

Differential effect of two hormonal contraceptives on the relative telomere length of youth with type 1 diabetes

Andrea Castro ¹, M. Cecilia Lardone ¹, Franco Giraudó ^{1,2}, Patricia López ^{1,2},
Eliana Ortiz ¹, Germán Iñiguez ¹, Fernando Cassorla ¹, Ethel Codner ¹

¹ Institute of Maternal and Child Research, School of Medicine, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile, Santiago 8360160, Chile.

² Hospital Clínico San Borja Arriarán, Servicio de Salud Metropolitano Central, Santiago, Chile, Santiago 8360160, Chile.

Supplementary Table

Supplementary Table. Clinical characteristics and laboratory measurements at follow-up

	After 12 months of contraceptive treatment						After 18 months of contraceptive treatment					
	Implant			COC			Implant			COC		
	T1D (n=19)	Control (n=19)	<i>P</i> value [#]	T1D (n=20)	Control (n=21)	<i>P</i> value [*]	T1D (n=17)	Control (n=15)	<i>P</i> value [#]	T1D (n=16)	Control (n=18)	<i>P</i> value [*]
Age, y	20.3 ± 3.0	20 ± 3.0	.759	20.6 ± 3.3	2.3 ± 2.9	.825	20.6 ± 3.0	19.9 ± 2.5	.597	22.2 ± 3.3	22.0 ± 3.2	.847
Weight, z score	.35 ± 1.1	.03 ± 1.1	.307	.57 ± .5	.31 ± .8	.199	.31 ± 1.0	-.04 ± 1.1	.355	.55 ± .6	.49 ± .9	.172
Height, z score	-.85 ± .9	.74 ± .8	0.872	-.55 ± .6	-.33 ± .5	.167	-.98 ± .9	-.73 ± .8	.610	-.51 ± .6	-.33 ± .5	.333
BMI, kg/m ²	25.6 ± 4.3	23.8 ± 4.0	.226	25.3 ± 2.4	23.8 ± 3.4	.116	25.4 ± 3.9	23.7 ± 3.7	.162	25.3 ± 2.7	25.0 ± 4.1	.810
BMI, z score	1.05 ± .9	.56 ± 1.2	.158	1.05 ± .6	.61 ± .87	.067	1.03 ± .8	.58 ± 1.0	.174	1.03 ± .7	.88 ± 1.01	.637
Body fat, %	3.2 ± 8.5	26.4 ± 9.4	.205	31.1 ± 4.4	29.5 ± 6.1	.367	3.1 ± 7.6	28 ± 7.3	.489	3.7 ± 5.5	32.0 ± 7.4	.570
HbA1c, %	7.8 ± 1.4	5.1 ± .3	< .001	7.8 ± 1.1	5.1 ± .4	< .001	7.7 ± 1.2	5.0 ± .2	< .001	7.8 ± 1.7	5.0 ± .2	< .001
Duration of diabetes, y	9.4 ± 3.6			1.5 ± 3.6			1.2 ± 3.4			11.3 ± 3.5		
Total daily insulin dose, UI/kg	.93 ± .4			.99 ± .4			.90 ± .3			.97 ± .4		
SBP, mmHg	118 ± 7	107 ± 12	.039	117 ± 11	111 ± 10	.046	115 ± 11	109 ± 9	.039	119 ± 13	109 ± 13	.049
DBP, mmHg	74 ± 8	63 ± 7	< .001	77 ± 7	70 ± 9	.012	73 ± 8	68 ± 7	< .001	80 ± 9	70 ± 9	.004
MAP, mmHg	90 ± 6.2	79 ± 9.2	< .001	90 ± 7.6	84 ± 7.5	.008	87 ± 8.3	81 ± 6.7	.042	93 ± 10	83 ± 9.1	.007
Total cholesterol, mmoles/L	154 ± 34	152 ± 33	.878	182 ± 35	180 ± 34	.774	162 ± 38	149 ± 20	.224	189 ± 35	173 ± 31	.593
LDL-cholesterol, mmo l/L	84 ± 28	86 ± 30	.879	89 ± 28	91 ± 32	.829	91 ± 37	79 ± 19	.343	93 ± 35	80 ± 24	.042
HDL-cholesterol, mmol /L	52 ± 15	47 ± 10	.290	71 ± 24	64 ± 16	.263	55 ± 13	49 ± 11	.180	69 ± 21	61 ± 15	.219
Triglycerides, mmol/L	91 ± 27	97 ± 38	.977	122 ± 82	131 ± 61	.291	86 ± 32	105 ± 61	.520	139 ± 154	161 ± 163	.178
hs-CRP, ng/mL	7.9 ± 7.1	2.0 ± 2.7	< .001	8.0 ± 6.9	3.5 ± 2.8	.035	5.9 ± 6.3	1.7 ± 2.2	.013	9.8 ± 9.7	8.1 ± 4.9	.829
Excessive weight, n (%)	10 (53)	4 (21)	.091	10 (50)	7 (33)	.350	8 (47)	4 (27)	.291	8 (50)	7 (39)	.730

Data represent mean ± standard deviation (SD). Comparison between T1D and Control group treated with COC (*) or Implant (#), calculated by Mann-Whitney or Student's t-test for continuous variables or Fisher's exact test for proportion of categorical variable. Excessive weight (patients with overweight or obesity).