

# Higher offspring survival among Tibetan women with high oxygen saturation genotypes residing at 4,000 m

Cynthia M. Beall\*†, Kijoung Song‡, Robert C. Elston§, and Melvyn C. Goldstein\*

\*Department of Anthropology, Case Western Reserve University, 238 Mather Memorial Building, 11220 Bellflower Road, Cleveland, OH 44106;

†GlaxoSmithKline, Collegeville, PA 19426; and §Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Case Western Reserve University, Wolstein Research Building, 10900 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44109

Contributed by Cynthia M. Beall, August 13, 2004

## objectifs

**Here we test the hypothesis that high-altitude native resident Tibetan women with genotypes for high oxygen saturation of hemoglobin, and thus less physiological hypoxic stress, have higher Darwinian fitness than women with low oxygen saturation genotypes.**

## méthodes

**Oxygen saturation and genealogical data were collected from residents of 905 households in 14 villages at altitudes of 3,800–4,200 m in the Tibet Autonomous Region along with fertility histories from 1,749 women.**

**Segregation analysis confirmed a major gene locus with an autosomal dominant mode of inheritance for high oxygen saturation levels, associated with a 10% higher mean.**

**Oxygen saturation genotypic probability estimators were then used to calculate the effect of the inferred oxygen saturation locus on measures of fertility, in a subsample of 691 women (20–59 years of age and still married to their first husbands, those with the highest exposure to the risk of pregnancy).**

Table 6. Estimates of fertility measures for three oxygen saturation genotypes

Variable	Mean $\pm$ SD [minimum, maximum, <i>n</i> ]	Genotypic mean AA	Genotypic mean AB	Genotypic mean BB	Multiple regression $R^2$	Multiple regression $P$ to test $H_0$ : AA = AB/BB	Permutation $P$ to test $H_0$ : AA = AB/BB
Number of pregnancies	4.62 $\pm$ 2.79 [1, 15, <i>n</i> = 689]	4.59	4.90	4.77	0.96 <sup>*†‡§</sup>	0.828	0.826
Number of live births	4.49 $\pm$ 2.72 [0, 15, <i>n</i> = 685]	4.45	4.76	4.62	0.96 <sup>*†‡§</sup>	0.820	0.823
Number of children now alive	4.09 $\pm$ 2.33 [0, 13, <i>n</i> = 664]	1.64	3.58	3.79	0.95 <sup>*†  **</sup>	0.046	0.039
Number of children who died	0.54 $\pm$ 0.10 [0, 8, <i>n</i> = 664]	2.53	0.77	0.48	0.38 <sup>†‡§**</sup>	0.007	0.009
Number of infant deaths	0.36 $\pm$ 0.74 [0, 7, <i>n</i> = 681]	1.69	0.62	0.32	0.28 <sup>†  </sup>	0.011	0.014
Proportion of livebirths now alive	0.90 $\pm$ 0.17 [0, 1, <i>n</i> = 664]	0.40	0.88	0.91	0.97 <sup>**††</sup>	0.004	0.006
Proportion of livebirths that died during infancy	0.07 $\pm$ 0.15 [0, 1, <i>n</i> = 654]	0.40	0.10	0.06	0.20 <sup>**</sup>	0.015	0.023
Proportion of livebirths that died between 1 and 15 years of age	0.02 $\pm$ 0.07 [0, 0.5, <i>n</i> = 653]	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.08 <sup>††</sup>	0.763	0.755
Proportion of livebirths that died before 15 years of age	0.09 $\pm$ 0.16 [0, 1, <i>n</i> = 653]	0.43	0.11	0.08	0.26 <sup>**††</sup>	0.036	0.042

\*Age at first pregnancy.

†Age at first birth.

‡Age at last pregnancy.

§Altitude.

¶Age at last birth.

||Marital type.

\*\*Currently using family planning.

††Maternal age.