





# Association between Maternal Birth Weight and Gestational Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Mehdi Shokri<sup>1</sup> · Mahsa Rizebandi<sup>2</sup> · Parviz Karimi<sup>1</sup> · Gholamreza Badfar<sup>3</sup> · Marzieh Parizad Nasirkandy<sup>4</sup> · Gholamreza Kalvandi<sup>5</sup> · Shoboo Rahmati<sup>6</sup>

Received: 16 March 2021 / Accepted: 1 March 2022 / Published online: 7 April 2022 © Federation of Obstetric & Gynecological Societies of India 2022

#### Abstracts

**Background and Aims** Gestational diabetes mellitus is one of the most important issue related to health status of mothers and their children throughout life. This meta-analysis has been conducted to assess relationship between maternal birth weight and gestational diabetes.

**Methods and Results** This article is written using PRISMA guideline for systematic review and meta-analysis. We searched epidemiological studies without a time limit from following databases - Scopus, PubMed, Science Direct, Embase, Web of Science, CINAHL, Cochrane, EBSCO, and Google Scholar search engine using MESH keywords. Heterogeneity was determined using the Cochran Q test and  $I^2$  index. Data were analyzed using comprehensive meta-analysis, version 2. The significance level of the tests was considered as P < 0.05.

**Results** The result of combining ten studies with a sample size of 228,409 cases using a fixed-effect model showed that low maternal birth weight increased the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus (1.71 [95% CI 1.43–2.06, P < 0.001]). In addition, the result of combining nine studies with a sample size of 227,805 cases using a random-effects model showed that macrosomia did not increase the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus, and there was no significant relationship between them (1.04 [95% CI 0.79–1.38; p value: 0.730]).

**Conclusion** The results of this systematic review and meta-analysis showed that low maternal birth weight could be a risk factor for gestational diabetes in adulthood.

Keywords Gestational diabetes · Maternal birth weight · Systematic review · Meta-analysis

Shoboo Rahmati shoboorahmati2014@gmail.com

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, Ilam University of Medical Sciences, Ilam, Iran
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Internal Medicine, School of Medicine, Ilam University of Medical Sciences, Ilam, Iran
- <sup>3</sup> Department of Pediatric, Faculty of Medicine, Ahvaz Jundishapour University of Medical Sciences, Ahvaz, Iran
- <sup>4</sup> Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, School of Medicine, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran
- <sup>5</sup> Associate Professor of Pediatrics Gastroenterology, Department of Pediatrics, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran
- <sup>6</sup> Student Research Committee, Department of Epidemiology, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran

# Introduction

Appropriate weight for full-term infants is 2.3 to 4.3 kg, but the acceptable range of birth weight is between 2.5 and 4 kg. Therefore, birth weight is the most important factor in determining infant health and growth [1, 2]. Low-birth-weight (LBW) infants are two to three times more likely to suffer from neurological, ophthalmic, hearing complications and mental retardation than normal infants [3, 4]. Animal and epidemiological studies have shown that both LBW and macrosomia are associated with the development of diabetes in adulthood [1, 5-8]. Many studies have investigated the abnormal effects of LBW and maternal macrosomia at birth, some of which were related to gestational diabetes [12-18]. Gestational diabetes mellitus is a state of glucose intolerance and, despite its incompatibility with the body, appears in pregnant women with no history of diabetes. The disease usually occurs between 24 and 28 weeks of pregnancy at the same time when placental lactogen is secreted by the placenta, which reduces insulin sensitivity in the mother. The prevalence is 3 to 6% of all pregnancies, 4% on an average. Gestational diabetes can cause serious problems for the mother and fetus, such as weight gain at birth, stillbirth in the last 4 weeks, preterm labor and neonatal respiratory distress syndrome, low blood sugar at birth, and possibility of seizures [9, 10]. Meta-analysis is the combination of data and results from a systematic review using statistical methods. After a systematic review, which is the prerequisite for meta-analysis, and based on the results, we obtain a single estimate for solving the problem or answering the question. One of the important goals of meta-analysis is to find out the inconsistencies of the results and their causes [12, 13, 24]. This study aimed to investigate the possible relationship between maternal birth weight and gestational diabetes.

## Methods

#### **Study Protocol**

This review article is written using PRISMA Guideline for systematic review and meta-analysis studies [21]. The stages of the study include search strategy, selection of studies, qualitative assessment of studies, and data extraction. All procedures were performed independently by two researchers. The third researcher examined the agreement between the results, and in cases of disagreement, resolved the disagreement.

#### Search Strategy

We searched for epidemiological studies published till December 23, 2020, in English databases including Scopus, PubMed, Science Direct, Embase, Web of Science, CINAHL, Cochrane, EBSCO, and Google Scholar search engine using MeSH Keywords "pregnancy diabetes" and "low birth weight." Combined searches were performed using the AND and OR functions. An example search in PubMed is given in the following:

- 1. Exp \*birth weight\*
- 2. Exp \*low birth weight\*
- 3. Exp \*macrosomia birth weight\*
- 4. Exp maternal
- 5. Exp \*gestational Diabetes Mellitus\*
- 6. Exp pregnancy diabetes.

#### **Study Selection**

We screened the studies by reviewing the title and abstract by two reviewers (SHR and MSH). Duplicate studies were eliminated manually or using Endnotes, version 5. We reviewed the full text of articles to evaluate the inclusion and exclusion criteria and did the final selection of articles after quality assessment.

## **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

The studies which qualified for inclusion were epidemiological studies published in English language that examined the association between gestational diabetes and maternal birth weight. Exclusion criteria were: (1) lack of relationship between gestational diabetes mellitus as an outcome and maternal weight loss as maternal exposure; (2) samples other than gestational diabetes mellitus; (3) letters to the editors without original data, review articles, and case reports, and (4) duplicate studies.

#### **Qualitative Assessment**

Two independent reviewers (SHR and MSH) included qualified articles in a checklist for qualitative assessment. The Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS) was used for evaluating the quality of nonrandomized studies in the meta-analysis [18]. Based on the scores from the checklist, studies were divided into three categories: low quality (below 6 points), medium quality (between 6 and 8 points), and high quality (between 9 and 10 points).

## **Data Extraction**

Data were independently extracted by two researchers (SHR and MSH), which included the first author's name, year of study, study location, type of study, country, continent, sample size (total, case and control), study outcomes (including LBW and macrosomia), odds ratio or relative risk, and *P* value.

## Definitions

Newborns weighing less than 2500 g are known as low birth weight regardless of gestational age [20]. Newborns born weighing more than 4000 g at birth, regardless of gestational age, are known as macrosomia (high birth weight) [20]. Gestational diabetes mellitus is a state of glucose intolerance and, despite its incompatibility with the body, appears in pregnant women with no history of diabetes. The disease usually occurs between weeks 24 and 28 of pregnancy at the same time when placental lactogen is secreted by the placenta, which reduces insulin sensitivity in the mother [9-11]. In the primary studies used in this meta-analysis, the diagnostic criteria were based on the World Health Organization, the American Diabetes Association, and the International Classification of Disease (ICD-9) [17, 22, 23].

#### **Statistical Analysis**

Data were entered into Excel 2016 and then transferred to comprehensive meta-analysis, version 2, for meta-analysis, and the results of the studies were analyzed using this software. Heterogeneity was determined using the Cochran Q test and the  $I^2$  index. There are three classifications in this area (below 25% is considered low heterogeneity, 25–75% is medium heterogeneity, and over 75% is high heterogeneity). The random-effects model was used in medium and high heterogeneity cases, while the fixed-effects model was used in cases of low heterogeneity.

In this study, a fixed-effects model was used to determine the relationship between gestational diabetes and maternal birth weight because of low heterogeneity. A random-effects model was used to determine the relationship between gestational diabetes and maternal weight gain. Sensitivity analysis was also performed. The level of significance was considered 0.05.

#### **Influence Analysis**

The robustness of the pooled estimate was evaluated by influence analysis (fixed- and random-effects model). Each study estimate was individually omitted from the dataset, and in each case, recalculation was done for a pooled estimate of the remaining studies. Finally, the OR (odds ratio) and 95% confidence interval were calculated for each study.

#### **Publication Bias and Statistical Software**

Publication bias was assessed by inspecting the funnel plot, and formal testing for funnel plot asymmetry was done using Begg's test and Egger's test.

#### Results

## **Search Results and Characteristics of Studies**

In this meta-analysis, 520 articles were identified based on primary search, and 248 duplicate articles were removed. After reviewing the abstracts, 210 articles were removed

Table 1 Summary of the included stud	ies
--------------------------------------	-----

RR (95%CI) First author, publica-Type of study/type Country/continent Years of follow Sample size RR (95% CI) for tion years (reference) of time low birth weight for microsomal (<2500 gr) (>4000 gr) Ogonowsk, 2014 [12] Cohort retrospective Poland/Europe 2000-2007 1588 1.59 (95% CI 0.92 (95% CI 1.03 - 2.460.59 - 1.42)Seghieri, 2002 [13] Italy/Europe 604 1.89 (95% CI Cohort retrospective 1.09 - 3.28)Zhu, 2017 [14] 2013 0.65 (95% CI 0.331 (95% CI Cohort retrospective Beijing/Asia 15,194 0.30 - 1.430.16-0.333) 2000-2010 2.16 (95% CI 1.53 (95% CI Innes, 2002 [15] Case-control/retro-New York/USA 23,395 spective 1.04 - 4.501.03 - 2.27)Savona, 2003 [16] Cohort/prospective Malta/Europe 1996-2001 7075 1.40 (95% CI 0.93 (95% CI 0.79 - 2.490.56-1.52)\* Williams, 1999 [17] 2.05 (95% CI 0.90 (95% CI Cohort retrospective Washington/USA 1987 - 199521,528 1.35 - 3.15) 0.70 - 1.30Williams, 1999 [17] Cohort retrospective Washington/USA 1987-1995 6359 1.75 (95% CI; 2.20 (95% CI 1.10 - 4.600.85 - 3.45Williams, 1999 [17] 0.90 (95% CI Cohort retrospective Washington/USA 1987-1995 7456 2.15 (95% CI 0.95 - 4.90)0.50 - 1.60)Williams, 1999 [17] 1.10 (95% CI 0.60-2) Cohort retrospective Washington/USA 1987-1995 6496 2.10 (95% CI 0.95 - 4.50)Egeland, 2000 [18] Norway/Europe 1988-1998 138,714 1.80 (95% CI 1.10-3) 1.50 (95% CI Cohort retrospective 0.80 - 2.90

<sup>\*</sup>It was calculated based on the number of exposures and the total number in both groups





for being irrelevant. After thoroughly reviewing the remaining 62 articles were evaluated for their quality, ten articles entered the meta-analysis process (Table 1 and Fig. 1).

# Relationship Between Gestational Diabetes, Maternal LBW and Macrosomia

The results of combining ten studies with a sample size of 228409 using a fixed-effects model showed that maternal LBW increased the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus (1.71 [95% CI 1.43–2.06, P < 0.001]) (Fig. 2A).

In addition, the results of combining nine studies with a sample size of 227,805 using a random-effects model showed that maternal macrosomia did not increase the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus, and there was no significant relationship between them (1.04 [95% CI 0.79–1.38; p value: 0.730]) (Fig. 2B).

# Subgroup Analysis of the Relationship between Gestational Diabetes and Maternal Birth Weight:

# **Based on Type of Study**

In eight cohort studies and one case–control study, RR and 95% CI of the correlation between gestational diabetes and maternal macrosomia were 0.98 (95% CI 0.74–1.32; p = 0.94) and 1.53 (95% CI 1.03–2.27; p = 0.35), respectively, and no significant difference was observed (p = 0.080).

## **Based on Year of Publication**

There were four, three, and two studies of the years < 2000, 2000–2010, and > 2010, with RR and 95% CI 1.13 (95% CI 0.82–1.55), 1.29 (95% CI 0.93–1.78), and 0.57 (95% CI 0.21–1.56), respectively, and no significant difference was observed (p = 0.308).

Study name		Statis	tics for e	ach sludy	_		Risk	ratio and 95%	<u>6 CI</u>		
	Risk ratio	Lower	Upper	Z-Value	p-Value						Relative weight
Ogonowsk, 2014	1.590	1.029	2.457	2.088	0.037	1	1		1		17.69
Seghieri, 2002	1.890	1.090	3.279	2.265	0.024						11.05
Zhu, 2017	0.650	0.298	1.419	-1.081	0.280		- I ·	∎-}-			5.50
Innes, 2002	2.160	1.038	4.493	2.061	0.039				-		6.25
Savona, 2003	1.400	0.789	2.486	1.149	0.251						10.17
Williams, 1999 (1)	2.050	1.342	3.131	3.321	0.001			-∰-			18.67
Williams, 1999 (2)	1.750	0.869	3.526	1.566	0.117			+=-			6.83
Williams, 1999 (3)	2.150	0.947	4.883	1.829	0.067				-		4.98
Williams, 1999 (4)	2.100	0.965	4.571	1.870	0.062				-		5.54
Egeland, 2000	1.800	1.090	2.973	2.296	0.022			-■-			13.32
	1.717	1.430	2.062	5.790	0.000			•			
	_					0.01	0.1	1	10	100	
Meta Analysia B											
Mete Analysia B		Statie	tics for a	ach etudu			Diek	ratio and 95	× CI		
Meta Analysia B Study name		Statis	tics for e	ach study	-		Risk	ratio and 95	% CI		
Meta Analysia B Study name	Risk ratio	_Statis Lower limit	tics for e Upper limit	ach study Z-Value	p-Value		Risk	ratio and 95	<u>% CI</u>		Relative weight
Meta Analysia B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014	Risk ratio 0.920	Statis Lower limit 0.593	tics for e Upper limit 1.427	ach study Z-Value -0.372	p-Value 0.710		<u>Risk</u>	ratio and 95	<u>% cı</u>	1	Relative weight 12.95
B B B Dgonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330	Statis Lower limit 0.593 0.163	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073	p-Value 0.710 0.002		<u>Risk</u>	ratio and 95'	<u>% CI</u>		Relative weight 12.95 8.46
Mata Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530	_Statis Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035		<u>Risk</u>	ratio and 95	<u>% CI</u>		Relative weight 12.95 8.46 13.82
Meta Analysia B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 nnes, 2002 Savona, 2003	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530 0.931	Statis Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031 0.567	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271 1.527	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110 -0.283	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035 0.777		Risk	ratio and 95	<u>% CI</u>		Relative weight 12.95 8.46 13.82 11.88
Meta Analysis B Study name Dgonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 nnes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1)	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530 0.931 1.000	Statis Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031 0.567 0.707	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271 1.527 1.414	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110 -0.283 0.000	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035 0.777 1.000		Risk	ratio and 95	<u>% CI</u>		Relativ weigh 12.95 8.46 13.82 11.88 14.81
Meta Analysis B Study name Dgonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 nnes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2)	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530 0.931 1.000 2.200	Statis Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031 0.567 0.707 1.076	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271 1.527 1.414 4.499	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110 -0.283 0.000 2.160	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035 0.777 1.000 0.031		<u>Risk</u>	ratio and 95	<u>% CI</u>		Relativ, weigh 12.95 8.46 13.82 11.88 14.81 8.35
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3)	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530 0.931 1.000 2.200 0.900	<u>Statis</u> Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031 0.503 0.707 1.076 0.503	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271 1.527 1.414 4.499 1.610	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110 -0.283 0.000 2.160 -0.355	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035 0.777 1.000 0.031 0.723		Risk	ratio and 95	<u>~ cı</u>		Relative weight 12.95 8.46 13.82 11.88 14.81 8.35 10.35
Atta Analysia B Study name Dgonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 nnes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3) Williams, 1999 (3)	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530 0.931 1.000 2.200 0.900 1.100	<u>Statis</u> Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031 0.507 0.707 1.076 0.503 0.602	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271 1.527 1.414 4.499 1.610 2.008	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110 -0.283 0.000 2.160 -0.355 0.310	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035 0.777 1.000 0.031 0.723 0.756		<u>Risk</u>	ratio and 95	<u>~ cı</u>		Relativ. weigh 12.95 8.46 13.82 11.88 14.81 8.35 10.35 10.02
Analysis B Study name Dgonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 nnes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3) Williams, 1999 (4) Eceland 2000	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530 0.931 1.000 2.200 0.900 1.100 1.500	<u>Statis</u> Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031 0.567 0.707 1.076 0.503 0.602 0.788	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271 1.527 1.414 4.499 1.610 2.008 2.856	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110 -0.283 0.000 2.160 -0.355 0.310 1.234	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035 0.777 1.000 0.031 0.723 0.756 0.217		Risk	ratio and 95	<u>~ cı</u>		Relativ. weigh 12.95 8.46 13.82 11.88 14.81 8.35 10.35 10.02 9.36
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3) Williams, 1999 (4) Egeland, 2000	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530 0.931 1.000 2.200 0.900 1.100 1.500	Statis Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031 0.567 0.707 1.076 0.503 0.602 0.788 0.788	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271 1.527 1.414 4.499 1.610 2.008 2.856	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110 -0.283 0.000 2.160 -0.355 0.310 1.234	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035 0.777 1.000 0.031 0.723 0.756 0.217 0.730		<u>Risk</u>	ratio and 95	<u>* cı</u>		Relatin weigl 12.9 8.46 13.82 11.86 14.81 8.33 10.03 10.02 9.36
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3) Williams, 1999 (4) Egeland, 2000	Risk ratio 0.920 0.330 1.530 0.931 1.000 2.200 0.900 1.100 1.500 1.049	Statis Lower limit 0.593 0.163 1.031 0.567 0.707 1.076 0.503 0.602 0.788 0.798	tics for e Upper limit 1.427 0.669 2.271 1.527 1.414 4.499 1.610 2.008 2.856 1.380	Z-Value -0.372 -3.073 2.110 -0.283 0.000 2.160 -0.355 0.310 1.234 0.345	p-Value 0.710 0.002 0.035 0.777 1.000 0.031 0.723 0.756 0.217 0.730		Risk	ratio and 95	<u>* CI</u>		Relativ weigh 12.95 8.46 13.82 11.86 14.81 8.35 10.05 9.36

Mola Analysia

Fig. 2 Relationship between gestational diabetes, maternal LBW and macrosomia

#### **Based on Continent**

There were five, five, and one study respectively from continents of USA, Europe, and Asia with RR and 95% CI of 1.22 (95% CI 0.92–1.61), 1.02 (95% CI 0.76–1.36) and 0.33 (95% CI 0.16–0.67) respectively, a significant difference was observed (p=0.004).

#### **Based on Quality**

There were three and six studies of high quality, and six medium-quality studies with RR and 95% CI were 0.81 (95% CI 0.38–1.73) and 1.11 (95% CI 0.88–1.40), respectively, and no significant difference was observed (p=0.308).

#### **Publication Bias**

Egger's test is more capable of detecting publication bias. *P* values for Begg's and Egger's tests for "association between gestational diabetes and maternal LBW" were p=0.928 and p=0.578, respectively, indicating that publication bias does not affect the results (Fig. 3A). *P* values for Begg's and Egger's tests for "association between gestational diabetes and maternal macrosomia" were p=0.928 and p=0.578, respectively, indicating that publication bias does not affect the publication between gestational diabetes and maternal macrosomia" were p=0.928 and p=0.578, respectively, indicating that the publication bias did not affect the results (Fig. 3B).



Fig. 3 Funnel chart for detecting the publication bias for the association between gestational diabetes mellitus, maternal LBW and maternal macrosomia

#### **Sensitivity Analysis**

Sensitivity analysis shows whether omitting a study can change the result. According to Fig. 4A and B, the present study showed that omitting a study at a time did not affect the result of the association between gestational diabetes, "maternal LBW" and "maternal macrosomia" (Fig. 4).

## Discussion

The present study is systematic review and meta-analysis about the relationship between gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) and maternal birth weight. Several studies have shown no association between gestational diabetes mellitus and macrosomia [12, 14, 16–18]. However, some studies have reported a significant association [15, 17]. In addition, some studies have not found a significant relationship between gestational diabetes mellitus and LBW [14, 16, 17], but in some studies, this relationship has been significant so that low maternal birth weight can increase the risk of diabetes at gestational age [12, 13, 15, 17, 18]. Therefore, the present analysis showed that maternal LBW increases the risk of gestational diabetes. This shows a U-shaped pattern of overall risk. These discrepancies might be explained, at least partially, by the different ethnicities of the studied populations. For example, in a population-based study, Williams et al. [17] found a U-shaped relationship only among African–American women; this relationship was inversely linear among Native American and Hispanic women. A similar U-shaped relationship was also found among Pima Indian women [23, 24]. However, a high incidence of gestational diabetes mellitus among women with high birth weights seems to reflect the overall high genetic predisposition in this ethnic group to develop early insulin resistance.

Low birth weight is a term used to describe newborns' weighing less than 2500 g. A typical baby usually weighs about 8 pounds (3500 g). A low-birth-weight baby may be healthy, even if he or she is small. But a low-birth-weight baby can also have many serious health problems, so birth weight is considered to be the most important factor in newborns' health [19]. It is a vital determinant of one's health throughout life, as studies have shown that birth weight may strongly influence metabolic status in adult-hood [12].

Study name		Statistics	s with stu	dy removed	<u>t</u>		Risk ratio	(95% CI)	with a	study removed	_
	Point	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value						
Ogonowsk, 2014	1.746	1.427	2.137	5.414	0.000	1					
Seghieri, 2002	1.697	1.398	2.061	5.341	0.000						
Zhu, 2017	1.817	1.505	2.194	6.217	0.000						
Innes, 2002	1.691	1.400	2.043	5.448	0.000						
Savona, 2003	1.758	1.449	2.132	5.722	0.000						
Williams, 1999 (1)	1.649	1.346	2.020	4.829	0.000						
Williams, 1999 (2)	1.715	1.419	2.073	5.574	0.000						
Williams, 1999 (3)	1.697	1.407	2.048	5.521	0.000						
Williams, 1999 (4)	1.697	1.406	2.049	5.504	0.000						
Egeland, 2000	1.705	1.401	2.076	5.319	0.000						
	1.717	1.430	2.062	5.790	0.000				•		
						0.01	0.1		1	10	100
Meta Analysis											
Meta Analysis B Study name		_Statistic	cs with st	udy remov	red_		_Risk rati	o (95% C	I) wit	h study remov	ed_
Meta Analysis B Study name	Point	_Statistic Lower limit	<u>cs with st</u> Upper limit	udy remov Z-Value	<u>ved</u> p-Value		_Risk rati	o (95% C	I) wit	h study remov	ed
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014	Point 1.070	_Statistic Lower limit 0.782	cs with st Upper limit 1.462	udy remov Z-Value 0.422	red p-Value 0.673		_Risk rati	o (95% C	i) wit	h study remov	ed
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017	Point 1.070 1.148	Statistic Lower limit 0.782 0.943	cs with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373	red p-Value 0.673 0.170		_ Risk rati	o (95% C	i) wit	h study remov	ed
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes. 2002	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989	Statistic Lower limit 0.782 0.943 0.741	cs with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076	red p-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940		_Risk rati	o (95% C	i) wit	h study remov	ed_
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989 1.066	Statistic Lower limit 0.782 0.943 0.741 0.783	cs with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320 1.453	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076 0.408	red p-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940 0.683		_Risk rati	o (95% C		h study remov	ed_
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1)	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989 1.066 1.057		CS with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320 1.453 1.453	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076 0.408 0.331	p-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940 0.683 0.741		_Risk rati	<u>o (95% C</u>		h study remov	ed_
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams (1999 (2)	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989 1.066 1.057 0.987	<u>Statistic</u> Lower limit 0.782 0.943 0.741 0.783 0.762 0.762	CS with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320 1.453 1.466 1.287	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076 0.408 0.331 -0.099	p-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940 0.683 0.741 0.922		_Risk rati	o (95% C		h study remov	ed_
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (2)	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989 1.066 1.057 0.987	Statistic Lower limit 0.782 0.943 0.741 0.783 0.762 0.757 0.750	CS with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320 1.453 1.466 1.287	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076 0.408 0.331 -0.098	red p-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940 0.683 0.741 0.922 0.667		_Risk rati	o (95% C		h study remov	ed
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3)	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989 1.066 1.057 0.987 1.069		CS with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320 1.453 1.466 1.287 1.446	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076 0.408 0.331 -0.098 0.430 0.430	red p-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940 0.683 0.741 0.922 0.667 0.771		_Risk rati	o (95% C		h study remov	ed
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3) Williams, 1999 (4) Enclosed 2020	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989 1.066 1.057 0.987 1.069 1.044		CS with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320 1.453 1.466 1.287 1.446 1.415	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076 0.408 0.331 -0.098 0.430 0.278	red p-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940 0.683 0.741 0.922 0.667 0.781 0.781		_Risk rati	o (95% C		h study remov	ed
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3) Williams, 1999 (4) Egeland, 2000	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989 1.066 1.057 0.987 1.069 1.044 1.012		CS with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320 1.453 1.466 1.287 1.446 1.415 1.356	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076 0.408 0.331 -0.098 0.430 0.278 0.079	red p-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940 0.683 0.741 0.922 0.667 0.781 0.937		_Risk rati	o (95% C		h study remov	ed
Meta Analysis B Study name Ogonowsk, 2014 Zhu, 2017 Innes, 2002 Savona, 2003 Williams, 1999 (1) Williams, 1999 (2) Williams, 1999 (3) Williams, 1999 (4) Egeland, 2000	Point 1.070 1.148 0.989 1.066 1.057 1.069 1.044 1.012 1.051		Cs with st Upper limit 1.462 1.398 1.320 1.453 1.466 1.287 1.446 1.415 1.356 1.380	udy remov Z-Value 0.422 1.373 -0.076 0.408 0.331 -0.098 0.430 0.278 0.079 0.355	P-Value 0.673 0.170 0.940 0.683 0.741 0.922 0.667 0.781 0.937 0.722		_Risk rati	<u>o (95% C</u>		h study remov	ed

Fig. 4 Sensitivity analysis of the association between gestational diabetes, "maternal LBW" and "maternal macrosomia"

However, the exact mechanism by which birth weight affects the risk of diabetes is still unclear. Increasing evidence links birth weight to possible epigenetic changes associated with chromatin remodeling and gene expression that underlie the developmental programming of metabolic disturbances [25]. Other theories support the role of genetic factors, which may determine both low birth weight and defective insulin secretion [26].

Meta Analysis

The P value of publication bias for studies was higher than 0.05 based on Egger's and Begg's tests, indicating that publication bias did not affect the results of the studies. It is assumed that the observed differences are due to differences in sampling and measurement of parameters in different communities.

The type of cohort studies have been retrospective and the data already existed and has not been recalled in this study. All studies had a similar method and definition for exposure (low birth weight [LBW] is defined as birth weight less than 2500 g, and macrosomia is defined as birth weight more than 4000 g), and they had a similar outcome of gestational diabetes; this quality of the primary studies was the main strength of this meta-analysis.

## **Study Limitations**

1. The inability of national and international databases to perform combined search using the keywords; this means that the database is not familiar with the composition of these keywords.

- 2. Some studies were omitted due to low quality, such as medical dissertations that did not have a clear method and correct sampling.
- 3. Exclusion of some studies due to lack of uniform reporting of articles and publication bias.
- 4. Exclusion of some studies because of inadequate information.
- 5. Exclusion of studies that did not have a specific outcome.
- 6. Exclusion of studies in which the definition of outcomes and exposures was unclear.

# Conclusions

The results of the present study, which were the general result of a variety of studies on the relationship between birth weight and gestational diabetes mellitus, showed that maternal LBW almost doubled the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus. However, in a group of mothers with macrosomia at birth, the association with gestational diabetes mellitus was not significant.

**Acknowledgments** The authors would like to thank the Clinical Research Development Unit of Imam Khomeini Hospital and Ilam University of Medical Sciences.

Authors' Contributions All the authors contributed to conceptualization, study design, and data analysis. Screening was completed by SHR, MP and MSH. SHR and MR supervised the screening process. Data extraction was carried out by MSH and SHR. Data analysis was performed by MR and SHR. SHR wrote the first draft of the manuscript. The manuscript was read and approved by all the authors.

# Declarations

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval This study was approved by IUMS.

Human and animal rights statement Research involving human participants and/or animals not applicable.

Informed consent Data was analyzed from published articles.

# References

1. Barker DJ, Hales CN, Fall CH, et al. Type 2 (non-insulindependent) diabetes mellitus, hypertension and hyperlipidaemia (syndrome X): relation to reduced fetal growth. Diabetologia. 1993;36:62–7.

- Hack M, Flannery DJ, Schluchter M, et al. Outcomes in young adulthood for very-low-birth-weight infants. N Engl J Med. 2002;346(3):149–57.
- Chen Y, Li G, Ruan Y, et al. An epidemiological survey on low birth weight infants in China and analysis of outcomes of full-term low birth weight infants. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2013;13(1):1–9.
- 4. Esakoff TF, Cheng YW, Sparks TN, et al. The association between birthweight 4000 g or greater and perinatal outcomes in patients with and without gestational diabetes mellitus. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2009;200(6):672-e1.
- Aerts L, Van Assche A. Is gestational diabetes a acquired condition? J Dev Physiol. 1979;1:219–25.
- Schaefer-Graf UM, Pawliczak J, Passow D, et al. Birth weight and parental BMI predict overweight in children from mothers with gestational diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2005;28(7):1745–50.
- Yeung EH, Hu FB, Solomon CG, et al. Life-course weight characteristics and the risk of gestational diabetes. Diabetologia. 2010;53(4):668–78.
- Retnakaran R, Ye C, Hanley AJ, et al. Effect of maternal weight, adipokines, glucose intolerance and lipids on infant birth weight among women without gestational diabetes mellitus. CMAJ. 2012;184(12):1353–60.
- 9. Endres LK, Sharp LK, Haney E, et al. Health literacy and pregnancy preparedness in pregestational diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2004;27(2):331–4.
- Crowther CA, Hiller JE, Moss JR, et al. Effect of treatment of gestational diabetes mellitus on pregnancy outcomes. N Engl J Med. 2005;352(24):2477–86.
- Hunt KJ, Schuller KL. The increasing prevalence of diabetes in pregnancy. Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am. 2007;34(2):173–99.
- Ogonowski J, Miazgowski T, Engel K, et al. Birth weight predicts the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus and pregravid obesity. Nutrition. 2014;30(1):39–43.
- Seghieri G, Anichini R, De Bellis A, et al. Relationship between gestational diabetes mellitus and low maternal birth weight. Diabetes Care. 2002;25(10):1761–5.
- 14. Zhu W-W, Yang H-X, Wang C, et al. High prevalence of gestational diabetes mellitus in Beijing: effect of maternal birth weight and other risk factors. Chin Med J. 2017;130(9):1019.
- Innes KE, Byers TE, Marshall JA, et al. Association of a woman's own birth weight with subsequent risk for gestational diabetes. JAMA. 2002;287(19):2534–41.
- Savona-Ventura C, Chircop M. Birth weight influence on the subsequent development of gestational diabetes mellitus. Acta Diabetol. 2003;40(2):101–4.
- 17. Williams M, Emanuel I, Kimpo C, et al. A population-based cohort study of the relation between maternal birthweight and risk of gestational diabetes mellitus in four racial/ethnic groups. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol. 1999;13(4):452–65.
- Egeland GM, Skjærven R, Irgens LM. Birth characteristics of women who develop gestational diabetes: population based study. BMJ. 2000;321(7260):546–7.
- Shokri M, Karimi P, Zamanifar H, et al. Epidemiology of low birth weight in Iran: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Heliyon. 2020;6(5):e03787.
- Guyer B, Hoyert DL, Martin JA, et al. Annual summary of vital statistics—1998. Pediatrics. 1999;104:1229–46.

- 21. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev. 2015;4(1):1.
- 22. Barnes RA, Edghill N, Mackenzie J, et al. Predictors of large and small for gestational age birthweight in offspring of women with gestational diabetes mellitus. Diabet Med. 2013;30(9):1040–6.
- 23. Seshadri R. American diabetes association gestational diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care. 2002;25:S94-6.
- 24. Pettitt DJ, Knowler WC. Long-term effects of the intrauterine environment, birth weight, and breast-feeding in Pima Indians. Diabetes Care. 1998;21(Suppl 2):B138-41.
- Gallou-Kabani C, Junien C. Nutritional epigenomics of metabolic syndrome: new perspective against the epidemic. Diabetes. 2005;54:1899–906.
- 26. Freathy RM, Bennett AJ, Ring SM, et al. Type 2 diabetes risk alleles are associated with reduced size at birth. Diabetes. 2009;58:1428–33.

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.