

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Pre-pregnant lipid levels and number of children: a prospective population-based cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-021188
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Dec-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Pirnat, Aleksandra; University of Bergen, Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care De Roo, Lisa; University of Bergen, Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care Skjaerven, Rolv; University of Bergen, Dep of Global Public Health and Primary Care; Norwegian Institute of Public Health Morken, Nils-Halvdan; University of Bergen, Department of Clinical Sciences; Haukeland University Hospital, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Keywords:	Pre-pregnant lipid levels, TG/HDL ratio, Maternal health, Parity, Female fertility

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Pre-pregnant lipid levels and number of children: a prospective population-based**
4
5 **cohort study**
6
7
8
9

10 Aleksandra Pirnat^{1*}, Lisa A DeRoo¹, Rolv Skjærven^{1,2}, Nils-Halvdan Morken^{3,4}
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 ¹Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care, University of Bergen, Bergen,
20
21 Norway
22
23

24 ²Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Bergen, Norway
25
26

27 ³Department of Clinical Science, University of Bergen, Norway
28
29

30 ⁴Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Correspondence address: Po Box 7804, 5018 Bergen, Norway Tel: +47 938 24 889; E-mail:
43
44 pirnatdraleksandra@gmail.com
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Word count:** 3560
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objective: To study pre-pregnant serum lipid levels and association with number of children.

Design: Prospective population-based cohort.

Setting: Linked data from Cohort of Norway and The Medical Birth Registry of Norway.

Participants: 2 645 women giving birth to their first child during 1994 - 2003 (488 one-child mothers and 2157 women with ≥ 2 births) and 1 677 nulliparous women.

Main outcome measures: Odds ratios (ORs) for no and one lifetime pregnancy (relative to ≥ 2 pregnancies) obtained by multinomial logistic regression; adjusted for age at examination, education, body mass index (BMI), smoking, time since last meal and oral contraceptive use.

Results: Assessed in quintiles, higher pre-pregnant triglyceride (TG) and triglyceride to high density lipoprotein (TG/HDL-c) ratio levels were associated with increased risk of one lifetime pregnancy compared to having ≥ 2 children. Compared to the highest quintile, women in the lowest quintile of HDL cholesterol levels had an increased risk of one lifetime pregnancy (OR 1.7 95% CI 1.2-2.4), as were women with the highest low density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles (compared to the lowest) (OR 1.2 95% CI 0.8-1.7; OR 2.2 95% CI 1.5-3.2; and OR 2.2 95% CI 1.5-3.2, respectively). Similar effects were found in women with BMI ≥ 25 and the highest LDL and total cholesterol levels in risk of lifetime nulliparity.

Conclusion: Women with unfavorable pre-pregnant lipid profile had higher risk of having no or only one child. These findings substantiate an association between pre-pregnant serum lipid levels and number of children. Previously observed associations between low parity and

1
2
3 increased cardiovascular mortality may in part be due to preexisting cardiovascular disease
4
5 lipid risk factors.
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Key words:** Pre-pregnant lipid levels, TG/HDL ratio, maternal health, parity, female fertility.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

23
24
25

- 26 • A large population-based health study with pre-pregnant health data.
- 27 • Linkage with the Medical Birth Registry of Norway provides complete registration of
- 28 total reproduction.
- 29 • The study lack data on family planning, dietary intake and duration of oral
- 30 contraceptive use, therefore the possibility of unmeasured confounding by those
- 31 factors cannot be ruled out.
- 32 • Non-fasting lipid measurements were used in the study, however, adjustments in our
- 33 analyses for time since last meal did not change the results.
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Introduction

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is an important public health problem and remains as the number one cause of death in women.(1) Reproductive history is important in evaluating health risks in women, as pregnancy may unmask a woman's predisposition for CVD.(1) Several studies have reported increased CVD mortality among women with no or only one lifetime pregnancy.(2, 3, 4) Efforts to elucidate the association between number of children and the risk of female CVD have been inconclusive.(1, 3) Proposed explanations are lifestyle risk factors associated with childrearing (5), sex hormone fluctuations, protective effect of future pregnancies,(3) lifestyle factors prior to conception such as elevated blood pressure and obesity (6) as well as metabolic irregularities triggered by gestation.(1) Detection of high density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol and apolipoprotein B (ApoB) in follicular fluid from oocytes (7, 8) suggests a relation between lipids and female reproductive function. More recent studies have reported associations between lipids and fertility in both sexes.(9) Low parity (as a feature of subfecundity) and cardiovascular events may share common pathophysiological mechanisms.(10)

While the role of serum lipids in cardio metabolic health is well established, showing low HDL and high triglycerides (TGs) to be strong predictors of CVD,(11) their role in reproduction is uncertain. It is also uncertain whether women with no or one lifetime pregnancy have a higher CVD risk to begin with, or whether future pregnancies may reduce the CVD risk.

1
2
3 We pursued this question by exploring the extent to which pre-pregnant serum lipid levels of
4 total, HDL and low density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio are
5 associated with having no and one lifetime pregnancy.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Population

We used linked data from Cohort of Norway (CONOR) and the Medical Birth Registry of Norway (MBRN). CONOR is a population-based collection of health data and blood samples provided by participants older than 20 years of age residing in several different regions in Norway during 1994 to 2003.⁽¹²⁾ Our subset included women with no children at the time of examination with standardized measurements of height, weight, and non-fasting lipids levels. Lifestyle factors were obtained through an extensive questionnaire that collected self-reported information on smoking, oral contraceptive (OC) use, self-reported status on receipt of social security benefits, attained level of education and various life style factors.⁽¹²⁾ Education in Norway consists of primary school (7 years), lower secondary school (3 years), upper secondary school (3 years) and higher education. The first 10 years are obligatory.

The MBRN has since 1967 recorded data on all deliveries in the country after 16th week of gestation.⁽¹³⁾ Based on mandatory notification, midwives and doctors report information using standard forms throughout pregnancy and at the time of delivery. The registry includes demographic information, mother's health prior and during pregnancy, complications in pregnancy and perinatal outcome. Using the unique national identification number given to all Norwegian citizens, each woman was linked to all her subsequent births (if any) after participating in CONOR. Women reporting no children in CONOR at the time of examination and with no valid records in the MBRN were considered having no pregnancies.

1
2
3 Women with baseline assessment of lifestyle factors in CONOR were linked to the MBRN.

4 We defined one-child mothers as women being 6 years out from their first pregnancy and with
5
6 no additional births registered in the MBRN.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 *Preconception measurements*

14
15 Non-fasting blood samples were analyzed on a Hitachi 911 Autoanalyzer (Hitachi, Mito,
16 Japan).(12) Applied reagents were from Boehringer Mannheim (Manheim, Germany). Serum
17
18 concentrations of total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol and TG were analyzed subsequent to
19
20 sampling. The total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol levels and TGs were measured by an
21
22 enzymatic method. The day-to-day coefficients of variation were 2.4% and 0.7-1.3% for total
23
24 cholesterol, HDL cholesterol and TG, respectively. To calculate LDL, we used the
25
26 Friedewald formula (14): Total serum cholesterol minus HDL cholesterol minus one fifth of
27
28 the triglyceride concentration. LDL cholesterol levels were calculated only for participants
29
30 with TG concentrations below 4.5mmol/l.(6, 14) Accordingly, TG/HDL-c ratio was expressed
31
32 as mmol/l.
33
34
35
36
37

38 Trained personnel measured height and weight with the participants wearing light clothes and
39
40 no shoes; measurements were taken as follows: - height to the nearest 1.0 cm and weight to
41
42 the nearest 0.5 kg. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kilogram/(height in
43
44 meters)².
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 *Statistical analyses*

52
53 Characteristics of the analyzed women were presented as means with standard deviations for
54
55 continuous data and as number with percentages for categorical data. Differences between
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 nulliparous women, one-child mothers and mothers with two or more children, as well as pre-
4 pregnant health status were analyzed by Chi-square tests and T tests where appropriate. Linear
5 associations across pre-pregnant lipid levels (in quintiles) for no and one lifetime pregnancy
6 were assessed by p-values for trend. Odds ratios (OR) of no and one lifetime pregnancy by
7 lipid levels and TG/HDL-c ratio, when compared to women with two or more pregnancies
8 were calculated using multinomial logistic regression and adjusted for mother's age at
9 examination, level of education (categorized in: <11 years and >11 years of education),
10 smoking (current smoker: yes, no), time since last meal, OC use (now, previously, never) and
11 BMI (linear term). To extend each woman's likelihood of completing her birth record, we
12 separately examined women who were 7 years out from their first pregnancy. About 95% of
13 Norwegian women will complete their second pregnancy within 7 years.(4) To test the effect
14 of (pre-pregnant) BMI, we stratified main analyses by BMI (<25 and \geq 25). To avoid
15 influence from age at first delivery on number of children, we excluded women older than 34
16 years at the time of first delivery in a sub analysis. Additionally, we performed sensitivity
17 analyses including only mothers who were 22-30 years old at the time of first delivery. Using
18 presence of a partner (ever) as a proxy for exposure to pregnancy among nulliparous women,
19 we performed logistic regression in a sub-analysis (nulliparous vs. women with \geq 2 births)
20 including only women with a reported partner (ever). All analyses were performed using The
21 Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 22.0 and 23.0, Chicago, Illinois).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

There were 4 743 women with baseline assessment of lifestyle factors in CONOR (1994-2003) that were linked to the MBRN. We excluded 421 women with pregnancy at the time of examination (n =139), unsure pregnancy status (n =157) and missing lipid assessments (n =125). Thus, 4 322 women were included in the analyses (1 677 nulliparous, 488 one-child mothers and 2 157 women with ≥ 2 births, see Figure 1). Sub-analyses included only women with reported partners (228 nulliparous and 216 mothers with ≥ 2 births).

Characteristics of the included women are given in Table 1. Nulliparous women were older at the time of examination, had higher BMI and were more frequent smokers compared to women with two or more births. A higher proportion of nulliparous women had >11 years of education. One-child mothers had higher mean age both at examination and at delivery (29.5 vs. 26.7 and 32.3 vs. 29.9, respectively), were more often smokers and had lower education than mothers with ≥ 2 births. The mean BMI prior to pregnancy was higher in one-child mothers (24.2 vs. 23.5), whereas mean years from examination to first delivery were similar for the two groups. Women with no and one child were less frequent users of OCs at the time of examination compared to mothers with ≥ 2 births (27.4%, 34.6% and 48.9%, respectively).

The proportion of diabetes at first delivery in one-child mothers was higher than in women with two or more births (1.4% versus 0.9%, $p=0.30$). Polycystic Ovary Syndrome (PCOS) was rare and we only had three cases in our material. A significantly higher number of one-child mothers had in-vitro fertilization (IVF) in their first pregnancy (7.2% versus 2.6% in women with ≥ 2 births, $p< 0.001$) (data not shown). This latter finding remained after excluding mothers older than 34 years at first delivery.

1
2
3 OR's with 95% CI's for no and one lifetime pregnancy (vs. ≥ 2 lifetime pregnancies) by lipid
4
5 levels (in quintiles) are presented in Table 2 and Figure 2. Significant trends in ORs for one
6
7 lifetime pregnancy across TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles were observed (p trend = 0.01).
8
9 OR for having one lifetime pregnancy for women with the highest TG quintile compared to
10
11 the lowest quintile was 2.2 (95% CI 1.5-3.2). ORs for having one lifetime pregnancy for
12
13 women with TG/HDL-c ratio levels in the two highest quintiles were 1.7 (95% CI 1.2-2.5)
14
15 and 2.2 (95% CI 1.5-3.2), respectively, compared to the lowest quintile. There were no
16
17 significant trends for LDL cholesterol, total cholesterol or HDL cholesterol, although ORs of
18
19 one lifetime pregnancy for the lowest HDL quintile were 1.7 (95% CI 1.2-2.4) and for the
20
21 highest LDL quintile 1.2 (95% CI 0.8-1.7). We found no increased risk of being nulliparous
22
23 by serum lipid levels except for the highest LDL and total cholesterol levels and these
24
25 estimates were not persuasive (ORs 1.2 [95% CI 0.9-1.6] and 1.2 [95% CI 0.9-1.5],
26
27 respectively). Truncation of data to extend the time for each woman to complete her birth
28
29 record (to 7 years) did not appreciably alter the results, neither did exclusion of women older
30
31 than 34 years at the time of first delivery nor the additional restriction of our analyses to
32
33 mothers aged 22-30 years at first pregnancy. The similar effects of pre-pregnant lipids as in
34
35 one child mothers were observed when sub analysis (nulliparous vs. ≥ 2 births) were
36
37 performed on women who had a partner (as a proxy for ever being exposed to pregnancy). For
38
39 women with partner, the risk of having no children was increased among the women in the
40
41 highest quintiles of TG and TH/HDL-c ratio (compared to the lowest quintiles) and also for
42
43 those in the lowest HDL quintile (compared to the highest) (OR 1.9, 95% CI 0.9-4.2; OR 2.0,
44
45 95% CI 1.0-4.1; and OR 1.6, 95% CI 0.7-3.6, respectively).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Stratified analyses by BMI are presented in Table 3. In women with BMI ≥ 25 there were
55
56 significant trends in ORs of having no children or one child across increasing levels of pre-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pregnant total cholesterol, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles (p trend= 0.04 and < 0.001,
4
5 respectively). The adjusted ORs of one lifetime pregnancy for women with BMI \geq 25 and TG
6
7 levels in the two highest quintiles were 2.1 (95% CI 0.9-4.8) and 3.5 (95% CI 1.6-7.4) and for
8
9 the two highest TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles 3.1 (95% CI 1.3-7.4) and 4.3 (95% CI 1.9-10.0)
10
11 compared to women in the lowest respective quintile. The risk of one lifetime pregnancy was
12
13 also significantly increased for women with BMI \geq 25 and the highest LDL and total
14
15 cholesterol as well as the lowest HDL quintiles (ORs 1.8 [95% CI 0.8-3.8]; 1.2 [95% CI 0.6-
16
17 2.4] and 2.6 [95% CI 1.3-5.3], respectively). Similarly, ORs of having no pregnancy (in
18
19 women with BMI \geq 25) were 1.7 (95% CI 1.0-3.0), 2.8 (95% CI 1.7-4.7) and 3.6 (95% CI 2.1-
20
21 6.1) for women with the highest LDL, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles, respectively,
22
23 compared to women with the lowest quintile. Increased risk of having no children was also
24
25 found for the overweight and obese women with the lowest HDL quintile (OR 1.9, 95%CI
26
27 1.2-3.0). Unlike in one-child mothers, risk of having no pregnancy among overweight and
28
29 obese women with higher total cholesterol levels only slightly changed from the main results.
30
31 In women with pre-pregnant BMI < 25, there were significant trends in risk of having one
32
33 lifetime pregnancy across increasing levels of pre-pregnant TG (p trend=0.04), TG/HDL-c
34
35 ratio (p trend=0.04) and HDL quintiles (p trend=0.05). There were increased risks of one
36
37 lifetime pregnancy in the highest TG quintile (OR 1.9, 95% CI 1.2-3.0) and the two highest
38
39 TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles (OR 1.6, 95% CI 1.0-2.4 and 1.8, 95% CI 1.2-2.8, respectively), as
40
41 well as the lowest HDL quintile (OR: 1.7, 95% CI: 1.1-2.6). Risks of no and one lifetime
42
43 pregnancy with higher LDL and total cholesterol levels only slightly changed compared to our
44
45 main results.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

Pre-pregnant lipid levels were associated with having one lifetime pregnancy. Women with high levels of LDL, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio as well as low HDL levels, measured years before conception, were at increased risk of having only one lifetime pregnancy. High levels of LDL and total cholesterol were associated with having no children, while in overweight and obese women this was true for all the lipids examined.

These findings provide a possible biological underpinning for a joint mechanistic pathway for reduced fertility and cardiovascular conditions.⁽¹⁰⁾ Our study suggests that the previously observed association between low parity and increased CVD risk may be confounded by preexisting adverse lipid levels. This does not support the hypothesis that having additional pregnancies reduces CVD risk.⁽³⁾ Rather, unfavorable lipid profiles may be related to both subfertility and later cardiovascular disease.

There is a lack of studies evaluating the relation between preconception lipid levels and fertility in women. The LIFE study found concentrations of free cholesterol to be associated with fecundity in both sexes.⁽⁹⁾ In contrast to our study, TGs and total cholesterol were not found to be significant in individual and couple-based adjusted models (as well as two other measured lipid components: phospholipids and total lipids), however, authors used different study design and lipid measurement methods. In accordance with our findings is the Framingham Heart Study, which detected a trend towards TG elevation and lower HDL serum levels among women with self-reported infertility (as not achieving pregnancy for ≥ 1

1
2
3 year).(15) The presence of HDL cholesterol and ApoB in follicular fluid from human oocytes,
4 suggests that these lipids play a direct role in reproduction.(7, 8, 16) Previous animal studies
5
6
7 have reported association between dyslipidemia and infertility.(17) Posed explanations have
8
9 been that abnormalities in HDL metabolism including change in structure, concentration or
10
11 function compromise female fertility.(7, 8, 16) It has been suggested that genetic
12
13 polymorphisms that alter function in proteins engaged in cholesterol metabolism may affect
14
15 human fertility.(18, 19) A possible mechanism could be the mediating role of HDL on
16
17 Paraoxonase 1 activity and related oxidative stress, a factor known to be associated with
18
19 adverse cardiovascular and fertility outcomes.(19)
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Recent insights suggest TG/HDL-c ratio to be a reliable marker of insulin resistance and
27
28 atherogenicity,(20) highlighting its ability to identify insulin resistance in apparently healthy
29
30 individuals.(21) Observed higher levels of TG/HDL-c ratio in our study are indicative of
31
32 possible preexisting metabolic risk factors among women with one lifetime pregnancy, as
33
34 well as subpopulation of nulliparous women (overweight, obese and with reported partners –
35
36 as a proxy for exposed to pregnancy). This is also consistent with increasing rates of infertility
37
38 in both sexes among population with metabolic syndrome.(9) The higher proportion of
39
40 diabetes in this group of women further supports this notion. In agreement, the Japan Nurses
41
42 Health study reported significant increase in risk of diabetes in young nulliparous women
43
44 (<45 years of age) with ovarian infertility.(22) Accordingly, the Framingham Heart Study
45
46 found infertile premenopausal women to have increased odds of diabetes and obesity.(15)
47
48
49 Given the accompanying metabolic irregularities among major causes of female
50
51 infertility,(15, 23) substantially higher proportion of IVF treatment among one-child mothers
52
53 indirectly supports metabolic implications. The latter finding remains after exclusion of
54
55 women older than 34 years at the time of first delivery.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In accordance with the literature,(23, 24) risk of having no and only one child showed strong
4 effects in overweight and obese women ($BMI \geq 25$) in stratified analyses (Table 3).

5
6 Nevertheless, the higher risk of having only one child remained in normal weight women
7 ($BMI < 25$) with the lowest HDL quintile and the highest TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles.
8
9 These findings mirror observations from the literature of metabolic irregularities among
10 normal weight women as independent risk factor for future fertility impairments.(25, 26) The
11 Life Study reported both female and male lipid concentrations to affect fecundity, irrespective
12 of their BMI.(9)

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 Compared to women with two or more pregnancies, total cholesterol levels above clinically
24 recommended range were associated with the risk of having no children, and this was
25 irrespective of BMI. The Life Study reported greater percentage of women with a history of
26 irregular menstrual cycles in the highest quartile of free cholesterol,(9) and the Japan Nurses
27 Health Study found women with ovarian infertility to be at high risk of
28 hypercholesterolemia.(22) In our study, total cholesterol levels were not associated with the
29 risk of having one lifetime pregnancy, except in overweight and obese women. This could
30 suggest that total cholesterol levels play varied roles in different subfecundity or infertility
31 sub-types.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In our study, women with one lifetime pregnancy had poorer lifestyle factors (BMI, smoking),
48 were older and less educated. Lower mean education among one-child mothers is in
49 agreement with a Nordic demographic study,(27) which shows that later onset of childbearing
50 is related to lower number of children finally born in women with low education. Given that
51 educational level and occupation are key indicators of socioeconomic status,(28) observed
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 lower parity among women with low education could also reflect unfavorable socioeconomic
4 position as a limiting factor to further pregnancies. However, a study exploring age at first
5 birth, parity and post-reproductive mortality suggests that late childbearing in itself may be a
6 signal of preexisting poor health of a woman.(29)
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14
15 The observed risk differences between nulliparous women and one-child mothers in our main
16 results (Figure 2, Table 2) could be explained by heterogeneity of causes for childlessness
17 among nulliparous women in this cohort. The risk may, therefore, be diluted by low risk
18 groups of women who are voluntary childless (30) or have not been exposed to pregnancy
19 (ever). Given the lack of information on women's reproductive planning in our data, we tried
20 to address this in a sub analysis including only women with reported partner (ever) as a proxy
21 for being exposed to pregnancy. Here we found that the results for nulliparous women were
22 similar to our main results for one-child mothers. Women with reported partner had higher
23 risk of having no children (compared to partnered women with ≥ 2 births) if their TG and
24 TG/HDL-c ratio levels were in the highest quintiles and HDL in the lowest quintile (OR 1.9,
25 0.9-4.2; OR 2.0, 95% CI 1.0-4.1; and OR 1.6, 95% CI 0.7-3.6, respectively). These findings
26 support the role of serum lipids in lifetime nulliparity among women with partners.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Our subset of women was from a large population-based health study with pre-pregnant
46 health data. Linked data from the MBRN provided complete registration of total reproduction.
47 The prospective design minimized the potential for bias. A weakness is that blood sampling
48 was performed in non-fasting state. Studies show that TG levels are sensitive to recent food
49 intake, while cholesterol levels seem to be less affected.(31) We addressed this by adjusting
50 our analyses for time since last meal and the main results were unchanged, suggesting that
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 non-fasting lipids are not likely to introduce a systematic bias. Non-fasting lipids have
4
5 successfully been used in lipid and CVD research.(9, 32, 33) No assessments of duration or
6
7 temporal proximity of OC use, dietary intake or stress were available, therefore unmeasured
8
9 confounding by those factors cannot be ruled out. Smoking adversely influences female
10
11 fertility,(34) with most of its effect attributed to HDL cholesterol decrease.(35) We accounted
12
13 for this in our analyses; however, smoking status of participants was only available at
14
15 enrollment in the survey. The ethnic homogeneity of the included women may reduce
16
17 generalizability of our findings.
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Unfavorable pre-pregnant lipid levels were associated with having no and one lifetime
25
26 pregnancy. Women's metabolic homeostasis is important for reproduction and also has cardio
27
28 metabolic implications.(25, 36) Preexisting poor lipid and metabolic profiles could represent
29
30 one of the possible linkages between previously observed reduced fertility and later
31
32 cardiovascular disease.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Acknowledgments.**

42
43
44 We thank Allen Wilcox for his valuable comments on this paper.
45
46

47 **Contributors**

48
49
50 All authors had full access to the data and are responsible for the integrity of the data. AP, RS,
51
52 LD and NHM designed the study. AP and NHM conducted the analyses; NHM created the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 figure and AP created the tables and the flow chart. AP drafted the manuscript. NHM, RS and
4
5 LD reviewed the preliminary analyses and initial draft and provided critical comments.
6
7

8 **Funding**

9
10
11 This work was supported by the Norwegian Association for Public Health with a doctoral
12
13 scholarship to AP. The Norwegian Association for Public Health had no role in the design and
14
15 conduct of the study; in the collection, analysis, the interpretation of the data; or in the
16
17 preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Competing interest statement**

25
26
27 None declared. All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at
28
29 http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding
30
31 author).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Ethical approval**

39
40 The study was approved by the regional ethical review board REK-Vest (Ref number
41
42 2013/118) and access to data was granted by the Steering Committee for CONOR and by the
43
44 MBRN.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Data sharing statement**

51
52
53 Due to the confidentiality requirements according to Norwegian law, data set containing
54
55 personal data and other information on the individual level (CONOR, MBRN) cannot be
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 made public. Researchers who are interested in analyzing data from the CONOR cohort or
4
5 MBRN may apply to the appropriate organizations (after having obtained the obligatory
6
7 permits according to Norwegian law).
8
9
10

11 **Figure Legends**

12 **Figure 1**

13
14
15
16
17
18 Norwegian women examined in Cohort of Norway (CONOR) before conception of their first
19
20 pregnancy and with linked data from the Medical Birth Registry of Norway (MBRN).
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Figure 2**

27
28
29 Odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95%CI) for no and one lifetime pregnancy
30
31 (reference: women with ≥ 2 pregnancies) by TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles in 4 322 women in
32
33 Cohort of Norway, 1994-2003. The estimates were obtained by multinomial logistic
34
35 regression and adjusted for age at examination, educational level, smoking, time since last
36
37 meal, oral contraceptive use and body mass index (linear term).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Sanghavi M, Kulinski J, Ayers CR, et al. Association between number of live births and markers of subclinical atherosclerosis: The Dallas Heart Study. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2016;23:391-399.
2. Grundy E, Kravdal O. Reproductive history and mortality in late middle age among Norwegian men and women. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008;167:271-279.
3. Lv H, Wu H, Yin J, et al. Parity and Cardiovascular Disease Mortality: a Dose-Response Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies. *Sci Rep* 2015;5:13411.
4. Skjaerven R, Wilcox AJ, Klungsoyr K, et al. Cardiovascular mortality after pre-eclampsia in one child mothers: prospective, population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2012;345:e7677.
5. Lawlor DA, Emberson JR, Ebrahim S, et al. Is the association between parity and coronary heart disease due to biological effects of pregnancy or adverse lifestyle risk factors associated with child-rearing? Findings from the British Women's Heart and Health Study and the British Regional Heart Study. *Circulation* 2003;107:1260-1264.
6. Magnussen EB, Vatten LJ, Lund-Nilsen TI, et al. Prepregnancy cardiovascular risk factors as predictors of pre-eclampsia: population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2007;335:978-81.
7. Gautier T, Becker S, Drouineaud V, et al. Human luteinized granulosa cells secrete apoB100-containing lipoproteins. *J Lipid Res* 2010;51:2245-2252.
8. Von Wald T, Monisova Y, Hacker MR, et al. Age-related variations in follicular apolipoproteins may influence human oocyte maturation and fertility potential. *Fertil Steril* 2010;93:2354-2361.
9. Schisterman EF, Mumford SL, Browne RW, et al. Lipid concentrations and couple fecundity: the LIFE study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2014;99: 2786-2794.

- 1
2
3 10. Parikh NI, Cnattingius S, Mittleman MA, et al. Subfertility and risk of later life maternal
4 cardiovascular disease. *Human reproduction* 2012;27:568-575.
5
6
7 11. Abdel-Maksoud MF, Eckel RH, Hamman RF, et al. Risk of coronary heart disease is
8 associated with triglycerides and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol in women and non-high-
9 density lipoprotein cholesterol in men. *J Clin Lipidol* 2012;6:374-381.
10
11
12 12. Naess O, Sogaard AJ, Arnesen E, et al. Cohort profile: cohort of Norway (CONOR). *Int J*
13 *Epidemiol* 2008;37:481-485.
14
15
16 13. Irgens LM. The Medical Birth Registry of Norway. Epidemiological research and
17 surveillance throughout 30 years. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* 2000;79:435-439.
18
19
20 14. Friedewald WT, Levy RI, Fredrickson DS. Estimation of the concentration of low-density
21 lipoprotein cholesterol in plasma, without use of the preparative ultracentrifuge. *Clin Chem*
22 1972;18:499-502.
23
24
25 15. Mahalingaiah S, Sun F, Cheng JJ, et al. Cardiovascular risk factors among women with
26 self-reported infertility. *Fertil Res Pract* 2017;11;3:7.
27
28
29 16. Miettinen HE, Rayburn H, Krieger M. Abnormal lipoprotein metabolism and reversible
30 female infertility in HDL receptor (SR-BI)-deficient mice. *J Clin Invest* 2001;108:1717-1722.
31
32
33 17. Lobaccaro JM, Gallot D, Lumbroso S, et al. Liver X Receptors and female reproduction:
34 when cholesterol meets fertility! *J Endocrinol Invest* 2013;36:55-60.
35
36
37 18. DeAngelis AM, Roy-O'Reilly M, Rodriguez A. Genetic alterations affecting cholesterol
38 metabolism and human fertility. *Biol Reprod* 2014;91:117.
39
40
41 19. Gupta S, Ghulmiyyah J, Sharma R, et al. Power of proteomics in linking oxidative stress
42 and female infertility. *Biomed Res Int* 2014;2014:916212.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20. Dobiasova M, Frohlich J. The plasma parameter log (TG/HDL-C) as an atherogenic
4 index: correlation with lipoprotein particle size and esterification rate in apoB-lipoprotein-
5 depleted plasma (FER(HDL)). *Clin Biochem* 2001;34:583-588.
6
7
8
9 21. Salazar MR, Carbajal HA, Espeche WG, et al. Identification of cardiometabolic risk:
10 visceral adiposity index versus triglyceride/HDL cholesterol ratio. *Am J Med* 2014;1277:152-
11 157.
12
13
14
15 22. Kurabayashi T, Mizunuma H, Kubota T, et al. Ovarian infertility is associated with
16 cardiovascular disease risk factors in later life: A Japanese cross-sectional study. *Maturitas*
17 2016;83:33-9.
18
19
20
21
22 23. Luke B. Adverse effects of female obesity and interaction with race on reproductive
23 potential. *Fertil Steril* 2017;107:868-877.
24
25
26
27 24. van der Steeg JW, Steures P, Eijkemans MJ, et al. Obesity affects spontaneous pregnancy
28 chances in subfertile, ovulatory women. *Hum Reprod* 2008;23:324-8.
29
30
31
32 25. Liu LX, Arany Z. Maternal cardiac metabolism in pregnancy. *Cardiovasc Res* 2014;101:
33 545-553.
34
35
36 26. Primeau V, Coderre L, Karelis AD, et al. Characterizing the profile of obese patients who
37 are metabolically healthy. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2011;35:971-981.
38
39
40
41 27. Andersson G, Knudsen LB, Neyer G, et al. Cohort fertility patterns in The Nordic
42 countries. *Demographic Research; Rostock* 2009;20:313-352.
43
44
45 28. Halland F, Morken NH, DeRoo LA, et al. Association of women's reproductive history
46 with long-term mortality and effect of socioeconomic factors. *Obstet Gynecol* 2015;126:1181-
47 7.
48
49
50
51
52 29. Spence NJ, Eberstein IW. Age at first birth, parity, and post-reproductive mortality among
53 white and black women in the US, 1982-2002. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;68:1625-32.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 30. Magnus MC, Iliodromiti S, Lawlor DA, et al. Number of Offspring and Cardiovascular
4 Disease Risk in Men and Women: The Role of Shared Lifestyle Characteristics. *Epidemiology*
5 2017;28:880-888.
6
7
8
9 31. Craig SR, Amin RV, Russell DW, et al. Blood cholesterol screening influence of fasting
10 state on cholesterol results and management decisions. *J Gen Intern Med* 2000;15:395-399.
11
12
13 32. Egeland GM, Klungsoyr K, Oyen N, et al. Preconception Cardiovascular Risk Factor
14 Differences Between Gestational Hypertension and Preeclampsia: Cohort Norway Study.
15 *Hypertension* 2016;67:1173-1180.
16
17
18
19 33. Nordestgaard BG, Benn M, Schnohr P, et al. Nonfasting tri- glycerides and risk of
20 myocardial infarction, ischemic heart disease, and death in men and women. *JAMA*
21 2007;298:299–308.
22
23
24
25
26
27 34. Baird DD, Wilcox AJ. Cigarette smoking associated with delayed conception. *JAMA*
28 1985;253:2979-2983.
29
30
31
32 35. Maeda K, Noguchi Y, Fukui T. The effects of cessation from cigarette smoking on the
33 lipid and lipoprotein profiles: a meta-analysis. *Prev Med* 2003;37:283-290.
34
35
36
37 36. Cardozo E, Pavone ME, Hirshfeld-Cytron JE. Metabolic syndrome and oocyte quality.
38 *Trends Endocrinol Metab* 2011;22:103-109.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Table 1 Characteristics of 4 322 Norwegian women in Cohort of Norway, 1994-2003 with: no, one or ≥ 2 children. Values are numbers (percentages) unless stated otherwise.

Mean values	1 677 no child	488 one child	2 157 ≥2 children
Age (SD) at examination	30.5 (2.1)	29.5 (5.2)	26.7 (4.0)
Age (SD) at first delivery	-	32.3 (4.9)	29.9 (3.8)
Years (SD)-examination to first pregnancy	-	3.7 (2.1)	4.1 (2.3)
Body mass index (SD) at examination*	24.8 (5.1)	24.2(4.5)	23.5 (3.4)
Oral contraceptive use*			
now	455 (27.4)	168 (34.6)	1047 (48.9)
previously	724 (43.5)	239 (49.2)	779 (36.4)
never	484 (29.1)	79 (16.3)	317 (14.8)
Smoking at examination*			
yes	537 (32.2)	182 (37.4)	462 (21.5)
no	1 132 (67.8)	304 (62.6)	1 685 (78.5)
Education*			
<11 years	312 (18.8)	127 (26.3)	300 (14.1)
≥11 years	1 344 (81.2)	356 (73.7)	1 834 (85.9)

SD = standard deviation; * missing data on smoking: 8 nulliparous, 2 one child mothers and 10 women with ≥ 2 children,; education: 21 nulliparous, 5 one child mothers and 23 women with ≥ 2 children; BMI: 10 nulliparous; OC use: 4 nulliparous, 2 one child mothers and 14 women with ≥2 children.

Table 2 Odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95%CI) for no and one lifetime pregnancy (reference: women with ≥ 2 pregnancies) by pre-pregnant lipid quintiles in 4 322 women in Cohort of Norway, 1994-2003. The estimates were obtained by multinomial logistic regression and adjusted for age at examination, educational level, smoking, time since last meal, oral contraceptive use and body mass index (linear term).

Lipid quintiles ** in mmol/l	n (%)	n ^a (%)	n ^b (%)	N	Nulliparous OR (95%CI)	One child mothers OR (95%CI)	P for trend
LDL cholesterol*							
<2.42	449 (56.9)	261 (33.0)	80 (10.1)	790	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	
2.43-2.84	433 (52.3)	309 (37.4)	85 (10.3)	827	1.1 (0.9-1.4)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)	
2.85-3.24	454 (52.2)	325 (37.4)	90 (10.4)	869	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	0.9 (0.7-1.3)	0.82
3.25-3.76	426 (48.0)	353 (39.8)	108 (12.2)	887	1.1 (0.7-1.2)	1.1 (0.8-1.6)	
>3.77	391 (41.9)	421 (45.1)	121 (13.0)	933	1.2 (0.7-1.1)	1.2 (0.8-1.7)	
Total cholesterol							
<4.19	432 (55.0)	259 (33.0)	94 (12.0)	785	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	
4.20-4.61	456 (54.6)	304 (36.4)	75 (9.0)	835	1.2 (0.9-1.5)	0.8 (0.5-1.1)	
4.62-5.0	434 (52.2)	306 (36.8)	91 (11.0)	831	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	0.9 (0.6-1.2)	
5.1-5.63	442 (45.7)	415 (43.0)	109 (11.3)	966	1.3 (1.0-1.7)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)	0.26
>5.64	393 (43.4)	393 (43.4)	119 (13.1)	905	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)	
TG (Triglyceride)							
<0.66	429 (48.6)	372 (42.2)	81 (9.2)	882	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	
0.67-0.86	447 (49.8)	350 (39.0)	100 (11.1)	897	0.9 (0.7-1.1)	1.2 (0.8-1.7)	
0.87-1.09	455 (54.4)	294 (35.1)	88 (10.5)	837	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.3 (0.9-1.9)	0.01
1.10-1.45	452 (53.6)	303 (35.9)	88 (10.4)	843	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	1.4 (1.0-2.0)	
>1.46	373 (43.3)	358 (41.6)	130 (15.1)	861	1.1 (0.9-1.5)	2.2 (1.5-3.2)	
HDL cholesterol							
<1.20	326 (47.5)	263 (38.3)	97 (14.1)	686	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	1.7 (1.2-2.4)	
1.21-1.40	271 (44.7)	260 (42.9)	75 (12.4)	606	1.0 (0.8-1.2)	1.2 (0.8-1.7)	
1.41-1.60	634 (53.0)	431 (36.1)	130 (10.9)	1195	1.0 (0.7-1.3)	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	0.18
1.61-1.84	443 (49.7)	356 (40.0)	92 (10.3)	891	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.1 (0.8-1.5)	
>1.85	483 (51.2)	367 (38.9)	94 (10.0)	944	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	

Number of women: with ≥ 2 children (n, reference group), nulliparous women (n^a), one child mothers (n^b), total women within category (N); *missing data within lipids on 16 cases of LDL and 2 cases of TG; ** Quintiles calculated on a total sample prior to pregnancy.

Table 3 Odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95%CI) for no and one lifetime pregnancy (reference: women with ≥ 2 pregnancies) by pre-pregnant lipid quintiles in 4 322 women in Cohort of Norway, 1994-2003. The estimates were obtained by multinomial logistic regression, presented stratified by body mass index (BMI) and adjusted for age at examination, educational level, smoking, time since last meal and oral contraceptive use.

Lipid quintiles** in mmol/l	Women with pre-pregnant BMI < 25							Women with pre-pregnant BMI ≥ 25						
	n	n ^a	n ^b	N	Nulliparous OR (95%CI)	One child mothers OR (95%CI)	p for trend	n	n ^a	n ^b	N	Nulliparous OR (95%CI)	One child mothers OR (95%CI)	p for trend
LDL cholesterol*														
<2.42	377	219	69	665	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.84	72	41	11	124	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.44
2.43-2.84	343	240	64	647	1.1 (0.9-1.5)	0.9 (0.6-1.4)		90	68	20	178	1.1 (0.6-2.1)	1.4 (0.6-3.3)	
2.85-3.24	341	216	67	624	1.0 (0.7-1.3)	0.9 (0.6-1.3)		113	109	23	245	1.5 (0.8-2.6)	1.4 (0.6-3.3)	
3.25-3.76	315	198	69	582	1.0 (0.8-1.4)	1.1 (0.7-1.6)		111	152	39	302	1.7 (1.0-3.0)	1.8 (0.8-4.0)	
>3.77	230	187	64	481	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	1.2 (0.8-1.8)		158	233	57	448	1.7 (1.0-3.0)	1.8 (0.8-3.8)	
Total cholesterol														
<4.19	359	198	75	632	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.13	73	60	19	152	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.04
4.20-4.61	341	231	57	629	1.4 (1.1-1.9)	0.8 (0.5-1.2)		115	73	17	205	0.6 (0.3-1.0)	0.7 (0.3-1.5)	
4.62-5.0	332	191	64	587	1.0 (0.7-1.3)	0.8 (0.5-1.2)		102	114	27	243	1.3 (0.8-2.2)	1.2 (0.6-2.5)	
5.1-5.63	327	244	72	643	1.3 (0.9-1.7)	0.9 (0.6-1.4)		114	167	37	318	1.5 (0.9-2.5)	1.2 (0.6-2.4)	
>5.64	248	196	66	510	1.3 (0.9-1.7)	1.0 (0.7-1.5)		143	197	53	393	1.2 (0.7-2.0)	1.2 (0.6-2.4)	
TG (Triglyceride)														
<0.66	363	311	69	743	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.04	66	59	12	137	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	<0.001
0.67-0.86	364	248	82	694	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	1.2 (0.5-2.8)		83	102	18	203	1.7 (1.0-3.0)	1.2 (0.5-2.8)	
0.87-1.09	339	208	65	612	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.3 (0.7-3.8)		115	85	23	223	1.6 (0.9-2.8)	1.7 (0.7-3.8)	
1.10-1.45	319	156	58	533	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	1.3 (0.9-4.8)		133	146	30	309	2.5 (1.5-4.4)	2.1 (0.9-4.8)	
>1.46	222	137	59	418	1.0 (0.7-1.4)	2.0 (1.7-7.4)		149	219	70	438	2.8 (1.7-4.7)	3.5 (1.6-7.4)	
HDL cholesterol														
<1.20	198	70	47	315	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.7 (1.1-2.6)	0.05	127	191	50	368	1.9 (1.2-3.0)	2.6 (1.3-5.3)	0.17
1.21-1.40	189	138	43	370	0.9 (0.7-1.1)	1.0 (0.6-1.5)		81	122	31	234	1.7 (1.0-2.8)	2.3 (1.1-4.9)	
1.41-1.60	475	287	93	855	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	1.1 (0.8-1.5)		158	143	37	338	1.4 (0.9-2.2)	1.8 (0.9-3.6)	
1.61-1.84	358	272	74	704	0.7 (0.5-1.0)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)		85	82	18	185	1.4 (0.8-2.4)	1.8 (0.8-4.0)	
>1.85	387	293	77	757	1.0 reference	1.0 reference		96	73	17	186	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	
TG/HDL-c ratio														
<0.39	374	321	70	765	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.04	67	42	10	119	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	<0.001
0.40-0.54	365	245	75	685	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	1.2 (0.8-1.7)		85	99	17	201	2.2 (1.2-4.0)	1.9 (0.7-4.9)	
0.55-0.73	365	213	71	649	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	1.2 (0.8-1.8)		101	91	22	214	2.4 (1.3-4.3)	2.2 (0.9-5.5)	
0.74-1.04	281	172	64	517	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.6 (1.1-2.4)		138	131	33	302	3.3 (1.9-5.9)	3.1 (1.3-7.4)	
>1.05	222	109	53	384	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	1.8 (1.2-2.8)		155	248	71	474	3.6 (2.1-6.1)	4.3 (1.9-10.0)	

Number of women: with ≥ 2 children (n, reference group), nulliparous women (n^a), one child mothers (n^b), total women within category (N); *missing data within lipids on 16 cases of LDL, 2 cases of TG and 2 cases of TG/HDL-c ratio; **Quintiles calculated on a total sample prior to pregnancy.




Figure 1

297x209mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2

296x209mm (300 x 300 DPI)

View only

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4, 5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6, 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6, 7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	6, 7
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	N/A
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6, 7, 8
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7, 8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	9, Figure 1
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	6, 7, 9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6, 7, 9
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	N/A
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Included – Figure 1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9, 10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9, Tables 1, 2, 3
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	9
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	9, 10, 11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	9, 10, 11
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	Tables 1, 2, 3
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	11
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	12
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	12, 13, 14, 15, 16
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	16
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	16

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Women's pre-pregnancy lipid levels and number of children: a Norwegian prospective population-based cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-021188.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Mar-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Pirnat, Aleksandra; University of Bergen, Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care De Roo, Lisa; University of Bergen, Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care Skjaerven, Rolv; University of Bergen, Dep of Global Public Health and Primary Care; Norwegian Institute of Public Health Morken, Nils-Halvdan; University of Bergen, Department of Clinical Sciences; Haukeland University Hospital, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Reproductive medicine
Keywords:	TG/HDL ratio, Maternal health, Parity, Female fertility, Pre-pregnancy lipid levels

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

only

1
2
3 **Women's pre-pregnancy lipid levels and number of children: a Norwegian prospective**
4 **population-based cohort study**
5
6
7
8
9

10 Aleksandra Pirnat^{1*}, Lisa A DeRoo¹, Rolv Skjærven^{1,2}, Nils-Halvdan Morken^{3,4}
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 ¹Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care, University of Bergen, Bergen,
20 Norway
21
22
23

24 ²Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Bergen, Norway
25
26

27 ³Department of Clinical Science, University of Bergen, Norway
28
29

30 ⁴Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Correspondence address: Po Box 7804, 5018 Bergen, Norway Tel: +47 938 24 889; E-mail:
43 pirnatdraleksandra@gmail.com
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Word count: 3509**
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objective: To study pre-pregnancy serum lipid levels and association with number of children.

Design: Prospective population-based cohort.

Setting: Linked data from Cohort of Norway and The Medical Birth Registry of Norway.

Participants: 2 645 women giving birth to their first child during 1994 - 2003 (488 one-child mothers and 2157 women with ≥ 2 births) and 1 677 nulliparous women.

Main outcome measures: Odds ratios (ORs) for no and one lifetime pregnancy (relative to ≥ 2 pregnancies) obtained by multinomial logistic regression; adjusted for age at examination, education, body mass index (BMI), smoking, time since last meal and oral contraceptive use.

Results: Assessed in quintiles, higher pre-pregnant triglyceride (TG) and triglyceride to high density lipoprotein (TG/HDL-c) ratio levels were associated with increased risk of one lifetime pregnancy compared to having ≥ 2 children. Compared to the highest quintile, women in the lowest quintile of HDL cholesterol levels had an increased risk of one lifetime pregnancy (OR 1.7 95% CI 1.2-2.4), as were women with the highest low density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles (compared to the lowest) (OR 1.2 95% CI 0.8-1.7; OR 2.2 95% CI 1.5-3.2; and OR 2.2 95% CI 1.5-3.2, respectively). Similar effects were found in women with BMI ≥ 25 and the highest LDL and total cholesterol levels in risk of lifetime nulliparity.

Conclusion: Women with unfavorable pre-pregnant lipid profile had higher risk of having no or only one child. These findings substantiate an association between pre-pregnant serum lipid

1
2
3 levels and number of children. Previously observed associations between low parity and
4
5 increased cardiovascular mortality may in part be due to preexisting cardiovascular disease
6
7 lipid risk factors.
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Key words:** Pre-pregnant lipid levels, TG/HDL ratio, maternal health, parity, female fertility.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

25
26
27
28

- 29 • Large population-based study with data collected before pregnancy.
- 30 • Linkage with the Medical Birth Registry of Norway providing complete registration of
31 total reproduction.
- 32 • Limitations include lack of data on family planning, dietary intake, duration of oral
33 contraceptive use, APOE genotype, low-grade inflammation and thyroid status.
- 34 • Non-fasting lipid measurements were used, however, adjustments in our analyses for
35 time since last meal did not change the results.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is an important public health problem and remains as the number one cause of death in women.(1) Reproductive history is important in evaluating health risks in women, as pregnancy may unmask a woman's predisposition for CVD.(1) Several studies have reported increased CVD mortality among women with no or only one lifetime pregnancy.(2, 3, 4) Efforts to elucidate the association between number of children and the risk of female CVD have been inconclusive.(1, 3) Proposed explanations are lifestyle risk factors associated with childrearing (5), sex hormone fluctuations, protective effect of future pregnancies,(3) lifestyle factors prior to conception such as elevated blood pressure and obesity (6) as well as metabolic irregularities triggered by gestation.(1) Detection of high density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol and apolipoprotein B (ApoB) in follicular fluid from oocytes (7, 8) suggests a relation between lipids and female reproductive function. More recent studies have reported associations between lipids and fertility in both sexes.(9) Low parity (as a feature of subfecundity) and cardiovascular events may share common pathophysiological mechanisms.(10)

While the role of serum lipids in cardio metabolic health is well established, showing low HDL and high triglycerides (TGs) to be strong predictors of CVD,(11) their role in reproduction is uncertain. It is also uncertain whether women with no or one lifetime pregnancy have a higher CVD risk to begin with, or whether future pregnancies may reduce the CVD risk.

1
2
3 We pursued this question by exploring the extent to which pre-pregnant serum lipid levels of
4 total, HDL and low density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio are
5 associated with having no and one lifetime pregnancy.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Population

We used linked data from Cohort of Norway (CONOR) and the Medical Birth Registry of Norway (MBRN). CONOR is a population-based collection of health data and blood samples provided by participants older than 20 years of age residing in several different regions in Norway during 1994 to 2003.⁽¹²⁾ Our subset included women with no children at the time of examination with standardized measurements of height, weight, and non-fasting lipids levels. Lifestyle factors were obtained through an extensive questionnaire that collected self-reported information on smoking, oral contraceptive (OC) use, self-reported status on receipt of social security benefits, attained level of education and various life style factors.⁽¹²⁾ Education in Norway consists of primary school (7 years), lower secondary school (3 years), upper secondary school (3 years) and higher education. The first 10 years are obligatory.

The MBRN has since 1967 recorded data on all deliveries in the country after 16th week of gestation.⁽¹³⁾ Based on mandatory notification, midwives and doctors report information using standard forms throughout pregnancy and at the time of delivery. The registry includes demographic information, mother's health prior and during pregnancy, complications in pregnancy and perinatal outcome. Using the unique national identification number given to all Norwegian citizens, each woman was linked to all her subsequent births (if any) after participating in CONOR. Women reporting no children in CONOR at the time of examination and with no valid records in the MBRN were considered having no pregnancies.

1
2 Women with baseline assessment of lifestyle factors in CONOR were linked to the MBRN.
3
4 We defined one-child mothers as women being 6 years out from their first pregnancy and with
5
6 no additional births registered in the MBRN.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 *Preconception measurements*

14
15 Non-fasting blood samples were analyzed on a Hitachi 911 Autoanalyzer (Hitachi, Mito,
16 Japan).(12) Applied reagents were from Boehringer Mannheim (Manheim, Germany). Serum
17
18 concentrations of total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol and TG were analyzed subsequent to
19
20 sampling. The total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol levels and TGs were measured by an
21
22 enzymatic method. The day-to-day coefficients of variation were 2.4% and 0.7-1.3% for total
23
24 cholesterol, HDL cholesterol and TG, respectively. To calculate LDL, we used the
25
26 Friedewald formula (14): Total serum cholesterol minus HDL cholesterol minus one fifth of
27
28 the triglyceride concentration. LDL cholesterol levels were calculated only for participants
29
30 with TG concentrations below 4.5mmol/l.(6, 14) Accordingly, TG/HDL-c ratio was expressed
31
32 as mmol/l.
33
34
35
36
37

38 Trained personnel measured height and weight with the participants wearing light clothes and
39
40 no shoes; measurements were taken as follows: - height to the nearest 1.0 cm and weight to
41
42 the nearest 0.5 kg. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kilogram/(height in
43
44 meters)².
45
46
47
48
49

50 *Patients and Public Involvement*

1
2
3 Patients or public were not directly involved in this study. The detailed explanation of the
4
5 recruitment process and the obtainment of written informed consent for CONOR was
6
7 provided elsewhere.(12)
8
9

10 11 12 13 *Statistical analyses*

14
15
16 Characteristics of the analyzed women were presented as means with standard deviations for
17
18 continuous data and as number with percentages for categorical data. Differences between
19
20 nulliparous women, one-child mothers and mothers with two or more children, as well as pre-
21
22 pregnant health status were analyzed by Chi-square tests and T tests where appropriate. Linear
23
24 associations across pre-pregnant lipid levels (in quintiles) for no and one lifetime pregnancy
25
26 were assessed by p-values for trend. Odds ratios (OR) of no and one lifetime pregnancy by
27
28 lipid levels and TG/HDL-c ratio, when compared to women with two or more pregnancies
29
30 were calculated using multinomial logistic regression and adjusted for mother's age at
31
32 examination, level of education (categorized in: <11 years and >11 years of education),
33
34 smoking (current smoker: yes, no), time since last meal, OC use (now, previously, never) and
35
36 BMI (linear term). To extend each woman's likelihood of completing her birth record, we
37
38 separately examined women who were 7 years out from their first pregnancy. About 95% of
39
40 Norwegian women will complete their second pregnancy within 7 years.(4) To test the effect
41
42 of (pre-pregnant) BMI, we stratified main analyses by BMI (<25 and \geq 25). To avoid
43
44 influence from age at first delivery on number of children, we excluded women older than 34
45
46 years at the time of first delivery in a sub analysis. Additionally, we performed sensitivity
47
48 analyses including only mothers who were 22-30 years old at the time of first delivery. Using
49
50 presence of a partner (ever) as a proxy for exposure to pregnancy among nulliparous women,
51
52 we performed logistic regression in a sub-analysis (nulliparous vs. women with \geq 2 births)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 including only women with a reported partner (ever). All analyses were performed using The
4 Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 22.0 and 23.0, Chicago, Illinois).
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Results**

23
24
25
26
27
28 There were 4 743 women with baseline assessment of lifestyle factors in CONOR (1994-
29 2003) that were linked to the MBRN. We excluded 421 women with pregnancy at the time of
30 examination (n =139), unsure pregnancy status (n =157) and missing lipid assessments (n
31 =125). Thus, 4 322 women were included in the analyses (1 677 nulliparous, 488 one-child
32 mothers and 2 157 women with ≥ 2 births, see Figure 1). Sub-analyses included only women
33 with reported partners (228 nulliparous and 216 mothers with ≥ 2 births).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Characteristics of the included women are given in Table 1. Nulliparous women were older at
46 the time of examination, had higher BMI and were more frequent smokers compared to
47 women with two or more births. A higher proportion of nulliparous women had >11 years of
48 education. One-child mothers had higher mean age both at examination and at delivery (29.5
49 vs. 26.7 and 32.3 vs. 29.9, respectively), were more often smokers and had lower education
50 than mothers with ≥ 2 births. The mean BMI prior to pregnancy was higher in one-child
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mothers (24.2 vs. 23.5), whereas mean years from examination to first delivery were similar
4
5 for the two groups. Women with no and one child were less frequent users of OCs at the time
6
7 of examination compared to mothers with ≥ 2 births (27.4%, 34.6% and 48.9%, respectively).
8

9
10 The proportion of diabetes at first delivery in one-child mothers was higher than in women
11
12 with two or more births (1.4% versus 0.9%, $p=0.30$). Polycystic Ovary Syndrome (PCOS)
13
14 was rare and we only had three cases in our material. A significantly higher number of one-
15
16 child mothers had in-vitro fertilization (IVF) in their first pregnancy (7.2% versus 2.6% in
17
18 women with ≥ 2 births, $p< 0.001$) (data not shown). This latter finding remained after
19
20 excluding mothers older than 34 years at first delivery.
21

22
23 OR's with 95% CI's for no and one lifetime pregnancy (vs. ≥ 2 lifetime pregnancies) by lipid
24
25 levels (in quintiles) are presented in Table 2 and Figure 2. Significant trends in ORs for one
26
27 lifetime pregnancy across TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles were observed (p trend = 0.01).
28
29 OR for having one lifetime pregnancy for women with the highest TG quintile compared to
30
31 the lowest quintile was 2.2 (95% CI 1.5-3.2). ORs for having one lifetime pregnancy for
32
33 women with TG/HDL-c ratio levels in the two highest quintiles were 1.7 (95% CI 1.2-2.5)
34
35 and 2.2 (95% CI 1.5-3.2), respectively, compared to the lowest quintile. There were no
36
37 significant trends for LDL cholesterol, total cholesterol or HDL cholesterol, although ORs of
38
39 one lifetime pregnancy for the lowest HDL quintile were 1.7 (95% CI 1.2-2.4) and for the
40
41 highest LDL quintile 1.2 (95% CI 0.8-1.7). We found no increased risk of being nulliparous
42
43 by serum lipid levels except for the highest LDL and total cholesterol levels and these
44
45 estimates were not persuasive (ORs 1.2 [95% CI 0.9-1.6] and 1.2 [95% CI 0.9-1.5],
46
47 respectively). Truncation of data to extend the time for each woman to complete her birth
48
49 record (to 7 years) did not appreciably alter the results, neither did exclusion of women older
50
51 than 34 years at the time of first delivery nor the additional restriction of our analyses to
52
53 mothers aged 22-30 years at first pregnancy. The similar effects of pre-pregnant lipids as in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 one child mothers were observed when sub analysis (nulliparous vs. ≥ 2 births) were
4 performed on women who had a partner (as a proxy for ever being exposed to pregnancy). For
5 women with partner, the risk of having no children was increased among the women in the
6
7 highest quintiles of TG and TH/HDL-c ratio (compared to the lowest quintiles) and also for
8
9 those in the lowest HDL quintile (compared to the highest) (OR 1.9, 95% CI 0.9-4.2; OR 2.0,
10
11 95% CI 1.0-4.1; and OR 1.6, 95% CI 0.7-3.6, respectively).
12
13
14
15

16
17
18
19 Stratified analyses by BMI are presented in Table 3. In women with BMI ≥ 25 there were
20
21 significant trends in ORs of having no children or one child across increasing levels of pre-
22
23 pregnant total cholesterol, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles (p trend= 0.04 and < 0.001 ,
24
25 respectively). The adjusted ORs of one lifetime pregnancy for women with BMI ≥ 25 and TG
26
27 levels in the two highest quintiles were 2.1 (95% CI 0.9-4.8) and 3.5 (95% CI 1.6-7.4) and for
28
29 the two highest TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles 3.1 (95% CI 1.3-7.4) and 4.3 (95% CI 1.9-10.0)
30
31 compared to women in the lowest respective quintile. The risk of one lifetime pregnancy was
32
33 also significantly increased for women with BMI ≥ 25 and the highest LDL and total
34
35 cholesterol as well as the lowest HDL quintiles (ORs 1.8 [95% CI 0.8-3.8]; 1.2 [95% CI 0.6-
36
37 2.4] and 2.6 [95% CI 1.3-5.3], respectively). Similarly, ORs of having no pregnancy (in
38
39 women with BMI ≥ 25) were 1.7 (95% CI 1.0-3.0), 2.8 (95% CI 1.7-4.7) and 3.6 (95% CI 2.1-
40
41 6.1) for women with the highest LDL, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles, respectively,
42
43 compared to women with the lowest quintile. Increased risk of having no children was also
44
45 found for the overweight and obese women with the lowest HDL quintile (OR 1.9, 95%CI
46
47 1.2-3.0). Unlike in one-child mothers, risk of having no pregnancy among overweight and
48
49 obese women with higher total cholesterol levels only slightly changed from the main results.
50
51 In women with pre-pregnant BMI < 25 , there were significant trends in risk of having one
52
53 lifetime pregnancy across increasing levels of pre-pregnant TG (p trend=0.04), TG/HDL-c
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ratio (p trend=0.04) and HDL quintiles (p trend=0.05). There were increased risks of one
4 lifetime pregnancy in the highest TG quintile (OR 1.9, 95% CI 1.2-3.0) and the two highest
5 TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles (OR 1.6, 95% CI 1.0-2.4 and 1.8, 95% CI 1.2-2.8, respectively), as
6 well as the lowest HDL quintile (OR: 1.7, 95% CI: 1.1-2.6). Risks of no and one lifetime
7 pregnancy with higher LDL and total cholesterol levels only slightly changed compared to our
8 main results.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Discussion**

23
24
25
26
27
28 Pre-pregnant lipid levels were associated with having one lifetime pregnancy. Women with
29 high levels of LDL, TG and TG/HDL-c ratio as well as low HDL levels, measured years
30 before conception, were at increased risk of having only one lifetime pregnancy. High levels
31 of LDL and total cholesterol were associated with having no children, while in overweight
32 and obese women this was true for all the lipids examined.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 These findings provide a possible biological underpinning for a joint mechanistic pathway for
44 reduced fertility and cardiovascular conditions.(10) Our study suggests that the previously
45 observed association between low parity and increased CVD risk may be confounded by
46 preexisting adverse lipid levels. This does not support the hypothesis that having additional
47 pregnancies reduces CVD risk.(3) Rather, unfavorable lipid profiles may be related to both
48 subfertility and later cardiovascular disease.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 There is a lack of studies evaluating the relation between preconception lipid levels and
7
8 fertility in women. The LIFE study found concentrations of free cholesterol to be associated
9
10 with fecundity in both sexes.(9) In contrast to our study, TGs and total cholesterol were not
11
12 found to be significant in individual and couple-based adjusted models (as well as two other
13
14 measured lipid components: phospholipids and total lipids), however, authors used different
15
16 study design and lipid measurement methods. In accordance with our findings is the
17
18 Framingham Heart Study, which detected a trend towards TG elevation and lower HDL serum
19
20 levels among women with self-reported infertility (as not achieving pregnancy for ≥ 1
21
22 year).(15) The presence of HDL cholesterol and ApoB in follicular fluid from human oocytes,
23
24 suggests that these lipids play a direct role in reproduction.(7, 8, 16) Previous animal studies
25
26 have reported association between dyslipidemia and infertility.(17) Posed explanations have
27
28 been that abnormalities in HDL metabolism including change in structure, concentration or
29
30 function compromise female fertility.(7, 8, 16) It has been suggested that genetic
31
32 polymorphisms that alter function in proteins engaged in cholesterol metabolism may affect
33
34 human fertility.(18, 19) One of the possible molecular mechanisms could be through a
35
36 mediating role of HDL on Paraoxonase 1 (PON1) activity. Paraoxonase (PON) is an HDL-
37
38 associated enzyme that inhibits LDL oxidation, and thus protects cells from oxidative
39
40 stress.(20) Its stability and binding affinity is strongly influenced by changes in shape and size
41
42 of HDL particles.(21) These changes may lead to decreased antioxidative capacity and
43
44 consecutively – oxidative stress. Oxidative stress is associated with adverse cardiovascular
45
46 and fertility outcomes, including atherosclerosis, PCOS, preeclampsia, endometriosis and
47
48 infertility .(19, 22) A recent study in women of reproductive age with upper normal ranges of
49
50 thyroid-stimulating hormone has suggested a direct link between unfavorable lipid profile and
51
52 increased oxidative membrane damage.(23)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Recent insights suggest TG/HDL-c ratio to be a reliable marker of insulin resistance and
4 atherogenicity,(24) highlighting its ability to identify insulin resistance in apparently healthy
5 individuals.(25) Observed higher levels of TG/HDL-c ratio in our study are indicative of
6 possible preexisting metabolic risk factors among women with one lifetime pregnancy, as
7 well as subpopulation of nulliparous women (overweight, obese and with reported partners –
8 as a proxy for exposed to pregnancy). This is also consistent with increasing rates of infertility
9 in both sexes among population with metabolic syndrome.(9) The higher proportion of
10 diabetes in this group of women further supports this notion. In agreement, the Japan Nurses
11 Health study reported significant increase in risk of diabetes in young nulliparous women
12 (<45 years of age) with ovarian infertility.(26) Accordingly, the Framingham Heart Study
13 found infertile premenopausal women to have increased odds of diabetes and obesity.(15)
14 Given the accompanying metabolic irregularities among major causes of female
15 infertility,(15, 27) substantially higher proportion of IVF treatment among one-child mothers
16 indirectly supports metabolic implications. The latter finding remains after exclusion of
17 women older than 34 years at the time of first delivery.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Dyslipidemia is associated with PCOS (28, 29, 30). However, we only identified 3 women
with PCOS in our study sample. Thus, presence of subclinical forms or underreporting may be
present.

In accordance with the literature,(27, 31) risk of having no and only one child showed strong
effects in overweight and obese women ($BMI \geq 25$) in stratified analyses (Table 3).

Nevertheless, the higher risk of having only one child remained in normal weight women
($BMI < 25$) with the lowest HDL quintile and the highest TG and TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles.

These findings mirror observations from the literature of metabolic irregularities among
normal weight women as independent risk factor for future fertility impairments.(32, 33) The

1
2
3 Life Study reported both female and male lipid concentrations to affect fecundity, irrespective
4
5 of their BMI.(9)
6
7
8
9

10 Compared to women with two or more pregnancies, total cholesterol levels above clinically
11 recommended range were associated with risk of having no children, irrespective of BMI. The
12 Life Study reported a higher percentage of women with a history of irregular menstrual cycles
13 in the highest quartile of free cholesterol.(9) The Japan Nurses Health Study found women
14 with ovarian infertility to be at high risk of hypercholesterolemia.(26) In our study, total
15 cholesterol levels were not associated with risk of having one lifetime pregnancy, except
16 among overweight and obese women. This could suggest that total cholesterol levels play
17 varied roles in different subfecundity or infertility sub-types. In addition, nulliparous women
18 in our study were older at examination and had higher BMI. Both age and obesity are
19 associated with systemic oxidative stress.(19, 22) It is possible that in such physiologic
20 environment clinically abnormal levels of certain lipids might activate additional pathologic
21 processes that adversely affect reproductive function.(28)
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 In our study, women with one lifetime pregnancy had poorer lifestyle factors (BMI, smoking),
42 were older and less educated. Lower mean education among one-child mothers is in
43 agreement with a Nordic demographic study,(34) which shows that later onset of childbearing
44 is related to lower number of children finally born in women with low education. Given that
45 educational level and occupation are key indicators of socioeconomic status,(35) observed
46 lower parity among women with low education could also reflect unfavorable socioeconomic
47 position as a limiting factor to further pregnancies. However, a study exploring age at first
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 birth, parity and post-reproductive mortality suggests that late childbearing in itself may be a
4
5 signal of preexisting poor health of a woman.(36)
6
7
8
9

10
11 The observed risk differences between nulliparous women and one-child mothers in our main
12
13 results (Figure 2, Table 2) could be explained by heterogeneity of causes for childlessness
14
15 among nulliparous women in this cohort. The risk may, therefore, be diluted by low risk
16
17 groups of women who are voluntary childless (37) or have not been exposed to pregnancy
18
19 (ever). Given the lack of information on women's reproductive planning in our data, we tried
20
21 to address this in a sub analysis including only women with reported partner (ever) as a proxy
22
23 for being exposed to pregnancy. Here we found that the results for nulliparous women were
24
25 similar to our main results for one-child mothers. Women with reported partner had higher
26
27 risk of having no children (compared to partnered women with ≥ 2 births) if their TG and
28
29 TG/HDL-c ratio levels were in the highest quintiles and HDL in the lowest quintile (OR 1.9,
30
31 0.9-4.2; OR 2.0, 95% CI 1.0-4.1; and OR 1.6, 95% CI 0.7-3.6, respectively). These findings
32
33 support the role of serum lipids in lifetime nulliparity among women with partners.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Strengths and limitations*

41
42
43 Our subset of women was from a large population-based health study with pre-pregnant
44
45 health data. Linked data from the MBRN provided complete registration of total reproduction.
46
47 The prospective design minimized the potential for bias. A weakness is that blood sampling
48
49 was performed in non-fasting state. Studies show that TG levels are sensitive to recent food
50
51 intake, while cholesterol levels seem to be less affected.(38) We addressed this by adjusting
52
53 our analyses for time since last meal and the main results were unchanged, suggesting that
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 non-fasting lipids are not likely to introduce a systematic bias. Non-fasting lipids have
3
4 successfully been used in lipid and CVD research.(9, 39, 40)
5
6

7
8 The study lacked data on Apolipoprotein E genotype, CRP and thyroid tests/thyroid
9
10 antibodies, factors that all are found to affect female fertility.(23, 41) No assessments of
11
12 duration or temporal proximity of OC use, dietary intake or stress were available, therefore
13
14 unmeasured confounding cannot be ruled out. Smoking adversely influences female
15
16 fertility,(42) with most of its effect attributed to HDL cholesterol decrease.(43) We accounted
17
18 for this in our analyses; however, smoking status of participants was only available at
19
20 enrollment. The ethnic homogeneity of the included women may reduce generalizability of
21
22 our findings.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Unfavorable pre-pregnant lipid levels were associated with having no and one lifetime
30
31 pregnancy. Women's metabolic homeostasis is important for reproduction and also has cardio
32
33 metabolic implications.(32, 44) Preexisting poor lipid and metabolic profiles could represent
34
35 one of the possible linkages between previously observed reduced fertility and later
36
37 cardiovascular disease.
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Acknowledgments.**

44
45
46 We thank Allen Wilcox for his valuable comments on this paper.
47
48

49 **Contributors**

50
51
52 All authors had full access to the data and are responsible for the integrity of the data. AP, RS,
53
54 LD and NHM designed the study. AP and NHM conducted the analyses; NHM created the
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 figure and AP created the tables and the flow chart. AP drafted the manuscript. NHM, RS and
4
5 LD reviewed the preliminary analyses and initial draft and provided critical comments.
6
7

8 **Funding**

9
10
11 This work was supported by the Norwegian Association for Public Health with a doctoral
12
13 scholarship to AP. The Norwegian Association for Public Health had no role in the design and
14
15 conduct of the study; in the collection, analysis, the interpretation of the data; or in the
16
17 preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Competing interest statement**

25
26
27 None declared. All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at
28
29 http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding
30
31 author).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Ethical approval**

39
40 The study was approved by the regional ethical review board REK-Vest (Ref number
41
42 2013/118) and access to data was granted by the Steering Committee for CONOR and by the
43
44 MBRN.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Data sharing statement**

51
52
53 This data set contains personal data and cannot be made public due to confidentiality
54
55 requirements according to Norwegian legislations. Researchers who are interested in
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 analyzing data from CONOR or the MBRN may apply to the appropriate organizations after
4
5 having obtained all necessary approvals according to Norwegian legislations.
6
7
8
9

10 **Figure Legends**

11 **Figure 1**

12
13
14
15
16 Norwegian women examined in Cohort of Norway (CONOR) before conception of their first
17 pregnancy and with linked data from the Medical Birth Registry of Norway (MBRN).
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Figure 2**

25
26
27 Odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95%CI) for no and one lifetime pregnancy
28 (reference: women with ≥ 2 pregnancies) by TG/HDL-c ratio quintiles in 4 322 women in
29 Cohort of Norway, 1994-2003. The estimates were obtained by multinomial logistic
30 regression and adjusted for age at examination, educational level, smoking, time since last
31 meal, oral contraceptive use and body mass index (linear term).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Sanghavi M, Kulinski J, Ayers CR, et al. Association between number of live births and markers of subclinical atherosclerosis: The Dallas Heart Study. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2016;23:391-399.
2. Grundy E, Kravdal O. Reproductive history and mortality in late middle age among Norwegian men and women. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008;167:271-279.
3. Lv H, Wu H, Yin J, et al. Parity and Cardiovascular Disease Mortality: a Dose-Response Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies. *Sci Rep* 2015;5:13411.
4. Skjaerven R, Wilcox AJ, Klungsoyr K, et al. Cardiovascular mortality after pre-eclampsia in one child mothers: prospective, population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2012;345:e7677.
5. Lawlor DA, Emberson JR, Ebrahim S, et al. Is the association between parity and coronary heart disease due to biological effects of pregnancy or adverse lifestyle risk factors associated with child-rearing? Findings from the British Women's Heart and Health Study and the British Regional Heart Study. *Circulation* 2003;107:1260-1264.
6. Magnussen EB, Vatten LJ, Lund-Nilsen TI, et al. Prepregnancy cardiovascular risk factors as predictors of pre-eclampsia: population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2007;335:978-81.
7. Gautier T, Becker S, Drouineaud V, et al. Human luteinized granulosa cells secrete apoB100-containing lipoproteins. *J Lipid Res* 2010;51:2245-2252.
8. Von Wald T, Monisova Y, Hacker MR, et al. Age-related variations in follicular apolipoproteins may influence human oocyte maturation and fertility potential. *Fertil Steril* 2010;93:2354-2361.
9. Schisterman EF, Mumford SL, Browne RW, et al. Lipid concentrations and couple fecundity: the LIFE study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2014;99: 2786-2794.

10. Parikh NI, Cnattingius S, Mittleman MA, et al. Subfertility and risk of later life maternal cardiovascular disease. *Human reproduction* 2012;27:568-575.
11. Abdel-Maksoud MF, Eckel RH, Hamman RF, et al. Risk of coronary heart disease is associated with triglycerides and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol in women and non-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol in men. *J Clin Lipidol* 2012;6:374-381.
12. Naess O, Sogaard AJ, Arnesen E, et al. Cohort profile: cohort of Norway (CONOR). *Int J Epidemiol* 2008;37:481-485.
13. Irgens LM. The Medical Birth Registry of Norway. Epidemiological research and surveillance throughout 30 years. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* 2000;79:435-439.
14. Friedewald WT, Levy RI, Fredrickson DS. Estimation of the concentration of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol in plasma, without use of the preparative ultracentrifuge. *Clin Chem* 1972;18:499-502.
15. Mahalingaiah S, Sun F, Cheng JJ, et al. Cardiovascular risk factors among women with self-reported infertility. *Fertil Res Pract* 2017;11;3:7.
16. Miettinen HE, Rayburn H, Krieger M. Abnormal lipoprotein metabolism and reversible female infertility in HDL receptor (SR-BI)-deficient mice. *J Clin Invest* 2001;108:1717-1722.
17. Lobaccaro JM, Gallot D, Lumbroso S, et al. Liver X Receptors and female reproduction: when cholesterol meets fertility! *J Endocrinol Invest* 2013;36:55-60.
18. DeAngelis AM, Roy-O'Reilly M, Rodriguez A. Genetic alterations affecting cholesterol metabolism and human fertility. *Biol Reprod* 2014;91:117.
19. Gupta S, Ghulmiyyah J, Sharma R, et al. Power of proteomics in linking oxidative stress and female infertility. *Biomed Res Int* 2014;2014:916212.
20. 1. Lazaros, L, Markoula, S, Kkyritsis, A, et al. Paraoxonase gene polymorphisms and stroke severity. *Eur J Neurol* 2010;17:757-759.

- 1
2
3 21. 2. Bhattacharyya T, Nicholls S, Topol E. Relationship of Paraoxonase 1 (PON1) Gene
4 Polymorphisms and Functional Activity With Systemic Oxidative Stress and Cardiovascular
5 Risk. *JAMA* 2008;299:1265-1276.
6
7
8
9 22. 3. Agarwal A, Gupta S, Sharma RK. Role of oxidative stress in female reproduction.
10
11 *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2005;14;3:28.
12
13
14 23. Karbownik-Lewinska M, Marcinkowska M, Stepniak J, et al. TSH ≥ 2.5 mIU/l is
15 Associated with the Increased Oxidative Damage to Membrane Lipids in Women of
16 Childbearing Age with Normal Thyroid Tests. *Horm Metab Res* 2017;49:321-326.
17
18
19 24. Dobiasova M, Frohlich J. The plasma parameter log (TG/HDL-C) as an atherogenic
20 index: correlation with lipoprotein particle size and esterification rate in apoB-lipoprotein-
21 depleted plasma (FER(HDL)). *Clin Biochem* 2001;34:583-588.
22
23
24
25 25. Salazar MR, Carbajal HA, Espeche WG, et al. Identification of cardiometabolic risk:
26 visceral adiposity index versus triglyceride/HDL cholesterol ratio. *Am J Med* 2014;127:152-
27 157.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 26. Kurabayashi T, Mizunuma H, Kubota T, et al. Ovarian infertility is associated with
35 cardiovascular disease risk factors in later life: A Japanese cross-sectional study. *Maturitas*
36 2016;83:33-9.
37
38
39
40
41 27. Luke B. Adverse effects of female obesity and interaction with race on reproductive
42 potential. *Fertil Steril* 2017;107:868-877.
43
44
45
46 28. Pugh SJ, Schisterman EF, Browne RW, et al. Preconception maternal lipoprotein levels in
47 relation to fecundability. *Hum Reprod* 2017;1;32:1055-1063.
48
49
50
51 29. Kiranmayee D, Kavya K, Himabindu Y, et al. Correlations Between Anthropometry and
52 Lipid Profile in Women With PCOS. *J Hum Reprod Sci* 2017;10:167-172.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 30. Palomba S, Falbo A, Chiossi G, et al. Lipid profile in nonobese pregnant women with
4 polycystic ovary syndrome: a prospective controlled clinical study. *Steroids* 2014;88:36-43.
5
6
7 31. van der Steeg JW, Steures P, Eijkemans MJ, et al. Obesity affects spontaneous pregnancy
8 chances in subfertile, ovulatory women. *Hum Reprod* 2008;23:324-8.
9
10
11 32. Liu LX, Arany Z. Maternal cardiac metabolism in pregnancy. *Cardiovasc Res* 2014;101:
12 545-553.
13
14
15 33. Primeau V, Coderre L, Karelis AD, et al. Characterizing the profile of obese patients who
16 are metabolically healthy. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2011;35:971-981.
17
18
19 34. Andersson G, Knudsen LB, Neyer G, et al. Cohort fertility patterns in The Nordic
20 countries. *Demographic Research; Rostock* 2009;20:313-352.
21
22
23 35. Halland F, Morken NH, DeRoo LA, et al. Association of women's reproductive history
24 with long-term mortality and effect of socioeconomic factors. *Obstet Gynecol* 2015;126:1181-
25 7.
26
27
28 36. Spence NJ, Eberstein IW. Age at first birth, parity, and post-reproductive mortality among
29 white and black women in the US, 1982-2002. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;68:1625-32.
30
31
32 37. Magnus MC, Iliodromiti S, Lawlor DA, et al. Number of Offspring and Cardiovascular
33 Disease Risk in Men and Women: The Role of Shared Lifestyle Characteristics. *Epidemiology*
34 2017;28:880-888.
35
36
37 38. Craig SR, Amin RV, Russell DW, et al. Blood cholesterol screening influence of fasting
38 state on cholesterol results and management decisions. *J Gen Intern Med* 2000;15:395-399.
39
40
41 39. Egeland GM, Klungsoyr K, Oyen N, et al. Preconception Cardiovascular Risk Factor
42 Differences Between Gestational Hypertension and Preeclampsia: Cohort Norway Study.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 40. Nordestgaard BG, Benn M, Schnohr P, et al. Nonfasting tri- glycerides and risk of
4 myocardial infarction, ischemic heart disease, and death in men and women. *JAMA*
5 2007;298:299–308.
6
7
8
9 41. Sjaarda LA, Radin RG, Swanson C, et al. Prevalence and Contributors to Low-grade
10 Inflammation in Three U.S. Populations of Reproductive Age Women. *Paediatr Perinat*
11 *Epidemiol* 2018;32:55-67.
12
13
14
15 42. Baird DD, Wilcox AJ. Cigarette smoking associated with delayed conception. *JAMA*
16 1985;253:2979-2983.
17
18
19
20 43. Maeda K, Noguchi Y, Fukui T. The effects of cessation from cigarette smoking on the
21 lipid and lipoprotein profiles: a meta-analysis. *Prev Med* 2003;37:283-290.
22
23
24
25 44. Cardozo E, Pavone ME, Hirshfeld-Cytron JE. Metabolic syndrome and oocyte quality.
26 *Trends Endocrinol Metab* 2011;22:103-109.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Table 1 Characteristics of 4 322 Norwegian women in Cohort of Norway, 1994-2003 with: no, one or ≥ 2 children. Values are numbers (percentages) unless stated otherwise.

Mean values	1 677 no child	488 one child	2 157 ≥ 2 children
Age (SD) at examination	30.5 (2.1)	29.5 (5.2)	26.7 (4.0)
Age (SD) at first delivery	-	32.3 (4.9)	29.9 (3.8)
Years (SD)-examination to first pregnancy	-	3.7 (2.1)	4.1 (2.3)
Body mass index (SD) at examination*	24.8 (5.1)	24.2(4.5)	23.5 (3.4)
Oral contraceptive use*			
now	455 (27.4)	168 (34.6)	1047 (48.9)
previously	724 (43.5)	239 (49.2)	779 (36.4)
never	484 (29.1)	79 (16.3)	317 (14.8)
Smoking at examination*			
yes	537 (32.2)	182 (37.4)	462 (21.5)
no	1 132 (67.8)	304 (62.6)	1 685 (78.5)
Education*			
<11 years	312 (18.8)	127 (26.3)	300 (14.1)
≥ 11 years	1 344 (81.2)	356 (73.7)	1 834 (85.9)

SD = standard deviation; * missing data on smoking: 8 nulliparous, 2 one child mothers and 10 women with ≥ 2 children.; education: 21 nulliparous, 5 one child mothers and 23 women with ≥ 2 children; BMI: 10 nulliparous; OC use: 4 nulliparous, 2 one child mothers and 14 women with ≥ 2 children.

Table 2 Odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95%CI) for no and one lifetime pregnancy (reference: women with ≥ 2 pregnancies) by pre-pregnant lipid quintiles in 4 322 women in Cohort of Norway, 1994-2003. The estimates were obtained by multinomial logistic regression and adjusted for age at examination, educational level, smoking, time since last meal, oral contraceptive use and body mass index (linear term).

Lipid quintiles ** in mmol/l	n (%)	n ^a (%)	n ^b (%)	N	Nulliparous OR (95%CI)	One child mothers OR (95%CI)	P for trend
LDL cholesterol*							
<2.42	449 (56.9)	261 (33.0)	80 (10.1)	790	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	
2.43-2.84	433 (52.3)	309 (37.4)	85 (10.3)	827	1.1 (0.9-1.4)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)	
2.85-3.24	454 (52.2)	325 (37.4)	90 (10.4)	869	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	0.9 (0.7-1.3)	0.82
3.25-3.76	426 (48.0)	353 (39.8)	108 (12.2)	887	1.1 (0.7-1.2)	1.1 (0.8-1.6)	
>3.77	391 (41.9)	421 (45.1)	121 (13.0)	933	1.2 (0.7-1.1)	1.2 (0.8-1.7)	
Total cholesterol							
<4.19	432 (55.0)	259 (33.0)	94 (12.0)	785	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	
4.20-4.61	456 (54.6)	304 (36.4)	75 (9.0)	835	1.2 (0.9-1.5)	0.8 (0.5-1.1)	
4.62-5.0	434 (52.2)	306 (36.8)	91 (11.0)	831	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	0.9 (0.6-1.2)	
5.1-5.63	442 (45.7)	415 (43.0)	109 (11.3)	966	1.3 (1.0-1.7)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)	0.26
>5.64	393 (43.4)	393 (43.4)	119 (13.1)	905	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)	
TG (Triglyceride)							
<0.66	429 (48.6)	372 (42.2)	81 (9.2)	882	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	
0.67-0.86	447 (49.8)	350 (39.0)	100 (11.1)	897	0.9 (0.7-1.1)	1.2 (0.8-1.7)	
0.87-1.09	455 (54.4)	294 (35.1)	88 (10.5)	837	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.3 (0.9-1.9)	0.01
1.10-1.45	452 (53.6)	303 (35.9)	88 (10.4)	843	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	1.4 (1.0-2.0)	
>1.46	373 (43.3)	358 (41.6)	130 (15.1)	861	1.1 (0.9-1.5)	2.2 (1.5-3.2)	
HDL cholesterol							
<1.20	326 (47.5)	263 (38.3)	97 (14.1)	686	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	1.7 (1.2-2.4)	
1.21-1.40	271 (44.7)	260 (42.9)	75 (12.4)	606	1.0 (0.8-1.2)	1.2 (0.8-1.7)	
1.41-1.60	634 (53.0)	431 (36.1)	130 (10.9)	1195	1.0 (0.7-1.3)	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	0.18
1.61-1.84	443 (49.7)	356 (40.0)	92 (10.3)	891	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.1 (0.8-1.5)	
>1.85	483 (51.2)	367 (38.9)	94 (10.0)	944	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	

Number of women: with ≥ 2 children (n, reference group), nulliparous women (n^a), one child mothers (n^b), total women within category (N); *missing data within lipids on 16 cases of LDL and 2 cases of TG; ** Quintiles calculated on a total sample prior to pregnancy.

Table 3 Odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95%CI) for no and one lifetime pregnancy (reference: women with ≥ 2 pregnancies) by pre-pregnant lipid quintiles in 4 322 women in Cohort of Norway, 1994-2003. The estimates were obtained by multinomial logistic regression, presented stratified by body mass index (BMI) and adjusted for age at examination, educational level, smoking, time since last meal and oral contraceptive use.

Lipid quintiles** in mmol/l	Women with pre-pregnant BMI < 25							Women with pre-pregnant BMI ≥ 25						
	n	n ^a	n ^b	N	Nulliparous OR (95%CI)	One child mothers OR (95%CI)	p for trend	n	n ^a	n ^b	N	Nulliparous OR (95%CI)	One child mothers OR (95%CI)	p for trend
LDL cholesterol*														
<2.42	377	219	69	665	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.84	72	41	11	124	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.44
2.43-2.84	343	240	64	647	1.1 (0.9-1.5)	0.9 (0.6-1.4)		90	68	20	178	1.1 (0.6-2.1)	1.4 (0.6-3.3)	
2.85-3.24	341	216	67	624	1.0 (0.7-1.3)	0.9 (0.6-1.3)		113	109	23	245	1.5 (0.8-2.6)	1.4 (0.6-3.3)	
3.25-3.76	315	198	69	582	1.0 (0.8-1.4)	1.1 (0.7-1.6)		111	152	39	302	1.7 (1.0-3.0)	1.8 (0.8-4.0)	
>3.77	230	187	64	481	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	1.2 (0.8-1.8)		158	233	57	448	1.7 (1.0-3.0)	1.8 (0.8-3.8)	
Total cholesterol														
<4.19	359	198	75	632	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.13	73	60	19	152	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.04
4.20-4.61	341	231	57	629	1.4 (1.1-1.9)	0.8 (0.5-1.2)		115	73	17	205	0.6 (0.3-1.0)	0.7 (0.3-1.5)	
4.62-5.0	332	191	64	587	1.0 (0.7-1.3)	0.8 (0.5-1.2)		102	114	27	243	1.3 (0.8-2.2)	1.2 (0.6-2.5)	
5.1-5.63	327	244	72	643	1.3 (0.9-1.7)	0.9 (0.6-1.4)		114	167	37	318	1.5 (0.9-2.5)	1.2 (0.6-2.4)	
>5.64	248	196	66	510	1.3 (0.9-1.7)	1.0 (0.7-1.5)		143	197	53	393	1.2 (0.7-2.0)	1.2 (0.6-2.4)	
TG (Triglyceride)														
<0.66	363	311	69	743	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.04	66	59	12	137	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	<0.001
0.67-0.86	364	248	82	694	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	1.2 (0.5-2.8)		83	102	18	203	1.7 (1.0-3.0)	1.2 (0.5-2.8)	
0.87-1.09	339	208	65	612	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.3 (0.7-3.8)		115	85	23	223	1.6 (0.9-2.8)	1.7 (0.7-3.8)	
1.10-1.45	319	156	58	533	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	1.3 (0.9-4.8)		133	146	30	309	2.5 (1.5-4.4)	2.1 (0.9-4.8)	
>1.46	222	137	59	418	1.0 (0.7-1.4)	2.0 (1.7-7.4)		149	219	70	438	2.8 (1.7-4.7)	3.5 (1.6-7.4)	
HDL cholesterol														
<1.20	198	70	47	315	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.7 (1.1-2.6)	0.05	127	191	50	368	1.9 (1.2-3.0)	2.6 (1.3-5.3)	0.17
1.21-1.40	189	138	43	370	0.9 (0.7-1.1)	1.0 (0.6-1.5)		81	122	31	234	1.7 (1.0-2.8)	2.3 (1.1-4.9)	
1.41-1.60	475	287	93	855	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	1.1 (0.8-1.5)		158	143	37	338	1.4 (0.9-2.2)	1.8 (0.9-3.6)	
1.61-1.84	358	272	74	704	0.7 (0.5-1.0)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)		85	82	18	185	1.4 (0.8-2.4)	1.8 (0.8-4.0)	
>1.85	387	293	77	757	1.0 reference	1.0 reference		96	73	17	186	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	
TG/HDL-c ratio														
<0.39	374	321	70	765	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	0.04	67	42	10	119	1.0 reference	1.0 reference	<0.001
0.40-0.54	365	245	75	685	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	1.2 (0.8-1.7)		85	99	17	201	2.2 (1.2-4.0)	1.9 (0.7-4.9)	
0.55-0.73	365	213	71	649	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	1.2 (0.8-1.8)		101	91	22	214	2.4 (1.3-4.3)	2.2 (0.9-5.5)	
0.74-1.04	281	172	64	517	0.9 (0.7-1.2)	1.6 (1.1-2.4)		138	131	33	302	3.3 (1.9-5.9)	3.1 (1.3-7.4)	
>1.05	222	109	53	384	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	1.8 (1.2-2.8)		155	248	71	474	3.6 (2.1-6.1)	4.3 (1.9-10.0)	

Number of women: with ≥ 2 children (n, reference group), nulliparous women (n^a), one child mothers (n^b), total women within category (N); *missing data within lipids on 16 cases of LDL, 2 cases of TG and 2 cases of TG/HDL-c ratio; **Quintiles calculated on a total sample prior to pregnancy.




Figure 1

297x209mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2

296x209mm (300 x 300 DPI)

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4, 5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6, 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6, 7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	6, 7
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	N/A
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6, 7, 8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7, 8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	9, Figure 1
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	6, 7, 9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6, 7, 9
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	N/A
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Included – Figure 1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9, 10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9, Tables 1, 2, 3
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	9
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	9, 10, 11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	9, 10, 11
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	Tables 1, 2, 3
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	11
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	12
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	12, 13, 14, 15, 16
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	16
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	16

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.