

Prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus using early oral glucose tolerance test

Authors

C. Kandauda

Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya

chadesil@yahoo.co.uk

S.S Manathunga

National Hospital of Sri Lanka

Email address- ssm123ssm@gmail.com

I.A Abeyagunawardena (corresponding author)

National Hospital of Sri Lanka

Home address- 155, George E De Silva Mawatha, Kandy, Sri Lanka

Email address- ishanya1993@gmail.com

Telephone No. - +94 77 8284334

ORCID No. - 0000-0003-0395-7863

K.M.H.C Thilakarathne

National Hospital, Kandy

harshanachathu.ac@gmail.com

29 **Abstract**

30 Introduction

31 Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM) is defined as diabetes first detected at the second or third
32 trimester of pregnancy, excluding preexisting diabetes. We aimed to build a predictive model of
33 GDM using booking oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) values.

34 Materials and Methods

35 Seventy-five healthy mothers who underwent 75g OGTT at 12-14 weeks and at 24-28 weeks were
36 recruited. GDM was diagnosed at 28 weeks by cutoffs proposed by the Hyperglycemia and
37 Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes study.

38 Sensitivities and specificities for diagnosing GDM using different cut-offs for each of the three
39 booking OGTT variables were measured. A series of multivariate binary logistic regression models
40 were fitted using different combinations of the three booking OGTT variables. In-sample
41 sensitivities and specificities for different cutoff probabilities of the models were calculated and
42 Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves were constructed. The Area Under the Curve
43 (AUC) of the ROC curve and the best cutoff value which maximized the sum of sensitivity and
44 specificity of each model were computed.

45 Results

46 AUC of ROC curves for isolated fasting, 1 hour and 2 hour booking OGTT values for the
47 prediction of GDM were 69.8%, 67.1% and 61.0% respectively. However, the logistic regression
48 model with fasting and 1 hour booking OGTT values as predictors out-performed all other models
49 with an AUC of 76.3%, in-sample sensitivity of 87.5% and a negative predictive value of 95.12%.

50 Conclusions

51 The future occurrence of GDM can be predicted utilizing a logistic model with fasting and 1 hour
52 booking OGTT variables, which enables early identification and intervention.

53 Keywords- OGTT, GDM, Gestational diabetes

54 **Introduction**

55 Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) remains one of the most common medical complications of
56 pregnancy and is associated with an array of maternal and fetal adverse outcomes. It is defined as
57 glucose intolerance with onset or first recognition in pregnancy [1]. GDM can result in
58 macrosomia, shoulder dystocia, preterm delivery, preeclampsia, neonatal hypoglycemia, neonatal
59 hyperbilirubinemia leading to prolonged hospital stays. Hence, meticulous screening programs are
60 implemented worldwide to screen for GDM with the aim of taking preemptive actions to control
61 hyperglycemia in pregnancy thus reducing adverse outcomes [2].

62 There had been controversies on the diagnosis and screening of GDM [3]. The 2002 National
63 Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Health Technology Assessment concluded that
64 there was insufficient evidence to advocate universal screening in pregnancy. Therefore, the
65 2008 NICE guidelines recommends pregnant women with BMI above 30 kg/m², a previous
66 macrosomic baby weighing 4.5 kg or more, previous gestational diabetes, a family history of
67 diabetes (first-degree relative with diabetes) or belonging to an ethnicity with a high prevalence
68 of diabetes identified during the booking visit to be offered screening with the two hour oral
69 glucose tolerance test (OGTT) [4].

70 GDM is diagnosed if the fasting blood glucose value is more than/equal to 5.1mmol/l (92 mg/dl),
71 1 hour plasma glucose more than/equal to 10.0 mmol/l (180 mg/dl) or if 2 hour blood glucose is
72 more than/equal to 8.5mmol/l (153 mg/dl) according to the hyperglycemia associated pregnancy

73 outcomes (HAPO) study [2]. Women with no risk factors undergo OGTT if glycosuria more than
74 2+ is detected in the routine urinary dipstick testing. For patients with a history of GDM, OGTT
75 is performed as soon as possible after the booking visit and at 24-28 weeks if the initial test is
76 normal. For women with other risk factors OGTT is performed at 24-28 weeks to detect GDM
77 [4].

78 This study aimed to build a predictive model for occurrence of GDM in high- risk women with
79 normal OGTT values at booking visit.

80 **Materials and Methods**

81 The study was conducted at the antenatal clinics in Kandy, Sri Lanka. Ethical clearance was
82 obtained from the Ethics Review Committee, Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya. A
83 total of 75 mothers with no other comorbidities, who had undergone a 75g OGTT at booking visit
84 between 12-14 weeks and at 24-28 weeks were recruited. Written informed consent was taken
85 from all subjects. Diagnosis of GDM at 28 weeks was made based on Hyperglycemia and Adverse
86 Pregnancy Outcomes (HAPO) study cutoffs [5].

87 The distribution of fasting plasma glucose values, one-hour plasma glucose values and two-hour
88 plasma glucose values were visualized using density curves for the GDM and non-GDM samples.
89 Correlations between the booking and the corresponding 28-week plasma glucose values were
90 calculated and separate Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves were constructed for
91 fasting, one-hour and two-hour booking plasma glucose values, for the diagnosis of GDM.

92 A series of multivariate binary logistic regression models were fitted using different combinations
93 of booking OGTT predictors for the prediction of GDM. In-sample sensitivities and specificities
94 for different cutoffs of log of odds ratios of the logistic models were calculated. ROC curves were

95 constructed and the Area Under the Curve (AUC) of the ROC curve and the best cutoff value
96 which maximized the sum of sensitivity and specificity of each model were computed.

97 **Results**

98 Distribution of the fasting, one-hour and two-hour booking plasma glucose values are visualized
99 in Fig 1, Fig 2 and Fig 3 respectively.

100 **Fig 1** Distribution of the fasting blood glucose values in GDM and non-GDM populations at the
101 booking visit

102 **Fig 2** Distribution of the one- hour blood glucose values in GDM and non-GDM populations at
103 booking visit

104 **Fig 3** Distribution of the two- hour blood glucose values in GDM and non-GDM populations at
105 booking visit

106 It can be observed that the plasma glucose values are shifted rightwards in the GDM samples
107 when compared to non-GDM samples. The correlation coefficients of fasting, one-hour and two-
108 hour plasma glucose values between the booking and 28-weeks tests of GDM and non- GDM
109 mothers are 0.29, 0.58 and 0.36 respectively as depicted in Fig 4, Fig 5 and Fig 6 respectively.

110 The Pearson Correlation coefficient was utilized.

111 **Fig 4** Scatterplot depicting correlation coefficient of fasting blood glucose value of GDM and
112 non-GDM mothers between booking visit and 28 weeks

113 **Fig 5** Scatterplot depicting correlation coefficient of one- hour blood glucose value of GDM and
114 non-GDM mothers between booking visit and 28 weeks

115 **Fig 6** Scatterplot depicting correlation coefficient of two hour blood glucose value of GDM and
116 non-GDM mothers between booking visit and 28 weeks

117 The discriminative powers of the isolated booking plasma glucose values are summarized in the
118 following Table 01.

119 Table 01

120 Discriminatory powers of individual booking visit plasma glucose values

Variable	Cutoff value (mg/dl)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	AUC (%)
Fasting plasma glucose	77.4	85.7	52.5	71.2
One-hour plasma glucose	138.5	57.1	83.1	70.4
Two-hour plasma glucose	102.1	57.1	69.5	59.0

121
122 The ROC curves for individual booking visit plasma glucose values for fasting, one hour and two
123 hours are illustrated in Fig 7, Fig 8 and Fig 9 respectively.

124 **Fig 7** ROC curve for booking visit fasting blood glucose level

125 **Fig 8** ROC curve for booking visit one- hour blood glucose level

126 **Fig 9** ROC curve for booking visit two- hour blood glucose level

127 The discriminative powers when booking visit plasma glucose values are combined together are
128 summarized in Table 02.

129 Table 02

130 Discriminatory powers of different combinations of booking visit plasma glucose values

Variables	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	AUC (%)
-----------	-----------------	-----------------	---------

Fasting, one-hour and two-hour values	85.7	67.8	79.3
Fasting and one-hour values	92.9	67.8	79.7
Fasting and two-hour values	85.7	57.6	71.3
One-hour and two-hour values	50.0	93.2	71.9

131

132 It can be noted that the combined booking plasma glucose values have a better discriminatory

133 power when compared to that of isolated plasma glucose values. The ROC curves of fasting and

134 one- hour combination, fasting and two- hour combination and the combination of fasting, one

135 hour and two- hour plasma glucose values are depicted in Fig 10, Fig 11 and Fig 12 respectively.

136 **Fig 10** ROC curve for fasting and one hour plasma glucose combination

137 **Fig 11** ROC curve for fasting and two hour plasma glucose combination

138 **Fig 12** ROC curve for fasting, one hour and two hour plasma glucose combination

139 **Discussion**

140 In Sri Lanka, all the mothers are offered screening for GDM as the population falls under a high-

141 risk group due to South Asian ethnicity and hence undergo OGTT at 24-28 weeks. However, A

142 narrative review published y Raets et al., indicate that mothers with early GDM are at more risk

143 of adverse pregnancy outcomes. It further highlights that some pregnant women have

144 hyperglycemia under the range of classification as diabetes at booking visit who will later be

145 diagnosed with GDM at 24-28 weeks [6].

146 According to our study the individual values of fasting, one- hour and two- hour blood glucose
147 individually does not predict the risk of future GDM with great accuracy. However, with regard
148 to the combination models it can be noted that the model utilizing the fasting and one-hour
149 plasma glucose values in the booking visit as input parameters was able to achieve an AUC of
150 79.7% for the ROC curve with a sensitivity of 92.86%, specificity of 67.80%, positive predictive
151 value of 40.62% and a negative predictive value of 97.56%. Hence, in a woman with a normal
152 OGTT this model is able to predict the chance of developing GDM in the future thus allowing
153 preemptive lifestyle modification and more stringent surveillance.

154 Lekva et al. recruited 1031 pregnant women with the aim of identifying the use of OGTT at 14-
155 16 weeks for the diagnosis of GDM by adjusting the cut offs. This study examined different
156 cutoffs of early OGTT values for the prediction of GDM and found that approximately 80%
157 sensitivity could be achieved when lowering fasting glucose cutoff by 8% and 60/120 minutes
158 glucose cutoffs by 32% for IADPSG 2010 and WHO 2013 criteria. However, it concluded
159 overall that early OGTT was not suitable to predict the occurrence of GDM [7].

160 In contrast, the logistic regression model proposed in this paper which takes into account both
161 fasting and 1 hour blood glucose value, has the potential to predict the future occurrence of
162 GDM with high sensitivity. This model can be utilized in antenatal care to identify women with a
163 seemingly normal OGTT at the booking visit but with a high risk of developing GDM, enabling
164 early lifestyle modifications and regular monitoring of blood glucose.

165 **Conclusion**

166 A logistic regression model with fasting and one-hour plasma glucose values in the booking visit
167 OGTT as input parameters, identifies women with the potential to develop GDM with high
168 sensitivity.

169 **Acknowledgements**

170 We wish to acknowledge the staff of the antenatal clinics in Kandy for their support during the
171 data collection process.

172 **References**

- 173 1. Association AD. 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes: Standards of Medical Care in
174 Diabetes—2019. *Diabetes Care*. 2019 Jan 1;42(Supplement 1):S13–28.
- 175 2. Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes. *N Engl J Med*. 2008 May
176 8;358(19):1991–2002.
- 177 3. Scott DA, Loveman E, McIntyre L, Waugh N. Screening for gestational diabetes: a
178 systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess Winch Engl*.
179 2002;6(11):1–161.
- 180 4. Recommendations | Diabetes in pregnancy: management from preconception to the postnatal
181 period | Guidance | NICE [Internet]. NICE; [cited 2022 Mar 5]. Available from:
182 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng3/chapter/Recommendations#gestational-diabetes>
- 183 5. Coustan DR, Lowe LP, Metzger BE, Dyer AR. The Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy
184 Outcome (HAPO) study: paving the way for new diagnostic criteria for gestational diabetes
185 mellitus. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2010 Jun 1;202(6):654.e1-654.e6.
- 186 6. Raets L, Beunen K, Benhalima K. Screening for Gestational Diabetes Mellitus in Early
187 Pregnancy: What Is the Evidence?. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*. 2021;10(6):1257.

188

189 7. Lekva T, Godang K, Michelsen AE, Qvigstad E, Normann KR, Norwitz ER, et al. Prediction
190 of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus and Pre-diabetes 5 Years Postpartum using 75 g Oral
191 Glucose Tolerance Test at 14–16 Weeks’ Gestation. *Sci Rep.* 2018 Sep 6;8(1):13392.

192




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6

1 hour - booking




Figure 8

2 hour - booking




Figure 9

Fasting and 1 hr




Figure 10

fasting and 2 hr




Figure 11

Fasting, 1 hr and 2 hr




Figure 12

Fasting - booking




Figure 7