ()-squared = 60.7% Author(s) and Year Forti, 2012 Ksk, 2010 Mozaffarian, 2008 Ohrvik, 2009 Salminen, 2010 Simms, 2007	p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight 2.83% 11.32% 28.81% 1.76% 3.54% 10.65%	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% C] 1.43 [0.96, 2.14] 0.89 [0.73, 1.09] 0.95 [0.84, 1.06] 1.06 [0.64, 1.76] 1.08 [0.61, 1.26] 1.03 [0.84, 1.27]	
Overall (I-squared = 60.7% Author(6) and Year Fortl, 2012 Kud, 2010 Kwa, 2010 Chrvik, 2009 Saminer, 2010 Simons, 2010 Simons, 2017 Simo	p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight 2.83% 11.32% 28.81% 1.76% 3.54% 10.65% 1.56%	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% Ci] 1.43 [0.96, 2.14] 0.86 [0.73, 1.09] 0.95 [0.84, 1.08] 1.08 [0.64, 1.76] 0.88 [0.61, 1.26] 1.03 [0.84, 1.27]	
Overall (I-squared = 60.7% Author(s) and Year Forti, 2012 Kuia, 2010 Mocalifarina, 2008 Chrvik, 2009 Saminen, 2010 Simons, 2007 Sun, 2012 Vere, 2008	p = 0.02)	100.00% 2.5 Weight 2.83% 11.32% 28.81% 1.76% 3.54% 10.65% 1.56% 12.05%	0.95 [0.86, 1.06] Relative Risk [95% C1] 1.43 [0.96, 2.14] 0.68 [0.73, 1.09] 1.06 [0.64, 1.76] 0.88 [0.61, 1.26] 1.03 [0.84, 1.27] 0.54 [0.55, 1.61] 0.58 [0.84, 1.19]	

MEN	

WOMEN

Author(s) and Year	Weight Relative Risk [95% CI]	Author(s) and Year	Weight Relative Risk [95% CI]
Forti 2012	283% 143 [0.96.2.14]		
Kuk. 2010	11.32% 0.89 [0.73, 1.09]	Kuk, 2010	19.84% 0.96 [0.69, 1.34]
Mozaffarian, 2008	28.81% 0.95 [0.84, 1.08]	Maggi, 2006	6.74% 0.72 [0.41, 1.27]
Ohrvik, 2009	1.76% 1.06 [0.64, 1.76]	Salminen, 2010	8.54% 0.93 [0.56, 1.54]
Salminen, 2010	3.54% 0.88 [0.61, 1.26]	Sun, 2012 -	2.55% 0.71 [0.28, 1.79]
Simons, 2007	10.65% 1.03 [0.84, 1.27]	Wang, 2007	16.63% 0.89 [0.62, 1.28]
Sun, 2012	1.56% 0.94 [0.55, 1.61]	Wen, 2008	12.23% 1.16 [0.76, 1.77]
Wen, 2008	12.05% 0.98 [0.81, 1.19]	Yen, 2015	27.20% 0.78 [0.59, 1.04]
Yen, 2015 +■H	24.07% 0.90 [0.78, 1.03]	Zambon, 2009	6.27% 1.26 [0.70, 2.27]
Zambon, 2009	3.41% 1.13 [0.78, 1.63]		
Overall (I-squared = 0%, p = 0.65)	100.00% 0.96 [0.90, 1.02]	Overall (I-squared = 0%, p = 0.71)	100.00% 0.91 [0.78, 1.05]
0.5 1 1.5	2.5	0.5 1 1.5 2.5	
4			

Weight Relative Risk [95% Cl] thor(s) and Year 2010 21.21% 0.83 [0.64, 1.08] 7.58% 1.10 [0.69, 1.76] 5.97% 1.60 [0.94, 2.73] ggi, 2006 minen, 2010 **—** ••••• , 2012 8.44% 0.69 [0.44, 1.08] ing, 2007 9.70% 1.30 [0.86, 1.96] n, 2008 15.88% 1.01 [0.74, 1.38] **⊢∎**--2015 27.66% 0.93/0.75 1.161 3.57% 0.71 [0.35, 1.43] mbon, 2009 • • • • • arall (I-squared = 11.4%, p = 0.18) 🔶 100.00% 0.96 [0.84, 1.10] 0.5 1 1.5 2.5

CARDIOVASCULAR MORTALITY

Author(s) and Year		Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]
Kuk, 2010		19.84%	0.96 [0.69, 1.34
Maggi, 2006	••••	6.74%	0.72 [0.41, 1.27]
Salminen, 2010	·•	8.54%	0.93 [0.56, 1.54]
Sun, 2012	•••	2.55%	0.71 [0.28, 1.79]
Wang, 2007	<b>-</b>	16.63%	0.89 [0.62, 1.28]
Wen, 2008		12.23%	1.16 [0.76, 1.77]
Yen, 2015		27.20%	0.78 [0.59, 1.04]
Zambon, 2009	·	6.27%	1.26 [0.70, 2.27]

CARDIOVASCULAR MORTALITY

Weight Relative Risk

		ALL-CAUSE MORTAL	ITY		
	Author(s) and Year		Weight	Relative Risk [95% Cl]	Author(s) an
	Forti, 2012		7.45%	1.62 [1.15, 2.28]	Kuk, 2010
	Kuk, 2010		12.37%	0.77 [0.65, 0.91]	Maggi, 2006
	Mozaffarian, 2008		12.71%	1.08 [0.92, 1.26]	Solminon 20
	Ohrvik, 2009	·	6.14%	1.06 [0.71, 1.59]	Sairmen, 20
MEN	Salminen, 2010		6.77%	0.87 [0.60, 1.26]	Sun, 2012
	Simons, 2007		12.20%	0.97 [0.82, 1.15]	Wang, 2007
	Sun, 2012		8.36%	0.74 [0.55, 1.00]	Wen, 2008
	Wen, 2008		12.80%	0.97 [0.83, 1.13]	Yen, 2015
	Yen, 2015		13.45%	0.79 [0.69, 0.90]	Zambon 200
	Zambon, 2009		7.75%	1.10 [0.79, 1.53]	2811001, 200
	Overall (I-squared = 71.1	%, p <0.001) 🝝	100.00%	0.95 [0.84, 1.08]	Overall (I-squ
		0.5 1 1.5 2	5		
	Author(s) and Year		Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]	Author(s) and Y
	Forti, 2012	<b>—</b>	6.89%	1.42 [0.99, 2.03]	Kuk, 2010
	Kuk, 2010		12.54%	0.90 [0.73, 1.10]	Maggi, 2006
	Mozaffarian, 2008		15.79%	0.79 [0.68, 0.91]	Salminon 2010
	Ohrvik, 2009	·	3.75%	0.94 [0.55, 1.60]	Galininen, 2010
WOMEN	Salminen, 2010	•••	7.01%	0.67 [0.47, 0.95]	Sun, 2012
	Simons, 2007	H <b>H</b> -1	13.48%	1.01 [0.84, 1.22]	Wang, 2007
	Sun, 2012	••••	4.72%	0.73 [0.46, 1.16]	Wen, 2008
	Wen, 2008		13.05%	1.05 [0.86, 1.28]	Yen, 2015
	Yen, 2015		14.98%	0.79 [0.67, 0.93]	Zambon 2009
	Zambon, 2009		7.77%	0.83 [0.60, 1.15]	
	Overall (I-squared = 53.7	%, p = 0.02) 🝝	100.00%	0.89 [0.80, 1.00]	Overall (I-square
		0.5 1 1.5 2	5		

Kuk, 2010		24.36% 0.	86 [0.66, 1.12]
Maggi, 2006	· · · · ·	7.22% 0	78 [0.48, 1.27]
Salminen, 2010	•	5.36% 0.	72 [0.41, 1.27]
Sun, 2012	••••	7.32% 0.	70 [0.43, 1.13]
Wang, 2007	<b>—</b> •—	12.09% 1	16 [0.80, 1.69]
Wen, 2008		16.20% 1.	13 [0.82, 1.56]
Yen, 2015		22.74% 0.	83 [0.63, 1.09]
Zambon, 2009	·	4.71% 1.	37 [0.75, 2.51]
Overall (I-squared = 2.5	%, p = 0.34) 📥	100.00% 0.	92 [0.80, 1.04]
	0.5 1 1.5 2.	5	
thor(s) and Year	0.5 1 1.5 2.	5 Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]
nthor(s) and Year	0.5 1 1.5 2.	5 Weight 16.10%	Relative Risk [95% CI] 0.78 [0.56, 1.09]
thor(s) and Year k, 2010 aggi, 2006		5 Weight 16.10% 9.83%	Relative Risk [95% CI] 0.78 (0.56, 1.09) 0.96 (0.54, 1.69)
ithor(s) and Year ik, 2010 aggi, 2006 ilminen, 2010		5 Weight 16.10% 9.83% 11.34%	Relative Risk [95% CI] 0.78 [0.58, 1.09 0.96 [0.54, 1.69] 0.76 [0.46, 1.25]
tthor(s) and Year k, 2010 aggi, 2006 Iminen, 2010 in, 2012		5 Weight 16.10% 9.83% 11.34% 6.07%	Relative Risk [95% CI] 0.78 (0.56, 1.09) 0.96 (0.54, 1.69) 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.34 (0.15, 0.77)
tthor(s) and Year k, 2010 aggi, 2006 Iminen, 2010 in, 2012 ang, 2007		5 Weight 16.10% 9.83% 11.34% 6.07% 15.02%	Relative Risk [95% C]] 0.78 [0.56, 1.09] 0.76 [0.54, 1.69] 0.76 [0.46, 1.25] 0.34 [0.15, 0.77] 1.21 [0.84, 1.75]
tthor(s) and Year k, 2010 aggl, 2008 liminen, 2010 in, 2012 ang, 2007 an, 2008		5 Weight 16.10% 9.83% 11.34% 6.07% 15.02% 13.73%	Relative Risk [95% CI] 0.78 [0.56, 1.09] 0.76 [0.54, 1.89] 0.76 [0.46, 1.25] 0.34 [0.15, 0.77] 1.21 [0.84, 1.75] 1.45 [0.96, 2.19]
tthor(s) and Year k, 2010 kggl, 2006 Iminen, 2010 n, 2012 ang, 2007 an, 2005		5 Weight 16.10% 9.83% 11.34% 6.07% 15.02% 13.73% 17.11%	Relative Risk [95% CI] 0.78 [0.56, 1.09] 0.96 [0.54, 1.69] 0.76 [0.46, 1.25] 0.34 [0.15, 0.77] 1.21 [0.84, 1.75] 1.45 [0.96, 2.19] 0.88 [0.65, 1.19]

	ALL-CAUSE MORTALITY				CARDIOVASCULAR MORTALITY				
	Author(s) and Year		Weight	Relative Risk	Author(s) and Year			Weight	Relative Risk
				[95% CI]					[ao.// ci]
	Forti, 2012		3.25%	1.56 [1.00, 2.42]	Kuk, 2010		-	17.73%	0.94 [0.73, 1.22]
	Mozaffarian, 2008		14.78%	1.00 [0.85, 1.18]	Maggi, 2006			11.16%	1.84 [1.18, 2.88]
	Ohrvik, 2009	<b></b>	2.12%	1.34 [0.77, 2.33]	Salminen, 2010	••		6.94%	0.65 [0.34, 1.24]
MEN	Salminen, 2010	<b></b>	4.38%	0.98 [0.68, 1.42]	Sun, 2012	-	· · · ·	8.93%	1.35 [0.79, 2.31]
	Simons, 2007		13.81%	1.06 [0.89, 1.26]	Wang, 2007			13.74%	1.57 [1.09, 2.26]
	Sun, 2012		4.35%	0.93 [0.64, 1.35]	Wen, 2008			15.91%	1.29 [0.95, 1.75]
	Wen, 2008	-	16.89%	1.17 [1.01, 1.35]	Yen, 2015			18.84%	1.37 [1.09, 1.73]
	ren, 2015 Zambon, 2009	181	3 05%	1.16 [1.04, 1.30]	Zambon, 2009	• •		6.76%	0.77 [0.40, 1.49]
	Zambon, 2009		3.95%	1.04 [0.70, 1.54]					
	Overall (I-squared = 32.5%, p = 0.17)	) 🔸	100.00%	1.07 [0.99, 1.16]	Overall (I-squared = 54.4%, p = 0	0.03)	•	100.00%	1.22 [1.00, 1.49]
					r				
	0.5	1 1.5 2.5	5		0.1	5	1 1.5 2.5		
	Australia and Mara								
	Author(s) and Year		Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]	Author(s) and Year			Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]
	Forti, 2012	<b>—</b>	7.07%	1.02 [0.70, 1.49]	Kuk. 2010	_	-	15.58%	1.08 [0.79 1.48]
	Kuk, 2010	+ <b>-</b>	12.71%	1.11 [0.92, 1.34]	Maggi 2006		-	11.01%	1 30 10 76 2 22
	Mozaffarian, 2008		14.41%	1.01 [0.87, 1.17]	Salmineo 2010			11.0179	1 45 (0 89, 2 27)
WOMEN	Ohrvik, 2009		4.28%	1.01 [0.58, 1.75]	Sum 2012			7.400	0.4910.00.4.6.1
	Salminen, 2010		8.22%	1.61 [1.15, 2.25]	oun, 2012 4	•	-	7.40%	0.46 [0.22, 1.04]
	Simons, 2007		13.03%	1.12 [0.93, 1.34]	wang, 2007			14.27%	1.03 [0.71, 1.50]
	sun, 2012 -	•	5.82%	0.72 [0.46, 1.12]	Wen, 2008			13.33%	1.74 [1.15, 2.64]
	Vien, 2008 Vien, 2015		12.72%	1.00 [0.88, 1.28]	Yen, 2015			15.04%	2.16 [1.54, 3.03]
	Zambon, 2009		8.76%	1.48 [1.08, 2.02]	Zambon, 2009			11.52%	1.78 [1.07, 2.96]
	Overall (I-squared = 64.9%, p = 0.00	3) 🔶	100.00%	1.16 [1.02, 1.32]	Overall (I-squared = 65.6%, p = 0	0.004)	-	100.00%	1.34 [1.03, 1.74]
					Г 0.1				

Kuk, 2010		15.58%	1.08 [0.79, 1.48]
Maggi, 2006		11.01%	1.30 [0.76, 2.22]
Salminen, 2010		11.85%	1.45 [0.89, 2.37]
Sun, 2012		7.40%	0.48 (0.22, 1.04
Wang, 2007		14.27%	1.03 (0.71, 1.50
Wen, 2008	<b>→</b>	13.33%	1.74 [1.15, 2.64]
Yen, 2015		15.04%	2.16 [1.54, 3.03]
Zambon, 2009		11.52%	1.78 [1.07, 2.96]

Area   Area <th></th> <th>ALL-CAUS</th> <th>E MORTALITY</th> <th></th> <th colspan="5">CARDIOVASCULAR MORTALITY</th>		ALL-CAUS	E MORTALITY		CARDIOVASCULAR MORTALITY				
		Author(s) and Year	Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]	Author(s) and Year	Weight	Relative Risk [95% Cl]		
		Forti 2012	3.55%	0.86 (0.60, 1.23)	Kuk 2010	22.078	1.05 (0.92, 1.94)		
Meximum 200 ••• 1400 • 141125.16 Barren, 2010 ••• 1200 • 1215125.15 Barren, 2010 ••• 1200 • 1200		Kuk, 2010	⊷ 13.62%	1.16 [0.99, 1.35]	Maggi 2006	20.07%	0.59 (0.27, 1 29)		
MEN Burken, 2007 Burken, 200		Mozaffarian, 2008	⊷∎⊷ 14.86%	1.44 [1.25, 1.66]	Salminen, 2010	4,91%	1.20 [0.70. 2.04]		
Binnews, 2010       4,199,12,210,11,71         Binnews, 2017       4,199,12,210,11,71         Binnews, 2010       2,277,113,113,113,113,113,113,113,113,113,1	MEN	Ohrvik, 2009	2.01%	1.23 [0.76, 2.00]	Sun. 2012	7.65%	0.75 [0.49, 1.15]		
Anterior and the second sec		Salminen, 2010	4.19%	1.29 [0.93, 1.79]	Wang, 2007	9.93%	1.28 (0.88, 1.86)		
Win 300 to 120 (bit 120 (bi		Simons, 2007 Sun. 2012	→→ 12.22% →→→ 6.91%	1.35 [1.06, 1.72]	Wen, 2006	15.48%	1.14 [0.84, 1.54]		
Win, 2015       0.2779       1.16 [1 / 0.12]         Win, 2015       0.2       1.15       2.0    Anthon(s) and Yer          Ministra, 2020       0.1       1.0       2.0       1.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.0       0.0       1.0 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.0       1.0 [1 / 1.13, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.0       0.0       0.0 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.0       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.0       0.0       0.0 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.00 [1 / 1.24, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.25, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.00 [1 / 1.25, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.25, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.25, 10]         Ministra, 2020       0.00 [1 / 1.25, 20]       0.00 [1 / 1.13, 10]       0.00 [1 / 1.25, 20]		Wen, 2008	⊷∎⊶ 15.30%	1.20 [1.04, 1.38]	Yen, 2015		0.98 [0.80, 1.21]		
$\frac{1}{9 \text{ cm}(1) + \text{squared}}{20 \text{ cm}(1) + \text{squared}} = 20 \text{ Sh}_{0} = 0.01 \text{ cm}(1) + \text{sq}_{1} = 0.000 \text{ s}_{1} = 1.0 \text{ g}_{2} = 1.0 \text{ g}_{1} = 0.000 \text{ s}_{1} = 1.0 \text{ g}_{2} = 0.000 \text{ s}_{1} = 0.000 \text{ s}_{1} = 1.0 \text{ g}_{2} = 0.000 \text{ s}_{1} = 0.0$		Yen, 2015	l <b>∎</b> i 22.77%	1.15 [1.04, 1.27]	Zambon, 2009	4.20%	0.87 [0.49, 1.55]		
Outside ()-squared = 28 (N, p = 0.1)       0000011 12 (11, 13, 13)         Outside ()-squared = 28 (N, p = 0.1)       0, 0, 0, 1, 13 (12, 13, 13, 13)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       Wight ()       1000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       000011 12 (11, 13, 130)         Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       Outside () and Yer       0		Zambon, 2009	4.58%	1.01 [0.74, 1.38]					
		Overall (I-squared = 28.0%, p = 0.18)	• 100.00%	1.21 [1.13, 1.30]	Overall (I-squared = 0%, p = 0.46)	• 100.00%	1.02 [0.91, 1.15]		
$\frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$		0.5	1 1.5 2.5		0.5	1 1.5 2.5			
For 2012 for we 2010 for we 2		Author(s) and Year	Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]	Author(s) and Year	Weight	Relative Risk [95% CI]		
Mag 200 Mag		Forti, 2012 H	5.76%	1.20 [0.82, 1.75]	Kuk. 2010	·∎ 15.28%	1.30 (0.95, 1.77)		
Maaritaria. 2010 Maaritaria.		Kuk, 2010	⊷∎→ 12.81%	1.33 [1.10, 1.61]	Maggi. 2006	9.71%	2.04 [1.11. 3.75]		
Soutem         Soute is 10 (s) 10		Mozaffarian, 2008	+∎→ 15.93%	1.36 [1.18, 1.56]	Salminan, 2010	13.16%	0.92 [0.61, 1.39]		
Berners, 2010 Buc, 2017 Buc, 2017 Win, 2008 Win, 2007 Win, 2009 Win, 2009 Wi	WOMEN	Ohrvik, 2009	→ 3.00%	1.63 [0.93, 2.86]	Sun 2012	6.98%	3 68 [1 63 8 32]		
Since, 200 Web, 2015 Since, 2009 Web, 2015 Since, 2009 Overall (-lequend = 515%, p = 0.04) 0.5 1 1.5 2.5 (0.5 1 1.5 2.5 (0.5 1 1.5 2.5) (0.5 1 1.5 2.5)		Salminen, 2010	8.53%	0.88 [0.66, 1.17]	When 2007	14 31%	1 29 (0 90, 1 84)		
wn, 2015 wn, 20		Simons, 2007	Here 13.41%	1.63 [1.36, 1.95]	Wang, 2007	14.31%	0.0010.50, 1.04]		
Yen, 2015		Wen, 2008	+	1.23 [1.02. 1.49]	Vien 2015	13.49%	1.08 (0.82, 1.31)		
		Yen, 2015	+∎- 16.34%	1.35 [1.18, 1.54]	Tem, 2015	16.01%	1.06 [0.62, 1.42]		
		Zambon, 2009	·• 6.97%	1.61 [1.16, 2.24]	Zambon, 2009	► 11.06%	2.17 [1.28, 3.08]		
					Overall (I-squared = 70.3%, p = 0.006)	100.00%	1.36 [1.04, 1.78]		
		Overall (I-squared = 51.6%, p = 0.04)	• 100.00%	1.35 [1.22, 1.50]					

CARDIOVASCULAR MORTALITY

	Author(s) and Year		Weight	Relative Risk [95% Cl]
	Forti, 2012		7.03%	1.40 [0.88, 2.23]
	Kuk, 2010		12.32%	0.95 (0.79, 1.15)
	Mozaffarian, 2008		12.93%	1.26 [1.08, 1.47]
	Ohrvík, 2009	•	3.74%	0.71 [0.33, 1.53]
MEN	Salminen, 2010	•••···	7.40%	0.65 [0.42, 1.01]
	Simons, 2007	<b>-</b>	10.47%	1.75 [1.32, 2.32]
	Sun, 2012	<b>-</b>	11.11%	1.37 [1.07, 1.76]
	Wen, 2008		12.76%	1.27 [1.08, 1.50]
	Yen, 2015	-	13.67%	0.89 [0.80, 0.99]
	Zambon, 2009		8.57%	0.95 [0.65, 1.38]
	Overall (I-squared = 81.)	™. p <0.001) →	100.00%	1.11 [0.94, 1.32]
		0.5 1 1.5	2.5	
	Author(s) and Year		Weight	Relative Risk [95% Cl]
	Forti, 2012	·	5.24%	0.88 [0.54, 1.44]
	Kuk, 2010	·	10.14%	1.35 [0.99, 1.85]
	Mozaffarian, 2008		20.02%	1.39 [1.20, 1.62]
	Ohrvik, 2009		<ul> <li>1.87%</li> </ul>	1.31 [0.54, 3.17]
VOMEN	Ohrvik, 2009 Salminen, 2010	••••	<ul> <li>1.87%</li> <li>5.27%</li> </ul>	1.31 [0.54, 3.17] 0.66 [0.40, 1.08]
VOMEN	Ohrvik, 2009 Salminen, 2010 Simons, 2007	••••	<ul> <li>1.87%</li> <li>5.27%</li> <li>10.56%</li> </ul>	1.31 [0.54, 3.17] 0.66 [0.40, 1.08] 1.27 [0.94, 1.72]
VOMEN	Ohrvik, 2009 Salminen, 2010 Simons, 2007 Sun, 2012		<ul> <li>1.87%</li> <li>5.27%</li> <li>10.56%</li> <li>7.06%</li> </ul>	1.31 [0.54, 3.17] 0.66 [0.40, 1.08] 1.27 [0.94, 1.72] 1.49 [0.99, 2.24]
VOMEN	Ohrvík, 2009 Salminen, 2010 Simons, 2007 Sun, 2012 Wen, 2008		<ul> <li>1.87%</li> <li>5.27%</li> <li>10.56%</li> <li>7.06%</li> <li>13.51%</li> </ul>	1.31 [0.54, 3.17] 0.66 [0.40, 1.08] 1.27 [0.94, 1.72] 1.49 [0.99, 2.24] 1.13 [0.88, 1.45]
VOMEN	Ohrvík, 2009 Salminen, 2010 Simons, 2007 Sun, 2012 Wen, 2008 Yen, 2015		<ul> <li>1.87%</li> <li>5.27%</li> <li>10.56%</li> <li>7.06%</li> <li>13.51%</li> <li>19.08%</li> </ul>	1.31 [0.54, 3.17] 0.66 [0.40, 1.08] 1.27 [0.94, 1.72] 1.49 [0.99, 2.24] 1.13 [0.88, 1.45] 1.04 [0.88, 1.22]
VOMEN	Ohrvik, 2009 Salminen, 2010 Simons, 2007 Sun, 2012 Wen, 2008 Yen, 2015 Zambon, 2009		<ul> <li>1.87%</li> <li>5.27%</li> <li>10.56%</li> <li>7.06%</li> <li>13.51%</li> <li>19.08%</li> <li>7.24%</li> </ul>	1.31 [0.54, 3.17] 0.66 [0.40, 1.08] 1.27 [0.94, 1.72] 1.49 [0.99, 2.24] 1.13 [0.88, 1.45] 1.04 [0.88, 1.22] 1.03 [0.69, 1.54]
WOMEN	Ohrvik, 2009 Salminen, 2010 Simons, 2007 Sun, 2012 Wen, 2008 Yen, 2015 Zambon, 2009 Overall (I-squared = 41.0	**************************************	<ul> <li>1.87%</li> <li>5.27%</li> <li>10.56%</li> <li>7.06%</li> <li>13.51%</li> <li>19.08%</li> <li>7.24%</li> <li>100.00%</li> </ul>	1.31 [0.54, 3.17] 0.66 [0.40, 1.08] 1.27 [0.94, 1.72] 1.49 [0.99, 2.24] 1.13 [0.88, 1.45] 1.04 [0.88, 1.22] 1.03 [0.69, 1.54]

Author(s) and Year Weight Relative Risk [95% CI] Kuk, 2010 14.59% 1.09 [0.78, 1.53] + 11.07% 0.82 [0.44, 1.53] + 9.01% 0.74 [0.33, 1.66] Maggi, 2006 Salminen, 2010 → 13.23% 3.23 [2.06, 5.07] Sun, 2012 Wang, 2007 12 44% 1 00 10 60 1 67 → 13.50% 2.26 [1.47, 3.47] Wen, 2008 --Yen, 2015 15.49% 1.31 [1.02, 1.68] Zambon, 2009 ----10.67% 0.85 [0.44, 1.65] Overall (I-squared = 79.8%, p <0.001) 0.5 1 1.5 2.5 Author(s) and Year Weight Relative Risk [95% CI] Kuk, 2010 → 14.52% 1.82 [1.04, 3.18] 
 8.23%
 0.77 [0.30, 1.96]

 10.13%
 0.89 [0.40, 1.99]
 Maggi, 2006 Salminen, 2010 → 10.86% 3.58 [1.68, 7.61] → 13.14% 0.71 [0.38, 1.33] → 13.46% 1.66 [0.90, 3.06] Sun, 2012 Wang, 2007

# HIGHLIGHTS

- Single metabolic syndrome components influence mortality differently by age and gender
- Low HDL cholesterol and hyperglycemia predict mortality more strongly for the female gender
- Hypertension increase mortality in older women, but not in older men
- Abdominal obesity and high triglyceride scarcely influence mortality in advanced age

, r in at