Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Renata Saucedo, Mexican Social Security Institute, Mexico

REVIEWED BY

Patricia Canto, Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico Fang Fang Zeng, Jinan University, China Xuying Tan, Guangzhou Medical University, China

*CORRESPONDENCE Guifang Deng Misyfly@163.com Jianjun Yang yangjianjun_1969@163.com

RECEIVED 28 August 2024 ACCEPTED 11 February 2025 PUBLISHED 27 February 2025

CITATION

Wang Y, Ren Q, Yuan H, Wang Y, Liu Y, Wei Y, Sun R, Yang H, Tian P, Yang J and Deng G (2025) Association of serum inflammatory markers in early-pregnancy with the risk for gestational diabetes mellitus: a prospective cohort in Shenzhen, China. *Front. Endocrinol.* 16:1486848. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2025.1486848

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Wang, Ren, Yuan, Wang, Liu, Wei, Sun, Yang, Tian, Yang and Deng. This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Association of serum inflammatory markers in earlypregnancy with the risk for gestational diabetes mellitus: a prospective cohort in Shenzhen, China

Yijin Wang¹, Qinqin Ren¹, Hui Yuan¹, Yang Wang¹, Yao Liu², Yuanhuan Wei², Ruifang Sun², Hongguang Yang², Ping Tian³, Jianjun Yang^{1*} and Guifang Deng^{2*}

¹Department of Public Health, Ningxia Medical University, Yinchuan, Ningxia, China, ²Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shenzhen Nanshan People's Hospital, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China, ³Department of Children Healthcare, Shenzhen Nanshan People's Hospital, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China

Introduction: The systemic immune-inflammation index (SII) and systemic inflammation response index (SIRI) have recently been reported as novel inflammatory markers of diabetes. However, the associations of SII and SIRI with the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) are unclear. In our study, we explored the association between the SII and SIRI in early pregnancy and the risk of GDM in pregnant women.

Methods: A prospective cohort of 1,505 pregnant women were recruited at 6–13 weeks of gestation in 2019 and 2020 in Shenzhen, China. SII and SIRI were determined by calculating the composite inflammation indicators from routine blood test results at 6–13 weeks of gestation, and an oral glucose tolerance test was conducted at 24–28 weeks of gestation to diagnose GDM. Logistic regression was used to analyse the correlations between the incidence of GDM and SII and SIRI. Using a restriction cubic spline with baseline SII and SIRI as continuous variables, the dose–response associations between the incidence of GDM and SII and SIRI were explored.

Results: Following Ln-transformation of the SII and SIRI, multivariate models showed that Ln (SII) (odds ratio [OR] = 1.759; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.272–2.432) and Ln (SIRI) (OR = 1.556; 95% CI: 1.187–2.042) were positively associated with the risk of GDM in a dose-dependent manner. The OR for the highest quartile of SII compared with the lowest quartile for the risk of GDM was 2.080 (95% CI: 1.447–2.990), and the OR for the highest quartile of SIRI compared with the lowest quartile was 1.694 (95% CI: 1.170–2.452). The restricted cubic spline model confirmed a linear association between Ln (SII) and Ln (SIRI) with the risk of GDM (p-nonlinear > 0.05).

Discussion: Higher SII and SIRI in early pregnancy are associated with an increased risk of GDM. As novel, valuable, and convenient indicators of inflammation, SII and SIRI could be used to a potential predictor for GDM in early pregnancy.

KEYWORDS

systemic immune-inflammation index, systemic inflammation response index, inflammation, gestational diabetes mellitus, pregnant, first-trimester, prospective cohort study

1 Introduction

As a common complication of pregnancy, GDM is characterised by an inadequate pancreatic response to insulin (1). GDM affects 14% of pregnancies globally (2), and the prevalence of GDM in China is 14.8% (3). GDM poses immediate and long-term health risks for both mother and child, such as pre-eclampsia, premature membrane rupture, shoulder dystocia, macrosomia, perinatal death, and future risks of hyperglycemia, diabetes, obesity, and cardiovascular disease (4–6). Adverse metabolic programmes in the offspring may exist prior to the diagnosis of GDM (7, 8). Therefore, there is a need for more effective indicators to predict GDM and control the risk factors.

Tumor necrosis factor (TNF) levels in pregnant women have been reported to be significantly and negatively correlated with insulin sensitivity (9, 10). Several inflammatory markers, such as interleukins, C-reactive protein, tumour necrosis factor-α, leukocytes, neutrophils, and monocytes, were associated with GDM (11-13). Considering the inherent susceptibility of inflammatory parameters to other factors, the neutrophil-tolymphocyte ratio (NLR), platelet-to-neutrophil ratio, platelet-tolymphocyte ratio (PLR), and monocyte-to-lymphocyte ratio (MLR) could be used in combination as theoretically more reliable markers for assessing inflammatory status than individual cells. Wenhua Liu et al. found that increased PLR and NLR were independent predictors of GDM (14). A systematic review and meta-analysis also reported higher NLR in GDM pregnancies than in normoglycemic controls recently (15). However, the progression of gestational diabetes is a complex biological process, and there is limitation to analyze the relationship between single biomarkers and the risk of GDM. Therefore, integrating more biomarker data for analysis could make up for the data problems caused by data loss, noise and other factors in single data analysis, and reduce the false positive caused by single biomarker analysis.

The Systemic Immune-Inflammation Index (SII) and the Systemic Inflammation Response Index (SIRI) are emerging

biomarkers that are derived from the counts of platelets, neutrophils, lymphocytes, and monocytes. These indices have been validated for their ability to offer a comprehensive assessment of an individual's inflammatory and immune status (16, 17). The SII and SIRI have been found to more reliably predict disease progression and prognosis in certain inflammation-related diseases, such as cardiovascular disease (18, 19) and cancer (20, 21). Recently SII and SIRI as straightforward and cost-effective indexs identifying individuals with insulin resistance, diabetes and its complications have been reported (22, 23). However, few studies focused on the association between SII and SIRI and GDM, and those that have been published have reported ambiguous conclusions. Only a few retrospective or observational studies reported higher SIRI and SII in the GDM group than the non-GDM group (24-26) from which causal inference could not be performed.

In this study, a prospective cohort was designed to explore the association of serum inflammatory markers in early-pregnancy with the risk for gestational diabetes mellitus in Shenzhen city, in which migrants account for more than 70% of urban residents, ranking first among the top ten immigrant cities in China.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study population

Our study was conducted from 2019 to 2020 at Shenzhen Nanshan People's Hospital, Shenzhen, China. Pregnant women were followed from their first antenatal visit until delivery. A cohort of pregnant women was established based on the following inclusion criteria: 1) age \geq 18 years; 2) singleton pregnancy; and 3) availability of complete medical records. Potential participants were excluded if they had: 1) twin or multiple pregnancies (n = 9); 2) preconceptional diabetes (n = 6); 3) hepatitis or impaired liver function (n = 74); 4) nephritis or impaired renal function (n = 9); 5) cardiovascular disease (n = 3); 6) autoimmune disease (n = 1); or 7) an acute or chronic inflammatory condition during pregnancy or an infectious disease (n = 73). We restricted the study sample to pregnant women who underwent routine blood measurements from 6 to 13 weeks of gestation and three glucose measurements

Abbreviations: SII, systemic immune-inflammation index; SIRI, systemic inflammation response index; PLR, platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio; NLR, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio; MLR, monocyte-to-lymphocyte ratio; BMI, body mass index; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure.

using the oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT), resulting in 1,505 pregnant women included in the analysis. Clinical information was obtained from the hospital record information system and was analysed anonymously. Baseline characteristics were obtained either through a standardised self-report questionnaire or a faceto-face interview. Ethical approval for this cohort was granted by the Ethics Committee of Shenzhen Nanshan People's Hospital. All subjects provided informed consent. The study was conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, as set forth by the World Medical Association.

2.2 Data collection and clinical measurements

A structured questionnaire and review of the hospital information system records were used to collect information on maternal age, weight, height, educational level, smoking status, alcohol consumption, family history, and pregnancy history. Maternal body mass index (BMI, kg/m²) was calculated as the weight (kg) divided by the square of the height (m²). A BMI > 24 kg/m² was defined as overweight. Smokers were defined as those who smoked one or more cigarettes per day, and alcohol consumption was defined as drinking at least one alcoholic beverage per week. Educational attainment was classified as primary, secondary, or college and above. Parity was defined as the number of live or stillborn infants prior to the current pregnancy.

At 6–13 weeks of gestation, peripheral venous blood was drawn for biochemical index testing. The participants were asked to fast the night before the blood was drawn. All samples were immediately centrifuged after standing for laboratory measurements. The neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, platelet count, white blood cell count, and monocyte count were measured using a haematology analyser (Sysmex XN90000; Sysmex, Kobe, Japan). SII and SIRI are derived from blood cell counts in samples that have been stringently tested using standardized protocols. These indices offer valuable insights into systemic inflammation and immune status.

2.3 SII/SIRI and covariates

SII was calculated using the formula (platelet count ($\times 10^9/L$)× neutrophil count ($\times 10^9/L$))/lymphocyte count ($\times 10^9/L$), and SIRI was calculated using the formula (monocyte count ($\times 10^9/L$) × neutrophil count ($\times 10^9/L$)/lymphocyte count ($\times 10^9/L$). The analyses included potential confounding factors associated with the SII, SIRI, and GDM, based on previous studies. The covariates were age, BMI, educational level, smoking status, alcohol consumption, family history of hypertension, family history of diabetes mellitus, number of pregnancies, parity, and history of miscarriage.

2.4 Assessment of GDM

Participants underwent a 75 g oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) during the 24-28th week of pregnancy. 75 g of glucose was given and maternal blood samples were taken at 0, 1, and 2 h to measure serum glucose concentration. According to the recommendations of the International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups Consensus Panel, all pregnant women receiving a 75-g OGTT at 24–28 weeks of gestation were diagnosed with GDM when one of the following criteria was met: fasting plasma glucose concentration \geq 5.1 mmol/L; 1-h plasma glucose concentration \geq 10.0 mmol/L; or 2-h plasma glucose concentration \geq 8.5 mmol/L.

2.5 Statistical analysis

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine whether continuous variables conformed to normal distribution. The independent samples t-test was used for normally distributed variables and the Mann-Whitney U-test was used for non-normally distributed variables. And the chi-square test was used for categorical variables. To investigate the association of SII and SIRI with the risk of GDM, we performed a multivariate logistic regression analysis. Model 1 had no covariates; Model 2 included age and BMI as covariates; and Model 3 included age, BMI, educational level, smoking status, alcohol consumption, family history of diabetes mellitus, family history of hypertension, number of pregnancies, parity, and history of miscarriages. The associations of SII and SIRI with the risk of GDM were assessed using odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The dose-response association between GDM and SII was explored using restricted cubic spline (RCS) curves adjusted for potential confounders, with the SII as the continuous variable. Subgroup analyses were performed according to age and BMI. Data were analysed using R software version 3.0.3 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) and SPSS 24.0 software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). A two-tailed p-value < 0.05 was defined as statistically significant.

3 Results

3.1 Baseline characteristics

We conducted a prospective study of 1,505 pregnant Chinese women (Table 1). Compared with those without GDM, those with GDM were older, had a higher BMI, and had a greater frequency of multiparity (p < 0.001). Those with GDM also had higher fasting plasma glucose, 1-hour post-load glucose, and 2-hour post-load glucose concentrations and higher blood pressure (p < 0.05). Furthermore, the patients with GDM had higher platelet counts, neutrophil counts, white blood cell counts, SII and SIRI than those without GDM (p < 0.05). No significant differences between groups were observed for the other indicators (all p > 0.05).

3.2 Association between GDM and SII

Following established methods, we logarithmically transformed SII and SIRI to normalize distributions and better detect

TABLE 1 Baseline characteristics.

N337168.Age acquories35.5 ±	Variable	GDM	Non-GDM	P value
Age categoriesInternational internati	Ν	337	1168	
< 35148 (43.9%)738 (63.2%)(≥ 35189 (56.1%)430 (36.8%)BM1 (kg/m²)21.51 ± 2.8420.44 ± 2.50<0001	Age	35.56 ± 4.36	33.62 ± 3.93	<0.001
Part of the set	Age categories			<0.001
Brit of a strain BRI (kg/m²)Differention BRI (kg/m²)Clother interpretion Strain St	< 35	148 (43.9%)	738 (63.2%)	
BMI categoriesIICCBMI categories41 (12.2%)259 (22.2%)I18.5234 (69.4%)806 (69%)I>2462 (18.4%)103 (8.8%)I>2462 (18.4%)103 (8.8%)IEducationIIIScondary30 (8.90%)105 (9.0%)ICollege or above252 (74.8%)875 (74.9%)ICollege or above10.3%)2 (0.2%)0.649Smoking status (%)10 (3%)210.2%)0.49Diabetes history (%)10 (3%)23 (2%)0.212Conception methodII0.212Natural228 (97.3%)1149 (98.4%)IParityJ20 (54.4%)19 (1.6%)IParity101 (30.6%)301 (25.8%)0.08Multiparity103 (30.6%)301 (25.8%)0.08GGTTIIIFasting plasma glucose $3c5 \pm 1.4d$ $3c1 \pm 1.28$ $c.001$ $1^{hnomol/1}$ $5c5 \pm 1.4d$ $c.11 \pm 1.28$ $c.001$ Iber Imanglucose $3c5 \pm 1.4d$ $c.11 \pm 1.28$ $c.001$ BER (mm Hg)I12.23 \pm 1.20 109.75 ± 1.24 $c.001$ Die P(mm Hg) $6a.91 \pm 3.24$ $6a.91 \pm 3.24$ $c.001$ Die P(mm Hg) $6a.91 \pm 3.24$ $c.001$ $c.001$ Die P(min Hg) $5a.81 \pm 3.24$ $c.001$ $c.001$ Die P(min Hg) $5a.81 \pm 3.24$ $c.001$ $c.001$ Die P(min Hg) $6a.91 \pm 3.24$ $c.001$ <t< td=""><td>≥ 35</td><td>189 (56.1%)</td><td>430 (36.8%)</td><td></td></t<>	≥ 35	189 (56.1%)	430 (36.8%)	
-10. 41 (12.2%) 259 (22.2%) 18.5-24 234 (69.4%) 806 (69%) 1 >24 62 (18.4%) 103 (8.8%) 1 Education 7 62 (18.4%) 103 (8.8%) 1 Frimary 30 (8.90%) 105 (9.0%) 1 9.94 Scondary 55 (16.3%) 188 (16.1%) 1 1 College or above 252 (74.8%) 875 (74.9%) 0.649 Smoking status (%) 1 (0.3%) 2 (0.2%) 0.519 Diabetes history (%) 10 (3%) 2 (3.2%) 0.225 Conception method 10 (3%) 39 (3.3%) 0.225 Atural 328 (97.3%) 1149 (98.4%) 1013 Atural 120 (30.6%) 191 (.6%) 1013 Atural 121 (30.6%) 1149 (98.4%) 1014 Pariny 107 (50.4%) 171 (61.4%) 1014 Multiparity 130 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.081 GGTT 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.091 His	BMI (kg/m ²)	21.51 ± 2.84	20.44 ± 2.50	<0.001
ICC C P ICC C P ICC C P ICC C P 18.5-24 234 (69.4%) 806 (69%) I >24 62 (18.4%) 103 (8.8%) I Education I 0.994 Primary 30 (8.90%) 105 (9.0%) I Scondary 55 (16.3%) 188 (16.1%) I College or above 252 (74.8%) 875 (74.9%) I Smoking status (%) 1 (0.3%) 2 (0.2%) 0.649 Alcohol status (%) 10 (3%) 23 (2%) 0.212 Mypertension history (%) 16 (4.7%) 39 (3.3%) 0.225 Conception method I 10.3%) 149 (98.4%) I Parity 101 (30.6%) 1149 (98.4%) I I Mutaral 9 (2.7%) 19 (1.6%) I I Mutiparity 107 (50.4%) 717 (61.4%) I I Mutiparity 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 I GGTT I I I I I	BMI categories			<0.001
>2416 CC 4716 CC 4716 CC 4716 CC 47>2462 (18.4%)103 (8.8%).Education30 (8.90%)105 (9.0%).Primary30 (8.90%)105 (9.0%).Secondary55 (16.3%)188 (16.1%).College or above252 (74.8%)875 (74.9%).Smoking status (%)1 (0.3%)2 (0.2%)0.649Alcohol status (%)1 (0.3%)2 (0.2%)0.349Diabetes history (%)10 (3%)23 (2%)0.27Mypertension history (%)16 (4.7%)39 (3.3%)0.212Conception method10 (3%)19 (1.6%).Natural9 (2.7%)19 (1.6%).Parity170 (50.4%)717 (61.4%).Parity170 (50.4%)31 (25.8%)0.08Multiparity103 (30.6%)301 (25.8%)0.08GGTT171 (51.4%)4.49 ± 0.28.Fasting plasma glucose4.76 ± 0.404.49 ± 0.28.nmol/L)SBP (mm Hg)12.23 ± 12.436.51 ± 1.00.Bood pressure (mmHg)12.23 ± 12.336.47 ± 8.21.Bood pressure (mmHg)8.80 ± 1.388.33 ± 1.94.Pattert (x10 ⁹ /L)25.86 ± 52.2124.310 ± 50.99.Pattert (x10 ⁹ /L)6.32 ± 1.685.90 ± 1.66.Pattert (x10 ⁹ /L)6.32 ± 1.685.90 ± 1.66.Pattert (x10 ⁹ /L)Pattert (x10 ⁹ /L) <t< td=""><td><18.5</td><td>41 (12.2%)</td><td>259 (22.2%)</td><td></td></t<>	<18.5	41 (12.2%)	259 (22.2%)	
Interval Interval Interval Interval Education 30 (8.90%) 105 (9.0%) Image: 100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100	18.5-24	234 (69.4%)	806 (69%)	
ImaryImageImageImagePrimary30 (8.90%)105 (9.0%)1Secondary55 (16.3%)188 (16.1%)1College or above252 (74.8%)875 (74.9%)0.649Smoking status (%)1 (0.3%)2 (0.2%)0.649Alcohol status (%)1 (0.3%)2 (0.2%)0.27Piabetes history (%)16 (4.7%)39 (3.3%)0.212Conception method1030 (3.0%)101.0%)10.1%Aturial228 (97.3%)144 (98.4%)1Arificial9 (2.7%)19 (1.6%)1Primiparity170 (50.4%)717 (61.4%)1Multiparity103 (30.6%)301 (25.8%)0.08OGTT103 (30.6%)301 (25.8%)0.091Fasting plasma glucose1.67 ± 0.4%4.49 ± 0.28c.001Chypost-load glucose9.65 ± 1.4%5.51 ± 1.0%c.001Chypost-load glucose1.62 ± 1.286.51 ± 1.0%c.001BP (mm Hg)11.22 ± 12.0310.75 ± 1.2.3c.001DBP (mm Hg)8.80 ± 8.326.47 ± 8.21c.001Piatelet (x10°/L)250.86 ± 52.21243.10 ± 50.94c.001Piatelet (x10°/L)6.32 ± 1.6%5.91 ± 1.6%c.001Piatelet (x10°/L)6.32 ± 1.6%5.91 ± 1.6%c.001	>24	62 (18.4%)	103 (8.8%)	
Number of the second ary Interaction Interaction Interaction Secondary 55 (16.3%) 188 (16.1%) Image of the second arge	Education			0.994
College or above252 (74.8%)875 (74.9%)(10.3%)2 (0.2%)0.649Smoking status (%)1 (0.3%)2 (0.2%)0.349Alcohol status (%)10 (3%)2 (3 (2%)0.27Diabetes history (%)16 (4.7%)39 (3.3%)0.225Conception method132 (97.3%)1149 (98.4%)0.212Natural328 (97.3%)1149 (98.4%)1Artificial9 (2.7%)19 (1.6%)Parity170 (50.4%)717 (61.4%)Multiparity167 (49.6%)451 (38.6%)0.08GGTT103 (30.6%)301 (25.8%)0.08GGTT103 (30.6%)301 (25.8%)0.08GGTT103 (30.6%)301 (25.8%)0.001Fasting plasma glucose (mmol/L) 6.51 ± 1.48 6.001 Li-h post-load glucose (mmol/L) 8.67 ± 1.34 6.51 ± 1.28 4.001 SBP (mm Hg)112.23 \pm 12.03109.75 \pm 12.23 4.001 DBP (mm Hg) 8.80 ± 1.93 8.33 ± 1.94 4.001 Patelet (x10 ⁹ /L) 6.82 ± 1.68 5.90 ± 1.66 4.001 NBC (x10 ⁹ /L) 6.32 ± 1.68 5.90 ± 1.66 4.001 Nutrophil (x10 ⁹ /L) 6.32 ± 1.68 5.90 ± 1.66 4.001	Primary	30 (8.90%)	105 (9.0%)	
Description Detection Detection Smoking status (%) 1 (0.3%) 2 (0.2%) 0.649 Alcohol status (%) 1 (0.3%) 1 (0.1%) 0.349 Diabetes history (%) 10 (3%) 23 (2%) 0.27 Hypertension history (%) 16 (4.7%) 39 (3.3%) 0.225 Conception method 1 0.149 0.212 Natural 328 (97.3%) 1149 (98.4%) 0.212 Artificial 9 (2.7%) 19 (1.6%) 6.001 Parity 170 (50.4%) 717 (61.4%) 6.001 Multiparity 167 (49.6%) 451 (38.6%) 0.8 OGTT 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 OGTT 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.001 Fasting plasma glucose 4.76 ± 0.40 4.49 ± 0.28 c.001 Ihpost-load glucose 9.65 ± 1.44 5.51 ± 1.08 c.001 SBP (mm Hg) 112.23 ± 12.33 109.75 ± 12.23 c.001 DBP (mm Hg) 68.09 ± 8.32 6.47 ± 8.21 0.002	Secondary	55 (16.3%)	188 (16.1%)	
Alcohol status (%) 1 (0.3%) 1 (0.1%) 0.349 Diabetes history (%) 10 (3%) 23 (2%) 0.27 Hypertension history (%) 16 (4.7%) 39 (3.3%) 0.225 Conception method Image: Conception method Image: Conception method 0.212 Natural 328 (97.3%) 1149 (98.4%) Image: Conception method	College or above	252 (74.8%)	875 (74.9%)	
Diabetes history (%) 10 (3%) 23 (2%) 0.27 Hypertension history (%) 16 (4.7%) 39 (3.3%) 0.225 Conception method I 0.212 0.212 Natural 328 (97.3%) 1149 (98.4%) I Artificial 9 (2.7%) 19 (1.6%) I Parity I 717 (61.4%) I Primiparity 170 (50.4%) 717 (61.4%) I Multiparity 167 (49.6%) 451 (38.6%) I History of miscarriage 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 OGTT I I I I Fasting plasma glucose (mmol/L) 4.76 ± 0.40 4.49 ± 0.28 <0.001	Smoking status (%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.2%)	0.649
Hypertension history (%) 16 (4.7%) 39 (3.3%) 0.225 Conception method I 9 (3.3%) 0.212 Natural 328 (97.3%) 1149 (98.4%) I Artificial 9 (2.7%) 19 (1.6%) I Parity 9 (2.7%) 19 (1.6%) I Parity 170 (50.4%) 717 (61.4%) I Multiparity 167 (49.6%) 451 (38.6%) I Multiparity 167 (49.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 OGTT I I I I Fasting plasma glucose (mmol/L) 4.76 ± 0.40 4.49 ± 0.28 0.001 1-h post-load glucose (mmol/L) 9.65 ± 1.44 7.51 ± 1.28 0.001 2-h post-load glucose (mmol/L) 8.67 ± 1.34 6.51 ± 1.00 I SBP (mm Hg) 112.23 ± 12.03 109.75 ± 12.23 0.001 MBC (x10 ⁹ /L) 8.80 ± 1.93 8.33 ± 1.94 0.002 WBC (x10 ⁹ /L) 520.86 ± 52.21 243.10 ± 50.99 0.007 Neutrophil (x10 ⁹ /L) 6.32 ± 1.68	Alcohol status (%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.1%)	0.349
Image: Conception method Image:	Diabetes history (%)	10 (3%)	23 (2%)	0.27
Natural 328 (97.3%) 1149 (98.4%) Artificial 9 (2.7%) 19 (1.6%) Parity - <0.001	Hypertension history (%)	16 (4.7%)	39 (3.3%)	0.225
Artificial 9 (2.7%) 19 (1.6%) Parity - <0.001	Conception method			0.212
Parity Constraints Constraints Constraints Primiparity 170 (50.4%) 717 (61.4%) Constraints Multiparity 167 (49.6%) 451 (38.6%) Constraints History of miscarriage 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 OGTT Image: Constraints 167 (49.6%) 4.51 (38.6%) Constraints GGTT 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 Constraints OGTT 1.476 ± 0.40 4.49 ± 0.28 c0.001 I-h post-load glucose (mmol/L) 9.65 ± 1.44 7.51 ± 1.28 c0.001 2-h post-load glucose (mmol/L) 8.67 ± 1.34 6.51 ± 1.00 c0.001 Blood pressure (mmHg) 112.23 ± 12.03 109.75 ± 12.23 c0.001 DBP (mm Hg) 68.09 ± 8.32 66.47 ± 8.21 0.002 WBC (x10 ⁹ /L) 8.80 ± 1.93 8.33 ± 1.94 c0.001 Platelet (x10 ⁹ /L) 250.86 ± 52.21 243.10 ± 50.99 0.007 Neutrophil (x10 ⁹ /L) 6.32 ± 1.68 5.90 ± 1.66 c0.001	Natural	328 (97.3%)	1149 (98.4%)	
Primiparity 170 (50.4%) 717 (61.4%) Multiparity 167 (49.6%) 451 (38.6%) History of miscarriage 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 OGTT Image: Comparison of the state of the	Artificial	9 (2.7%)	19 (1.6%)	
Multiparity 167 (49.6%) 451 (38.6%) History of miscarriage 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 OGTT Image: Constraint of the state of the st	Parity			<0.001
History of miscarriage 103 (30.6%) 301 (25.8%) 0.08 OGTT I I I Fasting plasma glucose 4.76 ± 0.40 4.49 ± 0.28 <0.001	Primiparity	170 (50.4%)	717 (61.4%)	
OGTT Image: Constraint of the sector of the se	Multiparity	167 (49.6%)	451 (38.6%)	
Fasting plasma glucose (mmol/L) 4.76 ± 0.40 4.49 ± 0.28 <0.001 1-h post-load glucose (mmol/L) 9.65 ± 1.44 7.51 ± 1.28 <0.001	History of miscarriage	103 (30.6%)	301 (25.8%)	0.08
I-h post-load glucose (mmol/L) 9.65 ± 1.44 7.51 ± 1.28 <0.001	OGTT			
(mmol/L) 9.65 ± 1.44 7.51 ± 1.28 <0.001		4.76 ± 0.40	4.49 ± 0.28	<0.001
(mmol/L) 8.6/ ± 1.34 6.51 ± 1.00 <0.001 Blood pressure (mmHg) SBP (mm Hg) 112.23 ± 12.03 109.75 ± 12.23 <0.001		9.65 ± 1.44	7.51 ± 1.28	<0.001
SBP (mm Hg) 112.23 ± 12.03 109.75 ± 12.23 <0.001		8.67 ± 1.34	6.51 ± 1.00	<0.001
DBP (mm Hg) 68.09 ± 8.32 66.47 ± 8.21 0.002 WBC (x10 ⁹ /L) 8.80 ± 1.93 8.33 ± 1.94 <0.001	Blood pressure (mmHg)			
WBC (x10 ⁹ /L) 8.80 ± 1.93 8.33 ± 1.94 <0.001 Platelet (x10 ⁹ /L) 250.86 ± 52.21 243.10 ± 50.99 0.007 Neutrophil (x10 ⁹ /L) 6.32 ± 1.68 5.90 ± 1.66 <0.001	SBP (mm Hg)	112.23 ± 12.03	109.75 ± 12.23	<0.001
Platelet (x10 ⁹ /L) 250.86 ± 52.21 243.10 ± 50.99 0.007 Neutrophil (x10 ⁹ /L) 6.32 ± 1.68 5.90 ± 1.66 <0.001	DBP (mm Hg)	68.09 ± 8.32	66.47 ± 8.21	0.002
Neutrophil (x10 ⁹ /L) 6.32 ± 1.68 5.90 ± 1.66 <0.001 Lymphocyte (x10 ⁹ /L) 1.83 ± 0.50 1.79 ± 0.46 0.155	WBC (x10 ⁹ /L)	8.80 ± 1.93	8.33 ± 1.94	<0.001
Lymphocyte (x10 ⁹ /L) 1.83 \pm 0.50 1.79 \pm 0.46 0.155	Platelet (x10 ⁹ /L)	250.86 ± 52.21	243.10 ± 50.99	0.007
	Neutrophil (x10 ⁹ /L)	6.32 ± 1.68	5.90 ± 1.66	<0.001
Monocyte (x10 ⁹ /L) 0.53 ± 0.14 0.51 ± 0.16 0.054	Lymphocyte (x10 ⁹ /L)	1.83 ± 0.50	1.79 ± 0.46	0.155
	Monocyte (x10 ⁹ /L)	0.53 ± 0.14	0.51 ± 0.16	0.054

(Continued)

TABLE 1 Continued

Variable	GDM	Non-GDM	P value
SII(x10 ⁹ /L)	913.7 ± 365.38	841.9 ± 342.45	<0.001
SIRI(x10 ⁹ /L)	1.75 ± 0.96	1.62 ± 0.92	0.003

Data was presented as Mean (± SD) for continuous variables and n (%) for categorical. BMI, body mass index; OGTT, oral glucose tolerance test; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; WBC, white blood cell count; SII, systemic immune-inflammation index; SIRI, systemic inflammation response index. Bold font indicates P<0.05.

associations with GDM risk (27–29). As presented in Table 2, the Ln (SII) was positively associated with GDM in the crude model and in Model 2 (adjusted for age and BMI). In Model 3 (adjusted for all variables), this positive association remained stable (OR = 1.759; 95% CI: 1.272-2.432; p = 0.001). Similar results were obtained when the data were analysed according to SII quartiles. After adjustment for multiple variables, the OR for the highest quartile of the SII compared with the lowest quartile was 2.080 (95% CI: 1.447–2.990). Moreover, the *p*-values for the trend of the three models were all less than 0.05. Further analysis using RCS confirmed a linear association between the SII and the risk of GDM (*p* for non-linearity = 0.147, Figure 1). The RCS regression model revealed that higher SII were associated with an increased risk of GDM.

Analyses stratified by age showed that, among participants aged < 35 years, the risk of GDM was 2.13-fold higher among those in the highest quartile of SII than among those in the lowest quartile (95% CI: 1.25–3.63). Moreover, among participants aged \geq 35 years, the OR for the highest quartile of SII as compared with the lowest quartile was 1.97 (95% CI: 1.19–3.25). A similar analysis for the subgroup of women with a pre-pregnancy BMI < 24 kg/m² yielded an OR of 2.33 (95% CI: 1.57-3.46). We did not find significant interactions between the SII, age, or BMI and GDM (*p* for interaction > 0.05, Figure 2).

3.3 Relationship between GDM and SIRI

The association between SIRI and the risk of developing GDM is depicted in Table 3. A positive association between the Ln (SIRI) and the risk of GDM was observed in the crude model. After adjusting for confounding factors, these associations were largely similar to those observed in the crude models (OR = 1.556; 95% CI: 1.187-2.042; p = 0.001). Sensitivity analyses using the SIRI quartile as a categorical variable were consistent with the results of the main analysis. In Model 3, the ORs (95% CI) were 1.543 (1.064–2.239), 1.606 (1.104–2.335), and 1.694 (1.170–2.452) for SIRI in quartiles 2, 3 and 4, respectively, compared with quartile 1. In addition, the *p*-values for the trends in GDM risk were significant in all models. There was a significant linear association between the Ln(SIRI) and the risk of GDM (p for non-linearity>0.05, Figure 1).

For participants aged \geq 35 years, the risk of developing GDM was 2.00 times higher (95% CI: 1.19–3.37) for those in the top quartile of SIRI than for those in the bottom quartile. Moreover, among participants with a BMI < 24 kg/m², the OR for the highest quartile of SIRI compared with the lowest quartile was 1.90 (95% CI:

TABLE 2 ORs (95%CI) for GDM according to the quartiles of SII.

Variables	Model1		Model2		Model3	
	OR (95%CI)	<i>P</i> -Value	OR (95%CI)	P-Value	OR (95%CI)	P-Value
Ln (SII)	1.753 (1.278-2.404)	<0.001	1.728 (1.252-2.383)	0.001	1.759 (1.272-2.432)	0.001
SII quartiles						
Quartiles 1	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Quartiles 2	1.412 (0.981-2.032)	0.063	1.481 (1.020-2.151)	0.039	1.499 (1.029-2.184)	0.035
Quartiles 3	1.412 (0.981-2.032)	0.063	1.341 (0.925-1.946)	0.122	1.332 (0.914-1.940)	0.135
Quartiles 4	2.009 (1.414-2.853)	<0.001	2.035 (1.420-2.916)	<0.001	2.080 (1.447-2.990)	<0.001
<i>P</i> for trend < 0.001		<0.001		<0.001		<0.001

Model 1 had no covariates, Model 2 added covariates age and BMI, and Model 3 adjusted variables: age, BMI, education, smoking status, alcohol consumption, family history of diabetes mellitus, family history of hypertension, number of pregnancies, parity, and history of miscarriages. 95%CI, 95% confidence interval; OR, odds ratio; SII, systemic immune-inflammation index. a p < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Bold font indicates P<0.05.

1.27–2.83). Figure 2 shows that neither age nor BMI significantly modified this positive correlation (p for interaction > 0.05).

4 Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to assess the association between SII and SIRI and the risk of GDM prospectively in a large cohort. We found that among pregnant women, a high SII or SIRI was strongly associated with an increased risk of GDM. This association remained significant after adjusting for confounders. In conclusion, SII and SIRI can be used as effective and relatively inexpensive predictors for assessing the risk of GDM in pregnant women.

Recently, there has been increasing evidence that the development of GDM may be associated with a low-grade systemic inflammatory state and placental inflammation during

pregnancy (30-32). The inhibition of insulin secretion occurs due to the secretion of pro-inflammatory cytokines and the mediation of pro-inflammatory signalling pathways (33). For example, proinflammatory cytokines, such as TNF - α , cause insulin resistance by promoting adipocyte catabolism and increasing serine/threonine phosphorylation of insulin receptor substrate-1 (IRS-1) through a variety of signalling pathways, including the IKKβ/NF-κB pathway (34). Some immune-related genes have been found to be highly expressed in the placentas of patients with GDM, and the proportion of M1 macrophages is higher in these placentas than in control placentas (35). Increased M1 macrophages secrete proinflammatory mediators such as TNF- α , IL-1 β and resistin, which act on adipocytes to induce a state of insulin resistance, leading to a positive feedback loop of inflammation and insulin resistance (36). In addition, excess adipose tissue enhances circulating monocyte recruitment and increases the production of pro-inflammatory cytokines (37). Inflammatory cytokines stimulate an increase in



FIGURE 1

Restricted cubic spline (RCS) regression analysis including (A) SII (p-nonlinear=0.147) (B) SIRI (p-nonlinear=0.015) with GDM risk. The median of SII 800.81, SIRI 1.65 was selected as the reference levels, respectively. The lines indicate estimated ORs, and the light-blue-shaded areas represent 95% CI.



insulin secretion, and excess insulin secretion further impairs pancreatic islet function, leading to glucose metabolism disorders (38).

There are a few studies reported inflammatory markers as predictor for the risk of diabetes (39, 40). However limited evidence is reported to explore the association between inflammation and GDM in retrospective and cross-sectional studies. Yildiz et al. found that SIRI and SII in the first trimester were significantly higher in the GDM group than in the non-GDM group in a prospective observational study of 201 pregnancies (24). In a retrospective study of 467 pregnancies, Ergani et al. found that SII were higher in the GDM group than the non-GDM group in the late stages of pregnancy. Moreover, SII significantly increased from early to late pregnancy in patients with GDM (25). However, causal inference could not be performed from these retrospective and cross-sectional studies, Moreover, the effects of confounding factors were not evaluated and subgroup analyses were not conducted. Xiaoyan Xiu et al. found in a retrospective study that higher levels of SII and SIRI were associated with pregnancy outcomes in patients with GDM (26). However, the relationship between inflammation index and gestational diabetes mellitus was not investigated. Our study used a different study design, sample size, biomarker

Variables	Model1		Model2		Model3		
	OR (95%CI)	<i>P</i> -Value	OR (95%CI)	P-Value	OR (95%CI)	<i>P</i> -Value	
Ln (SIRI)	1.520 (1.168-1.976)	0.002	1.530 (1.170-2.001)	0.002	1.556 (1.187-2.042)	0.001	
SIRI quartiles							
Quartiles 1	Reference	Reference Reference		erence		Reference	
Quartiles 2	1.568 (1.095-2.247)	0.014	1.511 (1.046-2.182)	0.028	1.543 (1.064-2.239)	0.022	
Quartiles 3	1.523 (1.062-2.185)	0.022	1.597 (1.104-2.311)	0.013	1.606 (1.104-2.335)	0.013	
Quartiles 4	1.709 (1.197-2.44)	0.003	1.654 (1.148-2.383)	0.007	1.694 (1.170-2.452)	0.005	
P for trend		0.011		0.017		0.015	

TABLE 3 ORs (95%CI) for GDM according to the quartiles of SIRI.

Model 1 had no covariates, Model 2 added covariates age and BMI, and Model 3 adjusted variables: age, BMI, education, smoking status, alcohol consumption, family history of diabetes mellitus, family history of hypertension, number of pregnancies, parity, and history of miscarriages. 95%CI, 95% confidence interval; OR, odds ratio; SIRI, systemic inflammation response index. a p < 0.05 was considered statistically.

Bold font indicates P<0.05.

assessment time, diagnostic criteria or grading level compared to previous studies. We extended these findings to a relatively large prospective cohort study of pregnant Chinese women and observed that those in the second quartile of SII had a 49.9% higher risk of developing GDM in early pregnancy, while those in the fourth quartile had a 2.08 times higher the risk of developing GDM in early pregnancy, compared with those in the first quartile. We also found that pregnant women with SIRI in the second, third, and fourth quartile had a 54.3%, 60.6%, and 69.4% higher risk, respectively, of GDM in early pregnancy than those with SIRI in the first quartile. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first prospective large cohort study to assess the association between SII and SIRI and the risk of GDM.

According to Huang et al., platelet counts were significantly higher in the GDM group than the non-GDM group (41). Moreover, Ye et al. found that white blood cells, neutrophils, lymphocytes, monocytes, and the NLR in early pregnancy were positively associated with the risk of GDM (13). Similarly, we found that platelet counts, neutrophil counts, and white blood cell counts were higher in the GDM group than the non-GDM group. A metaanalysis found that the NLR was significantly elevated in patients with GDM but was not significantly correlated with the PLR, which is also a component of the SII (42). A case-control study suggested that an increased white blood cells, PLR, and NLR may be causally associated with an increased risk of GDM (14). The SII and SIRI selected for use in this study included the platelet count, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, and monocyte count, while the PLR and NLR were components of the SII and SIRI, respectively. The experimental results truly reflected the burden of inflammation and accurately reflected the associations of SII and SIRI with GDM.

Excess adipose tissue has been found to lead to enhanced recruitment of circulating monocytes and increased production of pro-inflammatory cytokines, thus affecting insulin resistance (33). In addition, as humans age, the number and activity of cells change, and the body's balance changes, increasing susceptibility to related diseases (43). Age and obesity are also strongly associated with GDM (44–46). Considering that both age and obesity affect the risk of GDM and inflammation, we attempted, for the first time, to analyse the association between SII and SIRI and the risk of GDM using subgroups according to age and BMI. Neither age nor BMI had a significant effect on the associations of SII and SIRI with GDM in subgroup analyses. This suggests that the associations between higher SII or SIRI and the risk of GDM remain reliable, regardless of age or BMI.

Currently, the SII and SIRI are used as reliable indicators of inflammatory status to predict certain diseases, such as cardiovascular disease (18, 19) and cancer (20, 21),. Routine blood tests are widely used in clinical practice. SII and SIRI can be obtained through such tests. Blood samples are easy to obtain, and the routine tests are simple to operate, minimally invasive, and inexpensive. SII and SIRI contain measurements for three inflammatory cell types, which may better characterise the complex inflammatory mechanisms associated with GDM than indices comprising single or dual inflammatory cell types. In clinical practice, the SII and SIRI are expected to serve as biomarkers for the early identification and risk assessment of GDM.

Our study has several strengths and limitations. First, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first prospective large-sample cohort study to assess the associations of SII and SIRI with GDM in a population of pregnant Chinese women. Second, our study included confounding factors in the analyses, as much as possible, to investigate the utility of the SII and SIRI for the prediction of GDM. SII and SIRI were transformed into categorical variables to obtain consistent results and improve the stability of the data. RCS was used to analyse possible nonlinear associations between SII and SIRI and the risk of GDM. In addition, stratified analyses were performed to assess the effects of SII and SIRI. The measurement of SII and SIRI will help to stratify the risk of GDM and provide personalised guidance for its clinical management. Notably, there are some limitations of this study. First, we adjusted for a number of potential covariates. However, we could not completely exclude the effects of other unmeasured or residual confounders. Second, we performed subgroup analyses based only on age and BMI, and these analyses had limited statistical power. Finally, all study participants were from Shenzhen, China, and this relatively limited population source may have introduced selection bias.

5 Conclusions

The present study suggests that higher SII and SIRI increase the risk of GDM, and that SII and SIRI may serve as a direct and economical tool for predicting GDM in early pregnancy. Further studies are needed to confirm our findings.

Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Ethics statement

The protocol for this study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Shenzhen Nanshan People's Hospital ([2019] No.072644). The studies were conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. The participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Author contributions

YiW: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Writing – original draft. QR: Data curation, Investigation, Writing – review & editing. HuY: Data curation, Investigation, Writing – review & editing. YaW: Data curation, Investigation, Writing – review & editing. YL: Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing – review & editing. YuW: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. RS: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. HoY: Software, Writing – review & editing. PT: Resources, Writing – review & editing. JY: Conceptualization, Resources, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. GD: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This work was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant number 82103821), the Major Technological Project of Shenzhen Nanshan District Health System (grant number NSZD2023024), and the Key Project of Shenzhen Nanshan District of Science and Technology (grant number NS2024005), and the Key Project of Shenzhen Nanshan District of Science and Technology (grant number NS2023016).

References

1. McIntyre HD, Catalano P, Zhang C, Desoye G, Mathiesen ER, Damm P. Gestational diabetes mellitus. *Nat Rev Dis primers*. (2019) 5:47. doi: 10.1038/s41572-019-0098-8

2. Wang H, Li N, Chivese T, Werfalli M, Sun H, Yuen L, et al. IDF diabetes atlas: estimation of global and regional gestational diabetes mellitus prevalence for 2021 by international association of diabetes in pregnancy study group's criteria. *Diabetes Res Clin practice*. (2022) 183:109050. doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2021.109050

3. Gao C, Sun X, Lu L, Liu F, Yuan J. Prevalence of gestational diabetes mellitus in mainland China: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Diabetes Invest.* (2019) 10:154–62. doi: 10.1111/jdi.2019.10.issue-1

4. Moon JH, Jang HC. Gestational diabetes mellitus: diagnostic approaches and maternaloffspring complications. *Diabetes Metab J.* (2022) 46:3–14. doi: 10.4093/dmj.2021.0335

5. Sina BJ. Pregnancy and the global disease burden. *Reprod Health.* (2017) 14:170. doi: 10.1186/s12978-017-0420-4

6. Ye W, Luo C, Huang J, Li C, Liu Z, Liu F. Gestational diabetes mellitus and adverse pregnancy outcomes: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical Res ed)*. (2022) 377:e067946. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2021-067946

7. Venkataraman H, Ram U, Craik S, Arungunasekaran A, Seshadri S, Saravanan P. Increased fetal adiposity prior to diagnosis of gestational diabetes in South Asians: more evidence for the 'thin-fat' baby. *Diabetologia*. (2017) 60:399–405. doi: 10.1007/s00125-016-4166-2

8. Sovio U, Murphy HR, Smith GC. Accelerated fetal growth prior to diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus: A prospective cohort study of nulliparous women. *Diabetes Care.* (2016) 39:982–7. doi: 10.2337/dc16-0160

9. Hotamisligil GS, Peraldi P, Budavari A, Ellis R, White MF, Spiegelman BM. IRS-1mediated inhibition of insulin receptor tyrosine kinase activity in TNF-alpha- and obesity-induced insulin resistance. *Sci (New York NY)*. (1996) 271:665–8. doi: 10.1126/ science.271.5249.665

10. Skolnik EY, Marcusohn J. Inhibition of insulin receptor signaling by TNF: potential role in obesity and non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *Cytokine Growth factor Rev.* (1996) 7:161–73. doi: 10.1016/1359-6101(96)00021-4

11. Hosseini E, Mokhtari Z, Salehi Abargouei A, Mishra GD, Amani R. Maternal circulating leptin, tumor necrosis factor-alpha, and interleukine-6 in association with gestational diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gynecological Endocrinol.* (2023) 39:2183049. doi: 10.1080/09513590.2023.2183049

12. Alamolhoda SH, Yazdkhasti M, Namdari M, Zakariayi SJ, Mirabi P. Association between C-reactive protein and gestational diabetes: a prospective study. *J obstetrics gynaecology: J Institute Obstetrics Gynaecology.* (2020) 40:349–53. doi: 10.1080/01443615.2019.1631767

13. Ye YX, Wang Y, Wu P, Yang X, Wu L, Lai Y, et al. Blood cell parameters from early to middle pregnancy and risk of gestational diabetes mellitus. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* (2023) 108:e1702-e11. doi: 10.1210/clinem/dgad336

Acknowledgments

We thank the mothers who participated in this study and all the clinical staff at Shenzhen Nanshan People's Hospital for their support and contribution.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

14. Liu W, Lou X, Zhang Z, Chai Y, Yu Q. Association of neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio, platelet to lymphocyte ratio, mean platelet volume with the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Gynecological Endocrinol.* (2021) 37:105–7. doi: 10.1080/09513590.2020.1780579

15. Pace NP, Vassallo J. Association between neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio and gestational diabetes-A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Endocrine Soc.* (2021) 5:bvab051. doi: 10.1210/jendso/bvab051

16. Xia Y, Xia C, Wu L, Li Z, Li H, Zhang J. Systemic immune inflammation index (SII), system inflammation response index (SIRI) and risk of all-cause mortality and cardiovascular mortality: A 20-year follow-up cohort study of 42,875 US adults. *J Clin Med.* (2023) 12. doi: 10.3390/jcm12031128

17. Ma LL, Xiao HB, Zhang J, Liu YH, Hu LK, Chen N, et al. Association between systemic immune inflammatory/inflammatory response index and hypertension: A cohort study of functional community. *Nutrition metabolism Cardiovasc diseases: NMCD.* (2024) 34:334–42. doi: 10.1016/j.numecd.2023.09.025

18. He L, Xie X, Xue J, Xie H, Zhang Y. Association of the systemic immuneinflammation index with all-cause mortality in patients with arteriosclerotic cardiovascular disease. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* (2022) 9:952953. doi: 10.3389/ fcvm.2022.952953

19. Zhao Z, Zhang X, Sun T, Huang X, Ma M, Yang S, et al. Prognostic value of systemic immune-inflammation index in CAD patients: Systematic review and metaanalyses. *Eur J Clin Invest.* (2024) 54:e14100. doi: 10.1111/eci.14100

20. Chen JH, Zhai ET, Yuan YJ, Wu KM, Xu JB, Peng JJ, et al. Systemic immuneinflammation index for predicting prognosis of colorectal cancer. *World J* gastroenterology. (2017) 23:6261–72. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v23.i34.6261

21. Chao B, Ju X, Zhang L, Xu X, Zhao Y. A novel prognostic marker systemic inflammation response index (SIRI) for operable cervical cancer patients. *Front Oncol.* (2020) 10:766. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.00766

22. Guo H, Wan C, Zhu J, Jiang X, Li S. Association of systemic immuneinflammation index with insulin resistance and prediabetes: a cross-sectional study. *Front endocrinology*. (2024) 15:1377792. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2024.1377792

 Liu W, Zheng S, Du X. Association of systemic immune-inflammation index and systemic inflammation response index with diabetic kidney disease in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Metab syndrome obesity: Targets Ther.* (2024) 17:517–31. doi: 10.2147/DMSO.S447026

24. Yildiz EG, Tanacan A, Okutucu G, Bastemur AG, Ipek G, Sahin D. Can System Inflammation Response Index or Systemic Immune Inflammation Index predict gestational diabetes mellitus in the first trimester? A prospective observational study. Int J gynaecology obstetrics: Off Organ Int Fed Gynaecology Obstetrics. (2024) 166 (2):837–843. doi: 10.1002/ijgo.v166.2

25. Ergani SY, Yücel KY, Şahin B, Ateş C, Reis YA, Köse C, et al. The role of inflammation in cases with gestational diabetes mellitus: Systemic immune

inflammatory index according to trimesters. Am J Reprod Immunol (New York NY: 1989). (2024) 91:e13806. doi: 10.1111/aji.13806

26. Xiu X, Lin Y, Chen Z, Lin L, Zu Y, Yan J. Serum parameters of inflammatory markers as prognostic biomarkers with maternal-neonatal outcome in patients with GDM. *Front Med.* (2024) 11:1406492. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2024.1406492

27. Chen Y, Li Y, Liu M, Xu W, Tong S, Liu K. Association between systemic immunity-inflammation index and hypertension in US adults from NHANES 1999-2018. *Sci Rep.* (2024) 14:5677. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-56387-6

28. Liu B, Wang J, Li YY, Li KP, Zhang Q. The association between systemic immune-inflammation index and rheumatoid arthritis: evidence from NHANES 1999-2018. *Arthritis Res Ther.* (2023) 25:34. doi: 10.1186/s13075-023-03018-6

29. Chen Y, Huang R, Mai Z, Chen H, Zhang J, Zhao L, et al. Association between systemic immune-inflammatory index and diabetes mellitus: mediation analysis involving obesity indicators in the NHANES. *Front Public Health.* (2023) 11:1331159. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1331159

30. Ray GW, Zeng Q, Kusi P, Zhang H, Shao T, Yang T, et al. Genetic and inflammatory factors underlying gestational diabetes mellitus: a review. *Front endocrinology*. (2024) 15:1399694. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2024.1399694

31. Abell SK, De Courten B, Boyle JA, Teede HJ. Inflammatory and other biomarkers: role in pathophysiology and prediction of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Int J Mol Sci.* (2015) 16:13442–73. doi: 10.3390/ijms160613442

32. Skórzyńska-Dziduszko KE, Kimber-Trojnar Ż, Patro-Małysza J, Olszewska A, Zaborowski T, Małecka-Massalska T. An interplay between obesity and inflammation in gestational diabetes mellitus. *Curr Pharm Biotechnol.* (2016) 17:603–13. doi: 10.2174/1389201017666160127105926

33. Lekva T, Norwitz ER, Aukrust P, Ueland T. Impact of systemic inflammation on the progression of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Curr Diabetes Rep.* (2016) 16:26. doi: 10.1007/s11892-016-0715-9

34. Chen L, Chen R, Wang H, Liang F. Mechanisms linking inflammation to insulin resistance. *Int J endocrinology*. (2015) 2015:508409. doi: 10.1155/2015/508409

35. Pan X, Jin X, Wang J, Hu Q, Dai B. Placenta inflammation is closely associated with gestational diabetes mellitus. *Am J Trans Res.* (2021) 13:4068–79.

36. Olefsky JM, Glass CK. Macrophages, inflammation, and insulin resistance. Annu Rev Physiol. (2010) 72:219–46. doi: 10.1146/annurev-physiol-021909-135846

37. Lappas M. Activation of inflammasomes in adipose tissue of women with gestational diabetes. *Mol Cell endocrinology.* (2014) 382:74–83. doi: 10.1016/j.mce.2013.09.011

38. Chen Z, Jiang G, Jiang G, Ma S, Zhu Y, Zhao M. Circulating inflammatory cytokines and gestational diabetes mellitus: Unraveling the role of macrophage migration inhibitory factor (MIF) through a bidirectional mendelian randomization study. *Cytokine*. (2024) 182:156734. doi: 10.1016/j.cyto.2024.156734

39. Nie Y, Zhou H, Wang J, Kan H. Association between systemic immuneinflammation index and diabetes: a population-based study from the NHANES. *Front endocrinology*. (2023) 14:1245199. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2023.1245199

40. Meng C, Liu K. Nonlinear association of the systemic immune-inflammatory index with mortality in diabetic patients. *Front endocrinology*. (2024) 15:1334811. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2024.1334811

41. Huang Y, Chen X, You ZS, Gu F, Li L, Wang D, et al. The value of first-trimester platelet parameters in predicting gestational diabetes mellitus. *J maternal-fetal neonatal Med.* (2022) 35:2031–5. doi: 10.1080/14767058.2020.1774543

42. Hessami K, Tabrizi R, Homayoon N, Hashemi A, Heydari ST, Pourhoseini SA. Gestational diabetes mellitus and inflammatory biomarkers of neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio and platelet-lymphocyte ratio: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Biomarkers: Biochem Indic exposure response susceptibility to chemicals.* (2021) 26:491–8. doi: 10.1080/1354750X.2021.1926542

43. Maziashvili G, Juliana K, Siva Subramania Pillai Kanimozhi V, Javakhishvili G, Gurabanidze V, Gagua T, et al. The use of systemic inflammatory markers from routine blood tests in predicting preeclampsia and the impact of age on marker levels. *Cureus.* (2023) 15:e35836. doi: 10.7759/cureus.35836

44. Plows JF, Stanley JL, Baker PN, Reynolds CM, Vickers MH. The pathophysiology of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Int J Mol Sci.* (2018) 19. doi: 10.3390/ijms19113342

45. Dean SV, Lassi ZS, Imam AM, Bhutta ZA. Preconception care: nutritional risks and interventions. *Reprod Health*. (2014) 11 Suppl 3:S3. doi: 10.1186/1742-4755-11-S3-S3

46. Vernini JM, Moreli JB, Magalhães CG, Costa RAA, Rudge MVC, Calderon IMP. Maternal and fetal outcomes in pregnancies complicated by overweight and obesity. *Reprod Health*. (2016) 13:100. doi: 10.1186/s12978-016-0206-0