



## Estimation of the frequency of involuntary infertility on a nation-wide basis

Rémy Slama, Oluf Kristian Højbjerg Hansen, Béatrice Ducot, Aline Bohet, Ditte Sorensen, Lise Giorgis Allemand, Marinus Eijkemans, Lyliane Rosetta, Jean-Christophe Thalabard, Niels Keiding, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Rémy Slama, Oluf Kristian Højbjerg Hansen, Béatrice Ducot, Aline Bohet, Ditte Sorensen, et al.. Estimation of the frequency of involuntary infertility on a nation-wide basis: A nation-wide survey of couple fecundity. Human Reproduction, Oxford University Press (OUP), 2012, epub ahead of print. <10.1093/humrep/des070>. <inserm-00680532>

**HAL Id: inserm-00680532**

**<http://www.hal.inserm.fr/inserm-00680532>**

Submitted on 19 Mar 2013

**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 **Estimation of the frequency of involuntary infertility on a nation-**  
2 **wide basis**

3

4 Running title:

5 A nation-wide survey of couple fecundity

6

7 Authors:

8 R. Slama<sup>1,2</sup>, O. Hansen<sup>3</sup>, B. Ducot<sup>4,5</sup>, A. Bohet<sup>4,5</sup>, D. Sorensen<sup>3</sup>, L. Giorgis Allemand<sup>1,2</sup>,

9 M.J.C. Eijkemans<sup>6</sup>, L. Rosetta<sup>7</sup>, J.C. Thalabard<sup>8</sup>, N. Keiding<sup>3</sup>, J. Bouyer<sup>4,5</sup>

10

11 1: Inserm, Institut Albert Bonniot (U823), Team of Environmental Epidemiology applied to  
12 Reproduction and Respiratory Health, F-38042 Grenoble, France.

13 2: Grenoble University, Institut Albert Bonniot, Grenoble, France.

14 3: Department of Biostatistics, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

15 4: Inserm, CESP, Centre for research in Epidemiology and Population Health, U1018,  
16 Reproduction and child development Team, F-94276 Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France

17 5: Univ Paris-Sud, UMRS 1018, F-94276, Villejuif, France

18 6: Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary care, UMC Utrecht, The Netherlands.

19 7: CNRS, UPR 2147, Paris.

20 8: MAP5, UMR CNRS 8145, Paris Descartes University, Paris.

21

22 Corresponding author:

23 Rémy Slama, remy.slama@ujf-grenoble.fr

24

25 Word count:

26 Abstract: 246

27 Text: 5323

28

## 1 ABSTRACT

2

3 BACKGROUND: Assessing the couple fecundity on a nation-wide basis without excluding  
4 couples who eventually remain infertile is challenging. Our aim was to describe the couple  
5 fecundity (in terms of frequency of involuntary infertility) among the general population living  
6 in France. METHODS: We used a current-duration design. A random sample of 64,262  
7 households was selected in 2007-2008, allowing us to identify 15,810 women aged 18-44  
8 years. Eligible women (n=1089) were those having regular sexual intercourse with a male  
9 partner, not using any method of contraception and not having delivered in the previous 3  
10 months. These women reported information on the current duration of unprotected  
11 intercourse (CDUI, the time elapsed between the start of the period of unprotected  
12 intercourse and the time of inclusion in the study). The CDUI distribution was used to  
13 estimate the frequency of involuntary infertility, using a newly developed statistical technique  
14 that does not require couples to be followed-up until the end of the period of unprotected  
15 intercourse. RESULTS: CDUI was defined for 867 women. An estimated 46% of couples had  
16 no detected pregnancy conceived during the first 6 months of unprotected intercourse (95%  
17 confidence interval, 36-56%). The proportions of couples with no detected pregnancy within  
18 12 and 24 months were 24% (19-30%) and 11% (8-14%), respectively. CONCLUSIONS:  
19 These results constitute one of the few descriptions of the fecundity of a nation-wide  
20 representative sample of couples from the general population, not limited to couples who  
21 eventually conceived or to those resorting to medical help.

22

23 Key words: Fecundability; Fecundity; Infertility; Involuntary infertility; Pregnancy;

24

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Few descriptions of the couples' ability to conceive a pregnancy (fecundity) exist in non-  
3 selected groups of the general population. Fertility, the actual number of children per woman,  
4 is monitored in most countries and is statistically associated with having a time to pregnancy  
5 longer than 12 months (Joffe, et al., 2009). However, outside the specific context of  
6 populations not using contraceptive methods (Larsen and Vaupel, 1993), it constitutes a very  
7 indirect and probably not very sensitive indicator of the occurrence of impaired fecundity.  
8 Data on the use of assisted reproduction technologies (ART) are widely available (de  
9 Mouzon, et al., 2010, de Mouzon, et al., 2009), but information on the number of couples  
10 resorting to ART is difficult to interpret without knowledge of the population at risk (those  
11 trying to become pregnant), and because involuntarily infertile couples seek for medical help  
12 after variable durations of unprotected intercourse (Moreau, et al., 2010) and do not always  
13 resort to ART.

14 Fecundity studies relying on a pregnancy-based design have been conducted in several  
15 countries (Jensen, et al., 2001, Juul, et al., 1999, Muller, et al., 2006) (reviewed by Leridon,  
16 2007), but this design excludes couples who do not conceive finally, thus overestimating the  
17 fecundity level. Few surveys including couples who remain infertile have been conducted.  
18 The European Studies of Infertility and Subfecundity (Karmaus, et al., 1999), a set of  
19 retrospective studies conducted in Denmark, Germany, Poland, Italy and Spain in 1991-93,  
20 considered unsuccessful attempts at pregnancy. Some cohort studies of pregnancy planners  
21 have been conducted, but generally for etiologic or biologic purposes rather than to describe  
22 fecundity at the population level, and in selected populations (Bonde, et al., 1998, Buck, et  
23 al., 2004, reviewed by Guzick and Swan, 2006, Tietze, 1968, Weinberg, et al., 1994, Wilcox,  
24 et al., 1988, Zinaman, et al., 2000). Demographers have also studied perceived fecundity or  
25 impaired fecundity in the general population, for example in France (Leridon, 1992, Leridon,  
26 2007) or in the US National Survey of Family Growth (Stephen and Chandra, 2006); these  
27 studies, usually relying on large and well-defined population based samples are difficult to  
28 compare to the above-mentioned "time to pregnancy" studies, either because they did not

1 use an objective cut-off (e.g., 12 or 24 months) to define involuntary infertility (Leridon, 1992)  
2 or, in the case of the National Survey of Family Growth, because the number of cases of  
3 (current) 12-month infertility is not divided by the number of couples (currently) at risk of  
4 pregnancy, but by the size of the (larger) group of married women, regardless of whether  
5 they were “at risk” of pregnancy, leading to a much lower rate of involuntary infertility than in  
6 other studies (Guzick and Swan, 2006).

7 Our aim was to describe the frequency of involuntary infertility among the general population  
8 of France without excluding couples involuntarily infertile. In terms of approach and study  
9 design, the need to efficiently include infertile couples (Olsen and Rachootin, 2003, Sallmen,  
10 et al., 2000, Slama, et al., 2004) implied the exclusion of retrospective designs. Among  
11 prospective designs, the main options are the incident cohort design (Bonde, et al., 1998),  
12 the prevalent cohort design (Keiding, 1992, Wise, et al., 2010), and the current duration  
13 approach (Keiding, et al., 2002, Slama, et al., 2006). The very low eligibility rate of the  
14 incident cohort design –probably around 1% of women of reproductive age (Bonde, et al.,  
15 1998, Slama, et al., 2006) – made it in our eyes little suited for descriptive studies. The first  
16 stage of the prevalent cohort design requires one to recruit a cross-sectional sample of  
17 couples not using contraception and to collect the time elapsed since the start of the period  
18 at risk of pregnancy to account for left-censoring in the analysis; this first stage also  
19 corresponds to a current duration approach, which is therefore embedded into the prevalent  
20 cohort design. We have recently demonstrated the feasibility of this design (Slama, et al.,  
21 2006). For these reasons, we chose to use a current duration approach (Keiding, et al.,  
22 2002, Slama, et al., 2006, Weinberg and Gladen, 1986).

23

## 1 METHODS

2 The study, termed the Observatory of Fecundity in France (Obseff), aims is to describe the  
3 fecundity of couples from the general population at the nation-wide level, to describe  
4 characteristics of menstrual cycle function using urinary biomarkers and to characterize the  
5 influence of environmental factors (in particular atmospheric pollutants) on fecundity; only the  
6 first aim is presented here. Our study follows the methodology of our feasibility study on the  
7 current duration approach (Slama, et al., 2006), with slight modifications.

8

### 9 Population sample

10 Our approach was a two-stage stratified sampling (Slama, et al., 2006). At the first stage, a  
11 random probability sample of households was selected using a stratified random sample of  
12 all landline phones in mainland France (86% of households had a landline phone at the time  
13 of the survey). Subjects who only had a mobile phone or no phone were not included in the  
14 sample. Households in areas corresponding to urban areas of more than 100,000 inhabitants  
15 were over-sampled and corresponded to about 61% of the random list of phone numbers  
16 (compared to 46% in the whole French population), a feature taken into account in the  
17 analysis by a reweighing approach (see below).

### 18 *Eligibility criteria*

19 Eligible households were those which were the main residence of a woman aged 18 to 44  
20 years; if several women in this age range lived in the selected household, we randomly drew  
21 one, without selecting another one if she turned out not to be eligible. Women aged 18 to 44  
22 years (i.e. between their 18<sup>th</sup> and 45<sup>th</sup> birthdays) answered an eligibility questionnaire lasting  
23 about 4 minutes. Eligible women were those living with a male partner or engaged in a  
24 regular relationship with a male partner, who were not regularly using any method to avoid  
25 pregnancy (nor was their partner) at the time of the study. The interviewer asked questions  
26 about all types of methods to avoid pregnancy, enumerating all of them. Couples sporadically  
27 using contraception were not considered to be eligible, unless they simultaneously declared  
28 that they were trying to become pregnant. Women who did not have sexual intercourse in the

1 month prior to interview, and women who had delivered in the 3 months prior to interview  
2 were excluded. Women were asked if they were currently trying to become pregnant, but this  
3 was not an eligibility criterion. Indeed, following the logic of a previous study (Karmaus, et al.,  
4 1999), our aim was to capture the whole population theoretically at risk of pregnancy,  
5 whatever their fecundity level, without excluding those who are subfertile or may consider  
6 themselves sterile after some duration of involuntary infertility. For the same reason, we did  
7 not exclude from the main analysis women with irregular menstrual periods or couples in  
8 which a male fertility disorder (e.g., low sperm count) had been diagnosed. Sensitivity  
9 analyses excluding “non-planners” (defined with respect to the start of the period of  
10 unprotected intercourse) and women without menstrual bleeding in the last 12 months are  
11 provided (see below).

#### 12 *Correction for population sampling and selection bias*

13 We used a weighting approach to correct for possible differences between the women who  
14 accepted to reply to the eligibility questionnaire and women from the general population, and  
15 to correct for the over-sampling of subjects living in urban areas of more than 100,000  
16 inhabitants. First, a weight correcting for the over-sampling of large urban areas was defined;  
17 a weight correcting for the lower probability of inclusion of women who were not the only  
18 woman aged 18 to 44 years in the home was then generated. Finally a weight allowing the  
19 recruited population of women aged 18 to 44 years who answered the eligibility criteria to be  
20 more similar to the general population of women in this age range (based on the distributions  
21 of age, marital life, number of children, age at the end of studies observed in the national  
22 census) was created. The estimation of this last weight was based on a generalized raking  
23 procedure (Deville, et al., 1993) and was implemented using CALMAR macro implemented  
24 on SAS statistical software (INSEE). Finally, these weights were multiplied, and the  
25 corresponding final weight was used in all analyses.

26

27 Current duration of unprotected intercourse

1 The main outcome was the rates of 6-month (respectively 12- and 24-month) involuntary  
2 infertility, defined as the proportion of couples without a recognized pregnancy within 6  
3 months (respectively, 12 or 24 months) of unprotected intercourse (although the term  
4 *involuntary* tends to assume that couples wished to become pregnant -at least at the start of  
5 the period of unprotected intercourse- we also used it in analyses including all periods of  
6 unprotected intercourse, even those started in the absence of a pregnancy wish). These  
7 outcomes were derived from the current duration of unprotected intercourse (CDUI), using an  
8 approach outlined below. CDUI corresponds to the time elapsed between the start of the  
9 period of unprotected intercourse and the interview. Women were also asked to provide the  
10 duration elapsed since they last used a method to avoid pregnancy (in weeks, months and  
11 years), if any, which was used if the date was missing. The starting date of the period of  
12 unprotected intercourse was determined in three different ways. For the majority of women  
13 (63%), it corresponded to the date of discontinuation of use of the last contraceptive method,  
14 as declared by the woman. Women were asked if, upon discontinuing use of contraception,  
15 they had waited for 1, 2 or 3 cycles before actively trying to become pregnant; if this was the  
16 case then 28, 56 or 84 days, respectively, were subtracted from CDUI. We also checked that  
17 no pregnancy declared by the woman had occurred since this date, and corrected the  
18 starting date accordingly if this was not the case. If the couple had not used any method to  
19 avoid pregnancy since the last pregnancy (32% of women), then the starting date was  
20 defined as the end of the last pregnancy, plus three months in case of a live or stillbirth; if the  
21 resulting assumed starting date was after the date of interview (*e.g.*, for women who  
22 delivered a live newborn in the previous 3 months), then the couple was not considered to be  
23 eligible. For couples who had never used any method to avoid pregnancy and in which the  
24 woman had never been pregnant (5% of women), the starting date was that of the start of the  
25 relationship.

26

27 Estimation of the probability of pregnancy



1 The principle of the current duration approach is to infer the underlying distribution (or  
2 survival function) corresponding to an unobserved time interval until a given event, from the  
3 distribution of the so far elapsed part of this time interval (Keiding, et al., 2002, van Es, et al.,  
4 2000, Weinberg and Gladen, 1986, Yamaguchi, 2003). Here, we are interested in total time  
5 interval of unprotected intercourse before a pregnancy (if any), but we only observe couples  
6 not using contraception at a certain time period (the time of interview), without following them  
7 up like in a cohort study. More precisely, the end of the period of unprotected intercourse, in  
8 addition to successful conception, may also happen because the couple gives up (resumes  
9 contraception because the couple considers it is not anymore a good time to become  
10 pregnant, e.g. as a result of a change in their financial situation, or because the couple splits,  
11 becomes too old, die). The possible onset of fertility treatment can also be considered as the  
12 end of the period of unprotected intercourse, but another interpretation is possible. Indeed, it  
13 is possible to argue *either* that fertility treatments change to some extent the probability of  
14 conception away from the primary interest, so that the relevant time is unprotected  
15 intercourse before onset of medical infertility treatment; in other words, we then consider  
16 start of fertility treatment as another way of giving up trying. Alternatively, one may consider  
17 that the couple is still trying to become pregnant during fertility treatment, if our focus is the  
18 actual fecundity in today's society as it is (in which case onset of such treatments can be  
19 ignored in analyses). We present both results here since each one has its logic. Note that  
20 this way of handling a competing risk is necessary in the current duration approach in order  
21 to avoid complex hypotheses on the transition rate to infertility treatments, and that it differs  
22 from classical prospective (e.g., Cox) survival modelling, in which fertility treatments can be  
23 handled by censoring or as competing risks. Infertility treatments were assessed by asking  
24 specifically if each type of medical infertility treatment (drugs, artificial insemination, in vitro  
25 fertilization, intra-cytoplasmic sperm injection) had been used by the woman or her partner,  
26 and when.

27 The survival function corresponding to this underlying distribution has been estimated using  
28 a parametric approach assuming a generalized gamma distribution (Keiding, et al., 2002,

1 Yamaguchi, 2003). Confidence intervals were built using a bootstrap approach. The  
2 estimations were repeated restricting the population to women declaring that they were  
3 currently trying to become pregnant or that they had stopped using a contraceptive method  
4 because they wished to become pregnant (thereafter called “pregnancy planners”). A  
5 modification of the approach initially proposed (Keiding, et al., 2002, Slama, et al., 2006)  
6 regards very long current durations of unprotected intercourse. Many of these long durations  
7 most probably concern couples who are aware of strong subfertility or even sterility, and  
8 since our interest is in the shape of the distribution of time to pregnancy for the very first  
9 years, we based the estimation on all durations shorter than 36 months and replaced  
10 (without excluding them) those reported as being longer than 36 months by the information  
11 that they were longer than 36 months.

12 The resulting estimated survival function can be interpreted as an estimate of the proportion  
13 of couples who, after a given number of months, still have unprotected intercourse (that is,  
14 they did not give up the period of unprotected intercourse) and did not obtain a clinically  
15 detected pregnancy. In the case where couples with infertility treatments are excluded, it is  
16 an estimate of an alternative fecundity measure, namely the proportion of couples who, after  
17 a given number of months, still have unprotected intercourse and have neither obtained a  
18 clinically detected pregnancy nor started fertility treatment.

19

#### 20 Sensitivity analyses

21 We repeated the estimation of the proportion of couples who still have unprotected  
22 intercourse in various subgroups or imposing alternative sets of assumptions: 1) assuming  
23 that couples who had not resumed contraception since their last pregnancy had a duration of  
24 post-partum infertility of 6 months (instead of 3 in the main analysis); 2) excluding women  
25 who declared not to have had menstrual cycles in the last 12 months; 3) excluding couples  
26 who declared that they had used contraception sporadically (included in the main analysis if  
27 they declared to be currently trying to become pregnant) and 4) including couples with  
28 sporadic contraception mentioned in 3) above, but assigning them a reduced CDUI, to

- 1 account for the fact that they were not exposed to pregnancy risk during all months since the
- 2 start of the pregnancy attempt; in practice, we arbitrarily halved their CDUI.

## 1 RESULTS

## 2 Population sample

3 We drew a random sample of 64,262 households, 19,121 of which were the main residence  
4 of an 18-44 year old woman; 15,810 of these women accepted to reply to the eligibility  
5 questionnaire (Figure I). Among women aged 18-44 years, 4.8% were pregnant at the time of  
6 the eligibility questionnaire; 5.5% reported that they were currently trying to become pregnant  
7 and 4.4% declared that they planned to try to become pregnant within the next 12 months  
8 (Table I). Half of the women (48%) reported that they had no intention to try to become  
9 pregnant in the future.

10

## 11 Estimation of the frequency of infertility

12 Among the women who answered the eligibility questionnaire, 1089 (6.9%) were eligible; that  
13 is, they were not using any birth control method, had a male partner and had been sexually  
14 active in the previous month. Out of these, 943 accepted to participate. The estimated overall  
15 participation rate was 63% (Figure I). The current duration of unprotected intercourse (CDUI)  
16 could be defined for 867 participating women. The characteristics of women with a defined  
17 CDUI are shown in Table II. The median duration of CDUI, which has no direct interpretation,  
18 was 13.2 months, with 25-75<sup>th</sup> percentiles equal to 3.7-41.8 months. From CDUI, we  
19 estimated the underlying "survival" function, corresponding to the time to conception or end  
20 of the period of unprotected intercourse for the source population (Figure IIA). The estimated  
21 proportion of couples who would still not have conceived and would still be having  
22 unprotected intercourse 6 months after the start of the interval of unprotected intercourse  
23 was 46% (95% confidence interval, CI, 36-56%); it was 24% (95% CI, 19-30%) and 11%  
24 (95% CI, 8-14%) within 12 and 24 months after the start of the period of unprotected  
25 intercourse, respectively. Values were very slightly lower after restriction to the 708 couples  
26 who declared that they had stopped using birth control methods in order to obtain a  
27 pregnancy: rates were 45% (95% CI, 34-55%), 23% (18-28%) and 10% (8-12%) at 6, 12 and  
28 24 months, respectively. After restriction to nulliparous couples, the proportions of couples

1 who had not conceived and were still having unprotected intercourse at 6, 12 and 24 months  
2 after the start of the period of unprotected intercourse were 47% (95% CI, 26-68%), 26% (15-  
3 36%) and 11% (7-16%), respectively (Figure IIB). In the analysis based on the alternative  
4 fecundity measure (excluding from the initial population couples who had resorted to infertility  
5 treatments, in order to estimate the proportion of couples who had not conceived nor started  
6 infertility treatment and were still having unprotected intercourse), the rates at 6, 12 and 24  
7 months after the start of the period of unprotected intercourse were 43% (95% CI, 34-53%),  
8 20% (95% CI, 16-25%) and 8% (95% CI, 6-10%), respectively (Figure IIA).

9

#### 10 Sensitivity analyses

11 Assuming a duration of 6 months of post-partum infertility instead of 3 led to the exclusion of  
12 9 couples but had no impact on our estimates. Twelve women declared not to have had  
13 menstrual cycles over the last 12 months before inclusion, and, again, excluding them had  
14 no impact either on our results. Excluding couples who declared that they were trying to  
15 become pregnant and that they were using contraception sporadically (n=113) yielded very  
16 slightly increased rates of involuntary infertility (47%, 26% and 12% at 6, 12 and 24 months,  
17 respectively). Including these couples with a halved current duration decreased the rates of  
18 involuntary infertility to 37% (95% CI, 28-47%), 20% (15-25%) and 9% (7-11%) at 6, 12 and  
19 24 months, respectively.

20

## 1 DISCUSSION

2

3 Comparison with former studies

4 To our knowledge, our study is one of the first to estimate the frequency of involuntary  
5 infertility in a nation wide representative population sample and not relying on a retrospective  
6 study design.

7 Several studies using other designs have provided descriptions of the couple fecundity (e.g.  
8 Bonde, et al., 1998, Jensen, et al., 2001, Joffe, 2000, Karmaus, et al., 1999, Muller, et al.,  
9 2006, Scheike, et al., 2008, Slama, et al., 2008). Most of these studies relied on  
10 retrospectively collected information in women or men asked to describe earlier pregnancy  
11 attempts, using either *pregnancy-based* (Jensen, et al., 2001, Joffe, et al., 2005, Scheike, et  
12 al., 2008) or *historically prospective* (Karmaus, et al., 1999, Slama, et al., 2008) designs (the  
13 former design is restricted to pregnancy attempts ending in a pregnancy, while the latter also  
14 includes those ending with no pregnancy). In a historically prospective study, 932 couples  
15 from Denmark, Germany, Poland, Italy and Spain described their periods of unprotected  
16 intercourse resulting or not in a pregnancy, provided they had started less than 5 years prior  
17 to the interview (Karmaus, et al., 1999). When the analysis was restricted to the first period of  
18 unprotected intercourse, 23% of women had not conceived within the first 12 months of  
19 attempt (varying from 33% in Poland down to 15% in South Italy); when the most recent time  
20 of unprotected intercourse was considered (including current attempts started not more than  
21 5 years before interview), the proportion of women who had not conceived within 12 months  
22 of unprotected intercourse was 29% (Karmaus, et al., 1999). In a historically prospective  
23 study in two French rural areas conducted in 2000 that considered pregnancy attempts  
24 started between 1985 and 2000, Slama et al. (2008) reported a rate of 12-month involuntary  
25 infertility of 16%. In a prospective study among Danish first pregnancy planners followed-up  
26 for six months, 256 couples out of 430 conceived (Bonde, et al., 1998), which, after taking  
27 into account censoring, corresponds to a 6-month involuntary infertility rate of 36%. In  
28 another cohort of 221 women from America who volunteered in 1983-1985 as they were

1 planning to stop using birth-control methods in order to become pregnant, the 6-month  
2 cumulative pregnancy rate was 78% (Wilcox, et al., 1988). Retrospective studies relying only  
3 on periods of unprotected intercourse (or pregnancy attempts) leading to a live birth (the so-  
4 called “pregnancy-based” design) yield lower rates of 12-month involuntary infertility: in  
5 England, Joffe (2000) reported that 10% of couples whose first pregnancy attempt leading to  
6 a live birth started in 1991-93 had needed more than 12 months to conceive. In another  
7 pregnancy-based study in 4 European cities among couples who delivered in 1996-98, the  
8 corresponding rate for couples recruited in Paris was 9.9% (Jensen, et al., 2001); it ranged  
9 from 5 to 11% among fertile couples recruited using a similar design in four French cities in  
10 2002-2003 (Muller, et al., 2006). In the *Enquête Nationale Périnatale*, a national sample  
11 constituted of all women who delivered in all French maternity units in a given week in 2003  
12 (Blondel, et al., 2006), time to pregnancy could be defined for 10,262 out of 14,482 live  
13 births, and the rates of 6, 12 and 24-month infertility were 32% (95% CI, 31-33%), 18% (95%  
14 CI, 17-19%) and 6% (95% CI, 5-6%), respectively (Slama, et al., (in press)). Although our  
15 confidence intervals were relatively broad (19% to 30% for the estimated rate of 12-month  
16 infertility), our estimate of the rate of 12-month involuntary infertility is somewhat higher than  
17 the pregnancy-based values reported in the *Enquête Nationale Périnatale*. This is coherent  
18 with what can be expected from the facts that the latter study did not take couples remaining  
19 infertile or giving up the pregnancy attempt into account and that couples fecund enough to  
20 have many children are over-represented in such a pregnancy-based study.

21

## 22 Study population

23 Our study is based on a random sample from the general population. The estimated  
24 participation rate of eligible couples was 63%, which offers potential for bias. Our population  
25 was weighted to limit such bias. This weighing approach, consisting in making our population  
26 more similar to the general population in terms of age and age at the end of studies, is  
27 expected to correct efficiently for selection bias to the extent that factors associated with  
28 participation and fecundity level are statistically linked with these sociodemographic

1 variables. Unlike some previous studies on time to pregnancy using a pregnancy-based  
2 design, inclusion was not conditioned on couples having eventually obtained a pregnancy.  
3 We tried to identify all couples possibly at risk of pregnancy, without excluding sterile or  
4 subfertile couples. We chose not to condition inclusion on couples being currently trying to  
5 become pregnant, because subfertile couples who had started a pregnancy attempt in order  
6 to become pregnant may consider themselves subfertile or sterile after several months on  
7 involuntary infertility, and may and consequently declare that they are not trying anymore to  
8 become pregnant although they still have unprotected intercourse. We reported additional  
9 results limited to couples who declared to have started the period of unprotected intercourse  
10 in order to become pregnant so as to describe the fecundity of pregnancy planners, which  
11 turned out to be very similar to that estimated without that exclusion.

12 Including parous women may induce bias or limit representativeness of the population  
13 sample because previous reproductive history may impact persistency in trying to become  
14 pregnant; this may also limit comparability with future studies because of possible temporal  
15 changes in desired family size; for this reason, we also reported results restricted to  
16 nulliparous women. These women had a very slightly higher rate of 12-month involuntary  
17 infertility, compared to the overall population also including parous women.

18

19 Assumptions made by our design

20 Fecundity studies have several potential limitations. These relate in particular to the fact that  
21 couples with unplanned or mistimed pregnancies usually have no defined duration of  
22 unprotected intercourse; to variability in the delay before pregnancy detection, in access to  
23 and use of contraception or in desired family size. These limitations however apply to most  
24 other types of fecundity studies, and have been discussed at length elsewhere (see e.g.,  
25 Joffe, et al., 2005, Key, et al., 2009, Slama, et al., 2006, Weinberg, et al., 1994); we will here  
26 focus on sources of bias and assumptions specific to our study design. Our cross-sectional  
27 design implies that couples who have had unprotected intercourse for a long time have a  
28 higher probability of inclusion than couples with a shorter waiting time; however this length-



1 biased sampling is taken into account in the statistical analysis, which provides an unbiased  
2 estimate under certain assumptions (Keiding, et al., 2002, Weinberg and Gladen, 1986). A  
3 limitation of the design is that it does not allow one to distinguish couples who conceive a  
4 pregnancy from those who abandon the pregnancy attempt, either because they split or  
5 resume contraception before they conceive; that is, a period of involuntary infertility as  
6 defined in our study corresponds to the time until pregnancy occurrence or end of  
7 unprotected intercourse with no pregnancy. Data on the frequency of couples stopping a  
8 period of unprotected intercourse before pregnancy occurrence are limited; persistency in  
9 trying to become pregnant may vary according to mother's age at starting date, country  
10 (Basso, et al., 2000), and probably other factors such as parity. The impact of such attempts  
11 on the estimates from the current duration approach is expected to correspond to an  
12 overestimation of the fecundity level, whose amplitude will depend on the frequency of these  
13 attempts terminated because the couple split or resumed contraception. As forcefully pointed  
14 out by Basso et al. (Basso, et al., 2000), these pregnancy attempts not ending in a  
15 pregnancy also constitute a source of bias in the pregnancy-based design, which does not  
16 allow including them either and in which the collected time to pregnancy is conditioned on  
17 couples not giving up the period of unprotected intercourse; in that design also, their  
18 exclusion leads to an overestimation of the fecundity level. In a prevalent cohort based on  
19 couples recruited after less than 12 months of pregnancy attempt, the proportion of couples  
20 who reported to discontinue trying to become pregnant during the following year was 5%  
21 (Wise, et al., 2010). Compared to what had originally been suggested (Keiding, et al., 2002,  
22 Slama, et al., 2006), we report here results including couples who had initiated an infertility  
23 treatment since the start of the period of unprotected intercourse (as well as analyses  
24 excluding these couples, corresponding to the approach used in our previous publication). If  
25 these couples with infertility treatment are excluded, then the studied event is either  
26 pregnancy, or end of the period of unprotected intercourse or start of a fertility treatment; if  
27 these couples with infertility treatment are included, then the event is simply either pregnancy  
28 or end of the period of unprotected intercourse; both estimates are worth reporting.

1 Coherently, including these couples yielded a somewhat higher frequency of 12-month  
2 involuntary infertility (24%, compared to 20% if couples with a treatment are excluded),  
3 corresponding to a longer time to event.

4

5 Relevance of the current duration approach to describe fecundity

6 Describing and possibly monitoring couple fecundity takes on importance in the context of  
7 increasing use of ART and of the possible deterioration of male reproductive health. Indeed,  
8 several studies have described temporal decreases in sperm concentration and motility in  
9 specific areas of industrialised countries over the last decades (Auger, et al., 1995, Carlsen,  
10 et al., 1992, Nelson and Bunge, 1974, Swan, et al., 2000). These decreases cannot be  
11 considered as certain, in particular because studies reporting temporal trends in semen  
12 quality are often based on self-selected subjects, not allowing quantification of participation  
13 rates and description of possible selection bias (Cohn, et al., 2002, Eustache, et al., 2004,  
14 Hauser, et al., 2005, Muller, et al., 2004). If true, such a decline might have had an impact on  
15 fecundability, the cycle-specific probability of pregnancy among non-contracepting couples,  
16 as indicated by a simulation study (Slama, et al., 2004). This decline in fecundability may not  
17 imply strong changes in the average number of children per couple, but could entail  
18 increases in the proportion of couples subject to 1- to 5-year involuntary infertility (Leridon  
19 and Slama, 2008).

20 Very few studies directly tried to assess temporal trends in fecundability or involuntary  
21 infertility of populations (Jensen, et al., 2005, Joffe, 2000, 2008). These studies generally do  
22 not cover areas where temporal declines in semen quality have been reported. Results do  
23 not show decreases in couple fecundity. Their pregnancy-based design excludes couples  
24 who remain involuntarily infertile, therefore limiting the statistical power of analyses trying to  
25 highlight changes in fecundity, and possibly biasing the comparison towards absence of  
26 change in fecundity (Slama, et al., 2004). Additionally, it has been argued that temporal  
27 trends in the proportion of unwanted pregnancies and abortion rates may make it difficult to  
28 describe time trends in fecundity (Sallmen, et al., 2005). Several approaches can be used to

1 correct for these potential biases (Joffe, et al., 2006, Joffe, et al., 2005, Key, et al., 2009) but  
2 the efficiency of these approaches may in practice be limited in the context of a retrospective  
3 survey design (Sallmen, et al., 2006). For these reasons, alternatives to a retrospective  
4 design are worth investigating. These include the (incident) cohort design (Bonde, et al.,  
5 1998), the prevalent cohort design (Keiding, 1992, Wise, et al., 2010) and the current  
6 duration approach. Other designs have been suggested (Olsen and Andersen, 1999) but not  
7 applied to our knowledge.

8 The eligibility rate in the current duration approach is relatively low; we had to survey 15,810  
9 couples in order to recruit 867 couples (5.5%) with a defined current duration of unprotected  
10 intercourse. This eligibility rate is higher than that of the main other prospective design, the  
11 (classical) cohort design, in which couples are recruited before the start of the period of  
12 unprotected intercourse. Indeed, less than 2% of women aged 18-44 years contacted  
13 indicated that they planned to start a pregnancy attempt within the next 6 months, out of  
14 which probably not all will do so within this duration. Conversely, some couples may start a  
15 pregnancy attempt in the same time period without having planned it long in advance, and  
16 these would be hard to identify and include in an incident cohort. These study designs are  
17 actually not incompatible one with the other; indeed, couples who plan to start a pregnancy  
18 attempt soon (eligible in an incident or prevalent cohort on fecundity) can also be identified  
19 from the eligibility questionnaire of a current-duration study such as ours, and these can be  
20 followed-up, together with couples eligible for the current duration design at the time of  
21 interview. If repeated at regular time intervals, such a design could be used to prospectively  
22 monitor time trends in fecundity. This could be seen as a parallel to the studies monitoring  
23 semen quality in young men in Scandinavian countries (Jorgensen, et al., 2006); as  
24 suggested by Olsen and Rachootin (2003), a system monitoring fecundity should monitor  
25 semen quality in parallel to a measure of the couple fecundity such as involuntary infertility.

26

27 In conclusion, our study provides an estimate of the frequency of involuntary infertility in the  
28 general population showing that about one in four to five couples have not conceived a

1 detected pregnancy and are still having unprotected intercourse 12 month after having  
2 stopped using a contraceptive method, and that about one couple out of ten may still be  
3 unsuccessful in conceiving after 2 years of unprotected intercourse.

4

1   AUTHORS' ROLES

2   RS and JB initiated the study. RS, BD, NK, AB and JB designed the study and  
3   questionnaires; AB, BD, JB and RS supervised data collection. AB, BD and RS cleaned and  
4   prepared data. The statistical analyses were planned and supervised by RS and NK and  
5   carried out by OH, DS and LGA. RS drafted the first version of the manuscript. BD, LGA,  
6   MJCE, LR, JCT, NK and JB critically reviewed the manuscript.

7

8   ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

9   We thank Alfred Spira and Caroline Moreau for useful comments on the manuscript and  
10   Lucette Aussel for her technical assistance in the step of data collection. We are grateful to  
11   Henri Leridon for useful discussions and documentation.

12

13   FUNDING

14   The study was funded by grants from ANR (French Agency for Research, SEST call on  
15   Environmental and Occupational Health), ANSES (French Agency for Food, environmental  
16   and Occupational Health Safety, EST call on Environmental and Occupational Health), InVS  
17   (French Institute for Public Health Surveillance). The team of Environmental Epidemiology is  
18   funded by an AVENIR grant from Inserm (2007). The funding sources had no role on the  
19   design of the study, with the exception of members of InVS who were implied in the  
20   development of some parts of the study questionnaire.

21

## 1 REFERENCES

2

3 Auger J, Kunstmann JM, Czyglik F, Jouannet P. Decline in semen quality among fertile men  
4 in Paris during the past 20 years [see comments]. *N Engl J Med* 1995;**332**:281-285.

5 Basso O, Juul S, Olsen J. Time to pregnancy as a correlate of fecundity: differential  
6 persistence in trying to become pregnant as a source of bias. *Int J Epidemiol*  
7 2000;**29**:856-861.

8 Blondel B, Supernant K, Du Mazaubrun C, Breart G. [Trends in perinatal health in  
9 metropolitan France between 1995 and 2003: results from the National Perinatal  
10 Surveys]. *J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod (Paris)* 2006;**35**:373-387.

11 Bonde JP, Ernst E, Jensen TK, Hjollund NH, Kolstad H, Henriksen TB, Scheike T,  
12 Giwercman A, Olsen J, Skakkebaek NE. Relation between semen quality and fertility: a  
13 population-based study of 430 first-pregnancy planners. *Lancet* 1998;**352**:1172-1177.

14 Bonde JP, Hjollund NH, Jensen TK, Ernst E, Kolstad H, Henriksen TB, Giwercman A,  
15 Skakkebaek NE, Andersson AM, Olsen J. A follow-up study of environmental and  
16 biologic determinants of fertility among 430 Danish first-pregnancy planners: design  
17 and methods. *Reprod Toxicol* 1998;**12**:19-27.

18 Buck GM, Lynch CD, Stanford JB, Sweeney AM, Schieve LA, Rockett JC, Selevan SG,  
19 Schrader SM. Prospective pregnancy study designs for assessing reproductive and  
20 developmental toxicants. *Environ Health Perspect* 2004;**112**:79-86.

21 Carlsen E, Giwercman A, Keiding N, Skakkebaek NE. Evidence for decreasing quality of  
22 semen during past 50 years. *British Medical Journal* 1992;**305**:609-613.

23 Cohn BA, Overstreet JW, Fogel RJ, Brazil CK, Baird DD, Cirillo PM. Epidemiologic studies of  
24 human semen quality: considerations for study design. *Am J Epidemiol* 2002;**155**:664-  
25 671.

26 de Mouzon J, Lancaster P, Nygren KG, Sullivan E, Zegers-Hochschild F, Mansour R,  
27 Ishihara O, Adamson D. World collaborative report on Assisted Reproductive  
28 Technology, 2002. *Human reproduction* 2009;**24**:2310-2320.

- 1 de Mouzon J, Goossens V, Bhattacharya S, Castilla JA, Ferraretti AP, Korsak V, Kupka M,  
2 Nygren KG, Nyboe Andersen A. Assisted reproductive technology in Europe, 2006:  
3 results generated from European registers by ESHRE. *Human reproduction*  
4 2010;**25**:1851-1862.
- 5 Deville JC, Särndal CE, Sautory O. Generalized raking procedures in survey sampling.  
6 *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1993;**88**:1013-1020.
- 7 Eustache F, Auger J, Cabrol D, Jouannet P. Are volunteers delivering semen samples in  
8 fertility studies a biased population? *Hum Reprod* 2004;**19**:2831-2837.
- 9 Guzick DS, Swan S. The decline of infertility: apparent or real? *Fertil Steril* 2006;**86**:524-526;  
10 discussion 534.
- 11 Hauser R, Godfrey-Bailey L, Chen Z. Does the potential for selection bias in semen quality  
12 studies depend on study design? Experience from a study conducted within an  
13 infertility clinic. *Hum Reprod* 2005;**20**:2579-2583.
- 14 INSEE SAS macro CALMAR. INSEE (National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies  
15 [http://www.insee.fr/fr/methodes/default.asp?page=outils/calmar/accueil\\_calmar.htm](http://www.insee.fr/fr/methodes/default.asp?page=outils/calmar/accueil_calmar.htm)  
16 (accessed 30 March 2011).
- 17 Jensen TK, Slama R, Ducot B, Suominen J, Cawood E, Andersen AG, Eustache F, Irvine S,  
18 Auger J, Jouannet P et al. Regional differences in waiting time to pregnancy among  
19 couples from four European cities. *Human Reproduction* 2001;**16**:2697-2704.
- 20 Jensen TK, Joffe M, Scheike T, Skytthe A, Gaist D, Christensen K. Time trends in waiting  
21 time to pregnancy among Danish twins. *Hum Reprod* 2005;**20**:955-964.
- 22 Joffe M. Time trends in biological fertility in Britain [see comments]. *Lancet* 2000;**355**:1961-  
23 1965.
- 24 Joffe M, Key J, Best N, Keiding N, Scheike T, Jensen TK. Studying time to pregnancy by use  
25 of a retrospective design. *Am J Epidemiol* 2005;**162**:115-124.
- 26 Joffe M, Key J, Best N, Keiding N, Jensen TK. Human fertility decline? *Epidemiology*  
27 2006;**17**:238; author reply 238-239.

- 1 Joffe M, Key J, Best N, Jensen TK, Keiding N. The role of biological fertility in predicting  
2 family size. *Human reproduction* 2009;**24**:1999-2006.
- 3 Jorgensen N, Asklund C, Carlsen E, Skakkebaek NE. Coordinated European investigations  
4 of semen quality: results from studies of Scandinavian young men is a matter of  
5 concern. *Int J Androl* 2006;**29**:54-61; discussion 105-108.
- 6 Juul S, Karmaus W, Olsen J. Regional differences in waiting time to pregnancy: pregnancy-  
7 based surveys from Denmark, France, Germany, Italy and Sweden. The European  
8 Infertility and Subfecundity Study Group. *Hum Reprod* 1999;**14**:1250-1254.
- 9 Karmaus W, Juul S, on behalf of the European infertility and subfecundity study group.  
10 Infertility and subfecundity in population-based samples from Denmark, Germany,  
11 Poland and Spain. *European Journal of Public Health* 1999;**9**:229-235.
- 12 Keiding N. Independent delayed entry (with discussion). In Klein, J. P. and Goel, P. K. (eds)  
13 Survival analysis: State of the Art. 1992. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp.309-326.
- 14 Keiding N, Kvist K, Hartvig H, Tvede M, Juul S. Estimating time to pregnancy from current  
15 durations in a cross-sectional sample. *Biostatistics* 2002;**3**:565-578.
- 16 Key J, Best N, Joffe M, Jensen TK, Keiding N. Methodological issues in analyzing time  
17 trends in biologic fertility: protection bias. *American journal of epidemiology*  
18 2009;**169**:285-293.
- 19 Larsen U, Vaupel JW. Hutterite fecundability by age and parity: strategies for frailty modeling  
20 of event histories. *Demography* 1993;**30**:81-102.
- 21 Leridon H. Sterility and Subfecundity: from silence to impatience. *Population: an English*  
22 *selection* 1992;**4**:35-54.
- 23 Leridon H. Studies of fertility and fecundity: comparative approaches from demography and  
24 epidemiology. *C R Biol* 2007;**330**:339-346.
- 25 Leridon H, Slama R. The impact of a decline in fecundity and of pregnancy postponement on  
26 final number of children and demand for assisted reproduction technology. *Hum*  
27 *Reprod* 2008;**23**:1312-1319.



- 1 Moreau C, Ducot B, Spira A, Slama R. When do infertile couples choose to seek medical  
2 help? *Fertil Steril* 2010;**93**:737-744.
- 3 Muller A, De La Rochebrochard E, Labbe-Decleves C, Jouannet P, Bujan L, Mieusset R, Le  
4 Lannou D, Guerin JF, Benchaib M, Slama R et al. Selection bias in semen studies due  
5 to self-selection of volunteers. *Hum Reprod* 2004;**19**:2838-2844.
- 6 Muller A, Slama R, Labbe-Decleves C, Jouannet P, Bujan L, Mieusset R, Le Lannou D,  
7 Guerin JF, Benchaib M, Spira A. Geographic variations in probability of pregnancy in  
8 four cities of France. *Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique* 2006;**54**:55-60.
- 9 Nelson CM, Bunge RG. Semen analysis: evidence for changing parameters of male fertility  
10 potential. *Fertil Steril* 1974;**25**:503-507.
- 11 Olsen J, Andersen PK. We should monitor human fecundity, but how? A suggestion for a  
12 new method that may also be used to identify determinants of low fecundity.  
13 *Epidemiology* 1999;**10**:419-421.
- 14 Olsen J, Rachootin P. Invited Commentary: Monitoring Fecundity over Time-If We Do It,  
15 Then Let's Do It Right. *Am J Epidemiol* 2003;**157**:94-97.
- 16 Sallmen M, Lindbohm ML, Nurminen M. Paternal exposure to lead and infertility.  
17 *Epidemiology* 2000;**11**:148-152.
- 18 Sallmen M, Weinberg CR, Baird DD, Lindbohm ML, Wilcox AJ. Has Human Fertility Declined  
19 Over Time?: Why We May Never Know. *Epidemiology* 2005;**16**:494-499.
- 20 Sallmen M, Baird DD, Wilcox A, Weinberg CR, Lindbohm ML. Human Fertility Decline?  
21 (Author reply). *Epidemiology* 2006;**17**:238-239.
- 22 Scheike TH, Rylander L, Carstensen L, Keiding N, Jensen TK, Stromberg U, Joffe M, Akre  
23 O. Time trends in human fecundability in Sweden. *Epidemiology* 2008;**19**:191-196.
- 24 Slama R, Kold-Jensen T, Scheike T, Ducot B, Spira A, Keiding N. How would a decline in  
25 sperm concentration over time influence the probability of pregnancy? *Epidemiology*  
26 2004;**15**:458-465.

- 1 Slama R, Ducot B, Carstensen L, Lorente C, de La Rochebrochard E, Leridon H, Keiding N,  
2 Bouyer J. Feasibility of the Current-Duration Approach to Studying Human Fecundity.  
3 *Epidemiology* 2006;**17**:440-449.
- 4 Slama R, Boutou O, Ducot B, Spira A. Reproductive life events in the population living in the  
5 vicinity of a nuclear waste reprocessing plant. *J Epidemiol Community Health*  
6 2008;**62**:513-521.
- 7 Slama R, Ducot B, Keiding N, Blondel B, Bouyer J. (Fecundity of couples in France). *Bulletin*  
8 *d'Epidémiologie Hebdomadaire* (in press).
- 9 Stephen EH, Chandra A. Declining estimates of infertility in the United States: 1982-2002.  
10 *Fertil Steril* 2006;**86**:516-523.
- 11 Swan SH, Elkin EP, Fenster L. The Question of Declining Sperm Density Revisited: An  
12 Analysis of 101 Studies Published 1934-1996. *Environ Health Perspect* 2000;**108**:961-  
13 966.
- 14 Tietze C. Fertility after discontinuation of intrauterine and oral contraception. *Int J Fertil*  
15 1968;**13**:385-389.
- 16 van Es B, Klaassen CAJ, Oudshoorn K. Survival analysis under cross-sectional sampling:  
17 length bias and multiplicative censoring. *J Stat Plan Infer* 2000;**91**:295-312.
- 18 Weinberg CR, Gladen BC. The beta-geometric distribution applied to comparative  
19 fecundability studies. *Biometrics* 1986;**42**:547-560.
- 20 Weinberg CR, Baird DD, Wilcox AJ. Sources of bias in studies of time to pregnancy. *Stat*  
21 *Med* 1994;**13**:671-681.
- 22 Wilcox AJ, Weinberg CR, O'Connor JF, Baird DD, Schlatterer JP, Canfield RE, Armstrong  
23 EG, Nisula BC. Incidence of early loss of pregnancy. *N Engl J Med* 1988;**319**:189-194.
- 24 Wise LA, Rothman KJ, Mikkelsen EM, Sorensen HT, Riis A, Hatch EE. An internet-based  
25 prospective study of body size and time-to-pregnancy. *Human reproduction*  
26 2010;**25**:253-264.
- 27 Yamaguchi K. Accelerated failure-time mover-stayer regression models for the analysis of  
28 last-episode data. *Sociological Methodology* 2003;**33**:81-110.

1 Zinaman MJ, Brown CC, Selevan SG, Clegg ED. Semen quality and human fertility: a  
2 prospective study with healthy couples. *J Androl* 2000;**21**:145-153.

3

4

## 1 TABLES

2 Table I: Characteristics of the women who replied to the eligibility questionnaire.

Characteristic	Whole population (n=15,810)		Current duration group			
	n	Weighted % <sup>a</sup>	Yes (n=867)		No (n=14,943)	
			n	Weighted % <sup>a</sup>	n	% <sup>a</sup>
Age at interview (years)						
18-24	2,756	22.8	53	9.4	2,703	23.5
25-29	2,601	17.1	193	25.0	2,408	16.7
30-34	3,048	19.2	254	30.4	2,794	18.6
35-39	3,836	20.5	222	21.0	3,614	20.4
40-44	3,569	20.5	145	14.2	3,424	20.8
Currently has a male partner						
Yes	12,178	66.9	867	100	11,311	65.1
No	3,632	33.1	0	0	3,632	34.9
Number of children						
0	5,420	38.7	360	42.3	5,060	38.5
1	3,016	20.4	281	32.9	2,735	19.7
2	4,693	24.8	159	15.2	4,534	25.3
3 and more	2,681	16.2	67	9.6	2,614	16.5
Current contraception						
Yes, systematically used	13,105	82.0	0	0	13,105	86.5
Yes, sporadically used	136	0.9	113	13.1	23	0.2
No method to avoid pregnancy <sup>b</sup>	2,150	14.3	754	86.9	1,396	10.4
Surgical sterilisation <sup>c</sup>	406	2.8	0	0	406	2.9
Do not know	13	0.1	0	0	13	0.1
Defined CDUI						
Yes	867	5.2	867	100	0	0
No	14,943	94.9	0	0	14,943	100
Planning to try to become pregnant <sup>d</sup>						
Yes, currently trying	859	5.5	655	75.6	204	1.5
Yes, will start within 1 or 2 months	27	0.1	3	0.3	24	0.1
Yes, in about 3 months	60	0.4	2	0.1	58	0.4
Yes, within 4-6 months	181	0.9	1	0.03	180	1.0
Yes, within 7-12 months	511	3.0	12	1.7	499	3.1
Yes, in more than a year	1,789	12.0	17	2.2	1,772	12.5
Yes, but not planned when	3,460	24.9	32	4.0	3,428	26.1
No	7,700	48.1	139	15.6	7,561	49.9
Does not know	57	0.4	6	0.5	51	0.4
Currently pregnant	751	4.8	0	0	751	5.0

3

4 CDUI: Current duration of unprotected intercourse.

5

5 <sup>a</sup> Percentages were corrected for possible selection bias and over-representation of urban compared to rural

6

6 areas.

7

7 <sup>b</sup> Including pregnant women.

8

8 <sup>c</sup> Surgical sterilisation corresponded to tubal ligation, vasectomy or hysterectomy.

9

9 <sup>d</sup> Women with surgical sterilisation have not been asked about pregnancy planning.

10

11

12

1 Table II: Characteristics of the 867 women with defined current duration of unprotected  
2 intercourse.

Characteristic	n	Weighted % <sup>a</sup>
Age at interview		
18-24 years	53	9.4
25-29 years	193	24.9
30-34 years	254	30.4
35-39 years	222	21.0
40-44 years	145	14.2
Age at start of period of unprotected intercourse		
18-24 years	101	16.2
25-29 years	263	32.7
30-34 years	293	30.1
35-39 years	175	17.6
40-44 years	35	3.3
Number of children		
0	360	42.3
1	281	32.9
2	159	15.2
3 and more	67	9.6
Frequency of sexual intercourse		
1-3 per month	165	18.0
1-2 per week	418	47.5
>2 per week	269	34.6
Duration of menstrual cycle		
<27 days	161	24.2
27-29 days	356	42.4
>29 days	273	33.5
Medical treatment for infertility since start of the PUI		
No	708	83.4
Yes	159	16.6
Started the PUI to obtain a pregnancy		
Yes	708	80.8
No	159	19.3
Currently trying to become pregnant		
Yes	655	75.6
No	212	24.4
Smoking at the start of the PUI		
No	580	62.0
Yes	279	38.0
Body mass index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )		
<18.5	78	10.9
18.5-19.9	132	12.9
20-22.4	248	25.4
22.5-24.9	163	20.0
25-29.9	151	18.8
≥ 30	82	12.0
Current duration of unprotected intercourse <sup>b</sup>		
<3 months	182	20.2
3-5.9 months	113	12.9
6-11.9 months	118	13.2
12-23.9 months	130	16.2
24-35.9 months	75	8.9
≥ 36 months	249	28.6

3 PUI: Period of Unprotected Intercourse

4 <sup>a</sup> Percentages were corrected for possible selection bias and over-representation of urban compared to rural  
5 areas by a reweighting approach. This explains why the variables relative to medical treatment and to whether  
6 couples started the PUI to obtain a pregnancy have different weighted percentages although the number of  
7 subjects in each "Yes" and "No" categories, and hence the unweighted percentages, are the same.


8 <sup>b</sup> The distribution of the current duration of unprotected intercourse declared by couples has no direct  
9 interpretation due to the length-biased sampling and should therefore not be interpreted as an estimate of the  
10 frequency of involuntary infertility (given in Figure II).

## 1 FIGURES

2


3 Figure I: Flow chart of study population.

4



5

Figure II: Estimation of the proportion of sexually active couples still without detected pregnancy and still not using contraception, as a function of the number of months elapsed since the start of the period of unprotected intercourse. The usual clinical definitions of infertility would correspond to the values at 12 and 24 months. **A)** Whole eligible population (n=867, and n=708 after restriction to non treated couples); **B)** nulliparous couples only (n=360 and n=277 after restriction to non treated couples).



The survival function corresponding to time until pregnancy or end of the period of unprotected intercourse without pregnancy is indicated by the black solid line (estimated from the whole population at risk of pregnancy at inclusion). The green curve is the same estimate, but recomputed after exclusion of couples who had begun treatment for infertility. Dotted curves indicate 95% confidence intervals.