

Correlation between fetal subcutaneous fat tissue thickness and gestational diabetes mellitus

Thesis

**Submitted for the partial fulfillment of
Master Degree
In Obstetrics & Gynecology**

By

Mohamed Ahmed Sakr
Resident of Obstetrics & Gynecology
Dar Ismail Hospital
(MOH)
Alexandria

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Sherif Mohamed Habib
Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology
Ain Shams University

Dr. Amr Mohamed El-Helaly
Lecturer of Obstetrics & Gynecology
Ain Shams University

**Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
(2013)**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

رَبِّیْ أَوْزَعْنِیْ

أَنْ أَشْكُرَ نِعْمَتِكَ الَّتِي أَنْعَمْتَ
عَلَيَّ وَعَلَى وَالِدَيَّ وَأَنْ أَعْمَلَ
صَالِحًا تَرْضَاهُ وَأَدْخِلْنِي بِرَحْمَتِكَ
فِي عِبَادِكَ الصَّالِحِينَ

صدق الله العظيم

آية رقم 19

سورة النمل

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 Mohamed Habib

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. Amr Mohamed EL-Helaly

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 Ultrasound special
care unit for the fetus, my parents and my wife who
gave me a lot of help.

CONTENTS

	Page
<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>Aim of the work</u>	3
<u>Review</u>	
Screening and diagnosis of GDM	4
Infant of diabetic mothers.....	10
Macrosomia.....	32
Subcutaneous fetal mass estimation.....	42
<u>Material and methods</u>	52
<u>Results</u>	55
<u>Discussion</u>	79
<u>Conclusion</u>	83
<u>Recommendation</u>	84
<u>Summary</u>	85
<u>References</u>	88
<u>Arabic Summary</u>	

Abbreviations

AC	Abdominal circumference
ACOG	American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
AF	Amniotic fluid
BMI	Body mass index
BPD	Biparietal diameter
BPS	Biophysical profile score
BW	Birth weigh
CD	Caesarian delivery
CS	Caesarian section
DM	Diabetes mellitus
GDM	Gestational Diabetes mellitus
HC	Head circumference
GTT	Glucose tolerance test
IDM	Infant of diabetic mothers
IUGR	Intrauterine growth retardation
Ln	Natural logarithm
Kg	Kilogram
LGA	Large for gestational ag
L/S	Lecithin/sphingomyelin
NDDG	National Diabetes Data Group

Abbreviations

P	probability
RDS	Respiratory distress syndrome
ROC	Receiver Operating Characteristic
SD	Standard deviation
SEFT	Sonographic estimated fetal weight
SGA	Small for gestational age
T	Analysis of variance test (ANOVA)
TS	Thoracic spines
U/S	Ultrasonography
Wt	Weight

Figure	Title	Page
1	Algorithm for treatment of suspected macrosomia.....	41
2	A representative image at which routine estimates of fetal abdominal circumference are made as a part of the overall assessment of fetal growth.	47
3	A) Schematic of fat and lean mass of the fetal thigh that corresponds to (B) the ultrasound image. SQ, Subcutaneous tissue; M, muscle.....	47
4	subcutaneous fat tissue thickness at the level of BPD..	48
5	Maximum subcutaneous fat tissue thickness, from the inner to the outer aspect of the echogenic subcutaneous fat at the level of AC (abdominal circumference) with fetal abdomen free from contact with arms or legs and amniotic fluid between the fetal trunk and the uterine wall.	48
6	Maximum fetal subcutaneous fat tissue thickness, from the inner to the outer echogenic subcutaneous fat, sagittally at the level of the TS (thorax spine).....	49

7	Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Both Groups regarding Age.....	57
8	Box-plot chart showing Difference between Both Groups regarding weight.....	58
9	Box-plot chart showing Difference between Both Groups regarding to BMI.....	59
10	Box-Plot Chart showing Fasting Blood Glucose at 24 weeks' Gestation in Included Women in Both Groups.....	62
11	Box-Plot Chart showing 1-Hour Postprandial Blood Glucose at 24 weeks' Gestation in Included Women in Both Groups..	63
12	Box-Plot Chart showing 2-Hour Postprandial Blood Glucose at 24 weeks' Gestation in Included Women in Both Groups	64
13	Box-Plot Chart showing 3-Hour Postprandial Blood Glucose at 24 weeks' Gestation in Included Women in Both Groups	65
14	Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Both Groups regarding Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness measured at the Level of Scalp.....	68
15	Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Both Groups regarding Fetal	

	Subcutaneous Fat Thickness measured at the Level of Abdominal Circumference.....	69
16	Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Both Groups regarding Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness measured at the Level of Thoracic Spine	70
17	Scatter-Plot showing Correlation between Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness measured at the Level of Scalp and Fasting Blood Sugar in Included Women	73
18	Scatter-Plot showing Correlation between Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness measured at the Level of Abdominal Circumference and Fasting Blood Sugar in Included Women	74
19	Scatter-Plot showing Correlation between Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness measured at the Level of Thoracic Spine and Fasting Blood Sugar in Included Women.....	75
20	ROC Curves for the Association between Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness at Different Levels and GDM.....	76

Table No.	Title	Page
1	Detection and diagnosis of GDM.	8
2	. Difference between Both Groups regarding Age, Weight and BMI	56
3	Results of OGTT at 24 weeks' Gestation in Included Women in Both Groups.....	61
4	Difference between Both Groups regarding Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness measured at Different Body Levels.	67
5	Correlation between Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness measured at Different Body Levels and Maternal Weight, BMI and OGTT Values in Included Women	72
6	Area under ROC curves for the association between fetal subcutaneous fat thickness at different levels and GDM.	77
7	Accuracy of the Association between Fetal Subcutaneous Fat Thickness at Different Levels and GDM	78

Introduction

Gestational diabetes is the most common complication affecting women during pregnancy, due to possible maternal and fetal complication (**Metzger , Coustan ; 1998**).

This, as well as the associated maternal, perinatal and long-term morbidity, emphasizes the need for an appropriate and accurate screening method. Despite recent developments regarding the management of gestational diabetes, the likelihood of fetal macrosomia and other problems during pregnancy and labour remains significantly high in comparison to the general population. The glucose tolerance test is the most frequently used diagnostic test for gestational diabetes ; however, it is time consuming and less tolerated and is usually performed between 24 and 28 weeks of gestation (**WHO; 1980**).

It is well known that adipose tissue thickness and skin fold thickness are greater in newborns of mothers with gestational diabetes than in the offspring of mothers with normal glucose metabolism (**Greco P, et al..2003**).

Fetal adiposity is known to be a consequence of maternal diabetes (**Lanciprete G, et al 2008**).

Abnormal fetal growth, whether macrosomia or growth restriction, has important implications relating to both short-term perinatal and possibly long-term metabolic outcome (**Catalano, 2001**).

Studies have reported an increased adult risk of the insulin resistance syndrome (**Barker, 1993**).

In addition to intrinsic/genetic factors, fetal in utero metabolic environment may also affect the offspring's long-term growth and metabolism (the so-called metabolic imprinting effect). Long-term follow-up studies showed that a diagnosis of diabetes during gestation significantly increases the risk of both adolescent obesity and glucose intolerance, in contrast with that of children of the same woman when her glucose tolerance was normal during gestation (**Pettitt, 1993**) (**Yogev, 2009**).

Various factors have been associated with alterations in fetal growth. These include genetic factors such as neonatal sex and ethnic group; geographic factors such as altitude; maternal factors such as pre-gravid height, weight, and weight gain during gestation; and, to a lesser degree, paternal factors such as height and weight (**Catalano, 2001**).

In the assessment of fetal growth, the estimation of body composition has been a useful paradigm. As first hypothesized by **Sparks**, fetal fat-free mass may represent growth regulated

primarily by intrinsic/genetic factors, whereas fat mass maybe more affected by environmental factors such as the maternal metabolic environment. Maternal diabetes results in alterations of the fetoplacental metabolic environment, which also affect fetal growth (**Sparks, 1984**).

Excessive fetal growth occurs in as many as 50% of pregnancies, complicated by gestational diabetes mellitus with a frequency of LGA infants has been reported to be between 25% and 45 % (**Celeste, 2004**) (**Kitzmilller, 1986**).

Although fetal growth can be measured by birth weight, a more accurate way to characterize overgrowth is by an estimation of body composition, which includes lean body mass and fat mass. Lean body mass is metabolically active tissue and is relatively stable in utero while fat mass is more variable and sensitive to factors that affect fetal growth (**Cetin, 2005**) (**Miller, 1953**).

Aim of the Work

To evaluate the efficacy of ultrasound measurement of fetal subcutaneous fat as an alternative method in the diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus.

Screening and diagnosis of GDM

While the existence of an abnormality of glucose metabolism in some pregnant women cannot be disputed, a debate exists as to the clinical value and benefit of screening for GDM. Although an association between several maternal-fetal outcomes and the level of maternal hyperglycemia has been reported.(**Sermer M, et al 1995**).

A single approach of testing for GDM cannot be recommended at the present as there is not enough evidence-based data proving the beneficial effect of a large screening program. Each of the following approaches is acceptable:

1-Routine screening of women at 24–28 weeks of gestation may be recommended with the 50 g glucose challenge test (GCT), using a threshold of 7.8 mmol/L (140 mg/dL), except in those women who fulfill the criteria for low risk.

2-The diagnostic test can be the 100 g oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT), as recommended by ACOG, or the 75 g OGTT, according to the American Diabetes Association (ADA) criteria.

If GDM is diagnosed, glucose tolerance should be reassessed with a 75 g OGTT 6–12 weeks postpartum in order to identify women with persistent glucose intolerance.