# Increased BMI associated with decreased breastfeeding initiation in Million Veteran Program participants

Joanna Lankester PhD[1,2], Rodrigo Guarischi-Sousa PhD[2], Austin T Hilliard PhD[2], VA Million Veteran Program[3], Labiba Shere[2], Marya Husary MPH[2], Susan Crowe MD[4], Philip S Tsao PhD[1,2], David H Rehkopf ScD, MPH[5,1], Themistocles L Assimes MD, PhD[1,2,5]

1. Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
2. VA Palo Alto Health Care System, Palo Alto, CA, USA
3. A list of consortium members can be found in the Supplementary File
4. Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
5. Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

## IRB statement

The study received ethical and study protocol approval from the U.S. Veterans Affairs Central Institutional Review Board.

## Data Availability

Access to individual level data used in the present work requires approval by the U.S. Veterans Administration.

## Funding

JL is supported by the Big Data Scientific Training Enhancement Program (BD-STEP) through the Veterans Affairs and National Cancer Institute. TLA is supported by a grant from the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (R01DK114183). This research is based on data from the Million Veteran Program, Office of Research and Development, Veterans Health Administration, and was supported by Veterans Administration awards I01-01BX003362. The content of this manuscript does not represent the views of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the United States Government.

# Consortia

The VA Million Veteran Program. Members of the consortium can be found in the Supplementary File Text.


# Abstract

## Background

Breastfeeding has been associated with maternal and infant health benefits but has been inversely associated with body mass index (BMI) prepartum. Breastfeeding and BMI are both linked to socioeconomic factors.

## Methods

Data from parous female participants with available breastfeeding information from the Million Veteran Program cohort was included. BMI at enrollment and earliest BMI available were extracted, and polygenic scores (PGS) for BMI were calculated. We modeled breastfeeding for one month or more as a function of BMI at enrollment; earliest BMI where available pre-pregnancy; and PGS for BMI. We conducted Mendelian randomization for breastfeeding initiation using PGS as an instrumental variable.

## Results

A higher BMI predicted a lower likelihood of breastfeeding for one month or more in all analyses. A +5 $kg/m^2$ BMI pre-pregnancy was associated with a 24% reduced odds of breastfeeding, and a +5 $kg/m^2$ genetically predicted BMI was associated with a 17% reduced odds of breastfeeding.

## Conclusions

BMI predicts a lower likelihood of breastfeeding for one month or longer. Given the high success of breastfeeding initiation regardless of BMI in supportive environments as well as potential health benefits, patients with elevated BMI may benefit from additional postpartum breastfeeding support.



# Keywords

breastfeeding, breastfeeding initiation, body mass index, lactogenesis, polygenic risk scores, polygenic scores, Million Veteran Program

# Background

Breastfeeding is associated with maternal health benefits, such as lower incidence of type 2 diabetes, in addition to well established benefits for infants. Body mass may have a complex time-dependent relationship with breastfeeding. Some studies have found that breastfeeding is associated with greater postpartum weight loss, while others have found no effect[1]. In the other direction, body mass prepartum may impact breastfeeding. Prospective studies have shown that those who breastfeed, or breastfeed for a longer duration, already had a lower pre-pregnancy body mass index (BMI)[2, 3].

Breastfeeding is associated with socioeconomic factors. Women who breastfeed are more likely to be married and highly educated; they have a higher average household income, while they have lower rates of smoking and alcohol use[4-6]. Therefore, breastfeeding may be in part a marker of overall health status[7]. BMI is socioeconomically linked, and the association between BMI and breastfeeding could merely reflect practicalities such as work obligations that interfere with breastfeeding. However, this association has held even in a population with substantial postpartum work leave[8], suggesting plausible biologic factors. A delayed onset of lactogenesis observed among overweight and obese mothers could be a factor[9].

Use of a genetic risk score can mitigate some of the effects of confounding given that genetic variation is randomly assigned at conception due to the law of independent assortment. In this study, we look at the association between BMI and breastfeeding initiation in the Veteran population using both observational and genetic risk score methods.

# Methods

## Data Source

Million Veteran Program (MVP) is an observational cohort study and biobank of participants enrolled from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care system from 2011-present[10]. Data obtained for this project included phenotype data from the Baseline Survey, the Lifestyle Survey (which contains reproductive health questions), and electronic health records (EHR), as well as genotype data from the blood specimen drawn after enrollment. Participants in our study had enrolled between January 2011 and September 2021.

## Outcome and exposures

The Lifestyle Survey included sex-specific reproductive health questions, including the binary outcome variable for this study, “Did you breastfeed your child(ren) for a least 1 month?”, hereafter referred to as breastfeeding initiation. Participants eligible for inclusion were parous female participants who had completed the Lifestyle Survey with non-missing values for number of live births and breastfeeding initiation. BMI information was extracted from the CoreVitals table previously created by the MVP Data Analytics team. Weight and height in this table had been produced by harmonizing the EHR and Baseline Survey data.

The Baseline Survey value was used if the values agreed or if no measured value existed, but EHR data was used if the EHR and survey values were contradictory[11]. We also extracted directly from the EHR the earliest weight and height measured and the age at this measurement to obtain the earliest BMI. We used Python 3.9.1 for data extraction/transformation and R 4.0.3 for data analyses.

## Covariates

We obtained covariates of age, race, ethnicity, education, income, smoking status, and marital/partner status from the Baseline Survey. We obtained number of children born, breastfeeding initiation status, and age at first childbirth from the Lifestyle Survey. Details of these covariates are listed in Supplementary File Table S1. Summary statistics were extracted for covariates and breastfeeding initiation as a function of BMI variables.

## Statistical Analysis

### Observational Associations

We modeled breastfeeding initiation as a function of BMI using logistic regression. We used the two measures of BMI as previously described – BMI at enrollment and earliest BMI. We stratified the subset of participants whose earliest BMI was prior to childbirth as a sensitivity analysis due to the potential for reverse causation. BMI was considered both as a continuous variable and by quartile. Each analysis was conducted with three sets of covariates: (1) as a univariate analysis; (2) adjusted for age (at the date of the respective BMI value), race/ethnicity, education, income, smoking; (3) additionally adjusted for married/partnered status and number of children born.

### Genetic Associations

We used the PGS catalog entry 27 (https://www.pgscatalog.org/score/PGS000027/) to calculate a BMI polygenic score (PGS) in MVP participants. The entry included a set of weights for 2,100,302 genetic variants, or single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) derived from a genome wide association study of 238,944 individuals and validated in an independent data set of 119,951[12]. Both the training and validation datasets were independent of MVP. Genetic data in MVP originated from a custom Axiom array based on the Axiom Genotyping Platform and was imputed using the TOPMed panel in GRCh38/hg38[13]. A PGS for each individual was calculated as the sum of the products of imputed genetic dosage at each SNP and the corresponding PGS catalog weight[14]. These risk scores represent genetic liability for a higher BMI. Major ancestry groups had previously been determined based on Genetically Inferred Ancestry[15]. We standardized the PGS within each stratified ancestry group.

For genetic analyses, women were stratified based on their genetically inferred ancestry rather than their self-identified race/ethnicity. Population membership to all genotyped participants was assigned using a reference dataset of unrelated individuals from the 1000 Genomes Project (1KGP). This assignment was performed centrally as part

of a core MVP project and made available as a core resource for all MVP investigators[15]. We verified the association between the PGS and BMI. Within each genetically inferred major ancestry stratum, we evaluated the breastfeeding initiation outcome as a function of the PGS, both continuously and by quartile. We adjusted for age at enrollment and the first 10 genetic principal components.

We further used the PGS as an instrumental variable for a one-sample Mendelian Randomization analysis. We conducted a Wald ratio analysis within each major ancestry stratum, adjusting for the first 10 genetic principal components, using the R MendelianRandomization package.

# Results

The data yielded 20,375 individuals eligible for inclusion in this study, with BMI at enrollment available for 20,293 and BMI at/prior to the first offspring birth available for 532 (Supplementary File Figure S2). A total of 12,315 (60.7%) of participants had initiated breastfeeding. BMI at enrollment was positively associated with younger age of enrollment, self-identified Black or African American race, education less than a Bachelor's degree, low or medium income level, non-response to marital status and smoking survey questions, and formerly smoking, while it was inversely associated with currently smoking and currently married/partnered (Table 1a). BMI was strongly associated with the within-ancestry scaled PGS for BMI ($p=6.51 \times 10^{-142}$) and was inversely associated with having initiated breastfeeding ($p=7.53 \times 10^{-13}$). The mean BMI was 29.9 kg/m$^2$ (standard deviation 6.6), with means by quartile of 22.4, 27.1, 31.2, and 38.7. A standard deviation increase in the PGS was responsible for an increase in BMI at enrollment of 0.8-1.5 kg/m$^2$ and an increase in earliest pre-pregnancy BMI of 0.8-1.2 kg/m$^2$, depending on the ancestry group (Table 1b). The PGS had better performance in participants of European ancestry, consistent with the background of the training dataset that had been used to generate the PGS catalog entry.

**Table 1a: Covariates and outcome by body mass index (BMI) quartile (Q1 - lowest value, Q4 - highest value) and in total. Count (percentage) or mean (standard deviation).**

| Variable | Value or units | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | p value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BMI | kg/m^2 | 22.41 ( 1.93 ) | 27.1 ( 1.13 ) | 31.2 ( 1.33 ) | 38.74 ( 4.64 ) | 29.87 (6.56) | n/a |
| | Black | 696 (13.72%) | 1069 (21.07%) | 1193 (23.52%) | 1198 (23.62%) | 4156 (20.48%) | |
| | Hispanic | 348 (6.86%) | 436 (8.59%) | 416 (8.20%) | 348 (6.86%) | 1548 (7.63%) | |
| | White | 3803 (74.95%) | 3357 (66.17%) | 3275 (64.56%) | 3348 (66.00%) | 13783 (67.92%) | |
| Race/ethnicity | Other | 227 (4.47%) | 211 (4.16%) | 189 (3.73%) | 179 (3.53%) | 806 (3.97%) | 1.46E-45 |
| | No college degree | 1640 (32.32%) | 1627 (32.07%) | 1655 (32.62%) | 1775 (34.99%) | 6697 (33.00%) | |
| | Associates degree | 765 (15.08%) | 814 (16.05%) | 896 (17.66%) | 970 (19.12%) | 3445 (16.98%) | |
| | Bachelors degree | 1050 (20.69%) | 1073 (21.15%) | 986 (19.44%) | 896 (17.66%) | 4005 (19.74%) | |
| | Post-bachelors degree | 1026 (20.22%) | 872 (17.19%) | 759 (14.96%) | 559 (11.02%) | 3216 (15.85%) | |
| Education level | No answer | 593 (11.69%) | 687 (13.54%) | 777 (15.32%) | 873 (17.21%) | 2930 (14.44%) | 1.92E-48 |
| | Low | 1292 (25.46%) | 1274 (25.11%) | 1337 (26.36%) | 1545 (30.46%) | 5448 (26.85%) | |
| | Middle | 1236 (24.36%) | 1278 (25.19%) | 1344 (26.49%) | 1383 (27.26%) | 5241 (25.83%) | |
| | High | 1498 (29.52%) | 1445 (28.48%) | 1260 (24.84%) | 1004 (19.79%) | 5207 (25.66%) | |
| Income tertile | No answer | 1048 (20.65%) | 1076 (21.21%) | 1132 (22.31%) | 1141 (22.49%) | 4397 (21.67%) | 8.71E-31 |
| | Currently partnered or married | 3543 (69.83%) | 3412 (67.26%) | 3350 (66.04%) | 3282 (64.70%) | 13587 (66.95%) | |
| | Formerly married | 780 (15.37%) | 800 (15.77%) | 783 (15.43%) | 793 (15.63%) | 3156 (15.55%) | |
| | Never married | 125 (2.46%) | 144 (2.84%) | 143 (2.82%) | 114 (2.25%) | 526 (2.59%) | |
| Marital/partner status | No answer | 626 (12.34%) | 717 (14.13%) | 797 (15.71%) | 884 (17.43%) | 3024 (14.90%) | 1.96E-10 |
| | Never | 1994 (39.30%) | 2134 (42.07%) | 2074 (40.88%) | 2061 (40.63%) | 8263 (40.72%) | |
| | Former | 1496 (29.48%) | 1515 (29.86%) | 1536 (30.28%) | 1623 (31.99%) | 6170 (30.40%) | |
| | Current | 1038 (20.46%) | 776 (15.30%) | 738 (14.55%) | 559 (11.02%) | 3111 (15.33%) | |
| Smoking status | No answer | 546 (10.76%) | 648 (12.77%) | 725 (14.29%) | 830 (16.36%) | 2749 (13.55%) | 4.84E-30 |
| Age | years | 56.09 ( 13.94 ) | 55.97 ( 12.63 ) | 55.75 ( 11.78 ) | 55.5 ( 10.88 ) | 55.83 (12.36) | 0.00963 |
| Number of births | - | 2.16 ( 1.15 ) | 2.21 ( 1.15 ) | 2.19 ( 1.16 ) | 2.2 ( 1.15 ) | 2.19 (1.15) | 0.187 |
| Polygenic score for BMI (scaled within each ancestry group) | - | -0.28 ( 1.0 ) | -.08 ( 0.99 ) | 0.04 ( 0.97 ) | 0.27 ( 0.99 ) | -0.010 (1.01) | 6.51E-142 |
| | No | 1807 (35.61%) | 1906 (37.57%) | 2100 (41.40%) | 2165 (42.68%) | 7978 (39.31%) | |
| Breastfed | Yes | 3267 (64.39%) | 3167 (62.43%) | 2973 (58.60%) | 2908 (57.32%) | 12315 (60.69%) | 7.53E-15 |

**Table 1b: Relationship between polygenic score (PGS) and body mass index (BMI): by quartile (Q1 - lowest value, Q4 - highest value) and continuous. Mean (standard deviation) of BMI by PGS quartile. Coefficient, p value, and R^2 for the increase in BMI corresponding to 1 standard deviation of increase in PGS.**

| | Effect of PGS on BMI at enrollment | | | | | | | | Effect of PGS on earliest BMI at/before pregnancy | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group | n | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Continuous (kg/m^2) | p value (continuous) | R2 (continuous) | n | Continuous (kg/m^2) | p value (continuous) | R2 (continuous) |
| EUR | 11568 | 27.7 (6.1) | 29.1 (6.4) | 30.2 (6.7) | 31.6 (7.3) | 1.53 | 2.72E-134 | 0.051 | 310 | 1.22 | 7.94E-07 | 0.073 |
| AFR | 3589 | 29.7 (5.8) | 30.6 (6.2) | 31.2 (6.5) | 31.7 (6.1) | 0.811 | 4.76E-15 | 0.017 | 63 | 1.00 | 0.0737 | 0.036 |
| AMR | 1327 | 28.0 (5.8) | 29.9 (6.3) | 29.9 (5.5) | 31.2 (6.2) | 1.20 | 3.22E-13 | 0.039 | 60 | 0.815 | 0.122 | 0.024 |

**Table 2a: Observational analysis predicting breastfeeding initiation as a function of body mass index (BMI) at enrollment: by quartile (Q1 - lowest value, Q4 - highest value) and continuous (per +5 kg/m^2). Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval.**

| Covariates | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Continuous |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None (univariate) | ref. (1) | 0.91 (0.84,0.98) | 0.78 (0.72,0.84) | 0.74 (0.68,0.80) | 0.92 (0.90,0.94) |
| age + race/ethnicity + education level + income level + smoking status | ref. (1) | 0.97 (0.88,1.06) | 0.83 (0.75,0.90) | 0.78 (0.71,0.85) | 0.93 (0.91,0.95) |
| age + race/ethnicity + education level + income level + smoking status + married/partnered status + number of births | ref. (1) | 0.95 (0.86,1.04) | 0.81 (0.74,0.89) | 0.77 (0.70,0.84) | 0.93 (0.91,0.95) |

**Table 2b: Observational analysis predicting breastfeeding initiation as a function of earliest prepartum body mass index (BMI): by quartile (Q1 - lowest value, Q4 - highest value) and continuous (per +5 kg/m^2). Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval.**

| Covariates | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Continuous |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None (univariate) | ref. (1) | 0.91 (0.52,1.58) | 0.63 (0.34,1.17) | 0.37 (0.16,0.84) | 0.72 (0.56,0.92) |
| age at earliest BMI measurement + race/ethnicity + education level + income level + smoking status | ref. (1) | 0.87 (0.48,1.55) | 0.74 (0.38,1.43) | 0.37(0.15,0.94) | 0.76 (0.58,0.99) |
| age at earliest BMI measurement + race/ethnicity + education level + income level + smoking status + married/partnered status + number of births | ref. (1) | 0.87 (0.48,1.58) | 0.87 (0.44,1.72) | 0.34 (0.13,0.87) | 0.76 (0.58,1.00) |

**Table 2c: Genetic analysis predicting breastfeeding initiation as a function of polygenic score (PGS) for body mass index (BMI): by quartile (Q1 - lowest value, Q4 - highest value) and continuous (per +1 standard deviation of PGS). Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval. PC=principal component.**

| Ancestry group | Covariates | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Continuous |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EUR | age + PC1 + PC2 + PC3 + PC4 + PC5 + PC6 + PC7 + PC8 + PC9 + PC12 | ref. (1) | 0.89 (0.80,0.99) | 0.82 (0.74, 0.92) | 0.88 (0.79, 0.98) | 0.94 (0.91, 0.98) |
| AFR | age + PC1 + PC2 + PC3 + PC4 + PC5 + PC6 + PC7 + PC8 + PC9 + PC10 | ref. (1) | 0.91 (0.75, 1.11) | 0.89 (0.73, 1.09) | 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) | 0.94 (0.87, 1.01) |
| AMR | age + PC1 + PC2 + PC3 + PC4 + PC5 + PC6 + PC7 + PC8 + PC9 + PC11 | ref. (1) | 0.78 (0.55, 1.10) | 0.90 (0.62, 1.30) | 0.70 (0.47, 1.05) | 0.84 (0.73, 0.98) |

**Table 3: Mendelian randomization predicting breastfeeding initiation as a function of genetically predicted body mass index. P value, odds ratio (OR), and 95% confidence interval (CI) shown.**

| Ancestry group | p value | OR (CI) for +5 kg/m^2 |
|---|---|---|
| EUR | 0.002 | 0.83 (0.74, 0.93) |
| AFR | 0.111 | 0.69 (0.44, 1.09) |
| AMR | 0.0261 | 0.62 (0.41, 0.95) |

The observational analysis revealed that a higher BMI at enrollment was associated with a lower rate of breastfeeding initiation across all covariate models, whether BMI was considered continuously or by quartile (Table 2a; odds ratio (OR) = 0.93; 95% confidence interval [0.91, 0.95] per +5 kg/m$^2$ BMI for the fully adjusted model). Quartile estimates decreased monotonically (Q1, OR=1 (reference); Q2, OR=0.95 [0.86, 1.04]; Q3, 0.81 [0.74, 0.89]; Q4, 0.77 [0.70, 0.84]). In the subset of participants with a recorded BMI at or before the year of birth of the first offspring, effect sizes were larger with OR=0.76 [0.58, 1.00] per +5 BMI for the fully adjusted model (Table 2b). The fourth quartile showed an especially pronounced inverse association with breastfeeding initiation (OR=0.34 [0.13, 0.87]).

Genetic analyses included 11568, 3589, and 1327 participants of European (EUR), African (AFR), and Admixed American (AMR) ancestry, respectively, with an insufficient count of East Asian ancestry participants (131) to generate stable estimates. A higher PGS (and thus higher BMI) was predictive of a lower chance of breastfeeding initiation (Table 2c; OR=0.94 [0.91, 0.98] EUR; 0.94 [0.87, 1.01] AFR; 0.84 [0.73, 0.98] AMR per standard deviation of PGS).

Finally, the instrumental variable analysis with the PGS via Mendelian randomization showed a decrease in breastfeeding initiation with increased BMI (Table 3; per +5 kg/m$^2$ BMI, OR=0.83 [0.74, 0.93] EUR; 0.69 [0.44, 1.09] AFR; 0.62 [0.41, 0.95] AMR).

# Discussion

We found that BMI was inversely associated with breastfeeding initiation in all analyses in this study. Our analyses have mitigated against the likely pitfall of reverse causation (from a bidirectional relationship between breastfeeding and body mass) in two different ways: (1) through an observational pre-childbirth measurement in a subset and (2) via use of genetic risk scores. In the subset of individuals with pre-childbirth BMI available, a +5 kg/m$^2$ BMI was associated with a 24% reduced odds of breastfeeding, with a nonlinear trend indicating the highest BMIs led to the greatest risk of not initiating breastfeeding. The Mendelian randomization analysis found the genetic liability for +5 kg/m$^2$ BMI associated with at least a 17% reduced odds of breastfeeding. These findings suggest the importance of targeted, early breastfeeding support to those with higher BMIs who are at greater risk of being unable to initiate breastfeeding. Given that a lack of breastfeeding and a higher BMI are each independently linked with type 2 diabetes[2, 16], providing this targeted support could provide an important intervention for mitigating against risk of diabetes.

Multiple large scale studies have previously found a relationship between pre-pregnancy body mass and breastfeeding. The MIHA study at UCSF found that pre-pregnancy obesity predicted never breastfeeding[17]. Obesity and overweight status were also associated with lower breastfeeding initiation in the Norwegian MoBa data[18] and the Australian National Health Survey[19]. A retrospective analysis of over 176,000 women in the North West Thames region showed antenatal overweight/obesity associated with a markedly decreased odds of breastfeeding at discharge[20]. Pre-pregnancy body mass has also been implicated in earlier cessation of breastfeeding. In Nurses Health Study II data, BMI at age 18 years was inversely associated with duration of breastfeeding[2]. Pre-

pregnancy BMI was also a predictor of duration of breastfeeding in the Danish National Birth Cohort, despite a nearly universal initiation of breastfeeding[21].

Evidence is not compelling that intention to breastfeed by BMI drives these differences. Intent to breastfeed did not differ between BMI groups in the Infant Feeding Practices Study II (n=2824)[22], though obesity was associated with a shorter intended duration of breastfeeding in a smaller study from Cornell (n=114)[23]. Moreover, animal studies have also found that elevated body mass is associated with declines in lactation. Obese and overly lean pigs in late gestation have reduced mammary development[24]. Fat cow syndrome and high feeding before puberty are both linked to low milk yield in cows[25, 26]. Pups of obese rats gained significantly less weight in 3 weeks compared to controls[27]. Altogether this evidence suggests a biological mechanism for the impact of body weight on lactation.

Metabolic profile changes impairing lactogenesis II (the onset of copious milk production) could be driving the link between decreased breastfeeding and increased BMI. Delayed lactogenesis has previously been associated with cessation of breastfeeding by 4 weeks postpartum in the Infant Feeding Practices Study[28]. Lactogenesis II is driven by drop in progesterone with placental ejection and occurs regardless of attempting breastfeeding[29], and it is not associated with intention to breastfeed[30]. A delayed onset of lactation may lead to formula supplementation, which in turn may decrease the removal of milk from the breast, interfering with the supply-and-demand mechanism that drives the steady-state lactogenesis III by day 10 postpartum.

Metabolic factors, including BMI, have been consistently linked to a delay in lactogenesis II. Risk of delayed onset of lactation has been greater with overweight and obese BMI compared to normal range BMI in multiple studies, including a general population from UC Davis Medical Center[9] and a gestational diabetes mellitus specific population in SWIFT[30]. A study of 26 primiparas at a prenatal clinic found that 56% of the variation in the time to lactogenesis II was explained by a 1-hour post-glucose challenge serum insulin concentration[31]. Finally, a study of 40 women in the rural US found that the serum prolactin response to infant sucking was lower in those within an overweight/obese BMI range than in a normal BMI range[32]. Prolactin is a lactogenic hormone that enables milk production, but it also affects insulin sensitivity and lipid metabolism[33]. Serum prolactin – both during pregnancy[34] and at 6-9 weeks postpartum[35] – is inversely associated with later type 2 diabetes.

Structural changes in the breast could also be responsible for differences in lactogenesis. A study of diet-induced obese mice found delayed lactogenesis by one day compared to lean mice. In another subset of mice from this study, microscopy of mammary gland tissue cells from day 14 of pregnancy revealed abnormal alveolar development with reduced ductal branching in obese mice[36].

Researchers have questioned the direction of effect between breastfeeding and metabolic syndrome – breastfeeding as a reset of metabolic disruptions from pregnancy vs. metabolic disease adversely affecting breastfeeding such that adverse lactation outcomes are a marker of metabolic dysregulation[7, 37]. Both may be true. We have shown in this paper that a genetically predicted higher BMI associates with reduced likelihood of breastfeeding initiation. In light of other evidence, we consider that an impaired metabolic

profile, as most easily measured by BMI, is responsible for a decrease in breastfeeding initiation.

A strength of our study is the sample size. Although the Veteran population is mostly male, the large number of participants enrolled in MVP led to a substantial female population eligible for inclusion. Despite the relatively smaller number of participants with pre-partum measurements, a sample size of over 500 in this stratum was substantial and sufficient to detect an effect. Nevertheless, replication in additional populations would be warranted. Another strength is diversity, with over 40% of the genetic samples in subjects of non-European ancestry.

A weakness of our study was a limited measure of breastfeeding, with information only on whether breastfeeding occurred for one month and no further information on breastfeeding duration. We do not have information on whether breastfeeding was attempted but not sustained vs. never attempted. Moreover, the survey question does not differentiate between multiparas who breastfed all children vs. only one child for one month or more. The survey also did not include information on exclusivity of breastfeeding vs. combined breastfeeding and formula feeding. Further studies are needed in data sets with additional variables. Another weakness was that most measured BMIs occurred after pregnancy, so the observational analysis of BMI at enrollment may suffer from reverse causation.

In conclusion, we have shown that a higher BMI predicts a lower likelihood of initiation of breastfeeding. Importantly, this finding does not imply that patients with elevated BMI should not attempt breastfeeding; in fact, when adequately supported, breastfeeding initiation can be nearly universal[21]. Instead, additional support should be provided to those with higher BMI in the postpartum time to ensure successful breastfeeding initiation, which may represent an important intervention time with later maternal health benefits.

# References


1. Neville CE, McKinley MC, Holmes VA, Spence D, Woodside JV. The relationship between breastfeeding and postpartum weight change--a systematic review and critical evaluation. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2014; **38**: 577-90. PMID 23892523.
2. Stuebe AM, Rich-Edwards JW, Willett WC, Manson JE, Michels KB. Duration of lactation and incidence of type 2 diabetes. *Jama* 2005; **294**: 2601-10. PMID 16304074.
3. Gunderson EP, Jacobs DR, Jr., Chiang V, et al. Duration of lactation and incidence of the metabolic syndrome in women of reproductive age according to gestational diabetes mellitus status: a 20-Year prospective study in CARDIA (Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults). *Diabetes* 2010; **59**: 495-504. PMID 19959762.
4. CDC. *Rates of Any and Exclusive Breastfeeding by Socio-demographics among Children Born in 2020*. [cited June 17, 2024]; Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/breastfeeding/data/nis_data/rates-any-exclusive-bf-socio-dem-2020.htm
5. Dumas A, Toutain S, Simmat-Durand L. Alcohol Use During Pregnancy or Breastfeeding: A National Survey in France. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)* 2017; **26**: 798-805. PMID 28281881.
6. Weiser TM, Lin M, Garikapaty V, Feyerharm RW, Bensyl DM, Zhu BP. Association of maternal smoking status with breastfeeding practices: Missouri, 2005. *Pediatrics* 2009; **124**: 1603-10. PMID 19917583.
7. Stuebe AM. Does breastfeeding prevent the metabolic syndrome, or does the metabolic syndrome prevent breastfeeding? *Semin Perinatol* 2015; **39**: 290-5. PMID 26187772.
8. Baker JL, Michaelsen KF, Sørensen TI, Rasmussen KM. High prepregnant body mass index is associated with early termination of full and any breastfeeding in Danish women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2007; **86**: 404-11. PMID 17684212.
9. Nommsen-Rivers LA, Chantry CJ, Peerson JM, Cohen RJ, Dewey KG. Delayed onset of lactogenesis among first-time mothers is related to maternal obesity and factors associated with ineffective breastfeeding. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2010; **92**: 574-84. PMID 20573792.
10. Gaziano JM, Concato J, Brophy M, et al. Million Veteran Program: A mega-biobank to study genetic influences on health and disease. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016; **70**: 214-23. PMID 26441289.
11. Nguyen XT, Quaden RM, Song RJ, et al. Baseline Characterization and Annual Trends of Body Mass Index for a Mega-Biobank Cohort of US Veterans 2011-2017. *J Health Res Rev Dev Ctries* 2018; **5**: 98-107. PMID 33117892.
12. Khera AV, Chaffin M, Wade KH, et al. Polygenic Prediction of Weight and Obesity Trajectories from Birth to Adulthood. *Cell* 2019; **177**: 587-96.e9. PMID 31002795.
13. Hunter-Zinck H, Shi Y, Li M, et al. Genotyping Array Design and Data Quality Control in the Million Veteran Program. *Am J Hum Genet* 2020; **106**: 535-48. PMID 32243820.
14. Dudbridge F. Power and predictive accuracy of polygenic risk scores. *PLoS Genet* 2013; **9**: e1003348. PMID 23555274.

15. Verma A, Huffman JE, Rodriguez A, et al. Diversity and Scale: Genetic Architecture of 2,068 Traits in the VA Million Veteran Program. *medRxiv* 2023. PMID 37425708.
16. Gunderson EP, Lewis CE, Lin Y, et al. Lactation Duration and Progression to Diabetes in Women Across the Childbearing Years: The 30-Year CARDIA Study. *JAMA Intern Med* 2018; **178**: 328-37. PMID 29340577.
17. Heck KE, Braveman P, Cubbin C, Chávez GF, Kiely JL. Socioeconomic status and breastfeeding initiation among California mothers. *Public Health Rep* 2006; **121**: 51-9. PMID 16416698.
18. Winkvist A, Brantsæter AL, Brandhagen M, Haugen M, Meltzer HM, Lissner L. Maternal Prepregnant Body Mass Index and Gestational Weight Gain Are Associated with Initiation and Duration of Breastfeeding among Norwegian Mothers. *J Nutr* 2015; **145**: 1263-70. PMID 25904732.
19. Donath SM, Amir LH. Does maternal obesity adversely affect breastfeeding initiation and duration? *J Paediatr Child Health* 2000; **36**: 482-6. PMID 11036806.
20. Sebire NJ, Jolly M, Harris JP, et al. Maternal obesity and pregnancy outcome: a study of 287,213 pregnancies in London. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2001; **25**: 1175-82. PMID 11477502.
21. Kirkegaard H, Bliddal M, Støvring H, et al. Breastfeeding and later maternal risk of hypertension and cardiovascular disease - The role of overall and abdominal obesity. *Prev Med* 2018; **114**: 140-8. PMID 29953898.
22. Hauff LE, Leonard SA, Rasmussen KM. Associations of maternal obesity and psychosocial factors with breastfeeding intention, initiation, and duration. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014; **99**: 524-34. PMID 24401717.
23. Hilson JA, Rasmussen KM, Kjolhede CL. High prepregnant body mass index is associated with poor lactation outcomes among white, rural women independent of psychosocial and demographic correlates. *J Hum Lact* 2004; **20**: 18-29. PMID 14974697.
24. Farmer C. Nutritional impact on mammary development in pigs: a review. *J Anim Sci* 2018; **96**: 3748-56. PMID 29912353.
25. Morrow DA. Fat cow syndrome. *J Dairy Sci* 1976; **59**: 1625-9. PMID 965540.
26. Sejrsen K, Purup S, Vestergaard M, Foldager J. High body weight gain and reduced bovine mammary growth: physiological basis and implications for milk yield potential. *Domest Anim Endocrinol* 2000; **19**: 93-104. PMID 11025189.
27. Rolls BJ, Rowe EA. Pregnancy and lactation in the obese rat: effects on maternal and pup weights. *Physiol Behav* 1982; **28**: 393-400. PMID 7079354.
28. Brownell E, Howard CR, Lawrence RA, Dozier AM. Delayed onset lactogenesis II predicts the cessation of any or exclusive breastfeeding. *J Pediatr* 2012; **161**: 608-14. PMID 22575242.
29. Sriraman NK. The Nuts and Bolts of Breastfeeding: Anatomy and Physiology of Lactation. *Curr Probl Pediatr Adolesc Health Care* 2017; **47**: 305-10. PMID 29246381.
30. Matias SL, Dewey KG, Quesenberry CP, Jr., Gunderson EP. Maternal prepregnancy obesity and insulin treatment during pregnancy are independently associated with delayed lactogenesis in women with recent gestational diabetes mellitus. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014; **99**: 115-21. PMID 24196401.

31. Nommsen-Rivers LA, Dolan LM, Huang B. Timing of stage II lactogenesis is predicted by antenatal metabolic health in a cohort of primiparas. *Breastfeed Med* 2012; **7**: 43-9. PMID 21524193.
32. Rasmussen KM, Kjolhede CL. Prepregnant overweight and obesity diminish the prolactin response to suckling in the first week postpartum. *Pediatrics* 2004; **113**: e465-71. PMID 15121990.
33. Rassie K, Giri R, Joham AE, Mousa A, Teede H. Prolactin in relation to gestational diabetes and metabolic risk in pregnancy and postpartum: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)* 2022; **13**: 1069625. PMID 36619539.
34. Retnakaran R, Ye C, Kramer CK, et al. Maternal Serum Prolactin and Prediction of Postpartum β-Cell Function and Risk of Prediabetes/Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2016; **39**: 1250-8. PMID 27208323.
35. Zhang Z, Piro AL, Allalou A, et al. Prolactin and Maternal Metabolism in Women With a Recent GDM Pregnancy and Links to Future T2D: The SWIFT Study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2022; **107**: 2652-65. PMID 35666146.
36. Flint DJ, Travers MT, Barber MC, Binart N, Kelly PA. Diet-induced obesity impairs mammary development and lactogenesis in murine mammary gland. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab* 2005; **288**: E1179-87. PMID 15671082.
37. Stuebe AM, Rich-Edwards JW. The reset hypothesis: lactation and maternal metabolism. *Am J Perinatol* 2009; **26**: 81-8. PMID 19031350.