Table S1 Summary of the assessment of the quality of the evidence on extreme cold, extreme heat and extremely high DTR as a risk factor for CVD.

Reference		Extreme cold(n=13)		Extreme heat(n=12)		Extremely high DTR(n=8)	
	rating	bias	rating	bias	rating	bias	
Quality of the evidence assessment							
i=Downgrade c	onsideration	as					
Risk of bias	0	There is no substantial risk of bias across most	0	There is no substantial risk of bias across most	0	There is no substantial risk of bias across most	
across studies		studies.		studies.		studies.	
Indirectness	0	CVD mortality was appropriate outcome, studies	0	CVD mortality was appropriate outcome, studies	0	CVD mortality was appropriate outcome, studies	
		conducted in the population of interest, mostly		conducted in the population of interest, mostly		conducted in the population of interest, mostly	
		direct measures of exposure		direct measures of exposure		direct measures of exposure	
Inconsistency	0	Effect estimates likely to differ because of	0	Effect estimates likely to differ because of	0	Effect estimates likely to differ because of	
		differences in study methods and not be driven by		differences in study methods and not be driven by		differences in study methods and not be driven by	
		unexpected heterogeneity		unexpected heterogeneity		unexpected heterogeneity	
Imprecision	-1	Three studies had wide confidence intervals.	-1	One study had wide confidence intervals.	-1	One study had wide confidence intervals.	
Publication	-1	The evidence of publication bias was inspected	-1	The evidence of publication bias was inspected	0	No evidence for publication bias for studies that	
bias		visually in the egger's test.		visually in the egger's test.		would meet our inclusion criteria.	
ii. Upgrade considerations							
Size of the	1	Effect sizes are big in most studies	1	Effect sizes are big in most studies	1	Effect sizes are small in most studies	
effect							
Dose response	1	Most studies report broadly similar dose–response	1	Most studies report broadly similar dose-response	1	Most studies report broadly similar dose–response	
pattern		pattern		pattern		pattern	
Confounding	0	There is no evidence to suggest that possible	0	There is no evidence to suggest that possible	0	There is no evidence to suggest that possible	
minimizes		residual confounding factors reduce the estimation		residual confounding factors reduce the estimation		residual confounding factors reduce the estimation	

effect		of effectiveness		of effectiveness		of effectiveness
iii. Summary of	the quality a	ssessment				
Overall quality	Moderate	Moderate $+ (-1) + (-1) + 1 + 1 = moderate$,	Moderate	Moderate $+ (-1) + (-1) + 1 + 1 = moderate$,	High	Moderate $+ (-1) + 1 + 1 = high,$
of evidence		Downgrading/upgrading resulted in moderate		Downgrading/upgrading resulted in moderate		Downgrading/upgrading resulted in high rating for
starts:		rating for the quality of evidence		rating for the quality of evidence		the quality of evidence
Moderate						
Summary of	n/a	Overall, the evidence for a higher risk of	n/a	Overall, the evidence for a higher risk of	n/a	Overall, the evidence for a higher risk of
findings		cardiovascular mortality with extreme cold		cardiovascular mortality with extreme heat		cardiovascular mortality with extremely high DTR
		exposure was of moderate quality		exposure was of moderate quality		exposure was of moderate quality
Strength of evide	ence assessme	ent				
Quality of	Moderate		Moderate		High	
evidence						
Direction of	n/a	Direction largely as expected	n/a	Direction largely as expected	n/a	Direction largely as expected
effect estimates						
Confidence in	n/a	Studies on extreme cold measure directly the	n/a	Studies on extreme heat measure directly the	n/a	Studies on extremely high DTR measure directly
effect estimate		outcome of interest, direction of effect is largely		outcome of interest, direction of effect is largely		the outcome of interest, direction of effect is
		consistent, majority score low on risk of bias.		consistent, majority score low on risk of bias.		largely consistent, majority score low on risk of
						bias.
Other aspects	n/a	Differences in contextual factors, including	n/a	Differences in contextual factors, including	n/a	Differences in contextual factors, including
		population exposure level and vulnerability,		population exposure level and vulnerability,		population exposure level and vulnerability,
		differences in physical and physiological		differences in physical and physiological		differences in physical and physiological
		adaptation across study populations make		adaptation across study populations make		adaptation across study populations make
		interpretation and comparison difficult.		interpretation and comparison difficult.		interpretation and comparison difficult.

Overall	sufficient	We found sufficient evidence that extreme cold is	sufficient	We found sufficient evidence that extremely heat	sufficient	We found sufficient evidence that extremely high
strength of		positively associated with cardiovascular disease		is positively associated with cardiovascular		DTR is positively associated with cardiovascular
evidence		mortality in China, in which case chance, bias,		disease mortality in China, in which case chance,		disease mortality in China, in which case chance,
		and confounding factors can be reasonably		bias, and confounding factors can be reasonably		bias, and confounding factors can be reasonably
		excluded. The available evidence includes the		excluded. The available evidence includes the		excluded. The available evidence includes the
		results of one or more well designed studies, and		results of one or more well designed studies, and		results of one or more well designed studies, and
		quantitative estimates can only be interpreted		quantitative estimates can only be interpreted		quantitative estimates can only be interpreted
		broadly because of the lack of comparability		broadly because of the lack of comparability		broadly because of the lack of comparability
		across studies.		across studies.		across studies.