

# Systematic Review of risk score prediction models using maternal characteristics with and without biomarkers for the prediction of GDM

Durga Parkhi<sup>1</sup>, Swetha Sampathkumar<sup>1</sup>, Yonas Weldelessie<sup>1,2</sup>, Nithya Sukumar<sup>1,3</sup>, and Ponnusamy Saravanan<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Populations, Evidence, and Technologies, Division of Health Sciences, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>Department of Diabetes, Endocrinology, and Metabolism, George Eliot Hospital, Nuneaton, United Kingdom

✉ Ponnusamy Saravanan: [p.saravanan@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:p.saravanan@warwick.ac.uk)

**Abstract Background:** GDM is associated with adverse maternal and fetal complications. By the time GDM is diagnosed, continuous exposure to the hyperglycaemic intrauterine environment can adversely affect the fetus. Hence, early pregnancy prediction of GDM is important.

**Aim:** To systematically evaluate whether composite risk score prediction models can accurately predict GDM in early pregnancy.

**Method:** Systematic review of observational studies involving pregnant women of <20 weeks of gestation was carried out. The search involved various databases, grey literature, and reference lists till August 2022. The primary outcome was the predictive performance of the models in terms of the AUC, for <14 weeks and 14-20 weeks of gestation.

**Results:** Sixty-seven articles for <14 weeks and 22 for 14-20 weeks of gestation were included (initial search - 4542). The sample size ranged from 42 to 1,160,933. The studies were from Canada, USA, UK, Europe, Israel, Iran, China, Taiwan, South Korea, South Africa, Australia, Singapore, and Thailand. For <14 weeks, the AUC ranges were 0.59-0.88 and 0.53-0.95, respectively for models that used only maternal characteristics and for those that included biomarkers. For 14-20 weeks these AUCs were 0.68-0.71 and 0.65-0.92. Age, ethnicity, BMI, family history of diabetes, and prior GDM were the 5 most commonly used risk factors. The addition of systolic BP improved performance in some models. Triglycerides, PAPP-A, and lipocalin-2, combined with maternal characteristics, have the highest predictive performance. AUC varied according to the population studied. Pooled analyses were not done due to high heterogeneity.

**Conclusion:** Accurate GDM risk prediction may be possible if common risk factors are combined with biomarkers. However, more research is needed in populations of high GDM risk. Artificial Intelligence-based risk prediction models that incorporate fetal biometry data may improve accuracy.

**Keywords** · Gestational Diabetes Mellitus · composite risk score · systematic review · prediction model ·

machine learning

**Introduction** Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM) is defined as any degree of glucose intolerance with onset or first recognition during pregnancy Rodriguez and Mahdy (2019). GDM is associated with many short-term and long-term complications for the mother and her offspring Plant et al. (2020). Women with GDM have a higher risk of pre-eclampsia and a higher risk of Type 2 diabetes or cardiovascular disorders (CVD) in the long term. Offspring born to women with GDM can have a higher risk of both short-term and long-term adverse outcomes including cardiometabolic disorders in the long term Saravanan et al. (2020). GDM is highly prevalent among South Asian women compared to women from other ethnic groups K. W. Lee et al. (2018). Some estimates suggest this may affect 1 in 5 pregnancies in India and the risk of type 2 diabetes in this population is higher than in other populations Shivashri et al. (2022).

There is increasing evidence that GDM is diagnosed too late in pregnancy (Savio et al, Diabetes care) and excess fetal adiposity may be present several weeks before the onset of GDM Sukumar et al. (2016). In addition, despite good control of GDM, adverse metabolic programming may exist with resultant accelerated adiposity accumulation in infants born to mothers with GDM Logan et al. (2016). Therefore, it is imperative not only to diagnose GDM early in pregnancy but also to prevent the onset of GDM in women who are at higher risk. Accurate prediction of incident GDM may enable prevention. FIGO Best Practice Advice recommends viewing pregnancy as an opportunity to prevent type 2 diabetes mellitus Adam et al. (2023).

Screening for GDM varies across countries. Universal screening is recommended in populations with a high prevalence of GDM and selective screening where the prevalence is low. However, by either strategy, the pickup rate is only between 5 and 15%. Hence many women undergo unnecessary testing. Currently, the

common risk factors used for selective screening include age, BMI, family history (1st-degree relative) of diabetes, polycystic ovarian syndrome, previous history of GDM, previous history of macrosomia, and women from certain high-risk ethnic groups K. W. Lee et al. (2018), Pons, Rockett, de Almeida Rubin, Oppermann, and Bosa (2015). Different guidelines use different risk factors and none use composite risk scores. In addition to these 'traditional' risk factors, several other risk factors have been identified recently (such as triglycerides, adiponectin, the fetal abdominal wall thickness in early pregnancy, etc) but none have been included in any of the screening guidelines. Weighted incorporation of these risk factors in novel prediction methods using machine learning may also improve the predictive ability of GDM. Recently, several studies published the utility of such prediction models with mixed results (here cite the 2022 studies). We, therefore, conducted a systematic review of all the available studies that used composite risk prediction models before 20 weeks of gestation for the prediction of GDM. If proven, the accurate prediction may aid in implementing GDM prevention strategies early in pregnancy.

**Methods Research Design:** This study was conducted according to PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines.

**Search Methods:** We searched Medline, Embase, Cinahl, Web of Science, Scopus, and ProQuest databases, Cochrane trials, grey literature, and reference lists of relevant papers for articles published in English till August 2022. The main keywords for the search strategy included "gestational diabetes mellitus", "pregnancy", "glucose intolerance", "hyperglyc\*", "prediction model", "statistical model", "machine learning", "risk score", and "risk assessment". The detailed search criteria are listed in the Appendix. Additionally, the reference list of each identified study was manually searched to identify any additional studies. EndNote X7 was employed to manage the studies and remove duplicate items. The search was updated to include any additional studies on 28 Feb 2023.


**Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:** All included studies had to meet the following criteria: (1) published in English; (2) included pregnant women from the general population, with a clear definition for GDM diagnosis; (3) included composite risk score models for GDM prediction, with a clear description of the models and the time of collection of the predictors; and (4) showed the performance of the models in terms of auROC. Articles in other languages, other types of articles (eg, reports and reviews), or those that used

other measures for GDM detection were excluded. Articles with prediction models using predictors collected at > 20 weeks of pregnancy or unknown time points were also excluded. Search and data extraction were performed independently by two investigators (DP and SS). Disagreements were resolved by discussion with a third reviewer (PS).

**Data Extraction:** Data extraction was carried out by the Transparent Reporting of a Multivariable Prediction Model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD) protocol Moons et al. (2015). The following data were extracted from each study: (1) demographic information (ie, the country in which the data were gathered, the setting, the study design, the prediction temporality, and the outcome definition); (2) the candidate and final features of the model training, the prediction model type (Regression/Bayesian/ML/Other), and the model validation and application (risk equation and cut-off, if given); (3) prediction outcomes, performance measures including auROC, sensitivity, specificity, ppv, and npv, and calibration, if available.

**Quality and Bias Assessments:** The PROBAST questionnaire, which includes a total of 20 signaling questions in four domains (ie, participants, predictors, outcome, and analysis), was used as a tool for assessing the risk of bias and applicability of each included study Wolff et al. (2019).

**Statistical Analysis:** The performance of each composite risk score (CRS) model was described using the primary outcome measures of discrimination and calibration. Model discrimination or concordance index (C-index) is similar to the AUROC Steyerberg et al. (2010) and indicates its diagnostic or prognostic discrimination ability as none (AUROC  $\leq 0.6$ ), poor (AUROC  $> 0.6$  to  $0.7$ ), fair (AUROC  $> 0.7$  to  $0.8$ ), good (AUROC  $> 0.8$  to  $0.9$ ), or optimum (AUROC  $> 0.9$  to  $1$ ). Model calibration is a metric of the goodness of fit that assesses the agreement between observed and predicted outcomes and reflects the stability of the model via calibration plots. The  $I^2$  test was used to assess the statistical heterogeneity among the included studies Higgins et al. (2019). Where possible, the pooled estimates of AUROC, sensitivity, and specificity were calculated, but in presence of high heterogeneity between different CRS models, these were not carried out. The analysis of the included studies was divided into primary and subgroup analyses to judge the performances of the CRS methods in predicting GDM in different gestational period. Sensitivity analyses and subgroup analyses were also conducted to gain insight into potential sources of interstudy heterogeneity due to selector or inclusion



**Figure 1: Consort Diagram**

criteria bias. The abilities of the different ML algorithms (eg, LR, Bayesian model, SVM, and XGBoost) for predicting GDM were also carried out as additional analysis.


**Results Study selection:** A total of 123 studies were included out of the initial 4,542 studies. Out of these, 89 (72.36%) were in the gestational age range of less than 14 weeks or 14-20 weeks. Figure 1 shows the PRISMA flow diagram of the study selection process.

**Study characteristics:** Among the 89 included studies, 67 used prediction models <14 weeks gestation (Table 2) and 22 between 14 and 20 weeks of gestation (Table 3). Majority of these studies were published within the last 10 year and 11 were published in 2022. Eleven used ML-based techniques and others mostly used regression or Bayesian methods for prediction. Most regression-based studies used either forward stepwise selection or backward stepwise selection for multivariable feature selection. The studies were from the USA, Canada, UK, Europe, Israel, Iran, China, Taiwan, South Korea, South Africa, Australia, Singapore, and Thailand. Despite >90% of GDM is estimated to occur in South and Southeast Asia very few studies were found. **Studies of <14 weeks gestation:** Sample size of these studies varied between xx and yy. Out of the 67 studies, eight used ML-based techniques (Figure 1). The predictive value of AUROC

ranged from 0.59 to 0.88 for the models with only maternal characteristics and from 0.53 to 0.95 when the biomarkers were included. **Studies of 14-20 weeks of gestation:** Sample size of these studies varied between xx and yy. Out of the 22 studies, three used ML-based techniques (Figure 1). The predictive value of AUROC ranged from 0.68-0.71 for the models with only maternal characteristics and from 0.65-0.92 when the biomarkers were included.

The AUC also varied based on the population. age, ethnicity, BMI, family history of diabetes, and prior GDM were the most common maternal characteristics used. The addition of systolic blood pressure (BP) seems to improve performance. Triglycerides, PAPP-A, and lipocalin-2, combined with the other common maternal characteristics, have the highest predictive performance at <14 weeks. Supplement table 1 show a simplified summary of the studies, most commonly used risk predictors and the population studied 1. Of the 89 studies, only 22 (24.72%) presented calibration measures. Internal validation was performed in 29 studies (32.58%) using random split or k-fold cross-validation and bootstrapping. Only 15 studies out of 89 (16.85%) performed external validation.

**Quality Assessment:** Detailed quality assessment scores are shown in supplementary table xx and Figure 2. Eighty-three out of 89 studies, had a low bias of participants and six had moderate risk due to lack of



**Figure 2: Quality Assessment of the included studies**

**Table 1**

Sr. No.	Parameter	<14 weeks		14-20 weeks	
		M	M+B	M	M+B
1	No. of studies	21	46	3	22
2	ML-based	2	6	0	3
3	Sample size range	134-1,160,933	42-1,160,933	1303-105,379	103-417,601
4	auROC range	0.59-0.88	0.531-0.951	0.68-0.714	0.649-0.92
5	Countries studied	USA, UK, Europe, China, Australia, Singapore	USA, Canada, UK, Europe, China, South Korea, South Africa, Australia, Singapore, Thailand, Iran, Israel	USA, UK	USA, Canada, UK, Europe, Israel, Iran, China, Taiwan, Australia
6	Most common predictors	Age, ethnicity, BMI, family history of diabetes, and prior GDM	-	Age, BMI, family history of diabetes, and prior GDM	-
7	Predictors that improve model performance	Systolic BP	TG, PAPP-A, and lipocalin-2	Ethnicity, Previous pregnancy complications, VFT, SFT, PCOS	HbA1c, hsCRP, TC, LDL-C, visfatin, beta-hCG, AFP, TG

information on data sources and inclusion and exclusion criteria. All studies had a low bias of predictors. Moderate risk of bias were observed in eight studies and was high in three additional studies, on describing the outcomes (eg., definition of diagnostic criteria for GDM) A total of 52 (58.43%) studies had a high bias of analysis, of which 37 were due to use of univariate regression to select the significant predictors to be used in multivariate analysis. Additional 13 (14.61%) studies were classified as having high risk of bias due to sample size (<50 cases in the GDM category) and two (2.25%) more due to inappropriate handling of missing data. All studies were thought to have a low bias in applicability.

**Discussion** Our study is a comprehensive systematic review of all the published studies that used composite risk score prediction models for prediction of GDM in early gestation. Our key findings are: a) combining systolic BP with five commonly used risk factors such as age, ethnicity, BMI, family history of diabetes, and prior GDM improves the AUC for predicting GDM; b) inclusion of biomarkers with maternal characteristics improve the predictive performance; and c) use of ML-based techniques for prediction further improved the predictive scores, although the number of studies are limited.

Selective screening based on a composite risk scoring system is more effective in risk stratification of GDM women than a simple yes/no system based on standard risk factors. Risk factor-based approaches for screening for GDM are available, for example, Artzi et al. (2020a). However, it requires data from previous pregnancy, which might not always be practically available. Hence, we need a more practical approach to decide which women entering pregnancy will need testing for GDM.

Once such high-risk group is identified early on in pregnancy, clinicians can get sufficient time of 6-12 weeks to work towards prevention of GDM by implementing a proper diet and lifestyle intervention plan, as studied by Coomar et al. (2021). Overall, the performance of the prediction models published so far is not satisfactory to start implementing these in the clinics. The models purely based on maternal characteristics have low predictability and more research needs to be done to identify low-cost, yet highly predictive biomarkers. Moreover, very few studies used machine learning-based approach for building the prediction models Artzi et al. (2020a); Qiu et al. (2017); Y.-T. Wu et al. (2021); ?); ?, and this needs to be studied in greater detail, especially in the first trimester or at the time of first pregnancy visit, to unleash the existing predictive potential of the data and pave way for prevention strategies. Also, notable differences in the prediction performance of the models for populations of different origins justify the need for a population-

based approach for developing early pregnancy prediction models for GDM.

The key strengths of our review are an exhaustive search strategy using a variety of databases & reference lists, and subgroup analysis based on time of collection of predictors - < 14 weeks or 14-20 weeks & type of predictors - maternal or maternal + biomarkers. This review can help to guide future research in terms of the most predictive features for GDM prediction in the first trimester. Analysis of the population using which the prediction models were derived highlighted the regions of the world understudied to develop population-specific prediction models. Exclusion of studies which did not report auROC values is a limitation of this review, although a common performance measure was needed for uniformity and comparison between studies.

**Conclusion** Many composite risk score-based prediction models have been developed in the last decade for early pregnancy prediction of GDM. There is a lot of heterogeneity in the predictors used to build these models, time at which these predictors were collected, measures used to quantify performance of these models, and definitions used to label the GDM outcome. This is a first review to assess composite risk score prediction models in the first trimester for GDM prediction for different populations. All models do not clear the PROBAST quality assessment check, especially due to insufficient validation. This review describes the need of good-quality, population-specific prediction models, using AI-based approaches to predict GDM early, adopt proper diet and lifestyle interventions, and prevent adverse complications associated with GDM for the mother and the fetus.

**Declarations** Some journals require declarations to be submitted in a standardized format. Please check the Instructions for Authors of the journal to which you are submitting to see if you need to complete this section. If yes, your manuscript must contain the following sections under the heading 'Declarations':

- Funding
- Conflict of interest/Competing interests (check journal-specific guidelines for which heading to use)
- Ethics approval
- Consent to participate
- Consent for publication
- Availability of data and materials
- Code availability
- Authors' contributions

If any of the sections are not relevant to your manuscript, please include the heading and write 'Not applicable' for that section.

Editorial Policies for:

Springer journals and proceedings: <https://www.springer.com/gp/editorial-policies>

Nature Portfolio journals:  
<https://www.nature.com/nature-research/editorial-policies>

*Scientific Reports:*

<https://www.nature.com/srep/journal-policies/editorial-policies>

BMC journals:

<https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies>

**Acknowledgements** This work was supported by the funding from Warwick-Novo Nordisk international Doctoral Training Program (DP and SS) and partly by Medical Research Council, UK (MR/R020981/1) (PS and YW).

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
1	Visconti 2019 Visconti et al. (2019)	Calabria, Southern Italy	2410 (596 GDM + 1814 control)	31 (28-34), 33 (29-34)	12.2 (11.5-12.5), 12.2 (11.5-12.5)	Age, NT, PAPP-A, beta-hCG	Regression	0.531	0
2	Liu 2022 R. Liu et al. (2022)	China	6848 (967 GDM + 5881 control)	-	-	Sociodemographic, behavioral, and environmental factors	XGBoost	0.618 (0.612, 0.623)	1
3	Perisic 2022 Perišić et al. (2022)	UK	273309 (1270 GDM + 272039 control)	-	-	51 SNPs	Regression	0.63	-1
4	Zhang 2021 Y. Zhang et al. (2021)	Chengdu, China	1704	28.51 +- 4.04	-	FPG, TG, LDL-C, TC	Regression	0.643 (0.613, 0.673)	-1
5	Hinkle 2018 Hinkle, Tsai, Rawal, Albert, and Zhang (2018)	NICHD, USA	321 (107 GDM + 214 control)(NCC)	-	-	Age, race/ethnicity, pre-pregnancy overweight and obesity, FHDM, GDM in a prior pregnancy, and nulliparity, HbA1c at enrollment	Regression	0.65	1
6	Tramontana 2017 Tramontana et al. (2018)	Austria	764	30.72+- 6.01(control), 31.44+- 5.40(GDM)	-	BMI, afamin	Multivariable conditional logistic regression	0.668	0
7	Donovan 2017 B. Donovan et al. (2017)	California	258454	-	-	Age>34, obese BMI, FHDM, PCOS, ethnicity (American Indian/Alaska native, Asian, Hispanic, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander), nulligravida, hypertension, PAPP-A + hCG	Regression	0.678 (0.671-0.684)	0
8	Hao 2017 Hao and Lin (2017)	Beijing, China	820	29 (27, 32)	-	BMI, fasting glucose	Regression	0.689	-1

Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
9	Schuitmaker 2020 Schuitmaker, Beernink, Franx, Creemers, and Koster (2020)	Bilthoven, Netherlands	150 GDM + 100 control)	34.8 (30.8–37.6) (control), 35 (31.8–37.3) (GDM)	83 (75–86) (control), 83 (75–86) (GDM) days	Adiponectin, chemerin, leptin, sFRP4	Regression	0.699 (0.605, 0.793)	0
10	Bourdages 2018 Bourdages et al. (2018)	Quebec, Canada	1048	28.9 (control), 29.3 (GDM with no insulin), 30.4 (GDM with insulin)	13.1 (0.5) (control), 13.2 (0.5) (GDM with no insulin), 13.1 (0.6) (GDM with insulin)	Age, BMI, total adipose tissues thickness	Regression	0.70 (0.62, 0.77)	-1
11	Guo 2020 Guo et al. (2020)	Shanghai, China	10528	30.39 ± 3.52 (control), 31.73 ± 3.74 (GDM)	10.2 ± 3.5 (median)	Age, pre-pregnancy BMI, FPG and FHDM	Regression	0.70 (0.68 - 0.72)	0
12	Lovati 2013 Lovati et al. (2013)	Pavia, Italy	673 GDM + 366 control)	32.33(4.9) (control), 33.58 (4.7) (GDM)	-	Teede et al. + PAPP-A MoM	Regression	0.702 (0.66 0.74)	0
13	Adam 2017 Adam and Rheeder (2017)	Johannesburg, South Africa	554 GDM + 410 control)	27.2 IR(13–42 ± 5.8)	-	RBG, HbA1c, BMI>=30, age>=35, FHDM, previous macrosomia>=4000g, glycosuria, history of GDM, history of baby with congenital abnormality, unexplained stillbirth, recurrent pregnancy losses	Regression	0.703	1
14	Wang 2016 C. Wang et al. (2016)	Beijing, China	5265	28.29 ± 3.79 (control), 29.46 ± 3.96 (GDM)	-	Fasting glucose, Cholesterol, Triacylglycerols, TG/HDL-C ratio, LDL-C/HDL-C ratio, BMI>=28	Regression	0.717 (0.648–0.770)	-1



Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
15	van Hooorn 2021 Hooorn et al. (2021)	Netherlands	3723 GDM + 3542 control)	30.8 (4.2)	-	BMI >= 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> , FHDM, and history of GDM or macrosomia, non-western ethnicity (Southern Asians, Hindu, Afro-Caribbean, or from the Middle East, Morocco, or Egypt)	-	0.72 (0.68-0.76)	0
16	Zhu 2021 Zhu et al. (2021)	Man'anshan, China	2723	26.7 (all), (3.4) (3.4) (control), (4.3) (GDM)	10.0 (2.1) (all), (2.1) (control), (2.0) (GDM)	age, pre-pregnancy BMI, history of family diabetes, and season of conception + fasting plasma glucose and sampling gestational week + T3	Regression	0.726 (0.709,0.743)	-1
17	Wu 2022 Q. Wu et al. (2022)	Zhejiang, China	962	-	-	age, gravidity, parity, pre-pregnancy BMI, FHDM, way of conception, GRS (genetic risk score) using 4 SNPs	Regression	0.727 (0.690, 0.765)	0
18	Zhang 2020 X. Zhang et al. (2020)	Beijing, China	1385 GDM + 1111 control)	30.69±3.57 (control), 31.95±3.79 (GDM)	-	Age, BMI, HbA1c, and TG	Regression	0.728 (0.683-0.772)	-1
19	Donovan 2018 B. M. Donovan et al. (2018)	California	1156708	26±6.4 (all), (control), 25.7±6.3 (control), 29.3±6.1 (GDM) age at delivery	-	Age at delivery, pre-pregnancy BMI, race/ethnicity, preexisting hypertension, and FHDM	Parsimonious Regression	0.73 (0.73 - 0.73)	-1
20	Robinson 2019	California, Iowa, USA	1,160,933 (1,156,708 California + 4,225 Iowa)	25.9 (6.3)	-	Race/ethnicity, age at delivery, prepregnancy BMI, FHDM, and pre-existing hypertension	Regression	0.732 (0.728, 0.735)	1
21	Shen 2022 Shen et al. (2022)	Hong Kong, China	9372 (837 GDM + 8535 control)	32.48 (29.56-35.43) (control), 35.23 (31.91-37.51) (GDM)	-	Maternal characteristics + obstetric history	Regression	0.735 (0.722, 0.748)	0

Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
22	Yan et al. (2020)	Beijing, China	1600 (804 GDM + 796 control)	-	-	Top 15 indexes	XGBoost	0.7382	-1
23	Garmendia et al. (2020)	Chile	86362	26.0 (7.0)	-	Age, BMI, FHDM, prior GDM, prior PE, prior abnormal pregnancies, prior hypertension, parity, smoking, drinking, education, civil status	Regression	0.739	0
24	Badon et al. (2018)	Kaiser Permanente Northern California (KPNC)	753 (256 GDM + 497 control)(NCC)	28.4 (5.2) (control), 28.2 (5.5) (GDM)	-	Age at preconception $\geq$ 35, high-risk ethnicity (non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander), obesity at preconception, FHDM, and previous GDM + unweighted score with SHBG, glucose, and adiponectin	Conditional Regression	0.74	-1
25	Wang 2017	Sichuan, China	4378	30.53 $\pm$ 3.926 (control), 30.39 $\pm$ 3.66 (GDM)	-	Selected attributes out of 50 with their Pearson larger than 0.95	SVM	0.742	-1
26	Wang 2021	Fuzhou, China	1440	28.42 $\pm$ 3.30 (control), 30.39 $\pm$ 3.66 (GDM)	-	Age, TG, afamin, platelet/lymphocyte ratio	Regression	0.748	0
27	Phaloprakarn 2009	Bangkok, Thailand	1876 (586 GDM + 1290 control)	25.6 5.8 (control), 29.8 5.8 (GDM)	-	Age, BMI, FHDM, prior macrosomia, prior spontaneous abortions	Regression	0.752	-1
28	Hassiakos 2015	Athens, Greece	134 (40 GDM + 94 control)	30 (4.12) (control), 33 (4.2) (GDM)	-	Age, weight, log10 MoM IL-6	Regression	0.7586	0
29	Benhalima et al. (2020)	Belgium	1843 (231 GDM + 1612 control)	-	-	FHDM, prior GDM, non-Caucasian origin, age, height, weight, FPG, triglycerides and HbA1c	Regression	0.76	0

Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
30	Lappharat 2022 Lap-pharat, Rothma-nee, Jandee, Suksai, and Liab-suetrakul (2022)	Thailand	553 GDM + 499 control)	31 (27.0-35.0) (all), 31 (27.0-35.0) (control), 33 (30.0-37.0) (eGDM)	8 (6-10) median	previous GDM, HbA1c>35.3, FHDLP, FHDLM, physical inactivity, and history of preterm birth	Regression	0.76 (0.75, 0.76)	0
31	Han 2021 Han et al. (2021)	Guangzhou, China	141 GDM + 106 control)	30.04 ± 4.24 (control), 32.40 ± 4.56 (GDM)	-	Age, gravida, PV, VFI	Regression	0.761	0
32	Francis 2020 Francis et al. (2020)	NICHD, USA	2802	30.4±5.4 (control), 30.5±5.7 (GDM)	-	Age, BMI, FHDLM, ethnicity, glucose, HMW-adiponectin, chemerin, FABP4, sOB-R	Conditional LR	0.77	1
33	Yan-Ting 2021	Shanghai, China	31811	31 (28-34) median	-	7 variables from 17 variable panel	Regression	0.77 (0.76-0.78)	-1
34	Wang 2021	China	1139 GDM + 1053 control)	31.10(4.35) (control), 32.22(4.77) (GDM)	15.41(2.99) (control), 15.38(3.80) (GDM)	Age, BMI, FHDLM, gravidity, PCOS, AC, irregular menstruation	Random forest	0.777	0
35	Eleftheriades 2014 Eleftheriades et al. (2014)	Athens, Greece	134 GDM + 94 control)	30 (4.12) (control), 33 (4.2) (GDM)	-	Age, weight, Log10 PIGF	Regression	0.78	0
36	Wu 2021 T. Wu et al. (2021)	Shanghai, China	14992	31 (28-34) median	-	73 variables	Deep Neural Network	0.8	1

Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
37	Papastefanou 2015 Papastefanou et al. (2015)	-	134 GDM + 94 control	30 (4.12) (control), 33 (4.2) (GDM)	-	Age, weight, osteocalcin	Regression	0.8 (0.71 - 0.88)	0
38	Wang 2018 P. Wang et al. (2018)	China	1150 GDM + 1015 control	-	-	Age, BMI, gestational age at sampling, smoking, ethnicity, pre-existing hypertension and CVD, history of spontaneous abortion, gestational weeks at admission, family history of diabetes, physical activity, and blood levels of cholesterol, HDL, triglyceride, insulin, FPG and CRP, Irisin Ni, Cu, Se	Regression	0.809 (0.763-0.854)	-1
39	Chan 2022 Chan et al. (2022)	Shanghai, China	67 (33 GDM + 34 control)	30.7 (± 4.3) (all), 30.9 (± 4.1) (control), 30.5 (± 4.5) (GDM)	-		Regression	0.81	0
40	Gabbay-Benziv 2014 Gabbay-Benziv, Doyle, Blitzler, and Baschat (2015)	Baltimore	2441	29.8 (18-50) (control), 32.7 (20-44) (GDM)	-	Age, race, prior GDM, first trimester BMI, and systolic blood pressure (SBP)	Regression	0.819	0
41	Lee 2021 S. M. Lee et al. (2021)	South Korea	1443 GDM + 1357 control	-	-	previous GDM, PCOS/chronic hypertension/heart disease, NAFLD, ALT in early pregnancy, at 10-14 weeks (FG, TG, HDL, hepatosteatosis index), PA	SVM	0.819	-1
42	Kumar 2022	Singapore	909	30.3 ± 5.1	-	mean arterial BP, age, ethnicity, previous GDM	CatBoost gradient boosting algorithm	0.82 (0.71, 0.93)	-1

Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
43	Wang 2021	Nanjing, China	1640 (855 GDM + 785 control)	30.2 ± 4.1 (control), 31.0 ± 4.4 (GDM)	-	Age, height, pre-pregnancy body mass index, educational background, family history of diabetes, menstrual history, history of cesarean delivery, GDM, polycystic ovary syndrome, hypertension, and fasting blood glucose (FBG)	Regression	0.822 (0.785–0.858)	0
44	Syngelaki 2011	UK	75161 (1827 GDM + 73,334 control)			Age, weight, height, ethnicity, FHDM, use of ovulation drugs, birth weight of previous pregnancy, and prior GDM	Regression	0.823 (0.820–0.826)	
45	Syngelaki 2015	London, Gillingham, UK	75161 (1827 GDM + 73,334 control)	30.7 (36.1–34.6) (control), 33.1 (29.2–36.9) (GDM)	-	Age, weight, height, racial origin, FHDM, use of ovulation drugs, birth weight, and prior GDM	Regression	0.823 (0.820–0.826)	-1
46	Thagaard 2017 Thagaard et al. (2017)	Holbaek, Denmark	2590	-	-	Age, BMI, ethnicity, parity, smoking, adiponectin, leptin	Regression	0.824	-1
47	Sirico 2019 Sirico et al. (2019)	Italy	603	32; 8 (control), 29; 7 (GDM)	-	FHR, age, BMI, DV-PVI, NT, CRL, smoking	Regression	0.825 (0.786, 0.863)	0
48	Maymon 2018 Maymon, Meiri, Svirski, Weiner, and Cuckle (2019)	Israel	145	31 [30–32] (control), 32 [30–34] (GDM) median	85 [84–86] (control), 84 [82–86] (GDM) days	BMI, PAPP-A	Regression	0.827	0
49	Kouhkan 2019 Kouhkan et al. (2019)	Iran	270 (135 GDM + 135 control)	30.28 ± 4.89 (control), 32.15 ± 5.07 (GDM)	-	BMI, fasting glucose	Regression	0.83	-1

Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
50	Nanda 2011 Nanda, Savvidou, Syngelaki, Akolekar, and Nicolaides (2011)	London	380 (80 GDM+300 control) (maternal serum)	31.4 (26.7–35.2) (control), 33.2 (29.3–37.2) (GDM) median	89 (86–92) (control), 89 (86–92) (GDM) median days	Age, Ethnicity, BMI, prior GDM, prior macrosomia, Adiponectin, SHBG	Regression	0.842	-1
51	Rashidi 2021 Rashidi, Kalantari, Shahbazian, and Noughjah (2021)	Iran	1270 (454 GDM + 816 control)	49/5 ± 96/27 (control), 28/5 ± 9/29 (GDM)	-	BMI, fasting glucose	Regression	0.85	-1
52	Savvidou 2010 Savvidou et al. (2010)	London	372 (124 GDM + 248 control)(NCC)	32.6 5.2 (control), 34.3 5.0 (GDM)	87.4 3.2 (control), 87.3 3.6 (GDM) days	Age, BMI, Ethnicity, history of GDM, FHDm, GA at sampling, high systolic BP, log(HDL chol)+t-PA	Regression	0.861	0
53	Syngelaki 2015	London, UK	31,225			Age, FHDM, prior GDM, ethnicity, weight, height, conception method, neonate birth weight in last pregnancy, PAPP-A, P1GF	Multivariable LR with Bayesian statistics, Multiples of the Medians (MoMs)	0.869	
54	Zhao 2021 Zhao, Yang, Hung, Zheng, and Su (2021)	Xiamen, China	187,432 (49,611 GDM + 137,821 control)	28.34 (4.45) (control), 29.33 (4.88) (GDM)	-	Age, pre-pregnancy BMI, pre-pregnancy intake of folic acid, white cell count, platelet count, alanine transaminase, albumin, direct bilirubin, and creatinine	Regression	0.87	-1

Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
55	Correa 2019 Correa et al. (2019)	Santiago, Chile	96 (16 GDM + 80 control)	29.88 (5.75) (control), 32.63 (6.36) (GDM)	-	TC, TG, HOMA-IR, LDL-C, t-PA, insulin	Maximum likelihood estimation	0.87	0
56	De Wilde 2014 De Wilde et al. (2014)	Netherlands	189	29 [27- 31] (all), 29 [27- 31] (control), 30 [26- 33] (GDM)	-	First-degree relatives with T2DM, serum levels of fasting glucose, fasting insulin, androstenedione and SHBG	Regression	0.870 (0.81-0.93)	0
57	Farina 2017 Farina et al. (2017)	Bologna, Italy	72 (12 GDM + 60 control)	32 (24-43) (control), 33.5 (24-40) (GDM)	86 (84-91) (control), 86 (84-91) (GDM) days	BMI, adiponectin, PAPP-A	Regression	0.877	0
58	Sweeting 2017	Sydney, Australia	980 (248 GDM + 732 control)	32 (29-35) (control), 33 (30-36) (GDM)	-	Age, BMI, FHDM, prior GDM, ethnicity, parity	Regression	0.88	0
59	Sweeting 2017	Sydney, Australia	980 (248 GDM + 732 control)	-	-	Previous GDM, FHDM, age, south/east Asian ethnicity, parity and BMI	Regression	0.88 (0.85-0.92)	
60	Zheng 2022	Shanghai, China	584 (142 GDM + 442 control)	29.08 ± 4.31 (control), 30.38 ± 4.33 (GDM)	-	pre-pregnancy BMI, FPG, APTT, TT, TG, LDL-C, sdLDL-C, and APOB	Regression	0.892 (0.858, 0.927)	0
61	Chaparro 2018 Chaparro et al. (2018)	Santiago, Chile	42 (14 GDM + 28 control)	24 (21 to 28.5) (control), 28 (25 to 36) (GDM)	-	Glucose, GCF, P1GF	Regression	0.898	0
62	Sweeting 2017	Sydney, Australia	980 (248 GDM + 732 control)	-	-	FHDM, previous GDM, South/East Asian ethnicity, parity, BMI, PAPP-A, triglycerides, and lipocalin-2	Regression	0.91	

Table 2 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
63	Rasanen 2013 Rasanen et al. (2013)	Finland	182 GDM + 92 control)	26.2±4.0 (control), 31.3±6.0 (GDM)	9.7±1.4 (control), 10.1±0.8 (GDM)	hs-CRP, adiponectin, GlyFn, Hpl	Regression	0.919	0
64	Kumar 2022	Singapore	222	30.51 ± 3.11	-	HbA1c, mean arterial BP, fasting insulin, TG/HDL	Stacked ensemble with Gradient Boosting and linear SVM	0.93	0
65	Sweeting 2018	Sydney, Australia	980 GDM + 732 control)	(248)		BMI, FHDm, prior GDM, ethnicity, parity, TG, PAPP-A, lipocalin-2	Regression	0.93	0
66	Yoffe 2019 Yoffe et al. (2019)	Italy, Spain	43 (23 GDM + 20 control)	35.5 (33.0–37.8) (control), 36.5 (32.2–39.8) (GDM)	10.0 (10.0–10.0) (control), 10 (10.0–10.0) (GDM)	miR-23a	Regression	0.94	0
67	Tenenbaum 2020 Tenenbaum-Gavish et al. (2020)	Petach Tikva, Israel	205 GDM + 185 control)	(20)		BMI, insulin, sCD163, TNFalpha	Weighted linear regression, Multiples of the Medians (MoMs)	0.95	0
68	Liu 2021 ?	Beijing, China	94 (47 GDM + 47 control)	32.1 ± 2.88 (control), 33.0 ± 3.57 (GDM)	-	BMI, fasting glucose, putrescine	Regression	0.951	0



**Table 3**

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
1	Schaefer 2018 Schaefer et al. (2018)	Guangzhou, China	8381 GDM + 7252 control)	29.0 ± 3.3	-	Age, weight or BMI, family history of diabetes, and history of GDM, weight gain during pregnancy	Regression	0.649 (0.605–0.692)	0
2	Basraon 2015 Mele et al. (2015)	NICHD, USA	2300	-	-	BMI adjusted for: age, education, race, weeks of gestation at enrollment, alcohol and smoking status	Regression	0.68	0
3	Lu 2022 Lu et al. (2021)	Beijing, China	120,396 (18,400 GDM + 101,996 control)	-	-	Pregnancy examination data (includes biomarkers) at different gestational weeks	Stacking ML models	0.68	0
4	Hu 2019 Pan, Hu, and Zhong (2019)	Jiangsu, China	2119 (386 GDM + 1733 control)	26.63±4.27 (control), 29.89±4.32 (GDM)	-	eFBG + pBMI	Regression	0.71 (0.69 - 0.74)	0
5	Gao 2020 Gao et al. (2020)	Tianjin, China	19331 (1485 GDM + 17,846 control)	28.4±2.9 (control), 29.6±3.2 (GDM)	-	Age, BMI, height, family history of diabetes, systolic BP, and alanine aminotransferase	Regression	0.710 (0.680 - 0.741)	0
6	Falcone 2019 Falcone et al. (2019)	Vienna	574 (103 GDM + 471 control)	31.3±5.7 (control), 32.7±5.6 (GDM)	-	FPG, FCP	Regression	0.721	-1
7	Snyder 2020 Snyder et al. (2020)	California, USA	105379	29.0 (24.0–32.0) (control), 31.0(27.0–34.0) (GDM)	-	Race/ethnicity, age at delivery, pre-pregnancy BMI, FHDM, and pre-existing hypertension + PAPP-A, uE3, and INH	Regression	0.722 (0.712–0.733)	0
8	Jiang 2019 Jiang et al. (2020)	Taipei, Taiwan	431 (65 GDM + 366 control)	28.1±3.6 (control), 29.8±3.8 (GDM)	-	Age, parity, BMI, FHDM, GGT, TG, FPG, FINS + isoleucine + tyrosine	Regression	0.737 (0.664 - 0.809)	0

Table 3 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
9	Liu H. Liu et al. (2020)	Tianjin, China	19331 (1484 GDM + 17847 control)	28 (27–30) (control), 29 (28–31) (GDM)	-	Pre-pregnancy BMI, age, fasting plasma glucose at registration, and alanine aminotransferase	XGBoost	0.742 (0.715–0.769)	0
10	Sovio et al. (2022)	UK	499 (185 GDM + 314 control)	0.61 (0.56–0.66)	-	age, BMI, 4 metabolites	Regression	0.76 (0.72, 0.81)	0
11	Zheng et al. (2019)	Shanghai, China	4771	30.4 (all), (3.9) (control), (4.2) (GDM)	14.2 (1.74) (all), 14.2 (1.74) (control), 14.0 (1.75) (GDM)	Age, prepregnancy body mass index (BMI), FPG and TG	Bayesian	0.766 (0.731–0.801)	0
12	White et al. (2016)	UK	1303 (337 GDM + 966 control)	30.3 (control), 32.0 (GDM)	-	Age, previous GDM, family history of type 2 diabetes, systolic blood pressure, sum of skinfold thicknesses, waist:height and neck:thigh ratios + Random glucose, haemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), fructosamine, adiponectin, sex hormone binding globulin, triglycerides + NMR metabolites	Regression	0.77 (0.74–0.81)	1
13	Huang 2020		474	28.1 ± 3.7 (control), 29.7 ± 3.9 (GDM)	-	Age, parity, FHDM, history of macrosomia, and BMI, GGT, HBsAg and FPG in early pregnancy + ANGP8	Regression	0.772 (0.703–0.841)	0
14	Artzi et al. (2020b)	Israel	417,601	29.8 ± 5.3	-	DOB, (weight, height), no. 1st deg with DM, (high chol/miscarriage/ PCOS/preeclampsia/heart disease/prior GDM/high BP), pre-pregnancy HbA1c, (parity, prev GCT)	GBM	0.799	0

Table 3 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age (control), (GDM)	Mean GA (control), (GDM)	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
15	Sebastien 2015 Thériault, Giguère, Massé, Girouard, and Forest (2016)	Quebec, Canada	792 GDM + 528 control)	29.3 (5.5) 30.8 (5.8) (GDM)	15.3 (0.6) 15.3 (0.9) (GDM)	HbA1c, SHBG, hsCRP, age, BMI, ethnicity, past history of GDM, past history of macrosomia, FHDM, physical exercise before pregnancy and soft drink intake during pregnancy and soft drink intake before pregnancy	Regression	0.802 (0.760–0.843)	0
16	Harrison 2015 Hassikos et al. (2015)	Melbourne, Australia	224	-	-	Monash GDM risk prediction tool factors (past history of GDM, increasing maternal age and body mass index, Asian descent and family history of diabetes) + triglycerides, fasting glucose	Regression	0.83 (0.77 - 0.90)	0
17	Zhenyu 2016 Chi et al. (2016)	Beijing, China	836 GDM + 423 control)	33.440 ± 2.860	-	DFH: Diabetes Family History; AMH: Adverse Maternal History; UOF: Uterine Ovary Fibroids; MP: Multiple Pregnancy;HFH: Hypertension Family History; BMI: Body Mass Index; WBC: White Blood Cells Count; HBG: Hemoglobin; BPI: Before Pregnancy Infection; PBH: Pregnancy Bleeding History	Regression	0.836 (0.794-0.877)	0
18	Harrison 2018 Abell et al. (2018)	Melbourne, Australia	103	-	-	Age, BMI, ethnicity, past history of GDM and FHDM, High molecular weight (HMW) adiponectin	Regression	0.847(0.744–0.950)	
19	Enquobahrie 2015 Enquobahrie et al. (2015)	Seattle, Tacoma; Washington	358 GDM + 180 control)(NCC)Omega study	33.1 4.3 (control), 34.0 4.8 (GDM)	15.6 2.9 (control), 15.6 2.9 (GDM)	linoleic acid, oleic acid, myristic acid, d-galactose, d-sorbitol, o-phosphocolamine, l-alanine, l-valine, 5-hydroxy-l-tryptophan, l-phenylalanine-phenyl, l-serine, sarcosine, l-pyroglytamamic acid, and l-mimosine, l-lactic acid, glycolic acid, fumaric acid, and urea	Lasso Regression	0.87	-1

Table 3 continued from previous page

Sr No	Study	Population	No. of pregnancies	Mean Age	Mean GA	Best predictors	Method	Best AUC	Quality Assessment
20	Wang Y. Wang et al. (2021)	Nanjing, China	1640 (855 GDM + 785 control)			Age, height, pre-pregnancy body mass index, educational background, family history of diabetes, menstrual history, history of cesarean delivery, GDM, polycystic ovary syndrome, hypertension, and fasting blood glucose (FBG) + FPG and triglycerides at 14-20 weeks	Regression	0.886 (0.856-0.916)	0
21	Zhang C. Zhang, Wang, Li, Liu, and Chen (2020)	Tangshan, China	1158 (414 GDM + 744 control)	26.40±3.64 (control), 28.69±4.73 (GDM)	-	Age, pre-pregnancy BMI, a family history of diabetes, GDM history, PCOS history, and levels of HbA1C, SBP, TG, TC and LDL-c + VFT & SFT + visfatin & hs-CRP	Regression	0.911 (0.893-0.930)	0
22	Amini Amiri et al. (2020)	Tehran, Iran	523	28.76 (±5.33)	-	$\beta$ -hCG, uE3, AFP	Bayesian	0.92	0

## References

- Abell, S. K., Shorakae, S., Boyle, J. A., Courten, B. D., Stepto, N. K., Teede, H. J., & Harrison, C. L. (2018, June). Role of serum biomarkers to optimise a validated clinical risk prediction tool for gestational diabetes. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 59(2), 251–257. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajo.12833> doi: 10.1111/ajo.12833
- Adam, S., McIntyre, H. D., Tsoi, K. Y., Kapur, A., Ma, R. C., Dias, S., ... others (2023). Pregnancy as an opportunity to prevent type 2 diabetes mellitus: Figo best practice advice. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*, 160, 56–67.
- Adam, S., & Rheeder, P. (2017). Selective screening strategies for gestational diabetes: a prospective cohort observational study. *Journal of diabetes research*, 2017.
- Amini, M., Kazemnejad, A., Zayeri, F., Montazeri, A., Rasekhi, A., Amirian, A., & Kariman, N. (2020, June). Diagnostic accuracy of maternal serum multiple marker screening for early detection of gestational diabetes mellitus in the absence of a gold standard test. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 20(1). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-020-03068-7> doi: 10.1186/s12884-020-03068-7
- Artzi, N. S., Shilo, S., Hadar, E., Rossman, H., Barbash-Hazan, S., Ben-Haroush, A., ... Segal, E. (2020a). Prediction of gestational diabetes based on nationwide electronic health records. *Nature medicine*, 26(1), 71–76.
- Artzi, N. S., Shilo, S., Hadar, E., Rossman, H., Barbash-Hazan, S., Ben-Haroush, A., ... Segal, E. (2020b, January). Prediction of gestational diabetes based on nationwide electronic health records. *Nature Medicine*, 26(1), 71–76. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0724-8> doi: 10.1038/s41591-019-0724-8
- Badon, S. E., Zhu, Y., Sridhar, S. B., Xu, F., Lee, C., Ehrlich, S. F., ... Hedderston, M. M. (2018). A pre-pregnancy biomarker risk score improves prediction of future gestational diabetes. *Journal of the Endocrine Society*, 2(10), 1158–1169.
- Benhalima, K., Van Crombrugge, P., Moyson, C., Verhaeghe, J., Vandeginste, S., Verlaenen, H., ... others (2020). Estimating the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus based on the 2013 who criteria: a prediction model based on clinical and biochemical variables in early pregnancy. *Acta diabetologica*, 57(6), 661–671.
- Bourdages, M., Demers, M.-É., Dubé, S., Gasse, C., Girard, M., Boutin, A., ... Demers, S. (2018). First-trimester abdominal adipose tissue thickness to predict gestational diabetes. *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Canada*, 40(7), 883–887.
- Chan, Y.-N., Wang, P., Chun, K.-H., Lum, J. T.-S., Wang, H., Zhang, Y., & Leung, K. S.-Y. (2022). A machine learning approach for early prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus using elemental contents in fingernails.
- Chaparro, A., Zúñiga, E., Varas-Godoy, M., Albers, D., Ramírez, V., Hernández, M., ... Illanes, S. E. (2018). Periodontitis and placental growth factor in oral fluids are early pregnancy predictors of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Journal of periodontology*, 89(9), 1052–1060.
- Chi, Z., Zhang, S., Wang, Y., Yang, L., Yang, Y., & Li, X. (2016, June). Research of gestational diabetes mellitus risk evaluation method. *Technology and Health Care*, 24(s2), S499–S503. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3233/thc-161174> doi: 10.3233/thc-161174
- Coomar, D., Hazlehurst, J. M., Austin, F., Foster, C., Hitman, G. A., Heslehurst, N., ... others (2021). Diet and physical activity in pregnancy to prevent gestational diabetes: a protocol for an individual participant data (ipd) meta-analysis on the differential effects of interventions with economic evaluation. *BMJ open*, 11(6), e048119.
- Correa, P. J., Venegas, P., Palmeiro, Y., Albers, D., Rice, G., Roa, J., ... others (2019). First trimester prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus using plasma biomarkers: a case-control study. *Journal of perinatal medicine*, 47(2), 161–168.
- De Wilde, M., Veltman-Verhulst, S., Goverde, A., Lambalk, C., Laven, J., Franx, A., ... Fauser, B. (2014). Preconception predictors of gestational diabetes: a multicentre prospective cohort study on the predominant complication of pregnancy in polycystic ovary syndrome. *Human Reproduction*, 29(6), 1327–1336.
- Donovan, B., Baer, R., Oltman, S., Rand, L., Jelliffe-Pawlowski, L., & Ryckman, K. (2017). 544: Early prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus using first trimester screening biomarkers. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 216(1), S321.
- Donovan, B. M., Baer, R. J., Breheny, P. J., Carter, K. D., Robinson, J. G., Saftlas, A. F., ... Ryckman, K. K. (2018). 976: Improved first trimester selective screening for gestational diabetes mellitus in nulliparous women. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 218(1), S577.
- Eleftheriades, M., Papastefanou, I., Lambrinouadaki, I., Kappou, D., Lavranos, D., Akalestos, A., ... Chrousos, G. P. (2014). Elevated placental growth factor concentrations at 11–14 weeks of gestation to predict gestational diabetes mellitus. *Metabolism*, 63(11), 1419–1425.
- Enquobahrie, D. A., Denis, M., Tadesse, M. G., Gelaye, B., Resson, H. W., & Williams, M. A. (2015, November). Maternal early pregnancy serum metabolites and risk of gestational diabetes mellitus. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 100(11), 4348–4356. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2015-2862> doi: 10.1210/jc.2015-2862
- Falcone, V., Kotzaeridi, G., Breil, M. H., Rosicky, I., Stopp, T., Yerlikaya-Schatten, G., ... Göbl, C. S. (2019). Early assessment of the risk for gestational diabetes mellitus: Can fasting parameters of glucose metabolism contribute to risk prediction? *Diabetes & Metabolism Journal*, 43(6), 785. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4093/dmj.2018.0218> doi: 10.4093/dmj.2018.0218
- Farina, A., Eklund, E., Bernabini, D., Paladino, M., Righetti, F., Monti, G., & Lambert-Messerlian, G. (2017). A first-trimester biomarker panel for predicting the development of gestational diabetes. *Reproductive sciences*, 24(6), 954–959.
- Francis, E. C., Li, M., Hinkle, S. N., Cao, Y., Chen, J., Wu, J., ... others (2020). Adipokines in early and mid-pregnancy and subsequent risk of gestational diabetes: a longitudinal study in a multiracial cohort. *BMJ Open Diabetes Research and Care*, 8(1), e001333.
- Gabbay-Benziv, R., Doyle, L. E., Blitzer, M., & Baschat, A. A. (2015). First trimester prediction of maternal glycemic status. *Journal of perinatal medicine*, 43(3), 283–289.
- Gao, S., Leng, J., Liu, H., Wang, S., Li, W., Wang, Y., ... Yang, X. (2020, April). Development and validation of an early pregnancy risk score for the prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus in chinese pregnant women. *BMJ Open Diabetes Research & Care*, 8(1), e000909. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjdr-2019-000909> doi: 10.1136/bmjdr-2019-000909
- Garmendia, M. L., Mondschein, S., Montiel, B., & Kusanovic, J. P. (2020). Trends and predictors of gestational diabetes mellitus in chile. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*, 148(2), 210–218.
- Guo, F., Yang, S., Zhang, Y., Yang, X., Zhang, C., & Fan, J. (2020). Nomogram for prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus in urban, chinese, pregnant women. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 20(1), 1–8.
- Han, Z., Zhang, Y., Li, X., Chiu, W.-H., Yin, Y., & Hou, H. (2021). Investigation into the predictive potential of three-dimensional ultrasonographic placental volume and vascular indices in gestational diabetes mellitus. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, 12, 689888.
- Hao, M., & Lin, L. (2017). Fasting plasma glucose and body mass index during the first trimester of pregnancy as predictors of gestational diabetes mellitus in a chinese population. *Endocrine journal*, EJ16–0359.
- Hassiakos, D., Eleftheriades, M., Papastefanou, I., Lambrinouadaki, I., Kappou, D., Lavranos, D., ... Chrousos, G. (2015, January). Increased maternal serum interleukin-6 concentrations at 11 to 14 weeks of gestation in low risk pregnancies complicated with gestational diabetes mellitus: Development of a prediction model. *Hormone and Metabolic Research*, 48(01), 35–41. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0034-1395659> doi: 10.1055/s-0034-1395659
- Hassiakos, D., Eleftheriades, M., Papastefanou, I., Lambrinouadaki,

- I., Kappou, D., Lavranos, D., ... Chrousos, G. (2016). Increased maternal serum interleukin-6 concentrations at 11 to 14 weeks of gestation in low risk pregnancies complicated with gestational diabetes mellitus: development of a prediction model. *Hormone and Metabolic Research*, 48(01), 35–41.
- Higgins, J. P., Thomas, J., Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M. J., & Welch, V. A. (2019). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hinkle, S. N., Tsai, M. Y., Rawal, S., Albert, P. S., & Zhang, C. (2018). HbA1c measured in the first trimester of pregnancy and the association with gestational diabetes. *Scientific reports*, 8(1), 1–8.
- Jiang, R., Wu, S., Fang, C., Wang, C., Yang, Y., Liu, C., ... Huang, Y. (2020, January). Amino acids levels in early pregnancy predict subsequent gestational diabetes. *Journal of Diabetes*, 12(7), 503–511. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-0407.13018> doi: 10.1111/1753-0407.13018
- Kouhkan, A., Khamseh, M. E., Moini, A., Pirjani, R., Arabipoor, A., Zolfaghari, Z., ... Baradaran, H. R. (2019). Diagnostic accuracy of body mass index and fasting glucose for the prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus after assisted reproductive technology. *International Journal of Fertility & Sterility*, 13(1), 32.
- Lappharat, S., Rothmanee, P., Jandee, K., Suksai, M., & Liabsue-trakul, T. (2022). A model for predicting gestational diabetes mellitus in early pregnancy: a prospective study in thailand. *Obstetrics & Gynecology Science*, 65(2), 156–165.
- Lee, K. W., Ching, S. M., Ramachandran, V., Yee, A., Hoo, F. K., Chia, Y. C., ... Veettil, S. K. (2018). Prevalence and risk factors of gestational diabetes mellitus in asia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth*, 18(1), 1–20.
- Lee, S. M., Hwangbo, S., Norwitz, E. R., Koo, J. N., Oh, I. H., Choi, E. S., ... others (2021). 390 prediction of gestational diabetes in the first trimester using machine learning-based methods. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 224(2), S252–S253.
- Liu, H., Li, J., Leng, J., Wang, H., Liu, J., Li, W., ... Yang, X. (2020, September). Machine learning risk score for prediction of gestational diabetes in early pregnancy in tianjin, china. *Diabetes/Metabolism Research and Reviews*, 37(5). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/dmrr.3397> doi: 10.1002/dmrr.3397
- Liu, R., Zhan, Y., Liu, X., Zhang, Y., Gui, L., Qu, Y., ... Jiang, Y. (2022). Stacking ensemble method for gestational diabetes mellitus prediction in chinese pregnant women: A prospective cohort study. *Journal of Healthcare Engineering*, 2022.
- Logan, K. M., Emsley, R. J., Jeffries, S., Andrzejewska, I., Hyde, M. J., Gale, C., ... others (2016). Development of early adiposity in infants of mothers with gestational diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes care*, 39(6), 1045–1051.
- Lovati, E., Beneventi, F., Simonetta, M., Laneri, M., Quarleri, L., Scudeller, L., ... others (2013). Gestational diabetes mellitus: including serum pregnancy-associated plasma protein-a testing in the clinical management of primiparous women? a case-control study. *Diabetes research and clinical practice*, 100(3), 340–347.
- Lu, J., Zhang, S., Jiang, H., Yang, L., Hao, D., Yang, Y., ... Liu, X. (2021, March). Gestational diabetes mellitus prediction model: A risk factors analysis of pregnant women with gestational diabetes mellitus but have normal oral glucose tolerance test results in the second trimester of pregnancy. *Technology and Health Care*, 29, 57–63. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3233/thc-218006> doi: 10.3233/thc-218006
- Maymon, R., Meiri, H., Svirski, R., Weiner, E., & Cuckle, H. (2019). Maternal serum screening marker levels in twin pregnancies affected by gestational diabetes. *Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 299(3), 655–663.
- Mele, L., Myatt, L., Roberts, J., Hauth, J., Leveno, K., Varner, M., ... and, S. B. (2015, September). Relationship of early pregnancy waist-to-hip ratio versus body mass index with gestational diabetes mellitus and insulin resistance. *American Journal of Perinatology*, 33(01), 114–122. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0035-1562928> doi: 10.1055/s-0035-1562928
- Moons, K. G., Altman, D. G., Reitsma, J. B., Ioannidis, J. P., Macaskill, P., Steyerberg, E. W., ... Collins, G. S. (2015). Transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (tripod): explanation and elaboration. *Annals of internal medicine*, 162(1), W1–W73.
- Nanda, S., Savvidou, M., Syngelaki, A., Akolekar, R., & Nicolaides, K. H. (2011). Prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus by maternal factors and biomarkers at 11 to 13 weeks. *Prenatal diagnosis*, 31(2), 135–141.
- Pan, Y., Hu, J., & Zhong, S. (2019, December). The joint prediction model of pBMI and eFBG in predicting gestational diabetes mellitus. *Journal of International Medical Research*, 48(4), 030006051988919. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0300060519889199> doi: 10.1177/0300060519889199
- Papastefanou, I., Eleftheriades, M., Kappou, D., Lambrinoudaki, I., Lavranos, D., Pervanidou, P., ... Chrousos, G. P. (2015). Maternal serum osteocalcin at 11–14 weeks of gestation in gestational diabetes mellitus. *European journal of clinical investigation*, 45(10), 1025–1031.
- Perišić, M. M., Vladimir, K., Karpov, S., Štorga, M., Mostashari, A., & Khanin, R. (2022). Polygenic risk score and risk factors for gestational diabetes. *Journal of personalized medicine*, 12(9), 1381.
- Plant, N., Šumilo, D., Chapman, R., Webber, J., Saravanan, P., & Nirantharakumar, K. (2020). Unmet needs of women with gdm: a health needs assessment in sandwell, west midlands. *Journal of Public Health*, 42(4), e516–e524.
- Pons, R. S., Rockett, F. C., de Almeida Rubin, B., Oppermann, M. L. R., & Bosa, V. L. (2015). Risk factors for gestational diabetes mellitus in a sample of pregnant women diagnosed with the disease. In *Diabetology & metabolic syndrome* (Vol. 7, pp. 1–2).
- Qiu, H., Yu, H.-Y., Wang, L.-Y., Yao, Q., Wu, S.-N., Yin, C., ... others (2017). Electronic health record driven prediction for gestational diabetes mellitus in early pregnancy. *Scientific reports*, 7(1), 1–13.
- Rasanen, J. P., Snyder, C. K., Rao, P. V., Mihalache, R., Heinonen, S., Gravett, M. G., ... Nagalla, S. R. (2013). Glycosylated fibronectin as a first-trimester biomarker for prediction of gestational diabetes. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 122(3), 586–594.
- Rashidi, H., Kalantari, K., Shahbazian, H., & Noughjah, S. (2021). The relationship between fasting plasma glucose in the first trimester of pregnancy and the incidence of gestational diabetes in iran. *Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews*, 15(4), 102193.
- Rodriguez, Q., & Mahdy, H. (2019). Gestational diabetes.
- Saravanan, P., Magee, L. A., Banerjee, A., Coleman, M. A., Von Dadelszen, P., Denison, F., ... others (2020). Gestational diabetes: opportunities for improving maternal and child health. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, 8(9), 793–800.
- Savvidou, M., Nelson, S. M., Makgoba, M., Messow, C.-M., Sattar, N., & Nicolaides, K. (2010). First-trimester prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus: examining the potential of combining maternal characteristics and laboratory measures. *Diabetes*, 59(12), 3017–3022.
- Schaefer, K. K., Xiao, W., Chen, Q., He, J., Lu, J., Chan, F., ... Qiu, X. (2018, August). Prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus in the born in guangzhou cohort study, china. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*, 143(2), 164–171. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijgo.12627> doi: 10.1002/ijgo.12627
- Schuitmaker, J. H., Beernink, R. H., Franx, A., Cremers, T. I., & Koster, M. P. (2020). First trimester secreted frizzled-related protein 4 and other adipokine serum concentrations in women developing gestational diabetes mellitus. *Plos one*, 15(11), e0242423.
- Shen, L., Sahota, D. S., Chaemsaitong, P., Tse, W. T., Chung, M. Y., Ip, J. K. H., ... Poon, L. C. Y. (2022). First trimester screening for gestational diabetes mellitus with maternal factors and biomarkers. *Fetal Diagnosis and Therapy*, 49(5-6), 256–264.
- Shivashri, C., Hannah, W., Deepa, M., Ghebremichael-Weldeslassie, Y., Anjana, R. M., Uma, R., ... Saravanan, P. (2022). Prevalence of prediabetes and type 2 diabetes mellitus in south and southeast asian women with history of gestational diabetes mellitus: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Plos one*, 17(12), e0278919.
- Sirico, A., Lanzone, A., Mappa, I., Sarno, L., Stodki, M., Pitocco, D.,

- ... Rizzo, G. (2019). The role of first trimester fetal heart rate in the prediction of gestational diabetes: A multicenter study. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 243, 158–161.
- Snyder, B. M., Baer, R. J., Oltman, S. P., Robinson, J. G., Breheny, P. J., Safflas, A. F., ... Ryckman, K. K. (2020, May). Early pregnancy prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus risk using prenatal screening biomarkers in nulliparous women. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, 163, 108139. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2020.108139> doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2020.108139
- Sovio, U., Clayton, G. L., Cook, E., Gaccioli, F., Charnock-Jones, D. S., Lawlor, D. A., & Smith, G. C. S. (2022, April). Metabolomic identification of a novel, externally validated predictive test for gestational diabetes mellitus. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 107(8), e3479–e3486. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgac240> doi: 10.1210/clinem/dgac240
- Steyerberg, E. W., Vickers, A. J., Cook, N. R., Gerds, T., Gonen, M., Obuchowski, N., ... Kattan, M. W. (2010). Assessing the performance of prediction models: a framework for some traditional and novel measures. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 21(1), 128.
- Sukumar, N., Venkataraman, H., Wilson, S., Goljan, I., Selvamoni, S., Patel, V., & Saravanan, P. (2016). Vitamin b12 status among pregnant women in the uk and its association with obesity and gestational diabetes. *Nutrients*, 8(12), 768.
- Tenenbaum-Gavish, K., Sharabi-Nov, A., Binyamin, D., Møller, H. J., Danon, D., Rothman, L., ... others (2020). First trimester biomarkers for prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Placenta*, 101, 80–89.
- Thagaard, I. N., Krebs, L., Holm, J.-C., Lange, T., Larsen, T., & Christiansen, M. (2017). Adiponectin and leptin as first trimester markers for gestational diabetes mellitus: a cohort study. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM)*, 55(11), 1805–1812.
- Thériault, S., Giguère, Y., Massé, J., Girouard, J., & Forest, J.-C. (2016, January). Early prediction of gestational diabetes: a practical model combining clinical and biochemical markers. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM)*, 54(3). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2015-0537> doi: 10.1515/cclm-2015-0537
- Tramontana, A., Pablik, E., Stangl, G., Hartmann, B., Dieplinger, H., & Hafner, E. (2018). Combination of first trimester serum afamin levels and three-dimensional placental bed vascularization as a possible screening method to detect women at-risk for adverse pregnancy complications like pre-eclampsia and gestational diabetes mellitus in low-risk pregnancies. *Placenta*, 62, 9–15.
- van Hoorn, F., Koster, M., Naaktgeboren, C., Groenendaal, F., Kwee, A., Lamain-de Ruiten, M., ... Bekker, M. (2021). Prognostic models versus single risk factor approach in first-trimester selective screening for gestational diabetes mellitus: a prospective population-based multicentre cohort study. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 128(4), 645–654.
- Visconti, F., Quaresima, P., Chiefari, E., Caroleo, P., Arcidiacono, B., Puccio, L., ... others (2019). First trimester combined test (ftct) as a predictor of gestational diabetes mellitus. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(19), 3654.
- Wang, C., Zhu, W., Wei, Y., Su, R., Feng, H., Lin, L., & Yang, H. (2016). The predictive effects of early pregnancy lipid profiles and fasting glucose on the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus stratified by body mass index. *Journal of Diabetes Research*, 2016.
- Wang, P., Ma, H.-h., Hou, X.-z., Song, L.-l., Song, X.-l., & Zhang, J.-f. (2018). Reduced plasma level of irisin in first trimester as a risk factor for the development of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, 142, 130–138.
- Wang, Y., Ge, Z., Chen, L., Hu, J., Zhou, W., Shen, S., ... Bi, Y. (2021, May). Risk prediction model of gestational diabetes mellitus in a chinese population based on a risk scoring system. *Diabetes Therapy*, 12(6), 1721–1734. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13300-021-01066-2> doi: 10.1007/s13300-021-01066-2
- White, S. L., Lawlor, D. A., Briley, A. L., Godfrey, K. M., Nelson, S. M., Oteng-Ntim, E., ... and, D. P. (2016, December). Early antenatal prediction of gestational diabetes in obese women: Development of prediction tools for targeted intervention. *PLOS ONE*, 11(12), e0167846. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167846> doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0167846
- Wolff, R. F., Moons, K. G., Riley, R. D., Whiting, P. F., Westwood, M., Collins, G. S., ... Group†, P. (2019). Probast: a tool to assess the risk of bias and applicability of prediction model studies. *Annals of internal medicine*, 170(1), 51–58.
- Wu, Q., Chen, Y., Zhou, M., Liu, M., Zhang, L., Liang, Z., & Chen, D. (2022). An early prediction model for gestational diabetes mellitus based on genetic variants and clinical characteristics in china. *Diabetology & metabolic syndrome*, 14(1), 1–10.
- Wu, Y.-T., Zhang, C.-J., Mol, B. W., Kawai, A., Li, C., Chen, L., ... others (2021). Early prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus in the chinese population via advanced machine learning. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 106(3), e1191–e1205.
- Yan, J., Geng, Y., Xu, H., Tan, S., He, D., Yu, Y., ... Du, X. (2020). A prediction model of gestational diabetes mellitus based on first pregnancy test index. In *International conference on health information science* (pp. 121–132).
- Yoffe, L., Polsky, A., Gilam, A., Raff, C., Mecacci, F., Ognibene, A., ... others (2019). Early diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus using circulating micrnas. *European journal of endocrinology*, 181(5), 565–577.
- Zhang, C., Li, Y., Wang, J., Liu, C., & Chen, Y. (2020, June). Association between levels of aquaporin 3 in the placenta and adiponectin in the umbilical cord blood with gestational diabetes mellitus and pregnancy outcome. *Molecular Medicine Reports*, 22(2), 1498–1506. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3892/mmr.2020.11225> doi: 10.3892/mmr.2020.11225
- Zhang, X., Zhao, X., Huo, L., Yuan, N., Sun, J., Du, J., ... Ji, L. (2020). Risk prediction model of gestational diabetes mellitus based on nomogram in a chinese population cohort study. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 1–7.
- Zhang, Y., Lan, X., Cai, C., Li, R., Gao, Y., Yang, L., ... others (2021). Associations between maternal lipid profiles and pregnancy complications: a prospective population-based study. *American Journal of Perinatology*, 38(08), 834–840.
- Zhao, M., Yang, S., Hung, T. C., Zheng, W., & Su, X. (2021). Association of pre-and early-pregnancy factors with the risk for gestational diabetes mellitus in a large chinese population. *Scientific reports*, 11(1), 1–9.
- Zheng, T., Ye, W., Wang, X., Li, X., Zhang, J., Little, J., ... Zhang, L. (2019, July). A simple model to predict risk of gestational diabetes mellitus from 8 to 20 weeks of gestation in chinese women. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 19(1). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-019-2374-8> doi: 10.1186/s12884-019-2374-8
- Zhu, B., Han, Y., Deng, F., Huang, K., Yan, S., Hao, J., ... Tao, F. (2021). The role of triiodothyronine (t3) and t3/free thyroxine (ft4) in glucose metabolism during pregnancy: the ma'anshan birth cohort study. *Endocrine Connections*, 10(7), 685–693.