

Body mass index and subfertility: multivariable regression and Mendelian randomization analyses in the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study

Álvaro Hernáez^{1,2,3,*}, Tormod Rogne^{4,5,6}, Karoline H. Skåra¹, Siri E. Håberg¹, Christian M. Page^{1,7}, Abigail Fraser^{8,9,10}, Stephen Burgess^{11,12}, Deborah A. Lawlor^{8,9,10}, Maria Christine Magnus^{1,8,9}

1. Centre for Fertility and Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway.
2. Consorcio CIBER, M.P. Fisiopatología de la Obesidad y Nutrición (CIBEROBN), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain.
3. Blanquerna School of Health Sciences, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona, Spain.
4. Department of Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale University School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, USA.
5. Gemini Center for Sepsis Research, Department of Circulation and Medical Imaging, NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.
6. Clinic of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway
7. Department of Mathematics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
8. MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.
9. Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.
10. NIHR Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, Bristol, UK
11. MRC Biostatistics Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
12. Cardiovascular Epidemiology Unit, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

Corresponding author:

Alvaro Hernaez, PharmD, PhD
Centre for Fertility and Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health
PO 222 Skøyen, 0213 Oslo, Norway
Telephone: (+47) 955 23 51
e-mail: alvaro.hernaez@fhi.no

Running title: Body mass index and subfertility: multivariable regression and Mendelian randomization

1 **ABSTRACT**

2

3 **Background.** Higher body mass index (BMI) is associated with subfertility in women and
4 men. This relationship is further substantiated by a few small randomized-controlled trials
5 of weight reduction and success of assisted reproduction. The aim of the current study
6 was to expand the current evidence-base by investigating the association between BMI
7 and subfertility in men and women using multivariable regression and Mendelian
8 randomization.

9 **Methods and findings.** We studied 34,157 women (average age 30, average BMI 23.1
10 kg/m²) and 31,496 men (average age 33, average BMI 25.4 kg/m²) who were genotyped
11 and are participating in the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study. Self-
12 reported information was available on time-to-pregnancy and BMI. A total of 10% of
13 couples were subfertile (time-to-pregnancy ≥12 months). Our findings support a J-shaped
14 association between BMI and subfertility in both sexes using multivariable logistic
15 regression models. Non-linear Mendelian randomization validated this relationship. A 1
16 kg/m² greater genetically predicted BMI was linked to 15% greater odds of subfertility (95%
17 confidence interval 4% to 28%) in obese women (≥30.0 kg/m²) and 14% lower odds of
18 subfertility (-25% to -3%) in women with BMI <20.0 kg/m². A 1 kg/m² higher genetically
19 predicted BMI was linked to 23% greater odds of subfertility (6% to 43%) among obese
20 men and 36% decreased odds (-62% to 7%) among men BMI <20.0 kg/m². A genetically
21 predicted BMI of 23 and 25 kg/m² was linked to the lowest subfertility risk in women and
22 men, respectively. The main limitations of our study were that we did not know whether the
23 subfertility was driven by the woman, man, or both; the exclusive consideration of
24 individuals of northern European ancestry; and the limited amount of participants with
25 obesity or BMI values <20.0 kg/m².

26 **Conclusions.** We observed a J-shaped relationship between BMI and subfertility in both
27 sexes, when using both a standard multivariable regression and Mendelian randomization
28 analysis, further supporting a potential causal role of BMI on subfertility.

29

30

31 **ABBREVIATIONS**

32

33 *ART*, assisted reproductive technology; *BMI*, body mass index; *GRS*: genetic risk score;
34 *GWAS*: genome-wide association study; *MR*, Mendelian randomization; *MoBa*: the
35 Norwegian Mother, Father, and Child cohort study; *OR*: odds ratio; *SNP*, single nucleotide
36 polymorphism.

37 **AUTHOR SUMMARY**

38

39 **WHY WAS THIS STUDY DONE?**

- 40 • Higher body mass index (BMI) in both women and men is associated with
- 41 subfertility in in observational studies. A few small randomized-controlled trials of
- 42 weight reduction have reported an increased success of assisted reproduction in
- 43 women. In addition, women with BMI <18.5 kg/m² have lower conception rates with
- 44 assisted reproduction technologies. A non-linear relationship between BMI and
- 45 subfertility is suggested.
- 46 • We aimed to investigate the association between BMI and subfertility using both a
- 47 standard multivariable regression and a Mendelian randomization approach.

48

49 **WHAT DID THE RESEARCHERS DO AND FIND?**

- 50 • We examined the relationship between BMI and subfertility (time-to-pregnancy ≥12
- 51 months) among all men and women in the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child
- 52 Cohort Study with available genotype information and anthropometric data (34,157
- 53 women, 31,496 men).
- 54 • We observed a J-shaped relationship between BMI and subfertility in both sexes,
- 55 when using both a standard multivariable regression and Mendelian randomization
- 56 analysis.

57

58 **WHAT DO THESE FINDINGS MEAN?**

- 59 • Together with previous observational and trial evidence, findings support a causal
- 60 effect of overweight/obesity on subfertility in women and men.

- 61 • Our findings expand the current evidence by also indicating that individuals at the
62 lower end of the BMI distribution (<20 kg/m²) may have an increased risk of
63 subfertility.
- 64 • Current advice and support for overweight and obese subfertile couples to lose
65 weight should continue. Additionally, clinicians should consider appropriate advice
66 to those with low BMI on whether they should increase weight to obtain a normal
67 BMI.

68 INTRODUCTION

69

70 Body weight is associated with the ability to reproduce [1, 2]. In observational studies, high
71 body mass index (BMI) in women is associated with greater risk of subfertility, commonly
72 defined as trying to conceive without success for ≥ 12 months [3, 4], or a lower success of
73 assisted reproductive technology (ART) [5]. In addition, women with BMI < 18.5 kg/m² have
74 a lower chance of ART success [6], supporting the hypothesis of a non-linear relationship
75 between BMI and subfertility. In men, subfertility appears to be more prevalent among
76 those who are overweight or obese, and obese men are also overrepresented among ART
77 users [7, 8]. There is some experimental evidence indicating that weight reduction
78 interventions among women improve their likelihood of success after undergoing an ART
79 treatment [9].

80 BMI is closely linked to a broad range of other characteristics which are also
81 related to subfertility [10, 11]. In addition, previous studies addressing the role of BMI on
82 subfertility have not accounted for the partner's BMI, which may add to the effect as
83 individuals with greater BMI values are more likely to have a partner with elevated BMI
84 (assortative mating) [12]. Thus, it remains unclear whether there is a causal relationship
85 between BMI and subfertility, or if the association is due to confounding or partner's BMI.
86 The use of complementary methodological approaches could contribute to a better
87 understanding of this matter. Mendelian randomization (MR) uses genetic variants that are
88 robustly related to an exposure (e.g. BMI) to retrieve the unconfounded effect of that
89 exposure on an outcome (e.g. subfertility) [13]. Results from MR are less likely to be
90 confounded by the socioeconomic and behavioral factors that commonly affect
91 conventional regression analyses but, at the same time, are susceptible to bias due to
92 weak instruments and horizontal pleiotropy [14]. Given the different sources of bias

93 between multivariable regression and MR, when findings agree, it increases confidence in
94 the consistent results reflecting a causal effect [15].

95 Our aim was to investigate the association between BMI and subfertility in women
96 and men using multivariable logistic regression and MR.

97

98

99 **METHODS**

100

101 *The Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study*

102 Our study included participants in the Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study (MoBa) [16,
103 17]. The MoBa Study is a population-based pregnancy cohort study conducted by the
104 Folkehelseinstituttet/Norwegian Institute of Public Health. Participants were recruited from
105 all over Norway from 1999-2008. The women consented to participation in 41% of the
106 pregnancies. The cohort now includes 114,500 children, 95,200 mothers and 75,200
107 fathers. The current study is based on version #12 of the quality-assured data. The
108 establishment of MoBa and initial data collection was based on a license from the
109 Norwegian Data Protection Agency and approval from The Regional Committees for
110 Medical and Health Research Ethics. The MoBa cohort is now based on regulations
111 related to the Norwegian Health Registry Act.

112 For the current study, we defined a subsample of parents with available genotype
113 data and pre-pregnancy information on BMI. The genotype data used in this study come
114 from blood samples obtained from both parents during pregnancy [18] and followed the
115 pipeline described by Helgeland et al regarding genotype calling, imputation, and quality
116 control [19]. We have described our work according to the STROBE guidelines for
117 reporting MR (**S1 Checklist**) and cohort studies (**S2 Checklist**).

118

119 *BMI*

120 Maternal and paternal pre-pregnancy weight and height were reported in the questionnaire
121 completed at recruitment and used to calculate BMI as weight in kilograms divided by the
122 squared height in meters. Extreme BMI values <9 or >90 kg/m² were excluded.

123

124 *Genetic risk score for BMI*

125 We used the results from the most recent genome-wide association study (GWAS) of BMI
126 to create the genetic instrument in our analysis [20]. This GWAS included approximately
127 700,000 individuals of European ancestry (none of them participated in the MoBa cohort)
128 that yielded 941 independent single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with
129 BMI [20]. 896 of the 941 SNPs were available in the MoBa genotype data. We computed a
130 weighted genetic risk score (GRS) by multiplying the number of risk alleles by the effect
131 estimate of each variant and dividing by the total number of SNPs [21].

132

133 *Subfertility*

134 At the time of recruitment, women were asked whether the pregnancy was planned, and to
135 provide information on how many months it had taken them to conceive [17]. The answer
136 options were less than one month, 1-2 months, and 3 or more months. If the mother had
137 used ≥3 months, she was asked to further specify exactly how many months the couple
138 had been trying to conceive. Subfertility was defined as time-to-pregnancy ≥12 months or
139 having used ART. Those reporting a time-to-pregnancy <12 months or involved in
140 unplanned pregnancies were included in the reference group.

141

142 *Other variables*

143 From the MoBa questionnaires, we gathered information on age (continuous), educational
144 level (years of education equivalent to the US system [22, 23], continuous), cigarette

145 smoking (never smokers, former smokers, having quitted smoking by 12th –mothers– or
146 18th gestational week –fathers–, or being a current smoker), and previous number of
147 deliveries (0, 1, 2, or ≥ 3).

148

149 *Ethical approval*

150 The data collection in MoBa is approved by the Norwegian Data Inspectorate. Participants
151 provided a written informed consent before joining the cohort. This project was approved
152 by the Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics of South/East Norway
153 (reference: 2017/1362).

154

155 *Statistical analyses*

156 We used means and standard deviations to describe normally distributed continuous
157 variables, medians and 1st-3rd quartiles for non-normally distributed continuous variables,
158 and proportions for categorical variables. We assessed differences in baseline
159 characteristics among subfertile and non-subfertile parents using t-tests for normally
160 distributed continuous variables, Mann-Whitney U-tests for non-normally distributed
161 continuous variables, and chi-squared tests in categorical variables.

162 We first evaluated the presence of a linear relationship between BMI and
163 subfertility in women and men separately by standard logistic regressions. We examined
164 the evidence for a non-linear association by assessing the relationship between a 1 kg/m²
165 increase in measured BMI and subfertility odds in BMI categories defined by current WHO
166 guidelines: underweight and normal-low weight (<20.0 kg/m²), normal weight (20.0-24.9
167 kg/m²), overweight (25.0-29.9 kg/m²), and obesity (≥ 30.0 kg/m²). We also assessed
168 whether a model using smoothed cubic splines ($K+4$ degrees of freedom) to model the
169 relationship between BMI and subfertility fitted the data better than a simple linear term
170 using a likelihood ratio test. All logistic regression models were adjusted for age, education

171 years, smoking, and number of previous deliveries. We computed clustered standard
172 errors to account for dependency between women/men who participated with more than
173 one pregnancy.

174 In the MR analyses, we used a linear regression model to obtain a genetically
175 predicted BMI using the GRS for BMI as a predictor. We assessed the linear relationship
176 between genetically predicted BMI and subfertility by logistic regression models. We
177 explored non-linear associations by investigating the association between a 1 kg/m²
178 increase in the genetically predicted BMI and subfertility within residual BMI categories
179 using WHO definitions as previously described. Residual BMI is defined as the
180 participant's reported BMI minus the genetically predicted BMI. The stratification according
181 to residual BMI allows the comparison of participants who would have a similar BMI if they
182 had the same genetic information and is a strategy to minimize collider bias [24].

183 We also applied a fractional polynomial method to calculate non-linear MR
184 estimates of BMI on subfertility odds. In this procedure, we first divided the population into
185 100 strata of equal number of participants according to the residual BMI. We then
186 calculated the linear MR estimate in each stratum (the association of the GRS with the
187 outcome divided by the association of the GRS with the exposure). Finally, we performed
188 a meta-regression of these estimates against the mean value of the reported BMI in each
189 of the 100 strata using a fractional polynomial model as previously described [24, 25]. We
190 also calculated a fractional polynomial test, which assessed if the model using fractional
191 polynomials to model the relationship between genetically predicted BMI and subfertility
192 fitted the causal effect estimates better than a model with a simple linear term.

193 Three assumptions must be met in a valid MR study: the genetic instrument is
194 robustly associated with the exposure, the genetic instrument is only linked to the outcome
195 through the exposure of interest, and there is no confounding of the genetic instrument-
196 outcome associations [26]. The strength of the genetic instrument (the association

197 between the GRSs and BMI) was assessed in women and men separately using linear
198 regressions, F -statistics, and R^2 coefficients of determination. Regarding the second
199 assumption, a common cause of violation is horizontal pleiotropy (i.e. genetic instrumental
200 variables influence other risk factors for the outcome in addition to the exposure of
201 interest) [14]. To check this bias, we assessed the associations between quartiles of the
202 GRS and predefined risk factors for subfertility (age, educational levels, smoking, and
203 number of previous pregnancies). Whenever we found indication of pleiotropic effects, we
204 performed: 1) multivariable MR analyses if a valid genetic instrument could be calculated,
205 i.e. if there were GWAS or meta-analyses of GWAS whose summary data were available
206 [27]; or 2) stratified analyses. We identified summary GWAS data that enabled us to
207 conduct multivariable MR analyses for educational level and smoking initiation and
208 conducted stratified analyses according to age (below vs. over the median). For the
209 multivariable MR accounting for educational level we used the results from the most recent
210 GWAS of education, which included approximately 1.1 million individuals and reported
211 1,271 independent SNPs [28]. We estimated the genetically predicted years of education
212 using a GRS based on the 1,159 available SNPs in the MoBa genotype data. For the
213 multivariable MR accounting for smoking, we used the summary results of the most recent
214 GWAS, which included more than 1.2 million participants and reported 378 SNPs
215 associated with smoking initiation [29]. In this case, we estimated the genetically
216 determined risk of starting to smoke by a GRS based on the 355 available SNPs in the
217 MoBa genotype data. In both multivariable MR analyses, we estimated the genetically
218 predicted BMI values also including the GRS for education and the GRS for smoking
219 initiation. Similarly, the genetically predicted number of educational years and likelihood of
220 starting to smoke were estimated considering the GRS for BMI in addition to the GRS for
221 the covariate of interest. Finally, we assessed the association between the genetically
222 predicted BMI and subfertility as previously described using models further adjusted for the

223 genetically predicted education years and likelihood of starting to smoke. We further
224 explored unbalanced horizontal pleiotropy by methods developed for use in two sample
225 MR [30-32]. We first generated summary results of the association of each of the 896
226 SNPs related to BMI with subfertility in a GWAS in the MoBa cohort (full details of these
227 analyses are provided in the Supplemental Materials), and combined them with summary
228 data of their association with BMI [20] to create a two sample MR framework. We
229 performed the two sample MR by different methods, including random effects inverse
230 variance weighted regression, MR-Egger, weighted median method, and MR weighted
231 mode estimator. We checked the presence of horizontal pleiotropy by: estimating the MR-
232 Egger intercept (a deviation from zero would suggest horizontal pleiotropy); comparing the
233 causal estimates obtained in the inverse variance weighted regression, the MR-Egger, and
234 the weighted median methods (a divergence among them would also suggest horizontal
235 pleiotropy); and generating a scatterplot as a visual check for potentially pleiotropic outliers
236 in the variant-specific causal estimates [30-32]. We also estimated between SNP
237 heterogeneity (by the Cochran's Q and the Rücker's Q' statistics according to the inverse
238 variance weighted regression and MR-Egger methods, respectively). Finally, regarding the
239 third MR assumption (lack of confounding of the genetic instrument-outcome
240 associations), all the one sample MR analyses were adjusted for 10 ancestry-informative
241 principal components to account for population stratification [33].

242 As additional sensitivity analyses: 1) we restricted the analysis to parents reporting
243 having planned their pregnancies (28,328 women –83.0%– and 26,252 men –83.4%–);
244 and 2) we removed the conceptions by ART from the case group (716 and 680 in women
245 and men, respectively –21% of the overall subfertile cases–).

246 All analyses were performed in R Software version 4.0.3 (packages:
247 *compareGroups*, *estimatr*, *ggplot2*, *miceadds*, and *TwoSampleMR*). Code for data

248 management and statistical analysis is available here:

249 https://github.com/alvarohernaez/MR_BMI_subfertility_MoBa/blob/main/syntax.

250

251


252 RESULTS

253

254 *Study population*

255 Our study population consisted of 34,157 women (30 years old on average, mean pre-
256 pregnancy BMI 23.1 kg/m²) and 31,496 men (33 years old on average, mean BMI pre-
257 pregnancy 25.4 kg/m²) with singleton pregnancies and information on both BMI and
258 genotype (**Fig 1**). A total of 10% of the couples were subfertile. Women and men who
259 were subfertile were older, had a lower educational level, were more likely to be
260 current/former smokers, and more likely to be trying for a first pregnancy, and had on
261 average greater BMI (**Table 1**).

262



263 **Fig 1. Study flow chart**

264

265 **Table 1.** Population characteristics

	Women				Men			
	All (n = 34,157)	Subfertility reported (n = 3,492)	No subfertility reported (n = 30,665)	p-value	All (n = 31,496)	Subfertility reported (n = 3,243)	No subfertility reported (n = 28,253)	p-value
Age at delivery, years (mean ± SD)	30.1 ± 4.38	31.5 ± 4.40	29.9 ± 4.34	<0.001	32.6 ± 5.11	34.1 ± 5.37	32.4 ± 5.05	<0.001
Education years (mean ± SD)	17.4 ± 3.20	17.0 ± 3.33	17.4 ± 3.18	<0.001	16.4 ± 3.53	16.2 ± 3.54	16.5 ± 3.53	<0.001
Tobacco use (n, %):				<0.001				0.021
Never smokers	17884 (52.6%)	1758 (50.5%)	16126 (52.8%)		22998 (73.3%)	2295 (71.0%)	20703 (73.5%)	
Former smokers	8962 (26.3%)	922 (26.5%)	8040 (26.3%)		1059 (3.37%)	120 (3.71%)	939 (3.34%)	
Quitters before 12 th (♀) or 18 th week (♂)	4393 (12.9%)	454 (13.1%)	3939 (12.9%)		534 (1.70%)	61 (1.89%)	473 (1.68%)	
Current smokers	2784 (8.18%)	347 (9.97%)	2437 (7.98%)		6794 (21.6%)	757 (23.4%)	6037 (21.4%)	
Previous pregnancies (n, %):				<0.001				<0.001
0	15568 (45.6%)	2047 (58.7%)	13521(44.2%)		14468 (46.0%)	1902 (58.7%)	12566 (44.5%)	
1	12649 (37.1%)	1062 (30.4%)	11587 (37.8%)		11577 (36.8%)	974 (30.1%)	10603 (37.6%)	
2	4695 (13.8%)	293 (8.40%)	4402 (14.4%)		4308 (13.7%)	279 (8.61%)	4029 (14.3%)	
≥3	1193 (3.50%)	86 (2.47%)	1107 (3.62%)		1102 (3.50%)	84 (2.59%)	1018 (3.61%)	
BMI, kg/m ² (median, 1 st -3 rd quartile)	23.1 (21.1-25.9)	23.7 (21.5-27.2)	23.1 (21.1-25.7)	<0.001	25.4 (23.7-27.7)	25.8 (23.9-28.1)	25.4 (23.6-27.7)	<0.001
BMI categories (n, %)				<0.001				<0.001
<20 kg/m ²	4231 (12.4%)	410 (11.7%)	3821 (12.5%)		395 (1.25%)	42 (1.30%)	353 (1.25%)	
20.0-24.9 kg/m ²	19346 (56.6%)	1758 (50.3%)	17588 (57.4%)		13502 (42.9%)	1265 (39.0%)	12237 (43.3%)	
25.0-29.9 kg/m ²	7481 (21.9%)	823 (23.6%)	6658 (21.7%)		14398 (45.7%)	1508 (46.5%)	12870 (45.6%)	
≥30.0 kg/m ²	3099 (9.07%)	501 (14.3%)	2598 (8.47%)		3201 (10.2%)	428 (13.2%)	2773 (9.81%)	

266 SD: standard deviation

267

268 *Association between reported BMI and subfertility: multivariable logistic regressions*

269 In the standard multivariable linear association, each 1 kg/m² increase in BMI was linked to

270 4% greater odds of subfertility in women (odds ratio –OR– 1.04, 95% confidence interval –

271 CI– 1.04 to 1.05, $p < 0.001$) and men (OR 1.04, 95% CI 1.03 to 1.05, $p < 0.001$). However,

272 a non-linear model based on restricted cubic splines fitted the data better than a linear


273 term in both sexes (likelihood ratio tests: $p_{\text{women}} < 0.001$, $p_{\text{men}} = 0.035$; **Fig 2A and 2B**).

274 These relationships were J-shaped, with a positive association from BMI values of 22

275 kg/m² onwards in both sexes. A 1 kg/m² increase in BMI was linked to 4% greater odds of

276 subfertility in women with a BMI between 20.0 and 24.9 kg/m² (OR 1.04, 95% CI 1.00 to
277 1.08, $p = 0.031$), 10% increased odds in overweight women (OR 1.10, 95% CI 1.04 to
278 1.16, $p < 0.001$), and 4% greater odds in obese women (OR 1.04, 95% CI 1.01 to 1.07, $p =$
279 0.005). On the contrary, a 1 kg/m² increment in BMI was associated with 14% lower odds
280 of subfertility in women with BMI <20.0 kg/m² (OR 0.86, 95% CI 0.75 to 0.98, $p = 0.027$)
281 (**Fig. 2A**). In men, a 1 kg/m² increase in BMI was linked to 5% greater odds of subfertility in
282 participants with a BMI between 20.0 and 24.9 kg/m² (OR 1.05, 95% CI 1.00 to 1.10, $p =$
283 0.068), 6% increased odds in overweight men (OR 1.06, 95% CI 1.02 to 1.10, $p = 0.007$),
284 and 8% greater odds in obese men (OR 1.08, 95% CI 1.03 to 1.12, $p < 0.001$), and there
285 was no evidence of an association in those with BMI values <20.0 kg/m² (OR 0.80, 95% CI
286 0.51 to 1.25, $p = 0.322$) (**Fig. 2B**).

287



288

289 **Fig 2. Association between reported body mass index and subfertility in women (A)**


290 **and men (B).** Non-linear logistic regression analyses (smoothed cubic splines) adjusted

291 for age, education level, smoking, and number of previous pregnancies. A BMI of 25 kg/m²

292 was set as reference (black dot). Gray lines represent 95% confidence intervals

293 *MR analyses on BMI and subfertility in women*

294 Each one unit increase in the GRS was linked to a BMI increase of 0.044 kg/m² (95% CI
295 0.041 to 0.046, $p < 0.001$, 5.63% of BMI variation explained, F -statistic = 1,388). There
296 was evidence of a J-shaped relationship between the genetically predicted BMI and
297 subfertility in women (fractional polynomial test p -value for non-linearity = 0.033), which
298 was positive for BMI values ≥ 23.3 kg/m² (**Fig. 3**). A 1 kg/m² increase in genetically
299 predicted BMI was linked to 15% greater odds of subfertility in obese women (OR 1.15,
300 95% CI 1.04 to 1.28, $p = 0.010$), 14% lower odds in women with BMI < 20.0 kg/m² (OR
301 0.86, 95% CI 0.75 to 0.97, $p = 0.015$), and unrelated to subfertility in those with BMI values
302 between 20.0 and 24.9 kg/m² (OR 0.99, 95% CI 0.94 to 1.04, $p = 0.645$) and in overweight
303 women (OR 1.03, 95% CI 0.96 to 1.11, $p = 0.397$).



304


305 **Fig 3. Mendelian randomization analysis of body mass index and subfertility in**

306 **women.** A BMI of 25 kg/m² was set as reference (black dot). Gray lines represent 95%

307 confidence intervals.

308 *MR analyses on BMI and subfertility in men*

309 Each one unit increase in the GRS was linked to a BMI increase of 0.033 kg/m² in men
310 (95% CI 0.031 to 0.035, $p < 0.001$, 5.01% of BMI variation explained, F -statistic = 1,202).
311 We observed a non-linear, J-shaped association between genetically predicted BMI and
312 subfertility in men (p -value for non-linearity = 0.018), which was positive for BMI values \geq
313 25.2 kg/m² (**Fig. 3**). A 1 kg/m² increment in genetically predicted BMI was linked to 23%
314 greater odds of subfertility in obese men (OR 1.23, 95% CI 1.06 to 1.43, $p = 0.006$),
315 marginally related to 36% lower odds in men with BMI < 20.0 kg/m² (OR 0.64, 95% CI 0.38
316 to 1.07, $p = 0.090$; only 1.25% of all men belonged to this category), and unrelated to
317 subfertility in men with BMI values between 20.0 and 24.9 kg/m² (OR 0.96, 95% CI 0.88 to
318 1.04, $p = 0.341$) and in overweight participants (OR 1.01, 95% CI 0.93 to 1.09, $p = 0.894$).



319

320 **Fig 4. Mendelian randomization analysis of body mass index and subfertility in men.**

321 A BMI of 25 kg/m² was set as reference (black dot). Gray lines represent 95% confidence

322 intervals.

323 *Verification of MR assumptions*

324 Regarding horizontal pleiotropy, we observed an inverse relationship of GRS for BMI with
 325 education and age, and there was a lower proportion of never smokers in participants with
 326 high GRS values in both women (**S1 Table**) and men (**S2 Table**). In both sexes, we
 327 observed similar J-shaped associations between BMI and subfertility in the multivariable
 328 MR accounting for education and smoking to those observed in the main analyses (**Table**
 329 **2; S1 and S2 Figs**). In relation to age, we stratified our analyses in participants below and
 330 over the median age (30 years in women, 32 years in men). Genetically predetermined
 331 BMI had a similar non-linear, J-shaped associations with subfertility in both age groups as
 332 seen in the main analyses (**Table 2, S3 Fig**).

333 Further sensitivity analyses using a two sample MR framework indicated no
 334 evidence of a linear relationship between BMI and subfertility, no horizontal pleiotropy
 335 according to different methods with various assumptions, and no SNP heterogeneity (**S3**
 336 **Table, S4 Fig**).

337

338 **Table 2.** Multivariable and age-stratified MR analyses

	MR: main analyses	MR + education years (multivariable)	MR + smoking initiation (multivariable)	MR: age of delivery < median	MR: age of delivery > median
Women					
Linear MR					
OR for $\Delta 1 \text{ kg/m}^2$ (whole population)	1.02 (0.99 to 1.06)	1.02 (0.98 to 1.06)	1.02 (0.98 to 1.06)	1.01 (0.95 to 1.06)	1.04 (0.99 to 1.09)
Non-linear MR					
Fractional polynomial test (<i>p</i> -value for non-linearity)	0.033	0.029	0.047	0.067	0.030
OR for $\Delta 1 \text{ kg/m}^2$ (stratified analyses):					
< 20.0 kg/m^2	0.86 (0.75 to 0.97)	0.84 (0.73 to 0.97)	0.85 (0.74 to 0.97)	0.81 (0.68 to 0.97)	0.87 (0.72 to 1.04)
20.0-24.9 kg/m^2	0.99 (0.94 to 1.04)	0.99 (0.94 to 1.04)	0.98 (0.93 to 1.03)	0.97 (0.90 to 1.05)	1.00 (0.94 to 1.07)

25.0-29.9 kg/m ²	1.03 (0.96 to 1.11)	1.03 (0.96 to 1.12)	1.04 (0.96 to 1.13)	1.07 (0.95 to 1.20)	1.03 (0.93 to 1.13)
≥ 30.0 kg/m ²	1.15 (1.04 to 1.28)	1.15 (1.03 to 1.29)	1.16 (1.04 to 1.30)	1.08 (0.94 to 1.25)	1.24 (1.06 to 1.46)
BMI with lowest subfertility odds	23.3 kg/m ²	23.1 kg/m ²	23.6 kg/m ²	24.7 kg/m ²	22.1 kg/m ²
Men					
Linear MR					
OR for Δ1 kg/m ² (whole population)	1.01 (0.96 to 1.07)	1.00 (0.95 to 1.06)	1.02 (0.98 to 1.09)	1.06 (0.97 to 1.15)	1.00 (0.93 to 1.07)
Non-linear MR					
Fractional polynomial test (<i>p</i> -value for non-linearity)	0.018	0.037	0.011	0.018	0.048
OR for Δ1 kg/m ² (stratified analyses):					
< 20.0 kg/m ²	0.64 (0.38 to 1.07)	0.73 (0.41 to 1.28)	0.72 (0.39 to 1.35)	0.78 (0.39 to 1.55)	0.73 (0.28 to 1.91)
20.0-24.9 kg/m ²	0.96 (0.88 to 1.04)	0.95 (0.87 to 1.04)	0.96 (0.88 to 1.06)	0.98 (0.86 to 1.11)	0.94 (0.84 to 1.05)
25.0-29.9 kg/m ²	1.01 (0.93 to 1.09)	1.00 (0.92 to 1.09)	1.02 (0.93 to 1.11)	1.05 (0.92 to 1.19)	1.00 (0.91 to 1.10)
≥ 30.0 kg/m ²	1.23 (1.06 to 1.43)	1.24 (1.05 to 1.45)	1.25 (1.05 to 1.48)	1.32 (1.06 to 1.64)	1.19 (0.97 to 1.45)
BMI with lowest subfertility odds	25.2 kg/m ²	26.7 kg/m ²	24.5 kg/m ²	24.7 kg/m ²	25.5 kg/m ²

339 MR: Mendelian randomization; OR: odds ratio

340

341 *Other sensitivity analyses*

342 Genetically predetermined BMI presented similar non-linear, J-shaped associations with
 343 subfertility in both women and men also when restricting the analysis to those with planned
 344 pregnancies (**S4 Table, S5 Fig**) and after excluding ART users (**S5 Table, S6 Fig**).

345

346

347 DISCUSSION

348

349 Our findings from multivariable and MR analyses indicate that BMI has a J-shaped
 350 association with subfertility in both men and women. Both participants with BMI values

351 <20.0 kg/m² and obese individuals had an increased risk of subfertility. The consistency of
352 the results between multivariable regression and MR, and across several sensitivity
353 analyses, increases confidence in these findings being causal.

354 A positive association between BMI and subfertility has been reported in
355 observational studies among both women [3, 5, 8] and men [7, 8], with a particularly high
356 risk of subfertility among obese individuals [4]. We confirm this association in our data, as
357 higher BMI was associated with greater odds of subfertility from 22 kg/m² in the standard
358 multivariable regression models and from 23-25 kg/m² in the MR analyses. These
359 associations appeared unaffected by horizontal pleiotropy. Our findings are also supported
360 by randomized controlled trials reporting an increase in overall pregnancies and natural
361 conceptions among overweight/obese women after losing weight [9].

362 Several biological mechanisms can explain a potential association between high
363 BMI and subfertility. Obesity is linked to biochemical disruptions (insulin resistance,
364 adipocyte hyperactivation, greater levels of non-esterified fatty acids in plasma, increased
365 hepatic triglyceride synthesis) [34]. These are in turn linked to impaired endocrine
366 responses in women (lower synthesis of estrogens and luteinizing hormone, a greater
367 production of androgens, and a decay in sex hormone binding globulins) and men
368 (decreased testosterone levels, increased estrogen production in adipose tissue, defective
369 hypothalamic pituitary gonadal regulation, decreased concentrations of sex hormone
370 binding globulins) [34]. These endocrine alterations and other conditions linked to high BMI
371 values, such as low-grade inflammation in reproductive tissues and some sex-dependent
372 alterations (menstrual abnormalities, increased testicular heat, greater risk of erectile
373 dysfunction), may finally compromise fecundity [2, 34-36].

374 The J-shaped association between BMI and subfertility also support that
375 participants with low BMI may have a greater risk of subfertility. A decrease in BMI was
376 linked to greater subfertility in women with a BMI <20 kg/m², and we observed a similar

377 tendency among men. Our results agree with previous observational studies reporting
378 decreased fertility in underweight women who have undergone ART [6]. Low BMI values
379 could be linked to subfertility because they are intimately related to undernutrition, which is
380 associated with an impaired function of the reproductive system [37], defective
381 concentrations of adipocyte-related regulators of endocrine processes such as leptin [38],
382 and increased risk of pregnancy complications [39].

383 Our work presents some limitations. First, subfertility is a couple-dependent
384 measure, and was reported by mothers in the cohort (if a woman was classified as
385 subfertile, this condition was extrapolated to her partner). Thus, we are unable to
386 determine whether subfertility was driven by the woman, man, or both. In addition, there is
387 previous evidence of assortative mating on BMI [12], which could also confound the
388 association between BMI and subfertility. Second, MoBa is a pregnancy cohort, and only
389 includes couples who eventually conceived. Additional studies which are also able to
390 include couples who never conceived are warranted. Third, the BMI GRS was associated
391 with some predefined risk factors of subfertility, indicating that some horizontal pleiotropy
392 may be present. However, multivariable MR and stratified analyses confirmed a robust
393 association between BMI and subfertility, and additional sensitivity analyses found no
394 evidence of horizontal pleiotropy in our data. Fourth, most of the associations with
395 subfertility were found in the participants with extreme BMI values (of all women, 9.1%
396 were obese and 12.4% had BMI values below 20.0 kg/m²; of all men, 10.2% were obese
397 and only 1.25% had BMI values below 20.0 kg/m²) and therefore should be interpreted
398 with caution. Finally, our study sample (couples who eventually conceived and were of a
399 northern European ancestry) limits the generalizability of our conclusions to other
400 populations. Nevertheless, our work also has several strengths. To our knowledge, studies
401 exploring non-linear associations between BMI and subfertility using multivariable
402 regressions and an MR approach have been lacking. Both present different sources of

403 bias (multivariable regression could be biased by residual confounding, whilst MR could be
404 biased by unbalanced horizontal pleiotropy), but the consistency in the findings according
405 to both approaches increases confidence that these findings may be causal [14, 24]. This
406 was facilitated by having large numbers of well-characterized participants with genome-
407 wide and subfertility data coming from a relatively homogeneous population with northern
408 European ancestry. This last aspect minimized the risk of confounding due to population
409 stratification in our MR analyses, as well as the further adjustment for 10 ancestry-
410 informative principal components [33]. Finally, our genetic instrument is robust [40, 41] and
411 has been successfully used in several other MR studies [25, 42, 43].

412

413

414 **CONCLUSIONS**

415

416 We observed a J-shaped relationship between BMI and subfertility in both sexes,
417 when using both a standard multivariable regression and Mendelian randomization
418 analysis. Taken together, our results support a causal role of BMI on subfertility. Current
419 advice and support for overweight and obese subfertile couples to lose weight should
420 continue. Clinicians should also consider appropriate advice to those with low BMI on how
421 to increase their weight in a healthy way to promote fertility.

422 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

423

424 The MoBa Cohort Study is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care
425 Services and the Ministry of Education and Research. We are grateful to all the
426 participating families in Norway who take part in this on-going cohort study, and those who
427 contributed to the recruitment and the infrastructure surrounding the MoBa cohort.

428 We thank the Norwegian Institute of Public Health for generating high-quality
429 genomic data. This research is part of the HARVEST collaboration, supported by the
430 Research Council of Norway (#229624). We also thank the NORMENT Centre for
431 providing genotype data, funded by the Research Council of Norway (#223273), South
432 East Norway Health Authority and Stiftelsen Kristian Gerhard Jebsen. We further thank the
433 Center for Diabetes Research (University of Bergen) for providing genotype information
434 and performing quality control and imputation of the data in research projects funded by
435 the European Research Council Advanced Grant SELECTIONPREDISPOSED, Stiftelsen
436 Kristian Gerhard Jebsen, the Trond Mohn Foundation, the Research Council of Norway,
437 the Novo Nordisk Foundation, the University of Bergen, and the Western Norway Health
438 Authority.

439 This work was performed on the TSD (Tjeneste for Sensitive Data) facilities, owned
440 by the University of Oslo, operated and developed by the TSD service group at the
441 University of Oslo, IT-Department (tsd-drift@usit.uio.no).

442 This paper does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Norwegian
443 Research Council.

444

445

446 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

447

448 **Conceptualization:** Maria Christine Magnus

449 **Data curation:** Álvaro Hernáez, Maria Christine Magnus

450 **Formal analysis:** Álvaro Hernáez, Maria Christine Magnus

451 **Funding acquisition:** Maria Christine Magnus

452 **Investigation:** Siri E. Håberg, Abigail Fraser, Stephen Burgess, Deborah A. Lawlor, Maria
453 Christine Magnus

454 **Methodology:** Álvaro Hernáez, Tormod Rogne, Karoline H. Skåra, Siri E. Håberg,
455 Christian M. Page, Abigail Fraser, Stephen Burgess, Deborah A. Lawlor, Maria Christine
456 Magnus

457 **Project administration:** Maria Christine Magnus

458 **Resources:** Maria Christine Magnus

459 **Software:** Álvaro Hernáez, Tormod Rogne, Karoline H. Skåra, Christian M. Page

460 **Supervision:** Siri E. Håberg, Abigail Fraser, Stephen Burgess, Deborah A. Lawlor, Maria
461 Christine Magnus

462 **Validation:** Álvaro Hernáez

463 **Visualization:** Álvaro Hernáez, Karoline H. Skåra

464 **Writing – original draft:** Álvaro Hernáez

465 **Writing – review and editing:** Tormod Rogne, Karoline H. Skåra, Siri E. Håberg,
466 Christian M. Page, Abigail Fraser, Stephen Burgess, Deborah A. Lawlor, Maria Christine
467 Magnus

468
469

470 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

471

472 The consent given by the participants does not open for storage of data on an
473 individual level in repositories or journals. Researchers who want access to data sets for
474 replication should submit an application to datatilgang@fhi.no. Access to data sets
475 requires approval from the Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics in
476 Norway and an agreement with MoBa. Source data of the GWAS on BMI (Yengo L et al.,
477 Hum Mol Genet, 2018) are available in the GIANT Consortium website
478 ([https://portals.broadinstitute.org/collaboration/giant/index.php/GIANT_consortium_data_fil
479 es#GWAS_Anthropometric_2015_BMI_Summary_Statistics](https://portals.broadinstitute.org/collaboration/giant/index.php/GIANT_consortium_data_files#GWAS_Anthropometric_2015_BMI_Summary_Statistics)). Source data of the GWAS
480 on education years (Lee JJ et al., Nat Genet, 2018) are available in the Supplemental
481 Tables of the article (<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41588-018-0147-3#Sec34>). Finally,
482 source data of the GWAS on smoking initiation (Liu M et al., Nat Genet, 2019) are
483 available in the Supplemental Tables of the article
484 (<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41588-018-0307-5#Sec14>).

485
486

487 **FUNDING**

488

489 The MoBa Cohort Study is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and
490 Care Services and the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. This project
491 received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's
492 Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No 947684). This work
493 was also partly supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of
494 Excellence funding scheme, project number 262700. Open Access funding was provided
495 by the Folkehelseinstituttet/Norwegian Institute of Public Health. D.A.L. is a UK National
496 Institute for Health Research Senior Investigator (NF-SI-0611–10196) and is supported by
497 the US National Institutes of Health (R01 DK10324) and a European Research Council
498 Advanced Grant (DevelopObese; 669545). The funders had no role in the collection,
499 analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit
500 the article for publication.

501
502

503 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

504

505 S.B. is a payed statistical reviewer for PLOS Medicine. D.A.L. receives (or has
506 received in the last 10 years) research support from National and International government
507 and charitable bodies, Roche Diagnostics and Medtronic for research unrelated to the
508 current work. The rest of the authors declare that no competing interests exist.

509 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

510

511 **S1 Checklist. STROBE-MR checklist for Mendelian randomization studies.**

512 **S2 Checklist. STROBE checklist for cohort studies.**

513

514 **S1 Fig. Association between body mass index and subfertility: multivariable non-**
515 **linear Mendelian randomization considering the genetically determined number of**
516 **education years in women (A) and men (B).** A BMI of 25 kg/m² was set as reference
517 (black dot). Gray lines represent 95% confidence intervals.

518 **S2 Fig. Association between body mass index and subfertility: multivariable non-**
519 **linear Mendelian randomization considering the genetic predisposition to having**
520 **ever smoked in women (A) and men (B).** A BMI of 25 kg/m² was set as reference (black
521 dot). Gray lines represent 95% confidence intervals.

522 **S3 Fig. Mendelian randomization analyses of body mass index and subfertility**
523 **stratified by age.** Results in mothers below the median age (30 years, **A**) and over the
524 median age (**B**), and of fathers below the median age (32 years, **C**) and over the median
525 age (**D**) are presented. A BMI of 25 kg/m² was set as reference (black dot). Gray lines
526 represent 95% confidence intervals.

527 **S4 Fig. Scatterplot with the two sample Mendelian randomization analyses of body**
528 **mass index and subfertility in women (A) and men (B).** The figure also presents the
529 MR estimates according to the inverse variance weighted regression, MR-Egger, weighted
530 median method, and MR weighted mode estimator.

531 **S5 Fig. Mendelian randomization analyses of body mass index and subfertility in**
532 **planned pregnancies in women (A) and men (B).** A BMI of 25 kg/m² was set as
533 reference (black dot). Gray lines represent 95% confidence intervals.

534 **S6 Fig. Mendelian randomization analyses of body mass index and subfertility**
535 **excluding assisted reproductive technology pregnancies in women (A) and men (B).**
536 A BMI of 25 kg/m² was set as reference (black dot). Gray lines represent 95% confidence
537 intervals.

538

539 **S1 Table. A priori subfertility risk factors tabulated against BMI genetic risk score**
540 **quartiles in women.**

541 **S2 Table. A priori subfertility risk factors tabulated against BMI genetic risk score**
542 **quartiles in men.**

543 **S3 Table. Two sample Mendelian randomization analyses of body mass index and**
544 **subfertility, with indicators of horizontal pleiotropy and SNP heterogeneity.**

545 **S4 Table. Mendelian randomization analyses in planned pregnancies and after**
546 **excluding assisted reproductive technology pregnancies.**

547 **REFERENCES**

548

- 549 1. Sallmén M, Sandler DP, Hoppin JA, Blair A, Baird DD. Reduced fertility among
550 overweight and obese men. *Epidemiology*. 2006;17(5):520-3. doi:
551 10.1097/01.ede.0000229953.76862.e5.
- 552 2. Silvestris E, de Pergola G, Rosania R, Loverro G. Obesity as disruptor of the
553 female fertility. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol*. 2018;16(1):22. doi: 10.1186/s12958-018-0336-z.
- 554 3. Ramlau-Hansen CH, Thulstrup AM, Nohr EA, Bonde JP, Sørensen TI, Olsen J.
555 Subfecundity in overweight and obese couples. *Hum Reprod*. 2007;22(6):1634-7. doi:
556 10.1093/humrep/dem035.
- 557 4. van der Steeg JW, Steures P, Eijkemans MJ, Habbema JD, Hompes PG,
558 Burggraaff JM, et al. Obesity affects spontaneous pregnancy chances in subfertile,
559 ovulatory women. *Hum Reprod*. 2008;23(2):324-8. doi: 10.1093/humrep/dem371.
- 560 5. Pinborg A, Gaarslev C, Hougaard CO, Nyboe Andersen A, Andersen PK, Boivin J,
561 et al. Influence of female bodyweight on IVF outcome: a longitudinal multicentre cohort
562 study of 487 infertile couples. *Reprod Biomed Online*. 2011;23(4):490-9. doi:
563 10.1016/j.rbmo.2011.06.010.
- 564 6. Xiong YQ, Liu YM, Qi YN, Liu CR, Wang J, Li L, et al. Association between
565 prepregnancy subnormal body weight and obstetrical outcomes after autologous in vitro
566 fertilization cycles: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Fertil Steril*. 2020;113(2):344-
567 53.e2. doi: 10.1016/j.fertnstert.2019.09.025.
- 568 7. Campbell JM, Lane M, Owens JA, Bakos HW. Paternal obesity negatively affects
569 male fertility and assisted reproduction outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
570 *Reprod Biomed Online*. 2015;31(5):593-604. doi: 10.1016/j.rbmo.2015.07.012.
- 571 8. Mushtaq R, Pundir J, Achilli C, Naji O, Khalaf Y, El-Toukhy T. Effect of male body
572 mass index on assisted reproduction treatment outcome: an updated systematic review
573 and meta-analysis. *Reprod Biomed Online*. 2018;36(4):459-71. doi:
574 10.1016/j.rbmo.2018.01.002.
- 575 9. Best D, Avenell A, Bhattacharya S. How effective are weight-loss interventions for
576 improving fertility in women and men who are overweight or obese? A systematic review
577 and meta-analysis of the evidence. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2017;23(6):681-705. doi:
578 10.1093/humupd/dmx027.
- 579 10. Collins GG, Rossi BV. The impact of lifestyle modifications, diet, and vitamin
580 supplementation on natural fertility. *Fertil Res Pract*. 2015;1:11. doi: 10.1186/s40738-015-
581 0003-4.
- 582 11. Hart RJ. Physiological Aspects of Female Fertility: Role of the Environment,
583 Modern Lifestyle, and Genetics. *Physiol Rev*. 2016;96(3):873-909. doi:
584 10.1152/physrev.00023.2015.
- 585 12. Silventoinen K, Kaprio J, Lahelma E, Viken RJ, Rose RJ. Assortative mating by
586 body height and BMI: Finnish twins and their spouses. *Am J Hum Biol*. 2003;15(5):620-7.
587 doi: 10.1002/ajhb.10183.
- 588 13. Lawlor DA, Harbord RM, Sterne JA, Timpson N, Davey Smith G. Mendelian
589 randomization: using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in epidemiology.
590 *Stat Med*. 2008;27(8):1133-63. doi: 10.1002/sim.3034.

- 591 14. Davey Smith G, Hemani G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal
592 inference in epidemiological studies. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2014;23(R1):R89-98. doi:
593 10.1093/hmg/ddu328.
- 594 15. Lawlor DA, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Triangulation in aetiological epidemiology. *Int*
595 *J Epidemiol.* 2016;45(6):1866-86. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyw314.
- 596 16. Magnus P, Birke C, Vejrup K, Haugan A, Alsaker E, Daltveit AK, et al. Cohort
597 Profile Update: The Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). *Int J Epidemiol.*
598 2016;45(2):382-8. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyw029.
- 599 17. Magnus P, Irgens LM, Haug K, Nystad W, Skjaerven R, Stoltenberg C. Cohort
600 profile: the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). *Int J Epidemiol.*
601 2006;35(5):1146-50. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyl170.
- 602 18. Paltiel L, Haugan A, Skjerden T, K; H, Bækken S, Stensrud NK, et al. The biobank
603 of the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study – present status. *Norsk Epidemiologi.*
604 2014;24(1-2):29-35. doi: 10.5324/nje.v24i1-2.1755.
- 605 19. Helgeland Ø, Vaudel M, Juliusson PB, Lingaas Holmen O, Juodakis J, Bacelis J, et
606 al. Genome-wide association study reveals dynamic role of genetic variation in infant and
607 early childhood growth. *Nat Commun.* 2019;10(1):4448. doi: 10.1038/s41467-019-12308-
608 0.
- 609 20. Yengo L, Sidorenko J, Kemper KE, Zheng Z, Wood AR, Weedon MN, et al. Meta-
610 analysis of genome-wide association studies for height and body mass index in ~700000
611 individuals of European ancestry. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2018;27(20):3641-9. doi:
612 10.1093/hmg/ddy271.
- 613 21. Choi SW, Mak TS, O'Reilly PF. Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic risk score
614 analyses. *Nat Protoc.* 2020;15(9):2759-72. doi: 10.1038/s41596-020-0353-1.
- 615 22. Barrabés NØ, Greta Kjølstad. Norsk standard for utdanningsgruppering. 2016
616 [Accessed March 17, 2021]. Available from:
617 <https://www.ssb.no/utdanning/attachment/283616?ts=1583e453200>.
- 618 23. Rietveld CA, Medland SE, Derringer J, Yang J, Esko T, Martin NW, et al. GWAS of
619 126,559 individuals identifies genetic variants associated with educational attainment.
620 *Science.* 2013;340(6139):1467-71. doi: 10.1126/science.1235488.
- 621 24. Sun YQ, Burgess S, Staley JR, Wood AM, Bell S, Kaptoge SK, et al. Body mass
622 index and all cause mortality in HUNT and UK Biobank studies: linear and non-linear
623 mendelian randomisation analyses. *BMJ.* 2019;364:l1042. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l1042.
- 624 25. Rogne T, Solligård E, Burgess S, Brumpton BM, Paulsen J, Prescott HC, et al.
625 Body mass index and risk of dying from a bloodstream infection: A Mendelian
626 randomization study. *PLoS Med.* 2020;17(11):e1003413. doi:
627 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003413.
- 628 26. Burgess S, Davey Smith G, Davies NM, Dudbridge F, Gill D, Glymour MM, et al.
629 Guidelines for performing Mendelian randomization investigations. *Wellcome Open Res.*
630 2019;4:186. doi: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15555.2.
- 631 27. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Multivariable Mendelian randomization: the use of
632 pleiotropic genetic variants to estimate causal effects. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2015;181(4):251-
633 60. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwu283.

- 634 28. Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okbay A, Kong E, Maghzian O, Zacher M, et al. Gene discovery
635 and polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment
636 in 1.1 million individuals. *Nat Genet.* 2018;50(8):1112-21. doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0147-
637 3.
- 638 29. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, Li Y, Brazel DM, Chen F, et al. Association studies of up
639 to 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol
640 use. *Nat Genet.* 2019;51(2):237-44. doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0307-5.
- 641 30. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid
642 instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J*
643 *Epidemiol.* 2015;44(2):512-25. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv080.
- 644 31. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in
645 Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median
646 Estimator. *Genet Epidemiol.* 2016;40(4):304-14. doi: 10.1002/gepi.21965.
- 647 32. Hemani G, Bowden J, Davey Smith G. Evaluating the potential role of pleiotropy in
648 Mendelian randomization studies. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2018;27(R2):R195-r208. doi:
649 10.1093/hmg/ddy163.
- 650 33. Wang C, Zhan X, Liang L, Abecasis GR, Lin X. Improved ancestry estimation for
651 both genotyping and sequencing data using projection procrustes analysis and genotype
652 imputation. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2015;96(6):926-37. doi: 10.1016/j.ajhg.2015.04.018.
- 653 34. Amiri M, Ramezani Tehrani F. Potential Adverse Effects of Female and Male
654 Obesity on Fertility: A Narrative Review. *Int J Endocrinol Metab.* 2020;18(3):e101776. doi:
655 10.5812/ijem.101776.
- 656 35. Broughton DE, Moley KH. Obesity and female infertility: potential mediators of
657 obesity's impact. *Fertil Steril.* 2017;107(4):840-7. doi: 10.1016/j.fertnstert.2017.01.017.
- 658 36. Salas-Huetos A, Maghsoumi-Norouzabad L, James ER, Carrell DT, Aston KI,
659 Jenkins TG, et al. Male adiposity, sperm parameters and reproductive hormones: An
660 updated systematic review and collaborative meta-analysis. *Obes Rev.*
661 2021;22(1):e13082. doi: 10.1111/obr.13082.
- 662 37. Cai J, Liu L, Zhang J, Qiu H, Jiang X, Li P, et al. Low body mass index
663 compromises live birth rate in fresh transfer in vitro fertilization cycles: a retrospective
664 study in a Chinese population. *Fertil Steril.* 2017;107(2):422-9.e2. doi:
665 10.1016/j.fertnstert.2016.10.029.
- 666 38. Mitchell M, Armstrong DT, Robker RL, Norman RJ. Adipokines: implications for
667 female fertility and obesity. *Reproduction.* 2005;130(5):583-97. doi: 10.1530/rep.1.00521.
- 668 39. Dickey RP, Xiong X, Xie Y, Gee RE, Pridjian G. Effect of maternal height and
669 weight on risk for preterm singleton and twin births resulting from IVF in the United States,
670 2008-2010. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2013;209(4):349.e1-6. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2013.05.052.
- 671 40. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Bias in causal estimates from Mendelian randomization
672 studies with weak instruments. *Stat Med.* 2011;30(11):1312-23. doi: 10.1002/sim.4197.
- 673 41. Evans DM, Brion MJ, Paternoster L, Kemp JP, McMahon G, Munafò M, et al.
674 Mining the human phenome using allelic scores that index biological intermediates. *PLoS*
675 *Genet.* 2013;9(10):e1003919. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1003919.

- 676 42. Cheung CL, Tan KCB, Au PCM, Li GHY, Cheung BMY. Evaluation of GDF15 as a
677 therapeutic target of cardiometabolic diseases in human: A Mendelian randomization
678 study. *EBioMedicine*. 2019;41:85-90. doi: 10.1016/j.ebiom.2019.02.021.
- 679 43. Takahashi H, Cornish AJ, Sud A, Law PJ, Disney-Hogg L, Calvocoressi L, et al.
680 Mendelian randomization provides support for obesity as a risk factor for meningioma. *Sci*
681 *Rep*. 2019;9(1):309. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-36186-6.