

**Evaluation of fetal midhigh fat to
lean mass proportion as a predictor of
birth weight and fetal outcome in pre-
eclampsia and diabetes**

Thesis

**Submitted for the partial fulfillment of
Master Degree
in Obstetrics and Gynecology**

By

Yamen Mohamed Samir Yahia

M.B.B.Ch.

Alexandria University

Under supervision of

Prof. Dr. Sherif Abdel Khalek Akl

Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology

Ain Shams University

Dr. Rany M. Harara

Lecturer of Obstetrics & Gynecology

Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine

Ain Shams University

(2010)

Acknowledgement

First and foremost,
I would modestly like to thank

”ALLAH”

Not only for his great gifts
but also
for honoring me with his blessings,
furthermore for rewarding me for my work,
and granting me the power to do my best efforts
day and night
to accomplish this work

I would like to express my endless gratitude to

Prof. Sherif Abdel Khalek Akl

Professor of obstetrics & gynecology

Faculty of medicine, Ain Shams University

For giving me the honor to work under his supervision
and providing me with a lot of encouragement and
support

Also my deep thanks to

Dr. Rany Mohamed Harara

Lecturer of obstetrics & gynecology

Faculty of medicine, Ain Shams University

For his generous assistance, valuable guidance and
unfailing efforts during the whole period of the study
Finally I would like to thank my parents and my wife
who gave me a lot of help.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction and Aim of the work	i
Review of literature	1
Variations in fetal body weight	1
Fetal fat mass & lean mass	27
Estimation of fetal weight	40
Patients and Methods	61
Results	68
Discussion	89
Conclusion	106
Recommendations	107
References	108
Arabic summary	

AC		Abdominal circumference
AF		Amniotic fluid
AFI		Amniotic fluid index
BMI		Body mass index
BPD		Biparietal diameter
BPS		Biophysical profile score
BW		Birth weight
CRH		Corticotrophin releasing hormone
CD		Caesarian delivery
CS		Caesarian section
DM		Diabetes mellitus
FH		Fundal height
GDM		Gestational Diabetes mellitus
HC		Head circumference
GTT		Glucose tolerance test
IQ		Intelligence quotient
IUGR		Intrauterine growth retardation
Ln		Natural logarithm

Kg	Kilogram
LGA	Large for gestational age
MCA	Middle cerebral artery
P	probability
SD	Standard deviation
SEFT	Sonographic estimated fetal weight
SGA	Small for gestational age
T	Analysis of variance test (ANOVA)
UA	Uterine artery
U/S	Ultrasonography
Wt	Weight

Table No.	Title	Page
1	Clinical risk factors for fetal weight greater than 4000 gm.	45
2	Ultrasonographic fetal biometric algorithm for estimating fetal weight.....	57
3	Accuracy of single versus multiple sonographic fetal biometric examinations for detecting clinically relevant deviations in fetal weight.	59
4	Comparison between different studied groups as regard gravidity, parity, maternal age and maternal body mass index.	68
5	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the gestational age.....	69
6	Comparisons between different studied groups as regard the biometric measures.....	70
7	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the EFW.	72
8	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the AFI.	73
9	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the BPP and S/D ratio.	74

10	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the mid thigh lean mass area.....	75
11	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the fetal mid thigh subcutaneous fat area.....	76
12	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the total mid thigh area.....	77
13	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the birth weight.	78
14	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the Apgar score.	79
15	Comparison between different studied groups as regards the fat lean variables.....	81
16	Correlation between birth weight and some variables.	84
17	Correlation between Apgar score and some variables.....	85

Figure No.	Title	Page
1	The principal causes and most common conditions that is associated with fetal growth restriction.	8
2	Algorithm for treatment of suspected macrosomia.....	26
3	A representative image at which routine estimates of fetal abdominal circumference are made as part of the overall assessment of fetal growth.....	34
4	Schematic of fat and lean mass of the fetal thigh by Ultrasonographic image.	34
5	Different formulae used for estimating birth weight by ultrasound.	52
6	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the gestational age.....	69
7	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the AC.	71
8	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the EFW.	72
9	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the AFI.	73

10	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the S/D.....	74
11	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the midhigh lean mass.....	75
12	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the fetal midhigh subcutaneous fat	76
13	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the total midhigh area.....	77
14	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the actual birth weight.....	78
15	Comparison between different studied groups as regard Apgar score at 1 minute.	79
16	Comparison between different studied groups as regard Apgar score after 5 minutes.	80
17	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the midhigh fat percent.	82
18	Comparison between different studied groups as regard the midhigh lean percent.....	82
19	Comparisons between different studied groups as regard the fat lean variables.	83
20	Correlation between the birth weight and Fat/lean.	86

21	Correlation between the birth weight and Fat/HC.....	87
22	Correlation between the Apgar score and Fat/HC.....	88

Introduction

The identification of pregnancies at risk for preventable perinatal morbidity and mortality is a primary goal of the obstetric care provider **(Bernstein, 2005)**.

Abnormalities of fetal growth are leading contributors to the perinatal mortality rate **(Lerman, 2007)**.

Under conditions of fetal undergrowth, identified as fetal growth restriction (most commonly defined when estimated fetal weights or birth weights are below some preset percentile "third, fifth or tenth" of standardized population specific norms), the perinatal mortality rate is 6–10 times greater than that for a normally grown population **(Gardosi, 1998)**.

The risk of poor fetal growth is high in special situations including the neonatal complications of respiratory distress syndrome, hypoglycemia, hypocalcaemia, hyperphosphatemia, polycythemia, hyponatremia and hypothermia **(Bernstein, 2000)**.

Majority of routine Ultrasonographic parameters (Biparietal diameter, head circumference and femur length) are valuable in the assessment of gestational age due to their resistance to environmental influence which makes them less

well suited for identification of growth abnormalities **(Johnsen, 2004)**.

Employing measures of fetal abdominal wall thickness demonstrated that reduced abdominal wall thickness is linked to fetal growth restriction and increased morbidity **(Gardel, 1999)**.

Other researches have demonstrated that the fat mass compartment is disproportionately reduced in growth-restricted fetuses defined by weight **(Padoan, 2004)**.

Estimates of fetal fat have also been employed in the examination of fetal overgrowth. Using both abdominal wall fat thickness and proximal extremity fat area, several authors have identified increases in fetal fat mass in association with maternal diabetes **(Larciprete, 2003) (Rigano, 2000)**.

Other researches have demonstrated that sonographic estimates of proximal extremity fat area, normalizes when women with gestational diabetes achieve strict glycemic control **(Ferrazzi, 2000)**.

The fetal proximal extremities appear to be the primary anatomic location for the estimation of fetal lean body mass **(Bernstein, 1997)**.

The fetal overgrowth observed with maternal diabetes is associated with identifiable increases in fetal lean body mass, but these increases tend to be proportionately smaller than the increases observed in fat area (**Valensise, 2003**).

Reductions in lean body area have been observed in fetal growth restriction, although the proportional reduction in fetal fat mass is also generally of greater magnitude, One exception to this is in the fetus of the smoking mother (**Padoan, 2004**).

Recent researches suggest that decrease in lean area in diabetic and significant increase in total fat area, also in pre-eclamptic mothers there is a disproportionate decrease in fat and lean areas, as the decrease in fat was more pronounced (**Bernstein, 2000**).

The ponderal index was first described by Rohrer in 1921 as an index of corpulence (**Rohrer, 1922**).

It is an index of neonatal size (weight/length^3) which describes the nutritional state of the neonate. When compared with birth weight percentile, the ponderal index demonstrates an improved ability to predict asphyxia, acidosis, hypoglycemia, and hypothermia in fetal undergrowth.

Attempts to translate the ponderal index directly to the fetus have been faced by the difficulty in accurately assessing fetal length. Nevertheless, attempts to modify the ponderal index for fetal sonographic estimation have been made (**Walther, 1982**).

Inspite of the significant health consequences for abnormal growth, there is a poor predictive value of fetal weight for these complications. So, there is a high need for search for alternative markers of fetal growth abnormality beyond estimates of fetal weight to try and improve the prediction of perinatal risk.