

1 **Late reproduction is associated with extended female survival but not with familial**  
2 **longevity**

3

4

5 Authors:

6 Annelien C de Kat<sup>1</sup>, Femke Roelofs<sup>1</sup>, P. Eline Slagboom<sup>2</sup>, Frank JM Broekmans<sup>1</sup>, Marian

7 Beekman<sup>2</sup>, Niels van den Berg<sup>2</sup>

8

9 Affiliations:

10 1) Department of Reproductive Medicine and Gynecology, University Medical Center

11 Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

12 2) Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, section of Molecular Epidemiology, Leiden

13 University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

14

15

16 Abstract (350 words):

17 **Objective**

18 Female reproductive health comprises adequate oocyte quality and quantity, normal  
19 fecundability, a normal course of pregnancy, and the delivery of healthy offspring. General  
20 aging patterns and the maintenance of somatic health have been associated with female  
21 reproductive health. However, it is unknown whether better long-term somatic  
22 maintenance is directly related to reproductive outcomes, and whether there is a shared  
23 genetic predisposition underlying both somatic and reproductive aging. Here we investigate  
24 whether reproductive health is related to female lifespan or familial longevity.

25

26 **Design**

27 Observational study

28

29 **Subjects**

30 10,255 female members of a multigenerational historical cohort (1812-1910), the LINKing  
31 System for historical family reconstruction (LINKS) and 1,258 females from 651 long-lived  
32 families in the Leiden Longevity Study.

33

34 **Main outcome measures**

35 The association between reproductive characteristics and longevity was studied both on an  
36 individual and familial level. Individual survival was studied in relation to age at last  
37 childbirth and total number of children. Familial longevity was studied through parental  
38 survival and related to age at last childbirth, total number of children and a polygenic risk  
39 score (PRS) for age at menopause.

40

41 **Results**

42 Females giving birth to their last child at a higher age lived longer: for each year increase in  
43 the age of the birth of the last child, a woman's lifespan increased with 0.06 years (22 days)  
44 ( $p < 0.005$ ). Females who lived to be in the top 10% survivors of their birth cohort ( $n = 2,241$ ,  
45 21.9%) on average gave birth to their last child at a 1% later age than the remaining cohort  
46 (IRR=1.01,  $p < 0.005$ ).

47 Females with 1 or 2 long-lived parents did not have a higher mean age of last childbirth.  
48 There was neither a significant association between an increasing number of long-lived  
49 ancestral family members (familial longevity), nor the PRS.

50

## 51 **Conclusion**

52 Female reproductive health associates with a longer lifespan and with survival to more  
53 extreme ages (longevity). The heritable component in familial longevity, however, does not  
54 associate to extended reproductive health and the PRS underlying age at menopause does  
55 not explain familial longevity. Other factors in somatic maintenance that support a longer  
56 lifespan are likely to have an impact on reproductive health.

57

58 **Keywords**

59

60 Longevity – fertility – aging

## 61 Introduction

62 Female reproductive health encompasses the evolution of being born with a  
63 complete set of oocytes, fertility and pregnancy, to the deterioration of ovarian quality and  
64 quantity, and ultimately postmenopausal health. It is widely accepted that these milestones  
65 and transitions do not stand alone but may be subject to the same processes that govern  
66 overall somatic aging and health <sup>1</sup>. This relationship has not yet been fully clarified and it  
67 thus remains unknown to what extent the maintenance of somatic health is primarily  
68 essential to reproductive health or vice versa, and whether there is a genetic predisposition  
69 underlying both healthier somatic and reproductive aging.

70 Over the past decades a plethora of studies has sought to determine and explain the  
71 relationship between ovarian and overall somatic aging. Though there remains some  
72 dispute, several studies have observed that mothers who give birth to a child at an  
73 advanced age have a longer post-reproductive survival <sup>2,3</sup>. Studies also suggested a familial  
74 or genetic component underlying both an increasing somatic lifespan and a longer  
75 reproductive period or reproductive lifespan<sup>4,5</sup>, although others have proposed a trade-off  
76 mechanism for an increasing lifespan and childbearing<sup>6</sup>. The latter results originate from  
77 studies with varying sample sizes and potential biases in the selection of their study  
78 population and await confirmation from well-defined, large-scale cohorts. If longevity and  
79 late reproductive aging coincide in families, the study of both traits in longevity families may  
80 reveal shared genetic loci predisposing to better maintenance of somatic and reproductive  
81 cell functions.

82 Genetic studies into menopause generated polygenic risk scores (PRS) that indicate  
83 risk of early menopause and involved loci in DNA repair processes, known as hallmark

84 mechanisms of ageing<sup>7</sup>. It is unknown whether the genetic component in age at menopause  
85 associates with that in familial longevity.

86         The current study addresses the relationship between somatic and reproductive  
87 aging and health in both a large multigenerational historical cohort and a cohort of long-  
88 living families. We aim to test whether reproductive health is associated with longevity, as  
89 well as whether members of exceptionally long-living families exhibit more favorable  
90 reproductive outcomes, compared to families from the general population. Firstly, we  
91 investigate whether lifespan (age at death) and longevity (survival to extreme ages)  
92 associate with age at last childbirth and total number of children. Secondly, we investigate  
93 whether age at last childbirth and number of children are associated with the number of  
94 long-lived parents (0, 1 or 2 long-lived parents), as an indicator of familial longevity<sup>12</sup>.  
95 Thirdly, we investigate whether an increasing number of long-lived ancestors associates  
96 with a PRS for age at menopause, capturing alleles associated with age at menopause, as a  
97 proxy for the total reproductive lifespan.

98

99

## 100 Methods

101

### 102 LINKS Study population

103 We used data from the LINKing System for historical family reconstruction (LINKS)

104 which is a historical cohort of inhabitants of the province of Zeeland, the Netherlands, from

105 the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. The LINKS database contains demographic and genealogical

106 information derived from the Netherlands linked vital event registration. In the Netherlands,

107 birth, marriage and death certificates were registered from the year 1812 onward. Currently

108 LINKS Zeeland contains 739,453 birth, 387,102 marriage, and 641,216 death certificates that

109 were linked together to reconstruct intergenerational pedigrees and individual life courses<sup>8</sup>.

110 Two generations were identified in the dataset (Suppl Figure 1); F0 and F1, of which

111 the F1 generation is the index generation comprising the study participants. The F0

112 generation was selected by identifying couples who were married between 1812 and 1850

113 and had at least two children, ensuring that the F1 persons had at least one sibling. The

114 families were mutually exclusive, meaning that a parent in the F0 generation could only

115 contribute data for a single family. From the F1 generation, the LINKS research persons (RP)

116 were selected using the following criteria: members of the female sex, with an age of death

117 above 50 years and a single spouse who lived until the RP was at least 50 years, and who

118 delivered at least one child, ensuring high data quality. This selection made it possible to

119 study the reproductive outcomes in the study population throughout the entire fertile

120 lifespan. In both generations, a distinction was made between persons who belonged to the

121 top 10% of survivors in their birth cohort, and those who did not. This calculation was based

122 on Dutch lifetables, nationally collected data of survival of historic cohorts from Statistics

123 Netherlands (CBS)<sup>8</sup>. Reproductive characteristics of the RPs are derived using information of

124 their children (F3 generation). The reproductive characteristics that could reliably be  
125 extracted from the historic data were age at last childbirth and total number of children.

126

### 127 [Leiden Longevity Study population](#)

128 The Leiden Longevity Study (LLS) was initiated in 2002 to study the mechanisms that lead to  
129 exceptional survival in good health. The LLS currently consists of 651 three-generational  
130 families, defined by siblings who have the same parents. Inclusion took place between 2002  
131 and 2006 and initially started with the recruitment of living nonagenarian sibling pairs of  
132 European descent (F2 generation). Within a sibling pair, males were invited to participate if  
133 they were 89 years or older and females if they were 91 years or older (N=944, mean  
134 age=93 years), representing <0.5% of the Dutch population in 2001<sup>9,10</sup>. Inclusion was  
135 subsequently extended to the offspring of the sibling pairs and the partners of these  
136 offspring (F3 generation). This study focuses on all F3 generation females, which are  
137 henceforth denoted as LLS RPs (offspring and partners combined).

138 The LLS DNA samples were genotyped using Illumina Infinium HD Human660W-Quad and  
139 OmniExpress BeadChips (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). DNA genotyping for LLS was  
140 performed at baseline as described in detail in Beekman et al., 2006<sup>11</sup> with the Illumina  
141 Human660W and Illumina OmniExpress arrays (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). Genotype  
142 imputation was performed using 288,635 SNPs with SNP-wise call rate (>95%), minor allele  
143 frequency (>1%) and no deviation from the Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium ( $p$ -value  $> 1 \times 10^{-4}$ )  
144 at the Michigan Imputation Server (<https://imputationserver.sph.umich.edu/index.html>)  
145 with Haplotype Reference Consortium (HRC) reference panels (HRC1.1).

146 Mortality information was verified by birth or marriage certificates and passports whenever  
147 possible. Additionally, verification took place via personal cards which were obtained from

148 the Dutch Central Bureau of Genealogy. In January 2021 all mortality information was  
149 updated through the Personal Records Database (PRD) which is managed by Dutch  
150 governmental service for identity information.  
151 <https://www.government.nl/topics/personal-data/personal-records-database-brp>. The  
152 combination of officially documented information provides very reliable and complete  
153 ancestral as well as current mortality information.

154

### 155 Construction of LRC score in LLS data

156 Familial longevity was quantified with the Longevity Relatives Count (LRC) score. The  
157 LRC score can be interpreted as a weighted proportion (ranging between 0 and 10)<sup>12</sup>. For  
158 example, an LRC score of 5 for an RP indicates 50% long-lived family members, weighted by  
159 the genetic distance between RPs and their family members.

160

### 161 Construction of PRS of age at menopause in LLS data

162 The genome-wide association analysis for age at menopause resulted in a polygenic  
163 risk score (PRS)<sup>7</sup> that could be constructed from 290 SNPs. After we removed all T/A SNPs,  
164 SNPs with  $MAF < 0.01$  and  $HWE_{pvalue} < 10^{-4}$ , and an imputation quality  $< 0.8$ <sup>13</sup>, we were able  
165 to use 195 SNPs to construct the PRS for age at menopause in the LLS data set.

166

### 167 Statistical analysis

168 First, in LINKS, lifespan (age at death) was regressed on 1) age at last child birth  
169 (quantitative and categorical) and 2) number of children (quantitative and categorical),  
170 while adjusting for maternal birth cohort and age at marriage using a linear mixed-model  
171 with a random effect for the unique sibship ID to account for within sibship correlation.

172           Second, in LINKS, 1) age at last child birth and 2) number of children were regressed  
173 on a) the number of long-lived parents (0, 1 or 2 parents that belonged to the top 10%  
174 survivors of their birth cohort), as an indicator of familial longevity<sup>14</sup>, and b) whether the RP  
175 survived to the top 10% of her birth cohort, while adjusting for maternal birth cohort and  
176 age at marriage using a Poisson mixed-model with a random effect for the unique sibship ID  
177 to account for within sibship correlation.

178           Third, in the LLS, the standardized (mean=0, SD=1) PRS of age at menopause of RPs  
179 was regressed on the number of long-lived family members, as measured with the LRC score,  
180 while adjusting for standardized birth year using a linear mixed-model with a random effect  
181 for the family ID to account for within family correlation.

182           All analyses were performed with R version 4.0.2.

183

184

## 185 Results

186

### 187 Study populations

188 In the LINKS data, 10,255 female Research Persons (RPs; the F1 generation) were  
189 identified. Collectively, they had 7,664 mothers and 7,636 fathers (the F0 generation) and  
190 72,895 children (the F2 generation). In total, there were 7,721 unique families, taking into  
191 account that the RP generation included siblings. Mean age at death of the RPs was 73.9 ( $\pm$   
192 10.4) years and their mean number of children was 7.1 ( $\pm$  3.9). Further descriptive  
193 characteristics of the RP group are described in detail in Table 1.

194 The LLS cohort included 1,258 females with a mean age of 59 years.

195

### 196 Females giving birth to their last child at a higher age live longer

197 To confirm in the LINKS dataset that mothers who give birth to a child at an  
198 advanced age have a longer post-reproductive survival, we investigated the relation  
199 between age at last child and lifespan using linear mixed-model regression analysis. We  
200 observed that for each year increase in the age of the birth of the last child, a woman has a  
201 0.06 years (22 days) longer lifespan ( $p$ -value= $2.16 \cdot 10^{-3}$ ). When we compared the lifespan of  
202 females with a low ( $\leq 40$  years) vs high ( $\geq 45$  years) age at last child birth, we observed that  
203 females who delivered their last child beyond the age of 45 lived 1.41 years (17 months)  
204 longer than females who had their last child before 40 years ( $p$ -value= $9.07 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ), while  
205 adjusting for age at marriage and the mother's birth year (Table 2).

206 The number of children may relate both to age at latest childbirth and to survival of  
207 the mother, so we investigated whether the number of children associates with female  
208 lifespan. We performed a linear mixed-model regression analysis with lifespan as outcome  
209 and the number of children as the independent variable of interest, while adjusting for age  
210 at marriage and maternal birth year. We observed that with each additional child the

211 lifespan of females increased with 0.05 years ( $p$ -value= $7.63 \cdot 10^{-2}$ ). Moreover, females who  
212 had 10 or more children ( $N=2,771$ ) in comparison to females who had 4 and fewer children  
213 ( $N=2,990$ ) lived on average 0.61 years (18 days) longer, but this did not reach statistical  
214 significance (Table 2;  $p$ -value= $6.25 \cdot 10^{-2}$ ).

215         Next, we studied whether females who lived as long as the top 10% survivors of their  
216 birth cohort (long-lived), gave birth to their last child at higher ages than other females using  
217 mixed-model Poisson regression analysis. While adjusting for age at marriage and the RP's  
218 maternal birth year, we observed that the top 10% survivor ( $N = 2,241$ , 21.9%), on average  
219 gave birth to their last child at a 1% later age than the remaining cohort ( $N= 8,014$ ; 78.1%)  
220 (IRR=1.01;  $p$ -value= $2.75 \cdot 10^{-3}$ ). Thus, with an increasing age of last child, an RP has a very  
221 small increasing chance to become long-lived. Moreover, females who lived as long as the  
222 top 10% of their birth cohort, had on average 2% more children than other females  
223 (IRR=1.02,  $p$ -value= $9.19 \cdot 10^{-2}$ ), although this effect was not statistically significant. We  
224 conclude from the LINKS cohort that women with more offspring and a high age at last  
225 reproduction have a longer lifespan and that top 10% female survivors of their birth cohort  
226 are capable to reproduce longer than other women.

227

## 228 **Females with long-lived parents do not differ from females from the general** 229 **population with respect to their age at last child and number of children**

230         High quality somatic maintenance in individuals may beneficially affect both  
231 reproductive health and longevity. It has also been suggested that familial longevity and  
232 especially heritable mechanisms drive such joint beneficial effects. To study whether familial  
233 longevity associates with reproductive health, we investigated whether females from long-  
234 lived families have more offspring and higher age at last reproduction. We observed that  
235 RPs with 1 or 2 long-lived parents do not have a significantly higher number of children (IRR-

236 1 LL parent=0.98, p-value= $1.62 \cdot 10^{-1}$ ; IRR-2 LL parents=0.98, p-value= $6.44 \cdot 10^{-1}$ ) nor a higher  
237 mean age at last child birth (IRR-1 LL parent=0.99, p-value= $5.28 \cdot 10^{-2}$ ; IRR2 LL parents=1.00,  
238 p-value= $9.99 \cdot 10^{-1}$ ) compared to RPs without any long-lived parents (Table 3).

239

## 240 Females with long-lived parents have a similar genetic predisposition for a late 241 menopause as other females

242 To further study the genetic component underlying both longevity and reproductive  
243 health we focused on the Leiden Longevity Study. We investigated whether an increasing  
244 number of long-lived ancestors of female RPs, as measured with the LRC score, associates  
245 with an increasing number of alleles marking a later age at menopause. In the Leiden  
246 Longevity Study we included a generation of RP women (F3 generation; N=1,258) with a  
247 quantified family history of longevity, as well as their genotypes through single nucleotide  
248 polymorphism (SNP) data. We calculated a PRS for age at menopause based on the most  
249 recent Genome Wide Association Study (GWAS) <sup>7</sup>.

250 Using mixed-model linear regression, no statistically significant association between  
251 an increasing number of long-lived family members (familial longevity) and our polygenic  
252 score for age at menopause was observed (Beta=0.014 (95% CI=-0.01-0.04), P-  
253 value= $2.63 \cdot 10^{-1}$ ). Still, the effect size was in the expected direction: with every 10 percent  
254 increase in long-lived family members, the age at menopause, as expressed by our polygenic  
255 score, was 0.014 standard deviation lower.

## 256 Discussion

257 In the historic (1812-1910) multigenerational LINKS database of Zeeland (NL), we  
258 observed that females who gave birth to their last child at a higher age, and with increasing  
259 numbers of offspring had a longer lifespan. Moreover, females who were among the top 10%  
260 survivors of their birth cohort delivered their last child at a slightly higher age and overall  
261 had slightly more children. This could be explained by a better maintenance of both  
262 reproductive health and overall health that supports longevity. Next, we studied whether  
263 the genetic component in familial longevity might associate with that of reproductive health,  
264 possibly pointing to common mechanisms in of both traits. However, females descending  
265 from such long-lived families do not have a different number of offspring or age at last child  
266 than females from non-long-lived families. Moreover, in the LLS, there was no evidence for  
267 an association between the genetic predisposition for a delayed age at menopause and  
268 familial longevity, as measured by a score indicating the proportion of long-lived ancestors.  
269 Hence, we conclude that a high age of last childbirth and number of offspring are markers of  
270 good reproductive health and overall health supporting longevity. They are not, however,  
271 explained by the genetic component in longevity, neither in the LINKS population nor in the  
272 Leiden Longevity study. Finally, the heritable component underlying the clinical extremes of  
273 age at menopause as represented by a PRS <sup>7</sup> does not appear to coincide with that in  
274 familial longevity.

275 Our study affirms previous research that supports a relationship between a later age  
276 at last childbirth and increased post-reproductive survival<sup>2,3,15-19</sup> and the notion that the  
277 functioning of the reproductive system can be representative of females' health, not  
278 necessarily driving it as our data imply. The ability for late reproduction and a larger number  
279 of offspring could be facilitated by a longer reproductive period, i.e. later age at menopause.

280 Genes of DNA repair strongly relate to age at menopause<sup>7</sup>, suggesting that the latter is the  
281 result of overall somatic aging<sup>20</sup>. Although the genetic loci associated with age at  
282 menopause have not yet been directly correlated to human longevity or familial longevity, a  
283 meta-analysis relating SNPs to exceptional human longevity (in single cases) reported a  
284 correlation with several of the same SNPs that related to age at menopause<sup>21</sup>. Because the  
285 genetic predisposition for a late onset of menopause is not significantly associated to the  
286 familial component of human longevity in our study, the late reproducing females' health  
287 might also be affected by other factors that influence lifespan in singletons (long lived  
288 persons without long lived family members) such as good environmental circumstances,  
289 healthy lifestyles, or favorable social factors.

290 Besides oocyte quantity, oocyte quality is a necessary factor for reproductive success  
291 and is thought to be a causal factor of age-related fertility decline<sup>22</sup>. As females age, oocyte  
292 competence decreases, leading to an increased risk of aneuploidy and miscarriage, in turn  
293 leading to decreased fecundity. Suggested pathways of oocyte quality decline include  
294 deterioration of the maintenance of mitochondrial function<sup>23</sup> and the intrafollicular  
295 processes of DNA translation<sup>24</sup>. These processes are in turn thought to be subject to  
296 oxidative stress, to which the oocyte becomes more vulnerable with increasing age, as  
297 shown in animal models<sup>25</sup>. Fertility treatments such as in vitro fertilization (IVF) have  
298 previously, though not consistently, been linked to adverse cardiovascular outcomes in the  
299 short and long term<sup>26-28</sup>, which could suggest an adverse aging profile for the sub-fertile  
300 population, but it is not clear whether this can be attributed to effects of the treatment or  
301 population risk. While it is possible that the influence of the DNA damage repair genes  
302 associated with age at menopause additionally extends to oocyte quality, this remains to be  
303 further determined. Perhaps in oocytes, a group of cells that spend most of their life in

304 senescence, the pathways for cell maintenance are regulated somewhat differently than in  
305 somatic cells. This could be another explanation for the lack of association between familial  
306 longevity and the polygenic risk score for menopause as well as reproductive outcomes in  
307 our study. It is also possible that fecundity, and thus oocyte quality, cannot be adequately  
308 measured through the proxies of age at childbirth and number of offspring. In addition,  
309 because we study a by-definition relatively healthy group of females who lived to age 50  
310 and underwent at least one successful pregnancy and delivery, our study precludes an in-  
311 depth inquiry into the association between infertility or involuntary childlessness and  
312 longevity.

313         The method of linkage of families in the historical cohort makes our study uniquely  
314 suited to study the familial effects of reproduction and longevity. The methodological  
315 selection of the study population as well as the population size add to its strengths. Due to  
316 the historical nature of the data, the results are not influenced by the use of hormonal  
317 contraception or assisted reproductive techniques, therefore allowing for a reasonable  
318 assumption of unrestricted natural fertility.

319         Our results are limited by the obligatory use of proxy variables for fertility and  
320 reproductive success, as we were limited to the data stored in governmental registries.  
321 Furthermore, as mentioned we included a relatively healthy group of individuals who lived  
322 to be at least 50 years old. It is possible that this selection excludes individuals with  
323 accelerated aging genotypes and therefore attenuates any associations of reproduction with  
324 longevity.

325         In conclusion, we affirm that a late age at last childbirth is associated with a longer  
326 lifespan, and that traits of reproductive success seem to be markers of females' health in  
327 middle age, likely acquired by good environmental circumstances. Furthermore, we

328 conclude that neither parental nor more extended ancestral familial longevity are

329 characterized by reproductive success.

330

331 **Table 1.** LINKS study population selected for females that gave birth to at least one child.

|   | Total number  | Mean ± SD   | Range     |
|---|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| Number F1 RPs (N, % female)                       | 10,255 (100)  | -           | -         |
| Top 10% survivors of their birth cohort           | 2,241 (21.8)  |             |           |
| Number of unique sibships (N)                     | 7,721         | -           | -         |
| Birth year (Mean)                                 | -             | 1839        | 1812-1873 |
| Age at death in years (Mean ± SD)                 | -             | 73.9 ± 10.4 | 50-104    |
| Number of children (Mean ± SD)                    | 72,985        | 7.1 ± 3.9   | 1-24      |
| Number of children ≤ 4 (N, %)                     | 2,990 (29.2)  | 2.6 ± 1.1   | 1-4       |
| Number of children ≥ 10 (N, %)                    | 2,771 (27.1)  | 12.2 ± 2.1  | 10-24     |
| Age at first child in years (Mean ± SD)           | -             | 26.9 ± 4.9  | 15-49     |
| Age at last child in years (Mean ± SD)            | -             | 39.2 ± 5.0  | 18-51     |
| Last childbirth ≤ 40 years (N, %)                 | 5,190 (50.6)  | 35.5 ± 4.4  | 18-40     |
| Last childbirth ≥ 45 years (N, %)                 | 981 (9.6)     | 45.8 ± 1.0  | 45-51     |
| Age at marriage <sup>α</sup> in years (Mean ± SD) | -             | 25.9 ± 4.6  | 16-46     |
| Number of identified F0 parents (N, %)            | 15,300 (99.1) | -           | -         |
| RPs with 0 long-lived <sup>#</sup> parents (N, %) | 8,293 (80.9)  | -           | -         |
| RPs with 1 long-lived <sup>#</sup> parent (N, %)  | 1,849 (18.0)  | -           | -         |
| RPs with 2 long-lived <sup>#</sup> parents (N, %) | 113 (1.1)     | -           | -         |

332 <sup>α</sup>In the case of multiple marriages, age at first marriage was considered. <sup>#</sup>Belonging to the top 10% survivors of  
333 their birth cohort. 15.3% (2,344) of the identified parents have a missing age at death.

334  
335  
336  
337

338 **Table 2.** Age at last child birth and number of offspring associates with female lifespan.

|                                   | <b>N (mean/proportion)</b> | <b>Beta (CI)</b>  | <b>P-value</b>        |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Age at last child (quantitative)  | 10,255 (39.23)             | 0.06 (0.02- 0.10) | $2.16 \times 10^{-3}$ |
| Age at last child (qualitative)   |                            |                   |                       |
| Group 0: $\leq 40$ years          | 5,190 (50.6)               | REF               | REF                   |
| Group 1: $\geq 45$ years          | 981 (9.6)                  | 1.41 (0.71-2.012) | $9.07 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| Number of children (quantitative) | 10,255 (7.12)              | 0.05 (-0.01-0.11) | $7.63 \times 10^{-2}$ |
| Number of children (qualitative)  |                            |                   |                       |
| Group 0: $\leq 4$                 | 2,990 (29.2)               | REF               | REF                   |
| Group 1: $\geq 10$                | 2,771 (27.1)               | 0.61 (-0.03-1.25) | $6.25 \times 10^{-2}$ |

339 All analyses are adjusted for the maternal birth year and RPs age at marriage. In addition, our research design accounts for survival of RPs  
340 and their partner up to the age of 50 years and the number of marriages. Analyses are done using mixed-model linear regression using the  
341 lme4 and lmerTest package in R. Confidence intervals have been calculated in R with the "confint" function using the Wald method. 4  
342 separate analyses have been done with age at death as outcome; 1 where age at last child (quantitative definition) was independent  
343 variable of interest, 1 where age at last child (qualitative definition) was independent variable of interest, 1 where number of children  
344 (quantitative definition) was independent variable of interest, 1 where number of children (qualitative definition) was independent  
345 variable of interest.

346

347

348 **Table 3.** Association of age at last child birth and number of children with familial longevity.

|                              | <b>N (mean/proportion)</b> | <b>IRR (CI)</b>  | <b>P-value</b>          |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Age at last child</u>     |                            |                  |                         |
| Number of long-lived parents |                            |                  |                         |
| 0 long-lived parents         | 8,293 (80.9)               | REF              | REF                     |
| 1 long-lived parent          | 1,849 (18.0)               | 0.99 (0.98-1.00) | 5.28 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> |
| 2 long-lived parents         | 113 (1.1)                  | 1.00 (0.97-1.03) | 9.99 x 10 <sup>-1</sup> |
| RP long-lived                |                            |                  |                         |
| No                           | 8,014 (78.2)               | REF              | REF                     |
| Yes                          | 2,241 (21.8)               | 1.01 (1.00-1.02) | 2.75 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> |
| <u>Number of children</u>    |                            |                  |                         |
| Number of long-lived parents |                            |                  |                         |
| 0 long-lived parents         | 8,293 (80.9)               | REF              | REF                     |
| 1 long-lived parent          | 1,849 (18.0)               | 0.98 (0.96-1.01) | 1.62 x 10 <sup>-1</sup> |
| 2 long-lived parents         | 113 (1.1)                  | 0.98 (0.89-1.08) | 6.44 x 10 <sup>-1</sup> |
| RP long-lived                |                            |                  |                         |
| No                           | 8,014 (78.2)               | REF              | REF                     |
| Yes                          | 2,241 (21.8)               | 1.02 (1.00-1.04) | 9.19 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> |

349 All analyses are adjusted for the maternal birth year and RPs age at marriage. In addition, our research design accounts for survival of RPs  
350 and their partner up to the age of 50 years and the number of marriages. Analyses are done using mixed-model poisson's regression using  
351 the lme4 and lmerTest package in R. Confidence intervals have been calculated in R with the "confint" function using the Wald method. 4  
352 separate analyses have been done; 1 where age at last child was the outcome and the number of long lived parents was independent  
353 variable of interest, 1 where age at last child was the outcome and RP long-lived yes/no was independent variable of interest, 1 where  
354 number of children was the outcome and the number of long lived parents was independent variable of interest, and 1 where number of  
355 children was the outcome and RP long-lived yes/no was independent variable of interest.  
356

357 **References**

358

359

360

361

References

362 1. Laven JSE, Visser JA, Uitterlinden AG, Vermeij WP, Hoeijmakers JHJ. Menopause: Genome  
363 stability as new paradigm. *Maturitas*. 2016; 92: 15-23.

364 2. Gagnon A, Smith KR, Tremblay M, Vézina H, Paré PP, Desjardins B. Is there a trade-off  
365 between fertility and longevity? A comparative study of women from three large historical  
366 databases accounting for mortality selection. *Am J Hum Biol*. 2009; 21: 533-540.

367 3. Gagnon A. Natural fertility and longevity. *Fertil Steril*. 2015; 103: 1109-1116.

368 4. Perls TT, Alpert L, Fretts RC. Middle-aged mothers live longer. *Nature*. 1997; 389: 133.

369 5. Smith KR, Gagnon A, Cawthon RM, Mineau GP, Mazan R, Desjardins B. Familial  
370 aggregation of survival and late female reproduction. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2009; 64:  
371 740-744.

372 6. Westendorp RG, Kirkwood TB. Human longevity at the cost of reproductive success.  
373 *Nature*. 1998; 396: 743-746.

374 7. Ruth KS, Day FR, Hussain J, Martínez-Marchal A, Aiken CE, Azad A, Thompson DJ,  
375 Knoblochova L, Abe H, Tarry-Adkins JL, Gonzalez JM, Fontanillas P, Claringbould A, Bakker  
376 OB, Sulem P, Walters RG, Terao C, Turon S, Horikoshi M, Lin K, Onland-Moret NC, Sankar A,

377 Hertz EPT, Timshel PN, Shukla V, Borup R, Olsen KW, Aguilera P, Ferrer-Roda M, Huang Y,  
378 Stankovic S, Timmers PRHJ, Ahearn TU, Alizadeh BZ, Naderi E, Andrulis IL, Arnold AM,  
379 Aronson KJ, Augustinsson A, Bandinelli S, Barbieri CM, Beaumont RN, Becher H, Beckmann  
380 MW, Benonisdottir S, Bergmann S, Bochud M, Boerwinkle E, Bojesen SE, Bolla MK,  
381 Boomsma DI, Bowker N, Brody JA, Broer L, Buring JE, Campbell A, Campbell H, Castelao JE,  
382 Catamo E, Chanock SJ, Chenevix-Trench G, Ciullo M, Corre T, Couch FJ, Cox A, Crisponi L,  
383 Cross SS, Cucca F, Czene K, Smith GD, de Geus EJC, de Mutsert R, De Vivo I, Demerath EW,  
384 Dennis J, Dunning AM, Dwek M, Eriksson M, Esko T, Fasching PA, Faul JD, Ferrucci L,  
385 Franceschini N, Frayling TM, Gago-Dominguez M, Mezzavilla M, García-Closas M, Gieger C,  
386 Giles GG, Grallert H, Gudbjartsson DF, Gudnason V, Guénel P, Haiman CA, Håkansson N, Hall  
387 P, Hayward C, He C, He W, Heiss G, Høffding MK, Hopper JL, Hottenga JJ, Hu F, Hunter D,  
388 Ikram MA, Jackson RD, Joaquim MDR, John EM, Joshi PK, Karasik D, Kardia SLR, Kartsonaki C,  
389 Karlsson R, Kitahara CM, Kolcic I, Kooperberg C, Kraft P, Kurian AW, Kutalik Z, La Bianca M,  
390 LaChance G, Langenberg C, Launer LJ, Laven JSE, Lawlor DA, Le Marchand L, Li J, Lindblom A,  
391 Lindstrom S, Lindstrom T, Linet M, Liu Y, Liu S, Luan J, Mägi R, Magnusson PKE, Mangino M,  
392 Mannermaa A, Marco B, Marten J, Martin NG, Mbarek H, McKnight B, Medland SE,  
393 Meisinger C, Meitinger T, Menni C, Metspalu A, Milani L, Milne RL, Montgomery GW, Mook-  
394 Kanamori DO, Mulas A, Mulligan AM, Murray A, Nalls MA, Newman A, Noordam R, Nutile T,  
395 Nyholt DR, Olshan AF, Olsson H, Painter JN, Patel AV, Pedersen NL, Perjakova N, Peters A,  
396 Peters U, Pharoah PDP, Polasek O, Porcu E, Psaty BM, Rahman I, Rennert G, Rennert HS,  
397 Ridker PM, Ring SM, Robino A, Rose LM, Rosendaal FR, Rossouw J, Rudan I, Rueedi R,  
398 Ruggiero D, Sala CF, Saloustros E, Sandler DP, Sanna S, Sawyer EJ, Sarnowski C, Schlessinger  
399 D, Schmidt MK, Schoemaker MJ, Schraut KE, Scott C, Shekari S, Shrikhande A, Smith AV,  
400 Smith BH, Smith JA, Sorice R, Southey MC, Spector TD, Spinelli JJ, Stampfer M, Stöckl D, van

401 Meurs JBJ, Strauch K, Styrkarsdottir U, Swerdlow AJ, Tanaka T, Teras LR, Teumer A,  
402 Þorsteinsdottir U, Timpson NJ, Toniolo D, Traglia M, Troester MA, Truong T, Tyrrell J,  
403 Uitterlinden AG, Ulivi S, Vachon CM, Vitart V, Völker U, Vollenweider P, Völzke H, Wang Q,  
404 Wareham NJ, Weinberg CR, Weir DR, Wilcox AN, van Dijk KW, Willemsen G, Wilson JF,  
405 Wolffenbuttel BHR, Wolk A, Wood AR, Zhao W, Zygmont M, Biobank-based Integrative  
406 Omics Study (BIOS) Consortium, eQTLGen Consortium, Biobank Japan Project, China  
407 Kadoorie Biobank Collaborative Group, kConFab Investigators, LifeLines Cohort Study,  
408 InterAct consortium, 23andMe Research Team, Chen Z, Li L, Franke L, Burgess S, Deelen P,  
409 Pers TH, Grøndahl ML, Andersen CY, Pujol A, Lopez-Contreras AJ, Daniel JA, Stefansson K,  
410 Chang-Claude J, van der Schouw YT, Lunetta KL, Chasman DI, Easton DF, Visser JA, Ozanne  
411 SE, Namekawa SH, Solc P, Murabito JM, Ong KK, Hoffmann ER, Murray A, Roig I, Perry JRB.  
412 Genetic insights into biological mechanisms governing human ovarian ageing. *Nature*. 2021;  
413 .

414 8. van den Berg N, van Dijk IK, Mourits RJ, Slagboom PE, Janssens AAPO, Mandemakers K.  
415 Families in comparison: An individual-level comparison of life-course and family  
416 reconstructions between population and vital event registers. *Popul Stud (Camb)*. 2021; 75:  
417 91-110.

418 9. Schoenmaker M, de Craen AJM, de Meijer PHEM, Beekman M, Blauw GJ, Slagboom PE,  
419 Westendorp RGJ. Evidence of genetic enrichment for exceptional survival using a family  
420 approach: the Leiden Longevity Study. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2006; 14: 79-84.

- 421 10. Schoenmaker M, de Craen AJM, de Meijer PHEM, Beekman M, Blauw GJ, Slagboom PE,  
422 Westendorp RGJ. Evidence of genetic enrichment for exceptional survival using a family  
423 approach: the Leiden Longevity Study. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2006; 14: 79-84.
- 424 11. Beekman M, Blauw GJ, Houwing-Duistermaat JJ, Brandt BW, Westendorp RGJ, Slagboom  
425 PE. Chromosome 4q25, microsomal transfer protein gene, and human longevity: novel data  
426 and a meta-analysis of association studies. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2006; 61: 355-362.
- 427 12. van den Berg N, Rodríguez-Girondo M, Mandemakers K, Janssens AAPO, Beekman M,  
428 Slagboom PE. Longevity Relatives Count score identifies heritable longevity carriers and  
429 suggests case improvement in genetic studies. *Aging Cell.* 2020; 19: e13139.
- 430 13. Choi SW, Mak TS, O'Reilly PF. Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic risk score  
431 analyses. *Nat Protoc.* 2020; 15: 2759-2772.
- 432 14. van den Berg N, Rodríguez-Girondo M, van Dijk IK, Mourits RJ, Mandemakers K, Janssens  
433 AAPO, Beekman M, Smith KR, Slagboom PE. Longevity defined as top 10% survivors and  
434 beyond is transmitted as a quantitative genetic trait. *Nat Commun.* 2019; 10: 35-0.
- 435 15. Helle S, Lummaa V, Jokela J. Are reproductive and somatic senescence coupled in  
436 humans? Late, but not early, reproduction correlated with longevity in historical Sami  
437 women. *Proc Biol Sci.* 2005; 272: 29-37.
- 438 16. Sun F, Sebastiani P, Schupf N, Bae H, Andersen SL, McIntosh A, Abel H, Elo IT, Perls TT.  
439 Extended maternal age at birth of last child and women's longevity in the Long Life Family  
440 Study. *Menopause.* 2015; 22: 26-31.

- 441 17. Müller HG, Chiou JM, Carey JR, Wang JL. Fertility and life span: late children enhance  
442 female longevity. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2002; 57: 202.
- 443 18. McArdle PF, Pollin TI, O'Connell JR, Sorkin JD, Agarwala R, Schäffer AA, Streeten EA, King  
444 TM, Shuldiner AR, Mitchell BD. Does having children extend life span? A genealogical study  
445 of parity and longevity in the Amish. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2006; 61: 190-195.
- 446 19. Jaffe D, Kogan L, Manor O, Gielchinsky Y, Dior U, Laufer N. Influence of late-age births on  
447 maternal longevity. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2015; 25: 387-391.
- 448 20. Laven JSE. Early menopause results from instead of causes premature general ageing.  
449 *Reprod Biomed Online*. 2022; 45: 421-424.
- 450 21. Sebastiani P, Bae H, Sun FX, Andersen SL, Daw EW, Malovini A, Kojima T, Hirose N,  
451 Schupf N, Puca A, Perls TT. Meta-analysis of genetic variants associated with human  
452 exceptional longevity. *Aging (Albany NY)*. 2013; 5: 653-661.
- 453 22. Silber SJ, Kato K, Aoyama N, Yabuuchi A, Skaletsky H, Fan Y, Shinohara K, Yatabe N,  
454 Kobayashi T. Intrinsic fertility of human oocytes. *Fertil Steril*. 2017; 107: 1232-1237.
- 455 23. Chiang JL, Shukla P, Pagidas K, Ahmed NS, Karri S, Gunn DD, Hurd WW, Singh KK.  
456 Mitochondria in Ovarian Aging and Reproductive Longevity. *Ageing Res Rev*. 2020; 63:  
457 101168.
- 458 24. Llarena N, Hine C. Reproductive Longevity and Aging: Geroscience Approaches to  
459 Maintain Long-Term Ovarian Fitness. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2021; 76: 1551-1560.

- 460 25. Sasaki H, Hamatani T, Kamijo S, Iwai M, Kobanawa M, Ogawa S, Miyado K, Tanaka M.  
461 Impact of Oxidative Stress on Age-Associated Decline in Oocyte Developmental  
462 Competence. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)*. 2019; 10: 811.
- 463 26. Henriksson P. Cardiovascular problems associated with IVF therapy. *J Intern Med*. 2021;  
464 289: 2-11.
- 465 27. Yiallourou SR, Magliano D, Haregu TN, Carrington MJ, Rolnik DL, Rombauts L, Rodrigues  
466 A, Ball J, Bruinsma FJ, Da Silva Costa F. Long term all-cause and cardiovascular disease  
467 mortality among women who undergo fertility treatment. *Med J Aust*. 2022; 217: 532-537.
- 468 28. Bungum AB, Glazer CH, Arendt LH, Schmidt L, Pinborg A, Bonde JP, Tøttenborg SS. Risk of  
469 hospitalization for early onset of cardiovascular disease among infertile women: a register-  
470 based cohort study. *Hum Reprod*. 2019; 34: 2274-2281.
- 471  
472