



HAL
open science

Parity, breastfeeding and risk of coronary heart disease: A pan-European case-cohort study

Sanne A. E. Peters, Yvonne T. van Der Schouw, Angela M. Wood, Michael J. Sweeting, Karel G. M. Moons, Elisabete Weiderpass, Larraitz Arriola, Vassiliki Benetou, Heiner Boeing, Fabrice Bonnet, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Sanne A. E. Peters, Yvonne T. van Der Schouw, Angela M. Wood, Michael J. Sweeting, Karel G. M. Moons, et al.. Parity, breastfeeding and risk of coronary heart disease: A pan-European case-cohort study. *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology*, 2016, 23 (16), pp.1755-1765. 10.1177/2047487316658571 . hal-01397737

HAL Id: hal-01397737

<https://univ-rennes.hal.science/hal-01397737>

Submitted on 17 Jul 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Parity, breastfeeding and risk of coronary heart disease: a pan-European case-cohort study

2
3 Sanne A.E. Peters,^{1,2} Yvonne T. van der Schouw,² Angela M. Wood,^{3,4} Michael J. Sweeting,^{3,4} Karel G.M. Moons,² Elisabete
4 Weiderpass,^{5,6,7,8} Larraitz Arriola,^{*9} Vassiliki Benetou,^{*10,11} Heiner Boeing,^{*12} Fabrice Bonnet,^{*13} Salma T. Butt,^{*14} Françoise
5 Clavel-Chapelon,^{*15} Isabel Drake,^{*16} Diana Gavrilă,^{*17,18} Timothy J Key,^{*19} Eleni Klinaki,^{*11} Vittorio Krogh,^{*20} Tilman Kühn,^{*21}
6 Camille Lassale,^{*22} Giovanna Masala,^{*23} Giuseppe Matullo,^{*24,25} Melissa Merritt,^{*22} Elena Molina-Portillo,^{*18,26} Conchi Moreno-
7 Iribas,^{*27,28} Therese H. Nøst,^{*5} Anja Olsen,^{*29} N. Charlotte Onland-Moret,^{*2} Kim Overvad,^{*30,31} Salvatore Panico,^{*32} M Luisa
8 Redondo,^{*33} Anne Tjønneland,^{*29} Antonia Trichopoulou,^{*10,11} Rosario Tumino,^{*34} Renée Turzanski-Fortner,^{*21} Ioanna
9 Tzoulaki,^{*22} Patrik Wennberg,^{*35} Anna Winkvist,^{*36,37} Simon G. Thompson,^{3,4} Emanuele Di Angelantonio,^{3,4} Elio Riboli,²¹
10 Nicholas J. Wareham,³⁸ John Danesh,^{3,4,39} Adam S. Butterworth^{3,4}

11 *Denotes authors are listed alphabetically

- 12 1. The George Institute for Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
- 13 2. Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands
- 14 3. Cardiovascular Epidemiology Unit, Department of Public Health & Primary Care, University of Cambridge, UK
- 15 4. The National Institute for Health Research Blood and Transplant Unit (NIHR BTRU) in Donor Health and Genomics at
16 the University of Cambridge, UK
- 17 5. Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Tromsø, The Arctic University of
18 Norway, Tromsø, Norway
- 19 6. Department of Research, Cancer Registry of Norway, Institute of Population-Based Cancer Research, Oslo, Norway
- 20 7. Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- 21 8. Genetic Epidemiology Group, Folkhälsan Research Center, Helsinki, Finland
- 22 9. Public Health Division of Gipuzkoa, Instituto Bio-Donostia, Basque Government, CIBERESP, Spain
- 23 10. WHO Collaborating Center for Nutrition and Health, Unit of Nutritional Epidemiology and Nutrition in Public Health,
24 Department of Hygiene, Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, University of Athens Medical School, Athens, Greece
- 25 11. Hellenic Health Foundation, Athens, Greece
- 26 12. Department of Epidemiology, German Institute of Human Nutrition (DIfE), Potsdam-Rehbrücke, Germany
- 27 13. Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Rennes, University of Rennes, Villejuif, France
- 28 14. Department of Surgery, Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Skåne University Hospital, Malmö, Sweden
- 29 15. INSERM, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health (CESP), U1018, Nutrition, Hormones, and
30 Women's Health Team, Institut Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, France
- 31 16. Department of Clinical Science, Lund University, Malmö, Sweden
- 32 17. Department of Epidemiology, Murcia Regional Health Council, IMIB-Arrixaca, Murcia, Spain
- 33 18. CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
- 34 19. Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford
- 35 20. Epidemiology and Prevention Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, Milan, Italy
- 36 21. German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Division of Cancer Epidemiology, Heidelberg, Germany
- 37 22. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Imperial College London, London, UK
- 38 23. Molecular and Nutritional Epidemiology Unit, Cancer Research and Prevention Institute - ISPO, Florence, Italy
- 39 24. Human Genetics Foundation, Turin, Italy
- 40 25. Department of Medical Sciences, University of Turin, Italy
- 41 26. Escuela Andaluza de Salud Pública. Instituto de Investigación Biosanitaria IBS GRANADA. Hospitales Universitarios de
42 Granada/Universidad de Granada, Granada, Spain
- 43 27. Public Health Institute of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain
- 44 28. Red de Investigación en Servicios de Salud en Enfermedades Crónicas, Madrid, Spain

- 45 29. Diet, Genes and Environment, Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Copenhagen, Denmark
46 30. Department of Public Health, Section for Epidemiology, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark
47 31. Department of Cardiology, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark
48 32. Dipartimento di Medicina Clinica e Chirurgia, Federico II University, Naples, Italy
49 33. Public Health Directorate, Asturias, Spain
50 34. Cancer Registry and Histopathology Unit, Civic- M.P.Arezzo Hospital, ASP Ragusa , Italy
51 35. Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Family Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
52 36. Nutritional Research, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
53 37. Department of Internal Medicine and Clinical Nutrition, The Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg,
54 Gothenburg, Sweden
55 38. Medical Research Council Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
56 39. Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, Genome Campus, Hinxton, UK

57 Address for correspondence

58 Dr. Sanne A.E. Peters
59 The George Institute for Global Health, University of Oxford
60 34 Broad Street, Oxford OX1 3BD, United Kingdom
61 T: +44 1865 617 200 | F: +44 1865 617 202
62 E: sanne.peters@georgeinstitute.ox.ac.uk

63

64 Word count:

65 Abstract: 244

66 Manuscript: 2984

67 **Abstract**

68 *Objective:* There is uncertainty about the direction and magnitude of the associations between parity, breastfeeding and the
69 risk of coronary heart disease (CHD). We examined the separate and combined associations of parity and breastfeeding
70 practices with the incidence of CHD later in life among women in a large pan-European cohort study.

71 *Methods:* Data were used from EPIC-CVD, a case-cohort study nested within the EPIC prospective study of 520,000
72 participants from 10 countries. Information on reproductive history was available for 14,917 women, including 5,138 incident
73 cases of CHD. Using Prentice-weighted Cox regression separately for each country followed by random-effects meta-analysis,
74 we calculated hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for CHD, after adjustment for age, study centre, and
75 several socioeconomic and biological risk factors.

76

77 *Results:* Compared with nulliparous women, the adjusted HR was 1.19 (95% CI: 1.01-1.41) among parous women; HRs were
78 higher among women with more children (e.g., adjusted HR: 1.95, 1.19-3.20, for women with ≥ 5 children). Compared with
79 women who did not breastfeed, the adjusted HR was 0.71 (0.52-0.98) among women who breastfed. For childbearing women
80 who never breastfed, the adjusted HR was 1.58 (1.09, 2.30) compared with nulliparous women, whereas for childbearing
81 women who breastfed the adjusted HR was 1.19 (0.99, 1.43).

82

83 *Conclusion:* Having more children was associated with a higher risk of CHD later in life, whereas breastfeeding was associated
84 with a lower CHD risk. Women who both had children and breastfed did have a non-significantly higher risk of CHD.

85

86 **Key messages**

87 *What is already known about this subject?*

- 88 - Pregnancy poses a substantial challenge to the cardiovascular system of the mother and breastfeeding has been
89 suggested to reverse some of the pro-atherogenic changes.
90 - The direction and magnitude of the associations between parity, breastfeeding, and their combined effects, and the
91 risk of coronary heart disease (CHD) are uncertain.

92

93 *What does this study add?*

- 94 - Compared with nulliparous women, parous women were at 20% increased risk of CHD and the excess risk was higher
95 with increasing number of children.
96 - Breastfeeding was associated with a 30% lower risk of CHD, compared with parous women who did not breastfeed.
97 - Compared with nulliparous women, childbearing was more strongly associated with a higher risk of CHD among
98 women who had never breastfed. This is despite the higher number of children among women who had ever
99 breastfed.

100

101 *How might this impact on clinical practice?*

- 102 - Breastfeeding might reverse the physiological changes in pregnancy more quickly and more completely.
103 - If causal, promotion of prolonged breastfeeding in parous women may confer long-term cardiovascular benefit.

104

105 **Introduction**

106 Pregnancy is associated with profound changes in the maternal metabolic system, including weight gain, accumulation of
107 abdominal fat, increased insulin resistance, and higher circulating lipid levels.^{1,2} While these metabolic changes of pregnancy
108 support the growth of the foetus and prepare the mother's body for breastfeeding in the short-term, they may also have a
109 prolonged effect on maternal risk of cardiovascular diseases (CVD). However, previous studies have reported conflicting
110 associations on parity (i.e., the number of live children to whom a woman has given birth) and risk of CVD later in life.³⁻¹⁰

111 Conversely, since the metabolic changes in pregnancy appear to reverse more quickly and more completely with
112 breastfeeding, it has been proposed that breastfeeding could reduce maternal risk of cardiometabolic diseases.¹¹ Studies
113 have reported that, compared with women who have never breastfed, women who have breastfed have favourable
114 cardiometabolic profiles,^{12,13} and exhibit a lower burden of subclinical cardiovascular disease.¹⁴ There may be a lower risk of
115 developing metabolic syndrome,¹⁵ hypertension,^{16,17} and type 2 diabetes¹⁸⁻²¹ among women who have breastfed for longer
116 cumulative durations. However, it is uncertain whether there is an association between breastfeeding and incident CVD
117 outcomes.^{10,22-24} Also, while lifetime duration of breastfeeding will be affected by the number of children, it is unknown
118 whether extended duration of breastfeeding for one child is associated with the same extent of inverse association with CHD
119 risk as multiple periods of shorter breastfeeding across several pregnancies. Moreover, whether breastfeeding could
120 compensate for the potential effect of parity on CHD risk has not been examined.

121 The EPIC (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition)-CVD study provides an opportunity to
122 address these outstanding issues and to evaluate the separate and combined associations of parity and breastfeeding on the
123 risk of incident CHD in a large sample of women from diverse European countries.

124
125 **Methods**

126 EPIC-CVD is a large, prospective, case-cohort study nested within the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and
127 Nutrition (EPIC) study.^{25,26} Briefly, the EPIC study involves 366,521 women and 153,457 men, mostly aged 35–70 years,
128 recruited by 23 centres in 10 European countries (Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain,
129 Sweden, and the United Kingdom) between 1991 and 1999. Participants completed questionnaires on their diet, lifestyle, and
130 medical history, and data were centralized at the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) in Lyon, France. A
131 representative random subcohort of 18,249 participants (62% women), stratified by centre, was selected for the EPIC-CVD
132 project.²⁷ After exclusion of 609 participants with a prior history of myocardial infarction or stroke at baseline, 17,640
133 subcohort members remained. This study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki; ethical review boards of IARC and all
134 local institutions where participants had been recruited gave approval for the study, and all participants gave written
135 informed consent.

136

137

138

139 *Definition and ascertainment of CHD events*

140 First-time CHD events, whether non-fatal or fatal, as defined by codes 410-414 of the International Classification of Diseases
141 Ninth Edition (ICD-9), and codes I20-I25 of the Tenth Edition (ICD-10) were the primary study endpoint. Individual centres
142 used different methods to ascertain first-time non-fatal CHD events, including self-report and linkage with morbidity or
143 hospital registries. Non-fatal CHD events were further validated by additional review of medical records and/or linkage with
144 registries.²⁶ Fatal CHD events were generally ascertained through mortality registries. End of follow-up for CHD events varied
145 between centres and ranged between 2003 and 2010.

146

147 *Study population and measurement*

148 Of the 16,504 women in EPIC-CVD who did not have a known history of CHD or stroke at baseline, 14,917 women provided
149 data on reproductive history. Two EPIC centres (Bilthoven, the Netherlands, and Umea, Sweden) did not assess parity and
150 breastfeeding history and thus did not contribute to the analyses. Reproductive history, socioeconomic and lifestyle factors,
151 and medical history were assessed once using a self-administrated questionnaire at study baseline. Trained health
152 professionals measured blood pressure, weight, height, and waist circumference during a visit to each study centre, except in
153 the France and Oxford centres where anthropometry was self-reported. Blood pressure measurements were not available for
154 the Norway, Asturias, and Navarra centres. High blood pressure was defined as self-reported hypertension at baseline,
155 systolic blood pressure >140 or diastolic blood pressure >90, or self-reported use of hypertension medication. Body mass
156 index was calculated as weight divided by the square of height in meters. HDL cholesterol and total cholesterol levels,
157 measured in baseline serum samples using a Roche MODULAR ANALYTICS EVO analyser, were available in all centres except
158 Norway.

159

160 *Statistical analyses*

161 Baseline characteristics for the subcohort by parity were presented as means (standard deviation) or medians (interquartile
162 range) for continuous variables and as percentages for categorical variables. Cox proportional hazards models, modified for
163 the case-cohort design using the Prentice method²⁸, were used to estimate hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals for
164 first-time CHD by parity and breastfeeding history. Participants contributed only to the first CHD outcome (whether non-fatal
165 or fatal) experienced during follow-up, so fatal events that followed non-fatal events were not included. Given the multilevel
166 structure of the data, models were first fitted separately within each country before pooling the country-specific estimates by
167 multivariate random-effects meta-analysis using inverse variance weights. Age was used as the underlying time variable, with
168 entry time defined as the participant's age at recruitment, and exit time as the age of first-time CHD, loss-to-follow-up or
169 censoring at the end of the follow-up, whichever came first. The I^2 statistic was used to quantify the percentage of total
170 variability between countries due to between-country heterogeneity. Parity, defined as the number of live births, was
171 categorized as nulliparous (reference), 1 child, 2 children, 3 children, 4 children, or 5 or more children. Breastfeeding history
172 was examined among parous women, comparing women who ever breastfed to women who had never breastfed, and
173 categorized into groups of lifetime duration of breastfeeding (never [reference], >0-<3 months, 3-<6 months, 6-<12 months,

174 12-<23 months, and 23 months or more), and into groups of mean duration of breastfeeding per live-born child (never
175 [reference], >0-<1 months, 1-<3 months, 3-<6 months, and 6 months or more). Group-specific 95% confidence intervals were
176 estimated only from the variances that correspond to the amount of information underlying each group (including the
177 reference group).²⁹ Models were adjusted for age at study entry and centre (Model I), and then additionally for level of
178 attained education, smoking status, and number of livebirths (for breastfeeding history only) (Model II), followed by further
179 adjustment for other confounders and potential mediators (history of high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol,
180 history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI) (Model III). Model III was used as our primary, most conservative, analyses model. To
181 account for the impact of missing covariate data on our results, we restricted our main analyses to individuals with complete
182 data for all models. Secondary analyses allowed the set of individuals to vary between models and used all individuals with
183 non-missing values for the covariates separately for each model. To investigate whether age or number of live births modified
184 the association between parity or breastfeeding with CHD risk, we calculated the HRs for CHD in women <55 years versus ≥ 55
185 years of age, and in women with 1 or 2 children versus those with 3 children or more. Statistical interaction was evaluated by
186 adding a cross-product term to the country-specific regression models and pooling these using random-effects meta-analysis.
187 In a sensitivity analysis, we excluded women younger than 45 in whom reproductive history may not yet be complete. To
188 assess the combined effect of parity and breastfeeding on CHD risk, we also examined the association between parity, history
189 of breastfeeding and risk of first-time CHD in models including nulliparous women as the reference group. All statistical
190 analyses were performed using STATA, version 12.0 (Stata, College Station, TX).

191

192 **Results**

193 The baseline characteristics of the 9,985 women in the subcohort with information on reproductive history are shown in
194 Table 1. The mean (SD) age at entry was 52.7 (9.1) years. Parous women who had ever breastfed had more children than
195 parous women who had never breastfed. Supplementary Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for main characteristics by
196 centre. Overall, 88% of women were parous, with rates ranging from 83% in the UK to 93% in Norway. Of these 87% had ever
197 breastfed, ranging from 77% of women in France to over 92-96% of women in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. During a
198 median follow-up of 11.1 years (interquartile range 8.0-13.4), 5,138 women developed CHD, of whom 206 were also in the
199 subcohort (27 women without follow-up data available were excluded). The number of participants contributing to each of
200 the main analyses is shown in Supplementary Table 2.

201

202 *Parity and risk of coronary heart disease*

203 In total, 12,319 women had complete data on parity, including 3,336 incident CHD cases. The HR (95% CI) for CHD in parous
204 versus nulliparous women was 1.27 (1.09, 1.47) in the age- and centre adjusted model and attenuated to 1.19 (1.01, 1.41)
205 following adjustment for potential confounders and mediators (Table 2). The I² statistic for the multiple-adjusted analyses
206 was 0% (0%-67%), indicating that there was minimal heterogeneity between countries. Compared to nulliparous women, the
207 multiple-adjusted HRs for CHD were 1.17 (0.92, 1.49), 1.15 (1.02, 1.28), 1.15 (0.94, 1.40), 1.39 (1.14, 1.70), and 1.95 (1.19,

208 3.20) for women with 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 or more children, respectively (Table 2 and Figure 1). Results were similar in analyses
209 including the largest set of women with complete data available, irrespective of incomplete data in subsequent models, or
210 when restricting the analyses to women aged 45 years or older at study entry (Supplementary Tables 3 and 4).

211

212 *Breastfeeding history and risk of coronary heart disease*

213 Complete data on breastfeeding history was available for 8,044 parous women, including 2,404 incident CHD cases. Parous
214 women who had ever breastfed had a multiple-adjusted HR for CHD of 0.71 (95% CI: 0.52, 0.98) compared with parous
215 women who never breastfed (Table 2). There was substantial heterogeneity between countries; the I^2 statistic was 58% (2%-
216 82%). Compared with parous women who had never breastfed, women with a lifetime duration of breastfeeding of >0-<3
217 months, 3-<6 months, 6-<12 months, 12-<23 months, or 23 months or more had a multiple-adjusted HR for CHD of 0.73 (0.60,
218 0.89), 0.68 (0.56, 0.83), 0.69 (0.55, 0.87), 0.63 (0.51, 0.76), and 0.62 (0.45, 0.86), respectively (Figure 2 and Table 2). Similar
219 results were obtained in the analyses on the mean duration of breastfeeding per child and CHD risk (Figure 3 and Table 2).
220 Analyses restricted to women 45 years or older or including women with missing data on some covariables did not change the
221 findings materially (Supplementary Tables 3 and 4).

222

223 *Combination of parity and breastfeeding and risk of coronary heart disease*

224 Analyses of the combination of parity and breastfeeding indicated that parous women who had never breastfed were at a
225 significantly higher risk of CHD compared to nulliparous women (HR: 1.58 [1.09, 2.30]; Table 3). There was no significant
226 evidence for a higher risk of CHD in parous women who had ever breastfed (HR: 1.19 [0.99, 1.43]), although power to detect
227 weak effects was limited.

228

229 *Subgroup analyses*

230 Analyses in subgroups of women younger than 55 years versus those 55 years or above at study entry provided no evidence
231 for a different effect of parity by age, and neither did the association between number of children and risk of CHD differ
232 between the age groups (Table 4). A history of breastfeeding was associated with similar reductions in risk of CHD in younger
233 as in older women, and in women with 1 or 2 children as in those with 3 or more children. The associations between lifetime
234 duration of breastfeeding and duration of breastfeeding per child and CHD risk also did not differ between age groups or by
235 parity (Table 4).

236

237 **Discussion**

238 In this case-cohort analysis, nested within the 10-country EPIC prospective cohort study, we examined the separate and
239 combined associations of parity and breastfeeding on the risk of incident CHD. Our main findings are threefold.

240

241 First, we report that parous women are at higher risk of CHD as compared to nulliparous women; with the highest risk seen
242 among women who had the most offspring. These findings, therefore, add to the accumulating evidence that repeated
243 pregnancies could result in an accumulation of cardiometabolic changes, including elevated pro-atherogenic lipid levels,
244 accumulation of abdominal fat, endothelial dysfunction, atherosclerosis, and increased systemic inflammation,^{1,30,31} that may
245 have permanent effects on the cardiovascular system, leading to a higher risk of CHD later in life.³⁻⁷

246
247 Second, in agreement with previous observations that breastfeeding is associated with lower risk of the metabolic
248 syndrome,¹⁵ hypertension,^{16,17} and diabetes,¹⁸⁻²¹ our study supports the existence of inverse associations between
249 breastfeeding and CHD risk. Previous studies have reported that prolonged periods of breastfeeding could have beneficial
250 effects on maternal cardiovascular risk factors, including on lipids, blood pressure, insulin and glucose homeostasis, and body
251 mass index.^{12,32} Despite the large sample size of this study, we were unable to conclusively distinguish between a threshold
252 effect between never breastfeeding and any duration of breastfeeding or an inverse dose-response curve between longer
253 cumulative breastfeeding duration and CHD risk. Findings from the Nurses' Health Study suggested that the association
254 between lifetime duration of breastfeeding and risk of incident CHD was characterized by a threshold effect; only women
255 with lifetime cumulative breastfeeding duration of two years or more had a significantly lower risk of incident CHD compared
256 to women who had never breastfed.²³ Moreover, while a history of breastfeeding was associated with a slightly lower risk of
257 fatal CHD in a cohort of 267,400 women from Shanghai, the association did not strengthen with increased duration of
258 breastfeeding.¹⁰ In contrast, a previous study of more than 20,000 Norwegian women reported that breastfeeding was
259 associated with a lower risk of CVD mortality, potentially in a U-shaped fashion, but only among parous women younger than
260 65 years at study baseline.²²

261
262 Third, our study constitutes one of the few available analyses of the combined associations of parity and breastfeeding on the
263 incidence of CHD. Despite the higher number of children among women who had ever breastfed, we found that childbearing
264 women who had never breastfed were at higher risk of CHD than childbearing women who had ever breastfed. This is
265 consistent with the notion that the physiological changes in pregnancy could reverse more quickly and more completely with
266 breastfeeding, which in turn may confer cardiovascular protection later in life.¹¹

267
268 Our observations are consistent with the conclusions of previous studies that attempted to disentangle biological processes
269 related to pregnancy from lifestyle factors related to childrearing by comparing results from men and women within the same
270 cohort. For example, a study among men from prospective cohorts in the US found no relationship between the number of
271 children and the paternal risk of CHD,³³ whereas there was a positive association between having 6 or more pregnancies and
272 CHD risk among women from the same cohort.⁵ A cross-sectional analysis of men and women from the British Women's Heart
273 and Health Study and the British Regional Heart Study reported that having more offspring was associated with higher body
274 mass index for both male and female parents, and with more adverse lipid profiles and diabetes in women only.⁶ However, as

275 there was a positive association between offspring and CHD among women (but not men) in these cohorts, the authors
276 concluded that the biological effects of pregnancy in women persist into later life.

277

278 The strengths and potential limitations of our study merit consideration. Our analysis maximized power and efficiency by
279 conducting a case-cohort analysis of incident CHD in the large prospective EPIC cohort, thereby focusing measurement of
280 lipids and other biochemical risk factors on the most relevant subset of the cohort. The validity of our findings was enhanced
281 by our ability to adjust for a range of relevant covariates, and by the robustness of our results to a variety of sensitivity and
282 subgroup analyses. The generalisability of our findings was enhanced by the inclusion of women from 10 diverse European
283 countries. However, we cannot preclude the possibility that the associations observed in this study were, at least partly, due
284 to unmeasured or residual confounding. For example, confounding is a major concern in studies of breastfeeding and health
285 outcomes, because mothers who breastfeed are more likely to engage in other health-promoting behaviours such as high
286 fruit and vegetable consumption and abstinence from smoking.³⁴⁻³⁶ Nevertheless, we found that adjustment in our study for
287 several relevant factors did not materially affect the relationships we observed. Our study had insufficient data to account for
288 CHD risk factors before or during pregnancy that determine breastfeeding initiation and duration as well as future CHD risk,
289 leaving our results potentially liable to “reverse causality”. For example, women with pre-existing CHD risk factors such as
290 obesity, type 1 diabetes, preeclampsia, or polycystic ovary syndrome, might be less likely to initiate breastfeeding and or
291 could breastfeed for shorter durations than women without these CHD risk factors. Because our study involved self-reported
292 information on parity and breastfeeding, information that was sometimes recalled and recorded decades after childbirth and
293 weaning (with the added limitation that duration of breastfeeding was recorded in EPIC only for a woman’s first three
294 children and final child), the true strength of any associations we observed could have been underestimated. Finally, data on
295 the number of children in men was not available, so we were not able to dissect whether the association between parity and
296 CHD was due to biological effects of childbearing or factors related to childrearing.

297

298 In conclusion, this analysis of women from 10 European countries found that having more children was associated with a
299 higher risk of CHD later in life, whereas breastfeeding was associated with a lower CHD risk. Women who both had children
300 and breastfed were suggested to be at higher risk of CHD (albeit not statistically significantly), suggesting the need for studies
301 to determine whether breastfeeding compensates for the CHD risk associated with greater parity.

302

303 **Funding**

304 EPIC-CVD has been supported by the European Union Framework 7 (HEALTH-F2-2012-279233), the European Research
305 Council (268834), the UK Medical Research Council (G0800270 and MR/L003120/1), the British Heart Foundation (SP/09/002
306 and RG/08/014 and RG13/13/30194), and the UK National Institute of Health Research. EPIC Asturias was also supported by
307 the Regional Government of Asturias. EPIC-Greece is also supported by the Hellenic Health Foundation. EPIC-Oxford was also
308 supported by the UK Medical Research Council (MR/M012190/1) and Cancer Research UK (570/A16491). EPIC-Ragusa was
309 also supported by the Sicilian Government, AIRE ONLUS Ragusa, and AVIS Ragusa. EPIC-Sweden was also supported by
310 Swedish Cancer Society, Swedish Scientific Council, and Regional Government of Skåne and Västerbotten (Sweden).
311 EPIC-Turin was also supported also by the Compagnia di San Paolo and the Human Genetics Foundation-Torino (HuGeF).

312

313 **Acknowledgements**

314 We thank all EPIC participants and staff for their contribution to the study. We thank staff from the EPIC-CVD and EPIC-
315 InterAct Coordinating Centres for carrying out sample preparation and data-handling work, particularly Sarah Spackman
316 (EPIC-CVD Data Manager).

317

318 **Conflicts of interest**

319 None

320

321 **Author contributions:** SP, YS, AW, KM, MS, EW, and AB were involved in the concept and design of the study. SP
322 and MS conducted the statistical analyses. SP prepared the first draft of the manuscript. All authors were involved
323 in the acquisition and/or interpretation of the data, made critical revision of the manuscript for important
324 intellectual content, and provided final approval of the version to be published. SP, YS, and AB are responsible for
325 the integrity of the work as a whole.

326 **References**

- 327 1. Lain KY and Catalano PM. Metabolic changes in pregnancy. *Clinical obstetrics and gynecology*. 2007; 50: 938-48.
- 328 2. Sanghavi M and Rutherford JD. Cardiovascular physiology of pregnancy. *Circulation*. 2014; 130: 1003-8.
- 329 3. Parikh NI, Cnattingius S, Dickman PW, Mittleman MA, Ludvigsson JF and Ingelsson E. Parity and risk of later-life
330 maternal cardiovascular disease. *American heart journal*. 2010; 159: 215-21.e6.
- 331 4. Jaffe DH, Eisenbach Z and Manor O. The effect of parity on cause-specific mortality among married men and women.
332 *Maternal and child health journal*. 2011; 15: 376-85.
- 333 5. Ness RB, Harris T, Cobb J, et al. Number of pregnancies and the subsequent risk of cardiovascular disease. *The New
334 England journal of medicine*. 1993; 328: 1528-33.
- 335 6. Lawlor DA, Emberson JR, Ebrahim S, et al. Is the association between parity and coronary heart disease due to
336 biological effects of pregnancy or adverse lifestyle risk factors associated with child-rearing? Findings from the British
337 Women's Heart and Health Study and the British Regional Heart Study. *Circulation*. 2003; 107: 1260-4.
- 338 7. Koski-Rahikkala H, Pouta A, Pietilainen K and Hartikainen AL. Does parity affect mortality among parous women?
339 *Journal of epidemiology and community health*. 2006; 60: 968-73.
- 340 8. Steenland K, Lally C and Thun M. Parity and coronary heart disease among women in the American Cancer Society
341 CPS II population. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)*. 1996; 7: 641-3.
- 342 9. Colditz GA, Willett WC, Stampfer MJ, Rosner B, Speizer FE and Hennekens CH. A prospective study of age at
343 menarche, parity, age at first birth, and coronary heart disease in women. *American journal of epidemiology*. 1987; 126: 861-
344 70.
- 345 10. Gallagher LG, Davis LB, Ray RM, et al. Reproductive history and mortality from cardiovascular disease among women
346 textile workers in Shanghai, China. *International journal of epidemiology*. 2011; 40: 1510-8.
- 347 11. Stuebe AM and Rich-Edwards JW. The reset hypothesis: lactation and maternal metabolism. *American journal of
348 perinatology*. 2009; 26: 81-8.
- 349 12. Gunderson EP, Lewis CE, Wei GS, Whitmer RA, Quesenberry CP and Sidney S. Lactation and changes in maternal
350 metabolic risk factors. *Obstetrics and gynecology*. 2007; 109: 729-38.
- 351 13. Schwarz EB, Ray RM, Stuebe AM, et al. Duration of lactation and risk factors for maternal cardiovascular disease.
352 *Obstetrics and gynecology*. 2009; 113: 974-82.
- 353 14. McClure CK, Catov JM, Ness RB and Schwarz EB. Lactation and maternal subclinical cardiovascular disease among
354 premenopausal women. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*. 2012; 207: 46.e1-8.
- 355 15. Gunderson EP, Jacobs DR, Jr., Chiang V, et al. Duration of lactation and incidence of the metabolic syndrome in
356 women of reproductive age according to gestational diabetes mellitus status: a 20-Year prospective study in CARDIA
357 (Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults). *Diabetes*. 2010; 59: 495-504.
- 358 16. Lee SY, Kim MT, Jee SH and Yang HP. Does long-term lactation protect premenopausal women against hypertension
359 risk? A Korean women's cohort study. *Preventive medicine*. 2005; 41: 433-8.
- 360 17. Stuebe AM, Schwarz EB, Grewen K, et al. Duration of lactation and incidence of maternal hypertension: a longitudinal
361 cohort study. *American journal of epidemiology*. 2011; 174: 1147-58.
- 362 18. Jager S, Jacobs S, Kroger J, et al. Breast-feeding and maternal risk of type 2 diabetes: a prospective study and meta-
363 analysis. *Diabetologia*. 2014; 57: 1355-65.
- 364 19. Stuebe AM, Rich-Edwards JW, Willett WC, Manson JE and Michels KB. Duration of lactation and incidence of type 2
365 diabetes. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association*. 2005; 294: 2601-10.
- 366 20. Villegas R, Gao YT, Yang G, et al. Duration of breast-feeding and the incidence of type 2 diabetes mellitus in the
367 Shanghai Women's Health Study. *Diabetologia*. 2008; 51: 258-66.
- 368 21. Aune D, Norat T, Romundstad P and Vatten LJ. Breastfeeding and the maternal risk of type 2 diabetes: a systematic
369 review and dose-response meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Nutrition, metabolism, and cardiovascular diseases : NMCD*. 2014;
370 24: 107-15.
- 371 22. Natland Fagerhaug T, Forsmo S, Jacobsen GW, Midthjell K, Andersen LF and Ivar Lund Nilssen T. A prospective
372 population-based cohort study of lactation and cardiovascular disease mortality: the HUNT study. *BMC public health*. 2013;
373 13: 1070.
- 374 23. Stuebe AM, Michels KB, Willett WC, Manson JE, Rexrode K and Rich-Edwards JW. Duration of lactation and incidence
375 of myocardial infarction in middle to late adulthood. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*. 2009; 200: 138 e1-8.

- 376 24. Merritt MA, Riboli E, Murphy N, et al. Reproductive factors and risk of mortality in the European Prospective
377 Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; a cohort study. *BMC medicine*. 2015; 13: 252.
- 378 25. Riboli E, Hunt KJ, Slimani N, et al. European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC): study
379 populations and data collection. *Public health nutrition*. 2002; 5: 1113-24.
- 380 26. Danesh J, Saracci R, Berglund G, et al. EPIC-Heart: the cardiovascular component of a prospective study of nutritional,
381 lifestyle and biological factors in 520,000 middle-aged participants from 10 European countries. *European journal of*
382 *epidemiology*. 2007; 22: 129-41.
- 383 27. Langenberg C, Sharp S, Forouhi NG, et al. Design and cohort description of the InterAct Project: an examination of the
384 interaction of genetic and lifestyle factors on the incidence of type 2 diabetes in the EPIC Study. *Diabetologia*. 2011; 54: 2272-
385 82.
- 386 28. Prentice RL. A case-cohort design for epidemiologic cohort studies and disease prevention trials. *Biometrika*. 1986;
387 73: 1-11.
- 388 29. Easton DF, Peto J and Babiker AG. Floating absolute risk: an alternative to relative risk in survival and case-control
389 analysis avoiding an arbitrary reference group. *Statistics in medicine*. 1991; 10: 1025-35.
- 390 30. Stewart FM, Freeman DJ, Ramsay JE, Greer IA, Caslake M and Ferrell WR. Longitudinal assessment of maternal
391 endothelial function and markers of inflammation and placental function throughout pregnancy in lean and obese mothers.
392 *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism*. 2007; 92: 969-75.
- 393 31. Sanghavi M, Kulinski J, Ayers CR, et al. Association between number of live births and markers of subclinical
394 atherosclerosis: The Dallas Heart Study. *European journal of preventive cardiology*. 2016; 23: 391-9.
- 395 32. Natland ST, Nilsen TI, Midthjell K, Andersen LF and Forsmo S. Lactation and cardiovascular risk factors in mothers in a
396 population-based study: the HUNT-study. *International breastfeeding journal*. 2012; 7: 8.
- 397 33. Ness RB, Cobb J, Harris T and D'Agostino RB. Does number of children increase the rate of coronary heart disease in
398 men? *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)*. 1995; 6: 442-5.
- 399 34. Beck LF, Morrow B, Lipscomb LE, et al. Prevalence of selected maternal behaviors and experiences, Pregnancy Risk
400 Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS), 1999. *Morbidity and mortality weekly report Surveillance summaries (Washington,*
401 *DC : 2002)*. 2002; 51: 1-27.
- 402 35. Pesa JA and Shelton MM. Health-enhancing behaviors correlated with breastfeeding among a national sample of
403 mothers. *Public health nursing (Boston, Mass)*. 1999; 16: 120-4.
- 404 36. Yngve A and Sjostrom M. Breastfeeding determinants and a suggested framework for action in Europe. *Public health*
405 *nutrition*. 2001; 4: 729-39.

406

Figure legend

Figure 1: Adjusted hazard ratios (with group-specific 95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with number of live born children.

The highest category of live born children (5 or more) is plotted at 5.5. Adjusted for age at study entry, centre, level of attained education, smoking status, high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Figure 2: Adjusted hazard ratios (with group-specific 95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with lifetime duration of breastfeeding in parous women.

Categories are never, 0-<3 months, 3-<6 months, 6-<12 months, 12-<23 months, and 23 months or more. On the x-axis, results are placed on the mean lifetime duration of breastfeeding within category. Adjusted for age at study entry, centre, level of attained education, smoking status, number of livebirths, high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Figure 3: Adjusted hazard ratios (with group-specific 95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with mean duration of breastfeeding per live born child.

Categories are never, 0-<1 months, 1-<3 months, 3-<6 months, and 6 months or more. On the x-axis, results are placed on the mean duration of breastfeeding per child within category. Adjusted for age at study entry, centre, level of attained education, smoking status, number of livebirths, high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of women in the EPIC-CVD subcohort by parity and breastfeeding history

	Total	Nulliparous	Parous - never breastfed	Parous - ever breastfed
% of overall subcohort*	-	12.4	11.2	76.4
Age at study entry, years	52.7 (9.1)	52.7 (10.1)	52.0 (8.4)	52.7 (9.0)
Education level, %				
None	11.3	7.0	9.1	12.4
Primary	34.3	23.9	34.9	35.6
Secondary	15.4	18.2	19.4	14.5
Tertiary	39.0	50.9	36.6	37.5
Current smoker, %	21.7	25.4	20.4	21.1
History of diabetes, %	2.6	2.3	3.5	2.5
BMI, kg/m ²	26.1 (4.7)	24.9 (4.3)	26.4 (4.9)	26.2 (4.7)
Systolic blood pressure, mmHg	130.8 (20.0)	129.6 (20.4)	129.3 (19.9)	131.0 (19.9)
Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg	80.3 (10.6)	79.2 (10.4)	80.2 (11.2)	80.5 (10.5)
History of high blood pressure, %	34.3	30.1	33.2	35.0
Total cholesterol, mmol/L	6.0 (1.1)	6.0 (1.2)	6.0 (1.1)	6.0 (1.1)
HDL cholesterol, mmol/L	1.6 (0.4)	1.7 (0.4)	1.6 (0.4)	1.6 (0.4)
Postmenopausal, %	52.7	53.9	47.7	52.9
Age at menopause [†]	48.5 (4.9)	48.1 (5.3)	48.2 (5.0)	48.7 (4.9)
Number of children, %				
1 child	-	-	25.6	13.1
2 children	-	-	49.7	47.5
≥3 children	-	-	24.8	39.4
Lifetime duration of breastfeeding, months	-	-	-	9.7 (10.4)
Duration of breastfeeding per child, months	-	-	-	4.2 (3.7)

Values are mean (standard deviation) for continuous variables. *131 of 9,985 women with incomplete information about breastfeeding history were excluded. † postmenopausal women only.

Table 2: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with parity in all women and history of breastfeeding in parous women only

	Model I	Model II	Model III
Parity, n	12,319	12,319	12,319
Parous vs. not	1.27 (1.09, 1.47)	1.24 (1.07, 1.44)	1.19 (1.01, 1.41)
I ² for heterogeneity (95% CI)	7% (0%, 67%)	0% (0%, 65%)	0% (0%, 65%)
Number of children, n	9,701	9,701	9,701
None	1.00 (0.82, 1.22)	1.00 (0.82, 1.22)	1.00 (0.82, 1.23)
1 child	1.21 (1.00, 1.45)	1.16 (0.95, 1.42)	1.17 (0.92, 1.49)
2 children	1.21 (1.10, 1.33)	1.17 (1.10, 1.25)	1.15 (1.02, 1.28)
3 children	1.21 (1.05, 1.39)	1.20 (1.02, 1.40)	1.15 (0.94, 1.40)
4 children	1.46 (1.20, 1.77)	1.43 (1.18, 1.75)	1.39 (1.14, 1.70)
5 or more children	2.19 (1.41, 3.38)	2.02 (1.27, 3.20)	1.95 (1.19, 3.20)
Breastfeeding, n	8,044	8,044	8,044
Ever vs. never	0.71 (0.59, 0.85)	0.69 (0.57, 0.85)	0.71 (0.52, 0.98)
I ² for heterogeneity	8% (0%, 73%)	16% (0%, 59%)	58% (2%, 82%)
Lifetime duration of breastfeeding, n	8,012	8,012	8,012
Never breastfed	1.00 (0.84, 1.19)	1.00 (0.83, 1.21)	1.00 (0.75, 1.34)
>0 to <3 months	0.69 (0.57, 0.83)	0.69 (0.57, 0.83)	0.73 (0.60, 0.89)
≥3 to <6 months	0.71 (0.55, 0.91)	0.73 (0.60, 0.88)	0.68 (0.56, 0.83)
≥6 to <12 months	0.73 (0.61, 0.87)	0.70 (0.58, 0.84)	0.69 (0.55, 0.87)
≥12 to <23 months	0.65 (0.57, 0.74)	0.63 (0.53, 0.74)	0.63 (0.51, 0.76)
≥23 months	0.66 (0.50, 0.87)	0.60 (0.46, 0.78)	0.62 (0.45, 0.86)
Duration of breastfeeding per child, n	8,012	8,012	8,012
Never breastfed	1.00 (0.85, 1.17)	1.00 (0.84, 1.20)	1.00 (0.73, 1.37)
>0 to <1 months	0.79 (0.66, 0.94)	0.73 (0.61, 0.88)	0.77 (0.63, 0.94)
≥1 to <3 months	0.72 (0.62, 0.85)	0.71 (0.61, 0.83)	0.69 (0.61, 0.78)
≥3 to <6 months	0.66 (0.56, 0.78)	0.65 (0.55, 0.75)	0.67 (0.57, 0.77)
≥6 months	0.63 (0.51, 0.78)	0.66 (0.53, 0.82)	0.67 (0.56, 0.80)

Analyses of parity are conducted in all women. Analyses of breastfeeding are conducted in parous women only.

Model I: Adjusted for age at study entry and centre; Model II: model I + level of attained education, smoking status, and number of livebirths (for breastfeeding history only); Model III: model II + high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Table 3: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with the combined effects of parity and a history of breastfeeding

	N	Nulliparous	Parous – never breastfed	Parous – ever breastfed
Model I	9,511	1.00 [reference]	1.73 (1.30, 2.30)	1.24 (1.05, 1.46)
Model II	9,511	1.00 [reference]	1.72 (1.34, 2.20)	1.22 (1.02, 1.46)
Model III	9,511	1.00 [reference]	1.58 (1.09, 2.30)	1.19 (0.99, 1.43)

Model I: Adjusted for age at study entry and centre; Model II: model I + level of attained education and smoking status. Model III: model II + high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI. Model V: Model IV + number of live births

Table 4: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease by parity and history of breastfeeding in subgroups

	Age		Parity	
	<55 years	≥55 years	1-2 children	≥3 children
Parous (yes vs. no)	1.14 (0.83, 1.55)	1.20 (0.99, 1.46)	-	-
Number of children				
None	1.00 (0.77, 1.31)	1.00 (0.78, 1.28)	-	-
1 child	1.37 (0.79, 2.38)	1.07 (0.63, 1.80)	-	-
2 children	1.12 (0.64, 1.96)	1.67 (0.79, 3.53)	-	-
3 children	1.15 (0.75, 1.77)	1.36 (0.94, 1.96)	-	-
4 children	1.13 (0.81, 1.57)	1.53 (0.45, 5.19)	-	-
5 or more children	1.30 (0.91, 1.87)	1.84 (1.20, 2.82)	-	-
Ever breastfed (yes vs. no)	0.71 (0.52, 0.95)	0.77 (0.54, 1.08)	0.69 (0.51, 0.94)	0.76 (0.54, 1.08)
Lifetime duration of breastfeeding				
Never breastfed	1.00 (0.69, 1.45)	1.00 (0.72, 1.38)	1.00 (0.71, 1.41)	1.00 (0.71, 1.41)
>0 to <3 months	0.74 (0.49, 1.11)	0.67 (0.41, 1.10)	0.67 (0.45, 0.99)	0.87 (0.53, 1.41)
≥3 to <6 months	0.51 (0.35, 0.74)	0.68 (0.40, 1.15)	0.63 (0.42, 0.94)	0.79 (0.51, 1.22)
≥6 to <12 months	0.75 (0.46, 1.22)	0.61 (0.38, 1.01)	0.64 (0.36, 1.14)	0.72 (0.45, 1.17)
≥12 to <23 months	0.54 (0.34, 0.86)	0.60 (0.34, 1.05)	0.61 (0.37, 1.01)	0.65 (0.37, 1.14)
≥23 months	0.55 (0.29, 1.04)	0.55 (0.37, 0.81)	1.09 (0.48, 2.48)	0.62 (0.43, 0.89)
Duration of breastfeeding per child				
Never breastfed	1.00 (0.77, 1.31)	1.00 (0.70, 1.42)	1.00 (0.72, 1.39)	1.00 (0.72, 1.39)
>0 to <1 months	0.79 (0.54, 1.14)	0.71 (0.44, 1.15)	0.65 (0.42, 1.01)	0.96 (0.66, 1.40)
≥1 to <3 months	0.59 (0.42, 0.82)	0.66 (0.43, 1.03)	0.67 (0.46, 0.97)	0.70 (0.44, 1.10)
≥3 to <6 months	0.62 (0.40, 0.98)	0.63 (0.40, 0.99)	0.63 (0.40, 0.99)	0.70 (0.41, 1.17)
≥6 months	0.64 (0.44, 0.93)	0.59 (0.36, 0.97)	0.67 (0.43, 1.03)	0.63 (0.39, 1.01)

Analyses of parity are conducted in all women. Analyses of breastfeeding are conducted in parous women only.

Models are adjusted for age at study entry, centre, level of attained education, smoking status, , and number of livebirths (for breastfeeding history only), high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Figure 1




Figure 2





Figure 3



Supplementary Table 1: Baseline characteristics for main variables by EPIC centre

Country	EPIC centre	Total, N	Subcohort, N	CHD, N	Subcohort characteristics			
					Age at study entry, years	Current smoker, %	Parous, %	Ever breastfed*, %
Denmark	Aarhus	475	312	170	56.2 (4.4)	29.9	87.2	94.1
	Copenhagen	1,048	654	408	56.6 (4.3)	37.7	87.9	92.4
France	France	593	557	38	56.4 (6.5)	9.0	90.5	77.2
Germany	Heidelberg	554	489	68	49.3 (8.4)	20.3	81.8	81.8
	Potsdam	785	709	78	48.7 (9.2)	16.8	90.7	83.7
Greece	Greece	882	766	121	52.6 (12.2)	20.4	90.6	88.3
Italy	Florence	493	420	77	51.6 (7.6)	26.0	85.2	88.2
	Varese	462	293	173	51.3 (8.2)	21.2	90.4	81.9
	Ragusa	216	178	39	45.9 (7.9)	23.0	85.4	89.5
	Turin	271	237	36	51.1 (7.7)	20.3	83.5	72.7
	Naples	313	223	93	50.1 (7.7)	35.4	91.0	91.6
Norway	Norway	105	60	45	48.7 (4.6)	29.3	93.3	96.4
Spain	Asturias	568	480	96	47.6 (8.1)	19.0	90.6	84.7
	Granada	526	436	100	49.4 (8.4)	14.5	93.1	90.4
	Murcia	585	536	56	47.9 (8.5)	18.1	89.4	89.5
	Navarra	450	410	41	48.6 (7.9)	23.2	85.6	93.1
	San Sebastian	466	414	59	48.2 (7.9)	18.1	89.6	86.0
Sweden	Malmo	1,765	1,128	679	57.1 (8.0)	28.9	86.9	95.4
The Netherlands	Utrecht	1,761	914	891	57.7 (6.0)	22.0	85.7	82.6
United Kingdom	Cambridge	1,457	523	970	59.0 (9.4)	14.4	87.8	83.3
	Oxford	1,142	246	900	49.1 (11.6)	6.5	73.6	90.2
Overall		14,917	9,985	5,138	52.7 (9.1)	21.7	87.8	87.2

* Amongst parous women

Supplementary Table 2: Numbers of participants contributing to the primary analyses

	N total (events)	N subcohort (events)
Overall	14,890 (5,138)	9,985 (206)
Parous vs. not	12,319 (3,336)	9,170 (187)
Number of children	9,701 (2,685)	7,016 (170)
Breastfeeding, ever vs. never	8,044 (2,404)	5,789 (149)
Breastfeeding duration	8,012 (2,392)	5,766 (146)

Accepted manuscript

Supplementary Table 3: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with parity and history of breastfeeding in women with complete data on all covariates

	Model I	Model II	Model III
Parity			
N	14,890	14,138	12,319
Parous (yes vs. no)	1.20 (1.03, 1.41)	1.19 (1.01, 1.41)	1.19 (1.01, 1.41)
I ² for heterogeneity (95% CI)	25% (0%, 63%)	26% (0%, 64%)	0% (0%, 65%)
Number of children			
None	1.00 (0.85, 1.18)	1.00 (0.82, 1.22)	1.00 (0.82, 1.23)
1 child	1.23 (1.06, 1.42)	1.14 (0.99, 1.31)	1.17 (0.92, 1.49)
2 children	1.11 (1.00, 1.23)	1.11 (1.09, 1.13)	1.15 (1.02, 1.28)
3 children	1.14 (0.98, 1.32)	1.11 (0.98, 1.25)	1.15 (0.94, 1.40)
4 children	1.47 (1.24, 1.75)	1.45 (1.24, 1.70)	1.39 (1.14, 1.70)
5 or more children	1.92 (1.34, 2.76)	2.05 (1.30, 3.24)	1.95 (1.19, 3.20)
History of breastfeeding			
N	10,049	9,435	8,044
Ever breastfed (yes vs. no)	0.66 (0.57, 0.78)	0.64 (0.52, 0.78)	0.71 (0.52, 0.98)
I ² for heterogeneity	0% (0%, 68%)	20% (0%, 62%)	58% (2%, 82%)
Lifetime duration of breastfeeding			
Never breastfed	1.00 (0.86, 1.16)	1.00 (0.83, 1.21)	1.00 (0.75, 1.34)
>0 to <3 months	0.71 (0.59, 0.84)	0.64 (0.53, 0.77)	0.73 (0.60, 0.89)
≥3 to <6 months	0.67 (0.56, 0.81)	0.62 (0.52, 0.74)	0.68 (0.56, 0.83)
≥6 to <12 months	0.66 (0.59, 0.75)	0.62 (0.55, 0.69)	0.69 (0.55, 0.87)
≥12 to <23 months	0.62 (0.58, 0.67)	0.54 (0.49, 0.59)	0.63 (0.51, 0.76)
≥23 months	0.56 (0.46, 0.70)	0.51 (0.41, 0.65)	0.62 (0.45, 0.86)
Duration of breastfeeding per child			
Never breastfed	1.00 (0.93, 1.08)	1.00 (0.84, 1.19)	1.00 (0.73, 1.37)
>0 to <1 months	0.79 (0.68, 0.93)	0.68 (0.58, 0.81)	0.77 (0.63, 0.94)
≥1 to <3 months	0.69 (0.64, 0.75)	0.64 (0.57, 0.72)	0.69 (0.61, 0.78)
≥3 to <6 months	0.59 (0.49, 0.71)	0.59 (0.52, 0.67)	0.67 (0.57, 0.77)
≥6 months	0.56 (0.47, 0.67)	0.58 (0.50, 0.67)	0.67 (0.56, 0.80)

27 individuals with no follow-up were excluded from the analyses. Analyses of parity are conducted in all women. Analyses of breastfeeding are conducted in parous women only.

Model I: Adjusted for age at study entry and centre; Model II: model I + level of attained education, smoking status, and number of live born children (for breastfeeding analyses only); Model III: model II + high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Supplementary Table 4: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with parity and history of breastfeeding in women aged 45 years or older at study entry

	Model I	Model II	Model III
Parity			
N	10,420	10,420	10,420
Parous (yes vs. no)	1.25 (1.06, 1.48)	1.23 (1.04, 1.45)	1.19 (1.00, 1.41)
I ² for heterogeneity (95% CI)	17% (0%, 59%)	12% (0%, 54%)	0% (0%, 65%)
Number of children			
None	1.00 (0.81, 1.23)	1.00 (0.81, 1.23)	1.00 (0.81, 1.24)
1 child	1.23 (1.03, 1.46)	1.18 (0.98, 1.43)	1.20 (0.94, 1.53)
2 children	1.19 (1.10, 1.28)	1.16 (1.08, 1.24)	1.13 (1.11, 1.16)
3 children	1.20 (1.04, 1.39)	1.19 (1.00, 1.40)	1.14 (0.90, 1.44)
4 children	1.44 (1.19, 1.75)	1.43 (1.17, 1.73)	1.37 (1.09, 1.73)
5 or more children	2.19 (1.41, 3.41)	2.03 (1.27, 3.24)	1.95 (1.20, 3.18)
History of breastfeeding			
N	7,090	7,090	7,090
Ever breastfed (yes vs. no)	0.72 (0.59, 0.89)	0.70 (0.56, 0.88)	0.73 (0.52, 1.02)
I ² for heterogeneity	24% (0%, 66%)	24% (0%, 67%)	60% (9%, 83%)
Lifetime duration of breastfeeding			
Never breastfed	1.00 (0.81, 1.23)	1.00 (0.81, 1.23)	1.00 (0.74, 1.36)
>0 to <3 months	0.69 (0.57, 0.84)	0.69 (0.56, 0.84)	0.73 (0.59, 0.91)
≥3 to <6 months	0.72 (0.55, 0.94)	0.74 (0.60, 0.91)	0.69 (0.56, 0.86)
≥6 to <12 months	0.75 (0.62, 0.91)	0.71 (0.58, 0.88)	0.70 (0.55, 0.90)
≥12 to <23 months	0.67 (0.58, 0.78)	0.65 (0.54, 0.78)	0.65 (0.52, 0.81)
≥23 months	0.67 (0.51, 0.89)	0.61 (0.47, 0.81)	0.63 (0.46, 0.88)
Duration of breastfeeding per child			
Never breastfed	1.00 (0.85, 1.18)	1.00 (0.82, 1.21)	1.00 (0.71, 1.40)
>0 to <1 months	0.79 (0.67, 0.94)	0.73 (0.61, 0.88)	0.79 (0.64, 0.96)
≥1 to <3 months	0.73 (0.63, 0.85)	0.72 (0.62, 0.84)	0.70 (0.62, 0.80)
≥3 to <6 months	0.68 (0.55, 0.84)	0.66 (0.55, 0.79)	0.68 (0.58, 0.81)
≥6 months	0.65 (0.51, 0.83)	0.68 (0.54, 0.86)	0.69 (0.57, 0.83)

Analyses of parity are conducted in all women. Analyses of breastfeeding are conducted in parous women only.

Model I: Adjusted for age at study entry and centre; Model II: model I + level of attained education, smoking status, and number of live born children (for breastfeeding only); Model III: model II + high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.