

Journal Pre-proof

Male infertility and future cardiometabolic health: Does the association vary by sociodemographic factors?

Alex M. Kasman MD, MS , Shufeng Li MS ,
Barbara Luke ScD, MPH , Alastair G. Sutcliffe MD, PhD ,
Allan A. Pacey PhD , Michael L. Eisenberg MD

PII: S0090-4295(19)30697-1
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2019.06.041>
Reference: URL 21707

To appear in: *Urology*

Received date: 30 April 2019
Revised date: 3 June 2019
Accepted date: 24 June 2019

Please cite this article as: Alex M. Kasman MD, MS , Shufeng Li MS , Barbara Luke ScD, MPH , Alastair G. Sutcliffe MD, PhD , Allan A. Pacey PhD , Michael L. Eisenberg MD , Male infertility and future cardiometabolic health: Does the association vary by sociodemographic factors?, *Urology* (2019), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2019.06.041>



This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2019 Published by Elsevier Inc.

Male infertility and future cardiometabolic health: Does the association vary by sociodemographic factors?

Alex M. Kasman, MD, MS¹, Shufeng Li, MS¹, Barbara Luke, ScD³, MPH, Alastair G.

Sutcliffe, MD, PhD⁴, Allan A. Pacey, PhD⁵, Michael L. Eisenberg, MD^{1,2}

1. Department of Urology, Stanford University School of Medicine, California
2. Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California
3. Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Biology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan
4. Policy, Practice and Population Unit, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, University College London, London, UK
5. Department of Oncology and Metabolism, School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

Correspondence to: Department of Urology, Stanford University School of Medicine, 300 Pasteur Dr., Grant Building S285, Stanford, California 94305-5118 (Telephone: 650-723-5700, Fax: 650-498-5346); akasman@stanford.edu

Conflict of interests

All of the authors declare there are no competing conflicts of interests

Funding

Stanford Precision Health and Integrated Diagnostics Individual Seed Grant

Key words: infertility, male factor infertility, female factor infertility, cardiometabolic, epidemiology

Abstract

Objectives

To determine whether the association between male infertility and incident cardiometabolic disease is modified by socioeconomics, race, or geographic region.

Materials and Methods

Retrospective review of data from insurance claims from Optum's de-identified Clinformatics® Data Mart Database. Subjects were men, 18-50 years old, with an associated diagnosis of infertility in the United States between 2003 and 2016.

Analytic sample were men captured by the Optum's de-identified Clinformatics® Data Mart Database with an associated diagnosis of infertility. Men were classified as either infertile, or not, based on diagnosis or procedural codes. Cardiometabolic health outcomes were then assessed using CPT codes for diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and heart disease. Confounding factors were controlled for such as race, education, socioeconomic status, and region. The main outcomes were development of diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and heart disease.

Results

A total of 76,343 males were diagnosed with male factor infertility, 60,072 males who underwent fertility testing, and 183,742 males that underwent vasectomy (control population). For all men, infertile men had a higher risk of incident

hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, and heart disease when compared to those undergoing vasectomy. Identical associations were found across all education, income, racial, and geographic strata.

Conclusion

Our study suggests that men with infertility have a higher risk of cardiometabolic disease in the years following a fertility evaluation regardless of race, region, or socioeconomic status.

Key words: infertility, male factor infertility, female factor infertility, cardiometabolic, epidemiology

Introduction

Fifteen percent of couples are unable to conceive after 1 year of trying and are labeled infertile (1,2). With an estimated 1.9% of all births conceived by IVF resulting in nearly 76,000 live births in the United States in 2016, assisted reproductive techniques (ART) have excellent success (3,4). While there has been extensive focus on the outcomes of children born to infertile couples via ART since its inception, until recently there has been less focus on the health of their infertile fathers. However, recent data has suggested that infertile men are at higher risk of morbidity and mortality in the years following the infertility evaluation (5)(6)(7,8).

Several groups have previously demonstrated that men with infertility are at a higher risk of incident cardiometabolic disease including diabetes and heart disease (9,10). However, to date most populations studied have been homogenous or with incomplete sociodemographic data by which to identify infertile groups at highest risk and better identify a possible etiology. Investigators have posited genetic, environmental, developmental, and lifestyle related factors to explain the association. By examining the relationship between infertility and future cardiometabolic health among different races, sociodemographic groups, and geographic regions, it may be possible to gain insight into which infertile male populations are most at risk for later morbidity as well as understand possible etiologies. Given varying rates of cardiometabolic disease in different socioeconomic groups, we hypothesized that incidence of cardiometabolic disease in infertile men would vary by sociodemographic factors.

Materials and methods

Patients

We utilized the Optum's de-identified Clinformatics® Data Mart Database which is a database from a large national insurance provider that stores data from adjudicated and paid insurance claims from 2003 to 2016. Optum is a national database with information from adjudicated and paid insurance claims of privately-insured individuals and included between 6 and 7 million males annually during the study period. Individuals in the database represent a geographically and ethnically diverse population from a variety of age groups. Data includes

patient demographic characteristics, international classification of diseases (ICD-9 and 10) codes, and current procedural terminology (CPT) codes.

For the purpose of our study, we focused on men with an infertility diagnosis code, those undergoing fertility evaluation based on either diagnosis or procedural code and not associated with a code for infertility, and those with a diagnosis of vasectomy counseling or procedure code for vasectomy. Vasectomized men were used as a control as they have similar sociodemographic factors, health care access, and prior studies have at least 90% to be fertile. Men presenting for evaluation of infertility, but having no infertility diagnosed were used a secondary control population (11,12). These were identified by the presence in inpatient or outpatient claims of an infertility diagnosis code (International Classification of Diseases, 9th edition, Clinical Modification [ICD9] 606.x or ICD10 N46.x). We recorded the first date of a relevant diagnosis as the index date. A comparison group of men who underwent fertility testing was assembled based on diagnosis and procedural coding (current procedural terminology) for fertility testing or semen analysis (89300, 89310, 89320, 89321, 89322, 89325, 89329, 89330, 89331, V26.21). Given the variable infertility coding and reimbursement practices in the United States, we attempted to be as broad with our definition as possible. As with the male factor infertility group, we recorded the first date of a relevant diagnosis or procedure code as the index date. In addition, a comparison group of men with claims containing a diagnosis of vasectomy counseling (V25.09, V25.2, V26.52) or

procedure code for vasectomy (current procedural terminology 55250 or 55450) was assembled, as this group should include few or no infertile men. Men in this group were assigned an index date as the earliest date of a claim with a vasectomy diagnosis or procedure code.

In order to be included in the study, patients were required to be between 18 and 50 years old on the index date. Patients were also required to be enrolled in a plan covered by the database for at least 1 year after the index date. In all groups, patients with a prior cancer diagnosis or with a cancer diagnosis within the 1 year following the index date were excluded from the study.

Outcome Ascertainment

Health outcomes were identified using diagnosis codes on inpatient and outpatient claims. We chose common health conditions and identified men with codes indicating the presence of specific diseases: hypertension (ICD9 401–405, ICD-10 I10 – I16), diabetes (ICD-9 250, ICD-10 E08 – E13), hyperlipidemia (ICD-9 272.0–272.4, ICD-10 E78.00, E78.1, E78.2, E78.4, E78.5), ischemic heart disease (ICD-9 410–414, ICD-10 I20 – I25), and other heart disease (ICD-9 420–429, ICD-10 I30 – I52).

Statistical Analysis

Patients accrued at risk time beginning from their index dates until disease diagnosis or censored at the last enrollment date in a health plan in the Optum®

insurance claims database. The risks of chronic diseases between infertile versus the vasectomy groups, and infertile testing versus vasectomy groups were assessed using a Cox proportional hazards model while adjusting for age at index date, race, smoking (ICD-9: 305.1, V15.82; ICD-10: F17.200, Z87.891), obesity, which was determined using diagnosis codes (ICD-9: 278.0; ICD-10: E66.01, E66.2, E66.3, E66.9), which may be been underreported as granular BMI data was not available, number of visits per year, highest level of education, region, and income. All demographic factors were collected from the Optum data set. Men with prevalent comorbid diagnoses or diagnosis within 1 year of follow up were excluded from the analysis for that particular diagnosis. Analyses were stratified by race, education, income, and region. All P values were 2-sided with $p < 0.05$ considered statistically significant. Analyses were performed using SAS (version 9.4, SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

Results

The study population included 76,343 men diagnosed with male factor infertility, 60,072 males who underwent fertility testing with a semen analysis, and 183,742 males that underwent vasectomy (i.e. presumed to be fertile) (Table 1). The majority of individuals were between the ages of 30-39 across all groups. The mean age of infertile men was 35.4 +/- 5.8 years whereas those attending for vasectomy had a mean of 37.6 +/- 5.6 years; 14.2% of the infertile population and 12.1% of the vasectomized men were obese. A total of 10.9% of infertile men and 12.7% of vasectomized men were smokers. With regard to race, 65.5%

of infertile males were white, 7.5% black, 10% Asian, and 11.5% Hispanic with the remaining 5.5% unknown. By comparison, 82.2% of vasectomized men were white, 4.7% black, 2% Asian, 7.5% Hispanic, and 3.6% unknown. The majority of both populations were less than college educated, had annual income over \$100,000, and resided in the southern United States. Average follow up time was 4.5 years for infertile individuals and 4.8 years for vasectomized men.

After adjusting for age, follow up time, obesity, smoking, and health care utilization, male factor infertility was shown to have a higher risk of developing hypertension (HR 1.15, CI 1.13-1.18), diabetes (HR 1.5, CI 1.44-1.57), hyperlipidemia (HR 1.18, CI 1.16-1.21), and heart disease (HR 1.34, CI 1.25-1.45) compared to those undergoing vasectomy. The incidence of each comorbid condition did vary based on race/ethnicity, education, income, and region. However, the hazard ratios for all comorbidities was similar across all strata. Analyses stratified by race showed similar patterns (Table 2): the same association between infertility and incident cardiometabolic disease was present for each racial/ethnicity group examined (i.e. white, black, Asian, or Hispanic). However, the incidence of cardiometabolic disease did vary by race/ethnicity ($p < 0.0001$). The probability of development of diabetes increased over time for all races, however was less in whites (Figure 1).

In a similar fashion, analyses stratified by education (< HS, HS, less than college, or greater than or equal to college) (Table 3), income (<50K, 50-100K, or >100K

dollars per year) (Table 4), and region (Table 5) showed positive associations between infertility and incident cardiometabolic disease.

Discussion

This analysis demonstrates that infertile men are at a higher risk of cardiometabolic disease regardless of race/ethnicity, education, income, or region. While we have previously demonstrated an increased risk of chronic non-oncologic adverse outcomes in infertile men, such as diabetes and heart disease, the prior data have been limited by lack of details such as race and socioeconomic status that could have been confounding the observed hazard ratios (9). This study was able to evaluate race, educational level, region, and income to determine if these potential confounding factors changed the risk of development of adverse cardiopulmonary outcomes. The data presented here show when these sociodemographic factors are examined, the observed hazard ratios do not change indicating that infertility status is either a potential risk factor or biomarker for later health across all sociodemographic strata.

The primary focus of health outcomes in fertility research has traditionally been on the offspring born to those either deemed clinically infertile or having undergone fertility treatment. A large Danish cohort of 2.5 million children born to women with fertility problems (with no specification of fertility treatment) were shown to have increased incidence of mental disorders (13). Additionally, a cohort from Australia of 2,876 children born via ART showed similar findings (14).

However, until recently, less attention has focused on the health of the infertile male.

There is limited data on the later health outcomes of infertile men. Long term follow up of these individuals can be difficult in the absence of national health systems. As cancer registries exist in many countries, previous studies have focused on the increased incidence of certain cancers in infertile males. Data from private insurance claims has shown data that infertile males have a higher risk of incident cancer (15). Particular attention has been paid to an increased risk of testicular cancer in infertile individuals (7,16–19). Most recently, an analysis of 20,433 men who had undergone semen analysis and examined the risk of all cancers. Compared to fertile men, there was an increased risk of testicular cancer with a hazard rate of 3.3 with a particularly increased risk among those men identified as oligozoospermic (16).

To date, the etiology of the association between infertility and later health remains unknown. Authors have argued that genetic, developmental, or lifestyle factors may play a role. As we attempt to understand the association or even target selected screening for men, it would be helpful to know which groups are at highest risk. Moreover, as genetic and lifestyle factors have been posited to explain the association, it would be helpful to understand if the association between fertility and health varies based on race/ethnicity or socioeconomic status, or region (20). Indeed, it has been shown that semen quality varies based

on race, education, and region in the US (21,22). A study of 1423 Danish men showed that socioeconomic class was not associated with increased risk of hospitalization in the presence of abnormal semen analysis (23). In the current analysis, we found similar risk regardless of race/ethnicity, education, and income. The results suggest that the link between infertility and cardiometabolic health transcends socioeconomic status or geographic location. Importantly, while whites have an overall lower incidence of cardiometabolic disease, the relative risk of all cardiometabolic disease was similar across all races/ethnicities (24).

The underlying mechanism driving our findings of increased cardiometabolic risk in infertile individuals remains unknown and is likely multifactorial. As body mass index has been linked to infertility, this may help explain the increased risk of adverse cardiometabolic outcomes as obesity itself demonstrates an increased risk of similar outcomes (25). Hypogonadism has additionally been shown to increase an individual's risk of cardiovascular disease therefore a similar link may exist between infertility and cardiometabolic disease (26). As a large proportion of the genome, approximately 10%, participates in reproduction it is reasonable to hypothesize that defects within it may affect other areas (27).

The association identified by this analysis potentially presents a new opportunity for health counseling as men are evaluated for male infertility. Counseling on improved lifestyle modifications may have the potential to mitigate the risk of

future morbidity. However, future research needs to establish the etiology of the association between infertility and cardiometabolic disease before strong clinical recommendations can be made.

The present study is limited in the fact that it relies on insurance claims data, which have limited granular data about the enrollees. In addition, follow up is limited in a largely employed based health care database. Additionally, the extraction of diagnoses requires correct coding of diagnoses in insurance claims and can be subject to bias of the provider. Furthermore, key data on metabolic risk factors, such as family history, physical activity, were not available within the database we used.

In conclusion, in this large cohort of patients, while the overall risk of incident cardiometabolic disease remains low for infertile men, the work suggests that infertile men are at higher risks of cardiometabolic disease regardless of race/ethnicity or socioeconomic status, or region.

1. Thoma ME, Mclain AC, Louis F, King RB. Prevalence of infertility in the United States as estimated by the current duration approach and a traditional constructed approach. *Fertil Steril*. 2017;99(5):1324–31.
2. Louis J, Thoma M, Sorensen D, McLain A, King R, Sundaram R, et al. The prevalence of couple infertility in the United States from a male perspective : evidence from a nationally representative sample. *Andrology*. 2013;1(5):741–8.
3. Martinez G, Chandra A, Abma J, Jones J, Mosher W. Fertility , Contraception , and Fatherhood : Data on Men and Women From Cycle 6 (2002) of the National Survey of Family Growth. *Vital Heal Stat* 23. 2006;23(26):1–142.
4. Sunderam S, Kissim D, Crawford S, Golfer S, Boulet S, Warner L, et al. Assisted Reproductive Technology Surveillance - United Sates, 2015. *MMWR Surveill Sumaries* 2018. 2018;SS-3:1–28.
5. Jensen TK, Jacobsen R, Christensen K, Nielsen NC, Bostofte E. Good Semen Quality and Life Expectancy : A Cohort Study of 43,277 Men. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2009;170(5):559–65.
6. Eisenberg ML, Li S, Behr B, Ph D, Pera R, Ph D. Relationship between semen production and medical comorbidity. *Fertil Steril*. 2015;103(1):66–71.
7. Eisenberg ML, Betts P, Herder D, Lamb DJ, Lipshultz L. Increased risk of cancer among azoospermic men. *Fertil Steril*. 2013;100(3):681–5.
8. Hanson BM, Eisenberg ML, Hotaling JM, M FECS. Male infertility : a biomarker of individual and familial cancer risk. *Fertil Steril*. 2018;109(1):6–19.
9. Eisenberg ML, Li S, Cullen MR, Baker LC, Ph D. Increased risk of incident chronic medical conditions in infertile men : analysis of United States claims data. *Fertil Steril*. 2015;105(3):629–36.
10. Glazer CH, Bonde JP, Giwercman A, Vassard D, Pinborg A, Schmidt L, et al. Risk of diabetes according to male factor infertility: A register-based cohort study. *Hum Reprod*. 2017;32(7):1474–81.
11. Eisenberg ML, Henderson JT, Amory JK, Smith JF, Walsh TJ. Racial Differences in Vasectomy Utilization in the United States: Data From the National Survey of Family Growth. *Urology*. 2009;74(5):1020–4.
12. Hotaling JM, Patel DP, Brant WO, Myers JB, Cullen MR, Eisenberg ML. Demographic and socio-economic differences between men seeking infertility evaluation and those seeking surgical sterilization: From the National Survey of Family Growth. *BJU Int*. 2015;116(2):288–92.
13. Svahn MF, Hargreave M, Nielsen TSS, Plessen KJ, Jensen SM, Kjaer SK, et al. Mental disorders in childhood and young adulthood among children born to women with fertility problems. *Hum Reprod*. 2015;30(9):2129–37.
14. Hansen M, Greenop K, Bourke J, Baynam G, Hart R, Leonard H. Intellectual Disability in Children Conceived Using Assisted Reproductive Technology. *Pediatrics*. 2018;142(6).
15. Eisenberg ML, Li S, Brooks JD, Cullen MR, Baker LC. Sexual Function / Infertility Increased Risk of Cancer in Infertile Men : Analysis of U.S. Claims

- Data. *J Urol*. 2015;193(5):1596–601.
16. Hanson HA, Ph D, Anderson RE, Aston KI, Ph D. Subfertility increases risk of testicular cancer : evidence from population-based semen samples. *Fertil Steril*. 2016;105(2):322-328.e1.
 17. Jacobsen R, Bostofte E, Engholm G, Hansen J, Olsen JH, Skakkebaek NE. Risk of testicular cancer in men with abnormal semen characteristics: cohort study. *BMJ*. 2000;321:789–92.
 18. Jørgensen N, Vierula M, Jacobsen R, Pukkala E, Perheentupa A, Virtanen HE. Recent adverse trends in semen quality and testis cancer incidence among Finnish men. *Int J Androl*. 2010;34:e37-48.
 19. Walsh TJ, Croughan MS, Schembri M, Chan JM, Turek PJ. Increased risk of testicular germ cell cancer among infertile men. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009;169(4):351–6.
 20. Choy JT, Eisenberg ML. Male infertility as a window to health. *Fertil Steril*. 2018;110(5):810–4.
 21. Khandwala YS, Zhang CA, Li S, Behr B, Guo D, Eisenberg ML. Racial Variation in Semen Quality at Fertility Evaluation. *Urology*. 2017;106:96–102.
 22. Glazer CH, Li S, Zhang CA, Giwercman A, Bonde JP, Eisenberg ML. Racial and Sociodemographic Differences of Semen Parameters Among US Men Undergoing a Semen Analysis. *Urology*. 2018;123:126–32.
 23. Latif T, Mehlsen J, Eisenberg ML, Holmboe SA, Pors K, Brinth L, et al. Semen quality associated with subsequent hospitalizations – Can the effect be explained by socio- economic status and lifestyle factors ? *Andrology*. 2018;6:428–35.
 24. Menke A, Casagrande S, Geiss L, Cowie C. Prevalence of and Trends in Diabetes Among Adults in the United States, 1988-2012. *JAMA*. 2019;20910(10):1021–9.
 25. Salonia A, Matloob R, Gallina A, Abdollah F, Sacca A, Briganti A, et al. Are Infertile Men Less Healthy than Fertile Men? Results of a Prospective Case-Control Survey. *Eur Urol*. 2009;56:1025–32.
 26. Khaw K, Dowsett M, Folkard E, Bingham S, Wareham N, Luben R, et al. Endogenous Testosterone and Mortality Due to All Causes , Cardiovascular Disease , and Cancer in Men (EPIC-Norfolk) Prospective Population Study. *Circulation*. 2007;116(23):2694–701.
 27. Matzuk MM, Lamb DJ. The biology of infertility : research advances and clinical challenges. *Nat Med*. 2008;14(11):1197–214.

Supplementary figure 1 legend:

Figure 1. Probability of diabetes development over time and those individuals at risk of development at each follow up year

Table 1. Demographics of study population

	Category	Infertile	Infertile Evaluation	Vasectomy
N		76,343	60,072	183,742
Age, mean (SD)	Mean	35.3 (5.8)	35.4 (5.8)	37.6 (5.6)
	18-19	0.1	0.2	0
	20-29	15.6	15.1	7.4
	30-39	60.6	60.2	56.0
	40-50	23.7	24.6	36.7
Follow up, mean (SD)	Mean	4.5 (3.2)	4.2 (3.0)	4.8 (3.3)
Follow up, median (range)		3.5 (1 - 14)	3.2 (1 - 14)	3.8 (1 - 14)
Obesity		14.2	12.0	12.1
Smoking		10.9	9.9	12.7
Year of evaluation (%)	2003-2007	45.2	34.1	45.2
	2008-2011	30.1	32.6	30.0
	2012-2016	24.7	33.3	24.8
Average visits per person year, median(range)		2.1 (0 - 93.6)	1.8 (0 - 80.2)	1.9 (0 - 75.5)
Race (%)	White	65.5	70.8	82.2
	Black	7.5	6.1	4.7
	Asian	10	8.7	2.0
	Hispanic	11.5	9.3	7.6
	Unknown	5.5	5.0	3.6
Education (%)	< High School	0.5	0.3	0.2
	High School	19.3	15.7	18.9
	Less than college	50.8	51.6	55.3
	More than college	28.9	32.0	25.2
	Unknown	0.4	0.4	0.4

Income (%)	<\$50K	9.1	8.2	7.0
	\$50-100K	23.8	24.4	23.1
	>\$100K	37.1	41.5	45.2
	Unknown	30	25.9	24.7
Geographic Region (%)	Division			
	East North Central	12.9	16.1	17.7
	East South Central	3.3	1.8	3.7
	Middle Atlantic	13.6	9.6	4.3
	Mountain	7.1	9.9	11.0
	New England	5.7	2.5	2.8
	Pacific	10.4	8.9	7.5
	South Atlantic	24.6	24.3	22.8
	Unknown	0.1	0.1	0.1
	West North Central	9.8	11.7	13.9
	West South Central	12.6	15.1	16.2
	Region			
	Midwest	22.7	27.9	31.7
	Northeast	19.2	12.1	7.1
	South	40.5	41.2	42.7
Unknown	0.1	0.1	0.1	
West	17.5	18.8	18.5	

Table 2. Risk of medical co-morbidities in infertile males stratified by race.

Race	Co-morbidity	Infertile		Infertile evaluation		Vasectomy			
		N	Observed (%)	N	Observed (%)	HR Infertile vs evaluation	N	Observed (%)	HR Infertile vs vasectomy
All	Hypertension	67,232	10,457 (15.55)	53735	6992 (13.01)	1.04 (1.01 - 1.08)	159646	23193 (14.53)	1.15 (1.13 - 1.18)
	Diabetes	73,135	4,098 (5.6)	58071	2291 (3.95)	1.13 (1.08 - 1.19)	178424	6290 (3.53)	1.5 (1.44 - 1.57)
	Hyperlipidemia	66,908	13,767 (20.58)	53111	9448 (17.79)	1.04 (1.01 - 1.06)	157055	29609 (18.85)	1.18 (1.16 - 1.21)
	Heart disease	72,281	6,588 (9.11)	57293	4274 (7.46)	1.05 (1.01 - 1.09)	173558	14892 (8.58)	1.14 (1.1 - 1.17)
White	Hypertension	44,181	6,746 (15.27)	38220	4894 (12.80)	1.05 (1.01 - 1.09)	131714	18834 (14.30)	1.15 (1.12 - 1.19)
	Diabetes	48,2	2,233	41391	1382	1.15	14719	4703	1.49

	s	63	(4.63)		(3.34)	(1.07	1	(3.2)	(1.41 -
						-			1.57)
						1.23)			
	Hyperlip	44,3	8,488	38024	6382	1.03	12981	2402	1.15
	idemia	95	(19.1		(16.7	(0.999	4	6	(1.12 -
			2)		8)	-		(18.5	1.18)
						1.07)		1)	
	Heart	47,4	4,310	40610	3086	1.04	14281	1216	1.13
	disease	08	(9.09)		(7.6)	(0.99	1	2	(1.09 -
						-		(8.52)	1.17)
						1.09)			
Blac	Hyperte	4,72	980	3049	551	1.02	7051	1386	1.18
k	nsion	1	(20.7		(18.0	(0.92		(19.6	(1.08 -
			6)		7)	-		6)	1.28)
						1.14)			
	Diabete	5,35	434	3444	211	1.05	8200	462	1.48
	s	4	(8.11)		(6.13)	(0.89		(5.63)	(1.29 -
						-			1.69)
						1.24)			
	Hyperlip	4,98	1,046	3202	594	0.99	7343	1496	1.14
	idemia	4	(20.9		(18.5	(0.89		(20.3	(1.05 -
			9)		5)	-		7)	1.24)
						1.09)			
	Heart	5,32	581	3421	301	1.01	8087	802	1.16
	disease	7	(10.9		(8.8)	(0.88		(9.92)	(1.04 -
			1)			-			1.3)
						1.16)			
Asia	Hyperte	6,92	835	4803	486	1.05	3170	373	1.16
n	nsion	7	(12.0		(10.1	(0.93		(11.7	(1.02 -
			5)		2)	-		7)	1.32)
						1.17)			

	Diabetes	7,237	514 (7.1)	4992	277 (5.55)	1.09 (0.94 - 1.27)	3445	177 (5.14)	1.53 (1.28 - 1.83)
	Hyperlipidemia	6,420	1,601 (24.94)	4440	980 (22.07)	1.03 (0.95 - 1.11)	2930	628 (21.43)	1.41 (1.28 - 1.56)
	Heart disease	7,331	507 (6.92)	5067	251 (4.95)	1.22 (1.05 - 1.42)	3427	245 (7.15)	1.1 (0.94 - 1.29)
Hispanic	Hypertension	7,654	1,310 (17.12)	4936	728 (14.75)	1.01 (0.92 - 1.10)	11963	1843 (15.41)	1.16 (1.08 - 1.25)
	Diabetes	8,251	665 (8.06)	5327	301 (5.65)	1.19 (1.04 - 1.37)	13195	710 (5.38)	1.53 (1.37 - 1.71)
	Hyperlipidemia	7,470	1,842 (24.66)	4784	991 (20.71)	1.08 (1.001 - 1.17)	11400	2409 (21.13)	1.3 (1.22 - 1.39)
	Heart disease	8,246	816 (9.9)	5298	415 (7.83)	1.08 (0.96 - 1.22)	13028	1124 (8.63)	1.22 (1.11 - 1.34)

Table 3. Risk of medical co-morbidities in infertile males stratified by education

Educ ation	Co- morbid ity	Infe rtil e		Inferti le eval u ation		HR Inferti le vs evalu ation	Vasec tomy		HR Inferti le vs vasec tomy
		N	Obse rved (%)	N	Obse rved (%)		N	Obse rved (%)	
All	Hyperte nsion	67,2 32	10,45 7 (15.5 5)	53,73 5	6,992 (13.0 1)	1.04 (1.01 - 1.08)	159,6 46	2319 3 (14.5 3)	1.15 (1.13 - 1.18)
	Diabete s	73,1 35	4,098 (5.6)	58,07 1	2,291 (3.95)	1.13 (1.08 - 1.19)	178,4 24	6290 (3.53)	1.5 (1.44 - 1.57)
	Hyperlip idemia	66,9 08	13,76 7 (20.5 8)	53,11 1	9,448 (17.7 9)	1.04 (1.01 - 1.06)	157,0 55	2960 9 (18.8 5)	1.18 (1.16 - 1.21)
	Heart disease	72,2 81	6,588 (9.11)	57,29 3	4,274 (7.46)	1.05 (1.01 - 1.09)	173,5 58	1489 2 (8.58)	1.14 (1.1 - 1.17)
<High School	Hyperte nsion	330	55 (16.6 7)	168	17 (10.1 2)	1.76 (0.99 6 - 3.12)	350	52 (14.8 6)	1.6 (1.07 - 2.4)

	Diabetes	340	27 (7.94)	176	11 (6.25)	1.31 (0.63 - 2.73)	377	26 (6.9)	1.69 (0.96 - 2.99)
	Hyperlipidemia	330	60 (18.18)	165	24 (14.55)	1.32 (0.81 - 2.18)	333	55 (16.52)	1.63 (1.11 - 2.41)
	Heart disease	357	29 (8.12)	177	8 (4.52)	1.81 (0.8 - 4.06)	378	23 (6.08)	1.57 (0.87 - 2.83)
High School	Hypertension	12,586	2,316 (18.4)	8,285	1,330 (16.05)	1.01 (0.95 - 1.08)	29,466	4966 (16.85)	1.15 (1.09 - 1.21)
	Diabetes	13,947	945 (6.78)	9,052	471 (5.2)	1.06 (0.95 - 1.19)	33,537	1479 (4.41)	1.44 (1.32 - 1.57)
	Hyperlipidemia	12,930	2,595 (20.07)	8,351	1,439 (17.23)	1.04 (0.98 - 1.11)	30,205	5470 (18.11)	1.2 (1.14 - 1.26)
	Heart disease	13,961	1,282 (9.18)	9,047	719 (7.95)	0.97 (0.89 - 1.07)	33,005	2791 (8.46)	1.14 (1.06 - 1.22)
Less than college	Hypertension	34,008	5,456 (16.04)	27,500	3,705 (13.47)	1.06 (1.01 - 1.1)	87,931	1304 (14.83)	1.16 (1.13 - 1.2)

	Diabetes	37,1 32	2,122 (5.71)	29,95 1	1,190 (3.97)	1.19 (1.11)	98,61 4	3652 (3.7)	1.49 (1.41 - 1.58)
	Hyperlipidemia	34,0 30	6,984 (20.5 2)	27,42 5	4,918 (17.9 3)	1.02 (0.99 - 1.06)	86,74 6	1638 6 (18.8 9)	1.18 (1.15 - 1.22)
	Heart disease	36,7 66	3,244 (8.82)	29,56 7	2,108 (7.13)	1.07 (1.01 - 1.13)	96,05 2	8097 (8.43)	1.12 (1.07 - 1.17)
More than college	Hypertension	20,0 12	2,590 (12.9 4)	17,58 2	1,905 (10.8 3)	1.06 (0.99 - 1.12)	41,27 8	5037 (12.2)	1.16 (1.1 - 1.22)
	Diabetes	21,3 95	988 (4.62)	18,67 8	609 (3.26)	1.13 (1.02 - 1.25)	45,21 0	1115 (2.47)	1.64 (1.5 - 1.8)
	Hyperlipidemia	19,3 18	4,066 (21.0 5)	16,96 5	3,034 (17.8 8)	1.04 (0.99 - 1.09)	39,14 2	7592 (19.4)	1.16 (1.11 - 1.21)
	Heart disease	20,8 76	2,011 (9.63)	18,29 4	1,422 (7.77)	1.1 (1.02 - 1.17)	43,45 0	3932 (9.05)	1.18 (1.12 - 1.25)

Table 4. Risk of medical co-morbidities in infertile males stratified by income

Income	Co-morbidity	Infertile		Infertile evaluation		Vasectomy		HR Infertile vs vasectomy	
		N	Observed (%)	N	Observed (%)	N	Observed (%)		
All	Hypertension	67,232	10,457 (15.55)	53735	6,992 (13.01)	1.04 (1.01 - 1.08)	159,646	23193 (14.53)	1.15 (1.13 - 1.18)
	Diabetes	73,135	4,098 (5.6)	58071	2,291 (3.95)	1.13 (1.08 - 1.19)	178,424	6290 (3.53)	1.5 (1.44 - 1.57)
	Hyperlipidemia	66,908	13,767 (20.58)	53111	9,448 (17.79)	1.04 (1.01 - 1.06)	157,055	29609 (18.85)	1.18 (1.16 - 1.21)
	Heart disease	72,281	6,588 (9.11)	57293	4,274 (7.46)	1.05 (1.01 - 1.09)	173,558	14892 (8.58)	1.14 (1.1 - 1.17)
<50K	Hypertension	5,923	1,031 (17.41)	4245	605 (14.25)	1.04 (0.94 - 1.16)	10,948	17277 (15.77)	1.2 (1.11 - 1.3)

	Diabetes	6,560	455 (6.94)	4669	235 (5.03)	1.08 (0.92 - 1.27)	12,443	526 (4.23)	1.61 (1.41 - 1.83)
	Hyperlipidemia	6,075	1,189 (19.57)	4302	725 (16.85)	0.96 (0.88 - 1.06)	11,230	1834 (16.33)	1.24 (1.15 - 1.34)
	Heart disease	6,575	564 (8.58)	4690	321 (6.84)	1.02 (0.89 - 1.17)	12,303	958 (7.79)	1.12 (1 - 1.25)
50-100 K	Hypertension	15,640	2,596 (16.6)	12934	1,750 (13.53)	0.99 (0.93 - 1.05)	36,097	5610 (15.54)	1.13 (1.08 - 1.19)
	Diabetes	17,231	1,083 (6.29)	14128	592 (4.19)	1.12 (1.01 - 1.24)	40,935	1678 (4.1)	1.46 (1.34 - 1.58)
	Hyperlipidemia	15,739	3,300 (20.97)	12981	2,252 (17.35)	0.99 (0.94 - 1.05)	36,155	6830 (18.89)	1.18 (1.13 - 1.23)
	Heart disease	17,120	1,522 (8.89)	14011	940 (6.71)	1.05 (0.96 - 1.13)	40,035	3401 (8.5)	1.1 (1.03 - 1.17)
100 K	Hypertension	24,998	4,170 (16.68)	22338	3,072 (13.75)	1.05 (1.001 - 1.1)	72,192	1102 (15.24)	1.15 (1.11 - 1.2)

							7)	
Diabetes	27,2	1,585	24181	976	1.15	80,796	2894	1.49
s	59	(5.81)		(4.04)	(1.06		(3.58)	(1.4 -
					-			1.59)
					1.24)			
Hyperlipidemia	24,4	5,857	21752	4,424	1.03	69,419	1509	1.15
	18	(23.9		(20.3	(0.99		7	(1.11 -
		9)		4)	-		(21.7	1.18)
					1.07)		5)	
Heart disease	26,6	2,935	23592	2,107	1.05	77,796	7639	1.15
	35	(11.0		(8.93)	(0.99		(9.82)	(1.1 -
		2)			-			1.2)
					1.11)			

JOURNAL PRE-PROOF