

Weight change and ovarian steroid profiles in young women

Judith Flynn Chapman, Ph.D.,^a Matthew H. McIntyre, Ph.D.,^b Susan F. Lipson, Ph.D.,^a and Peter T. Ellison, Ph.D.^a

^a Department of Anthropology, Harvard University Peabody Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts; and ^b Department of Anthropology and College of Medicine, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida

Objective: To investigate possible short-term effects of voluntary weight loss on ovarian steroid profiles in young women, in light of better established long-term effects in older women.

Design: We tested for an association of voluntary weight change over the course of a menstrual cycle with salivary E₂ and P profiles in the same menstrual cycle.

Setting: Students were recruited in a college residence hall, and they provided daily saliva samples to a researcher living nearby.

Patient(s): The 65 women who participated were all college students and ranged in age between 18 and 23 years.

Intervention(s): None.

Main Outcome Measure(s): Weight was assessed in the first week of the menstrual cycle and first week of the following menstrual cycle. Estradiol and P were measured by radioimmunoassay in daily saliva samples.

Result(s): We did not detect a suppressive effect of weight loss on the overall level of either hormone. However, we did find evidence for more distinct follicular and luteal E₂ peaks in women who gained weight. Peak luteal P also arrived about 2 days earlier in women who gained weight.

Conclusion(s): This finding adds to evidence that short-term response of ovarian function to weight loss in young women is less pronounced than long-term response in older women. (Fertil Steril® 2008; ■: ■–■. ©2008 by American Society for Reproductive Medicine.)

Key Words: Energy balance, weight change, estradiol, progesterone

Substantial evidence shows that extended periods of moderate negative energy balance and elevated physical activity can suppress ovarian steroid output in later menstrual cycles (1–3). Effects of energy balance on ovarian function in premenopausal women are important both for understanding the evolution of the female reproductive system (4) and potentially for the prevention of estrogen-dependent diseases that have been linked to Western lifestyles, especially endometrial (5) and breast (6) cancers.

In addition to more established effects of long-term energetic stress, some research has also found that moderate voluntary weight loss in mature women (25–40 years old) can immediately suppress concurrent luteal P production

(7). We investigated effects of voluntary weight loss or gain during a single menstrual cycle on profiles of E₂ and P in the same cycle of younger women.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants and Measures

Sixty-five female college students participated in a study designed to test the effects of energy balance and psychologic stress on ovarian function. We focused only on the effects of energy balance as indicated by weight change. Their ages ranged from 18 to 23 years (median 20 years). None of the women had used oral contraceptives, and all reported having regular menstrual cycles before enrollment in the study. Although we cannot exclude the possibility of early pregnancy loss, all reported not having been pregnant about 6 months after the end of the menstrual cycle under study. The project was approved by Harvard University's Institutional Review Board.

Subjects were asked to collect saliva samples upon waking, for one complete menstrual cycle. Samples were collected directly into tubes pretreated with sodium azide, a preservative, and were stored at room temperature until being returned to the laboratory (8–10). We assayed E₂

Received November 15, 2007; revised and accepted December 31, 2007.


J.F.C. has nothing to disclose. M.H.M. has nothing to disclose. S.F.L. has nothing to disclose. P.T.E. has nothing to disclose.

Supported by the Wenner-Gren Anthropological Association, the Woodrow Wilson-Johnson & Johnson Women's Health Dissertation Awards, and an NSF Dissertation Improvement Award.

Reprint requests: Matthew McIntyre, Ph.D., S.M., Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology and College of Medicine, University of Central Florida, 309 Howard Phillips Hall, 4000 Central Florida Blvd., Orlando, Florida, 32816 (E-mail: mmcintyr@mail.ucf.edu).

FIGURE 1

Weight change and salivary E₂ concentrations over the course of a menstrual cycle: predicted values and 95% confidence intervals from a fourth-order polynomial model.



Chapman. Weight change and ovarian function. *Fertil Steril* 2008.

only in samples collected over the last 20 days of the menstrual cycle, to ensure the presence of detectable levels. For the same reason, we also assayed P in samples collected only over the last 14 days of the cycle. Of 1,300 anticipated samples for assay of E₂, 148 (11.4%) were missing. Of 910 samples anticipated for assay of P, 111 (12.2%) were missing. One sample was excluded because its color suggested contamination. The remaining missing samples were either not collected by participants or not returned to researchers. There was no evidence that missing data were biased relative to reverse cycle day ($\chi^2_{19 \text{ df}} = 24.2$; $P=.19$) or cycle phase ($\chi^2_{1 \text{ df}} = 1.76$; $P=.18$).

Saliva samples were assayed for E₂ and P using previously described methods (11). Each saliva sample and standard was run in duplicate. The empirical sensitivity limits were 4 pmol/L for E₂ and 13 pmol/L for P. For estradiol, interassay coefficients of variation were 16% for high-hormone-concentration pooled saliva control samples, 22% for low-hormone-concentration pooled saliva control samples, and 17% and 11% for the two manufacturer-supplied control samples (diluted 1:3). The intra-assay coefficient of variation was 10%. For P, interassay coefficients of variation were 14% for high pools, 33% for low pools, and 23% and 8% for the two manufacturer-supplied controls (diluted 1:25 and 1:50). The intra-assay coefficient of variation was 9%.

Women were weighed to the nearest 0.1 kg using a single electronic scale (Tanita BF-350). Weights were recorded at the start of the menstrual cycle under study and again within 1 week after the next menses. Weight change was taken as the difference between the two measurements. Other measurements, including waist and hip circumference and height, were

also taken before and after the menstrual cycle under study, and ages were reported in a questionnaire.


Statistical Methods

We used weight change as both a continuous variable and, at the suggestion of an anonymous reviewer, in three categories: weight loss greater than 0.5 kg, weight gain greater than 0.5 kg, and no change greater than 0.5 kg. We used analysis of variance to test for differences in average E₂ and P levels and for differences in other factors among the three weight-change groups.

To further evaluate associations of weight change with E₂ and P profiles, we used linear mixed modeling. This technique allows for comparison of outcomes that vary over time, such as hormone levels. We used logged values of E₂ and P, because the distribution of each was right skewed. However, for the sake of clarity, we returned predicted values and standard errors from the log scale for display in Figures 1 and 2. To achieve smooth profiles, we modeled the effect of reverse cycle day on steroid hormone levels using polynomial terms as predictor variables: for E₂, reverse cycle day (d), d^2 , d^3 , d^4 ; for progesterone, reverse cycle day (d), d^2 , d^3 . We used four polynomial terms for E₂, to capture the expected 2-peak profile, and three polynomial terms for P. We modeled effects of weight change as a main effect plus interaction terms with reverse cycle day and powers of reverse cycle day. This approach allows weight change to be associated with complex differences in hormone profiles. The overall significance of differences in the pattern and level of hormone profiles can be tested with a likelihood ratio test. A significant likelihood ratio test in this context indicates that the overall hormone profile varies by weight-change status.

FIGURE 2

Weight change and salivary P concentrations during the luteal phase: predicted values and 95% confidence intervals from a third-order polynomial model.



Chapman. Weight change and ovarian function. *Fertil Steril* 2008.

Potential confounding factors were included as continuous covariates in the linear mixed models described above in the same way as weight change (i.e., main effect plus interactions with powers of reverse cycle day). We determined confounding if significant likelihood ratio tests became nonsignificant after the inclusion of the potential confounder.

RESULTS

Weight change ranged from a loss of 2.1 kg to a gain of 4.3 kg (median -0.1 kg). Of 65 women, 22 lost more than 0.5 kg, 25 maintained constant weight, and 18 gained more than 0.5 kg.

Table 1 compares women in each category of weight change. Significant differences were observed only for hip and waist circumference, which were larger at the start of the cycle among women who gained weight over the course of the cycle. Contrary to our predictions, we did not detect significant differences in average levels of either E_2 or P. However, the power to detect differences, assessed post hoc, was more limited than expected. Even to detect one standard deviation of difference, which in this study would reflect greater than 50% difference in average E_2 or P levels, post hoc power was less than 0.9.

TABLE 1

Differences among young women by category of weight change.

	Lost weight (n = 22)		No weight change (n = 25)		Gained weight (n = 18)		ANOVA statistics	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	P
Age (yrs)	19.5	1.1	19.8	1.1	19.4	0.9	1.1	.33
Height (cm)	167.1	8.0	163.8	5.5	165.8	6.1	1.5	.24
Body mass index	22.2	3.5	21.9	3.4	23.6	3.4	1.4	.25
Hip circumference (cm)	99.7	9.5	97.0	6.2	106.9	17.8	3.9	.03
Waist circumference (cm)	72.0	8.7	70.3	7.4	77.6	12.0	3.2	.05
Average E_2 (pmol/L)	13.9	6.7	14.8	8.7	13.8	8.7	0.1	.90
Average P (pmol/L)	158.7	101.9	162.0	87.9	140.3	68.1	0.7	.49
Cycle length (days)	29.3	4.6	30.6	5.3	31.2	5.6	1.1	.35

Note: ANOVA = analysis of variance.

Chapman. Weight change and ovarian function. *Fertil Steril* 2008.

However, weight change did predict significant differences in estradiol profile among these three categories (global test: $P < .01$) but did not reach significance when considering weight change as a linear predictor (global test: $P = .08$). There was also a significant interaction with the term for reverse cycle day to the fourth power, d^4 (linear effect: $P < .01$; trichotomous effect: $P < .01$), indicating more distinct follicular and luteal E_2 peaks among women who gained weight, as can be seen in Figure 1.

We also detected significant overall differences in P profile (linear effect: $P < .01$; trichotomous effect: $P < .01$), as shown in Figure 2. In particular, the first order interaction between weight change and reverse cycle day was significant, indicating that peak P occurred about 2 days later in the cycle among women who lost weight compared with women who gained weight. The associations described above remained statistically significant after controlling for potential confounding factors, including age, height, body mass index, hip and waist circumference, and cycle length.

DISCUSSION

Contrary to our expectation, there was no significant association of weight change with average levels of either E_2 or P. Although our findings did not fully accord with our expectations based on earlier findings, there were some similarities. In particular, we note that, comparing profiles rather than absolute levels, women who gained weight had higher P levels early in the luteal phase, whereas women who lost weight had higher P later in the luteal phase.

Lager and Ellison (7) noted depression in levels of early luteal P in cycles during which women lost weight, relative to cycles in which the same women gained weight. Comparing cycles within women may have given Lager and Ellison (7) greater power to detect effects of weight loss than we enjoyed in this study. By comparing cycles in different women, we included error due to differences in baseline hormone levels. Comparing cycles within women also reduces concerns about spurious associations due to between-person confounding, because women are being compared with themselves. Instead, we attempted to identify confounding factors statistically, which is less preferred.

The tendency among women who gained weight to show a salivary E_2 profile with a distinct follicular peak may suggest higher fecundity. A rapid increase in mid-late follicular salivary E_2 has been associated with higher probability of

conception (12). Again, comparisons across, rather than within, women may have limited our ability to detect expected effects on mean E_2 level.

A final possible explanation for the differences between our results and those of previous studies, especially Lager and Ellison (7), is that the women participating in this study were between 18 and 23 years old. Lager and Ellison (7) studied cycles in women with a mean age of about 29 years. Young women appear to have relatively depressed P profiles (13) and may be less, rather than more, susceptible to subtle effects of negative energy balance than older women with robust menstrual cycles.

REFERENCES

1. Ellison PT, Peacock NR, Lager C. Salivary progesterone and luteal function in 2 low-fertility populations of northeast Zaire. *Hum Biol* 1986;58:473–83.
2. Jasienska G, Ellison PT. Energetic factors and seasonal changes in ovarian function in women from rural Poland. *Am J Hum Biol* 2004;16:563–80.
3. Jasienska G, Ziolkiewicz A, Thune I, Lipson SF, Ellison PT. Habitual physical activity and estradiol levels in women of reproductive age. *Eur J Cancer Prev* 2006;15:439–45.
4. Ellison PT. Energetics and reproductive effort. *Am J Hum Biol* 2003;15:342–51.
5. Kaaks R, Lukanova A, Kurzer MS. Obesity, endogenous hormones, and endometrial cancer risk: a synthetic review. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2002;11:1531–43.
6. Eliassen AH, Missmer SA, Tworoger SS, Spiegelman D, Barbieri RL, Dowsett M, et al. Endogenous steroid hormone concentrations and risk of breast cancer among premenopausal women. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006;98:1406–15.
7. Lager C, Ellison PT. Effect of moderate weight-loss on ovarian-function assessed by salivary progesterone measurements. *Am J Hum Biol* 1990;2:303–12.
8. Ellison PT, Lipson SF. Salivary estradiol—a viable alternative? *Fertil Steril* 1999;72:951–2.
9. Lipson SF, Ellison PT. Development of protocols for the application of salivary steroid analyses to field conditions. *Am J Hum Biol* 1989;71:863–8.
10. Lu YC, Bentley GR, Gann PH, Hodges KR, Chatterton RT. Salivary estradiol and progesterone levels in conception and nonconception cycles in women: evaluation of a new assay for salivary estradiol. *Fertil Steril* 1999;71:863–8.
11. Jasienska G, Ziolkiewicz A, Ellison PT, Lipson SF, Thune I. Large breasts and narrow waists indicate high reproductive potential in women. *Proc Biol Sci* 2004;271:1213–7.
12. Lipson SF, Ellison PT. Comparison of salivary steroid profiles in naturally occurring conception and nonconception cycles. *Hum Reprod* 1996;11:2090–6.
13. Ellison PT, Lager C, Calfee J. Low profiles of salivary progesterone among college undergraduate women. *J Adolesc Health* 1987;8:204–7.