

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

Running title: Smoking and subfertility

Álvaro Hernáez^{1,2,3,*}, Robyn E. Wootton^{4,5}, Christian M. Page^{1,6}, Karoline H. Skåra¹, Abigail Fraser^{4,7,8}, Tormod Rogne^{1,9,10}, Per Magnus¹, Pål R. Njølstad^{11,12}, Ole A. Andreassen^{13,14}, Stephen Burgess^{15,16}, Deborah A. Lawlor^{4,7,8}, Maria Christine Magnus^{1,4,7}

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. MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.
5. Nic Waals Institute, Lovisenberg Diaconal Hospital, Oslo, Norway.
6. Department of Mathematics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
7. Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.
8. NIHR Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, Bristol, UK
9. Department of Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale University School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, USA.
10. Gemini Center for Sepsis Research, Department of Circulation and Medical Imaging, NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.
11. Department of Clinical Science, Center for Diabetes Research, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

12. Children and Adolescent Clinic, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway
13. Norwegian Centre for Mental Disorders Research, NORMENT, Division of Mental Health and Addiction, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway
14. Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
15. MRC Biostatistics Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
16. 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) 95523951

e-mail: alvaro.hernaez@fhi.no

ORCID: 0000-0001-8593-1477

1 **ABSTRACT**

2

3 **Objective.** To investigate the association between smoking-related traits and subfertility.

4 **Design.** Prospective study.

5 **Setting.** Nationwide cohort in Norway.

6 **Patients.** 28,606 women (average age 30) and 27,096 men (average age 33) with
7 questionnaire and genotype information from the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child
8 Cohort Study.

9 **Intervention.** Self-reported information on smoking (having ever smoked [both sexes], age
10 at smoking initiation [women only], smoking cessation [women only], and cigarettes
11 smoked per week in current smokers [both sexes]) was gathered. Genetically
12 predetermined levels or likelihood of presenting the mentioned traits were estimated for
13 Mendelian randomization (MR) analyses.

14 **Main outcome measure.** Subfertility, defined as time-to-pregnancy ≥ 12 months.

15 **Results.** A total of 10% of couples were subfertile. In multivariable regression accounting
16 for age, years of education, body mass index, and number of previous pregnancies,
17 having ever smoked was not linked to subfertility in women or men. A higher intensity of
18 tobacco use in women who were current smokers was related to greater odds of
19 subfertility (+ 1 standard deviation [SD, 48 cigarettes/week]: odds ratio [OR] 1.12, 95%
20 confidence interval [CI] 1.03 to 1.21), also after adjusting for the partner's tobacco use.
21 Later smoking initiation (+ 1 SD [3.2 years]: OR 0.89, 95% CI 0.84 to 0.95) and smoking
22 cessation (relative to not quitting: OR 0.83, 95% CI 0.75 to 0.93) were linked to decreased
23 subfertility in women who had ever smoked. Nevertheless, MR results were not
24 directionally consistent for smoking intensity and cessation and were imprecisely
25 estimated in two-sample MR, with wide confidence intervals that overlapped with the
26 multivariable regression results. In men, greater smoking intensity was marginally linked to

27 greater odds of subfertility in multivariable analyses, but this association was attenuated
28 when adjusting for the partner's smoking intensity (+ 1 SD [54 cigarettes/week]: OR 1.05,
29 95% CI 0.96 to 1.15). MR estimates were directionally consistent but again imprecisely
30 estimated.

31 **Conclusions.** We did not find robust evidence of an effect of smoking on subfertility. This
32 may be due to a true lack of effect, weak genetic instruments, or other kinds of
33 confounding. The relevant limitations across all methods highlights the need for larger
34 studies with information on subfertility.

35 **INTRODUCTION**

36 Smoking is a well-known source of thousands of pro-oxidative and pro-inflammatory
37 compounds (1), capable of damaging reproductive tissues which in turn may compromise
38 fecundity (2-4). Observational studies in women have reported that active smoking was
39 linked to 14% greater odds of subfertility (trying to conceive for ≥ 12 months) (5) and
40 smoking intensity was dose-dependently associated with greater subfertility risk (6).
41 Tobacco use has also been related to surrogate indicators of decreased fertility such as
42 accelerated follicular depletion and earlier menopause (7, 8). Although smoking has been
43 linked to oligozoospermia and morphological defects of sperm (9), two prospective studies
44 reported no association between tobacco use and subfertility in men (10, 11). Considering
45 this evidence, the Practice Committee of the American Society of Reproductive Medicine
46 has suggested a causal effect of tobacco use on clinical subfertility (12). However, existing
47 evidence is subject to numerous methodological limitations. The primary concerns raised
48 were that the relationship between smoking and decreased fertility has not been shown to
49 be sufficiently strong, residual confounding cannot be ruled out, and most studies were
50 retrospective and thus unable to reveal any potential exposure-to-effect sequence (12).

51 The use of complementary methodological approaches with different strengths and
52 sources of bias could help clarify whether there is a causal relationship between tobacco
53 use and subfertility (13). Mendelian randomization (MR) is based on the use of genetic
54 variants that are linked to an exposure (e.g. having ever smoked, a greater intensity of
55 current tobacco use) to assess the unconfounded effect of this exposure on a certain
56 outcome (e.g. subfertility) (14). It can be performed using data from a single sample (one-
57 sample MR: exposure, outcome, and genetic variants are measured in the same
58 population) or from two samples (two-sample MR: the association between genetic
59 variants and the exposure are assessed in one population and the association between
60 genetic variants and the outcome are studied in a second population) (15). In this paper,

61 we compare results from multivariable logistic regression, one-sample MR, and two-
62 sample MR, considering that these are affected by different and unrelated sources of bias
63 when studying the association between smoking-related traits and subfertility (15-17)
64 (**Table 1**). Similar results in all of them would allow for more robust conclusions (13).

65 Our aim was to investigate the association between tobacco use and subfertility in
66 women and men by multivariable logistic regression and one- and two-sample MR.

67

68

69 **METHODS**

70

71 *Study participants*

72 Our study used data from the Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study (MoBa) (18, 19). The
73 MoBa Study is a population-based pregnancy cohort study conducted by the Norwegian
74 Institute of Public Health. Pregnant women and their partners across Norway were
75 recruited between 1999 and 2008 at the time of the routine ultrasound screening (around
76 18th gestational week). The cohort now includes 114,500 children, 95,200 mothers and
77 75,200 fathers. The current study is based on version #12 of the quality-assured data.

78 For the current study, we defined a subsample of parents with available genotype
79 data and pre-pregnancy information on tobacco use. The genotype data in this study came
80 from blood samples gathered from both parents during pregnancy (20) and followed the
81 pipeline described by Helgeland et al (genotype calling, imputation, and quality control)
82 (21). Our work is described according to the STROBE guidelines for reporting MR and
83 cohort studies (22, 23).

84

85 *Tobacco use*

86 Parents responded to questions related to their smoking habits in the questionnaire
87 completed at recruitment. First, they reported if they had ever smoked. After an affirmative
88 answer, participants reported their age when they started smoking, if they were smokers
89 when they conceived, if they had quit smoking (and the date when they quit), and the
90 amount of cigarettes per week they currently smoked (or used to smoke for former
91 smokers). Using these data, we defined three exposure variables: ever smoker (yes/no,
92 available for the whole population), age at smoking initiation (continuous, available in
93 current/former smokers), and smoking cessation (yes/no, available in current/former
94 smokers). In addition, we computed the average cigarettes smoked per week at
95 conception or during the two years prior to conception (continuous, available in current
96 smokers and in participants who smoked at this time).

97

98 *Selection of genetic variants and generation of instrumental variables*

99 Genetic instruments were extracted from the most recent genome-wide association study
100 (GWAS) on smoking-related traits (24). It included more than 1.2 million individuals (none
101 of them participated in the MoBa cohort) and reported 378 conditionally independent single
102 nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with smoking initiation, 10 linked to the age
103 of smoking initiation, 24 related to smoking cessation, and 55 associated with smoking
104 heaviness (cigarettes per week) (24). Independent SNPs were defined according to
105 linkage disequilibrium blocks across the genome using the methods by Li J et al., Gao X et
106 al., and Chen Z et al. (25-27), presented a minor allele frequency $\geq 0.1\%$ and were
107 associated with their respective phenotypes according to the standard genome-wide
108 significance threshold ($p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$). A total of 355, 10, 23, and 50 independent SNPs were
109 available for smoking initiation, age of smoking initiation, smoking cessation, and smoking
110 heaviness, respectively, in the MoBa genotype database.

111 For the one-sample MR analyses, we generated a weighted genetic risk score
112 (GRS) by multiplying the number of risk alleles by the effect estimate of each variant and
113 dividing this value by the total number of SNPs (28). SNPs were used individually as the
114 genetic instruments in the two-sample MR.

115

116 *Subfertility*

117 Women were asked at recruitment if the pregnancy was planned and to provide
118 information on how many months it had taken them to conceive (19). The answer options
119 were “<1 month”, “1-2 months” and “3 or more months”. If the mother responded “3 or
120 more months”, she was asked to further specify how many months they were trying to
121 conceive. We defined subfertility as trying to conceive for ≥ 12 months or having used
122 assisted reproductive technologies. Those reporting trying for <12 months (defined as
123 fertile) were included in the reference group. Participants involved in unplanned
124 pregnancies were excluded.

125

126 *Other variables*

127 Information on the age of the participants (continuous), educational level (years of
128 education equivalent to the US system (29, 30), continuous), pre-pregnancy body mass
129 index (BMI, continuous), and previous number of deliveries (0, 1, 2, or ≥ 3) was gathered in
130 the baseline visit of the study as potential confounders.

131

132 *Ethical approval*

133 The MoBa cohort is conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki for Medical
134 Research involving Human Subjects. The establishment of MoBa and initial data collection
135 was based on a license from the Norwegian Data Protection Agency. It is now based on
136 regulations related to the Norwegian Health Registry Act. Participants provided a written

137 informed consent before joining the cohort. This project was approved by the Regional
138 Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics of South/East Norway (reference:
139 2017/1362).

140

141 *Statistical analyses*

142 Normally distributed continuous variables were described by means and standard
143 deviations (SD), non-normally distributed continuous variables by medians and 25th-75th
144 percentiles, and categorical variables by proportions. Differences in baseline
145 characteristics between subfertile and fertile parents, and between participants with and
146 without genotype information in the MoBa cohort, were investigated by t-tests in normally
147 distributed continuous variables, Mann-Whitney U-tests in non-normally distributed
148 continuous variables, and chi-squared tests in categorical variables.

149

150 Multivariable regression analyses

151 We assessed the association between smoking-related traits and subfertility in women and
152 men by multivariable logistic regressions (adjusted for predefined subfertility risk factors:
153 age, years of education, BMI, and number of previous pregnancies (31, 32)). For binary
154 exposures (smoking initiation and smoking cessation), we investigated the differences in
155 the odds of subfertility in those exposed compared with those who were not. For
156 continuous variables, we assessed the relationship between an increase in 1 SD in age at
157 smoking initiation (in ever smokers) and the number of cigarettes smoked per week (in
158 current smokers) with odds of subfertility. We also assessed whether a model using
159 smoothed cubic splines ($K+4$ degrees of freedom) fitted the data better than a linear
160 function using a likelihood ratio test. In those traits in which there was information from
161 both parents (smoking initiation and number of cigarettes smoked per week), we further
162 adjusted logistic regression models for the partner's trait to minimize bias due to

163 assortative mating. Clustered standard errors were computed to account for non-
164 independence between pregnancies in participants with data on multiple pregnancies.

165

166 One-sample Mendelian randomization

167 We used logistic regression to estimate the genetically predicted likelihood of smoking
168 initiation (in both sexes) and smoking cessation (in women), and linear regression to
169 calculate the genetically predicted values of age at smoking initiation (in women) and the
170 number of cigarettes smoked per week (in both sexes), using their respective GRSs as
171 predictors. Next, we assessed the linear relationship between an increase in one SD in the
172 genetically predicted traits and subfertility using logistic regression.

173

174 Two-sample Mendelian randomization

175 We first performed two GWASs (one for women and one for men) to obtain summary
176 associations of each SNP, across the genome, with subfertility in the MoBa cohort. Full
177 details of this procedure are available in the **Supplemental Materials**. Next, in these
178 subfertility GWAS summary data, we looked for the SNPs related to each of the smoking
179 traits and extracted the information related to their association with subfertility. We
180 harmonized both datasets and excluded palindromic SNPs with minor allele frequencies
181 close to 0.5 (24, 33). Following these exclusions, we had 301, 43, 7 and 16 SNPs for
182 analyses of smoking initiation, intensity, age at initiation, and cessation, respectively.
183 Finally, we used inverse variance weighted regression as the main two-sample MR
184 analysis (15).

185

186 Verification of MR assumptions

187 The key assumptions of MR are: 1) the genetic instrument is robustly related to the
188 exposure, 2) the genetic instrument is only associated with the outcome through the

189 exposure of interest, and 3) there is no confounding of the genetic instrument-outcome
190 associations (15).

191 Regarding the first assumption, we checked the strength of the association
192 between the genetic instruments and their phenotypes. For binary exposures we used
193 logistic regression, area under the ROC curve, and pseudo- R^2 by the Nagelkerke method,
194 and for continuous exposures we used linear regressions, F -statistics and R^2 . Since weak
195 instruments deviate MR causal estimates towards the null in two-sample MR, concordance
196 between one-sample and two-sample MR reduces the concern that estimates might be
197 influenced by weak instrument bias (34). We also performed the Robust Adjusted Profile
198 Score two-sample MR method, which is unbiased by weak instruments (34, 35).

199 The second assumption may be violated when the genetic instruments influence other risk
200 factors for the outcome independently of the exposure of interest (horizontal pleiotropy)
201 (16). To evaluate horizontal pleiotropy in one-sample MR, we checked the association of
202 GRSs with known risk factors for subfertility. We studied the relationship between 1 SD
203 increase in the GRS and the risk factors (age, years of education, BMI, number of previous
204 deliveries) (31, 32) using linear regressions. If any of the GRSs was associated with a risk
205 factor, we considered that a potential pleiotropic effect was present for all the smoking-
206 related traits. We then performed multivariable MR analyses if GWAS data for the potential
207 pleiotropic variable was available (17). There was evidence of one or more of the smoking
208 trait GRS associating with education and BMI and we were able to undertake multivariable
209 MR for both. For education we used the GWAS by Lee JJ et al. ($n = 1,271$ independent
210 SNPs, ~ 1.1 million participants (36); 1,159 of the SNPs were available in MoBa). For BMI
211 we used the GWAS by Yengo L et al ($n = 941$ independent SNPs, $\sim 700,000$ participants
212 (37); 896 of the SNPs were available in MoBa). We generated GRS for education and BMI
213 using the same method as used for the smoking traits and then included the GRS for
214 education and BMI in the one-sample MR regression models. (17). The genetic smoking

215 instruments also associated with age, and we performed stratified analyses according to
216 age (below vs. over the median). In addition, we estimated the association between the
217 GRSs for smoking traits and subfertility in non-exposed participants (the GRSs for age of
218 smoking initiation or smoking cessation in never smokers, and the GRS for current
219 smoking intensity in never + former smokers). As we would expect no association in non-
220 exposed participants, any evidence of one would indicate the presence of bias.

221 In two-sample MR we explored unbalanced horizontal pleiotropy through sensitivity
222 analyses comparing the main estimates to those obtained from MR-Egger, the weighted
223 median and weighted mode methods (38-40). The inverse variance weighted method
224 assumes no unbalanced horizontal pleiotropy as it forces the regression line through SNP-
225 exposure and SNP-outcome coordinates to go through zero. MR-Egger does not make
226 this assumption and it does not force the line through zero. A non-zero intercept is an
227 indication of unbalanced horizontal pleiotropy and the slope is subsequently corrected.
228 The weighted median and weighted mode analyses are valid if less than 50% of the weight
229 comes from SNPs that are not related to other risk factors for the outcome. Concordance
230 in the estimates across the different approaches reduces the concern regarding
231 unbalanced pleiotropy (38-40). We also checked for influential outliers in the variant-
232 specific causal estimates (indicative of horizontal pleiotropy) in scatterplots (38-40).
233 Finally, we evaluated between SNP heterogeneity, using Cochran's Q and the Rücker's Q'
234 with the inverse variance weighted and Egger regression methods, respectively.
235 Heterogeneity indicates a possible violation of the MR assumptions, of which pleiotropy is
236 probably a major cause (38-40).

237 To reduce the potential for confounding of the genetic instrument-outcome
238 association due to population stratification (third assumption), we adjusted for the first 10
239 ancestry-informative principal components in the one-sample MR (41).

240

241 Software

242 Analyses were performed in R Software version 4.0.3 (packages: *compareGroups*,
243 *estimatr*, *ggplot2*, *miceadds*, and *TwoSampleMR*) and the GWASs to determine which
244 SNPs were associated with subfertility in the MoBa cohort in Plink v1.9 and GWAMA (42,
245 43). Code for data management and statistical analysis has been made available in
246 https://github.com/alvarohernaez/MR_smoking_subfertility_MoBa/ .

247

248

249 **RESULTS**

250

251 *Description of the study population and genetic instruments*

252 Our study population consisted of 28,606 women and 27,096 men with genotype
253 information (**Figure 1**). A total of 10% of the couples were subfertile. Women and men who
254 were subfertile were older, had a lower educational attainment, had a higher BMI, and
255 were more likely to be pregnant for the first time. In relation to smoking habits, there was a
256 higher proportion of ever smokers in subfertile couples and, among tobacco users,
257 smoking intensity was higher in subfertile individuals (**Table 2**). MoBa participants without
258 genotype data were not meaningfully different to those with genetic data in age, years of
259 education, BMI, or number of previous pregnancies compared to those with genotype
260 data. However, participants with genotype data were more likely to be subfertile, presented
261 a different proportion of ever smokers (women were less likely and men were more prone
262 to have ever smoked), and showed a lower smoking intensity among current smokers
263 (**Supplemental Table 1**).

264 **Table 3** shows the associations of the GRS for each trait with smoking traits in
265 MoBa together with statistics related to instrument strengths.

266

267 *Comparison of main multivariable regression, one-sample, and two-sample MR results*

268 **Figure 2A** shows the confounder-adjusted associations, one-sample, and two-sample MR
269 results for each smoking trait in women. For smoking initiation, there were similar close to
270 the null results in both multivariable regression (odds ratio [OR] 1.03, 95% confidence
271 interval [CI] 0.95 to 1.11) and one-sample MR (OR 1.01, 95% CI 0.98 to 1.05), and an
272 inverse, but also close to the null, relationship in two-sample MR (OR 0.90, 95% CI 0.75 to
273 1.09). Regarding smoking intensity, it was linearly linked to greater odds of subfertility in
274 multivariable regression (1 SD increase in the number of cigarettes smoked per week [+48
275 cigarettes/week]: OR 1.12, 95% CI 1.03 to 1.21; $p\text{-value}_{\text{non-linearity}} = 0.970$), even after
276 adjusting for the partner's smoking heaviness (OR 1.10, 95% CI 1.01 to 1.19;
277 **Supplemental Table 2**). However, close to the null results were observed in one-sample
278 MR (OR 0.96, 95% CI 0.89 to 1.03) and a notable inverse, but imprecisely estimated result
279 in two-sample MR analyses (OR 0.68, 95% CI 0.40 to 1.15). For age at smoking initiation,
280 a broadly similar pattern of results across the three measures was seen. We observed a
281 linear association between later smoking initiation and lower odds of subfertility in
282 multivariable analyses (1 SD increase in the age of smoking initiation in ever smokers
283 [+3.2 years]: OR 0.89, 95% CI 0.84 to 0.95; $p\text{-value}_{\text{non-linearity}} = 0.933$), close to the null
284 results in one-sample MR (OR 0.96, 95% CI 0.91 to 1.02), and a greater, directionally
285 concordant but imprecise association in two-sample MR (OR 0.47, 95% CI 0.11 to 2.01).
286 Finally, for cessation amongst those who had ever smoked, there were similar, in terms of
287 OR, inverse associations in multivariable regression (OR 0.83, 95% CI 0.75 to 0.93) and
288 two-sample MR (OR 0.80, 95% CI 0.46 to 1.38), the latter with wide confidence intervals,
289 whereas the result in one-sample MR was close to the null (OR 1.04, 95% CI 0.99 to
290 1.09).

291 Results from the three methods for smoking initiation in men showed broadly
292 similar patterns to those seen for women (**Figure 2B**). However, a linear association

293 between higher smoking intensity and greater odds of subfertility was suggested in
294 multivariable analyses (1 SD increase in the number of cigarettes smoked per week [+54
295 cigarettes/week]: OR 1.08, 95% CI 0.99 to 1.18; $p\text{-value}_{\text{non-linearity}} = 0.123$), attenuated when
296 adjusting for the partner's smoking intensity (OR 1.05, 95% CI 0.96 to 1.15; **Supplemental**
297 **Table 2**). A similar but imprecise association was observed in two-sample MR (OR, 1.11,
298 95% CI 0.78 to 1.59), and close to the null results in one-sample MR (OR 1.02, 95% CI
299 0.95 to 1.10). It was not possible to complete multivariable regression and one-sample MR
300 analyses in men, because detailed information on smoking was not obtained from fathers
301 in MoBa. Nonetheless, in two-sample MR, close to the null, highly imprecise associations
302 were found for age of smoking initiation (OR 0.95, 95% CI 0.19 to 4.68) and smoking
303 cessation (OR 0.94, 95% CI 0.57 to 1.54).

304

305 *Sensitivity analyses*

306 We observed associations between some smoking related GRSs and age (in women),
307 education years (in both sexes) and body mass index (in both sexes) (**Supplemental**
308 **Table 3**). Results of multivariable one-sample MR accounting for education and BMI and
309 age-stratified analyses were consistent with the main analyses (**Supplemental Table 4**).
310 No associations between the GRSs for smoking traits and subfertility were found in non-
311 smokers (**Supplemental Table 5**).

312 Regarding two-sample MR additional methods, between SNP heterogeneity,
313 potentially linked to horizontal pleiotropy, was observed for the genetic instrument for
314 smoking intensity in women, as well as highly imprecise MR estimates (**Supplemental**
315 **Table 6, Supplemental Figure 1**).

316

317

318 **DISCUSSION**

319 We found close to the null associations between smoking initiation and subfertility, using
320 confounder adjusted multivariable regression and MR in women and men. Regarding
321 smoking heaviness, it was associated with greater subfertility odds in both sexes in
322 multivariable regression. However, we found close to the null relationships in one-sample
323 MR, a suggested clinically important inverse association in two-sample MR in women, and
324 a substantial attenuation of the association in multivariable regression in men when
325 adjusted for the partner's smoking status. A similar pattern of association across the three
326 methods was observed for age at initiation in women, whereas there were consistent
327 inverse associations with smoking cessation between multivariable regression and two
328 sample MR in women. Taken together, our findings do not provide strong evidence for
329 effects of smoking on subfertility. However, results for two-sample MR were very
330 imprecise, highlighting the need for large collaborative GWAS of subfertility, one-sample
331 MR results may have been influenced by weak instrument and, despite numerous
332 sensitivity analyses, we cannot rule out completely bias due to horizontal pleiotropy in MR
333 analyses or residual confounding in the multivariable regression analyses.

334 A link between smoking and subfertility has been reported in human studies since
335 the 1980s, particularly in women (5, 6, 44). Nevertheless, the American Society of
336 Reproductive Medicine warned in 2018 of some methodological flaws in the available body
337 of evidence including the risk of residual confounding, the small magnitude of the
338 association, and the retrospective nature of most studies (14). We address these
339 limitations here by assessing the association between several smoking-related traits and
340 subfertility in a large prospective study comparing multivariable regression results to those
341 from one-sample and two-sample MR, undertaking several sensitivity analyses to explore
342 possible sources of bias. Our multivariable regression results were similar to previous
343 studies, including point estimates that were close to the null for several smoking traits (6,
344 44). The magnitude of these relationships was modest, and they were generally consistent

345 in direction to MR results, though with greater power and hence narrower confidence
346 intervals. In particular, confidence intervals for estimates for smoking intensity and age at
347 initiation (which are directly comparable) overlapped, suggesting the three sets of results
348 were consistent with each other. It is possible that residual confounding due to poorer
349 health status, worse diet quality, increased alcohol consumption, lower levels of physical
350 activity, etc. (45-47) could explain the decreased fertility among smokers in multivariable
351 analyses, with possible weak instruments in some of our one-sample MR analyses being
352 biased towards these confounded results. Moreover, we could not rule out bias due to
353 assortative mating completely (individuals who smoke are more likely to select a partner
354 who also smokes (48), which may distort any potential association in couple-based
355 outcomes such as fertility). Last, the genetic instruments for age of smoking initiation and
356 smoking cessation were also weak. Although we used several approaches to minimize the
357 likelihood of weak instrument bias, this could still have influenced findings, and in the two-
358 sample MR in particular results were imprecise, suggesting low power to reject the null
359 hypothesis (33, 38, 39, 49). Regarding men, we did not find any robust relationship
360 between tobacco-related habits and subfertility across methods. These results are in line
361 with previous prospective studies (10, 11).

362 Our work has some limitations. First, subfertility is a couple-dependent parameter
363 that was reported by mothers in the cohort, and we could not determine the cause (female
364 causes, male, or both). Second, MoBa is a pregnancy cohort, only including couples who
365 were able to conceive. Further studies considering couples who never conceived
366 (infertility) are needed. Subfertility is a less severe manifestation of infertility and, therefore,
367 an association between smoking-related traits and an absolute incapacity to conceive may
368 be possible. Third, our results may have been affected by selection bias as there was
369 some differences between participants with and without genetic data. In addition, smokers
370 are under-represented in the MoBa cohort relative to the whole Norwegian population (50).

371 Nevertheless, associations between smoking and pregnancy outcomes (low birthweight,
372 placental abruption, and stillbirth) proved unaffected by selection bias in prior studies when
373 the MoBa cohort and the general Norwegian population were compared (50). Finally, our
374 study population (adult women and men of a northern European ancestry who were
375 capable of conceiving) restricts the generalizability. However, our work also presents
376 several strengths. To our knowledge, this is the first prospective study assessing the
377 relationship between smoking and subfertility using three complementary approaches
378 affected by different sources of bias that have been thoroughly investigated and
379 acknowledged. In addition, our study includes a relatively homogeneous population. This
380 aspect minimizes the risk of confounding due to population stratification in MR, together
381 with the adjustment for the first 10 principal components (41).

382

383

384 **CONCLUSIONS**

385 We did not find robust evidence of an effect of smoking on subfertility. This may be due to
386 a true lack of effect, weak genetic instruments, or other kinds of confounding. However,
387 the comparison of different analytical approaches with complementary sources of bias has
388 highlighted relevant limitations across all methods, and in particular highlights the needs
389 for larger studies with information on subfertility.

390 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

391 Consent given by the participants does not open for storage of data on an individual level
392 in repositories or journals. Researchers who want access to datasets for replication should
393 submit an application to datatilgang@fhi.no. Access to datasets requires approval from the
394 Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics in Norway and an agreement
395 with MoBa.

396 Source data of the GWAS on smoking initiation, age of smoking initiation, smoking
397 cessation, and smoking intensity) are available in the Supplemental Tables of the article by
398 Liu M et al. (published in Nat Genet in 2019: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41588-018-0307-5#Sec14>). Source data of the GWAS on education years are available in the
400 Supplemental Tables of the article by Lee JJ et al. (published in Nat Genet in 2018:
401 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41588-018-0147-3#Sec34>). Finally, source data of the
402 GWAS on BMI (Yengo L et al., Hum Mol Genet, 2018) are available in the GIANT
403 Consortium website
404 ([https://portals.broadinstitute.org/collaboration/giant/index.php/GIANT_consortium_data_fil](https://portals.broadinstitute.org/collaboration/giant/index.php/GIANT_consortium_data_files#GWAS_Anthropometric_2015_BMI_Summary_Statistics)
405 [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)).

406
407
408 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

409 The MoBa Cohort Study is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care
410 Services and the Ministry of Education and Research. We thank all the participating
411 families in Norway who take part in this ongoing cohort study, and those who contributed
412 to the recruitment and the infrastructure of the cohort.

413 We thank the Norwegian Institute of Public Health for generating high-quality
414 genomic data. This research is part of the HARVEST collaboration, supported by the
415 Research Council of Norway (project reference: #229624). We also thank the NORMENT

416 Centre for providing genotype data, funded by the Research Council of Norway (project
417 reference: #223273), South East Norway Health Authority, and Stiftelsen Kristian Gerhard
418 Jebsen. We further thank the Center for Diabetes Research (University of Bergen) for
419 providing genotype information and performing quality control and imputation of the data in
420 research projects funded by the European Research Council Advanced Grant
421 SELECTIONPREDISPOSED, Stiftelsen Kristian Gerhard Jebsen, the Trond Mohn
422 Foundation, the Research Council of Norway, the Novo Nordisk Foundation, the University
423 of Bergen, and the Western Norway Health Authority.

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

427 This paper does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Norwegian
428 Research Council.

429

430

431 **FUNDING**

432 The MoBa Cohort Study is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care
433 Services and the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. This project received
434 funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020
435 research and innovation program (grant agreement No 947684). This work was also partly
436 supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence funding
437 scheme, project number 262700, and the project "Women's fertility – an essential
438 component of health and well-being", number 320656. Open Access funding was provided
439 by the Folkehelseinstituttet/Norwegian Institute of Public Health. D.A.L. is a UK National
440 Institute for Health Research Senior Investigator (NF-SI-0611–10196) and is supported by
441 the US National Institutes of Health (R01 DK10324) and a European Research Council

442 Advanced Grant (grant agreement No 669545). The funders had no role in the collection,
443 analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit
444 the article for publication.

445

446

447 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

448 D.A.L. receives (or has received in the last 10 years) research support from National and
449 International government and charitable bodies, Roche Diagnostics and Medtronic for
450 research unrelated to the current work. The rest of the authors declare that no competing
451 interests exist.

452 **REFERENCES**

453

- 454 1. Talhout R, Schulz T, Florek E, van Benthem J, Wester P, Opperhuizen A.
455 Hazardous compounds in tobacco smoke. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2011;8:613-28.
- 456 2. Amiri M, Ramezani Tehrani F. Potential Adverse Effects of Female and Male
457 Obesity on Fertility: A Narrative Review. *Int J Endocrinol Metab* 2020;18:e101776.
- 458 3. Broughton DE, Moley KH. Obesity and female infertility: potential mediators of
459 obesity's impact. *Fertil Steril* 2017;107:840-7.
- 460 4. Liu Y, Ding Z. Obesity, a serious etiologic factor for male subfertility in modern
461 society. *Reproduction* 2017;154:R123-r31.
- 462 5. Hyland A, Piazza K, Hovey KM, Tindle HA, Manson JE, Messina C *et al.*
463 Associations between lifetime tobacco exposure with infertility and age at natural
464 menopause: the Women's Health Initiative Observational Study. *Tob Control* 2016;25:706-
465 14.
- 466 6. Baird DD, Wilcox AJ. Cigarette smoking associated with delayed conception. *Jama*
467 1985;253:2979-83.
- 468 7. Adena MA, Gallagher HG. Cigarette smoking and the age at menopause. *Ann Hum*
469 *Biol* 1982;9:121-30.
- 470 8. Baron JA, La Vecchia C, Levi F. The antiestrogenic effect of cigarette smoking in
471 women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1990;162:502-14.
- 472 9. Bundhun PK, Janoo G, Bhurtu A, Teeluck AR, Soogund MZS, Pursun M *et al.*
473 Tobacco smoking and semen quality in infertile males: a systematic review and meta-
474 analysis. *BMC Public Health* 2019;19:36.
- 475 10. de Mouzon J, Spira A, Schwartz D. A prospective study of the relation between
476 smoking and fertility. *Int J Epidemiol* 1988;17:378-84.

- 477 11. Jensen TK, Henriksen TB, Hjollund NH, Scheike T, Kolstad H, Giwercman A *et al.*
478 Adult and prenatal exposures to tobacco smoke as risk indicators of fertility among 430
479 Danish couples. *Am J Epidemiol* 1998;148:992-7.
- 480 12. Penzias A, Bendikson K, Butts S, Coutifaris C, Falcone T, Gitlin S *et al.* Smoking
481 and infertility: a committee opinion. *Fertil Steril* 2018;110:611-8.
- 482 13. Lawlor DA, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Triangulation in aetiological epidemiology. *Int*
483 *J Epidemiol* 2016;45:1866-86.
- 484 14. Lawlor DA, Harbord RM, Sterne JA, Timpson N, Davey Smith G. Mendelian
485 randomization: using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in epidemiology.
486 *Stat Med* 2008;27:1133-63.
- 487 15. Burgess S, Davey Smith G, Davies NM, Dudbridge F, Gill D, Glymour MM *et al.*
488 Guidelines for performing Mendelian randomization investigations. *Wellcome Open Res*
489 2019;4:186.
- 490 16. Davey Smith G, Hemani G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal
491 inference in epidemiological studies. *Hum Mol Genet* 2014;23:R89-98.
- 492 17. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Multivariable Mendelian randomization: the use of
493 pleiotropic genetic variants to estimate causal effects. *Am J Epidemiol* 2015;181:251-60.
- 494 18. Magnus P, Birke C, Vejrup K, Haugan A, Alsaker E, Daltveit AK *et al.* Cohort
495 Profile Update: The Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). *Int J Epidemiol*
496 2016;45:382-8.
- 497 19. Magnus P, Irgens LM, Haug K, Nystad W, Skjaerven R, Stoltenberg C. Cohort
498 profile: the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). *Int J Epidemiol*
499 2006;35:1146-50.
- 500 20. Paltiel L, Haugan A, Skjerden T, K; H, Bækken S, Stensrud NK *et al.* The biobank
501 of the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study – present status. *Norsk Epidemiologi*
502 2014;24:29-35.

- 503 21. Helgeland Ø, Vaudel M, Juliusson PB, Lingaas Holmen O, Juodakis J, Bacelis J *et*
504 *al.* Genome-wide association study reveals dynamic role of genetic variation in infant and
505 early childhood growth. *Nat Commun* 2019;10:4448.
- 506 22. Davey Smith G, Davies NM, Dimou N, Egger M, Gallo V, Golub R *et al.* STROBE-
507 MR: Guidelines for strengthening the reporting of Mendelian randomization studies. *PeerJ*
508 *Preprints* 2019;7:e27857v1.
- 509 23. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP.
510 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)
511 statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Bmj* 2007;335:806-8.
- 512 24. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, Li Y, Brazel DM, Chen F *et al.* Association studies of up
513 to 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol
514 use. *Nat Genet* 2019;51:237-44.
- 515 25. Chen Z, Liu Q. A new approach to account for the correlations among single
516 nucleotide polymorphisms in genome-wide association studies. *Hum Hered* 2011;72:1-9.
- 517 26. Gao X, Becker LC, Becker DM, Starmer JD, Province MA. Avoiding the high
518 Bonferroni penalty in genome-wide association studies. *Genet Epidemiol* 2010;34:100-5.
- 519 27. Li J, Ji L. Adjusting multiple testing in multilocus analyses using the eigenvalues of
520 a correlation matrix. *Heredity (Edinb)* 2005;95:221-7.
- 521 28. Choi SW, Mak TS, O'Reilly PF. Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic risk score
522 analyses. *Nat Protoc* 2020;15:2759-72.
- 523 29. Barrabés N, Østli GK. Norsk standard for utdanningsgruppering 2016. In, 2016.
- 524 30. Rietveld CA, Medland SE, Derringer J, Yang J, Esko T, Martin NW *et al.* GWAS of
525 126,559 individuals identifies genetic variants associated with educational attainment.
526 *Science* 2013;340:1467-71.

- 527 31. Dribe M, Hacker JD, Scalone F. The impact of socio-economic status on net fertility
528 during the historical fertility decline: a comparative analysis of Canada, Iceland, Sweden,
529 Norway, and the USA. *Popul Stud (Camb)* 2014;68:135-49.
- 530 32. Sharma R, Biedenharn KR, Fedor JM, Agarwal A. Lifestyle factors and
531 reproductive health: taking control of your fertility. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2013;11:66.
- 532 33. Burgess S, Bowden J, Fall T, Ingelsson E, Thompson SG. Sensitivity analyses for
533 robust causal inference from Mendelian randomization analyses with multiple genetic
534 variants. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)* 2017;28:30.
- 535 34. Barry C, Liu J, Richmond R, Rutter MK, Lawlor DA, Dudbridge F *et al.* Exploiting
536 collider bias to apply two-sample summary data Mendelian randomization methods to one-
537 sample individual level data. *medRxiv* 2020.
- 538 35. Zhao Q, Wang J, Hemani G, Bowden J, Small DS. Statistical inference in two-
539 sample summary-data Mendelian randomization using robust adjusted profile score. *The*
540 *Annals of Statistics* 2020;48:1742-69, 28.
- 541 36. Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okbay A, Kong E, Maghzian O, Zacher M *et al.* Gene discovery
542 and polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment
543 in 1.1 million individuals. *Nat Genet* 2018;50:1112-21.
- 544 37. Yengo L, Sidorenko J, Kemper KE, Zheng Z, Wood AR, Weedon MN *et al.* Meta-
545 analysis of genome-wide association studies for height and body mass index in ~700000
546 individuals of European ancestry. *Hum Mol Genet* 2018;27:3641-9.
- 547 38. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid
548 instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J Epidemiol*
549 2015;44:512-25.
- 550 39. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in
551 Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median
552 Estimator. *Genet Epidemiol* 2016;40:304-14.

- 553 40. Hemani G, Bowden J, Davey Smith G. Evaluating the potential role of pleiotropy in
554 Mendelian randomization studies. *Hum Mol Genet* 2018;27:R195-r208.
- 555 41. Wang C, Zhan X, Liang L, Abecasis GR, Lin X. Improved ancestry estimation for
556 both genotyping and sequencing data using projection procrustes analysis and genotype
557 imputation. *Am J Hum Genet* 2015;96:926-37.
- 558 42. Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LC, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-
559 generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *Gigascience*
560 2015;4:7.
- 561 43. Mägi R, Morris AP. GWAMA: software for genome-wide association meta-analysis.
562 *BMC Bioinformatics* 2010;11:288.
- 563 44. Howe G, Westhoff C, Vessey M, Yeates D. Effects of age, cigarette smoking, and
564 other factors on fertility: findings in a large prospective study. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)*
565 1985;290:1697-700.
- 566 45. Dallongeville J, Marécaux N, Fruchart JC, Amouyel P. Cigarette smoking is
567 associated with unhealthy patterns of nutrient intake: a meta-analysis. *J Nutr*
568 1998;128:1450-7.
- 569 46. Ng R, Sutradhar R, Yao Z, Wodchis WP, Rosella LC. Smoking, drinking, diet and
570 physical activity-modifiable lifestyle risk factors and their associations with age to first
571 chronic disease. *Int J Epidemiol* 2020;49:113-30.
- 572 47. Perkins KA, Rohay J, Meilahn EN, Wing RR, Matthews KA, Kuller LH. Diet,
573 alcohol, and physical activity as a function of smoking status in middle-aged women.
574 *Health Psychol* 1993;12:410-5.
- 575 48. Agrawal A, Heath AC, Grant JD, Pergadia ML, Statham DJ, Bucholz KK *et al.*
576 Assortative mating for cigarette smoking and for alcohol consumption in female Australian
577 twins and their spouses. *Behav Genet* 2006;36:553-66.

- 578 49. Davies NM, von Hinke Kessler Scholder S, Farbmacher H, Burgess S, Windmeijer
579 F, Smith GD. The many weak instruments problem and Mendelian randomization. *Stat*
580 *Med* 2015;34:454-68.
- 581 50. Nilsen RM, Vollset SE, Gjessing HK, Skjaerven R, Melve KK, Schreuder P *et al.*
582 Self-selection and bias in a large prospective pregnancy cohort in Norway. *Paediatr*
583 *Perinat Epidemiol* 2009;23:597-608.
- 584

585 **TABLES**

586

587 **Table 1.** Comparison among multivariable logistic regression, one- and two-sample Mendelian randomization regarding sources of

588 bias in the association between smoking and subfertility

	Residual confounding (the effect of smoking on subfertility could be due to behavioral or socioeconomic conditions intimately related to smoking, such as poor diet, poorer health status, etc.)	Weak genetic instruments (the available genetic instruments for smoking traits explain a small proportion of the variability of the exposure)	Horizontal pleiotropy (the genetic instruments for smoking traits influence the risk of subfertility via mechanisms other than smoking)	Confounding of the genetic instrument-outcome association (by population stratification)
Multivariable regression	High risk	Unaffected	Unaffected	Unaffected
One-sample MR	Low risk	Overestimated associations. Consistence with two-sample MR estimates minimizes the risk of this bias	Possibility to explore the association between genetic instruments and other subfertility risk factors. Multivariable MR could then be used to correct for such bias	Adjustment for ancestry-informative principal components minimizes the risk of this bias

Two-sample MR	Low risk	Bias towards the null association. The Robust Adjusted Profile Score approach is immune to this bias	Consistence among MR methods, lack of between SNP heterogeneity, and lack of outliers in MR scatterplots minimizes the risk of this bias	High risk
------------------	----------	---	---	-----------

589

590 **Table 2.** Population characteristics among genotyped participants

	Women				Men			
	All (n = 28,606)	Subfertility reported (n = 3,439)	No subfertility reported (n = 25,167)	p-value	All (n = 27,096)	Subfertility reported (n = 3,275)	No subfertility reported (n = 23,821)	p-value
Age (years), mean ± SD	30.3 ± 4.15	31.5 ± 4.36	30.2 ± 4.09	<0.001	32.7 ± 4.90	34.1 ± 5.36	32.6 ± 4.81	<0.001
Education years, mean ± SD	17.5 ± 3.11	17.0 ± 3.33	17.6 ± 3.08	<0.001	16.6 ± 3.50	16.2 ± 3.54	16.6 ± 3.49	<0.001
BMI (kg/m ²), median (25 th -75 th percentiles)	23.1 (21.2-25.9)	23.7 (21.5-27.2)	23.1 (21.1-25.7)	<0.001	25.5 (23.7-27.7)	25.8 (24.0-28.1)	25.4 (23.7-27.7)	<0.001
Previous pregnancies n (%):				<0.001				<0.001
0	12,888 (45.1%)	2,020 (58.8%)	10,868 (43.2%)		12,282 (45.4%)	1,923 (58.8%)	10,359 (43.5%)	
1 or more	15,680 (54.9%)	1,415 (41.2%)	14,265 (56.8%)		14,784 (54.6%)	1,348 (41.2%)	13,436 (56.5%)	
Ever smokers (all participants), n (%):	13,389 (46.8%)	1,722 (50.1%)	11,667 (46.4%)	<0.001	13,186 (48.7%)	1,668 (50.9%)	11,518 (48.4%)	0.006
Age of smoking initiation (current + former smokers), median (25 th -75 th percentiles)	17.0 (15.0-19.0)	16.0 (15.0-18.0)	17.0 (15.0-19.0)	0.017	-	-	-	-
Current + former smokers who quit smoking, n (%):	7,627 (57.0%)	910 (52.8%)	6,717 (57.6%)	<0.001	-	-	-	-
Cigarettes/week (current smokers), median (25 th -75 th percentiles)		42.0 (10.0-70.0)	52.5 (12.0-105)	40.0 (10.0-70.0)	<0.001	70.0 (21.0-105)	70.0 (35.0-105)	70 (21.0

591

592 **Table 3.** Description of genetic instrumental variables¹

593


Binary exposures					
	SNPs (<i>n</i>)	GRS value (mean ± SD)	Likelihood of presenting the exposure per each 1-point increase in the GRS OR (95% CI)	Pseudo- <i>R</i> ²	Area under the ROC curve
GRS for smoking initiation (women)	355	375 ± 11.9	1.02 (1.018 to 1.022)	1.87%	0.57
GRS for smoking initiation (men)	355	376 ± 11.8	1.02 (1.017 to 1.022)	1.69%	0.56
GRS for smoking cessation (women)	23	24.5 ± 2.52	1.03 (1.019 to 1.047)	0.22%	0.52
Continuous exposures					
	SNPs (<i>n</i>)	GRS value (mean ± SD)	Change in the exposure per each 1-point increase in the GRS Coef. (95% CI)	<i>R</i> ²	<i>F</i> -statistic
GRS for cigarettes smoked per week (women)	50	51.2 ± 6.90	0.80 (0.62 to 0.98)	1.43%	76
GRS for cigarettes smoked per week (men)	50	51.2 ± 6.96	0.87 (0.66 to 1.09)	1.34%	64
GRS for age of smoking initiation (women)	10	7.78 ± 1.83	0.023 (-0.014 to 0.059)	0.01%	1

594 1. The associations of smoking cessation and age of smoking initiation with their
595 respective GRSs in men could not be validated due to the lack of information on this
596 phenotype.

597 **FIGURES**


598

599 **Figure 1.** Study flow chart



600

601 **Figure 2.** Association between smoking-related traits and subfertility in women (A) and
 602 men (B).



603