

1 **IMPACT OF DIETARY PATTERN ON NUTRITIONAL STATUS OF PREGNANT**
2 **WOMEN IN LOW AND HIGH STRATA BETWEEN THE AGE GROUP OF 30-39**
3 **YEARS IN MUMBAI**

4
5
6
7 **ABSTRACT**

8
9 **BACKGROUND**

10
11 Maternal Nutrition plays an important role in shaping the mother's and fetal health. Therefore
12 intake of High salt, High fat, High sugar in the diet might lead to Over nutrition among pregnant
13 women due to varied food choices of the since most of the subjects consumed outside food,
14 Sugar Sweetened Beverages such as (Cola, Pepsi, Thumps Up, Soda, Sherbet etc), Processed
15 Food such as(Ready to eat food, Mayonnaise, Cheese spread etc) which consist of increase
16 amount of preservative which might affect the mother and foetal's health. Since there was
17 increase intake of above food groups and decrease intake of macro and micronutrients in the diet
18 through food group such as Fruits, Nuts and Oilseed, Green Leafy Vegetables etc. Therefore
19 there might be increased risk of Over nutrition among women which might lead to
20 GDM(Gestational Diabetes Mellitus), IUGR(Intra Uterine Growth Retardation), Low Birth
21 weight etc.

22
23 **AIM**

24 To study the impact of dietary pattern on Nutritional of pregnant women in Low and High Strata

25
26 **METHOD**

27 A purposive random sampling was done among pregnant women because only 2nd trimester
28 pregnant women were selected for the study. The 50 subjects were divided into LSES (Lower
29 Socioeconomic Strata) &HSES (Higher Socioeconomic Strata) on the basis of Kuppuswamy
30 Index. The dietary pattern of the subjects was assessed through FFQ (Food Frequency
31 Questionnaire) & 3 Day Diet Recall.

32
33

34 **RESULT**

35 There was increase consumption of High Fat, High Salt, High Sugar in the diet through
36 consumption of food group such as Outside Food, Processed Food, Sugar Sweetened Beverages
37 etc and in comparison the consumption of Macro and Micronutrient rich food group was lower
38 which included Fruits, Green Leafy Vegetables, Nuts and oilseed etc. In Lower Strata the
39 consumption of above food group was low because they were financially not stable therefore
40 they were given additional services where the company paid their ration balance so that they
41 could consume selective food group which were costing comparatively more. Since the
42 RDA(Recommended Dietary Allowances) requirements were not met therefore the women were
43 prescribed Iron, Calcium and Folic Acid supplements in the diet to decrease the risk of Maternal
44 and fetal complication such as GDM(Gestational Diabetes Mellitus), NTD(Neural Tube Defect),
45 IUGR(Intra Uterine Growth Retardation) etc.

46

47 **CONCLUSION**

48 Therefore to decrease the risk of Maternal and Fetal Complications intake of Macro and
49 Micronutrients in the diet is imperative and it is important to organize Nutrition Intervention
50 programmes and counsel the pregnant women about Maternal Nutrition and how decrease intake
51 of Nutrients in the diet might lead to Maternal Under nutrition and Over nutrition and its related
52 risk.

53 Keywords: Over nutrition, Micronutrient Deficiencies, GDM (Gestational Diabetes Mellitus)
54 IUGR (Intra Uterine Growth Retardation) and Nutrition Intervention Programme.

55

56 **INTRODUCTION**

57 Maternal obesity or over nutrition before or during pregnancy might result in fetal growth
58 restriction and increased risk of neonatal mortality and morbidity in humans (Bazer et.al, 2004).
59 Maternal obesity increases the risk for spontaneous abortion, unexplained stillbirth, preeclampsia
60 and Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. It was also observed that it might increase the risk of
61 abnormal fetal growth. Fetal macrosomia (defined as an estimated fetal weight of greater than or
62 equal to 4500 g), which might appear to be increased by 2- to 3-fold in obese parturients. The
63 risk of fetal macrosomia was more among obese women with prevalence rates of fetal
64 macrosomia at 13.3% and 14.6% for obese and morbidly obese women, respectively, compared

65 with 8.3% for the normal weight control group. Fetal macrosomia in obese women was
66 associated not only with an increase in the absolute size of the fetus, but it might also lead to a
67 change in body composition. The average fat mass of infants born to mothers with a normal BMI
68 ($< 25 \text{ kg/m}^2$) was 334 g and the infant born to women with a BMI $> 25 \text{ kg/m}^2$ had a mean fat
69 mass of 416 g. It had led to an increased risk of Neural Tube defect where a 1 kg/m^2 increase in
70 BMI was associated with a 7% increased risk of having an infant with NTD (Neural Tube
71 Defect) due to reduction in the amount of folic acid reaching the developing embryo due to
72 insufficient absorption and greater maternal metabolic demands, chronic hypoxia, and increased
73 circulating levels of triglycerides, uric acid, estrogen, and insulin (due, in part, to increased
74 insulin resistance). Sugar-sweetened beverages (SSB) are drinks with added sugar including:
75 non-diet soft drinks/sodas, flavored juice drinks, sports drinks, sweetened tea, coffee drinks,
76 energy drinks, and electrolyte replacement drinks. The calories in sugar sweetened beverages can
77 contribute to weight gain and provide little to no nutritional value. Sugar-sweetened beverages
78 do not fill you up the same way that food does. Those extra calories can lead to other health risks
79 including obesity, tooth decay, heart disease and type 2 diabetes. Consumption of SSB >5
80 servings/week showed 22% increased risk of GDM among women due to presence of AGE of in
81 the drink which lead to insulin resistance and Inflammation in the body.(Chen et.al,2009). Some
82 evidence from biochemical studies among populations with high marine-food intakes suggesting
83 that higher intakes of long-chain omega-3 fatty acids during pregnancy might result in an
84 increased duration of gestation and might also improve fetal growth (Frazer et.al, 2010).
85 Participants who had consumed fried foods more than four times/week had a 37% higher risk of
86 developing overweight/obesity in comparison with those who had consumed fried foods less than
87 twice/week. during frying which leads to oxidation, hydrogenation and this leads to loss of
88 linoleic and linoleic acid and an increase in Trans fatty acid, which will lead to reduce insulin
89 sensitivity and increased risk of Type 2 diabetes. (Bao et.al, 2014). Inadequacy of micronutrients
90 intake was also typical of obese “western” diets, poor of vegetables and fruit. Indeed, over-
91 nourished women were often malnourished, with macro- and/or micronutrients imbalances
92 potentially affecting fetal growth (Laroeti et.al, 2015).

93 Overweight and obesity might result from an imbalance between energy consumed (too much)
94 and energy expended (too little). Overweight and obesity during pregnancy might lead to various

95 risks such as Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) is defined as any degree of glucose
96 intolerance with onset or first recognition during pregnancy, pre-eclampsia, still birth, fetal
97 macrosomia, Cesarean delivery etc. (WHO, 2018). Deficiencies of micronutrients such as
98 vitamin A, iron, iodine and folate were particularly common among during pregnancy, due to
99 increased nutrient requirements of the mother and developing fetus. These deficiencies might
100 negatively impact the health of the mother, her pregnancy, as well as the health of the newborn
101 baby. The most current evidence showed that giving multiple micronutrient supplements to
102 pregnant women might reduce the risk of low birth weight and of small size for gestational age,
103 compared with iron and folic acid supplementation alone (www.who.org).

104 **METHODOLOGY**

105 A. **Sampling:** The target group for the project was pregnant women who belonged to 2nd
106 Trimester. A purposive sampling technique was used to select the participants for the study. A
107 total of 50 samples of pregnant women in the age group of 30-39 years were selected from the
108 Malhar Maternity and General Nursing Home, Mumbai.

109
110 B. **Kuppuswamy Index:** This is the most commonly used scale for determining the SES of
111 an urban family. Kuppuswamy scale was developed for assessing the SES of an urban individual.
112 It took three parameters into account, namely, education, occupation, and income of the
113 individual. It was modified to enable SES assessment of a family rather than an individual. The
114 parameters were modified as education and occupation of the HOF (Head of the family) and the
115 income of the whole family, pooled from all the sources.

Education of head of family	Score	Occupation of head of family	Score	Total per capita family income per month (as given originally in 1976)	Score
Professional degree	7	Professional	10	2000 and above	12
Graduate	6	Semi profession	6	RS 1000-1999	10
Intermediate/diploma	5	Clerical/shop/farm	5	RS 750-999	6
High school	4	Skilled worker	4	RS 500-749	4
Middle school	3	Semiskilled worker	3	300-499	3
Primary school	2	Unskilled worker	2	RS 101-299	2
Illiterate	1	Unemployed	1	Less than RS 100	1

116

117 The total score is calculated by adding up all the three scores, namely, education, occupation,
 118 and total family income. According to the total score thus calculated, the family is placed in the
 119 appropriate socioeconomic class as explained in the following.

120 C. **Food Frequency Questionnaire:** FFQs assesses the frequency with which foods and/or
 121 food groups were eaten over a certain period of time. The questionnaire includes a food list i.e.
 122 Consumption of Outside food, bakery food, Sweets, Sugar Sweetened Beverages, Cereals,
 123 pulses, Dairy Products etc. which was either Less than 1 time per month, 1-3 times per month, 1-
 124 3 times per week, 4-6 times per week & 1 time per day. . A frequency category section, and can
 125 be self- or interviewer- administered.

126

127 D. **3 Day Diet Recall:** 3 Day 24 hour Dietary Recall was taken on 2 weekdays and 1
 128 weekend day. During a 3day 24- hour recall, respondents that is pregnant women were asked, to
 129 recall and report foods and beverages of all meals consumed over the preceding 24 hours and 24-
 130 hour period starts with the first thing eaten by the respondent in the morning until the last food
 131 item consumed before she got up the next morning. Each and every detail of food must be
 132 assessed like time i.e what time it was eaten , what food was consumed either homemade food or
 133 outside food , what was the ingredient added to that meal , how much ml /l of water , milk was
 134 consumed , what was the quantity of the packaged foods consumed , how much oil was used in
 135 the whole day , how many meals were skipped , note any other beverages were consumed , note
 136 down and specific food allergy ,how was the meal prepared and midnight cravings so that it will

137 be easy to calculate energy and other nutrients and help in assessing the nutritional status of the
138 respondent.

139 RESULT

140 NUTRITIVE VALUE

141 1. ENERGY

142 **Table 1: Paired Sample Statistic for Energy Consumption**

	Socioeconomic Strata	No of Samples	Mean \pm Std. Deviation	t-test	Sig(2-tailed)
ENERGY Kcal	Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)	21	1497 \pm 293	1.12	.265
	Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)	29	1586 \pm 261		

143
144 Table 1 demonstrated that in Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES) and Higher
145 Socioeconomic Strata (HSES) the energy consumption did not meet the Recommended Dietary
146 Allowances (RDA). It was observed that the consumption of energy in both the strata was more
147 in the form of empty calories (such as Fried Food, Sweets, SSB etc) and the energy consumption
148 through homemade food was comparatively lower in both the strata. Table 1(a) illustrates that
149 the mean pre-energy consumption in LSES was 1497 \pm 293kcal and in HSES was 1586 \pm 261kcal.
150 There was no significant difference observed in both the strata (LSES & HSES) at
151 p=0.05(p=.265).

152 2. PROTEIN

153 **Table 2: Paired Sample Statistics for Protein Consumption**

	Socioeconomic Strata	No of Samples	Mean \pm Std. Deviation	t-test	Sig(2-tailed)
PROTEIN (gm)	Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)	21	46.7 \pm 12.6	.598	.553
	Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)	29	44.6 \pm 12.1		

154

155 Table 2 demonstrated that in Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES) and Higher
156 Socioeconomic Strata (HSES) the protein consumption did not meet the Recommended Dietary
157 Allowances (RDA) requirements. It was observed that there was intake of pulses and Non-
158 Vegetarian foods in the diet by both the strata but the consumption of the protein through the
159 above food groups did not meet the daily requirements and there were selective subjects in the
160 study had completely stopped the consumption of Non-Vegetarian food in the diet due to
161 pregnancy. And the subjects who were vegetarian, the daily consumption of protein was not met
162 as per RDA(Recommended Dietary Allowance) Guidelines because their consumption of pulses
163 was not on daily basis but rather on weekly basis which had led to decrease in intake of protein .
164 Hence the mean protein consumption in LSES was 46.7 ± 12.6 gm and in HSES was 44.6 ± 12.1 gm
165 and therefore no significant difference was observed at $p=0.05$ ($p=.553$).

166 3. CARBOHYDRATE

167 **Table 3: Paired Sample Statistics of CHO consumption**

	Socioeconomic Strata	No of Samples	Mean \pm Std. Deviation	t-test	Sig(2-tailed)
CARBOHYDRATE (gm)	Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)	21	160.9 ± 42.5	.056	.955
	Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)	29	160.2 ± 44.2		

168

169 Table 3 demonstrated that demonstrated that in Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES) and
170 Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES) the Carbohydrate consumption as per Recommended
171 Dietary Allowances (RDA) requirements. It was also observed that there was increase
172 consumption of simple CHO in the diet by both the strata through consumption of Bakery food
173 and refined flour in the diet. And the consumption of CHO through other food groups was
174 comparatively lower such as through Vegetables, Fruits, Pulses etc which might provide all the
175 nutrients and vitamins which were important during Pregnancy. Therefore the mean CHO

176 consumption in LSES was 160.9 ± 44.2 gm and in HSES was 160.2 ± 44.2 gm and hence no
177 significant difference was observed at $p=0.05$ ($p=.955$).

178

179 4. FAT

180 **Table 4: Paired Sample Statistics of Fat Consumption**

	Socioeconomic Strata	No of Samples	Mean \pm Std. Deviation	t-test	Sig(2-tailed)
FAT (gm)	Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)	21	68.1 \pm 13.6	1.24	.219
	Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)	29	72.1 \pm 8.9		

181

182 Table 4 demonstrated that in Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES) and Higher
183 Socioeconomic Strata (HSES) the Fat consumption did not meet the Recommended Dietary
184 Allowances (RDA) requirements and the consumption was comparatively higher than RDA. It
185 was also observed that the fat consumption in the diet by both the strata was through Fried food,
186 processed food, Bakery food (Margarine and butter) etc., the consumption of good quality fat by
187 the subjects in both the strata through consumption of Nuts and Oilseed, Fish etc was
188 comparatively lower therefore the consumption of Omega-3 fatty acid, Folic Acid in the diet was
189 low because the consumption of this fatty acid in the diet plays a significant role during
190 pregnancy for the growth and brain development of the foetus. Therefore the mean consumption
191 of Fat in LSES was 68.1 ± 13.6 gm and in HSES was 72.1 ± 8.9 gm and hence there was no
192 significant difference observed at $p=0.05$ ($p=.219$).

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200 **5. DIETARY FIBRE**

201 **Table5(a): Paired Sample Statistics for Dietary Fibre Consumption**

	Socioeconomic Strata	No of Samples	Mean ± Std. Deviation	t-test	Sig(2-tailed)
DIETARY FIBRE(gm)	Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)	21	23.8 ± 7.69	.912	.366
	Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)	29	21.6 ± 8.99		

202
 203 Table 5 demonstrated that in **Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)** and **Higher**
 204 **Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)** the Fibre consumption did not meet the **Recommended Dietary**
 205 **Allowances (RDA)** requirements. It was also noticed that the consumption of fibre in the diet
 206 was at par in both the strata with consumption through Fruits, Vegetables, Pulses etc because the
 207 consumption of the above food group by the subjects in both the strata was more on weekly basis
 208 than on daily basis, therefore the fibre requirements were not met during pregnancy. The
 209 constipation was one of the symptoms during pregnancy but the condition had worsened with
 210 decrease fibre intake in the diet and one of the reasons might be due to decrease physical activity
 211 among the subjects. Therefore the mean consumption of fibre in LSES was 23.8±7.69gm and in
 212 HSES was 21.6±8.99gm and hence no significant difference was observed at p=0.05(p=.366)

213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223

224 **6. IRON**

225 **Table 6: Paired Sample Statistics for Iron Consumption**

	Socioeconomic Strata	No of Samples	Mean ± Std. Deviation	t-test	Sig(2-tailed)
IRON(mg)	Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)	21	18.6±43.5	1.13	.262
	Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)	29	9.41±3.27		

226

227 Table 6 demonstrated that in **Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)** and **Higher**
 228 **Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)** the consumption of Iron was as per **Recommended Dietary**
 229 **Allowances (RDA)** requirements. It was also observed that in both the strata the subjects were
 230 prescribed Iron Tablets and supplements to meet the requirements since their consumption
 231 through diet was lower. The iron requirement through diet was through Vegetables, Green leafy
 232 Vegetables, Non-Veg food, Fruits etc. In spite of the consumption of these foodgroup the
 233 requirements were not met and one reason might be that the portion size consumption was not
 234 enough because it was comparatively lesser by the subjects belonging to both the strata and there
 235 was not sufficient consumption of Vitamin C rich food in the diet which might help in the
 236 absorption of Iron in the body. Therefore the mean consumption of Iron in LSES was
 237 18.6±43.5mg and in HSES was 9.41±3.27mg and hence no significant difference was observed
 238 at p=0.05(p=.262).

239

240

241

242

243

244

245 **7. CALCIUM**

246 **Table 7: Paired Sample Statistics for Calcium Consumption**

	Socioeconomic Strata	No of Samples	Mean ± Std. Deviation	t-test	Sig(2-tailed)
CALCIUM(mg)	Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)	21	296.7 ± 93.3	.2.01	.050
	Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)	29	250.8 ± 68.2		

247
 248 Table 7 demonstrated that in Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES) and Higher
 249 Socioeconomic Strata (HSES) the Calcium consumption did not meet the Recommended Dietary
 250 Allowances (RDA) requirements. It was also observed that the consumption of Dairy Products in
 251 both the strata by selective subject was lower due to pregnancy, therefore the subjects¹² were
 252 prescribed Calcium Supplements to meet the requirements whereas there were selective subjects
 253 whose Dairy product consumption was appropriate and therefore the mean consumption of
 254 Calcium in LSES was 296.7±93.3mg and in HSES was 250.8±68.2mg and hence there was
 255 significant difference observed at p=0.05(p=.050).

256
 257 **8. FOLIC ACID**

258 **Table 8: Paired Sample Statistics for Folic Acid consumption**

	Socioeconomic Strata	No of Samples	Mean ± Std. Deviation	t-test	Sig(2-tailed)
FOLIC ACID (mcg)	Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)	21	310.5 ± 283.8	.195	.846
	Higher Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)	29	295.5 ± 257.6		

259
 260 Table 8 demonstrated that in Lower Socioeconomic Strata (LSES) and Higher
 261 Socioeconomic Strata (HSES) the Folic Acid consumption did not meet the Recommended
 262 Dietary Allowances (RDA) requirements but the consumption was at par with RDA. It was also
 263 observed that the consumption of folic Acid through diet in both the strata was comparatively

264 lower because the subjects consumption of Folic acid rich food such as Fish, Almond, Walnuts,
265 Groundnut etc through diet was negligible and instead there was increase consumption of Red
266 meat in the diet instead of fish which might lead to increase inflammation in the body. Since the
267 requirements couldn't be met therefore the subjects were prescribed Folic Acid Tablets.
268 Therefore the mean consumption of Folic Acid in LSES was 310.5 ± 283.8 mcg and in HSES was
269 295.5 ± 257.6 mcg and hence there was no significant difference at $p=0.05$ ($p=.846$).

270

271 **DISCUSSION**

272 Dieatry Pattern was studied and it was observed that there was increase intake of High Fat, High
273 salt, Processed food, Sugar Sweetened beverages etc. in both the stratum. Therefore there might
274 be an increase risk of Over nutrition among **High Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)** women as
275 compared to **Low Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)** women because it was the consumption of the
276 above food was more among **High Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)** subjects because most of the
277 subjects were working women and it was noticed that the inadequate consumption was due to
278 increase social gatherings, corporate meetings etc, Therefore the women among **High**
279 **Socioeconomic Strata (HSES)** were advised to carry Tiffin boxes, during meetings carry nuts or
280 replace the choice of food groups in the diet with healthy choices such as Fruits, Nuts, Sprouts
281 etc to meet the nutritional requirements. Since the food choices of this stratum was inadequate
282 therefore the women were prescribed Calcium, Folic Acid and Iron tablets or supplements in the
283 diet .Whereas in **Low Socioeconomic Strata (LSES)** there might be an increase risk of
284 micronutrient deficiencies because the women were not economically stable to purchase food
285 groups which were rich in Folic acid, Iron and Calcium, therefore the women were advised to
286 consume food groups which were economically within the budget to purchase and meet the
287 nutritional requirements in the diet. And the risk of Undernutrition might be lower because the
288 women of both the stratum belong to urban areas and according to evidence based studies the
289 risk of maternal undernutrition was more among women belonging to rural areas. Hence it was
290 imperative to spread awareness about Maternal Malnutrition and the associated risk such as
291 **Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM) Intra Uterine Growth Retardation (IUGR)**, pre-eclampsia,
292 Macrosomia etc. Therefore inadequate dietary intake might lead to the above pregnancy risk
293 among women of both the stratum.

294 **CONCLUSION**

295 Dietary Intake might play an imperative in decreasing the risk of Maternal Malnutrition. This can
296 be decreased by spreading awareness through Nutrition Intervention Programmes about Maternal
297 Malnutrition and how through consumption of macro and micronutrients through diet in the right
298 portion might meet the requirements and decrease the associated complications of Undernutrition
299 and Overnutrition during pregnancy.

300 **CONSENT**

301 A written consent had been collected from the Malhar Maternity & General Nursing Home with
302 the approval by the concerned Gynecologist to make sure that she had no issues in letting her
303 patients participate in the study.

304

305 **References**

306

307 **1. January 2003, Gestational Diabetes Mellitus, Diabetes Care, Volume 26, Supplement 1.**

308

310 2. Irene Cetin and Arianna Laoreti, 11th October 2015, The importance of maternal nutrition
311 for health, Journal of Pediatric and Neonatal Individualized Medicine, doi:
10.7363/040220.

312 3. Liwei Chen, Frank B. Hu, Edwina Yeung, Walter Willett, and Cuilin Zhang, Dec 2009,
313 Prospective Study of Pre-Gravid Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Consumption and the Risk
314 of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus, Diabetes care, Volume-32, Issue-12, Pg No- 2236-
315 2241, doi: 10.2337/dc09-0866.

316 4. Meaghan A Leddy, Michael L Power, and Jay Schulkin, 2008, The Impact of Maternal
317 Obesity on Maternal and Fetal Health, Reviews of Obstetric & Gynecology, Volume 1,
318 Issue-4, Pg No-170-178.

319

320

321 5. Wei Bao, Deirdre K. Tobias, Sjurdur F. Olsen and Cuilin Zhan, Dec 2014, Pre-
322 pregnancy fried food consumption and the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus: a
323 prospective cohort study, Diabetologia, Volume-57, Issue-12, doi: 10.1007/s00125-014-
324 3382-x.

325 6. www.who.org.

326

327 **7. <http://www.health.ri.gov/healthrisks/sugarsweetenedbeverages/>**

328