

1 **The association between maternal intra-abdominal pressure,**
2 **pregnancy induced hypertension**

3

4

5 Sajith Jayasundara ^{1*}, Malik Goonewardene ^{1,2}, Lanka Dassanayake ^{1,2}

6

7 ¹Academic Obstetric Unit, Teaching Hospital, Mahamodara, Galle, Sri Lanka

8 ²Department of obstetrics and gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ruhuna, Galle,
9 Sri Lanka

10

11

12 * Corresponding Author

13 E-mail: sajithjayasundara@yahoo.co.uk

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Abstract

Introduction

Pregnancy leads to a state of chronically increased intra-abdominal pressure (IAP) caused by a growing fetus, fluid, and tissue. Increased intra-abdominal pressure is leading to state of Intra-Abdominal Hypertension (IAH) and Abdominal Compartment Syndrome. Clinical features and risk factors of preeclampsia is comparable to abdominal compartment syndrome. Intra-abdominal pressure (IAP) may be associated with the pathogenesis of pregnancy induced hypertension.

Objectives

The study aimed to determine the antepartum and postpartum IAP levels in women undergoing caesarean delivery (CD) and association between hypertension in pregnancy, and antepartum and postpartum IAP levels in women undergoing caesarean delivery (CD).

Method

Seventy pregnant women (55 normotensive, 15 hypertension in pregnancy) undergoing antepartum, non-emergency CD, had their intravesical pressure measured before and after the CD, the intravesical pressure measurements obtained with the patient in the supine position were considered to correspond to the IAP. Multivariable linear regression models were used to study associations between intraabdominal pressure and baseline characteristics in normotensive pregnancies and hypertensive pregnancies.

42 **Results**

43 In normotensive pregnancies at mean gestation age of 38 weeks +2days (95%CI 37+6 to 38 +4) ,
44 mean antepartum IAP was 12.7 mmHg(95%CI 11.6 to 13.8) and the mean postpartum IAP was
45 7.3 mmHg (95% CI 11.6 to 13.8).

46 Multivariable linear regression models showed hypertension in pregnancy group antepartum IAP
47 positively associated with coefficient value of 1.617 (p= 0.268) comparing with normotensive
48 pregnancy group.

49 Postpartum IAP in hypertension in pregnancy group positively associated with coefficient value
50 of 2.519 (p= 0.018) comparing with normotensive pregnancy group.

51 IAP difference is negatively associated with hypertension in pregnancy (coefficient -1.013, p=
52 0.179)

53 **Conclusion**

54 In normotensive pregnancies at term, the IAP was in the IAH range of the non-pregnant population.
55 Higher Antepartum IAP and Postpartum IAP are associated with hypertension in pregnancy.
56 Reduction of IAP from antepartum period to postpartum period was less with hypertension in
57 pregnancy.

58

59

60

61

62 **Introduction**

63 Pregnancy with growing fetus and amniotic fluid, leading to increased pressure within the
64 abdominal cavity. The importance of the diagnosis and management of intra-abdominal
65 hypertension (IAH) and abdominal compartment syndrome is increasingly recognized in different
66 fields of medicine. To date, little is known about normal values of intra-abdominal pressure (IAP)
67 during pregnancy either in healthy or complicated pregnancies.

68 Despite decades of research into the etiology and mechanism of preeclampsia, its exact
69 pathogenesis remains uncertain. Several authors have hypothesized that Intra-abdominal
70 hypertension (IAP) as an etiologic factor of pregnancy induced hypertension (PIH). Risk factors
71 and clinical manifestation of abdominal compartment syndrome are similar to the preeclampsia
72 and eclampsia. Supporting this hypothesis is the fact that PIH is more often seen in association
73 with a first pregnancy (when the abdomen has not been previously stretched) than subsequent
74 pregnancies, with twin pregnancies which would be more likely to be associated with an increased
75 IAP and with obesity [1]. An animal study has shown that chronically increased intra-abdominal
76 pressure would lead to systemic hypertension [2].

77 In the 1900s, Paramore had suggested uncompensated elevated IAP as a possible etiologic factor
78 in the development of preeclampsia [3].

79 Harvey Sugerman hypothesized that preeclampsia is a venous disease secondary to an increased
80 intra-abdominal pressure. Pregnancy with high IAP may produce all of the pathology associated
81 with preeclampsia secondary to compression, producing decreased flow in the venous system
82 throughout the body [4]. It is postulated that this decreased venous flow increases progressively
83 throughout the body as the IAP rises, leading to lower body edema, fetal ischemia and placental

84 ischemia, pre- mature maturation and infarction, decreased renal venous flow leading to activation
85 of the juxtaglomerular apparatus , hypertension and proteinuria, decreased portal and splenic
86 venous flow with hepatic ischemia, necrosis, elevated liver enzymes (transaminases),
87 hypersplenism with thrombocytopenia and hemolysis, increased intra-thoracic pressure with upper
88 body edema, decreased jugular venous flow, increased intra-cranial pressure, and seizures.

89 **Method**

90 Ethical approval was obtained from Ethical Review Committee, Faculty of Medicine, University
91 of Ruhuna, Galle, Sri Lanka. Informed written consent was obtained from all the participants in
92 the study. The enrolment was carried out in 2016 and 2017.

93 A cross sectional study was carried out on a cohort of 70 women with singleton pregnancies,
94 undergoing antepartum, non-emergency Caesarean Delivery (CD) in the Academic Obstetric Unit,
95 Teaching Hospital, Mahamodara, Galle, Sri Lanka. Pregnant women underwent Category 1
96 caesarean delivery and caesarean delivery performed during active phase of labour, are excluded.

97 Antenatal care data was collected to data sheet, from in-ward clinical records, antenatal care
98 records and investigation results.

99 The participants were transferred to the operating room and the pre-operative blood pressure was
100 recorded. Prior to spinal or general anaesthesia, patients were placed in the supine position, and a
101 transurethral 16-Fr Foley catheter was inserted into the bladder with non-touch technique under
102 aseptic conditions. Urinary bladder was emptied and the sample of urine checked for albumin.
103 Intra vesical pressure measurements was taken using the Intravesical pressure measurement system
104 according to the world abdominal compartment society recommendation with patient in supine
105 position, mid axillary level as zero reference and 25ml of bladder inflation volume.

106 All the measurements were obtained by the principal investigator. Three consecutive
107 measurements were obtained at the end of expiration and mean value of the three measurement
108 was calculated. Measurements was repeated between six to eight hours post-operatively. Birth
109 weight of the babies were measured using same standard weight measuring scale.

110 The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 22.0; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) version 22.0 was
111 used for statistical analysis. Data normality was assessed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.
112 Statistical comparisons among groups were performed using the independent *t* test and Chi-square
113 test. All *p* values were two tailed and statistical significance was set as $p < 0.05$.

114 The effect of belonging in the hypertensive group on the dependent variables antepartum IAP,
115 postpartum IAP and difference between antepartum IAP and postpartum IAP was estimated using
116 least squares multivariable regression analyses, adjusting for maternal BMI, birthweight,
117 gestational age and parity. Linear regression analysis was used as the dependent variable is
118 continuous in all three cases (antepartum IAP, postpartum IAP, IAP difference). Firstly, a pearson
119 correlation analysis was conducted in order to test for pairwise correlations between BMI,
120 birthweight and gestational age. Birthweight and gestational age were found to be highly positively
121 correlated (correlation coefficient: 0.78) therefore it was decided that birthweight would need to
122 be retained and gestational age would need to be removed from all subsequent regression analyses.

123 For each of the three dependent variables, different combinations of regression models were fit in
124 order to assess all possible combinations of variables and choose the model with the highest
125 adjusted R^2 value. The adjusted R^2 value is a robust goodness-of-fit metric in linear regression
126 models and shows the percentage of the variance of the dependent variable that is attributed to the
127 independent variables, accounting for the number of variables in the model. Squared
128 transformations of variables in the regression models were also examined in order to check for

129 improvements in model fitting. Hypertension was included in the models as a binary categorical
 130 variable; hypertensive subjects were assigned the value 1 while normotensive the value 0. A p
 131 value lower than 0.05 corresponding to each coefficient in the model was used as a criterion for
 132 significance.

133 Results

134 Seventy subjects who undergoing caesarean delivery (CD) were enrolled. Subjects were
 135 categorized into, normotensive (n=55, 78.6%) and Hypertension in pregnancy (HIP) (n= 15,
 136 21.4%). HIP include Gestational hypertension (n=5), Preeclampsia (n= 8) , Eclampsia (n=1) and
 137 chronic hypertension (n=1). Mean values with standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals
 138 or Median with interquartile range calculated in each parameter calculated in each category as
 139 shown in Table 1.

140 **Table 1. Characteristics of subjects**

	Normotensive (n=55)	Hypertension in Pregnancy (n=15)	<i>p</i> value
Age (Years)			
Mean(95% CI)	32.5 (31.4 to 33.7)	32.9 (29.8 to 35.9)	0.805*
GA (weeks + days)			
Mean (95% CI)	38+1(37+6 to 38+4)	34+2 (32+3 to 36+1)	0.000*
Parity			
Median(IQR)	2.0(1)	2.0 (3.0)	0.220**
BMI (kg/m ²)			
Mean (95% CI)	23.6 (22.9 to 24.3)	24.5 (23.1 to 25.9)	0.241*

141 CI = Confidence interval GA = Gestational age IQR = Interquartile Range * Independent t test

142 ** Chi-square test

143 Outcome measures in normotensive category and hypertension in pregnancy category compared
 144 with Systemic blood pressures, IAP parameters, and birth weight of the neonates. Mean values

145 with 95% Confidence interval calculated in each parameter calculated in each category as shown
 146 in Table 2.

147 **Table 2. Systematic blood pressure and Intra- abdominal pressure in normotensive**
 148 **category and hypertension in pregnancy category**

	Normotensive (n=55)	Hypertension in Pregnancy (n=15)	<i>p</i> value
Birth weight (g)			
Mean	2934.5	1886.7	0.000*
95% CI	2798.6 to 3070.5	1415.9 to 2357.4	
Antepartum MAP (mmHg)			
Mean	87.5	122.2	0.000*
95% CI	85.9 to 89.1	114.5 to 129.9	
Postpartum MAP (mmHg)			
Mean	86.0	101.3	0.000*
95% CI	84.4 to 87.7	94.4 to 108.2	
Antepartum IAP (mmHg)			
Mean	12.7	12.5	0.892*
95% CI	11.6 to 13.8	10.0 to 15.0	
Postpartum IAP (mmHg)			
Mean	7.3	9.2	0.022*
95% CI	6.5 to 8.0	7.3 to 11.2	
IAP difference^a (mmHg)			
Mean	5.4	3.3	0.002*
95% CI	4.8 to 6.0	2.1 to 4.6	

149 95%CI= 95% Confidence interval MAP=Mean arterial pressure, IAP=Intra-abdominal pressure
 150 a - IAP difference = Pre caesarean Delivery intra-abdominal pressure – Post caesarean delivery
 151 intra-abdominal pressure * Independent t test

152

153 Different combinations of variables in each model were tested in order to retain the most efficient
154 model for each dependent variable. The most robust and parsimonious regression model, i.e. the
155 model with the highest adjusted R^2 (0.032), when considering the effect of the aforementioned
156 independent variables on antepartum IAP included hypertension and birthweight as independent
157 variables. Birthweight ($p = 0.042$) was found to be a significant predictor of antepartum IAP while
158 hypertension was found to be positively associated to antepartum IAP (coef: 1.617) although a
159 statistically significant effect was not established ($p = 0.268$). Distribution of antepartum IAP level
160 against the birth weight shown in Fig 1.

161 **Fig 1. Antepartum IAP level and the birth weight in normotensive and hypertension in**
162 **pregnancy**

163 The most efficient model with respect to predicting IAP difference (R^2 : 0.190) included the
164 variables hypertension ($p = 0.179$) and birthweight squared ($p = 0.01$). Hypertension was negatively
165 associated (coef: -1.01) to IAP difference although a statistically significant effect was not
166 established ($p = 0.179$). Distribution of IAP difference level against the birth weight shown in Fig
167 2.

168 **Fig 2. IAP difference and the birth weight in normotensive and hypertension in pregnancy**

169 The most efficient model with respect to predicting post-IAP (R^2 : 0.059) included hypertension
170 and birthweight. Hypertension was found to be positively (coef: 2.519) and significantly associated
171 to postpartum IAP ($p = 0.018$). Distribution of postpartum IAP level against the birth weight shown
172 in Fig 3.

173 **Fig 3. Postpartum IAP and the birth weight in normotensive and hypertension in pregnancy**

174 Overall, for all three dependent variables, hypertension and birthweight produced the best adjusted
 175 R² scores so these were the variables that were chosen to be included in the models.

176 Discussion

177 Intra-abdominal pressure in normotensive pregnancy

178 In this study, 55 of normotensive subjects at term, antepartum IAP was 12.69 mmHg (95% CI
 179 =11.62 to 13.77) and postpartum IAP 7.26 mmHg (6.54 to 7.98). Comparing with other five studies
 180 published regarding antepartum and postpartum IAP is shown in Table 3.

181 **Table 3 . Comparison of studies of intra-abdominal pressure in normotensive pregnancies**

Author	Our study	Fuchs F <i>et al</i> 2013 [5]	Chun R <i>et al</i> 2011 [6]	Staelens A <i>et al</i> 2014 [7]	Al Khan A <i>et al</i> 2011 [8]	Abdel-Razeq <i>et al</i> 2010 [9]
Country	Sri Lanka	France	Canada	Belgium	USA	USA
Sample size	55	70	20	23	100	21
Age	32.53(31.4 to 33.7)	34 (27-41)	31(SD 5)	29.3 (SD 3.5)	31.7 (5.1)	-
Gestational Age (weeks)	38.25 (37.9 to 38.6)	38.1 (38 to 39)	38.6 (SD 1.6)	39.0 (0.6)	38.4 (0.8)	-
Birth weight	2934.55 (2799 to 3071)	3210 (2445 to 4215)	-	3590 (SD- 472.2)	3422.8 (450.1)	-
Antepartum IAP	12.69 (11.6 to 13.8)	14.2 (6.3 to 23)	10.9 (6.23 to 15.57)	14.0 (11.4 to 16.6)	22.0 (2.9)	-
Postpartum IAP	7.26 (6.54 to 7.98)	11.5 (5 to 19.7)	-	9.8 (6.8 to 12.8)	16.4 (2.6)	6.4 (1.2 to 11.6)
Measuring technique	Supine, 25ml, level of mid axillary line	Supine, 25ml, level of symphysis pubis	Supine, 25ml, level of mid axillary line	Supine, 20ml, , level of mid axillary line	Supine with leftward tilt, 50ml	Supine, 25ml, symphysis pubis

182 IAP – Intra abdominal pressure, SD – Standard deviation

183

184 In the current study, normotensive pregnancies at term, antepartum IAP of 12.6mmHg (95% CI
 185 =11.6- 13.8) is within the range of three studies, Fuchs F et al [5],Chun R et al[6] and Staelens A
 186 et al[7]. In our study , antepartum mean IAP slightly lower than Fuchs F et al and Staelens A et al
 187 mean antepartum IAP which may attribute with birth weight and other demographic factors. Al
 188 Khan A *et al* [8] study IAP value is higher than our antepartum IAP. This higher value of IAP,
 189 probably due to methodological overestimation, as is noticed by Chun et al [6] and Staelens A. et
 190 al[7].

191 Postpartum IAP in this study was within the range of Postpartum IAP of Fuchs F et al [5], Staelens
 192 A et al [6], and Abdel-Razeq et al [9]studies. Al Khan A et al [8] study IAP value is higher than
 193 our postpartum IAP.

194 **Intra-abdominal pressure in hypertension in pregnancy**

195 In our study, antepartum, postpartum IAP levels are 12.5 mmHg (10.04 to 15.01) and 9.21 mmHg
 196 (7.26 to 11.16) respectively at mean gestational age and 34.3 weeks and mean birth weight of
 197 1886.66g. Antepartum IAP is within in the range of Grade 1 IAH. Postpartum IAP level slightly
 198 higher than the normal level of IAP in non-pregnant population.

199 **Table 4. Comparison of intra-abdominal pressure in hypertension in pregnancy**

	Mesut A. Ünsal et al 2016	Current study	
Category	Hypertension in pregnancy n=35	Hypertension in pregnancy n=15	<i>p</i> value
Age (95% CI)	28.6 (22.4 to 34.8)	32.87 (29.54 to 36.19)	0.03*
Parity	1 (0 to 6)	2	

Gestational age (95% CI)	33 (24 to 40)	34.26 (32.24 to 36.28)	0.32*
BMI (95% CI)	27.0 (19.1 to 34.9)	24.50 (23.00 to 26.00)	0.24*
Birth weight (95% CI)	1910.9 (997.8 to 2824)	1886.66 (1415.89 to 2357.44)	0.93*
Ante-partum IAP -mmHg (95% CI)	13.46 (11.55 to 15.37)	12.53 (10.04 to 15.01)	0.30*
Post-partum IAP mmHg (95% CI)	10.00 (7.57 to 12.43)	9.21 (7.26 to 11.16)	0.36*

200 IAP- Intra abdominal pressure BMI – Body Mass Index * Independent *t* test

201

202 Mesut A. Ünsal et al published a study comparing the IAP in hypertension in pregnancy and
203 normotensive pregnancy [10].

204 Comparing with Mesut A. Ünsal et al study and this study, both Antepartum IAP and Postpartum
205 IAP of hypertension in pregnancy category, within same range as shown in Table 4.

206 Multivariable regression analyses were used to compare the IAP levels in two categories. Because
207 two groups have different birth weights and gestational age which directly influence the IAP levels.

208 Regression analysis of antepartum IAP showed 1.6 times higher IAP level in hypertension in
209 pregnancy compared to the normotensive group when adjusted for birthweight. However, it is not
210 statistically significant, which is probably due to the small sample size in the hypertensive group.

211 Association between IAP and hypertension in pregnancy, can be better explained with serial
212 estimation of antepartum IAP in different gestations using a larger sample.

213 Reduction of IAP from antepartum period to postpartum period is 1.013 times less in hypertension
214 in pregnancy, compared to normotensive pregnancy when adjusted for birthweight.

215 Postpartum IAP level is 2.5 times higher in hypertensive pregnancies compared to normotensive
216 pregnancies after adjusting for birth weight, BMI and parity. It is statistically significant.
217 Delivery of the fetus and placenta is considered as the curative treatment in preeclampsia. This is
218 based on theory of “preeclampsia is disease of placental origin”. This theory is challenged in the
219 situation of postpartum preeclampsia, eclampsia and de novo postpartum hypertension. It raises
220 the possibility of a residual factor or pathological process that exist absence of the fetus and the
221 placenta. Our study revealed higher postpartum IAP level and less reduction of IAP level from
222 antepartum period to postpartum period in hypertension in pregnancy. It infer the association of
223 high postpartum intra-abdominal pressure and development of postpartum preeclampsia,
224 eclampsia and de novo postpartum hypertension.

225 **Conclusion**

226 In normotensive pregnancies at term, mean antepartum IAP was 12.69mmHg (95%CI 11.61 to
227 13.77) and postpartum mean IAP was 7.26mmHg (95% CI 11.61 to 13.77). In normotensive
228 pregnancy at term, IAP is within the range of IAH of non-pregnant population.

229 Higher antepartum and postpartum IAP level, less reduction of IAP after delivery of the fetus and
230 placenta is associated with hypertension in pregnancy compare to the normotensive pregnancy.

231

232 **Acknowledgment**

233 We would like to thank all volunteers for participation in this study. We thank Kosala Gayan
234 Weerakoon for helpful discussions and support, and Kyriakos Kouvelakis for assistance with
235 statistical analysis.

236 Reference

- 237 1. Zhang J, Zeisler J, Hatch MC, Berkowitz G. Epidemiology of pregnancy-induced
238 hypertension. *Epidemiol Rev.* 1997;19(2):218-32. doi:
239 10.1093/oxfordjournals.epirev.a017954. PMID: 9494784.
- 240 2. Bloomfield GL, Sugerman HJ, Blocher CR, Gehr TW, Sica DA. Chronically increased
241 intra-abdominal pressure produces systemic hypertension in dogs. *Int J Obes Relat Metab*
242 *Disord.* 2000 Jul;24(7):819-24. doi: 10.1038/sj.ijo.0801234. PMID: 10918527.
- 243 3. Paramore RH. The Intra-abdominal Pressure in Pregnancy. *Proc R Soc Med.*
244 1913;6(Obstet Gynaecol Sect):291-334. PMID: 19977092; PMCID: PMC2006436.
- 245 4. Sugerman HJ. Hypothesis: preeclampsia is a venous disease secondary to an increased
246 intra-abdominal pressure. *Med Hypotheses.* 2011 Nov;77(5):841-9. doi:
247 10.1016/j.mehy.2011.07.051. Epub 2011 Sep 1. PMID: 21862236.
- 248 5. Fuchs F, Bruyere M, Senat MV, Purenne E, Benhamou D, Fernandez H. Are standard
249 intra-abdominal pressure values different during pregnancy? *PLoS One.* 2013 Oct
250 25;8(10):e77324. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0077324. PMID: 24204808; PMCID:
251 PMC3808400.
- 252 6. Chun R, Baghirzada L, Tiruta C, Kirkpatrick AW. Measurement of intra-abdominal
253 pressure in term pregnancy: a pilot study. *Int J Obstet Anesth.* 2012 Apr;21(2):135-9. doi:
254 10.1016/j.ijoa.2011.10.010. Epub 2012 Feb 11. PMID: 22326198.
- 255 7. Staelens AS, Van Cauwelaert S, Tomsin K, Mesens T, Malbrain ML, Gyselaers W. Intra-
256 abdominal pressure measurements in term pregnancy and postpartum: an observational
257 study. *PLoS One.* 2014 Aug 12;9(8):e104782. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0104782.
258 PMID: 25117778; PMCID: PMC4130571.

- 259 8. Al-Khan A, Shah M, Altabban M, Kaul S, Dyer KY, Alvarez M, Saber S. Measurement
260 of intraabdominal pressure in pregnant women at term. J Reprod Med. 2011 Jan-
261 Feb;56(1-2):53-7. PMID: 21366128.
- 262 9. Abdel-Razeq SS, Campbell K, Funai EF, Kaplan LJ, Bahtiyar MO. Normative
263 postpartum intraabdominal pressure: potential implications in the diagnosis of abdominal
264 compartment syndrome. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2010 Aug;203(2):149.e1-4. doi:
265 10.1016/j.ajog.2010.02.055. Epub 2010 Apr 24. PMID: 20417482.
- 266 10. Ünsal MA, İnce Ü, Cengiz S, Karahan SC, Aran T. The Relationship Between
267 Intraabdominal Hypertension and Preeclampsia. Gynecol Obstet Reprod Med
268 2017;23(1):1-5
269




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3