http www.aimjournal.ir

Original Article



Open Access

The Association Between Major Dietary Patterns and Pregnancy-related Complications

Hossein Hajianfar, PhD^{1,2,3,4}; Ahmad Esmaillzadeh, PhD^{1,5,6}; Awat Feizi, PhD⁷; Zahra Shahshahan, Ob&Gyn⁸; Leila Azadbakht, PhD^{1,5,9*}

¹Food Security Research Center, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

²Food Safety Research Center(SALT), Semnan University of Medical Sciences, Semnan, Iran

³Department of Nutrition, School of Nutrition and Food Science, Semnan University of Medical Sciences, Semnan, Iran

⁴Research Committee of Community Nutrition, School of Nutrition and Food Science, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

⁵Department of Community Nutrition, School of Nutritional Sciences and Dietetics, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

⁶Obesity and Eating Habits Research Center, Endocrinology and Metabolism Molecular-Cellular Sciences Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

⁷Departments of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, School of Health, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran.

⁸Departments of Gynecology, School of Medicine Science, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

⁹Diabetes Research Center, Endocrinology and Metabolism Clinical Sciences Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract

Background: Most pregnancy-related complications are associated with increased risks of adverse outcomes for mother and her infant. Although, relations between diet and pregnancy's complications indicate that there may be some benefits of nutritional factors to prevent such disorders, there are rare studies regarding the associations of dietary patterns and mentioned complications. So, the aim of the present study was to determine the relationship between dietary patterns and risk of pregnancy-related complications.

Methods: The current prospective observational study was based on the data collected from 812 pregnant women. Dietary data was collected using a validated semi-quantitative food frequency questionnaire.

Results: Three major dietary patterns identified according to the results from the factor loading matrix were: (i) 'western dietary pattern'; (ii) 'traditional dietary pattern'; (iii) 'healthy dietary pattern'. Overall, this study demonstrated a marginal significant inverse association between high adherence to healthy dietary pattern and chance of having pre-eclampsia. Also, a high chance of pre-eclampsia was observed among women with the most adherence to western dietary pattern.

Conclusion: We found that dietary patterns might be associated with the risk of pregnancy-related complications. Further studies are required to confirm these findings.

Keywords: Healthy dietary patterns, Pregnancy-related complications, Traditional dietary patterns, Western dietary patterns **Cite this article as:** Hajianfar H, Esmaillzadeh A, Feizi A, Shahshahan Z, Azadbakht L. The association between major dietary patterns and pregnancy-related complications. Arch Iran Med. 2018;21(10):443–451.

Received: November 9, 2017, Accepted: May 27, 2018, ePublished: October 1, 2018

Introduction

Most pregnancy-related complications including gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), hypertensive disorders, and nausea and vomiting in pregnancy (NVP) are associated with increased risks of adverse outcomes for mother and her infant.¹⁻⁵ Women with GDM are at a greater risk of experiencing pre-eclampsia, high blood pressure, giving birth by caesarean section, having their labor induced and experiencing perineal trauma. Developing type 2 diabetes in later life is another adverse effect of GDM. In addition, the babies of women who have been diagnosed with GDM are at risk of developing metabolic disorders such as diabetes and metabolic syndrome in childhood and later life.^{1,2}

On the other hand, hypertensive disorders including pre-eclampsia and gestational hypertension are major contributors to maternal-fetal and perinatal morbidity and mortality.⁶ The mentioned disorders are associated with earlier onset of chronic hypertension and a higher risk of stroke and ischemic heart diseases.7,8

Although, some risk factors (such as age and ethnicity) associated with the development of pregnancy-related complications are non-modifiable, some special preventive programs showed a significant reduction in pregnancy's complications with lifestyle modifications.^{9,10}

Recent studies about relations between diet and pregnancy's complications indicate that there may be some benefits of nutritional factors to prevent such disorders.¹⁰ Regular intake of some kind of foods such as fried foods are associated with increased GDM risk.¹¹ Inconsistently, certain foods such as vegetables and fruits are related to lower GDM risk.¹²

Findings about hypertensive disorders are controversial. Although one study revealed no association between dietary patterns and changes of blood pressure levels during pregnancy and at early postpartum,¹³ other study suggested that a dietary pattern characterized by high intake of vegetables, plant foods, and vegetable oils could decrease

*Corresponding Author: Leila Azadbakht, Department of Community Nutrition, School of Nutrition and Food Science, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran. Tel: +981311792-2719, Fax: +9813116682509, Email: azadbakht@hlth.mui.ac.ir

the preeclampsia risk, whereas a high intake of processed meat, sweet drinks, and salty snacks could increase the risk.¹⁴

However, according to our knowledge, there are few studies regarding the association of dietary patterns and pregnancy-related complications. Compared to the intake of single nutrients or foods, considering the general pattern of a diet to assess diet quality could provide a better vision into diet–disease relations and may be more predictive of chronic disease risk.¹⁵ In addition, assessing the relationship between intake of single nutrient and risk of diseases may be complicated due to the nutrient-nutrient interactions.¹⁶

Dietary patterns are based on cultural, geographical and regional influences which have effects on health outcomes. Therefore, studies from developed countries may not offer appropriate evidence for global public health policies.^{17,18} and specific studies in this area are needed in developed countries.

Although limited data are available regarding the association of major dietary patterns and risk of pregnancyrelated complications in Western nations, we found no study in this regard in the Middle East, where almost all lifestyle components are significantly different from those in Western countries.¹⁹

So, the purpose of the current study was to investigate the association between major dietary patterns during gestational period and pre-eclampsia, gestational hypertension, GDM and NVP risk among Iranian women. Such findings will be used to implement informative interventional programs to reduce mentioned complications and develop practical policies to improve the diet quality among women at risk of complications.

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Participants

This was a prospective observational study that assessed the relationship between major dietary patterns and preeclampsia, gestational hypertension, GDM and NVP risk among pregnant women who were referred to health centers during the first-trimester of pregnancy in Isfahan in 2015– 2016.

The inclusion criteria were pregnant women with gestational age of 8–16 weeks without any medical condition or use of medications, with following a specific diet. Exclusion criteria was avoiding of follow-up during the study. The study population consisted of 812 pregnant women aged 20–40 years selected by the multi-stage cluster random sampling method. Sample size for this study was calculated by considering 20 samples for each food group which estimated 30 to 40 groups. So, according to this formula, 800 pregnant women were required for the study.

Data Collection

Assessment of Dietary Intake

During the first visit at gestational age of 8–16 weeks, dietary intakes were assessed by the validated and reliable 117-item semi-quantitative food-frequency questionnaire (FFQ). The validity and reliability of the questionnaire were previously confirmed.²⁰ For each item, participants

were asked about the portion-sizes and frequency of food consumption in the previous year, on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis. Portion sizes of foods were converted to grams using household measures. We included supplements to total intake of specific nutrients. All nutrient values were energy-adjusted using the residuals method. Then nutrient and energy intakes were computed by using Nutritionist IV software (version 7.0; N-Squared Computing, Salem, OR), which was designed for Iranian foods.

Assessment of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus

GDM was defined as the abnormal glucose homeostasis including fasting plasma glucose concentration more than 95 mg/dL and 1-hour plasma glucose after eating 50 g of glucose, more than 140 mg/dL) at 24-28 gestational weeks,²¹ which was assessed during the second visit at gestational age.

Assessment of Pre-eclampsia

Pre-eclampsia was diagnosed in the presence of hypertension associated with proteinuria. Hypertension was defined as a blood pressure of at least 140 mm Hg (systolic) or at least 90 mm Hg (diastolic) on at least two occasions and at least 4–6 hours apart after the 20th week of gestation in women known to be normo-tensive beforehand. Proteinuria was also defined as a protein concentration of 300 mg/L or more in 24-h urine sample.²²

Assessment of NVP

Interviewers asked participants whether or not they had any NVP during the first visit. Participants answered yes or no.

Assessment of Gestational Hypertension

Blood pressure was measured twice after the participants sat for 15 min during the first visit, at 8–16 weeks. SBP \ge 140 mm Hg or DBP \ge 90 mm Hg during or after the 20th week of amenorrhea was considered as gestational hypertension.²³

Assessment of Biochemical Factors

Fasting blood samples for measurement of glucose concentrations were drawn after an overnight fast of 12 hours, and measured on the day of blood collection by using the glucose oxidase method with commercially available reagents (Bio System, Tehran, Iran) adapted to a Selecta auto analyzer.

Serum insulin concentrations were measured by using an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) with commercial reagents (Monobind, Tehran, Iran). Glycohemoglobin (by using immunoturbidimetric method), serum total cholesterol, triglycerides, HDL cholesterol concentration, blood urea nitrogen and proteinuria (by using photometric method), LDL cholesterol (by using enzymatic method) and urine and serum creatinine (by using Jaffe method), were measured with commercially available enzymatic reagents (Pars Azmoon, Tehran, Iran) adapted to a Selecta auto analyzer.

Assessment of Other Variables

Data on the anthropometric measurements as well as

demographic and clinical information were collected during the first visit.

To assess participants' knowledge on demographic and lifestyle factors, we used a standard self-reported questionnaire.

Subjects' weight was measured using a balanced digital scale to the nearest 100 g, in light clothing without shoes. Height was measured with a tape measure while the subjects were in a standing position. Body mass index (BMI), defined as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared, was calculated.

Statistical Analysis

Principal component factor analysis was applied to identify major dietary patterns. Food items similar in nutrient profile were combined into 33 predefined food groups (Table 1). Certain items which were unique in their nutrient profile were not combined (eg, salt). The factors were rotated by varimax rotation. We used the Scree plot (eigenvalues >1.5) to determine number of factors to retain Factor scores of dietary patterns were calculated by summing intakes of foods weighed by their factor loading for each participant. Participants were categorized by quartiles of dietary pattern scores.

The distribution of participants in terms of categorical variables across quartiles of dietary pattern scores was examined using χ^2 test. We applied one-way analysis of variance to compare means of continuous variables across quartiles of dietary pattern scores. Analysis of covariance was used for assessment of adjusted intakes of foods and nutrients across quartiles of dietary patterns. The association of major dietary patterns with pregnancy complications was assessed using logistic regression in different models. Adjustments for energy intake, age and BMI were done in the first statistical model. Further statistical control was made for physical activity and social-economic levels in the second model. All models were done by treating the first category (quartile 1) of dietary patterns as the reference.

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software version 19.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA). The significance level was set at P less than 0.05.

Table 1. Food Grouping Used in the Dietary Patterns

Food Groups	Food Items
Bulky vegetables	Eggplant, cabbage, turnip, mushroom, squash, stewed pumpkin
Leafy vegetables	Leafy vegetables, cooked vegetables, celery, spinach, lettuce
Colored vegetables	Tomato, carrot, pepper, tomato paste, ketchup
Green vegetables	Green peas, green beans, cucumber
Garlic,Onion	Garlic, onion
Fruits	Cantaloupe ,watermelon, pear, apricot, sweet cherry, sour cherry, apple, peach, green tomato, pomegranate, plum, banana
Sweet fruits	Melon, persimmon, date, fig, grapes, raisin, berries
Citrus	Kiwi, orange, tangerine, lemon and sour lemon, strawberry
Olive	Olive, olive oils
Nuts	Peanuts, almonds, pistachios, hazelnuts, roasted seeds, walnuts
Legumes	Beans, peas, lima beans, broad beans, lentils, soy
Saturated fat	Cream, butter, animal oil, mayonnaise, solid oil
Unsaturated fat	Liquid oil, olive oil
Low fat dairy	Yogurt, whey, cheese, dough, low fat milk
High fat dairy	Full fat milk, Chocolate milk, Ice cream
Whole grains	Dark breads (Iranian bread), barley bread, wheat germ, Bulgur, Barley
Refined grains	White bread (lavash, baguettes), rice, toasted bread, sweet bread, white flour, biscuits, corn, macaroni, noodle
Potato	Fries, Potato
Red meat	All kinds of meat, minced meat
Fish	Fish, Tuna
Poultry	Chicken with or without skin
Eggs	Eggs
Fruit juice	Fruit juice, lemon juice, compote
Soft drinks	Soft drinks
Sweets and desserts	Sweets, gaz, sohan, chocolate, halva
Marinades	Salty pickles
Sugar	Sugar, candies, sugar cubes, honey, jam
Salt	Salt
Spices	Spices
Pizza	Pizza
Coffee	Coffee
Tea	Tea
Processed meat	Sausages

Results

Identified Major Dietary Patterns

Three factors were considered as major dietary patterns labeled based on the earlier literature and our interpretation of the data. (*i*) 'western dietary pattern' which was highly loaded by processed meats, fruits, fruits juice, citrus, nuts, fish, desserts and sweets, sugar, saturated fat, sweet fruit(Melon- Persimmon- Date- Fig- Grapes- Raisin- Berries that have high glycemic index), potato, legumes, coffee, egg, pizza, high fat dairy, whole grain and soft drinks; (*ii*) 'traditional dietary pattern' which was high in refined grains, colored vegetables, olive, sugar, salt, spices, unsaturated fat, garlic, onion and tea; (*iii*) 'healthy dietary pattern' which was high in green vegetables, leafy vegetables, colored vegetables, fruits, low fat dairy, poultry, bulky vegetables, red meat, citrus, nuts, fish, olive, marinades, sweet fruit, egg and unsaturated fat.

General Characteristics and Dietary Intakes of Study Participants

The overall characteristics of the study participants across different categories of western, traditional and healthy dietary patterns are presented in Table 2.

Women in the highest quartile of healthy dietary pattern were more likely to be employed and graduated from the university and also have an employed husband, history of IUGR or history of early delivery compared with those in the lowest quartile. In addition, the distribution of the women across category of western dietary pattern showed that those with the highest adherence to western dietary pattern were significantly more likely to have high socialeconomic level, employed husband, history of cesarean and history of IUGR and stillbirth. Furthermore, there were significant statistical differences in distribution of women regarding social-economic level, education, and husband's education across category of traditional dietary pattern.

Biochemical factors of the study participants across categories of dietary patterns were also illustrated in Table 3.

There were significant differences in Hb and MCH levels across quartiles of healthy dietary pattern.

Multivariable-adjusted odds ratios for NVP, preeclampsia, GDM and high systolic and diastolic blood pressures among pregnant women across quartile categories of dietary patterns are shown in Table 4.

The comparison of NVP risks in different categories of dietary patterns showed that greater adherence to western dietary pattern was significantly associated with higher NVP risk in the crude (odds ratio [OR]: 1.88; 95% CI: 1.09–3.24, P = 0.04), and model 1 (OR: 1.84; 95% CI: 1.04–3.26, P = 0.04). This association did not remain significant even after taking potential confounders into account in the model 2 (OR: 1.90; 95% CI: 1.03–3.51, P = 0.09). However, healthy and traditional dietary patterns were not associated with NVP risk in all crude and adjusted models (Table 4).

Findings about pre-eclampsia (Table 4) showed that those in the top quartile of adherence to healthy dietary pattern had a significant lower chance of having pre-eclampsia compared with those in the lowest quartile in the crude model (OR 0.73, 95% CI [0.44–1.20], P = 0.04) and in the model 1 (OR 0.52, 95% CI [0.27–1], P = 0.03). After adjusting for potential confounding variables in model 2 [OR 0.49, 95% CI [0.24–1], P = 0.05], this association attenuated.

On the contrary, higher significant chance of having preeclampsia was found among women with more adherence to western dietary pattern (OR 2.08, 95% CI [1–4.36], P =0.02) in the final adjusted model.

We also found significant association between western dietary pattern and high systolic blood pressure in the crude model (OR 0.16, 95% CI [0.06–0.43], P = 0.001), model 1 (OR 0.15, 95% CI [0.05–0.43], P = 0.001), and model 2 (OR 0.13, 95% CI [0.04–0.42], P = 0.002) (Table 4).

Furthermore, lower risk of diastolic blood pressure was marginal significantly associated with a western dietary pattern (OR 0.08, 95% CI [0.01-0.67], P = 0.05) (Table 4).

However, adherence to mentioned dietary patterns was not related to GDM in all crude and adjusted models (Table 4).

Discussion

The effect of diet does not occur through the addition of single nutrients or food. So, dietary pattern approach would allow holistic identification of diet and disorder relations to provide information beyond those assessed by single nutrient.

To our knowledge, studies evaluating the association of dietary patterns and pregnancy-related complications are scarce, and current study, with 812 subjects is one of the largest studies in this field.

This study demonstrated a marginally significant inverse association between high adherence to healthy dietary pattern and chance of having pre-eclampsia. Consistently, a significant chance of having pre-eclampsia was observed among women with the most adherence to western dietary pattern.

Earlier systematic review and meta-analysis study showed the beneficial effect of a diet rich in fruits and vegetables on pre-eclampsia, although not all results were statistically significant.²⁴

A healthy diet can contribute to mitigating the metabolic stress such as systemic oxidative stress and inflammation that occur during pregnancy.²⁵⁻²⁷ Such pathological inflammation and oxidative stress lead to vascular endothelial cell dysfunction following the damage of biological molecules which is the initiator of the pathophysiological events of pre-eclampsia.^{28,29} So, healthy dietary pattern, in contrast to western dietary pattern, can result in such protective effects on the pre-eclampsia.

Our findings about NVP showed a positive non-significant relationship between western dietary pattern and NVP risk.

Other studies revealed that cereal consumption, high intake of carbohydrates and added sugar,³⁰ alcohol and meat³¹ were significantly associated with NVP rate among pregnant women. In addition, increasing severity of nausea was also related to decreasing healthy diet score from before to early pregnancy.³²

QI Q2 Q3 Q4 PValue Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 PValue Q1 Q2 Q3	Healthy		-		Healthy					Western					Traditional		
m) Normal 25.7° 23.7 25.7° 23.7 25.7 23.7 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.6 2			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	<i>P</i> Value ^a	Q	Q2	Q3	Q4	<i>P</i> Value ^a	Q	Q2	Q3	Q4	<i>P</i> value ^a
m ¹¹ Overweight 242 267 23 261 -0.3 247 27 236 236 education Employed 214 19.8 2.03 38.1 0.01 294 253 256 244 cocupation Employed 17.4 2.33 26.6 2.33 21.1 Coll 23.3 26.5 24.4 25.3 25.6 24.4 education Employed 17.4 2.33 22.7 21.1 Coll 24.5 23.3 26.6 24.6 occupation Self-employed 17.4 2.33 22.7 21.1 Coll 23.3 26.6 24.6 oblower 23.4 24.7 24.1 24.7 24.7 23.3 26.6 24.6 oblower 28.3 26.4 24.7 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 occupation Caduate 21.2 24.3 24.3 24.3	1 1 1 3)	Normal	25.7ª	23.7	26.5	24.1	L	25.2	23.5	25.2	26.1		24.1	24.1	27.2	24.6	-
Housekeeper 253 266 259 221 239 252 253 256 246 reacher 214 198 206 381 001 294 254 206 246 freacher 289 173 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 234 234 234 234 234 234 233 264 234 233 264 234	biMI (Kg/m²)	Overweight	24.2	26.7	23	26.1	c.U	24.7	27	24.7	23.6	0.0	26.1	26.1	22.2	25.6	0.4
occupation Employed 214 19.8 20.6 38.1 0.01 29.4 23.4 20.6 24.6 Teacher 28.9 15.8 20.3 28.9 15.8 26.3 28.9 13.4 36.8 18.4 Teacher 28.9 15.8 26.3 28.9 15.8 26.3 23.1 23.1 23.6 14.4 Worker 33.9 14.2 25.7 26.8 33.1 23.6 11 Undergaduate 25.4 25.4 25.1 24 25.7 25.6 23.3 33.1 23.6 24.6 Undergaduate 23.3 26.7 23.1 21.8 0.0 25.5 25.4 25.7 25.5 23.4 26.4 27.6 26.4 Induction Undergaduate 23.1 21.1 0.0 22.5 25.4 26.4 26.4 26.4 Induction Undergaduate 23.1 23.1 23.1 23.1 23.1 23.1<		Housekeeper	25.3	26.6	25.9	22.2		23.9	25.2	25.3	25.6		24.5	26.4	25	24.1	
	Mother's occupation	Employed	21.4	19.8	20.6	38.1	0.01	29.4	25.4	20.6	24.6	0.4	27.8	19.8	24.6	27.8	0.3
		Teacher	28.9	15.8	26.3	28.9		26.3	18.4	36.8	18.4		23.7	15.8	23.7	36.8	
occupation Self-employed 27 293 217 211 <000 245 263 259 213 233 213 236 213 235 233 235 213 235 213 235 213 235 213 235 213 235 213 235 213 235 233 264 orducation Undergaduate 281 246 231 213 263 233 264 225 231 216 225 231 216 226 231 226 231 226 231 226 231 226 231 226 231 226 231 226 231 226		Employed	17.4	22.3	29.3	31		22.7	23.1	23.1	31		26.9	21.9	23.1	28.1	
Worker 339 14.2 55.2 26.8 33.1 23.6 11 education Undergraduate 25.4 25.4 25.1 24 25.7 23.5 27.3 23.5 education Craduate 24.8 24.6 24.6 24.6 26.7 23.3 26.4 education Undergraduate 23.3 26.7 23.1 21.8 24.6 26.7 23.3 26.4 education Undergraduate 28.1 24.1 27.5 23.3 26.4 27.6 24.1 form 28.1 24.7 25.6 24.1 25.7 23.4 31.2 21.8 24.6 form 23.7 25.6 24.1 25.5 24.1 27.6 21.6 25.7 form 23.7 25.6 24.1 25.5 24.4 26 26.7 form 24 25.5 24.4 0.0 24.5 25.9 25.5 25.4 for<	Father's occupation	Self-employed	27	29.3	22.7	21.1	<0.001	24.5	23.3	26.3	25.9	0.001	23.6	27	26.3	23.1	0.5
education Undergraduate 25.4 25.4 25.1 24 25.7 25.7 25.3 27.3 23.3 26.4 23.3 26.4 23.3 26.4 23.3 26.4 23.3 26.4 23.3 26.4 23.3 26.4 23.3 26.4 22.5 23.3 26.4 22.5 24.4 26.6 24.4 26.6 24.6 22.5 26.4 22.5 24.4 22.5 24.4 22.5 24.4 22.5 24.4 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 22.6 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Worker</td><td>33.9</td><td>14.2</td><td>25.2</td><td>26.8</td><td></td><td>32.3</td><td>33.1</td><td>23.6</td><td>11</td><td></td><td>26.8</td><td>23.6</td><td>23.6</td><td>26</td><td></td></t<>		Worker	33.9	14.2	25.2	26.8		32.3	33.1	23.6	11		26.8	23.6	23.6	26	
• cuotation Graduate 24.6 24.6 24.6 24.6 24.6 23.3 24.4 26 23.3 26.7 23.3 27.6 23.3 26.7 26.1 26.1 26.1 26.1 26.1 27.6 23.8 27.6 23.6 23.6 23.6 23.6 23.6 23.6 23.6 23.6 24.6 22.5 26.9 21.6 27.6 28.1 21.6 27.6 28.6 23.2 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 24.6 22.5 28.6 21.6 22.5 nonmic status Moderate 24.6 22.5 24.1 0.5 24.6 22.5 28.7 28.6 28.7 28.6 28.7 28.6 28.7 28.6 28.6 28.6 28.7 28.6 28.7 28.6 28.6 28.6 28.6 28.6 28.6 28.6 <t< td=""><td>Martin of the state</td><td>Undergraduate</td><td>25.4</td><td>25.4</td><td>25.1</td><td>24</td><td>0</td><td>25.7</td><td>23.5</td><td>27.3</td><td>23.5</td><td>Ċ</td><td>21.3</td><td>28.1</td><td>27.6</td><td>23</td><td>000</td></t<>	Martin of the state	Undergraduate	25.4	25.4	25.1	24	0	25.7	23.5	27.3	23.5	Ċ	21.3	28.1	27.6	23	000
ducation Undergraduate 28.3 26.7 23.1 21.8 0.01 22.5 23.8 27.6 26.1 Indergraduate 21.2 22.9 26.7 29.2 20.1 27.5 26.4 22 Indergraduate 28.1 23.4 31.2 17.2 23.8 31.2 21.9 24 Inderstatus Moderate 25.2 27.6 25.2 23.4 31.2 17.2 24.3 21.6 24.1 Inductatus 26.9 24.1 25.5 24.3 26.6 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 Nome 25.3 24.3 26.6 24.1 0.0 25.4 23.7 24.3 24.4 23.2 24.8 24.5 25.5	MOUTER S EQUCATION	Graduate	24.8	24.6	24.6	26	0.9	24.4	26	23.3	26.4	0.4	28.2	22.3	23	26.4	c0.0
Outdottie C1.2 22.9 26.7 29.2 0.01 27.5 26.4 2.2 24 low 28.1 23.4 31.2 17.2 32.8 31.2 17.2 low 28.1 23.4 31.2 17.2 32.8 31.2 21.9 21.9 high 23.7 25.6 24.1 25.2 22.1 0.5 20.1 21.8 31 27.2 Nomai 23.7 25.6 24.1 25.5 23.4 0.7 24.8 23.2 24.8 24.7 24.8 25.7 24.9 27.9 24.8 25.7 25.4 24.7 24.8 25.7 25.4 24.7 24.8 25.7 24.7 24.8 25.7 24.7 24.8 25.7 25.9 25.7 25.9 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7	Enthoute adjunction	Undergraduate	28.3	26.7	23.1	21.8	0.01	22.5	23.8	27.6	26.1	-	22.7	28.5	25.4	23.4	0.07
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		Graduate	21.2	22.9	26.7	29.2	10.0	27.5	26.4	22	24	0.1	28.1	20.1	24.5	27.3	20.0
onomic status Moderate 25.2 27.6 25.6 24 26.6 24.3 21.8 31 272 High 23.7 25.6 24 26.6 24.3 24.3 24.3 28.5 Normal 26.9 24.1 25.5 24.4 25.6 24.6 25.6 25.7 25.1 25.6 25.7		Low	28.1	23.4	31.2	17.2		32.8	31.2	21.9	14.1		12.5	37.5	29.7	20.3	
High 23.7 25.6 24 26.6 24.3 28.5	Socio-economic status	Moderate	25.2	27.6	25.2	22.1	0.5	20.1	21.8	31	27.2	0.02	20.7	32.3	26.2	20.7	<0.001
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		High	23.7	25.6	24	26.6		24.3	24	23.2	28.5		27.2	19	23.5	30.3	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Dolition	Cesarean	26.9	24.1	25.5	23.4	r o	22.4	22	30.8	24.8	0.0.0	24.8	24.8	24.1	26.2	00
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Delivery	Normal	24	25.2	24.8	26		26.5	26.7	21.6	25.2	70.0	25.2	25	25.4	24.4	6.0
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		No	25.3	24.8	25.8	24.1	0.0.0	23.9	24.5	25.9	25.7	0000	24.1	25.4	25.2	25.3	c (
Bith Ves 25.2 25.2 25.1 0.04 25.2 24.7 24.8 25.3 5.9 24.7 24.8 25.3 5.9 24.7 24.8 25.3 5.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.1 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.9 25.1 25.2 25.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 24.1 26.1 26.2 25.9 26.1 26.2 2	NDOI	Yes	24.3	24.3	8.1	43.2	70.0	45.9	32.4	8.1	13.5	700.0	37.8	18.9	21.6	21.6	C.U
$ \begin{array}{lcccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Drotorm Birth	No	24.6	25.2	25.2	25.1	100	25.2	24.7	24.8	25.3	-	24.4	24.8	25.6	25.2	10
No 24.8 25.1 25.2 24.9 0.16 25.2 24.5 25.1 25.1 25.1 25.1 25.1 25.1 25.1 25		Yes	52.9	5.9	23.5	17.6	0.04	17.6	41.2	35.3	5.9	0.1	41.2	35.3	5.9	17.6	0
Ves 50 12.5 0 37.5 0.10 0 75 12.5 12.5 12.5 No 25.8 25.8 24 24.3 0.3 25.4 24.6 24.8 25.2 Ves 21.6 21.6 29 27.8 0.3 23.5 26.5 24.1 25.2 Very low 55.6 22.2 11.1 11.1 22.2 44.4 22.2 11.1 Low 25.8 28.9 21.3 24.1 0.02 25.2 26.1 23.9 24.7 Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 0.02 25.2 26.2 23.9 24.7 Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 0.02 26.2 26.2 26.2 23.9 24.7	C 4: 11 h :	No	24.8	25.1	25.2	24.9	21.0	25.2	24.5	25.1	25.1	0.01	24.8	25	25.2	25	с о
No 25.8 25.8 24 24.3 0.3 25.4 24.6 24.8 25.2 25.2 Ves 27.8 21.6 21.6 29 27.8 0.3 23.5 26.5 25.9 24.1 Vey low 55.6 22.2 11.1 11.1 22.2 44.4 22.2 11.1 Low Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 24.1 0.02 25.2 26.2 23.9 24.7 Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 0.02 25.2 26.2 23.9 24.7 0.01 24.8 26 26.2 23.9 24.7 0.01 25.4 24.4 22.2 11.1 11.1 11.1 11.1 11.1 11	INTICITIO	Yes	50	12.5	0	37.5	01.0	0	75	12.5	12.5	0.01	50	25	0	25	c.0
Ves 21.6 21.6 29 27.8 U.3 23.5 26.5 25.9 24.1 Very low 55.6 22.2 11.1 11.1 22.2 44.4 22.2 11.1 Low 25.8 28.9 21.3 24.1 22.2 24.4 22.2 11.1 Low 25.8 28.9 21.3 24.1 0.02 25.2 23.9 24.7 Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 0.02 25.2 26.2 23.9 24.7 Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 0.02 26.2 26.2 23.3 Units 20.1 27.1 0.02 24.8 26.6 26.6 26.3 23.3	Aboution	No	25.8	25.8	24	24.3	0	25.4	24.6	24.8	25.2	0	24.8	25.1	24.8	25.4	00
Very low 55.6 22.2 11.1 11.1 22.2 44.4 22.2 11.1 Low 25.8 28.9 21.3 24.1 0.02 25.2 26.2 23.9 24.7 Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 0.02 24.8 26.2 23.9 24.7 Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 0.02 24.8 26 26 23.3 Underate 20.7 20.7 27.7 20.0 27.6 23.3		Yes	21.6	21.6	29	27.8	c.0	23.5	26.5	25.9	24.1	6.0	25.9	24.7	25.9	23.5	0.7
Low 25.8 28.9 21.3 24.1 25.2 26.2 23.9 24.7 Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 0.02 24.8 26 26 23.3 U.A. 20 37 200 215 23.5 24.8 26 26 23.3		Very low	55.6	22.2	11.1	11.1		22.2	44.4	22.2	11.1		11.1	22.2	22.2	44.4	
Moderate 22.5 19.1 31.3 27.1 ^{0.02} 24.8 26 26 23.3 U.M. 20 277 200 215 23.3	A ctivity	Low	25.8	28.9	21.3	24.1	000	25.2	26.2	23.9	24.7	-	27.8	24.3	24.9	23	
	ACUVIC	Moderate	22.5	19.1	31.3	27.1	70.0	24.8	26	26	23.3		22.5	26.3	25.6	25.6	C•0
20.0 27.7 50.6 21.2 50.6		High	20	27.7	30.8	21.5		23.1	9.2	30.8	36.9		16.9	29.2	24.6	29.2	

Table 2. General Characteristics of the Study Participants Across Different Categories of Dietary Patterns

BMI, Body mass index; IUGR, Intrauterine growth retardation, Q, quartile. ^a Resulted from ANOVA for quantitative variables and chi-square test for categorical data Values are presented as percent.

		Healthy	lthy		5		Wes	Western		-		Traditional	tional		ž
	Q,	${\bf Q}_2$	\mathbf{Q}_3	Q	2	${\bf Q}_2$	Q,	\mathbf{Q}_4	Q	<u> </u>	Q,	Q4	Q	\mathbf{Q}_2	<u>.</u>
Т3	128.27±38.21	125.35±32.14	$128.27 \pm 38.21 125.35 \pm 32.14 132.08 \pm 26.93 118.67 \pm 26.82$	118.67±26.82	0.43	124.69 ± 32.07	129.08 ± 31.63	115.59±28.63 132.63±26.32	132.63±26.32	0.33	136.04 ± 31.36	116.03 ± 29.34	136.04±31.36 116.03±29.34 126.25±29.15	123.43±31.28	0.15
Τ4	9.45±1.65	9.85±1.36	9.95±1.71	9.59 ± 2.01	0.74	9.47 ± 1.87	9.91 ± 1.57	9.26±1.76	10.51 ± 1.43	0.13	10.32±1.44	9.78±1.47	9.46±2.16	9.41±1.64	0.25
TSH	2.8±1.77	2.76±1.73	2.69±1.63	2.61±1.49	0.76	2.94 ± 1.95	2.73±1.74	2.6±1.43	2.64±1.55	0.27	2.84±1.78	2.7±1.52	2.65±1.51	2.67±1.83	0.71
FBS	88.23±13.15	88.27±9.75	88.65 ± 10.85	87.28±11.27	0.70	87.57±10.76	86.83±10.68	89.91±12.73	88±10.66	0.06	87.7±13.5	87.73±9.9	88.64±11.35	88.57±10.24	0.82
LDL	100.25±24.71	95±24.71	91.12±22.35	109.4 ± 15.46	0.59	104.71±22.35	95.33±30.66	94.65±12.02	101±14.20	0.87	103.25±14.22	94.5±22.15	66±17.22	106.93 ± 19.81	0.27
ŗ	0.75±0.11	0.78±0.12	0.76±0.15	0.76±0.14	0.34	0.75±0.12	0.77 ± 0.18	0.75 ± 0.11	0.76±0.11	0.52	0.76±0.16	0.77±0.12	0.75±0.11	0.76±0.13	0.86
BUN	12.48±4.27	12.07±4.44	12.96±4.59	13.03±5.05	0.24	13.35 ± 4.94	12.42 ± 4.27	12.97±4.58	11.97 ± 4.57	0.05	1.99 ± 4	12.29±4.5	13.25 ± 4.99	12.92±4.75	0.08
ЧH	12.74±1.02	13.09±1.12	12.85±1.02	12.95±1.04	0.008	12.91±1	12.92±1.16	12.87±1.02	12.93±1.04	0.92	12.92±1.1	12.89±1.05	12.9±1.08	12.93 ± 0.99	0.98
Hc	38.63±2.47	39.23±2.55	38.85±2.66	39.09±2.49	0.14	39.29±2.37	38.97±2.71	38.84±2.6	38.84±2.49	0.38	38.98±2.58	38.99±2.65	38.84±2.58	39.01±2.41	0.92
MCV	86.20±4.79	85.66±4.98	85.15 ± 4.85	84.80±5.06	0.08	85.69 ± 4.98	85.92±5.13	84.91 ± 4.80	85.54±4.87	0.31	85.82 ± 5.14	85.56±4.77	84.55±5	86.07±4.73	0.03
MCH	28.52±2	28.80±1.97	28.36±2	28.05±1.88	0.01	28.16±1.99	28.54 ± 2.06	28.37±2.02	28.68±1.86	0.12	28.23±2	28.72±1.91	28.29±2.11	28.54±1.86	0.1
MCHC	33.21±1.26	32.95±1.20	33.47±1.25	33±1.29	0.24	33.11±1.30	33.25±1.23	33.07±1.26	32.6±1.19	0.54	33.13±1.41	33.49±1.19	33.3±1.33	32.82±1.06	0.07
RBC	4.51 ± 0.36	4.55 ± 0.43	4.56 ± 0.40	4.53 ± 0.39	0.60	4.51 ± 0.38	4.52 ± 0.41	4.58 ± 0.39	4.54 ± 0.40	0.41	4,56±0.42	4.5 ± 0.4	4.56±0.37	4.53 ± 0.39	0.39
T3, Triioc Corpuscu	T3 Triiodothyronine, T4, Thyroxine, TSH, Thyroid Stimulating Hormone, FBS, Fasting Blood Sugar, LDL, Low-density Lipoprotein, Cr, Creatinine, BUN, Blood Urea Nitrogen, Hb, Hemoglobin, Hc, Hematocrit, MCV, Mean Corpuscular Hemoglobin, MCHC, Mean Corpuscular Hemoglobin, Corpuscular Hemoglobin, Corpuscular Hemoglobin, Corpuscular Hemoglobin, MCHC, Mean Corpuscular He	hyroxine, TSH, T 1, Mean Corpusc	Thyroid Stimulatii Sular Hemoglobii	ng Hormone, FB: n, MCHC, Mean	S, Fastin _i Corpus	g Blood Sugar, L scular Hemoglob	DL, Low-density in concentration	Lipoprotein, Cr, (, RBC, Red Blood	Creatinine, BUN I Cell	, Blood	Urea Nitrogen, I	Hb, Hemoglobin	ı, Hc, Hematocri	it, MCV, Mean	

20 2 5

*Resulted from ANOVA. Values are presented as mean ± SD.

su.	
Patterns	
ietary I	
\Box	
els of	
ent Levels	
Diffe	
Risk in I	
e	
Pressur	
lood Pr	
В	
stolic	
h Sys	
, Hig	
Pressure	
l Pre	
Blood	
astolic F	
ligh D	
Ч, Н	
GD/	
psia,	
-eclam	
Pre-e	
IVP, F	
of N	
rison	
mpar	
e Cor	
4. The	
ble	
Та	ĺ

Healthy Dietary Pattern Western Dietary Pattern			H	Healthy Dietary Pattern	attern			M	Western Dietary Pattern	attern				Traditional Dietary Pattern	Pattern	
	Model	ð	ó	ő	ð	P-Value*	ø	ó	ő	ð	<i>P</i> -Value [*]	Ø	ó	ő	ð	P-Value*
	Crude		1.3 (0.78-2.15)	0.88 0.51-1.49)	0.66 (0.38-1.16)	60.0		1.06 (0.6-1.89)	1.63 (0.94-2.81)	1.88 (1.09-3.24)	0.04	-	1.39 (0.84-2.30)	1.01 (0.59-1.73)	0.99 (0.57-1.70)	0.5
NVP	Model 1		1.41 (0.83-2.40)	0.96 (0.55-1.67)	0.72 (0.39-1.30)	0.12	-	0.92 (0.5-1.69)	1.54 (0.87-2.72)	1.84 (1.04-3.26)	0.04	1	1.40 (0.82-2.37)	0.97 (0.55-1.70)	0.95 (0.54-1.70)	0.4
	Model 2		1.24 (0.72-2.16)	0.96 (0.54-1.72)	0.65 (0.34-1.22)	0.2	-	1.07 (0.55-2.06)	1.67 (0.91-3.07)	1.90 (1.03-3.51)	0.09	-	1.24 (0.71-2.17)	0.8 (0.44-1.45)	0.85 (0.47-1.55)	0.4
	Crude		1.14 (0.721.81)	0.58 (0.35-0.98)	0.73 (0.44-1.20)	0.04	. 	1.62(0.98-2.69)	1.49 (0.89-2.48)	1.31 (0.78-2.21)	0.21	. 	1.1 (0.67-1.81)	1.03 (0.62-1.71)	1.24 (0.76-2.02)	0.8
Pre- eclampsia	Model 1	. 	0.95 (0.50-1.79)	0.44 (0.22-0.86)	0.52 (0.27-1)	0.03	. 	1.94(1.01-3.74)	1.51 (0.782.91-)	1.49 (0.76-2.91)	0.26		1.28 (0.68-2.41)	1.59 (0.82-3.11)	1.71 (0.9-3.23)	0.3
	Model 2	. 	0.92 (0.46-1.82)	0.44 (0.21-0.92)	0.49 (0.24-1)	0.05	. 	3.25 (1.51-6.99)	2.02 (0.97-4.20)	2.08 (1-4.36)	0.02		1.27 (0.64-2.55)	1.41 (0.68-2.93)	1.25 (0.63-2.49)	0.8
	Crude	~~	0.6 (0.29-1.24)	0.74 (0.36-1.49)	0.88 (0.44-1.75)	0.5		0.66 (0.31-1.4)	1.1 (0.56-2.16)	0.58 (0.27-1.23)	0.2		0.8 (0.36-1.81)	1.42 (0.69-2.91)	1.35 (0.65-2.80)	0.4
GDM	Model 1	~~	0.6 (0.27-1.31)	0.9 (0.43-1.89)	1.06 (0.51-2.2)	0.5		0.71 (0.32-1.57)	1 (0.49-2.03)	0.6 (0.27-1.34)	0.49		0.97 (0.41-2.25)	1.76 (0.82-3.81)	1.82 (0.84-3.95)	0.2
	Model 2		0.61 (0.27-1.43)	0.95 (0.43-2.12)	1.04 (0.46-2.31)	0.6	-	0.62 (0.25-1.52)	0.91 (0.42-1.98)	0.52 (0.22-1.25)	0.39	~~	0.8 (0.32-1.99)	1.36 (0.58-3.14)	1.71 (0.75-3.88)	0.28
	Crude		0.71 (0.22-2.27)	0.85 (0.28-2.58)	0.71 (0.22-2.26)	0.92	. 	0.62 (0.23-1.63)	0.35 (0.11-1.11)	0.08 (0.01-0.67)	0.05		0.99 (0.34-2.89)	0.7 (0.22-2.25)	0.56 (0.16-1.94)	0.75
DBP	Model 1	. 	0.53 (0.15-1.85)	0.75 (0.24-2.37)	0.57 (0.17-1.88)	0.72	. 	0.63 (0.22-1.77)	0.38 (0.11-1.27)	0.07 (0.00-0.64)	0.07		1.13 (0.37-3.48)	0.66 (0.19-2.20)	0.56 (0.15-2.04)	0.65
	Model 2		0.49 (0.13-1.78)	0.68 (0.2-2.2)	0.22 (0.04-1.14)	0.31		1.03 (0.33-3.2)	0.44 (0.11-1.63)	0.1 (0. 01-0.95)	0.13	-	1.44 (0.41-5.09)	0.57 (0.13-2.38)	0.86 (0.21-3.45)	0.58
	Crude		0.82 (0.4-1.68)	1.06 (0.54-2.08)	0.7 (0.33-1.47)	0.68		0.83 (0.45-1.50)	0.33 (0.15-0.71)	0.16 (0.06-0.43)	<0.001		0.99 (0.5-1.97)	0.75 (0.36-1.56)	0.81 (0.4-1.67)	0.83
SBP	Model 1	~~	0.77 (0.36-1.63)	0.98 (0.48-1.97)	0.61 (0.28-1.33)	0.57		0.77 (0.41-1.46)	0.35 (0.16-0.77)	0.15 (0.05-0.43)	0.001		1.08 (0.53-2.2)	0.75 (0.35-1.59)	0.82 (0.39-1.73)	0.76
	Model 2		0.83 (0.37-1.86)	0.81 (0.36-1.80)	0.58 (0.24-1.40)	0.7	-	0.63 (0.3-1.3)	0.36 (0.15-0.81)	0.13 (0.04-0.42)	0.002	-	1.03 (0.44-2.36)	0.74 (0.31-1.76)	1.07 (0.47-2.44)	0.83
*Using Man Model 1: ad Model 2: ad	itel-Haensze ijusted for er justed for er	el exter nergy ii nergy ii	*Using Mantel-Haenszel extension x2 test. Model 1: adjusted for energy intake, age and BMI Model 2: adjusted for energy intake, age, BMI, so	*Using Mantel-Haenszel extension χ2 test. Wodel 1: adjusted for energy intake, age and BMI Wodel 2: adjusted for energy intake, age, BMI, socio economic and physical activity.	ic and physical	activity.										

Furthermore, in the current study, adherence to mentioned dietary patterns was not related to GDM. Some findings suggest that although the vegetable pattern was associated with a decreased risk of GDM, a prudent pattern (healthy dietary style) was not related to mentioned disorder.³³ However, others reported that a dietary pattern rich in fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and fish, and low in red and processed meat, refined grains, and high-fat dairy could have an association with a lower risk of GDM.³⁴

In this study, we interestingly found that a lower risk of high systolic blood pressure was marginally associated with a western dietary pattern. A similar result was obtained about diastolic blood pressure which was a marginally significant association.

Most other publications have reported no association between dietary patterns and changes of SBP and DBP levels during pregnancy and at early postpartum.^{13,35}

In this study, we found that there is a high consumption of red meats in the healthy dietary pattern, and refined grains, salt and sugar in the traditional dietary pattern. Mentioned unhealthy foods, might have given an adverse score to the healthy and traditional dietary patterns.

This might be a reason why we failed to report a significant negative association between high adherence to healthy dietary pattern and some pregnancy-related complications.

It should be mentioned that refined grains are a major source of carbohydrate intake in Iranian diet, which has been shown to be associated with higher risk of some chronic disorders. Iranian usual diet also contains high amounts of salt, and mean salt intake is almost two fold higher than the recommended intake. In addition, consumption of fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy is low; however, legumes intake is good.³⁶ Therefore, understanding the differences between healthy, western and traditional dietary patterns and Iranian usual dietary pattern might help interpreting the findings we obtained.

Also, pre-pregnancy consumption of unhealthy diets should be considered as a risk factor for some pregnancy-related complications. We cannot overlook that the long time adherence to a specific diet can affect health outcomes.³⁷ Even, transient NVP at the early pregnancy should be taken into account as an important factor to change the diet quality from before pregnancy.

Beside the diet, another point that needs to be considered is other lifestyle factors during early pregnancy that are associated with pregnancy-related complications. Interestingly, each healthy lifestyle behavior (eating a healthy diet, being physically active, not smoking, or having low stress levels) showed 23% reduction in risk of GDM.²⁵

In the present study, some odds ratios and 95% CIs for association between major dietary patterns and pregnancy complications were inflated which is a hallmark of sparse data bias. This bias happens when the data lack adequate case numbers for some combination of exposure and outcome levels.^{38,40} Hence, the interpretation of our findings must be done with caution.

Although we adjusted the effect of several confounder

variables like energy intake, age, BMI, socio economic and physical activity in statistical analysis, the impact of gene variation was not considered. Future studies should stratified subjects according to the gene variation. Therefore, these potential limitations should be considered in interpretation of our results.

However, the main strength of the current study is that few studies have collected data on dietary patterns and pregnancy-related complications.

In summary, evaluations carried out in the present study indicate that different dietary patterns have an association with the risk of pre-eclampsia and hypertension in pregnant women.

Larger studies are needed to determine whether dietary patterns lead to significant modifications in pregnancyrelated complications. Also, future studies are required to evaluate causal relationships between diet quality indices and pregnancy complications.

Authors' Contribution

HH, AE, AF, ZS and LA collected data. HH, AE, AF, and LA performed statistical analysis. HH, AE, and LA wrote the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures

The authors have no conflicts of interest.

Ethical Statement

We obtained written informed consent from all participants. This study was approved by the research council (research project number: 193053) and ethics committee (research ethics number: IR.MUI.REC193053).

References

- Brown J, Ceysens G, Boulvain M. Exercise for pregnant women with gestational diabetes for improving maternal and fetal outcomes. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;6:Cd012202. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012202.pub2.
- Brown J, Martis R, Hughes B, Rowan J, Crowther CA. Oral anti-diabetic pharmacological therapies for the treatment of women with gestational diabetes. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;1:Cd011967. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD011967.pub2.
- Nakimuli A, Nakubulwa S, Kakaire O, Osinde MO, Mbalinda SN, Kakande N, et al. The burden of maternal morbidity and mortality attributable to hypertensive disorders in pregnancy: a prospective cohort study from Uganda. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2016;16:205. doi: 10.1186/s12884-016-1001-1.
- Schoenaker DA, Soedamah-Muthu SS, Callaway LK, Mishra GD. Prepregnancy dietary patterns and risk of developing hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: results from the Australian Longitudinal Study on Women's Health. Am J Clin Nutr. 2015;102(1):94-101. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.114.102475.
- Heitmann K, Nordeng H, Havnen GC, Solheimsnes A, Holst L. The burden of nausea and vomiting during pregnancy: severe impacts on quality of life, daily life functioning and willingness to become pregnant again - results from a cross-sectional study. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2017;17(1):75. doi: 10.1186/ s12884-017-1249-0.
- Nakimuli A, Nakubulwa S, Kakaire O, Osinde MO, Mbalinda SN, Kakande N, et al. The burden of maternal morbidity and mortality attributable to hypertensive disorders in pregnancy: a prospective cohort study from Uganda. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2016;16:205. doi: 10.1186/s12884-016-1001-1.
- Arab A, Rafie N, Mansourian M, Miraghajani M, Hajianfar H. Dietary patterns and semen quality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. Andrology. 2018;6(1):20-8. doi: 10.1111/andr.12430.
- 8. Timpka S, Stuart JJ, Tanz LJ, Rimm EB, Franks PW, Rich-Edwards

JW. Lifestyle in progression from hypertensive disorders of pregnancy to chronic hypertension in Nurses' Health Study II: observational cohort study. Bmj. 2017;358:j3024. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j3024.

- O'Dea A, Tierney M, McGuire BE, Newell J, Glynn LG, Gibson I, et al. Can the Onset of Type 2 Diabetes Be Delayed by a Group-Based Lifestyle Intervention in Women with Prediabetes following Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM)? Findings from a Randomized Control Mixed Methods Trial. J Diabetes Res. 2015;2015:798460. doi: 10.1155/2015/798460.
- Lind JM, Hennessy A, McLean M. Cardiovascular disease in women: the significance of hypertension and gestational diabetes during pregnancy. Curr Opin Cardiol. 2014;29(5):447-53. doi: 10.1097/hco.00000000000094.
- Osorio-Yanez C, Gelaye B, Qiu C, Bao W, Cardenas A, Enquobahrie DA, et al. Maternal intake of fried foods and risk of gestational diabetes mellitus. Ann Epidemiol. 2017;27(6):384-90.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2017.05.006.
- Sahariah SA, Potdar RD, Gandhi M, Kehoe SH, Brown N, Sane H, et al. A Daily Snack Containing Leafy Green Vegetables, Fruit, and Milk before and during Pregnancy Prevents Gestational Diabetes in a Randomized, Controlled Trial in Mumbai, India. J Nutr. 2016;146(7):1453s-60s. doi: 10.3945/ jn.115.223461.
- 13. Eshriqui I, Vilela AA, Rebelo F, Farias DR, Castro MB, Kac G. Gestational dietary patterns are not associated with blood pressure changes during pregnancy and early postpartum in a Brazilian prospective cohort. Eur J Nutr. 2016;55(1):21-32. doi: 10.1007/s00394-014-0819-4.
- Brantsaeter AL, Haugen M, Samuelsen SO, Torjusen H, Trogstad L, Alexander J, et al. A dietary pattern characterized by high intake of vegetables, fruits, and vegetable oils is associated with reduced risk of preeclampsia in nulliparous pregnant Norwegian women. J Nutr. 2009;139(6):1162-8. doi: 10.3945/ jn.109.104968.
- 15. Hu FB. Dietary pattern analysis: a new direction in nutritional epidemiology. Curr Opin Lipidol. 2002;13(1):3-9.
- de Seymour J, Chia A, Colega M, Jones B, McKenzie E, Shirong C, et al. Maternal Dietary Patterns and Gestational Diabetes Mellitus in a Multi-Ethnic Asian Cohort: The GUSTO Study. Nutrients. 2016;8(9). doi: 10.3390/nu8090574.
- 17. Kibret KT, Chojenta C, Gresham E, Tegegne TK, Loxton D. Maternal dietary patterns and risk of adverse pregnancy (hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and gestational diabetes mellitus) and birth (preterm birth and low birth weight) outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Public Health Nutr. 2018:1-15. doi: 10.1017/S1368980018002616.
- Kant AK, Graubard BI, Schatzkin A. Dietary patterns predict mortality in a national cohort: the National Health Interview Surveys, 1987 and 1992. J Nutr. 2004;134(7):1793-9. doi: 10.1093/jn/134.7.1793.
- Rafieifar S, Pouraram H, Djazayery A, Siassi F, Abdollahi Z, Dorosty AR, et al. Strategies and Opportunities Ahead to Reduce Salt Intake. Arch Iran Med. 2016;19(10):729-34. doi: 0161910/aim.0011.
- Hashemi R, Motlagh AD, Heshmat R, Esmaillzadeh A, Payab M, Yousefinia M, et al. Diet and its relationship to sarcopenia in community dwelling Iranian elderly: a cross sectional study. Nutrition. 2015;31(1):97-104. doi: 10.1016/j.nut.2014.05.003.
- 21. Mahan LK, Escott-Stump S, Krause MV. Krause's food & nutrition therapy. Elsevier Saunders; 2007.
- 22. Cunningham FG, Leveno KJ, Bloom SL, Spong CY, Dashe JS, Hoffman BL, et al. New York: Williams Obstetrics. 24th ed. McGraw-Hill; 2014.
- Fauvel JP. [Hypertension during pregnancy: Epidemiology, definition]. Presse Med. 2016;45(7-8 Pt 1):618-21. doi: 10.1016/j.lpm.2016.05.015.
- 24. Schoenaker DA, Soedamah-Muthu SS, Mishra GD. The

association between dietary factors and gestational hypertension and pre-eclampsia: a systematic review and metaanalysis of observational studies. BMC Med. 2014;12:157. doi: 10.1186/s12916-014-0157-7.

- 25. Badon SE, Enquobahrie DA, Wartko PD, Miller RS, Qiu C, Gelaye B, et al. Healthy Lifestyle During Early Pregnancy and Risk of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. Am J Epidemiol. 2017;186(3):326-33. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwx095.
- Miraghajani M, Zaghian N, Mirlohi M, Feizi A, Ghiasvand R. The Impact of Probiotic Soy Milk Consumption on Oxidative Stress Among Type 2 Diabetic Kidney Disease Patients: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. J Ren Nutr. 2017;27(5):317-24. doi: 10.1053/j.jrn.2017.04.004.
- 27. Miraghajani M, Azadbakht L. Can soy products affect on inflammation level? A review on the current evidence. Journal of Isfahan Medical School. 2011;29(151).
- Jauniaux E, Burton GJ. [The role of oxidative stress in placentalrelated diseases of pregnancy]. J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod (Paris). 2016;45(8):775-85. doi: 10.1016/j.jgyn.2016.02.012.
- 29. Borzychowski AM, Sargent IL, Redman CW. Inflammation and pre-eclampsia. Semin Fetal Neonatal Med. 2006;11(5):309-16. doi: 10.1016/j.siny.2006.04.001.
- Huo L, Li B, Wei F. Maternal nutrition associated with nausea and vomiting during pregnancy: A prospective cohort China study. Biomed Res. 2017;28.(10):4543-8.
- Pepper GV, Craig Roberts S. Rates of nausea and vomiting in pregnancy and dietary characteristics across populations. Proc Biol Sci. 2006;273(1601):2675-9. doi: 10.1098/ rspb.2006.3633.
- Crozier SR, Inskip HM, Godfrey KM, Cooper C, Robinson SM. Nausea and vomiting in early pregnancy: Effects on food intake and diet quality. Matern Child Nutr. 2017;13(4). doi: 10.1111/ mcn.12389.
- He JR, Yuan MY, Chen NN, Lu JH, Hu CY, Mai WB, et al. Maternal dietary patterns and gestational diabetes mellitus: a large prospective cohort study in China. Br J Nutr. 2015;113(8):1292-300. doi: 10.1017/s0007114515000707.
- Schoenaker DA, Mishra GD, Callaway LK, Soedamah-Muthu SS. The Role of Energy, Nutrients, Foods, and Dietary Patterns in the Development of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review of Observational Studies. Diabetes Care. 2016;39(1):16-23. doi: 10.2337/dc15-0540.
- Soto R, Guilloty N, Anzalota L, Rosario Z, Cordero JF, Palacios C. Association between maternal diet factors and hemoglobin levels, glucose tolerance, blood pressure and gestational age in a Hispanic population. Arch Latinoam Nutr. 2015;65(2):86-96.
- Valipour G, Esmaillzadeh A, Azadbakht L, Afshar H, Hassanzadeh A, Adibi P. Adherence to the DASH diet in relation to psychological profile of Iranian adults. Eur J Nutr. 2017;56(1):309-20. doi: 10.1007/s00394-015-1081-0.
- Lamyian M, Hosseinpour-Niazi S, Mirmiran P, Moghaddam Banaem L, Goshtasebi A, Azizi F. Pre-Pregnancy Fast Food Consumption Is Associated with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus among Tehranian Women. Nutrients. 2017;9(3). doi: 10.3390/ nu9030216.
- Greenland S, Mansournia MA, Altman DG. Sparse data bias: a problem hiding in plain sight. BMJ. 2016;352:i1981. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i1981.
- Mansournia MA, Geroldinger A, Greenland S, Heinze G. Separation in Logistic Regression: Causes, Consequences, and Control. Am J Epidemiol. 2018;187(4):864-70. doi: 10.1093/ aje/kwx299.
- Greenland S, Mansournia MA. Penalization, bias reduction, and default priors in logistic and related categorical and survival regressions. Stat Med. 2015;34(23):3133-43. doi: 10.1002/sim.6537.

© 2018 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons. org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.