

# **JRHS**

Journal of Research in Health Sciences

journal homepage: www.umsha.ac.ir/jrhs



# **Original Article**

# Risk Factors of Congenital Hypothyroidism Using Propensity Score: A Matched Case-Control Study

Shahab Rezaeian (MSc)<sup>a</sup>, Jalal Poorolajal (MD, PhD)<sup>b</sup>, Abbas Moghimbegi (PhD)<sup>b</sup>, and Nader Esmailnasab (PhD)<sup>c\*</sup>

- <sup>a</sup> Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran
- <sup>b</sup> Research Center for Modeling of Noncommunicable Diseases, Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran
- <sup>c</sup> Kurdistan Research Center for Social Determinants of Health, School of Medicine, Kurdistan University of Medical Sciences, Sanandaj, Iran

#### ARTICLE INFORMATION

#### Article history:

Received: 09 May 2013
Revised: 26 June 2013
Accepted: 30 June 2013
Available online: 10 July 2013

#### Keywords:

Congenital hypothyroidism Propensity score Logistic regression Case-control studies

\* Correspondence

Nader Esmailnasab (PhD)
Tel: +98 811 8380090
Fax: +98 811 8380509

E-mail: esmailnasab@yahoo.com

#### **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between congenital hypothyroidism and several variables using two different adjustment methods.

**Methods:** This matched case-control study was conducted in Hamadan Province, the west of Iran, in 2012 enrolling neonates born between 2005 and 2011 and covered by screening program for congenital hypothyroidism. The neonates with TSH titer more than 10 mU/l or T4 titer less than 6.4  $\mu$ g/dl were considered as cases. Each case was individually matched for birth place and year with four neonates with normal TSH and T4 titers as controls. The data were analyzed using two different approaches including propensity score and multiple conditional logistic regression model.

Results: Of 1313 enrolled neonates, 277 (159 girls) were cases and 1036 (531 girls) were controls. The most important prognostic factors which had significant effect on congenital hypothyroidism included twin, birth season, maturity, jaundice at birth, birth weight, age at pregnancy, maternal anemia and goiter, gestational age, delivery type, father's education and smoking status, and consanguinity. The associations reported by logistic regression were stronger that of than propensity score analysis in most items, although the differences were not statistically significant.

**Conclusions:** We addressed the effect of numerous potential risk factors on congenital hypothyroiditis and the impact of these factors on the disease occurrence. However, future prospective studies are needed to test these findings and hypothesis and to investigate the true effect of these potential risk factors on congenital hypothyroiditis.

Citation:

Rezaeian S, Poorolajal J, Moghimbegi A, Esmailnasab N. Risk Factors of Congenital Hypothyroidism Using Propensity Score: A Matched Case-Control Study. J Res Health Sci. 2013;13(2):151-156.

# Introduction

ongenital hypothyroidism, caused by thyroid hormone deficiency at birth, is a major preventable cause of mental retardation worldwide <sup>1</sup>. According to previous evidence, the incidence of this disorder is reported in Iran one per 1000 in Kerman Province <sup>2</sup>, 1.7 per 1000 in Gilan Province <sup>3</sup>, and 2.7 in Isfahan Province <sup>4</sup> while the global average of congenital hypothyroidism (CH) is estimated one per 3000 to 4000 live births <sup>1</sup>. After eradication iodine deficiency in Iran <sup>5</sup>, the pilot project for screening CH started in 2003 by the Ministry of Health and Medical Education and then was performed throughout the country in October 2005 <sup>6</sup>. The main goal of this screening program was early detection

and treatment of neonates with CH in order to prevent from severe complications of the disease such as mental retardation, cretinism, and neonatal mortality <sup>7-9</sup>.

Several studies have been conducted to investigate CH and its associated risk factors. Based on the current evidence, several individual and environmental factors have effect on CH such as gender, birth weight, race, age, consanguinity, parental education, type of labor, birth order, twin and drug usage during pregnancy <sup>10-13</sup>. However, the issue of confounding is key in epidemiologic inference and practice. When there are several potential risk factors and the question of interest is to assess the net relationship between CH and each variable separately, it

is necessary to investigate the association between one factor at a time and the outcome of interest while adjusting for all other variables.

There are several strategies to minimize the effect of confounding variables. The practice of matching is particularly common and useful in the context of case-control studies when trying to make cases and controls as similar as possible regarding the potential confounders. However, matching may be logistically difficult in certain situation, particularly when there are multiple variables <sup>14</sup>. Another alternative approach for controlling confounding variables is using regression techniques. Multiple regressions allow the examination of the effects of all exposure variables simultaneously adjusting for all the other variables in the model. However, the results may be unstable when the exposure variables are numerous and the sample size is limited.

Another alternative approach for minimizing the effect of confounding variables is regression models such as multiple logistic regression analysis. The third alternative adjustment approach is so called propensity score <sup>15</sup>. This method was suggested for the first time by Rosenbaum and Rubin in 1983 <sup>16</sup>. This method which has recently yielded increasing use in health related investigations <sup>17</sup> allows matching on several variables simultaneously using conditional probability.

The aim of this study was to investigate the net relationship between CH and several variables using and comparing two different adjustment approaches including propensity score versus multiple logistic regression model.

#### **Methods**

In 2005, a national screening program for early detection of CH was conducted by Iranian Ministry of Health and Medical Education (MOHME) throughout the country and has been in progress up to now. Most of the data used in this study was extracted from the database recorded the results of this screening program. This program is a part of the legal responsibility of MOHME which is necessary for evaluation of the common diseases, monitoring of the surveillance system and health policy, thus no written or verbal consent was taken from the participants for their information to be stored in the database or being used anonymously for research. Additional data was collected through interview with parents after explaining the objectives of the study for them. Since no intervention was carried out in this study, we just took parents' verbal informed consent to participate in this study and answer to our questions. The response rate of 87.5% documents the process. The local Human Subject Review Board of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences approved this consent procedure (No 4642).

This matched case-control study was conducted in Hamadan Province, the west of Iran, in 2012 enrolling all neonates born in this province between 2005 and 2011

covered by screening program for congenital hypothyroidism. The neonates who had incomplete medical records in the local health centers or had no accessible mailing address were excluded from the study. In the screening program, blood samples had already been taken from all neonates' heel in order to detect hypothyroidism in the early neonatal period. The neonatal TSH titer more than 10 mU/l or T4 titer less than 6.4  $\mu$ g/dl was considered as CH  $^{18}$ . The neonates with CH were considered as cases. For each case, four neonates with normal TSH and T4 titers were selected as controls with the same birth place and year as the related case. Accordingly, the cases were individually matched with the associated controls to the one to four for birth place and year.

However, because of large number of variables investigated in this study, we used propensity score to assess the net effect of each variable controlling the potential confounding effects of the other variables. Propensity score for each individual was defined as conditional probability of being in the relevant group (cases or controls) given the predictive variable being identified for that individual as follows <sup>16</sup>:

Propensity Score = pr  $(Z_i = 1|X_i=x_i)$ 

In this formula,  $Z_i = 1$  if the subject is a case and  $Z_i = 0$  if the individual is a control.  $X_i$  represents a vector of predictor variables in subject i for which the cases and controls were matched. Then, conditional logistic regression model was used to estimate the propensity score.

We investigated the effect of 19 potential risk factors on congenital hypothyroidism. The available data were extracted from the neonates' medical records using a checklist of items including demographic characteristics of the neonates such as sex, birth date and weight, jaundice, twin, birth place, birth order, and demographic characteristics of the parents such as educational level, age at pregnancy, type of delivery, mothers' occupation, and maternal anemia. Additional information was collected through interview with parents during home visit including consanguinity, maternal history of hypothyroiditis or goiter, and using medications during pregnancy such as levothyroxine, liothyronine, metimasol or carbimasol.

In order to control and minimize the effect of potential confounding factors, data were analyzed using two different adjustment approach including simple and multiple conditional logistic regression model and propensity score. All statistical analyses were performed at 0.05 significance levels using statistical software Stata 11 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

# **Results**

Out of 1313 neonates enrolled in this study, 277 (159 girls) were cases and 1036 (531 girls) were controls. For 72 cases, we found less than four matched controls. The response rate was 87.5%. The neonates' mean birth

weight was 2998.7 (±19.7) gr. The mothers' mean age in last pregnancy was 30.3 (±0.18) years. The distribution of several characteristics of cases and controls and their associations with CH are shown and compared in Table 1.

According to the univarite conditional logistic regression analysis, odds ratio (OR) estimate of CH was 1.71 in twins compared to singletons (P=0.004).

Table 1: Analysis of simple (unadjusted) and multiple (adjusted) conditional logistic regression as well as propensity score approach by the characteristics of the cases and controls (Pseudo  $R^2 = 0.4489$ )

Gender   Boy	118 1159 230 47 83 61 46 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	505 531 929 107 364 218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188	1.00 1.29 1.00 1.71 1.00 1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31 0.95	95% CI  0.98, 1.69  1.18, 2.47  0.86, 1.81 0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59  0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70 0.86, 2.01	- 0.065 - 0.004 - 0.244 0.344 0.001	1.00 1.15 1.00 1.31 1.00 1.28 0.86 2.45	95% CI  0.80, 1.66  0.78, 2.19  0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45 1.53, 3.94	- 0.434 - 0.302 - 0.352 0.561 <b>0.001</b>	1.00 1.20 1.00 1.49 1.00 1.33 0.95 2.26	95% CI  0.86, 1.68  0.92, 2.40  0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55 1.44, 3.54	0.283 - 0.106 - 0.234 0.828 0.001
Boy   1   Girl   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	159 230 47 83 61 446 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	531 929 107 364 218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188 929	1.29 1.00 1.71 1.00 1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.98, 1.69  1.18, 2.47  0.86, 1.81 0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59  0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.065 0.004 - 0.244 0.344 0.001	1.15 1.00 1.31 1.00 1.28 0.86 2.45	0.80, 1.66 - 0.78, 2.19 - 0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45	0.434 - 0.302 - 0.352 0.561	1.20 1.00 1.49 1.00 1.33 0.95	0.86, 1.68 0.92, 2.40 0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55	0.106 - 0.234 0.828
Girl 1 Twin No 2 Yes 2 Birth season Spring 8 Summer 6 Fall 4 Winter 8 Birth order 1st 5 2nd 5 3rd 4 4th 6 5th or more 4 Maturity Mature 2 Premature 6 Jaundice at birth No 1 Yes 1 Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 <2500 5 3500 1 8 Signal	159 230 47 83 61 446 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	531 929 107 364 218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188 929	1.29 1.00 1.71 1.00 1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.98, 1.69  1.18, 2.47  0.86, 1.81 0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59  0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.065 0.004 - 0.244 0.344 0.001	1.15 1.00 1.31 1.00 1.28 0.86 2.45	0.80, 1.66 - 0.78, 2.19 - 0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45	0.434 - 0.302 - 0.352 0.561	1.20 1.00 1.49 1.00 1.33 0.95	0.86, 1.68 0.92, 2.40 0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55	0.106 - 0.234 0.828
Twin  No 2 Yes  Birth season  Spring 8 Summer 6 Fall 4 Winter 8  Birth order  1st 5 2nd 5 3rd 4 4th 6 5th or more 4  Maturity  Mature 2 Premature 2 Premature 3  Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 <2500 8 >3500 1  42500 8 36-43 4  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job	230 47 83 61 46 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	929 107 364 218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188	1.00 1.71 1.00 1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	1.18, 2.47 0.86, 1.81 0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59 0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.004 - 0.244 0.344 0.001	1.00 1.31 1.00 1.28 0.86 2.45	0.78, 2.19 0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45	0.302 - 0.352 0.561	1.00 1.49 1.00 1.33 0.95	0.92, 2.40 0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55	0.106 - 0.234 0.828
No 2 Yes 2  Birth season Spring 8 Summer 6 Fall 4 Winter 8  Birth order 1st 5 2nd 5 3rd 4 4th 6 5th or more 2  Maturity Mature 2 Premature 6  Jaundice at birth No 1 Yes 1  Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 2500 3500  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job	47 83 61 46 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	107 364 218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188 929	1.71 1.00 1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.86, 1.81 0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59 0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.004 - 0.244 0.344 0.001	1.31 1.00 1.28 0.86 2.45	0.78, 2.19 - 0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45	0.302 - 0.352 0.561	1.49 1.00 1.33 0.95	0.92, 2.40 - 0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55	0.234 0.828
Yes       2         Birth season       Spring       8         Spring       8         Summer       6         Fall       4         Winter       8         Birth order       1         1st       5         2nd       5         3rd       4         4th       6         5th or more       4         Maturity       Mature       2         Premature       4         Jaundice at birth       No       1         Yes       1         Birth weight (gr)       2500-3500       1         <2500-3500	47 83 61 46 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	107 364 218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188 929	1.71 1.00 1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.86, 1.81 0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59 0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.004 - 0.244 0.344 0.001	1.31 1.00 1.28 0.86 2.45	0.78, 2.19 - 0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45	0.302 - 0.352 0.561	1.49 1.00 1.33 0.95	0.92, 2.40 - 0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55	0.234 0.828
Birth season  Spring Summer Fall Winter  Sirth order  1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th or more  Maturity Mature Premature Jaundice at birth No 1 Yes 1 Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 3500  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 36-43 Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic Non academic Maternal job	83 61 46 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	364 218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188	1.00 1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.86, 1.81 0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59 0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.244 0.344 <b>0.001</b>	1.00 1.28 0.86 2.45	0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45	0.352 0.561	1.00 1.33 0.95	0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55	0.234 0.828
Spring   Summer   Fall   2   Winter   Sirth order   1st   5   2nd   5   3rd   4th   6   5th or more   2   4th   6   5th or more   4   4   4   4   4   4   4   4   4	61 46 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188	1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59 0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.244 0.344 <b>0.001</b>	1.28 0.86 2.45	0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45	0.352 0.561	1.33 0.95	0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55	0.234 0.828
Summer Fall Winter  Birth order  1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th or more  Maturity Mature Premature Jaundice at birth No 1 Yes 1 Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 3500  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 36-43  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic Non academic Maternal job	61 46 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	218 244 210 214 248 180 206 188	1.25 0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59 0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.244 0.344 <b>0.001</b>	1.28 0.86 2.45	0.76, 2.15 0.51, 1.45	0.352 0.561	1.33 0.95	0.83, 2.14 0.58, 1.55	0.234 0.828
Fall Winter 8  Birth order  1st 5 2nd 5 3rd 4 4th 6 5th or more 4  Maturity Mature 2 Premature 6  Jaundice at birth No 1 Yes 1  Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 <2500 53500 5  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 42  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job	46 87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	244 210 214 248 180 206 188	0.83 1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.56, 1.23 1.29, 2.59 0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.344 <b>0.001</b>	0.86 2.45	0.51, 1.45	0.561	0.95	0.58, 1.55	0.828
Winter 8 Birth order  1st 2nd 5 3rd 4 4th 6 5th or more 4 Maturity Mature 2 Premature 6 Jaundice at birth No 1 Yes 1 Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 <2500 8 >3500 1 <2500 5 Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 4 Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2 Maternal job	87 56 58 49 68 46 213 64	210 214 248 180 206 188	1.83 1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	1.29, 2.59 - 0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	0.001	2.45				,	
Sirth order	56 58 49 68 46 213 64	214 248 180 206 188	1.00 0.90 1.08 1.31	0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70	-		1.53, 3.94	0.001	2.26	1.44, 3.54	0.001
1st 2nd 3 3rd 4 4th 6 5th or more 4  Maturity	58 49 68 46 213 64	248 180 206 188	0.90 1.08 1.31	0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70		1.00				,	
2nd 3rd 4 4th 6 5th or more 4  Maturity	58 49 68 46 213 64	248 180 206 188	0.90 1.08 1.31	0.59, 1.36 0.69, 1.70					1.00		
3rd 4th 6 5th or more 2  Maturity   Mature 2  Fremature 6  Jaundice at birth No 1  Yes 1  Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1  <2500 3500 8  >3500 8  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2  36-43 4  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job	49 68 46 213 64	180 206 188 929	1.08 1.31	0.69, 1.70		1.00 0.64	0.36, 1.15	0.138	1.00 0.77	0.46 1.20	0.320
4th 5th or more 4  Maturity	68 46 213 64	206 188 929	1.31		0.731	0.64	0.36, 1.13	0.138	0.77	0.46, 1.29 0.46, 1.37	0.320
5th or more  Maturity  Mature 2 Premature 2  Jaundice at birth  No 1 Yes 1  Birth weight (gr)  2500-3500 1 <2500 8 >3500 5  Maternal age (yr)  18-35 2 36-43 4  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job	46 213 64 127	188 929			0.731	1.03	0.57, 1.29	0.243	1.21	0.46, 1.57	0.403
Maturity         Mature         2           Premature         6           Jaundice at birth         No         1           Yes         1           Birth weight (gr)         2500-3500         1           <2500         5           Maternal age (yr)         18-35         2           36-43         2           Mathers' educational level         Academic         3           Non academic         2           Maternal job	213 64 127	929	0.93	0.60, 1.51	0.203	0.90	0.37, 1.89	0.932	1.02	0.73, 2.03	0.438
Mature         2           Premature         6           Jaundice at birth         No         1           Yes         1           Birth weight (gr)         2500-3500         1           <2500	64 127			0.00, 1.31	0.626	0.90	0.40, 1.74	0.736	1.02	0.38, 1.80	0.937
Premature  Jaundice at birth  No 1 Yes 1  Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 <2500 5 >3500 5  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 2  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job	64 127		1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	
Jaundice at birth  No 1 Yes 1  Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 <2500 8 >3500 5  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 2  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job	127	107	2.65	1.86, 3.77	0.001	3.56	2.10, 6.04	0.001	2.81	1.81, 4.37	0.001
No 1 Yes 1  Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 <2500 53500 5  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 44  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job		107	2.03	1.60, 3.77	0.001	3.30	2.10, 0.04	0.001	2.01	1.61, 4.57	0.001
Yes 1 Birth weight (gr) 2500-3500 1 <2500 8 >3500 5 Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 4 Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2 Maternal job		738	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	
Birth weight (gr)  2500-3500 1  <2500 8  >3500 5  Maternal age (yr)  18-35 2 36-43 4  Mathers' educational level  Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job	150	738 298	2.96	2.25, 3.91	0.001	3.47	2.38, 5.05	0.001	3.39	2.41, 4.78	0.001
2500-3500 1 <2500 8 >3500 5  Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 44  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic 2  Maternal job		430	2.90	4.43, 3.71	0.001	5.47	4.30, 3.03	0.001	5.37	2.41, 4.70	0.001
<2500	140	435	1.00		_	1.00	_	_	1.00		
>3500 S Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 Mathers' educational level Academic S Non academic 2 Maternal job	86	311	0.84	0.62, 1.15	0.276	0.96	0.63, 1.45	0.832	0.91	0.62, 1.34	0.640
Maternal age (yr) 18-35 2 36-43 4 Mathers' educational level Academic 3 Non academic 2 Maternal job	51	290	0.54	0.35, 0.73	0.270	0.51	0.31, 0.82	0.032	0.55	0.35, 0.85	0.040
18-35 2 36-43 4 Mathers' educational level Academic 3 Non academic 2 Maternal job	31	290	0.51	0.55, 0.75	0.001	0.51	0.31, 0.62	0.000	0.55	0.55, 0.65	0.007
36-43  Mathers' educational level Academic Non academic  Maternal job	228	758	1.00		_	1.00	_	_	1.00		
Mathers' educational level Academic 3 Non academic 2 Maternal job	49	278	0.60	0.43, 0.84	0.003	0.54	0.34, 0.84	0.007	0.61	0.40, 0.92	0.019
Academic 3 Non academic 2 Maternal job		276	0.00	0.43, 0.64	0.003	0.54	0.54, 0.64	0.007	0.01	0.40, 0.92	0.019
Non academic 2 Maternal job	35	147	1.00		_	1.00	_	_	1.00		
Maternal job	242	889	1.13	0.76, 1.67	0.537	1.29	0.56, 2.98	0.549	1.14	0.70, 1.87	0.589
	L-T-L	00)	1.13	0.70, 1.07	0.557	1.2)	0.30, 2.70	0.547	1.17	0.70, 1.07	0.507
	243	913	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	-	1.00	_	_
	34	123	1.04	0.70, 1.56	0.833	1.10	0.46, 2.64	0.828	0.89	0.54. 1.49	0.675
Maternal anemia	54	123	1.04	0.70, 1.50	0.033	1.10	0.40, 2.04	0.020	0.07	0.54. 1.47	0.075
	211	900	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	-	1.00	_	_
	66	136	2.07	1.48, 2.89	0.001	2.28	1.43, 3.65	0.001	2.11	1.37, 3.25	0.001
Maternal smoking	00	130	2.07	1.10, 2.0)	0.001	2.20	1.13, 5.05	0.001	2.11	1.57, 5.25	0.001
	274	1021	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_
	3	8	1.38	0.37, 5.22	0.634	1.21	0.22, 6.86	0.822	1.00	0.22, 4.50	0.997
Maternal goiter history	J	Ü	1.00	0.07, 0.22	0.00	1.21	0.22, 0.00	0.022	1.00	0.22,	0.,,,
	219	940	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_
	58	96	2.74	1.90, 3.97	0.001	3.46	2.06, 5.83	0.001	3.05	1.91, 4.88	0.001
Father's educational level					****			*****		-1.7 -,	
	46	287	1.00	_	_	1.00	-	_	1.00	_	_
	231	749	1.91	1.36, 2.70	0.001	1.72	1.09, 2.70	0.019	1.69	1.11, 2.56	0.014
Father's smoking	-01		1.,1	1.00, 2.70	0.001	11,72	1.05, 2.70	0.025	1.07	1111, 2100	0.01.
_	209	878	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_
	68	158	1.85	1.33, 2.58	0.001	1.71	1.08, 2.69	0.022	1.54	1.01, 2.34	0.043
Gestational age (week)				-100, =100	0.001		,	0.022			0.0.0
0 ,	118	578	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	-	1.00	_	-
	64	107	2.94	2.02, 4.28	0.001	ND	ND	ND	1.24	0.80, 2.00	0.317
	95	351	1.31	0.96, 1.77	0.086	1.15	0.78, 1.71	0.477	1.21	0.83, 1.77	0.324
Delivery type				*** **, *** **			,			,	
2 2 I	65	567	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_
	145	381	3.42	2.46, 4.76	0.001	3.15	2.09, 4.76	0.001	2.85	1.97, 4.14	0.001
~ .	67	88	6.97	4.54, 10.72	0.001	7.44	4.19, 13.20	0.001	6.28	3.82, 10.34	0.001
Consanguinity			0.71	, 10.72	J.JUI	,	, 13.20	J.JUI	0.20	5.0 <b>2</b> , 10.5 r	0.001
	110	760	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_
	57	179	2.33	1.61, 3.38	0.001	2.25	1.40, 3.60	0.001	1.91	1.25, 2.90	0.003
	110	97	7.99	5.58, 11.45	0.001	7.95	4.97, 12.70	0.001	6.30	4.17, 9.49	0.003
Drug usage during pregnar		)1	1.77	J.JO, 11.4J	0.001	1.73	7.71, 12.70	0.001	0.50	7.11, J. <del>4</del> 3	0.001
0 0 01 0	11 <b>cy</b> 239	890	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_	1.00	_	_
	38	146	0.95	0.62, 1.44	0.800	0.96	0.53, 1.76	0.917	1.08	0.66, 1.76	0.755

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Adjusted for all variables shown in the table; ND: No data

The neonates who were born in winter were significantly at higher risk of CH compared to those neonates born in spring (P=0.001), however, there was no association between other seasons and congenital hypothyroidism. The OR estimate CH was 2.65 in premature neonates compared to mature ones (P=0.001). The OR estimate of CH among neonates with jaundice at birth was 2.96 compared to those neonates without jaundice (P=0.001). There was no significant difference between the occurrence of CH among normal and low birth weight neonates. However, neonates with birth weight greater than 3500 gr had lower risk of CH compared to neonates with normal weight. The neonates who were born to mothers older than 35 years (P=0.003), or mother who had anemia (P=0.001) or goiter (P=0.001) during pregnancy or mothers with gestational age less than 37 or greater than 40 weeks were significantly at higher risk of congenital hypothyroidism. Furthermore, neonates who had smoking father had great risk of CH compared to those neonates whose fathers were nonsmokers (P=0.001). The chance of CH was higher among neonates with low educated fathers compared to those neonates with high educated fathers. Both emergency and elective cesarean sections increased significantly the risk of CH compared to vaginal delivery (P=0.001). In addition, the risk of CH was higher among neonates whose parents were married with second or third degree relatives (P=0.001). There was no statistically significant association between gender, birth order, mothers' educational level and occupation, maternal smoking, and using medications during pregnancy. Almost the same results were seen in multiple conditional logistic regression and propensity score analyses.

# **Discussion**

We assessed the effect of 19 different potential risk factors on CH. When there are several risk factors affecting the outcome of interest, each variable may confound the effect of other variables. The term confounding refers to a situation in which a non-causal association between a given exposure and an outcome is observed as a result of the influence of the a third variable. A number of statistical techniques have been suggested to control confounding. The basic idea underlying adjustment is to use a statistical model in order to estimate what the association between the exposure and the outcome would be, given a constant value or level of the suspected confounding variables <sup>19</sup>. For this purpose, we used and compared two different statistical models for adjustment including multiple logistic regression and propensity score analyses. We assessed the effect of several potential risk factors of CH simultaneously using the two statistical methods to adjust for underlying confounding effect of other variables. The statistical power of logistic regression was higher for some associations and that of propensity score was higher for some others. However, the overall statistical power of the two methods was nearly the same and the results of the both methods were almost similar with no statistically significant difference.

Several studies have investigated different prognostic factors of congenital hypothyroidism. According to our findings, girls were at higher risk of CH than boys although the association was not statistically significant. Previous studies showed an association between gender and CH. Albert et al. 20 conducted a case control study on 1,053,457 live births in New Zealand in order to investigate the etiology of increasing incidence of CH. They reported that 86% of cases had ascintiscan, 67% of which had thyroid dysgenesis with a female to male ratio of 5.0:1.0. Hinton et al. 11 analyzed US data from 1991 to 2000 and showed that race, ethnicity, sex, and pregnancy outcomes have an effect on the incidence rate of CH, although there have been some inconsistencies and regional differences. The risk of CH was higher among twins. This finding was confirmed by previous similar studies <sup>12,21</sup>. Oliver et al. reported the incidence rate of CH 3.2 per 10,000 in singletons and 10.1 per 10,000 among twins <sup>22</sup>.

Our findings showed a significant association between birth season and CH so that neonates born in winter were at higher risk of hypothyroidism compared to those born in spring. However, the results of previous literature were inconsistent regarding seasonal relationship. Rocchi et al. <sup>23</sup> reported no seasonal effect in Italy while Gu et al. <sup>24</sup> in Japan indicated that temperature and season had significant effect on congenital hypothyroidism. Ordookhani et al. <sup>25</sup> reported a significant correlation between winter and congenital hypothyroidism. One reason that may be attributed to this controversy may be the number of covariates assessed by different studies and the statistical methods of adjustment they used for analysis. Another reason is the environmental and genetic factors that may have affected the results.

According to our findings, gestational age less than 37 or more than 40 weeks increased the risk of congenital hypothyroidism. In other words, there was a U-shape correlation between gestational age and congenital hypothyroidism. Such a finding was reported by previous studies. Medda et al. <sup>12</sup> conducted a population-based case-control study and performed a multivariate conditional logistic regression and indicated that short (<37 weeks) and advanced (>40 weeks) gestational ages were significantly associated congenital hypothyroidism. In addition, Mao et al. <sup>26</sup>screened 387,926 infants and concluded that prevalence of CH is associated with gestational age.

Cigarette smoking by parents can increase the risk of congenital hypothyroidism. The association was statistically significant for smoking fathers but non-significant for smoking mothers due to sparse data. There were only 11 mothers who were smokers three of which had children with congenital hypothyroidism. Since the sample size for this subgroup was small, the association did not become statistically significant. Previous literatures re-

ported that risk of CH was higher among neonates whose parents were smokers <sup>12,22</sup>.

The risk of CH was higher among both low educated mothers and fathers. The results of previous literatures were inconsistent. Medda et al. 12 showed no relationship between parents' educational level and CH while Connelly et al. 27 reported an inverse relationship between mothers' educational level and congenital hypothyroidism.

Both emergency and elective cesarean sections increased the risk of congenital hypothyroidism. McElduff et al. <sup>28</sup> investigated to determine whether neonates delivered by cesarean section have higher risk of CH than neonates delivered vaginally. They assessed 2031 infants and concluded that TSH levels was greater among babies

Like any match case-control study, an important limitation of this study was finding control subjects with the same birth place and year as that of the cases. For 72 out of 277 cases, we found less than four matched controls. However, this study had a number strengths and implications. First, effect of several risk factors were investigated simultaneously using two different adjustment methods including multiple logistic regression and propensity score to control for confounding and to obtain net effect of each variable. These statistical approaches reduced the possibility of confounding and made the results more reliable. Furthermore, Pseudo R-squared was 0.4489. That means the proportion of the total variability of the outcome that is accounted for by the variables in the model. Accordingly, the model could predict the predisposing factors effecting CH very well. These results may be useful for preventive screening programs and can be used for high-risk populations.

# **Conclusion**

We addressed the effect of numerous potential risk factors on congenital hypothyroiditis and the impact of these factors on the disease occurrence. However, future prospective studies are needed to test these findings and hypothesis and to investigate the true effect of these potential risk factors on congenital hypothyroiditis. Furthermore, most of these factors are preventable or at least modifiable and should be focus of special attention by the policymakers who plan preventive screening programs in order to detect and manage high-risk populations.

# **Acknowledgments**

This article was a part of MSc thesis in Epidemiology. We would like to thank Vic-Chancellor of Education and Vic-Chancellor of Research and Technology of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences for approving this study.

# **Conflict of interest statement**

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

# **Funding**

This study was funded by the Vic-Chancellor of Research and Technology of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences.

# References

- 1. Beardsall K, Ogilvy Stuart AL. Congenital hypothyroidism. Current Paediatrics. 2004;14(5):422-429.
- 2. Eftekhari N, Asadikaram Gh, Khaksari M, Salari Z, Ebrahimzadeh M. The prevalence rate of Congenital hypothyroidism in Kerman, Iran in 2005-2007. Journal of Kerman University of Medical Sciences. 2008;15(3):243-
- 3. Mohtasham AZ, Mousavi SM, Hosein Zadeh M. Newborn screening for congenital hypothyroidism in Rasht, North of Iran, 2007. Early Human Development. 2008;84(1):S122.
- 4. Hashemipour M, Amini M, Iranpour R, Sadri GH, Javaheri N, Haghighi S, et al. Prevalence of congenital hypothyroidism in Isfahan, Iran: results of a survey on 20,000 neonates. Horm Res. 2004;62(2):79-83.
- 5. Azizi F, Sheikholeslam R, Hedayati M, Mirmiran P, Malekafzali H, Kimiagar M, et al. Sustainable control of iodinedeficiency in Iran: beneficial results of the implementation of the mandatory law on salt iodization. J Endocrinol Invest. 2002;25(5):409-413.
- 6. Delavari A, Yar Ahmadi S, Mahdavi A. The physician and congenital hypothyroidism. Tehran: CDC; 2007.
- 7. Boileau P, Bain P, Rives S, Toublanc JE. Earlier onset of treatment or increment in LT4 dose in screened congenital hypothyroidism: which as the more important factor for IQ at 7 years? *Horm Res* 2004;61(5):228-233.
- 8. Rastogi MV, LaFranchi SH. Congenital hypothyroidism. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2010;5:17.
- 9. Zimmermann MB, Jooste PL, Pandav CS. Iodinedeficiency disorders. Lancet. 2008;372(9645):1251-1262.
- 10. Deladoëy J, Bélanger N, Van Vliet G. Random variability in congenital hypothyroidism from thyroid dysgenesis over 16 years in Québec. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2007;92(8):3158-3161.
- 11. Hinton CF, Harris KB, Borgfeld L, Drummond-Borg M, Eaton R, Lorey F, et al. Trends in incidence rates of congenital hypothyroidism related to select demographic factors: data from the United States, California, Massachusetts, New York, and Texas. Pediatrics. 2010;125 Suppl 2:S37-47.
- 12. Medda E, Olivieri A, Stazi MA, Grandolfo ME, Fazzini C, Baserga M, et al. Risk factors for congenital hypothyroidism: results of a population case-control study (1997-2003). Eur J Endocrinol. 2005;153(6):765-773.
- 13. Pearce MS, Korada M, Day J, Turner S, Allison D, Kibirige M, et al. Increasing incidence, but lack of seasonality, of elevated TSH levels, on newborn screening, in the North of England. J Thyroid Res. 2010;2010:1019485.
- 14. Szklo M, Nieto FF. Epidemiology beyond the basics. 2nd ed. Massachusetts: Jones and Bartlett Publishers; 2007.

- **15.** D'Agostino RB. Tutorial in biostatistics: propensity score methods for bias reduction in the comparison of a treatment to a non-randomized control group. *Stat Med.* 1998:17:2265-2281.
- **16.** Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*. 1983;70(1):1-55.
- **17.** Stürmer T, Joshi M, Glynn RJ, Avorn J, Rothman KJ, Schneeweiss S. A review of the application of propensity score methods yelded increasing use, advantages in specific savings, but not substantially different estimates compared with conventional multivariable methods. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2006;59(5):437-447.
- **18.** Delavari A, Yar Ahmadi S, Ordookhani A, Noroozi Nejad A, Mahdavi A, Safaie A, et al. *National neonatal screening: national congenital hypothyroidism screening program and transient TSH rising in neonates.* Tehran: Ministry of Health and Medical Education; 2005 [Persian].
- **19.** Szklo M, Nieto FJ. *Epidemiology, beyond the basics*. Sudbury: Jones and Bartlett Publishers; 2007.
- **20.** Albert BB, Cutfield WS, Webster D, Carll J, Derraik JG, Jefferies C, et al. Etiology of increasing incidence of congenital hypothyroidism in New Zealand from 1993-2010. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2012;97(9):3155-3160.
- **21.** Karamizadeh Z, Dalili S, Sanei-far H, Karamifard H, Mohammadi H, Amirhakimi G. Does Congenital Hypothyroidism Have Different Etiologies in Iran? *Iran J Pediatr.* 2011;21(2):188-192.

- **22.** Olivieri A, Medda E, De Angelis S, Valensise H, De Felice M, Fazzini C, et al. High risk of congenital hypothyroidism in multiple pregnancies. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2007;92(8):3141-3147.
- **23.** Rocchi MB, Perlini C, Ciatti R, Burroni M. Is the birthdate a risk factor for congenital hypothyroidism? A statistical answer based on personal experience. *Minerva Pediatr*. 2001;53(6):531-536.
- **24.** Gu YH, Kato T, Harada S, Inomata H, Saito T, Aoki K. Seasonality in the incidence of congenital hypothyroidism in Japan: gender-specific patterns and correlation with temperature. *Thyroid.* 2007;17(9):869-874.
- **25.** Ordookhani A, Padyab M, Goldasteh A, Mirmiran P, Richter J, Azizi F. Seasonal variation of neonatal transient hyperthyrotropinemia in Tehran province,1998-2005. *Chronobiol Int.* 2010;27(9-10):1854-1869.
- **26.** Mao HQ, Yang RL, Liu ZH. Correlation of congenital hypothyroidism with birth weight and gestational age in newborn infants. *Zhejiang Da Xue Xue Bao Yi Xue Ban*. 2007;36(4):378-381.
- 27. Connelly JF, Rickards AL, Coakley JC, Price GJ, Francis I, Mathur KS, et al. Newborn screening for congenital hypothyroidism, Victoria, Australia, 1977-1997. Part 2: Treatment, progress and outcome. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab.* 2001;14(9):1611-1634.
- **28.** McElduff A, McElduff P, Wiley V, Wilcken B. Neonatal thyrotropin as measured in a congenital hypothyroidism screening program: influence of the mode of delivery. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2005;90(12):6361-6363.