



Contents available at ScienceDirect

Diabetes Research
and Clinical Practice

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/diabres



International
Diabetes
Federation



Impact of maternal height and gestational diabetes mellitus on offspring birthweight [☆]

Senja Masalin ^{a,b,*}, Merja K. Laine ^{a,c}, Hannu Kautiainen ^{d,e}, Mika Gissler ^{f,g},
Marko Raina ^{c,h}, Pirjo Pennanen ^c, Johan G. Eriksson ^{a,e,i,j,k}

^a Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland

^b Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland

^c Vantaa Health Center, Vantaa, Finland

^d Primary Health Care Unit, Kuopio University Hospital, Kuopio, Finland

^e Folkhälsan Research Center, Helsinki, Finland

^f National Institute for Health and Welfare, Information Department, Helsinki, Finland

^g Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden

^h Apotti, Helsinki, Finland

ⁱ National Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Chronic Disease Prevention, Helsinki, Finland

^j Singapore Institute for Clinical Sciences (SICS), Agency for Science and Technology (A*STAR), Singapore

^k Obstetrics & Gynecology, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore and National University Health System, Singapore

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29 August 2018

Received in revised form

12 December 2018

Accepted 4 January 2019

Available online 11 January 2019

Keywords:

Birthweight

Gestational diabetes mellitus

Maternal height

Offspring

Primiparous

Stature

ABSTRACT

Aims: To evaluate the impact of gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) and maternal height on offspring birthweight.

Methods: This is an observational cohort study, encompassing 4 111 Finnish primiparous women from Vantaa city, Finland, with singleton deliveries between 2009 and 2015. Data were obtained from the Finnish Medical Birth Register. The study population was divided into five groups according to maternal height. Cut-offs for height levels were I \leq 158 cm, II 159–163 cm, III 164–167 cm, IV 168–172 cm, V \geq 173 cm. The main outcome measure was offspring birthweight, expressed as Z-scores according to sex and gestational age.

Results: Independently, both maternal height and GDM increased offspring birthweight ($p < 0.001$ for height and GDM). When studying the interaction, a significant increase in offspring birthweight was noted only in extreme height categories; group I \leq 158 cm ($p = 0.011$), group IV 168–172 cm ($p = 0.010$) and group V \geq 173 cm ($p < 0.001$) and the impact was similar in both sexes. Maternal height had no impact on offspring ponderal index ($p = 0.20$ for trend).

Conclusions: In extreme height categories, short and tall primiparous women with GDM are at risk for delivering larger offspring compared to women without GDM of similar height.

© 2019 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

[☆] This study has been conducted in the city of Vantaa, Finland and in the city of Helsinki, Finland.

* Corresponding author at: Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care, Tukholmankatu 8 B, 00014 Helsingin yliopisto, Finland.

E-mail address: senja.lindholm@helsinki.fi (S. Masalin).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2019.01.004>

0168-8227/© 2019 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Fetal growth is a complex and multifactorial process influenced by several factors including genetic factors, in utero environment, maternal metabolism, duration of pregnancy and neonatal sex [1,2]. Of pregnancy complications, hypertensive disorders and gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) are the best known underlying factors affecting fetal growth [3–5]. Offspring birth size, especially when considered macrosomic, increases the risk for delivery complications such as prolonged labor, operative vaginal delivery, cesarean section and admission of the newborn to neonatal centers [6]. Furthermore, a non-optimal fetal growth environment has been shown to have long-term effects on cardiovascular and metabolic disturbances, partly through its impact on birth size [7]. Due to short- and long-term health consequences associated with body size at birth, it is of interest to study factors potentially influencing fetal growth.

GDM is a common pregnancy complication and has long been defined as any kind of abnormal glucose metabolism with onset or first detection during pregnancy [8]. Recent definitions are more precise in differentiating between pre-existing diabetes mellitus and GDM, depending on either different diagnostic criteria using 2-h 75-g oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) or timing of diagnosis during pregnancy [9–11]. The prevalence of GDM varies between 2% and 32% with a 9% median estimate for North America and 6% for Europe [12]. GDM is known to increase the risk of macrosomia and metabolic disturbances for both mother and child later in life [13–16].

Maternal anthropometry and its effects on fetal growth have been widely studied. Pre-pregnancy body mass index (BMI) has a direct effect on offspring birthweight and obesity increases the risk of macrosomia [17]. It has also been shown that GDM augments the effects of maternal BMI on offspring birthweight when combined [5,18,19]. Maternal stature has been shown to be positively associated with newborn size at birth [20–22].

Glucose metabolism itself is also affected by anthropometry. In non-pregnant, non-diabetic individuals it has been shown that taller people with a BMI below 35 kg/m² tend to have lower postprandial glucose levels compared to shorter people with the same BMI, using standard 2-h 75-g OGTT, with no difference in fasting glucose levels [23]. It has also been shown that short stature in pregnant women is associated with elevated postprandial glucose levels with no difference in fasting glucose levels [24,25].

In 2016, we initiated a long-term follow-up cohort study in the city of Vantaa, Finland, to assess both short- and long-term consequences of disturbances in glucose regulation on women's and their offspring's health. Since it has been shown that stature in pregnant women affects offspring size at birth and alters glucose metabolism, the aim of this study is to simultaneously study the impact of maternal height and GDM on offspring birthweight.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Subjects

This study is an observational cohort study in the city of Vantaa, the fourth biggest city in Finland. Between January 1st 2009 and December 31st 2015, 7 750 primiparous women without a history of previously diagnosed diabetes mellitus gave birth. Of those, 4 111 women with Finnish background (born in Finland with Finnish or Swedish as mother tongue) and aged ≥ 18 years gave birth to a singleton offspring between gestational weeks 37 and 42 and had complete height and weight data together with complete data from a standard 2-h 75-g OGTT. The Finnish Current Care Guidelines for GDM recommends screening of all pregnant women during their first pregnancy for GDM using 2-h 75-g OGTT, except in low-risk patients, i.e. women aged under 25 years, with a BMI between 18.5– and 25 kg/m² and with no family history of diabetes [26].

Data on maternal-fetal characteristics and pregnancy outcomes were obtained from the Medical Birth Register, which is administrated by the National Institute for Health and Welfare in Finland and receives the information from all Finnish maternity hospitals. The following information on the primiparous women was obtained from this source: pre-gestational weight, height, previous pregnancies (miscarriages, induced abortions or ectopic pregnancies) and deliveries, infertility treatment, smoking during pregnancy, and hospitalization due to hypertension during pregnancy [27]. The following information on the offspring was collected: sex, birth length, birthweight, and head circumference.

GDM was defined according to the Finnish Current Care Guidelines for GDM as one or more pathological glucose values in a standard 2-h 75-g OGTT [26]. The diagnostic thresholds were: fasting plasma glucose ≥ 5.3 mmol/L, 1-h glucose ≥ 10.0 mmol/L, and 2-h glucose ≥ 8.6 mmol/L [26].

Macrosomia was defined as offspring birthweight ≥ 4 500 g. Large for gestational age (LGA) and small for gestational age (SGA) were defined as a birthweight >90 th percentile and <10 th percentile, respectively, according to gestational age and sex. Ponderal index (PI), was calculated for estimating body proportionality at birth and was defined as birth weight (kg) divided by birth length (m) in third power: $PI = \text{kg/m}^3$ [28].

Educational attainment was defined according to years of schooling, as obtained from Statistics Finland [29].

2.2. Statistical analysis

Data are presented as means with range or standard deviations (SD) or as counts with percentages. Standardized values were divided into five height level categories using z-scores: I (< -1.5), II (-1.5 to < -0.319), III (-0.319 to < 0.319), IV (0.319 to < 1.15), and V (≥ 1.15) corresponding to grades containing 12.5, 25, 25, 25, and 12.5% of the total distribution. Cut-offs for maternal height levels were I ≤ 158 cm, II 159–163 cm, III

164–167 cm, IV 168–172 cm, V \geq 173 cm. Offspring birthweight and PI were calculated as Z-scores (according to sex and gestational age). Statistical significances for the unadjusted hypothesis of linearity across categories of height levels were evaluated by using the Cochran-Armitage test for trend and analysis of variance with an appropriate contrast. Adjusted hypothesis of linearity (orthogonal polynomial) was evaluated using generalized linear models (e.g. analysis of covariance and logistic models) with appropriate distribution and link function. Models included age, education years and pre-pregnancy body mass as covariates. A possible nonlinear relationship between prevalence of GDM or offspring birthweight and the maternal standardized height was assessed by using 5-knot-restricted cubic spline regression. The length of the distribution of knots was located at the 5th, 27.5th, 50th, 72.5th, and 95th percentiles corresponding to standardized height values of -1.66 , -0.66 , 0.01 , 0.67 and 1.67 . For restricted cubic splines, also known as natural splines, knot locations are based on Harrell's recommended percentiles or user-specified points [30]. The normality of the variables was tested by using the Shapiro–Wilk W test. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Stata 15.0 (StataCorp LP; College Station, Texas, USA) statistical package was used for the analysis.

2.3. Ethical approval

This study has been approved by the ethics committee of the Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa (356/13/03/03/2015, November 2nd 2015), and by the health authority of Vantaa city, Finland. Permission to use register data for this study were given by the National Institute for Health and Welfare, and Statistics Finland. According to the ethics committee of Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa, and the health authority of Vantaa city, the study participants do not need to provide the Statement of Informed Consent, since this is an observational register-based study and the registered people were not contacted.

3. Results

3.1. Characteristics of the study participants

Baseline characteristics of the 4 111 study participants divided into five height levels are shown in Table 1. The cut-offs were: I \leq 158 cm, II 159–163 cm, III 164–167 cm, IV 168–172 cm, and V \geq 173 cm. Mean height of the study participants was 166.0 (SD 6.0) cm. Height was positively associated with age and educational attainment (both $p < 0.001$).

Baseline characteristics of the offspring according to maternal height levels are shown in Table 2. Boys had a mean birthweight of 3 564 (SD 466) g, birth length 50.7 (SD 2.0) cm, and head circumference 35.3 (SD 1.4) cm, while the corresponding values for girls were 3 458 (SD 446) g, 49.9 (SD 2.0) cm, and 34.8 (SD 1.4) cm, respectively. Maternal height was positively associated with offspring birthweight, birth length, and head circumference in both sexes, as well as with a higher prevalence of macrosomia and large for gestational age (LGA) newborns (all $p < 0.001$). In contrast, maternal height was inversely associated with small for gestational

Table 1 – Baseline characteristics of the 4 111 primiparous women according to height levels.

Characteristics of the women	Height levels					p-value for linearity
	I N = 442	II N = 990	III N = 974	IV N = 1132	V N = 573	
Height (cm), mean (range)	156 (137–158)	161 (159–163)	165 (164–167)	170 (168–172)	176 (173–190)	<0.001
Age (years), mean (SD)	28.7 (4.7)	29.3 (4.8)	29.6 (4.8)	29.6 (4.8)	30.1 (4.6)	0.012
Cohabiting, n (%)	352 (80)	802 (81)	803 (82)	936 (83)	489 (85)	0.10
Smokers ^a , n (%)	79 (18)	158 (16)	141 (14)	174 (15)	79 (14)	<0.001
Years of education, mean (SD)	13.5 (2.5)	13.8 (2.5)	13.8 (2.4)	13.9 (2.5)	14.2 (2.5)	0.93
Prepregnancy BMI (kg/m ²), mean (SD)	24.9 (4.7)	24.6 (4.3)	24.8 (4.6)	24.9 (5.0)	24.7 (5.0)	0.15
Fertility treatment, n (%)	93 (21)	202 (20)	189 (19)	245 (22)	89 (16)	0.068
Hypertensive disorders ^b , n (%)	34 (8)	92 (9)	94 (10)	122 (11)	60 (10)	0.94
	31 (7)	54 (5)	73 (7)	79 (7)	31 (5)	

BMI, body mass index; SD, standard deviation.

Statistical significances for the unadjusted hypothesis of linearity across categories of height levels were evaluated by using the Cochran-Armitage test for trend and analysis of variance.

^a Included those who quit smoking during pregnancy.

^b Hospitalization due to hypertension during pregnancy.

Table 2 – Baseline characteristics of the 4 111 offspring according to maternal height.^a

Characteristics of the offspring	Height levels					p-value for linearity
	I N = 442	II N = 990	III N = 974	IV N = 1132	V N = 573	
Boys, n (%)	238 (54)	516 (52)	527 (54)	572 (51)	298 (52)	0.37
Birthweight (g), mean (SD)						
Boys	3 435 (451)	3 483 (443)	3 529 (478)	3 653 (461)	3 700 (445)	<0.001
Girls	3 304 (441)	3 406 (415)	3 466 (448)	3 511 (465)	3 539 (423)	<0.001
Birth length (cm), mean (SD)						
Boys	50.0 (2.0)	50.3 (1.9)	50.5 (1.9)	51.0 (2.0)	51.3 (1.9)	<0.001
Girls	49.1 (2.0)	49.7 (1.9)	49.8 (1.9)	50.1 (2.0)	50.4 (1.9)	<0.001
Birth weight (Z-score), mean (SD)						
Boys	−0.31 (0.94)	−0.18 (0.95)	−0.07 (1.00)	0.19 (0.99)	0.33 (0.99)	<0.001
Girls	−0.37 (0.94)	−0.17 (0.91)	0.04 (1.01)	0.15 (1.02)	0.19 (1.01)	<0.001
Ponderal index, (weight [kg]/ height [m] ³), mean (SD)						
Boys	27.4 (2.6)	27.2 (2.4)	27.3 (2.5)	27.5 (2.4)	27.4 (2.5)	0.42
Girls	27.4 (2.6)	27.8 (2.3)	27.9 (2.5)	27.9 (2.5)	27.7 (2.5)	0.76
Head circumference (cm), mean (SD)						
Boys	35.0 (1.5)	35.1 (1.4)	35.3 (1.5)	35.5 (1.4)	35.6 (1.4)	<0.001
Girls	34.3 (1.5)	34.7 (1.3)	34.8 (1.4)	35.0 (1.4)	35.0 (1.3)	<0.001
Macrosomia (birthweight ≥ 4500 g), n (%)	2 (0.5)	12 (1.2)	23 (2.4)	37 (3.2)	20 (3.5)	<0.001
LGA (>90 h percentile), n (%)	22 (5.0)	66 (6.7)	100 (10.3)	148 (13.1)	75 (13.1)	<0.001
SGA (<10 h percentile), n (%)	69 (15.6)	122 (12.3)	107 (11.0)	78 (6.9)	34 (5.9)	<0.001

SD, standard deviation.

Statistical significances for the unadjusted hypothesis of linearity across categories of height levels were evaluated using Cochran-Armitage test for trend and analysis of variance.

^a Cut-offs for the different height levels were I ≤ 158 cm, II 159–163 cm, III 164–167 cm, IV 168–172 cm, and V ≥ 173 cm.

age (SGA) newborns ($p < 0.001$). Ponderal index of newborns did not differ across different maternal height levels.

3.2. Maternal height and prevalence of gestational diabetes

Fig. 1 shows the prevalence of GDM at five different height levels and on a continuous scale with standardized height, adjusted for age and educational attainment. The prevalence of GDM was highest among the shortest women (≤ 158 cm) with a prevalence of 23.9% (95% CI 19.9–27.9) and lowest in the group of average height women (164–167 cm) with a prevalence of 18.7% (95% CI 15.5–21.9) (Fig. 1B). There was an inverse relationship across maternal height levels and prevalence of GDM ($p = 0.018$ for linearity).

3.3. Effect of maternal height and gestational diabetes on offspring birthweight and ponderal index

Fig. 2 shows the impact of maternal height and GDM and their interaction on offspring birthweight, adjusted for maternal age, pre-pregnancy BMI and educational attainment. In prim-




Fig. 1 – Prevalence of GDM according to height of the women. (A) Prevalence of GDM at five different height levels, with cut-offs for height levels at I ≤ 158 cm, II 159–163 cm, III 164–167 cm, IV 168–172 cm, and V ≥ 173 cm. Whiskers show 95% confidence intervals. (B) Prevalence of GDM on a continuous scale with standardized maternal height. The curve was derived from a 5-knot restricted cubic splines regression model and gray area represent 95% confidence interval. Both figures were adjusted for age and educational attainment. GDM, gestational diabetes.




Fig. 2 – Impact of maternal height and GDM on offspring birthweight. The impact of maternal height and GDM and their interaction on offspring birthweight in five different height levels (A) and as a continuum (B) with standardized maternal height adjusted for age, pre-pregnancy body mass index and educational attainment. Cut-offs for maternal height levels were I ≤ 158 cm, II 159–163 cm, III 164–167 cm, IV 168–172 cm, V ≥ 173 cm. Offspring birthweight was calculated as Z-scores (according to sex and gestational age). GDM, Gestational diabetes mellitus.

iparous women without GDM, offspring birthweight increased with maternal height ($p < 0.001$ for trend). Similarly, in primiparous women with GDM offspring birthweight increased with maternal height ($p < 0.001$ for trend), except in women of average height (159–167 cm) which included about half of the study participants, in whom GDM had no significant influence on offspring birthweight. Maternal height had no impact on offspring PI ($p = 0.20$ for trend, adjusted for maternal age, pre-pregnancy BMI and educational attainment) (Fig. 3). The impact of maternal height and GDM on offspring birthweight was similar for both sexes, as shown in Fig. 4.

4. Discussion

According to the study findings in our cohort including Finnish women and their offspring, in primiparous women without GDM, offspring birthweight increased with maternal height. Interestingly, in primiparous women with GDM such an association with offspring birthweight was observed only in the extreme height categories of short and tall women, but not in women of average height. There was a significant interaction between maternal height and GDM on offspring birthweight, and the same trend was observed in both sexes. Tall primiparous women had an increased risk of newborn macrosomia and LGA newborns. Similarly, short stature was associated with SGA newborns. PI, in contrast, did not differ

across different maternal height levels. Moreover, maternal height and GDM had no impact on PI.

The nationwide prevalence of GDM in Finland increased during our study period from 11.2% to 15.9% in 2015 [27]. The high prevalence of GDM in our cohort is in line with nationwide findings. Overall, GDM prevalence can be considered high in Finland, when compared to a median estimate of 6% in Europe, even though GDM prevalence have been shown to vary between 2 and 32% globally [12]. The comprehensive screening for GDM since 2008 in Finland might possibly explain this rather high prevalence in our country and particularly in this study, in which only women with high-risk for GDM with complete OGTT data were included.

Our findings regarding maternal height and offspring birthweight in pregnancies without GDM were expected. Many other studies have shown a positive association between maternal height and offspring birth size [20–22,31]. Moreover, the positive association between maternal height and LGA babies, as well as the negative association between maternal height and SGA babies have been recognized previously. In fact, a recent German study reported similar relationships [32]. Interestingly, neither maternal height nor GDM had any impact on PI. This might indicate that body proportionalities did not differ across different maternal height levels at term.

The association between maternal height and offspring birth size has been thought to reflect mainly genetic factors [21], although the height of the mother and offspring body size, especially in developing countries, are also consequences of the nutritional status early in life [33]. Further, some physical aspects are thought to explain the correlation, including maternal constraint. In shorter mothers, there can be physical limitations for the growth of the uterus that can restrict fetal growth [34].

In most previous studies, a positive correlation between GDM and offspring birth size has been reported, but the effect of GDM on offspring birth size has been studied with no distinction of maternal stature [4,13,35]. In 1952, Jørgen Pedersen theorized that hyperglycemia of the mother led to hyperglycemia of the fetus and that this, in turn, amplified the fetal response to insulin [36]. Pedersen's hypothesis has formed the basic understanding of the pathophysiological consequences of diabetes during pregnancy. Modifying Pedersen's hypothesis has led to the idea, that the impact of GDM on birth size is thought to be due to insulin resistance in diabetic mothers and an elevated glucose level that passes through the placenta. This, in turn, increases the insulin levels of the fetus and leads to an excessive uptake of glucose, storage of glycogen and the formation of adipose tissue, resulting in macrosomia [13]. The Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes (HAPO) study showed no threshold for glucose in relation to adverse pregnancy outcomes [4]. The results indicated a strong, positive and continuous association between increasing maternal glucose concentrations, already below those that are diagnostic for diabetes mellitus, and an increased birthweight [4].

GDM is a heterogenic metabolic disorder and is thought to be caused by increasing insulin resistance due to placental hormonal influence and maternal adiposity in late pregnancy, impaired beta-cell function, genetic predisposition and in

some cases autoimmunity [37]. Glucose metabolism has been shown to be affected by stature both in non-pregnant and pregnant individuals. In non-pregnant individuals, studies have shown that taller individuals tend to have lower postprandial glucose levels compared to shorter individuals using standard OGTT, with no difference in fasting glucose levels [23–25,38–40]. In line with our findings, previous studies have also proven GDM to be more common in shorter women [24,25,41], although some findings show no differences in stature between GDM and non-GDM women [42].

It is not fully understood how stature influences glucose metabolism, but there are several hypotheses trying to explain the association. Taller people have more muscle mass, although not necessarily a higher percentage of muscle tissue in relation to total body mass. It is generally accepted that muscle tissue is the major tissue involved in glucose metabolism [39]. It has been theorized that the inverse association between height and postprandial glucose levels after a standard 2-h OGTT reflects the larger amount of metabolically active muscle tissue that taller individuals, compared to shorter individuals, have to metabolize the same fixed load of glucose [39]. Height has also been positively associated with both pancreatic beta cell function and insulin sensitivity [38], possibly indicating a more favorable glucose regulation in tall, compared to short individuals.

According to our findings, the simultaneous effect of maternal height and GDM affects offspring birthweight only in the extreme height categories of short and tall women. In Finland, GDM is diagnosed using a fixed load of 75-g glucose in association with a 2-h OGTT, regardless of maternal height, weight or body composition. The varying effect of GDM on offspring birthweight observed in different maternal height levels can probably partly be explained by differences in maternal anthropometrics including body composition. Perhaps, taller women with GDM might have a more severe degree of impairment in their glucose regulation compared to shorter women, consequently more often leading to macrosomia among the offspring. Among short women, it is possible that the muscle mass is limited – both quantitatively and qualitatively – and thus already a mild elevation in glucose concentration is more likely to affect the fetus.

One can also speculate about possible effects of assortative mating on stature and paternal genetic imprinting on traits and disease burden in the fetus. According to a meta-analysis about assortative mating for human heights there is a moderate positive trend for assortative mating for height despite ethnicities, although, height cannot be considered as a major factor when choosing a partner [43]. Similarly, it is important to knowledge the possible impact of a short mothers' own early growth and nutritional status. Birth size is known to be positively associated with adult height [44], in other words might short individuals have had a low birthweight and a non-optimal prenatal growth. There are several studies indicating that intrauterine growth restriction and malnutrition in infancy can lead to impaired glucose regulation and impaired endogenous pancreatic function in adulthood, predisposing to type 2 diabetes [45,46].

The question remains why offspring birthweight is not affected by GDM in women of average height? Interestingly, a recent Australian study shows no elevation at macrosomia




Fig. 3 – Impact of maternal height and GDM on offspring Ponderal Index. The impact of maternal height and GDM and their interaction on offspring Ponderal Index in five different height levels (A) and as a continuum (B) with standardized maternal height adjusted for age, pre-pregnancy body mass index and educational attainment. Cut-offs for maternal height levels were I ≤ 158 cm, II 159–163 cm, III 164–167 cm, IV 168–172 cm, V ≥ 173 cm. Offspring Ponderal Index was calculated as Z-scores (according to sex and gestational age). GDM, Gestational diabetes mellitus, PI, Ponderal Index.

rates in diet-treated GDM women compared to non-diabetic controls, suggesting that a milder and diet-treated GDM could have a lower impact on risk of macrosomia [47]. Possibly, GDM is milder in women of average height where the influence of stature on glucose metabolism would be less.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the simultaneous effect of maternal height and GDM on offspring birthweight. According to our study findings, GDM increased offspring birthweight only in women with short or tall stature, while among the majority of women of average height no impact of GDM on birth size was observed. In clinical practice, this might indicate that both short and tall primiparous women with GDM should have a more intense follow up during pregnancy, and if needed, a customized plan for delivery. This area needs to be further explored, also taking into account the mother's own birthweight and potential transgenerational aspects.

The strength of this study is that the study cohort encompasses all adult Finnish primiparous women from the city of Vantaa, the fourth largest city in Finland, who gave birth to a singleton infant at term during a seven-year follow-up. The diagnosis of GDM is based on a 2-h 75-g oral glucose tolerance test and is considered reliable while it is standardized nationwide, and the diagnostic criteria have been the same during the follow-up period.

The study has some limitations. We had no information on measures of insulin resistance, gestational weight gain, family history of diabetes, physical activity nor dietary habits. We




Fig. 4 – Impact of maternal height and GDM on offspring birthweight in girls and boys. The impact of maternal height and GDM and their interaction on offspring birthweight in both girls (A) and boys (B) in five different height levels (age, pre-pregnancy body mass index and educational attainment adjusted). Cut-offs for height were I ≤ 158 cm, II 159–163 cm, III 164–167 cm, IV 168–172 cm, V ≥ 173 cm. Offspring birthweight was calculated as Z-scores (according to sex and gestational age). GDM, Gestational diabetes mellitus.

also missed data on paternal anthropometry. Body composition and birthweight of the mothers' were unknown. In this cohort all study participants were Finnish, therefore the generalization of our results globally can be limited. Noteworthy is that even if all women included in the study had a reliable GDM diagnosis based upon OGTT results, we have no other information on metabolic parameters and associations between these and offspring birthweight were unknown.

In conclusion, short and tall Finnish primiparous women with GDM are at risk of delivering larger infants compared to women without GDM with the same height. GDM does not affect offspring birthweight in Finnish primiparous women of average height. Among tall Finnish women with GDM, the prevalence of macrosomia is increased. Maternal height had no impact on offspring PI. To minimize the adverse effects of an increased birthweight and/or macrosomia, special attention should be paid to women with GDM, especially in the subgroups of short and tall women.

Acknowledgments

Funding: Research Foundation for Primary Health Care, Finland, and The Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa, Finland, awarded a research grant for this study. Samfundet Folkhälsan, Helsinki, Finland funded for the statistical analysis. The funding sources had no role for the conduct of the research or the preparations for the article.

Conflict of interest

None.

Appendix A. Supplementary material

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2019.01.004>.

REFERENCES

- [1] Catalano PM, Kirwan JP. Maternal factors that determine neonatal size and body fat. *Curr Diab Rep* 2001;1(1):71–7.
- [2] Love EJ, Kinch RA. Factors influencing the birth weight in normal pregnancy. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1965;91:342–9.
- [3] Shen M, Smith GN, Rodger M, White RR, Walker MC, Wen SW. Comparison of risk factors and outcomes of gestational hypertension and pre-eclampsia. *PLoS ONE* 2017;12(4): e0175914. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175914>.
- [4] Metzger BE, Lowe LP, Dyer AR, Trimble ER, Chaovarindr U, Coustan DR, et al. Hyperglycemia and adverse pregnancy outcomes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358(19):1991–2002. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa0707943>.
- [5] Catalano PM, McIntyre HD, Cruickshank JK, McCance DR, Dyer AR, Metzger BE, et al. The hyperglycemia and adverse pregnancy outcome study: associations of GDM and obesity with pregnancy outcomes. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35(4):780–6. <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc11-1790>.
- [6] Mocanu EV, Greene RA, Byrne BM, Turner MJ. Obstetric and neonatal outcome of babies weighing more than 4.5 kg: an analysis by parity. *Eur J Obstet, Gynecol, Reprod Biol* 2000;92(2):229–33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-2116\(99\)00280-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-2116(99)00280-8).
- [7] Gluckman PD, Hanson MA, Cooper C, Thornburg KL. Effect of in utero and early-life conditions on adult health and disease. *N Engl J Med* 2008;359(1):61–73. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra0708473>.
- [8] Gestational diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes care* 2004;27(Suppl. 1):S88–S90. <https://doi.org/10.2337/diacare.27.2007>.
- [9] WHO guidelines approved by the guidelines review committee. In: Diagnostic criteria and classification of hyperglycaemia first detected in pregnancy. Geneva: World Health Organization Copyright (c) World Health Organization 2013; 2013.
- [10] Classification and diagnosis of diabetes. *Diabetes care* 2017;40(Suppl. 1):S11–S24. <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc17-S005>.
- [11] Agarwal MM. Gestational diabetes mellitus: an update on the current international diagnostic criteria. *World J Diabetes* 2015;6(6):782–91. <https://doi.org/10.4239/wjd.v6.i6.782>.
- [12] Zhu Y, Zhang C. Prevalence of gestational diabetes and risk of progression to type 2 diabetes: a global perspective. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16(1):7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11892-015-0699-x>.
- [13] Kc K, Shakya S, Zhang H. Gestational diabetes mellitus and macrosomia: a literature review. *Ann Nutr Metab* 2015;66(Suppl 2):14–20. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000371628>.
- [14] Mitanchez D, Yzydorczyk C, Siddeek B, Boubred F, Benahmed M, Simeoni U. The offspring of the diabetic mother—short- and long-term implications. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol* 2015;29(2):256–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2014.08.004>.
- [15] Bellamy L, Casas JP, Hingorani AD, Williams D. Type 2 diabetes mellitus after gestational diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet (London, England)* 2009;373(9677):1773–9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(09\)60731-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60731-5).
- [16] Tobias DK, Stuart JJ, Li S, Chavarro J, Rimm EB, Rich-Edwards J, et al. Association of history of gestational diabetes with long-term cardiovascular disease risk in a large prospective cohort of US women. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.2790>.
- [17] Yu Z, Han S, Zhu J, Sun X, Ji C, Guo X. Pre-pregnancy body mass index in relation to infant birth weight and offspring overweight/obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8(4):e61627. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061627>.
- [18] Bystrom M, Liu A, Quinton AE, Champion BL, Mann K, Peek M, et al. Gestational diabetes independently increases birth length and augments the effects of maternal bmi on birth weight: a retrospective cohort study. *Front Pediatr* 2014;2:112. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2014.00112>.
- [19] Miao M, Dai M, Zhang Y, Sun F, Guo X, Sun G. Influence of maternal overweight, obesity and gestational weight gain on the perinatal outcomes in women with gestational diabetes mellitus. *Sci Rep* 2017;7(1):305. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-00441-z>.
- [20] Polzlberger E, Hartmann B, Hafner E, Stumpflein I, Kirchengast S. Maternal height and pre-pregnancy weight status are associated with fetal growth patterns and newborn size. *J Biosoc Sci* 2017;49(3):392–407. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021932016000493>.
- [21] Kirchengast S, Hartmann B, Schweppe KW, Husslein P. Impact of maternal body build characteristics on newborn size in two different European populations. *Hum Biol* 1998;70(4):761–74.
- [22] Han Z, Lutsiv O, Mulla S, McDonald SD. Maternal height and the risk of preterm birth and low birth weight: a systematic review and meta-analyses. *J Obstet Gynaecol Canada: JOGC = Journal d'obstetrique et gynecologie du Canada: JOGC* 2012;34(8):721–46. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1701-2163\(16\)35337-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1701-2163(16)35337-3).
- [23] Rehunen SKJ, Kautiainen H, Eriksson JG, Korhonen PE. Adult height and glucose tolerance: a re-appraisal of the importance of body mass index. *Diabetic Med: J Brit Diabetic Assoc* 2017;34(8):1129–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dme.13382>.
- [24] Jang HC, Min HK, Lee HK, Cho NH, Metzger BE. Short stature in Korean women: a contribution to the multifactorial predisposition to gestational diabetes mellitus. *Diabetologia* 1998;41(7):778–83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s001250050987>.
- [25] Branchtein L, Schmidt MI, Matos MC, Yamashita T, Pousada JM, Duncan BB. Short stature and gestational diabetes in Brazil. *Brazilian Gestational Diabetes Study Group. Diabetologia* 2000;43(7):848–51.
- [26] [Update on current care guideline: gestational diabetes]. *Duodecim; laaketieteellinen aikakauskirja* 2013;129(17):1798–1799.
- [27] THL. Medical Birth Register 2015. Available at: <http://www.thl.fi/en/statistics/parturients>. [accessed 12/17, 2017].
- [28] Landmann E, Irwin R, Misselwitz B, Gortner L. Ponderal index for discrimination between symmetric and asymmetric growth restriction: percentiles for neonates from 30 weeks to 43 weeks of gestation. *J Maternal-Fetal Neonatal Med* 2006;19(3):157–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767050600624786>.
- [29] STAT. Koulutusaste 2016. Available at: <http://www.stat.fi/meta/luokitukset/koulutus/001-2016/kuvaus>. [accessed 12/17, 2017].
- [30] Harrell Jr FE. *Regression modeling strategies: with applications to linear models, logistic regression, and survival analysis*. New York: Springer; 2001.
- [31] Pickett KE, Abrams B, Selvin S. Maternal height, pregnancy weight gain, and birthweight. *Am J Hum Biol: Off J Hum Biol Council* 2000;12(5):682–7. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6300\(200009/10\)12:5<682::AID-AJHB13>3.0.CO;2-X](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6300(200009/10)12:5<682::AID-AJHB13>3.0.CO;2-X).

- [32] Olbertz BM, Knie A, Straube S, Hentschel R, Schleußner E, Hagenah HP, et al. Somatic development at birth as influenced by maternal characteristics-an analysis of the German Perinatal Survey. *J Perinat Med* 2018;46(8):889–92. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jpm-2017-0039>.
- [33] Camilleri AP. The obstetric significance of short stature. *Eur J Obstetr Gynecol Reprod Biol* 1981;12(6):347–56.
- [34] Hisham TJ, Moawed SA. The relation of low birth weight to psychosocial stress and maternal anthropometric measurements. *Saudi Med J* 2000;21(7):649–54.
- [35] Yang J, Cummings EA, O'Connell C, Jangard K. Fetal and neonatal outcomes of diabetic pregnancies. *Obstet Gynecol* 2006;108(3 Pt 1):644–50. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.AOG.0000231688.08263.47>.
- [36] Pedersen J. Diabetes and pregnancy; blood sugar of newborn infants during fasting and glucose administration. *Nord Med* 1952;47(30):1049.
- [37] Buchanan TA, Xiang AH. Gestational diabetes mellitus. *J Clin Invest* 2005;115(3):485–91. <https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI24531>.
- [38] Vangipurapu J, Stancakova A, Jauhiainen R, Kuusisto J, Laakso M. Short adult stature predicts impaired beta-cell function, insulin resistance, glycemia, and type 2 diabetes in Finnish men. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2017;102(2):443–50. <https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2016-2933>.
- [39] Sicree RA, Zimmet PZ, Dunstan DW, Cameron AJ, Welborn TA, Shaw JE. Differences in height explain gender differences in the response to the oral glucose tolerance test-the AusDiab study. *Diabetic Med: J Brit Diabetic Assoc* 2008;25(3):296–302. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-5491.2007.02362.x>.
- [40] Faerch K, Borch-Johnsen K, Vaag A, Jorgensen T, Witte DR. Sex differences in glucose levels: a consequence of physiology or methodological convenience? The Inter99 study. *Diabetologia* 2010;53(5):858–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-010-1673-4>.
- [41] Anastasiou E, Alevizaki M, Grigorakis SJ, Philippou G, Kyprianou M, Souvatzoglou A. Decreased stature in gestational diabetes mellitus. *Diabetologia* 1998;41(9):997–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s001250051022>.
- [42] Tabak AG, Kerenyi Z, Nagy E, Bosnyak Z, Madarasz E, Tamas G. Height and gestational diabetes mellitus. *Diabetic Med: J Brit Diabetic Assoc* 2002;19(4):344–5.
- [43] Stulp G, Simons MJ, Grasman S, Pollet TV. Assortative mating for human height: a meta-analysis. *Am J Hum Biol* 2017;29(01):e22917. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.22917>.
- [44] Pietilainen KH, Kaprio J, Rasanen M, Winter T, Rissanen A, Rose RJ. Tracking of body size from birth to late adolescence: contributions of birth length, birth weight, duration of gestation, parents' body size, and twinning. *Am J Epidemiol* 2001;154(1):21–9.
- [45] Phipps K, Barker DJ, Hales CN, Fall CH, Osmond C, Clark PM. Fetal growth and impaired glucose tolerance in men and women. *Diabetologia* 1993;36(3):225–8.
- [46] Whincup PH, Kaye SJ, Owen CG, Huxley R, Cook DG, Anazawa S, et al. Birth weight and risk of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2008;300(24):2886–97. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2008.886>.
- [47] Vally F, Presneill J, Cade T. Macrosomia rates in women with diet-controlled gestational diabetes: a retrospective study. *J Pregnancy* 2017;2017:4935397. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/4935397>.