

Managing gestational diabetes mellitus with telemedicine during COVID-19: Was there an impact on pregnancy outcomes?

Farrah Naz Hussain MD, Katherine L. Garvey MPH, Liza Karotkin MD, Sophia Scarpelli-Shchur RN CDE, Kristina Martimucci Feldman DO, Tirtza Spiegel Strauss MD, Lois Brustman MD

Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mount Sinai West, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

Background

At the height of the COVID-19 pandemic in New York, our Diabetes in Pregnancy Program became exclusively telemedicine. Prior studies have demonstrated telemedicine interventions improve outcomes, but there is limited data on the impact on gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM).



Objective

To compare compliance and perinatal outcomes in women with GDM who participated in telemedicine versus in-person visits during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Study Design

IRB-approved retrospective cohort study comparing those with GDM who received telemedicine diabetes care in March-June 2020 to those who received care in-person in March-June 2018.

Primary perinatal outcomes:

- Polyhydramnios
 - Large for gestational age (LGA)
 - Shoulder dystocia
 - Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and hypoglycemia
- These primary outcomes were combined into a composite outcome for multivariable analysis.

Results

Table 1. Baseline and GDM characteristics of included participants.

| Variable | 2018 (N = 104) | 2020 (N = 109) | P-value |
|--|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Maternal age – mean (± SD) | 35.2 (± 4.6) | 35.6 (± 4.1) | 0.5611 |
| Pregravid BMI, kg/m ² | 24.5 (± 5.1) | 25.0 (± 6.0) | 0.7686 |
| Gravidity | 2.2 (± 1.4) | 2.2 (± 1.3) | 0.7605 |
| Parity | 0.4 (± 0.6) | 0.5 (± 0.7) | 0.1401 |
| Race | | | 0.0955 |
| Asian | 25 (25.5) | 40 (36.7) | |
| Black | 7 (7.1) | 6 (5.5) | |
| Hispanic | 12 (12.2) | 5 (4.6) | |
| Other | 0 (0.0) | 2 (1.8) | |
| White | 54 (55.1) | 56 (51.4) | |
| Maternal Comorbidities | | | |
| Chronic hypertension | 2 (1.9) | 4 (3.7) | 0.6835 |
| Thyroid Disease | 27 (26.0) | 21 (19.3) | 0.2424 |
| Gestational hypertension | 6 (5.8) | 2 (1.8) | 0.1629 |
| Preeclampsia without severe features | 2 (1.9) | 0 (0.0) | 0.2372 |
| Preeclampsia with severe features | 0 (0.0) | 3 (2.8) | 0.2469 |
| COVID Infection | 0 (0.0) | 2 (1.8) | 0.4979 |
| GDM Characteristics | | | |
| Gestational age at GDM diagnosis – mean (± SD) | 27.0 (± 2.6) | 26.3 (± 4.2) | 0.6543 |
| 1 hour GCT (mg/dL) | 156.0 (± 21.7) | 160.2 (± 26.1) | 0.5950 |
| GTT fasting (mg/dL) | 82.8 (± 10.7) | 84.0 (± 11.6) | 0.5242 |
| GTT 1 hour (mg/dL) | 186.2 (± 27.7) | 189.0 (± 24.5) | 0.5478 |
| GTT 2 hour (mg/dL) | 161.4 (± 26.7) | 166.3 (± 28.2) | 0.2173 |
| GTT 3 hour (mg/dL) | 113.3 (± 29.7) | 126.0 (± 33.8) | 0.0018 |
| HbA1c at Diagnosis | 5.1 (± 0.4) | 5.4 (± 0.4) | 0.0005 |
| 3rd trimester Avg. FS (mg/dL) | 96.9 (± 7.9) | 99.2 (± 7.7) | 0.0161 |
| 3rd trimester Avg. FS/day | 3.4 (± 0.8) | 3.7 (± 0.6) | <.0001 |
| Prior GDM – no. (%) | 8 (7.7) | 19 (18.3) | 0.0232 |
| GDM Treatment | | | |
| Diet | 60 (57.7) | 68 (62.4) | 0.4845 |
| Glyburide | 24 (23.1) | 9 (8.3) | 0.0028 |
| Metformin | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | N/A |
| Insulin | 25 (24.0) | 32 (29.4) | 0.3807 |

Table 2. Maternal and neonatal outcomes in women receiving telehealth GDM care during the COVID pandemic in 2020 versus in-person visits during the same time period in 2018.

| PRIMARY MATERNAL AND NEONATAL OUTCOMES | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Variable | 2018 (N = 104) | 2020 (N = 109) | P-value |
| Neonatal and maternal composite outcome – no. (%) | 46 (45.1) | 37 (34.6) | 0.1203 |
| Shoulder dystocia | 2 (1.9) | 2 (1.8) | 1.0000 |
| Hyperbilirubinemia | 12 (11.5) | 7 (6.4) | 0.1904 |
| Hypoglycemia | 17 (16.3) | 20 (18.3) | 0.6998 |
| Large for gestational age (LGA) | 15 (14.4) | 11 (10.3) | 0.3600 |
| Polyhydramnios | 7 (6.9) | 6 (5.6) | 0.6944 |
| Total weight gain at delivery, lbs – mean (± SD) | 24.4 (± 11.4) | 20.6 (± 12.4) | 0.0232 |
| SECONDARY OUTCOMES | | | |
| Variable | 2018 (N = 104) | 2020 (N = 109) | P-value |
| Gestational age at delivery – mean (± SD) | 39.1 (± 1.1) | 38.8 (± 1.2) | 0.0290 |
| Birth weight (g) | 3334 (± 354) | 3221 (± 438) | 0.0396 |
| HC/AC | 0.99 (± 0.04) | 1.00 (± 0.05) | 0.0139 |
| AC (%) | 55.1 (± 17.7) | 48.6 (± 21.2) | 0.0245 |
| APGARS 1 Min | 8.4 (± 0.8) | 8.4 (± 1.2) | 0.2176 |
| APGARS 5 Min | 8.9 (± 0.3) | 8.9 (± 0.5) | 0.5026 |
| Arterial cord pH | 7.22 (± 0.05) | 7.24 (± 0.07) | 0.0231 |
| Arterial base excess (mEq/L) | 7.6 (± 3.8) | 7.0 (± 3.7) | 0.2218 |
| Last EFW on ultrasound (g) | 3221 (± 405) | 3062 (± 467) | 0.0090 |
| AFI on last ultrasound | 14.4 (± 5.5) | 13.6 (± 5.1) | 0.2651 |
| Mode of delivery – no. (%) | | | 0.0995 |
| Cesarean section | 39 (38.2) | 27 (24.8) | |
| Operative vaginal delivery | 10 (9.8) | 11 (10.1) | |
| Vaginal delivery | 53 (52.0) | 71 (65.1) | |
| NICU admission | 4 (3.8) | 5 (4.8) | 1.0000 |
| Preterm birth | 4 (4.1) | 4 (3.7) | 1.0000 |

Results

- 213 women met inclusion criteria: 109 in 2020 and 104 in 2018.
- Baseline characteristics were similar between groups.
- Women in 2020 had significantly greater HbA1C at diagnosis (5.4 vs 5.1%, p=0.0005), 3rd trimester average glucose (99.2 vs 96.9 mg/dL, p=0.02), 3rd trimester average fingersticks/day (3.7 vs 3.4, p<0.0001), and weight gain at delivery (p=0.02).
- The 2020 cohort had significantly fewer visits (4.6 vs 5.6, p<0.0001), visits with downloaded vs self-reported blood glucose data (3.5 vs 4.3, p=0.002) and antenatal ultrasounds (7.4 vs 9.4, p<0.0001).
- Attendance rates were higher for telemedicine and in-person visits in 2020 vs 2018 (97% vs 93%, p=0.007).
- No statistically significant differences were found in incidence of polyhydramnios (p=0.69), LGA (p=0.36), shoulder dystocia (p=1.00), hyperbilirubinemia (p=0.19) or hypoglycemia (p=0.70).
- After adjusting for maternal age and pregravid BMI, there was no association between maternal and neonatal composite outcome and cohort year (p=0.1139).

Conclusions

Use of telemedicine during the COVID-19 pandemic did not significantly affect perinatal outcomes, but did improve compliance among women with GDM who received care compared to historical controls. Our findings suggest telemedicine is an effective method for management of GDM.