

1 **Association of assisted reproductive technology with offspring growth and**  
2 **adiposity from infancy to early adulthood**

3 Ahmed Elhakeem PhD<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Amy E. Taylor PhD<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Hazel M. Inskip PhD<sup>4,5</sup>, Jonathan Huang  
4 PhD<sup>6</sup>, Muriel Tafflet MSc<sup>7</sup>, Johan L. Vinther MSc<sup>8</sup>, Federica Asta MSc<sup>9</sup>, Jan S. Erkamp  
5 MD<sup>10,11</sup>, Luigi Gagliardi MD<sup>12</sup>, Kathrin Guerlich MPH<sup>13</sup>, Jane Halliday PhD<sup>14,15</sup>, Margreet  
6 W. Harskamp-van Ginkel MD<sup>16</sup>, Jian-Rong He MD<sup>17</sup>, Vincent WV. Jaddoe PhD<sup>11,10</sup>, Sharon  
7 Lewis PhD<sup>14,15</sup>, Gillian M. Maher PhD<sup>18,19</sup>, Yannis Manios PhD<sup>20,21</sup>, Toby Mansell  
8 PhD<sup>14,15</sup>, Fergus P McCarthy PhD<sup>22,19</sup>, Sheila W. McDonald PhD<sup>23,24</sup>, Emanuela Medda  
9 MSc<sup>25</sup>, Lorenza Nisticò MD<sup>25</sup>, Angela Pinot de Moira PhD<sup>8</sup>, Maja Popovic PhD<sup>26</sup>, Irwin KM.  
10 Reiss PhD<sup>11</sup>, Carina Rodrigues PhD<sup>27,28</sup>, Theodosia Salika MSc<sup>4</sup>, Ash Smith BSc<sup>29</sup>, Maria A.  
11 Stazi MSc<sup>25</sup>, Caroline Walker PhD<sup>29</sup>, Muci Wu BSc<sup>23</sup>, Bjørn A. Åsvold PhD<sup>30,31,32</sup>, Henrique  
12 Barros PhD<sup>27,28</sup>, Sonia Brescianini MSc<sup>25</sup>, David Burgner PhD<sup>14,33,34</sup>, Jerry KY. Chan  
13 PhD<sup>35,36</sup>, Marie-Aline Charles PhD<sup>7,37</sup>, Johan G. Eriksson PhD<sup>6,38,39,40</sup>, Romy Gaillard  
14 PhD<sup>11,10</sup>, Veit Grote MD<sup>13</sup>, Siri E. Håberg PhD<sup>41</sup>, Barbara Heude PhD<sup>7</sup>, Berthold Koletzko  
15 MD<sup>13</sup>, Susan Morton PhD<sup>29</sup>, George Moschonis PhD<sup>42</sup>, Deirdre Murray PhD<sup>43,19</sup>, Desmond  
16 O' Mahony PhD<sup>44</sup>, Daniela Porta MSc<sup>9</sup>, Xiu Qiu PhD<sup>17</sup>, Lorenzo Richiardi PhD<sup>26</sup>, Franca  
17 Rusconi MD<sup>12</sup>, Richard Saffery PhD<sup>14,15</sup>, Suzanne C. Tough PhD<sup>23,24</sup>, Tanja GM. Vrijkotte  
18 PhD<sup>16</sup>, Scott M. Nelson PhD<sup>3,45</sup>, Anne-Marie Nybo Andersen PhD<sup>8</sup>, Maria C. Magnus  
19 PhD<sup>41</sup>, ART-Health Cohort Collaboration, Deborah A. Lawlor PhD<sup>1,2,3</sup>

20 <sup>1</sup>MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

21 <sup>2</sup>Population Health Science, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

22 <sup>3</sup>NIHR Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, Bristol, UK

23 <sup>4</sup>MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

24 <sup>5</sup>NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University

25 Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK

26 <sup>6</sup>Singapore Institute for Clinical Science, Agency for Science, Technology, and Research,  
27 Singapore

28 <sup>7</sup>Université de Paris, Inserm, INRAE, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Statistics  
29 (CRESS), Paris, France

30 <sup>8</sup>Section of Epidemiology, Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen,  
31 Copenhagen, Denmark

32 <sup>9</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Lazio Regional Health Service, Rome, Italy

33 <sup>10</sup>The Generation R Study Group, Erasmus MC, University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The  
34 Netherlands

35 <sup>11</sup>Department of Paediatrics, Erasmus MC, University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The  
36 Netherlands

37 <sup>12</sup>Department of Mother and Child Health, Ospedale Versilia, Viareggio, AUSL Toscana  
38 Nord Ovest, Pisa, Italy

39 <sup>13</sup>LMU - Ludwig Maximilians Universität Munich, Division of Metabolic and Nutritional  
40 Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Dr. von Hauner Children's Hospital, LMU University  
41 Hospitals, Munich, Germany

42 <sup>14</sup>Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Parkville, VIC, Australia

43 <sup>15</sup>University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

44 <sup>16</sup>Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Department of Public and Occupational  
45 Health, Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

46 <sup>17</sup>Division of Birth Cohort Study, Guangzhou Women and Children's Medical Center,  
47 Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China

48 <sup>18</sup>School of Public Health, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

49 <sup>19</sup>The Irish Centre for Maternal and Child Health Research (INFANT), University College

50 Cork, Cork, Ireland

51 <sup>20</sup>Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, School of Health Science and Education, Harokopio

52 University, Athens, Greece

53 <sup>21</sup>Institute of Agri-Food and Life Sciences, Hellenic Mediterranean University Research

54 Centre, Heraklion, Greece

55 <sup>22</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

56 <sup>23</sup>Department of Paediatrics, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary,

57 Canada

58 <sup>24</sup>Department of Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of

59 Calgary, Calgary, Canada

60 <sup>25</sup>Center for Behavioral Sciences and Mental Health- Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome, Italy

61 <sup>26</sup>Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Department of Medical Sciences, University of Turin and CPO

62 Piemonte, Turin, Italy

63 <sup>27</sup>EPIUnit - Instituto de Saúde Pública, Universidade do Porto, Porto, Portugal

64 <sup>28</sup>Laboratório para a Investigação Integrativa e Translacional em Saúde Populacional (ITR),

65 Porto, Portugal

66 <sup>29</sup>Centre for Longitudinal Research - He Ara ki Mua, Faculty of Medical and Health

67 Sciences, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

68 <sup>30</sup>K.G. Jebsen Center for Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Public Health and Nursing,

69 Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, NTNU, Norwegian University of Science and

70 Technology, Trondheim, Norway

71 <sup>31</sup>HUNT Research Centre, Department of Public Health and Nursing, Faculty of Medicine

72 and Health Sciences, NTNU, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Levanger,

73 Norway

74 <sup>32</sup>Department of Endocrinology, Clinic of Medicine, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim

75 University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

76 <sup>33</sup>Department of Paediatrics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

77 <sup>34</sup>Department of Paediatrics, Monash University, Clayton, VIC, Australia

78 <sup>35</sup>Department of Reproductive Medicine, KK Women's and Children's Hospital, Singapore

79 <sup>36</sup>Academic Clinical Program in Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Duke-NUS Medical School,  
80 Singapore

81 <sup>37</sup>Ined, Inserm, EFS Joint Unit Elfe, Paris, France

82 <sup>38</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology and Human Potential Translational Research  
83 Programme, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore

84 <sup>39</sup>Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care, University of Helsinki and  
85 Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland

86 <sup>40</sup>Folkhälsan Research Center, Helsinki, Finland

87 <sup>41</sup>Centre for Fertility and Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway

88 <sup>42</sup>Department of Food, Nutrition and Dietetics, School of Allied Health, Human Services and  
89 Sport, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

90 <sup>43</sup>Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

91 <sup>44</sup>National Longitudinal Study of Children in Ireland, Economic and Social Research  
92 Institute, Dublin, Ireland

93 <sup>45</sup>School of Medicine, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

94 \* Corresponding author:

95 Dr Ahmed Elhakeem, MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol,  
96 Bristol, UK; Population Health Science, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol,  
97 Bristol, UK, [a.elhakeem@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:a.elhakeem@bristol.ac.uk)

98 Abstract=350 words, Text=3000 words, Figures=5, References=34, Supplementary items=16

99 **ABSTRACT**

100 **Importance:** People conceived using assisted reproductive technology (ART) make up an  
101 increasing proportion of the world's population, and their numbers are expected to continue  
102 rising.

103 **Objective:** Investigate association of ART conception with growth and adiposity outcomes  
104 from infancy to early adulthood in offspring from a large multinational multi-cohort study.

105 **Design:** 26 population-based cohort studies.

106 **Setting:** Europe, Asia-Pacific, and North America

107 **Participants:** Infants, children, adolescents, and young adults born from 1984 to 2018, with  
108 mean ages at assessment of growth/adiposity outcomes ranging from 0.6 month to 27.4 years.

109 **Exposures:** Conception by ART (conventional *in vitro* fertilisation and intracytoplasmic  
110 sperm injection) versus natural conception (NC).

111 **Main Outcomes and Measures:** Length/height, weight, and body mass index (BMI). Each  
112 cohort was analysed separately with adjustment for maternal BMI, age, smoking, education,  
113 parity, ethnicity, and offspring sex and age. Cohort results were combined in random effects  
114 meta-analysis for thirteen age groups.

115 **Results:** Up to 158,066 offspring (4,329 conceived by ART) were included in each age-  
116 group meta-analysis; 47.6% to 60.6% were female. Compared with NC, ART-conceived  
117 offspring were slightly shorter, lighter, and thinner from infancy to early adolescence. The  
118 differences in growth/adiposity outcomes were largest at the youngest ages and attenuated  
119 with older child age, e.g., adjusted standardised mean differences (95% confidence intervals)  
120 in offspring weight at age '<3 months', '17 to 23 months', '6 to 9 years', and '14 to 17 years'

121 were -0.27 standard deviation (SD) units (-0.39 to -0.16), -0.16SD (-0.22 to -0.09), -0.07SD  
122 (-0.10 to -0.04), and -0.02SD (-0.15 to 0.12), respectively. There was no evidence that results  
123 were driven by parental subfertility or of difference between conventional *in vitro* fertilisation  
124 and intracytoplasmic sperm injection however, smaller offspring size appeared to be limited  
125 to offspring conceived by fresh but not frozen embryo transfer, compared with NC. More  
126 marked but less precise differences were observed for body fat measurements. There was  
127 imprecise evidence that offspring conceived by ART may develop greater adiposity by early  
128 adulthood.

129 **Conclusions and Relevance:** People conceiving or conceived by ART can be reassured that  
130 differences in early growth and adiposity are small and no longer evident by late adolescence.

131

## 132 **KEYWORDS**

133 BMI; Cohort; Height; IVF, Weight

134

135

136 **KEY POINTS**

137 **Question** Is conception by assisted reproductive technology associated with growth and  
138 adiposity from infancy to early adulthood?

139 **Findings** In this multi-cohort study of up to 158,066 European, Asian-Pacific, and Canadian  
140 infants, children, adolescents, and young adults, those conceived using assisted reproductive  
141 technology were on average shorter, lighter, and thinner from infancy up to early adolescence  
142 when compared with their naturally conceived peers though differences were small across all  
143 ages and reduced with older age.

144 **Meaning** Parents conceiving or hoping to conceive through assisted reproductive technology  
145 and their offspring should be reassured that differences in early life growth and adiposity are  
146 small and no longer apparent by late adolescence.

147 Assisted reproductive technology (ART), which mainly involves *in vitro* fertilisation (IVF)  
148 and intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI), has resulted in over 8 million births worldwide  
149 during the last four decades (1, 2), and use of ART is expected to continue rising for several  
150 reasons, including increasingly delayed childbearing (3, 4). Ever since the first ART birth in  
151 1978, the primary research focus has been on improving live-birth rates (5). Now that ART is  
152 acknowledged as an effective procedure for infertility treatment, attention has shifted towards  
153 identifying and reducing any adverse effects of ART on maternal or offspring health. Studies  
154 examining growth-related outcomes have mostly considered perinatal measures, with results  
155 showing an increased risk of low birthweight, small-for-gestational-age, and preterm birth in  
156 those conceived using ART (6-9). Furthermore, studies comparing ART procedures suggest  
157 perinatal differences between conventional IVF and ICSI (10), and between fresh and frozen  
158 embryo transfers (11-14).

159 Besides perinatal outcomes, long-term associations between ART conception and offspring  
160 growth and adiposity remain largely unknown, with the few studies that have examined these  
161 mostly limited by small sample size, short follow-up, and limited adjustment for confounders  
162 or overadjustment for possible mediators (15-17). A recent study which examined trajectories  
163 of change in height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) from birth to age 7 years (n=81,461  
164 offspring with 1,721 conceived by ART) in the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort  
165 Study (MoBa) found that ART-conceived offspring started smaller and grew faster than NC  
166 offspring (18). Another more recent but considerably smaller Singaporean birth cohort study  
167 (n=1,180 offspring with 85 conceived by ART) discovered smaller height and lower skinfold  
168 thickness at age 6 years in ART-conceived than NC offspring (19).

169 Our primary aim was to conduct a multi-cohort study to provide evidence on the associations  
170 of ART conception (compared with NC) with offspring growth and adiposity from infancy to



171 early adulthood. We additionally compared results according to parental subfertility status, in  
172 males and females, in ICSI and conventional IVF, and in fresh and frozen embryo transfers.

173

## 174 **METHODS**

175 This multi-cohort study was carried out within the newly established Assisted Reproductive  
176 Technology and future Health (ART-Health) consortium, following a pre-specified analysis  
177 plan (<https://osf.io/qhwvc/>), and is reported in line with The Strengthening the Reporting of  
178 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement guidelines (20).

179

### 180 **Cohort studies**

181 Eligible cohorts were identified from the European Union Child Cohort Network (21-23) and  
182 by searching cohort profile papers. We targeted population-based cohorts without selection or  
183 oversampling of ART-conceived offspring to reduce potential for selection bias and to ensure  
184 identical growth and adiposity assessments for ART-conceived and NC offspring. All cohorts  
185 from any geographical region with birth years from older to more contemporary cohorts were  
186 eligible for inclusion provided they had data on whether offspring were conceived by ART or  
187 NC, and one or more offspring growth or adiposity outcome measures assessed from age one  
188 month (including repeated measurements). A total of thirty cohorts were invited to participate  
189 and 26 were included in this study (**eTable 1**). Detailed description of the 26 included cohorts  
190 is provided in the **eMethods**.

191 All cohorts had ethical approval from the relevant local or national ethics committees and all  
192 offspring gave informed consent/assent to participate in the respective cohorts and secondary  
193 data analyses. Details on ethics approvals and consent are in **eMethods**.

194

### 195 **Mode of conception and fertility treatment**

196 Fertility treatment use was defined according to the International Glossary on Infertility and  
197 Fertility Care (1). Information on mode of conception and fertility treatment was collected  
198 using questionnaires or by record linkage (**eMethods**). This information was used to identify  
199 if offspring were conceived by ART (i.e., IVF or ICSI) or were naturally conceived (NC) i.e.,  
200 without any fertility treatment. We additionally identified (i) if ART conception involved IVF  
201 or ICSI, (ii) whether fresh embryo transfer (ET) or frozen-thawed embryo transfer (FET) was  
202 used, and (iii) whether NC offspring were born to fertile or sub-fertile parents, depending on  
203 a time to pregnancy of within 12 months or >12 months after they begun trying, respectively  
204 (1, 24).

205

### 206 **Offspring growth/adiposity outcomes**

207 Primary outcomes for this study were length/height (centimetre (cm)), weight (kilograms  
208 (kg)), BMI ( $\text{kg/m}^2$ ), and secondary outcomes were waist circumference (cm), total body fat  
209 %, and fat mass index (FMI;  $\text{kg/m}^2$ ). Length/height and weight were obtained from research  
210 clinics, child health records, and maternal-/self-reports, with BMI calculated from these as  
211 weight in kilograms divided by height in metres squared. Waist circumference was mostly  
212 measured during research clinics. Body fat % was calculated from bioelectrical impedance  
213 analysis done during research clinics, and FMI was derived as fat mass in kilograms from  
214 dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry scans divided by height in metres squared. Details on  
215 outcome measurements and ages in each cohort are in the **eMethods**. Descriptive data on  
216 outcomes and ages at outcome assessments are in **eTable 2**.

217 Outcome age groups for this study were determined by available data from each cohort i.e.,  
218 ages at outcomes assessment. Cohorts were allocated to meta-analysis age groups by mean  
219 age at outcome assessment with the aim of maximising cohort numbers in each age group  
220 meta-analysis. The primary outcomes were allocated to thirteen age groups, and secondary  
221 outcomes (available in 17/26 cohorts) were allocated to four age groups. If a cohort had >1  
222 outcome assessment in an age group, we selected the one with the biggest sample size.

223

## 224 **Confounders**

225 We used a Directed Acyclic Graph (**eFigure 1**) to identify and adjust for confounders i.e.,  
226 anything that could plausibly cause ART use and influence offspring growth/adiposity (25,  
227 26). This process identified the following maternal factors as potential confounders: age at  
228 pregnancy/birth, socioeconomic position (education), pre/early-pregnancy BMI, pre/early-  
229 pregnancy smoking, parity, and ethnicity. Nineteen cohorts were able to adjust for all these  
230 confounders, four did not adjust for ethnicity but were ethnically homogeneous, one did not  
231 adjust for parity because it only included nulliparous women, and two were unable to adjust  
232 for BMI and smoking. Details on the available confounders in each cohort is in **eMethods**.

233

## 234 **Statistical analysis**

235 Analyses were performed separately in each cohort applying standard statistical code, with  
236 results combined using meta-analysis. In cohort-specific analyses, we estimated associations  
237 of ART conception (versus NC) with offspring outcomes using linear regression adjusted for  
238 confounders (plus offspring age and sex). Analysis was done in offspring with data on mode  
239 of conception,  $\geq 1$  growth/adiposity outcome, and confounders. To facilitate comparison of  
240 results for different outcomes and ages, outcomes were analysed in age-, sex- cohort-specific

241 standard deviation (SD) units (mean=0, SD=1). Cohort results were subsequently combined  
242 by random-effects meta-analyses in sub-groups defined by mean age at outcome assessment.  
243 Variability in the pooled estimates that is due to between-cohort heterogeneity was quantified  
244 by the  $I^2$  statistic (27). Influential cohorts (i.e., whose exclusion led to considerable change in  
245 the meta-analysis model) were identified by repeating each meta-analyses with each cohort  
246 left out in turn.

247 To separate effects of ART from any effects of parental subfertility, we repeated analyses  
248 comparing ART-conceived with NC offspring of sub-fertile parents and separately for NC  
249 offspring from fertile parents. Differences by sex and ART treatment types were explored by  
250 repeating analyses stratified by sex; comparing IVF/ICSI separately with NC; and comparing  
251 fresh ET/FET separately with NC. Lastly, we explored if results reflected effects on multiple  
252 births by repeating analysis in singletons and investigated if results were mediated by birth  
253 size and pregnancy duration by including extra adjustments (on top of confounders) for birth  
254 weight and gestational age.

255

## 256 **RESULTS**

257 A total of 26 cohorts with participants from Europe (n=20 cohorts), Australia (n=2 cohorts),  
258 and one each from New Zealand, China, Singapore, and Canada was included in this study  
259 (**eTable 1**). Most (n=23 cohorts) were population-based cohorts, two were twins register  
260 cohorts, and one was a clinical cohort of ART-conceived young adults and NC controls from  
261 the same source population. Birth years were from 1984-2018, with most (n=19 cohorts) born  
262 >2002. Mean age at outcome ranged from 0.6 month to 27.4 years. Fifteen cohorts included  
263 singletons and multiple births (proportion of multiple births across these ranged from 0.9% to  
264 12.9%), nine included singletons only, and two included twins only. Between 3 to 16 cohorts

265 were included in each meta-analysis with numbers of participants in each meta-analysis  
266 ranging from 158,066 (4,329 ART) for weight at age 3 to 5 months to 3,111 (151 ART) for  
267 FMI at age >17 years.

268 Mean length/height was on average smaller in ART-conceived than NC offspring across all  
269 age groups, although for some ages, point estimates were close to the null value which was  
270 included in the CIs (**Figure 1**). The largest differences in length/height were at the youngest  
271 ages and these differences attenuated with older child age. ART-conceived offspring were  
272 more similar in height to NC older adolescents and young adults although estimates were  
273 imprecise (**Figure 1**).

274 Mean weight was lower in ART-conceived than NC offspring from age <3 months up to age  
275 10 to 13 years though CIs included the null at ages 6 to 8 months, 9 to 11 months, and 10 to  
276 13 years (**Figure 1**). As for length/height, differences were greatest at the youngest ages and  
277 smaller at older offspring ages. The difference in mean weight was close to the null in older  
278 adolescents and mean weight in young adults was slightly higher in ART-conceived than NC  
279 offspring but with wide CIs (**Figure 1**).

280 Differences in mean BMI followed a similar pattern to that of weight, with mean BMI lower  
281 in ART-conceived than NC offspring up to age 10 to 13 years, with differences being greatest  
282 at youngest ages but with wide CIs that included the null value for some results (**Figure 1**).  
283 As for weight, difference in mean BMI was closest to the null in older adolescents and mean  
284 BMI was somewhat slightly higher for ART-conceived than NC young adults although this  
285 was imprecisely estimated (**Figure 1**).

286 Results for waist circumference, total body fat %, and FMI were like those observed for  
287 weight and BMI, with lower mean adiposity measurements in ART-conceived than NC  
288 offspring during childhood and adolescence, though with larger differences that were

289 imprecisely estimated for several time points (**Figure 2**). As for weight and BMI, adiposity  
290 measures were higher in ART-conceived than NC adults, but with larger mean differences  
291 and wider CI's that included the null (**Figure 2**).

292 Between-cohort heterogeneity was low to moderate for all outcomes at all ages, with a few  
293 exceptions. There was substantial between-cohort heterogeneity in results for length/height,  
294 weight, and BMI at ages <3 months and 3-5 months (**Figure 1**). Sensitivity analysis showed  
295 that results for outcomes at both ages were robust to influential cohorts, although they were  
296 slightly attenuated when the MoBa cohort was omitted (**eFigure 8**).

297 For some additional analyses there were too few ART conceptions to include all older age  
298 groups. Results were similar when ART was compared with sub-fertile NC and fertile NC  
299 (**Figure 3**), when ICSI and IVF were compared with NC (**Figure 4**), and in females and  
300 males (**eFigure 9**). Mean length/height, weight, and BMI were on average lower in those  
301 conceived by fresh ET compared with NC offspring across all available age groups i.e., from  
302 age <3 months to age 6 to 9 years (**Figure 5**). Conversely, differences were closer to the null  
303 for FET compared with NC, though results were imprecise (**Figure 5**). The differences in all  
304 growth and adiposity outcomes were only partially attenuated when analyses were restricted  
305 to singletons (**eFigure 10**), whereas differences between ART-conceived and NC offspring  
306 (**eFigure 11**), and between fresh ET and NC offspring (**eFigure 12**) were considerably  
307 attenuated after further adjustment for birth weight and gestational age, particularly at  
308 younger ages.

309

## 310 **DISCUSSION**

311 We used data from 26 multinational cohort studies to investigate the association between  
312 ART conception and offspring growth and adiposity. The large number of offspring, and

313 length of follow-up, allowed us to explore findings in subgroups by age from infancy to early  
314 adulthood. We found that offspring conceived by ART were on average shorter, lighter, and  
315 thinner from infancy to early adolescence than NC offspring. Differences were largest earlier  
316 in life but were small in magnitude across all ages. There was little evidence that differences  
317 were driven by parental subfertility given similar results when we compared ART with NC  
318 where parents conceived after 12 months and where conception occurred within a shorter  
319 period since start of trying. Those conceived from fresh embryos were smaller than NC  
320 offspring whereas frozen-thawed embryos were comparable to NC. Results appeared  
321 independent of multiple births and were at least partly mediated by birth weight and  
322 gestational age, particularly at younger ages.

323 Our findings are in line with previous studies and reviews of outcomes at birth and in young  
324 children (6, 15-17). Although not directly comparable with our study, our finding of smaller  
325 associations among older children is consistent with results from a recent study that found  
326 more rapid growth from birth to 3 years in ART-conceived than NC offspring (18). That  
327 study also examined outcomes at age 17 years in individuals screened for conscription in  
328 Norway and found no difference between ART-conceived and NC offspring at that age,  
329 which is consistent with our finding of no difference in growth in older adolescence.

330 Our results for fresh ET and FET are consistent with previous studies showing smaller birth  
331 weight in fresh ET compared with NC, and higher birth weight and large-for-gestational-age  
332 in FET compared with fresh ET (12, 13). Our study also agrees with results from a UK record  
333 linkage study that assessed birth size and body size at 6-8 weeks and 5 years in offspring born  
334 between 1997-2009, showing that compared with NC, offspring born by fresh embryos were  
335 lighter, and those born by FET were heavier at birth and 6-8 weeks, and that all groups had  
336 similar weight at 5 years (16).

337 The reasons for lower birth weight and higher risk of small-for-gestational-age shown in  
338 previous studies (8, 15) and the (modestly) smaller infant/child size in our study in ART-  
339 conceived offspring are not fully understood. The gametic and embryonic manipulations  
340 associated with ART may impact embryonic/fetal development in a manner that is reflected  
341 in different growth patterns relative to NC individuals. Growth differences could also reflect  
342 physiological responses to ART-induced lower birth size (and gestational age), and unlikely  
343 to be sex-specific or differ by ART type given our finding of broadly similar results in males  
344 and females and conventional IVF and ICSI. This is supported by our finding that differences  
345 attenuate by adjustment for birthweight and gestational age, though, this should be interpreted  
346 with caution since assumptions for such analyses and potential for collider bias makes them  
347 difficult to interpret (25, 26, 28). Other possible explanations include effects of ART-induced  
348 epigenetic alterations (29, 30), and effects of the ovarian stimulating hormones administered  
349 prior to ART. The different findings for fresh ET and FET may reflect effects of ovarian  
350 stimulation on endometrium and corpus luteum when using fresh embryos (31) or the impact  
351 of freezing on embryos.

352 Ours is the first study to date to explore long-term associations with waist circumference,  
353 body fat % and FMI, with results suggesting ART-conceived individuals had lower central  
354 and total adiposity in childhood, and possibly higher levels in adulthood. Our early life results  
355 agree with findings from 85 Singaporean ART-conceived offspring showing smaller skinfold  
356 thickness than NC offspring at 6 years (19). Our finding suggestive of an association between  
357 ART and higher adiposity in young adults agrees with results from a Nordic registry study  
358 showing slightly increased obesity risk in young ART-conceived adults (32). One possible  
359 reason for this result is that the rapid infant growth we observed in ART-conceived offspring  
360 continues (at a decelerating rate) for extended time. This is consistent with prior evidence of



361 an association between rapid infant growth and adult overweight and obesity (33), and with  
362 cardiovascular disease risk in later adulthood (34).

363 It is important to note that our pooled effect sizes were small across all age groups, including  
364 at the youngest ages where they were largest in magnitude. For example, when expressed in  
365 its natural units, the largest differences in weight, observed at age <3 months, was 183 grams  
366 (95%CI: 105 to 261) lower in those conceived by ART. Therefore, it is unlikely that these  
367 differences will result in any clinically meaningful differences at any age. It is also worth  
368 acknowledging that our pooled results represent average differences in outcomes across all  
369 populations from all included cohorts, and there was some evidence of heterogeneity for  
370 some outcomes. However, sensitivity analyses indicated results were robust to influential  
371 cohorts and heterogeneity was due to differences in directionally consistent effect sizes.

372 Strengths of this study include the large sample size and inclusion of cohorts from different  
373 geographic regions which should make our findings generalisable to more populations. The  
374 large numbers allowed an assessment of heterogeneity in the main results, an exploration of  
375 potential roles of subfertility, different ART treatments, multiple births, and indirect effects  
376 through prematurity. Use of birth cohorts with comparison with NC children from the same  
377 underlying population as those conceived by ART and with identical baseline data collection,  
378 follow-up periods, and assessments in ART-conceived and NC children, is another important  
379 strength. Many previous studies compared clinical ART cohorts with a comparator group  
380 selected at the time of outcome assessment, thus lacking early data on potential confounders,  
381 and these were often selected from relatives/friends of the couples undergoing ART, which  
382 may introduce a selection bias (17). Record linkage studies mostly avoid this selection bias  
383 but are generally limited in the extent to which they can adjust for confounding or explore  
384 role of sub-fertility.

385 Limitations include low precision/power at older ages, which highlights the importance of  
386 measuring outcomes in adult life. Those with outcomes at older ages were exposed to ART  
387 some decades ago using treatments and embryo culture techniques that are less relevant to  
388 contemporary practices, thus making it difficult to know the extent to which findings would  
389 generalise to more recently born cohorts. Therefore, there is a need to promote collection of  
390 data on mode of conception from birth cohorts and to ensure those conceived by ART are  
391 included so that future analyses can continually add new cohorts to examine changes in  
392 associations by birth years and age. Our analysis was restricted to those with complete data  
393 on mode of conception, outcomes, and confounders which may have reduced precision of  
394 estimates and introduced bias due to missing data. Residual confounding by unmeasured  
395 factors (e.g., paternal health) is possible and might influence our findings.

396 In conclusion, we found that ART-conceived offspring were on average slightly smaller and  
397 had modestly lower adiposity than NC offspring during early life, with associations reduced  
398 with older child age, with some imprecise evidence for higher adiposity by early adulthood  
399 with ART conception. Overall, our findings are reassuring since differences in early growth  
400 were small though, there is a need for additional follow-up and studies with larger numbers  
401 into older ages to investigate the possibility of greater adiposity in adulthood.

402

#### 403 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

404 Cohort-specific acknowledgements and finding statements are provided in the supplement.  
405 The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research  
406 Council under agreement No 101021566 (ART-HEALTH), the European Union's Horizon  
407 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 733206 (LifeCycle), the  
408 Medical Research Council (MC\_UU\_00011/6), British Heart Foundation (CH/F/20/90003

409 and AA/18/7/34219), and Bristol National Institute of Health Research Biomedical Research  
410 Centre (NF-0616-10102). DAL has received support from Medtronic and Roche Diagnostics  
411 for research unrelated to that presented here. SMN has received support from Roche  
412 Diagnostics, Access Fertility, Modern Fertility, Ferring Pharmaceuticals, TFP, and Merck for  
413 research unrelated to that presented here. All the other authors declare no competing interests.  
414 AE had full access to the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data  
415 and the accuracy of the data analysis.

416

## 417 REFERENCES

- 418 1. Zegers-Hochschild F, Adamson GD, Dyer S, et al. The International Glossary on  
419 Infertility and Fertility Care, 2017. *Hum Reprod* 2017; **32**(9): 1786-801.
- 420 2. Crawford G, Ledger W. In vitro fertilisation/intracytoplasmic sperm injection beyond  
421 2020. *BJOG* 2019; **126**(2): 237-43.
- 422 3. Wang H, Abbas KM, Abbasifard M, et al. Global age-sex-specific fertility, mortality,  
423 healthy life expectancy (HALE), and population estimates in 204 countries and territories,  
424 1950–2019: a comprehensive demographic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study  
425 2019. *Lancet* 2020; **396**(10258): 1160-203.
- 426 4. Levine H, Jørgensen N, Martino-Andrade A, et al. Temporal trends in sperm count: a  
427 systematic review and meta-regression analysis. *Hum Reprod Update* 2017; **23**(6): 646-59.
- 428 5. Smith ADAC, Tilling K, Nelson SM, Lawlor DA. Live-birth rate associated with  
429 repeat in vitro fertilization treatment cycles. *JAMA* 2015; **314**(24): 2654-62.

- 430 6. Goisis A, Remes H, Martikainen P, Klemetti R, Myrskylä M. Medically assisted  
431 reproduction and birth outcomes: a within-family analysis using Finnish population registers.  
432 *Lancet* 2019; **393**(10177): 1225-32.
- 433 7. Pinborg A, Wennerholm UB, Romundstad LB, Loft A, Aittomaki K, Söderström-  
434 Anttila V, et al. Why do singletons conceived after assisted reproduction technology have  
435 adverse perinatal outcome? Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Hum Reprod Update*.  
436 2013;19(2):87-104.
- 437 8. Berntsen S, Söderström-Anttila V, Wennerholm U-B, Laivuori H, Loft A, Oldereid  
438 NB, et al. The health of children conceived by ART: ‘the chicken or the egg?’. *Hum Reprod*  
439 *Update*. 2019;25(2):137-58.
- 440 9. Dhalwani NN, Boulet SL, Kissin DM, Zhang Y, McKane P, Bailey MA, et al.  
441 Assisted reproductive technology and perinatal outcomes: conventional versus discordant-  
442 sibling design. *Fertil Steril*. 2016;106(3):710-6.e2.
- 443 10. Esteves SC, Roque M, Bedoschi G, Haahr T, Humaidan P. Intracytoplasmic sperm  
444 injection for male infertility and consequences for offspring. *Nat Rev Urol*. 2018;15(9):535-  
445 62.
- 446 11. Smith A, Tilling K, Lawlor DA, Nelson SM. Live birth rates and perinatal outcomes  
447 when all embryos are frozen compared with conventional fresh and frozen embryo transfer: a  
448 cohort study of 337,148 in vitro fertilisation cycles. *BMC Med*. 2019;17(1):202.
- 449 12. Terho AM, Pelkonen S, Opdahl S, Romundstad LB, Bergh C, Wennerholm UB, et al.  
450 High birth weight and large-for-gestational-age in singletons born after frozen compared to  
451 fresh embryo transfer, by gestational week: a Nordic register study from the CoNARTaS  
452 group. *Hum Reprod*. 2021;36(4):1083-92.
- 453 13. Westvik-Johari K, Romundstad LB, Lawlor DA, Bergh C, Gissler M, Henningsen A-  
454 KA, et al. Separating parental and treatment contributions to perinatal health after fresh and

- 455 frozen embryo transfer in assisted reproduction: A cohort study with within-sibship analysis.  
456 PLOS Med. 2021;18(6):e1003683.
- 457 14. Shi Y, Sun Y, Hao C, Zhang H, Wei D, Zhang Y, et al. Transfer of Fresh versus  
458 Frozen Embryos in Ovulatory Women. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(2):126-36.
- 459 15. Hart R, Norman RJ. The longer-term health outcomes for children born as a result of  
460 IVF treatment: Part I--General health outcomes. Hum Reprod Update. 2013;19(3):232-43.
- 461 16. Hann M, Roberts SA, D'Souza SW, Clayton P, Macklon N, Brison DR. The growth of  
462 assisted reproductive treatment-conceived children from birth to 5 years: a national cohort  
463 study. BMC Med. 2018;16(1):224.
- 464 17. Guo XY, Liu XM, Jin L, Wang TT, Ullah K, Sheng JZ, et al. Cardiovascular and  
465 metabolic profiles of offspring conceived by assisted reproductive technologies: a systematic  
466 review and meta-analysis. Fertil Steril. 2017;107(3):622-31.e5.
- 467 18. Magnus MC, Wilcox AJ, Fadum EA, Gjessing HK, Opdahl S, Juliusson PB, et al.  
468 Growth in children conceived by ART. Hum Reprod. 2021;36(4):1074-82.
- 469 19. Huang JY, Cai S, Huang Z, Tint MT, Yuan WL, Aris IM, et al. Analyses of child  
470 cardiometabolic phenotype following assisted reproductive technologies using a pragmatic  
471 trial emulation approach. Nat Commun. 2021;12(1):5613.
- 472 20. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The  
473 Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:  
474 guidelines for reporting observational studies. Lancet. 2007;370(9596):1453-7.
- 475 21. Jaddoe VWV, Felix JF, Andersen AN, Charles MA, Chatzi L, Corpeleijn E, et al. The  
476 LifeCycle Project-EU Child Cohort Network: a federated analysis infrastructure and  
477 harmonized data of more than 250,000 children and parents. Eur J Epidemiol.  
478 2020;35(7):709-24.

- 479 22. Pinot de Moira A, Haakma S, Strandberg-Larsen K, van Enkevort E, Kooijman M,  
480 Cadman T, et al. The EU Child Cohort Network’s core data: establishing a set of findable,  
481 accessible, interoperable and re-usable (FAIR) variables. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2021;36(5):565-  
482 580.
- 483 23. Voerman E, Santos S, Inskip H, Amiano P, Barros H, Charles MA, et al. Association  
484 of gestational weight gain with adverse maternal and infant outcomes. *JAMA.*  
485 2019;321(17):1702-15.
- 486 24. Carson SA, Kallen AN. Diagnosis and management of infertility: a review. *JAMA.*  
487 2021;326(1):65-76.
- 488 25. Pearce N, Lawlor DA. Causal inference—so much more than statistics. *Int J*  
489 *Epidemiol.* 2017;45(6):1895-903.
- 490 26. Lipsky AM, Greenland S. Causal Directed Acyclic Graphs. *JAMA.*  
491 2022;doi:10.1001/jama.2022.1816
- 492 27. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-  
493 analyses. *Bmj.* 2003;327(7414):557-60.
- 494 28. Munafò MR, Tilling K, Taylor AE, Evans DM, Davey Smith G. Collider scope: when  
495 selection bias can substantially influence observed associations. *Int J Epidemiol.*  
496 2018;47(1):226-35.
- 497 29. Novakovic B, Lewis S, Halliday J, Kennedy J, Burgner DP, Czajko A, et al. Assisted  
498 reproductive technologies are associated with limited epigenetic variation at birth that largely  
499 resolves by adulthood. *Nat Commun.* 2019;10(1):3922.
- 500 30. Caramaschi D, Jungius J, Page CM, Novakovic B, Saffery R, Halliday J, et al.  
501 Association of medically assisted reproduction with offspring cord blood DNA methylation  
502 across cohorts. *Hum Reprod.* 2021; 36(8):2403-2413.

- 503 31. Shapiro BS, Daneshmand ST, Garner FC, Aguirre M, Hudson C, Thomas S. Evidence  
504 of impaired endometrial receptivity after ovarian stimulation for in vitro fertilization: a  
505 prospective randomized trial comparing fresh and frozen–thawed embryo transfer in normal  
506 responders. *Fertil Steril*. 2011;96(2):344-8.
- 507 32. Norrman E, Petzold M, Gissler M, Spangmose AL, Opdahl S, Henningsen A-K, et al.  
508 Cardiovascular disease, obesity, and type 2 diabetes in children born after assisted  
509 reproductive technology: A population-based cohort study. *PLOS Med*.  
510 2021;18(9):e1003723.
- 511 33. Monteiro POA, Victora CG. Rapid growth in infancy and childhood and obesity in  
512 later life – a systematic review. *Obes Rev*. 2005;6(2):143-54.
- 513 34. Eriksson JG, Forsen T, Tuomilehto J, Winter PD, Osmond C, Barker DJ. Catch-up  
514 growth in childhood and death from coronary heart disease: longitudinal study. *BMJ*.  
515 1999;318(7181):427-31.

516

## 517 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

518 **Figure 1 Parts A-C. Mean difference in (A) length/height, (B) weight, and (C) body mass**  
519 **index between ART-conceived and NC offspring.** Figure shows the pooled adjusted mean  
520 differences in SD units [and 95% confidence intervals] in (A) length/height, (B) weight, and  
521 (C) body mass index at each age group between ART-conceived and NC offspring (ART  
522 minus NC). Cohort-specific results were adjusted for maternal age, parity, BMI, smoking,  
523 education, ethnicity/country of birth, plus offspring sex and age. St. is the number of cohort  
524 studies; NC is the number of NC offspring; ART is the number of ART-conceived offspring;  
525  $I^2$  represents the percentage of total variability that is due to between cohort heterogeneity.  
526 Cohort-specific results are provided in eFigure 2-4.

527 **Figure 2 Parts A-C. Mean difference in (A) waist circumference, (B) body fat %, and**  
528 **(C) fat mass index between ART-conceived and NC offspring.** Figure shows the pooled  
529 adjusted mean differences in SD units [and 95% confidence intervals] in (A) waist  
530 circumference, (B) body fat %, and (C) fat mass index at each age group between ART-  
531 conceived and NC offspring (ART minus NC). Cohort-specific results were adjusted for  
532 maternal age, parity, BMI, smoking, education, ethnicity/country of birth, plus offspring sex  
533 and age. St. is the number of cohort studies; NC is the number of NC offspring; ART is the  
534 number of ART-conceived offspring;  $I^2$  represents the percentage of total variability that is  
535 due to between cohort heterogeneity. Cohort-specific results are provided in eFigure 5-7.

536 **Figure 3. Mean difference in growth and adiposity outcomes between ART-conceived**  
537 **and NC offspring, separately for NC offspring of sub-fertile and fertile parents.** Figure  
538 shows the pooled adjusted mean differences in SD units and 95% confidence intervals in  
539 growth and adiposity outcomes at each age group between ART-conceived and NC offspring  
540 (ART minus NC) of fertile parents ( $\leq 12$  months to pregnancy and sub-fertile parents ( $> 12$   
541 months to pregnancy)). Cohort-specific results were adjusted for maternal age, parity, BMI,  
542 smoking, education, ethnicity/country of birth, plus offspring sex and age. The number of  
543 offspring at each age for the primary outcomes (length/height, weight and BMI) varied from  
544 2,955 ART, 93,877 fertile NC, and 11,153 sub-fertile NC for weight at age 3 to 5 months to  
545 51 ART, 3,350 fertile NC, and 494 sub-fertile NC for BMI at  $> 17$  years.

546 **Figure 4. Mean difference in growth and adiposity outcomes between ART-conceived**  
547 **and NC offspring, separately for offspring conceived by conventional IVF and ICSI.**  
548 Figure shows the pooled adjusted mean differences in SD units and 95% confidence intervals  
549 in growth and adiposity outcomes at each age group between ART-conceived and NC  
550 offspring (ART minus NC), separately for offspring conceived by conventional IVF and  
551 ICSI. Cohort-specific results were adjusted for maternal age, parity, BMI, smoking,




552 education, ethnicity/country of birth, plus offspring sex and age. St. is the number of cohort  
553 studies. The number of offspring at each age for the primary outcomes (length/height, weight,  
554 and BMI) varied from 1,517 conventional IVF, 1,382 ICSI, and 102,386 NC for weight at age  
555 3 to 5 months to 105 conventional IVF, 37 ICSI, and 11,164 NC for BMI at age 14 to 17  
556 years.


557 **Figure 5. Mean difference in length/height, weight, and body mass index between ART-**  
558 **conceived and NC offspring, separately for offspring conceived using fresh and frozen-**  
559 **thawed embryo transfer.** Figure shows the pooled adjusted mean differences in SD units  
560 and 95% confidence intervals in length/height, weight, and body mass index at each age  
561 group between ART-conceived and NC offspring (ART minus NC), separately for offspring  
562 conceived using fresh embryo transfer and frozen-thawed embryo transfer. Cohort-specific  
563 results were adjusted for maternal age, parity, BMI, smoking, education, ethnicity/country of  
564 birth, plus offspring sex and age The number of offspring at each age varied from 1,904 fresh  
565 embryo transfer, 303 frozen-thawed embryo transfer, and 78,128 NC for weight at age 3 to 5  
566 months to 433 conventional fresh embryo transfer, 84 frozen-thawed embryo transfer, and  
567 15,490 NC for BMI at age 17 to 23 months.

Age Group	I <sup>2</sup>	St.	NC	ART	Estimate [95% CI]
-----------	----------------	-----	----	-----	-------------------



**A. length/height**




**B weight**





**C. body mass index**







mean difference in SD units







- ART vs. NC (sub-fertile parents)
- ART vs. NC (fertile parents)





 ART (fresh embryo transfer) vs. NC  
 ART (frozen-thawed embryo transfer) vs. NC