

1 **Spirometry performance quality and lung function pattern during pregnancy; should**
2 **testing conditions and interpretation criteria be re-evaluated?**

3
4 Jacktan J Ruhighira^{1*}, Fredirick L Mashili², Alexander M Tungu², Stephen Kibusi³

5 1. Department of Physiology, University of Dodoma 2. Department of Physiology, Muhimbili
6 University of Health and Allied Sciences 3. Department of Public Health, University of
7 Dodoma

8 **Abstract**

9 **Introduction:** Despite the prevalence of respiratory disorders in the gravid state, and the crucial
10 role of spirometry in respiratory medicine, its utility for assessing lung function during pregnancy
11 remains infrequent. Putative reasons for this include reservations regarding spirometry
12 performance and its potential influence on test outcomes, although the literature documenting such
13 concerns is insufficient. This study sought to evaluate whether variations in spirometry test
14 performance could impact the diagnosis of pulmonary function patterns throughout gestation.

15 **Methods:** We used spirometry data from a cross-sectional study of 120 pregnant and 114 non-
16 pregnant women who underwent spirometry with uniform instructions given to all subjects. Data
17 were subjected to chi-square testing and subsequently evaluated through logistic regression
18 analysis.

19 **Results:** The acceptable performance rate among pregnant participants was 77.3%, with the most
20 common quality grade being C (37.5%). Pregnant individuals exhibited 2.1 times the odds of
21 achieving a B grade ($p=0.037$, 95% CI=1.0-4.2) and 4.1 times the odds of achieving an F grade
22 ($p=0.02$, 95% CI=1.6-9.9) instead of an A grade. Additionally, they manifested 2.9 times the odds
23 of generating unsatisfactory performance ($p=0.007$, 95% CI=1.3-6.1) compared to non-pregnant
24 participants. Also, pregnant participants displayed 2.5 times the odds of exhibiting a restrictive

25 pattern ($p=0.021$, 95% CI=1.1-5.7); but pattern classification was not associated with quality
26 grades.

27 **Conclusion:** Despite the higher likelihood of suboptimal spirometry quality, the observed pattern
28 classification remains as expected physiologically, suggesting that spirometry is still a valid tool
29 for assessing lung function in pregnancy.

30 **Introduction**

31 Spirometry is a cost-effective and commonly used noninvasive lung function test. It assesses lung
32 function by measuring the amount of air and speed of forceful exhalation (1). Despite its
33 importance in respiratory medicine, spirometry is not usually used to assess lung function during
34 pregnancy, although respiratory conditions are common in pregnancy (2). One of the reasons
35 could be worrying about performance during pregnancy and its potential influence on test results.
36 While this concern could hold, the documentation and evidence supporting it are insufficient.

37 The spirometry test must meet quality criteria to be useful in respiratory medicine. The American
38 Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society (ATS/ERS) has established spirometry
39 acceptability and reproducibility criteria. The acceptable session has to begin with maximal
40 inhalation, followed by an abrupt, most forceful exhalation without hesitation and continue
41 smoothly without interruption by inhalation or cough for at least six seconds (3). The
42 reproducibility is defined by the difference between the two largest forced vital capacities (FVC)
43 and forced expiratory volumes in the first second (FEV1) (4).

44 Depending on quality and reproducibility, a quality control grade is assigned to the spirometry test
45 at the end of the session. The criteria for performance grading (5) are described in Table 1. Grades
46 A-C are considered clinically important and acceptable to interpret spirogram lung function

47 patterns (6). There is a lack of studies to assess quality control grades during pregnancy which
48 could probably determine which grades are clinically meaningful during this period.

49 *Table 1: Spirometry performance quality control grades (5)*

Quality Control Grade	Number of Acceptable Manoeuvres	Repeatability (ml)
A	3	<150
B	3	150-200
C	2	150-200
D	2	>200
E	1	NA
F	0	NA

50 Even in non-gravid states, errors during spirometry such as submaximal inhalation, hesitations,
51 coughing during the manoeuvre, early termination, and variable effort are common (7). With
52 massive adaptations to pregnancy, spirometry can be expected to be even harder. Also, although
53 spirometry values may remain in the normal range, they are lowered during pregnancy (8) which
54 can be critical for those who had a borderline pre-pregnancy respiratory function. In the current
55 analysis, we aimed to compare spirometry test performance and lung function patterns among
56 pregnant and non-pregnant women and see if they were associated. Based on the normal
57 physiology of pregnancy (9), we hypothesized that restrictive spirometry patterns would be more
58 common in pregnant than in non-pregnant women, regardless of spirometry performance quality.

59 **Materials and Methods**

60 **Study design and participants**

61 We used data obtained from a cross-sectional spirometry study involving pregnant and non-
62 pregnant women (8). We included 120 pregnant women randomly recruited from Mnazi Mmoja
63 Hospital in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Included pregnant participants were aged 18-35, had a 6-36

64 weeks singleton pregnancy, and booked their first antenatal visit during their first trimester. Ages
65 under 18 were excluded due to presumed immature reproductive systems, while those above 35
66 were left out to exclude the effects of pregnancy in advanced age. The first five weeks were
67 excluded due to the uncertainty of pregnancy diagnosis, while term pregnancy was excluded
68 because of the increased risk associated with intrabdominal pressure during spirometry
69 manoeuvre. Also, 114 non-pregnant participants were consecutively recruited from the Muhimbili
70 University of Health Sciences (MUHAS) if they had similar characteristics except for being
71 pregnant. Non-pregnant women who were pregnant in the preceding 42 days were excluded for
72 possible effects of a previous pregnancy. Potential participants who had any contraindication for
73 spirometry were excluded from the study. Detailed information on recruitment, inclusion, and
74 exclusion criteria has been previously described (8).

75 **Spirometry test procedure and data collection process**

76 Spirometry was done in a seating position using EasyOne® (ndd Medical Technologies, Zurich,
77 Switzerland) digital spirometer set to diagnostic mode from May 10 to July 27, 2021. Participants
78 were given similar instructions by the same technician adapted from the ATS/ERS 2019
79 spirometry standardization update (4) and American National Health and Nutrition Examination
80 Survey (NHANES) 2011 manual (10). Everyone observed hand hygiene and kept a distance
81 without facing each other directly. More details on spirometry procedures have been previously
82 described (8).

83 **Variable measurements**

84 The current analysis's main outcome variables were spirometry test session quality control grade,
85 acceptability, and lung function pattern. Each session was graded by the spirometer, and those
86 graded A-C were considered acceptable while those graded D-F were regarded as unacceptable.

87 Only acceptable sessions were included in the analysis of the pattern. The definition of lung
88 function pattern by spirometry (10) is described in Table 2.

89 *Table 2: Definition of lung function pattern by spirometry (10)*

Lung Function Pattern	FEV1/FVC	FEV1%	FVC%
Normal	>70%	>80%	>80%
Obstructive	<70%	<80%	>80%
Restrictive	>70%	<80%	<80%
Mixed	<70%	<80%	<80%

90 Exposure variables were participant characteristics; age, pregnancy status, body weight, height,
91 parity, and gestational age. Age and parity were obtained by participant self-reporting. Height and
92 body weight were measured using Seca® (Seca GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg, Germany) scales.
93 Weight was further categorized into body mass index (BMI) groups, but BMI in pregnancy was
94 obtained using weight recorded in the first trimester instead of unavailable pre-pregnancy weight.
95 Gestational age was obtained from an obstetric ultrasound done in the first trimester.

96 **Data analysis**

97 Data were coded, entered, and analyzed using SPSS version 26 software. Participant characteristics
98 were described using frequencies and percentages. The respective characteristic differences
99 between pregnant and non-pregnant participants were analyzed by the chi-square test. The
100 difference between pregnant and non-pregnant spirometry performance acceptability, quality
101 control grades, and lung function patterns were preliminary analyzed by the chi-square test and
102 further by logistic regression. Since the two groups under comparison differed in body weight and
103 it was found to have an association with quality control grades, the difference was adjusted for
104 body weight using ordinal regression analysis.

105 Ethical consideration

106 The study was cleared by MUHAS's ethical review board, and permission to conduct the study
107 was sought from administrative authorities. A pre-arranged written informed consent was provided
108 and signed by all participants. All test procedures were carried out per Helsinki's declaration.
109 Although spirometry is considered safe during pregnancy (11), safety precautions were taken,
110 including taking a test in a seating position. Potential participants for whom spirometry was
111 contraindicated were excluded from the study. Participants diagnosed with dysfunctional patterns
112 were referred for further evaluation.

113 Results

114 Characteristics of study participants

115 This analysis included 234 participants, among whom 120 were pregnant and 114 were non-
116 pregnant women (Table 3). The majority of participants were aged between 20-24 (38.1%), had
117 normal body weight (47.5%), had a height of 150-159 cm (51.3), and had never given birth
118 (48.6%). Most pregnant participants were in their third trimester between 28-35 weeks of gestation
119 (44.1%). The pregnant and non-pregnant participants differed by age (p-value <0.001), body
120 weight (p-value <0.043), and parity (p-value <0.001).

121 *Table 3: Characteristics of Study Participants (n=234)*

Characteristic		Pregnant	Non-pregnant	p-value*
		Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	
<i>Age (years)</i>	18-19	3 (2.5)	12 (10.5)	<0.001
	20-24	32 (26.7)	58 (50.9)	
	25-29	36 (30)	20 (17.5)	
	30-35	49 (40.8)	24 (21.1)	
<i>Body weight</i>	Underweight	6 (5)	10 (8.8)	0.043
	Normal weight	50 (41.7)	61 (53.5)	
	Overweight	39 (32.5)	20 (17.5)	
	Obese	25 (20.8)	23 (20.2)	

<i>Body height</i>	135-139	1 (0.8)	0 (0)	0.147
	140-149	11 (9.2)	12 (10.5)	
	150-159	70 (58.3)	50 (43.9)	
	160-169	37 (30.8)	47 (41.2)	
	170+	1 (0.8)	5 (4.4)	
<i>Parity</i>	0	42 (35)	71 (62.3)	<0.001
	1	41 (34.2)	17 (14.9)	
	2	19 (15.8)	13 (11.4)	
	3	14 (11.7)	6 (5.3)	
	4	4 (3.3)	7 (6.1)	
<i>Gestational Age</i>	1st trimester	11		
	2nd trimester	34		
	3rd trimester	75		
	<20 weeks	26		
	20-28 weeks	41		
	28-35 weeks	53		

**p*-value for the characteristic difference between pregnant and non-pregnant participants

122

123 **Spirometry performance during pregnancy**

124 Acceptable performance was 77.3% (Figure 1) among pregnant participants, with the majority
 125 achieving grade C (37.5%), while it was 90.4% amongst non-pregnant participants, with the
 126 majority achieving grade B (30.7%). With reference to grade A, pregnant participants had 2.1
 127 times the odds of achieving a B grade ($p=0.037$, 95% CI=1.0-4.2) and 4.1 times the odds of
 128 achieving an F ($p=0.02$, 95% CI=1.6-9.9) than their non-pregnant counterparts. When adjusted for
 129 body weight, pregnant participants had 3.8 times the odds of achieving a grade below A ($p=0.001$,
 130 95% CI=1.7-8.2) than non-pregnant participants as weight increased. Moreover, pregnant
 131 participants had 2.9 times the odds of producing unacceptable performance ($p=0.007$, 95% CI=1.3-
 132 6.1) than non-pregnant participants.

133 *Figure 1: Spirometry performance of pregnant and non-pregnant participants (n=234, Error*
 134 *bar=95% CI)*

135 The spirometry performance quality grades were associated with body weight ($p=0.015$), height
136 ($p=0.018$) and gestational age ($p=0.014$) but only body weight was significant after applying the
137 logistic regression model. The acceptability of spirometry performance was not associated with
138 any of the factors under study.

139 **Spirometry patterns of lung function during pregnancy**

140 About 71.7% ($n=66$) of pregnant participants had normal patterns, while it was 92.6% ($n=104$)
141 among controls. The pregnant participants had 2.5 times the odds of having a restrictive pattern
142 ($p=0.021$, 95% CI=1.1-5.7) and remained significant even after adjusting for spirometry
143 performance quality. The patterns were not associated with any of the participants' characteristics
144 or performance quality.

145 *Figure 2: Spirometry pattern of lung function of pregnant and non-pregnant participants*
146 *($n=196$, Error bar=95% CI)*

147 **Discussion**

148 We studied spirometry performance among pregnant in comparison to non-pregnant women and
149 evaluated whether test performance capability and quality substantially affect results. Our findings
150 revealed that despite suboptimal test performance quality in pregnant as compared to non-pregnant
151 women, the test results still portrayed physiologically expected patterns in pregnancy.
152 Interestingly, we found no association between test quality grade and lung function patterns in
153 pregnant and non-pregnant women.

154 Being pregnant increased the odds of achieving lower spirometry performance quality grades and
155 more likely to produce unacceptable sessions than non-pregnant participants. While most pregnant
156 participants had only two acceptable manoeuvres with repeatability exceeding 200 ml, most of the

157 non-pregnant participants had three or more with repeatability not exceeding 200 ml. Also,
158 pregnant participants were more likely to have restrictive lung function patterns.

159 Performing acceptable spirometry requires understanding and correct execution of given
160 instructions. Lower-quality grades could be due to impaired cognitive function, especially
161 attention, memory, and execution reported during pregnancy (12). Alternatively, pregnant
162 participants could have had divided attention as they were attending antenatal services, hence
163 failure to comprehend instructions for the correct execution (13). Yet, the lower acceptability
164 quality of spirometry performance in pregnancy could be a contributing factor to the lower
165 volumes as compared to their non-pregnant counterparts (8) although the values are believed to
166 remain within normal limits (9).

167 Body weight independently correlated with spirometry performance during pregnancy. Weight
168 change is a marked cardiometabolic alteration occurring during pregnancy and corresponds with
169 physical performance (14). Also, we didn't find any correlation between body age, height, and
170 gestational age with spirometry performance, but these have been important predictors of test
171 values (15). Contrary to the other studies (16,17), no factor under study was associated with the
172 overall acceptability. This analysis included participants of close age and context and hence might
173 have had less heterogeneity to reveal the effect of the factors.

174 In the current analysis, spirometry was more likely to classify pregnant women as having
175 restrictive lung function patterns, as has been documented previously (18). This can be attributed
176 to pregnancy-induced ribcage restriction and diaphragmatic changes due to an alteration in
177 fibre length and abdominal pressure (19). The spirometry classification of lung function pattern
178 was independent of quality grades; thus, A-C grades can still be clinically acceptable during
179 pregnancy. Further studies can examine if spirometry interpretation criteria can be re-evaluated to

180 accommodate suboptimal performance during pregnancy such as exploring the potential of using
181 grade D under certain conditions. Although disregarded, the potential of lowering quality control
182 criteria has been evaluated previously (20).

183 Our comparisons could have been limited as we did not assess the intellectual abilities, which
184 could have influenced comprehension and therefore execution of instructions for correct
185 spirometry (6). Also, pregnant participants were recruited randomly, while non-pregnant controls
186 were recruited consecutively, and only pregnant participants who booked their first antenatal visit
187 in their first trimester were included in the study.

188 **Acknowledgement**

189 We acknowledge Mr Elibariki Kapinda the laboratory technician from MUHAS who conducted
190 spirometry.

191 **Conclusion**

192 Despite the higher likelihood of pregnant individuals producing suboptimal spirometry test quality,
193 the observed pattern classification remains consistent with physiological expectations. This
194 suggests that spirometry is still a valid tool for assessing lung function in pregnancy. However, the
195 suboptimal performance rates among pregnant individuals highlight the need to reevaluate the use
196 of spirometry in this population to ensure optimal testing conditions and accurate interpretation of
197 results.

198 **References**

- 199 1. Behr J, Furst DE. Pulmonary function tests. In: Rheumatology [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2020
200 Sep 8]. p. v65–7. Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/rheumatology/article-
201 lookup/doi/10.1093/rheumatology/ken313](https://academic.oup.com/rheumatology/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/rheumatology/ken313)
- 202 2. Collier SA, Rasmussen SA, Feldkamp ML, Honein MA. Prevalence of self-reported
203 infection during pregnancy among control mothers in the National Birth Defects

- 204 Prevention Study. *Birth Defects Res Part A Clin Mol Teratol* [Internet]. 2009 Mar 1 [cited
205 2021 Mar 4];85(3):193–201. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/bdra.20540>
- 206 3. Miller MR, Hankinson J, Brusasco V, Burgos F, Casaburi R, Coates A, et al.
207 Standardisation of spirometry. *Eur Respir J* [Internet]. 2005 Aug 1 [cited 2023 Mar
208 29];26(2):319–38. Available from: <https://erj.ersjournals.com/content/26/2/319>
- 209 4. Graham BL, Steenbruggen I, Barjaktarevic IZ, Cooper BG, Hall GL, Hallstrand TS, et al.
210 Standardization of spirometry 2019 update an official American Thoracic Society and
211 European Respiratory Society technical statement. Vol. 200, *American Journal of*
212 *Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*. American Thoracic Society; 2019. p. E70–88.
- 213 5. Enright PL, Johnson LR, Connett JE, Voelker H, Buist AS. Spirometry in the Lung Health
214 Study: 1. Methods and quality control. *Am Rev Respir Dis*. 1991 Dec 17;143(6):1215–23.
- 215 6. Enright P, Vollmer WM, Lamprecht B, Jensen R, Jithoo A, Tan W, et al. Quality of
216 Spirometry tests performed by 9893 adults in 14 countries: The BOLD Study. *Respir*
217 *Med*. 2011 Oct 1;105(10):1507–15.
- 218 7. Spirometry Quality Assurance: Common Errors and Their Impact on Test Results. *Dep*
219 *Heal Hum Serv* [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2023 Mar 30];200(8):E70–88. Available from:
220 [http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/spirometry/training.html%0Ahttp://www.atsjournals.org/
221 doi/suppl/10.1164/rccm.201908-1590ST](http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/spirometry/training.html%0Ahttp://www.atsjournals.org/doi/suppl/10.1164/rccm.201908-1590ST).
- 222 8. Ruhighira JJ, Mashili FL, Tungu AM, Mamuya S. Spirometry profiles among pregnant
223 and non-pregnant African women: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Womens Health*
224 [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2023 Apr 1];22(1):1–14. Available from:
225 <https://link.springer.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-022-02081-6>
- 226 9. LoMauro A, Aliverti A. Respiratory physiology of pregnancy. *Breathe* [Internet]. 2015
227 Dec 1 [cited 2023 Apr 1];11(4):297–301. Available from:
228 <https://breathe.ersjournals.com/content/11/4/297>
- 229 10. Center for Health Statistics N. *Respiratory Health Spirometry Procedures Manual*. 2011.
- 230 11. Cooper BG. An update on contraindications for lung function testing. *Thorax* [Internet].
231 2011 [cited 2020 Sep 12];66:714–23. Available from: <http://thorax.bmj.com/>
- 232 12. Henry JF, Sherwin BB. Hormones and cognitive functioning during late pregnancy and
233 postpartum: A longitudinal study. *Behav Neurosci*. 2012 Feb;126(1):73–85.
- 234 13. Logan DM, Hill KR, Jones R, Holt-lunstad J, Michael J. *Journal of Clinical and*
235 *Experimental Neuropsychology* How do memory and attention change with pregnancy
236 and childbirth? A controlled longitudinal examination of neuropsychological functioning
237 in pregnant and postpartum women How do memory and attention ch.
238 2014;(December):37–41.
- 239 14. Physical Activity and Exercise During Pregnancy and the Postpartum Period | ACOG
240 [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 9]. Available from: [https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-
241 guidance/committee-opinion/articles/2020/04/physical-activity-and-exercise-during-
242 pregnancy-and-the-postpartum-period](https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/committee-opinion/articles/2020/04/physical-activity-and-exercise-during-pregnancy-and-the-postpartum-period)

- 243 15. Quanjer PH, Stanojevic S, Cole TJ, Baur X, Hall GL, Culver BH, et al. Multi-ethnic
244 reference values for spirometry for the 3-95-yr age range: The global lung function 2012
245 equations. *Eur Respir J* [Internet]. 2012 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Jun 14];40(6):1324–43.
246 Available from: www.erj.ersjournals.com
- 247 16. Tan WC, Bourbeau J, O'donnell D, Aaron S, Maltais F, Marciniuk D, et al. Quality
248 Assurance of Spirometry in a Population-Based Study –Predictors of Good Outcome in
249 Spirometry Testing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/154125552013822857> [Internet]. 2014
250 [cited 2023 Apr 4];11(2):143–51. Available from:
251 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.3109/15412555.2013.822857>
- 252 17. Schermer TRJ, Crockett AJ, Poels PJP, Van Dijke JJ, Akkermans RP, Vlek HF, et al.
253 Quality of routine spirometry tests in Dutch general practices. *Br J Gen Pract* [Internet].
254 2009 Dec 1 [cited 2023 Apr 4];59(569):e376–82. Available from:
255 <https://bjgp.org/content/59/569/e376>
- 256 18. Amare YE, Haile D. Evaluation of Pulmonary Function Tests Among Pregnant Women of
257 Different Trimesters in Debre Berhan Referral Hospital, Shoa, Ethiopia. *Int J Womens*
258 *Health* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 7 [cited 2023 Apr 9];12:1135–43. Available from:
259 [https://www.dovepress.com/evaluation-of-pulmonary-function-tests-among-pregnant-](https://www.dovepress.com/evaluation-of-pulmonary-function-tests-among-pregnant-women-of-differe-peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-IJWH)
260 [women-of-differe-peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-IJWH](https://www.dovepress.com/evaluation-of-pulmonary-function-tests-among-pregnant-women-of-differe-peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-IJWH)
- 261 19. LoMauro A, Aliverti A, Frykholm P, Alberico D, Persico N, Boschetti G, et al.
262 Adaptation of lung, chest wall, and respiratory muscles during pregnancy: Preparing for
263 birth. *J Appl Physiol* [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2023 Apr 9];127(6):1640–50. Available from:
264 <https://journals.physiology.org/doi/10.1152/jappphysiol.00035.2019>
- 265 20. Torre-Bouscoulet L, Velázquez-Uncal M, García-Torrentera R, Gochicoa-Rangel L,
266 Fernández-Plata R, Enright P, et al. Spirometry Quality in Adults With Very Severe Lung
267 Function Impairment. 2015;
- 268
- 269




Figure 1




Figure 2