A core outcome set for the treatment of pregnant women with pregestational diabetes: an international consensus study

Oratile Kgosidialwa[1], Delia Bogdanet[1], Aoife M. Egan[2], Paula M. O'Shea[1], Christine Newman[1], Tomás P Griffin[1], Carmel McDonagh[1], Christine O'Shea[1], Louise Carmody[1], Shamil D. Cooray[3,4], Eleni Anastasiou[5], Ewa Wender-Ozegowska[6], Cheril Clarson[7,8], Alexandra Spadola[9], Fernanda Alvarado[9], Eoin Noctor[10], Gene Dempsey[11],Angela Napoli[12], Caroline Crowther[13], Sander Galjaard[14], Mary R. Loeken[15,16], Michael J.A. Maresh[17], Paddy Gillespie[18], Harold de Valk[19], Andrea Agostini[20], Linda Biesty[21], Declan Devane[21,22], Fidelma Dunne[1]; For the INSPIRED research group.

[1]College of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland.

[2]Division of Endocrinology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, USA.

[3]Diabetes and Endocrinology Units, Monash Health, Clayton, VIC, Australia.

[4]Monash Centre for Health Research and Implementation, Monash University, Clayton, VIC, Australia.

[5]Department Diabetes & Pregnancy Outpatients, Mitera Hospital, Athens, Greece.

[6]Department of Reproduction, Poznan University of Medical Sciences, Poznan, Poland.

[7]Department of Pediatrics, University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada.

[8]Lawson Health Research Institute, London, ON, Canada.

[9]Mother Infant Research Institute, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.

[10]Division of Endocrinology, University Hospital Limerick, Limerick, Ireland.

[11]INFANT Centre and Department of Paediatrics & Child Health, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland.

[12]Department of Clinical and Molecular Medicine, Sant'Andrea University Hospital, Sapienza, University of Rome, Rome, Italy.

[13]Liggins Institute, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.16825

[14]Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Division of Obstetrics and Prenatal Medicine, Erasmus MC, University Medical Centre Rotterdam, Gravendijkwal 230, 3015 CE, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

[15]Section of Islet Cell and Regenerative Biology, Joslin Diabetes Center, Boston, MA, USA.

[16]Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA.

[17]Department of Obstetrics, St Mary's Hospital, Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, UK.

[18]Health Economics and Policy Analysis Centre (HEPAC), National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland.

[19]Department of Internal Medicine, University Medical Centre Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

[20]A.S.LViterbo Distretto A, Consultorio Montefiascone, Rome, Italy.

[21]School of Nursing & Midwifery, National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland

[22]HRB-Trials Methodology Research Network, National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland

Corresponding author

Dr Oratile Kgosidialwa

Galway Diabetes Research Centre, Galway University Hospital, Galway, Ireland

Phone: +353 91 542039

Email: Oratile.Kgosidialwa2@hse.ie

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4249-6302

Shortened running title: A COS for the treatment of pregnant women with pregestational diabetes

Word Count: 3498

Abstract

Objective

To develop a core outcome set (COS) for randomised controlled trials (RCTs) evaluating the effectiveness of interventions for the treatment of pregnant women with pregestational diabetes mellitus (PGDM).

Design

A consensus developmental study.

Setting

International.

Population

Two hundred and five stakeholders completed the first round.

Methods

The study consisted of three components. 1) A systematic review of the literature to produce a list of outcomes reported in RCTs assessing the effectiveness of interventions for the treatment of pregnant women with PGDM. 2) A three-round, online eDelphi survey to prioritise these outcomes by international stakeholders (including healthcare professionals, researchers and women with PGDM). 3) A consensus meeting where stakeholders from each group decided on the final COS.

Results

We extracted 131 unique outcomes from 67 records meeting the full inclusion criteria. Of the 205 stakeholders who completed the first round, 174/205 (85%) and 165/174 (95%) completed round 2 and 3, respectively. Participants at the subsequent consensus meeting chose 19 outcomes for inclusion into the COS: trimester specific HbA1c, maternal weight gain during pregnancy, severe maternal hypoglycaemia, diabetic ketoacidosis, miscarriage, pregnancy induced hypertension, pre-

eclampsia, maternal death, birth weight, large for gestational age, small for gestational age, gestational age at birth, preterm birth, mode of birth, shoulder dystocia, neonatal hypoglycaemia, congenital malformations, stillbirth and neonatal death.

Conclusions

This COS will enable better comparison between RCTs to produce robust evidence synthesis, improve trial reporting and optimise research efficiency in studies assessing treatment of pregnant women with PGDM.

Tweetable abstract 165 key stakeholders have developed #Treatment #CoreOutcomes in pregnant women with #diabetes existing before pregnancy

Introduction

Pregestational diabetes mellitus (PGDM) is defined as diabetes existing before pregnancy (including type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus). PGDM affects 1-4% of pregnancies depending on the population [1, 2]. PGDM prevalence continues to rise globally [3-5], partly due to the obesity epidemic and increasing maternal age [4]. PGDM is associated with adverse pregnancy outcomes including congenital malformations [6], macrosomia [2], preterm birth [2, 7] and increased rates of caesarean delivery [2, 7]. It is also associated with worsening diabetes complications such as diabetic retinopathy and nephropathy [8-10], at least during pregnancy, and developing co-morbidities such as pre-eclampsia (PET) and other hypertensive disorders [11, 12]. Thus, PGDM poses a significant healthcare and economic burden. As a result, there have been advancements in education [13, 14], technology [15, 16] and pharmacology [17] to improve maternal and infant outcomes in women with PGDM.

There is evidence that these advances have improved clinical outcomes for women with diabetes in pregnancy [18]. However, there is no standardised approach to choosing which outcomes are measured or reported making it difficult to compare and contrast the effects of various interventions and robustly synthesize evidence from a combination of trials [19]. To help standardise reporting of outcomes in maternal diabetes, the International Association of Diabetes in Pregnancy Study Groups compiled and created a repository of definitions for maternal and fetal outcomes to

be used universally [19]. This work provides details on 'how' to collect but not 'what' outcomes to measure and report. While it is essential to provide definitions of outcomes, guidance is needed on what outcomes to collect. One approach to help standardise outcome measurement and reporting is using a systematically developed 'Core Outcome Set (COS)'. A COS is an agreed standardised set of outcomes that should be measured and reported, as a minimum, in all clinical trials in specific areas of health or health care [20]. In this process, key stakeholders are consulted to ensure that clinically relevant and patient relevant outcomes are identified and reported. The Core Outcome Measures for Effectiveness Trials (COMET) Initiative (www.comet-initiative.org) provides guidance on COS development and provide a database for ongoing COSs.

This study aimed to develop a COS for randomised controlled trials (RCTs) evaluating the effectiveness of interventions for the treatment of pregnant women with PGDM.

Methods

Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee, Galway University Hospitals, Galway, Ireland (Ref: C.A 2293). The study was registered prospectively with the COMET database (http://www.comet-initiative.org/studies/details/1425). The systematic review component of the study was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) database (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020173549). A detailed study protocol prepared in line with the Core Outcome Set-STAndardised Protocol Items (COS-STAP) Statement recommendations [21] has been published elsewhere[22].

This study consisted of 3 components:

1. A systematic literature review to identify a list of all outcomes reported in prior or ongoing randomised controlled studies (RCTs) of interventions for the treatment of pregnant women with PGDM.
2. A three-round eDelphi survey where key stakeholders prioritised these outcomes.
3. A consensus meeting where a list of core outcomes was finalised to form the COS.

Systematic Review

Data Sources and Searches

The following databases were searched for RCTs evaluating the effectiveness of interventions in pregnant women with PGDM; CENTRAL (via the Cochrane Library), Web of Science Medline (via OVID platform), Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (via EBSCO host platform) and Embase.ClinicalTrials.gov and references were checked for studies not captured in the search. A combination of keywords and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms were used to search for specific concepts. They were then combined using Boolean operators to formulate the final search strategy. A sample search strategy is shown in the supplementary Table S1.

Study Selection

We included any RCT assessing outcomes of treatment interventions in pregnant women with PGDM reported in English. Two reviewers (OK and DB) independently screened titles and abstracts of the selected studies to ensure eligibility. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and recourse to a third author (FD) if necessary. Full-text papers of selected studies were reviewed by both reviewers before the final decision regarding inclusion.

Data Extraction

All reported outcomes were extracted from the 'methods' and 'results' section of the paper. A sample of the extraction template is shown in Table S2.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

Outcomes were grouped into 'maternal', 'fetal/neonatal' and 'other' outcomes. The study advisory group (SAG) including women with PGDM (CM and CO), HCPs and researchers (OK , DB , PMO, LB,DD and FD) then reviewed the outcomes and further grouped them into the following domains:. maternal (blood/urine parameters and monitoring, complications, life impact/psychological, miscellaneous), fetal/infant (laboratory measures, biometrics and anthropometrics, complications, miscellaneous) and other.

eDelphi Study Process

A three-round eDelphi survey was completed using the SurveyMethods software (https://surveymethods.com/). During this process, stakeholders were asked to rate outcomes for inclusion into the COS.

Stakeholders

Stakeholders were an international group of participants, including women and their representatives, healthcare professionals (HCPs), researchers and policymakers. Women were recruited via email, face to face and social media. We recruited HCPs, researchers and policymakers with experience in the care of women with PGDM via email and social media. The leads of national and international organisations involved in the care of women with PGDM were contacted via email to encourage the participation of their members. All who participated were also encouraged to forward the study invite to anyone they deemed to have expertise in any field of maternal diabetes. We sent reminder emails to all participants who did not complete the survey.

Online international eDelphi surveys

In the email invite explaining the study, we provided a link to direct the stakeholders to the survey page. Participants were able to provide explicit consent to take part in the study before proceeding. All participants who consented to the study were asked to provide demographic information including name, gender, ethnicity, stakeholder group, country of residence and email address at each survey round. A list of outcomes grouped into domains was provided to participants who were asked to rate the importance of the outcome for inclusion in the COS using a 9-point Likert type scale with score l representing an outcome of least importance and 9 representing an outcome of critical importance. The 'unable to rate' option was available for all the outcomes for those who were unable to decide on a particular outcome. Clinical terms were explained using plain English to help those unfamiliar with medical terms, particularly women and their representatives, better understand the outcomes.

On the first round, participants were asked to rate outcomes and include up to two outcomes they thought might have been omitted. They were also required to complete the survey within four weeks with reminder emails sent to those who had not completed the questionnaire within the first two weeks to reduce attrition rates. On completion of round 1, participants were sent their results in addition to those of their stakeholder group and the collective group to review.

All outcomes from round 1 were included in round 2. In addition, the unique outcomes suggested by at-least two participants in round 1 were included in the round 2 survey. Only participants who completed round 1 were invited to round 2. Outcomes satisfying the inclusion criteria in round 2

progressed to round 3. 'Consensus in' for any outcome was defined as ≥70% participants scoring 7 to 9 and <15% scoring 1 to 3. 'Consensus out' was defined as ≤50% participants scoring 7-9 in each stakeholder group. Outcomes that did not meet any of these criteria were labelled as 'no consensus'. Only outcomes labelled as 'consensus in' progressed to round 3. Stakeholders were sent their individual results in addition to those of their stakeholder group and the collective group to review.

Participants who completed round 1 and 2 were invited to complete round 3. Only outcomes labelled as 'consensus in' progressed to the consensus meeting. These outcomes were forwarded to the consensus meeting participants before the meeting to review.

Consensus meeting

An online consensus meeting was carried out on the 1st of October 2020 via Zoom (https://zoom.us/) to finalise the COS. The meeting was chaired by an experienced, non-voting facilitator (DD).The facilitator provided an overview of the study, introduced each outcome, provided a plain language explanation, and ensured that all participants had an opportunity to make their opinion heard during the discussions. The panel consisted of an international audience with broad expertise in clinical maternal diabetes and research. Participants used a live poll within Zoom to vote anonymously on each outcome brought forward from round 3. Participants were asked to vote 'yes' or 'no' for each outcome for inclusion in the COS after an open discussion. An outcome was included in the final COS when ≥70% participants voted 'yes'. Voting was repeated after further discussion for outcomes with a borderline score (e.g., 69% 'yes'/31% 'no'). To facilitate dissemination and usefulness, some outcomes were renamed if necessary.

Patient Involvement

Women were invited to participate as part of the SAG prior to commencement of the study. In this role, women contributed to important aspects of the study. They reviewed all listed outcome plain English definitions prior to dissemination to the wider audience to ensure that outcomes were understood by non-medical participants. They were involved in participant recruitment, COS development and manuscript writing.

Results

Systematic Review

The results of the systematic review are shown in figure S1. Of the 1475 potentially relevant studies, 67 [16, 17, 23-87]fulfilled the inclusion criteria (table 1). Two hundred and ten outcomes were extracted from the studies. Following SAG review where similar outcomes were combined, duplicate outcomes removed and outcome terminology clarified, 131 unique outcomes (69 maternal, 61 fetal/infant and one other) were presented for the first round (Table S3).

eDelphi Surveys

The first round was completed by 205 participants. One hundred and forty-eight (72.2%) of the participants were female. One hundred and twenty-three (60.0%), 36 (17.6%) and 46 (22.4%) participants identified as HCP , researcher/policymaker, and woman with PGDM/representative respectively. HCP were represented by clinical biochemists, diabetologists/endocrinologists, diabetes nurse specialists, dieticians, general practitioners, midwives, obstetricians, paediatricians, and pharmacists. The country of residence and ethnicity distribution of participants for all the three rounds are shown in Table S4. One hundred and sixty-two (79.0%), 19 (9.3%), 10 (4.9), 6 (2.9%), 6 (2.9%) and two (1.0%) participants were from Europe, North America, Australia & New Zealand, Asia, South America and Africa respectively in round 1.

Round 2 was completed by 174 participants, giving a retention rate of 85% from round 1. Six new outcomes were added to round 2 as they had been suggested by more than one participant in round 1, bringing the total number of outcomes for round 2 to 137 (table 2 and 3).These additional outcomes were; ‘cardiovascular complications’, ‘post-partum depression’, ‘diabetes burnout’, ‘duration of breastfeeding’, ‘offspring incidence of diabetes’ and ‘out of pocket cost of treatment’. One hundred and twenty-five (71.8%) participants were female. One hundred and twenty-one (69.5%), 14 (8.0%) and 39 (22.4%) participants identified as HCPs , researcher/policymaker and woman with PGDM/ representative respectively.

Ninety-five percent (165/174) of the participants completed round 3. Eighty-one outcomes were brought forward from round 2. In round 3, 116 (70.3%), 13 (7.9%) and 36 (21.8%) of respondents identified as HCPs , researchers/policymakers and women /representatives respectively. Sixty-two outcomes classified as ‘consensus in’ were brought forward to the consensus meeting.

Consensus Meeting

The consensus meeting panel consisted of 26 voting participants and one non-voting facilitator. The voting participants were an international audience from all the stakeholder groups; HCPs (n=21), researchers/policymakers (n=3) and women (n=2). Most of the HCPs also identified as researchers. Of those who identified as HCPs , 11 were endocrinologists, 6 were obstetricians, one midwife, one paediatrician, one neonatologist and one chemical pathologist. Participants were based in Europe (n=19), North America (n=5) and Australia/ New Zealand (n=2).

Before voting on each outcome, participants were shown the results (graphical representation and percentages) of how that outcome had scored in round three by each stakeholder group and the group as a collective. Six outcomes had a borderline score on initial voting (i.e. 69% 'yes' /31% 'no'). These outcomes were discussed at length and voting was carried out again. Discussions were broadly centred around ease of measuring the outcome, consensus on definitions and overall clinical relevance and importance. All outcomes for inclusion in the COS were then discussed at the end of the meeting and any queries discussed and addressed. A list of the final COS including 8 maternal and 11 fetal/neonatal outcomes is shown in Table 4. .

Time above glycaemic target', 'time in range' and 'duration of hypoglycaemia' although important, were felt to be applicable only to studies where continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) data were available. It was recommended that these outcomes can be reported in CGM studies in addition to this COS.

Some outcomes although deemed important were excluded from the COS., 'Polyhydramnios' was excluded because it is typically considered a surrogate marker for adverse pregnancy outcomes, rather than an endpoint in itself. 'Progression of retinopathy' was excluded because not all studies (especially those based in emerging economies) can measure this outcome and thus would limit acceptability. 'Neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) admissions' was excluded because of differences in criteria for admission of infants to NICU. Outcomes excluded because lack of universally agreed definitions include: 'glycaemic control' and 'hypoxic ischaemic encephalopathy'. 'Severe maternal hypoglycaemia' was favoured over 'maternal hypoglycaemia' because the former is more clinically meaningful. The following outcomes were excluded because

they were well below the inclusion threshold at the initial vote and although the meeting chair opened and encouraged discussion on each of these outcomes, no participant voiced a desire to include: 'HELLP syndrome', 'cardiovascular complications' and 'APGAR (5 minutes)'.'Excessive maternal weight gain during pregnancy' was changed to 'maternal weight gain during pregnancy' to encompass all weight changes during pregnancy including excessive and insufficient weight gain.

Discussion

Main Findings

An international group of key stakeholders agreed on a 19 outcome COS for future studies evaluating interventions in pregnant women with PGDM. We hope that the systematic implementation of this COS will help reduce outcome reporting heterogeneity and bias. This will help build robust evidence synthesis and reduce research waste in this important topic.

Strengths and Limitations

Outcomes reported in RCTs only, were used as the basis of our systematic literature review as the aim of the study was to define a COS for RCTs. We chose to search for studies in the databases reported in the methods for the literature review as prior COS studies by our group in the area of maternal diabetes from these databases yielded comprehensive results [88, 89]. Limiting our search to the English language, may have introduced selection bias,however, in round one of the eDelphi survey, we gave participants the opportunity to add outcomes that they felt were omitted from the extracted list.

From the systematic search, 210 outcomes were extracted from the literature. To limit respondent fatigue during the eDelphi surveys, the SAG combined similar outcomes and removed duplicates, resulting in 131 unique outcomes. There is very little guidance in the literature in how to define, extract, group, and count trial outcomes [90]. Advise was sought from relevant professionals, e.g neonatologist, to ensure that outcome definitions and grouping were appropriate.

The INSPIRED group believes in the importance of Patient and Public Involvement [91]. Therefore, women were involved in a number of important aspects of the study including being part of the

SAG and the consensus meeting in addition to making up the second largest group of stakeholders in all rounds of the eDelphi survey.

There is currently no consensus on the ratio of patients to HCPs/researchers in both the eDelphi process and the consensus meeting. In this study, the consensus meeting was represented mainly by HCPs/researchers but also included two women. This has the potential to introduce bias. However, during the consensus meeting, women shared experiences of outcomes that were important to them. In doing so, the group took on board patients' unique point of view prior to voting.

There is also no consensus on the best way to facilitate patient participation in COS development. Work has been done to tease out ways of making COS development more meaningful and accessible for patients[92]. The COMET People and Patient Participation, Involvement and Engagement working group has been established within the initiative specifically focusing on the public's involvement and participation in the development of COSs.

Unique outcomes were scored by local and international stakeholders in an online eDelphi survey format to give equal voice to all stakeholders. The stakeholders had a variety of expertise in all areas of maternal diabetes. Another limitation in our study is that, although we sought to recruit participants internationally, a majority of the respondents were from Europe and North America, similar to other COSs [93]. Although this has not been formally evaluated, others have suggested translating surveys into different languages and having a facilitator engage with stakeholders (particularly patients) during the eDelphi process to improve engagement with low- and middle-income country (LMIC) participants [94]. However, the outcomes listed in the final COS (table 1) are for the most part easily measured and recorded globally. This will make the COS globally applicable where studies performed in LMIC can adapt the COS in addition to their specific outcomes of interest.

There is no consensus regarding study sample size appropriate for COS development. Prior COS work by our group involved 173 and 288 participants respectively after round one [88, 89]. In this study, we had 205 participants after round one. There were low attrition rates between rounds of the eDelphi survey (15% round one to two and 5% round two to three).

All outcomes satisfying the inclusion criteria from round three of the eDelphi survey were brought forward to a consensus meeting where an international audience with expertise in this area of maternal diabetes participated in decision making for the final COS. Adapting to the current social distancing measures in the setting of a COVID-19 pandemic, we conducted a successful online consensus meeting. As the consensus meeting was made up of an international group in different time zones, communication and organisation were key in the weeks and days leading up to the meeting to find a suitable time for all. Anonymous voting during this time ensured that no single person was put under pressure to vote a certain way for any given outcome. The facilitator ensured that all voices were heard and detailed discussions informed voting.

Interpretation

Outcome reporting in the RCTs assessing treatment interventions in pregnant women with PGDM is heterogenous regardless of the specific intervention under study. It should be emphasised that this COS was focused on 'what should be measured and/or reported' and not 'how it should be measured'. A general plain English definition of each outcome was provided during both the eDelphi survey stage and consensus meeting in order to assist those unfamiliar with medical terms to make informed decisions. This COS highlights the importance of a common language and is complementary to prior work by Feig et al which provides a repository of a set of definitions for clinical outcomes in diabetes in pregnancy [19].

Although this COS focused specifically on RCTs, it has relevance to other types of studies, audits and quality improvement projects. Researchers are also not limited to outcomes listed in the COS but can measure and report additional outcomes of particular relevance to their topic [20]. For example, although none of the maternal life impact and psychological outcomes were included in the COS, these are still important outcomes that need further research.

Apart from HbA1c measurement, all of the outcomes listed in the COS are primarily observational and thus would not require additional resources.

The James Lind Alliance through the Diabetes and Pregnancy Priority Setting Partnership (PSP) has formulated a list of ten questions chosen by patients and clinicians to prioritise future research in diabetes and pregnancy to deliver maximum value and impact. For diabetes in pregnancy, a significant number of these research questions will assess interventions to improve outcomes for

both mother and baby. Thus, it is now timely to entrench this COS in the research in order to make meaningful comparisons between interventions in the future.

Conclusions

This is the first COS for studies evaluating the effectiveness of interventions for the treatment of pregnant women with PGDM. This COS, agreed upon by key stakeholders including women with diabetes, will enable greater comparison and evidence synthesis across future RCTs in this area of maternal diabetes. In addition, this COS will help improve trial reporting and minimise research waste by prioritising the collection and reporting of outcomes that matter to all relevant stakeholder group. We now call upon researchers, funders and journals to incorporate this COS into trials, thereby improving research in pregnant women with PGDM and ultimately the health of these women and their babies. The use of an online platform to conduct the consensus meeting is novel in this type of research but is likely to be used more commonly and has the ability for increased participation from LMIC.

Acknowledgments

We thank all the stakeholders who participated in this study, particularly the women with PGDM and their representatives. We also thank Eric McSpadden (University Hospitals Galway, Galway, Ireland) who provided technical support.

Conflict-of-interest statement

None of the authors have any conflict of interest to declare.

Author contributions

OK and DB conducted the literature review. OK, DB, CM, CO, AME, PMO, CN, LB, DD, FD contributed to participant recruitment, COS development (as part of the SAG) and manuscript writing. TPG, LC, SDC, EA, EWO, C Clarson, AS, FA, EN, GD, AN, C Crowther, SG, MRL, MJAM, PG, HdeV, AA contributed to participant recruitment, COS development and manuscript writing. All authors revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content and approved the final version to be published. OK co-ordinated the study and is responsible for the integrity of the work as a whole.

Ethics Approval

Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee, Galway University Hospitals, Galway, Ireland (Ref: C.A 2293).

Funding/financial support

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency.

Figures and tables legends

Table 1: List of trials included in the systematic review.

Table 2: Maternal outcomes progression from round 2 of eDelphi to end of consensus meeting.

* Outcome suggested by more than one participant in round 1.

Outcome rephrased to 'maternal weight gain during pregnancy' at the consensus meeting

Table 3: Fetal/Infant and Other outcomes progression from round 2 of eDelphi to end of consensus meeting.

* Outcome suggested by more than one participant in round 1.

Table 4: Final list of outcomes to be included in a COS of all future studies of treatment interventions in pregnant women with pregestational diabetes (HbA1c Glycated haemoglobin, * Rephrased from 'Excessive maternal weight gain during pregnancy').

Figure S1: PRISMA flowchart of selection of studies for systematic review.

Table S1: Sample search strategy from EMBASE (via EBSCOHOST platform) (Searched up to 16 January 2020).

Table S2: Sample outcome extraction (T2DM Type 2 diabetes mellitus, PIH Pregnancy induced hypertension, PET Pre-eclampsia, BGL Blood glucose levels, NICU Neonatal intensive care unit, LGA Large for gestational age, SGA Small for gestational age, TTN Transient tachypnea of the newborn, RDS-Respiratory distress syndrome, BP Blood pressure).

Table S3: Outcomes included in eDelphi round 1 and percentage of participants scoring each outcome 7-9.

Table S4: Country of residence and ethnicity distribution of eDelphi survey participants.

References

1. Deputy NP, Kim SY, Conrey EJ, Bullard KM. Prevalence and Changes in Preexisting Diabetes and Gestational Diabetes Among Women Who Had a Live Birth - United States, 2012-2016. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2018;67(43):1201-7.

2. Wahabi H, Fayed A, Esmaeil S, Mamdouh H, Kotb R. Prevalence and Complications of Pregestational and Gestational Diabetes in Saudi Women: Analysis from Riyadh Mother and Baby Cohort Study (RAHMA). Biomed Res Int. 2017;2017:6878263.

3. Fadl HE, Simmons D. Trends in diabetes in pregnancy in Sweden 1998-2012. BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care. 2016;4(1):e000221.

4. Albrecht SS, Kuklina EV, Bansil P, Jamieson DJ, Whiteman MK, Kourtis AP, et al. Diabetes trends among delivery hospitalizations in the U.S., 1994-2004. Diabetes Care. 2010;33(4):768-73.

5. Guariguata L, Linnenkamp U, Beagley J, Whiting DR, Cho NH. Global estimates of the prevalence of hyperglycaemia in pregnancy. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2014;103(2):176-85.

6. Eriksen NB, Damm P, Mathiesen ER, Ringholm L. The prevalence of congenital malformations is still higher in pregnant women with pregestational diabetes despite near-normal HbA1c: a literature review. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2019;32(8):1225-9.

7. Mackin ST, Nelson SM, Kerssens JJ, Wood R, Wild S, Colhoun HM, et al. Diabetes and pregnancy: national trends over a 15 year period. Diabetologia. 2018;61(5):1081-8.

8. Vestgaard M, Ringholm L, Laugesen CS, Rasmussen KL, Damm P, Mathiesen ER. Pregnancy-induced sight-threatening diabetic retinopathy in women with Type 1 diabetes. Diabet Med. 2010;27(4):431-5.

9. Rasmussen KL, Laugesen CS, Ringholm L, Vestgaard M, Damm P, Mathiesen ER. Progression of diabetic retinopathy during pregnancy in women with type 2 diabetes. Diabetologia. 2010;53(6):1076-83.

10. Spotti D. Pregnancy in women with diabetic nephropathy. J Nephrol. 2019;32(3):379-88.

11. Knight KM, Thornburg LL, Pressman EK. Pregnancy outcomes in type 2 diabetic patients as compared with type 1 diabetic patients and nondiabetic controls. J Reprod Med. 2012;57(9-10):397-404.

12. Shen M, Smith GN, Rodger M, White RR, Walker MC, Wen SW. Comparison of risk factors and outcomes of gestational hypertension and pre-eclampsia. PLoS One. 2017;12(4):e0175914.

13. Howorka K, Pumprla J, Gabriel M, Feiks A, Schlusche C, Nowotny C, et al. Normalization of pregnancy outcome in pregestational diabetes through functional insulin treatment and modular out-patient education adapted for pregnancy. Diabet Med. 2001;18(12):965-72.

14. Yamamoto JM, Hughes DJF, Evans ML, Karunakaran V, Clark JDA, Morrish NJ, et al. Community-based pre-pregnancy care programme improves pregnancy preparation in women with pregestational diabetes. Diabetologia. 2018;61(7):1528-37.

15. Kallas-Koeman MM, Kong JM, Klinke JA, Butalia S, Lodha AK, Lim KI, et al. Insulin pump use in pregnancy is associated with lower HbA1c without increasing the rate of severe hypoglycaemia or diabetic ketoacidosis in women with type 1 diabetes. Diabetologia. 2014;57(4):681-9.

16. Stewart ZA, Wilinska ME, Hartnell S, O'Neil LK, Rayman G, Scott EM, et al. Day-and-Night Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery in a Broad Population of Pregnant Women With Type 1 Diabetes: A Randomized Controlled Crossover Trial. Diabetes Care. 2018;41(7):1391-9.

17. Hod M, Mathiesen ER, Jovanovic L, McCance DR, Ivanisevic M, Duran-Garcia S, et al. A randomized trial comparing perinatal outcomes using insulin detemir or neutral protamine Hagedorn in type 1 diabetes. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2014;27(1):7-13.

18. Feig DS, Murphy HR. Continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with Type 1 diabetes: benefits for mothers, using pumps or pens, and their babies. Diabet Med. 2018;35(4):430-5.

19. International Association of Diabetes in Pregnancy Study Group Working Group on Outcome D, Feig DS, Corcoy R, Jensen DM, Kautzky-Willer A, Nolan CJ, et al. Diabetes in pregnancy outcomes: a systematic review and proposed codification of definitions. Diabetes Metab Res Rev. 2015;31(7):680-90.

20. Clarke M, Williamson PR. Core outcome sets and systematic reviews. Syst Rev. 2016;5:11.

21. Kirkham JJ, Gorst S, Altman DG, Blazeby JM, Clarke M, Tunis S, et al. Core Outcome Set-STAndardised Protocol Items: the COS-STAP Statement. Trials. 2019;20(1):116.

22. Kgosidialwa O, Bogdanet D, Egan A, O'Shea PM, Biesty L, Devane D, et al. Developing a core outcome set for the treatment of pregnant women with pregestational diabetes-a study protocol. Trials. 2020;21(1):1017.

23. Linden K, Berg M, Adolfsson A, Sparud-Lundin C. Person-centred, web-based support in pregnancy and early motherhood for women with Type 1 diabetes mellitus: a randomized controlled trial. Diabet Med. 2018;35(2):232-41.

24. Mostello D. Adherence to a Diabetes Care Regimen Following Text Message Intervention in Pregnant Women With Diabetes. https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03025984; 2016.

25. Ainuddin JA, Karim N, Zaheer S, Ali SS, Hasan AA. Metformin treatment in type 2 diabetes in pregnancy: an active controlled, parallel-group, randomized, open label study in patients with type 2 diabetes in pregnancy. J Diabetes Res. 2015;2015:325851.

26. Carr KJ, Idama TO, Masson EA, Ellis K, Lindow SW. A randomised controlled trial of insulin lispro given before or after meals in pregnant women with type 1 diabetes--the effect on glycaemic excursion. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2004;24(4):382-6.

27. Bartholomew ML, Soules K, Church K, Shaha S, Burlingame J, Graham G, et al. Managing Diabetes in Pregnancy Using Cell Phone/Internet Technology. Clin Diabetes. 2015;33(4):169-74.

28. Murphy HR, Kumareswaran K, Elleri D, Allen JM, Caldwell K, Biagioni M, et al. Safety and efficacy of 24-h closed-loop insulin delivery in well-controlled pregnant women with type 1 diabetes: a randomized crossover case series. Diabetes Care. 2011;34(12):2527-9.

29. Feig DS, Donovan LE, Corcoy R, Murphy KE, Amiel SA, Hunt KF, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with type 1 diabetes (CONCEPTT): a multicentre international randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2017;390(10110):2347-59.

30. Bartal M. Detemir Versus NPH for Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Pregnancy: A Comparative-effectiveness, Open Label, Randomized Controlled Trial. https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03620890; 2018.

31. Beazley D, Ahokas R, Livingston J, Griggs M, Sibai BM. Vitamin C and E supplementation in women at high risk for preeclampsia: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2005;192(2):520-1.

32. Berry DC, Thomas SD, Dorman KF, Ivins AR, de Los Angeles Abreu M, Young L, et al. Rationale, design, and methods for the Medical Optimization and Management of Pregnancies with Overt Type 2 Diabetes (MOMPOD) study. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2018;18(1):488.

33. Beyuo T, Obed SA, Adjepong-Yamoah KK, Bugyei KA, Oppong SA, Marfoh K. Metformin versus Insulin in the Management of Pre-Gestational Diabetes Mellitus in Pregnancy and Gestational Diabetes Mellitus at the Korle Bu Teaching Hospital: A Randomized Clinical Trial. PLoS One. 2015;10(5):e0125712.

34. Brooten D, Youngblut JM, Brown L, Finkler SA, Neff DF, Madigan E. A randomized trial of nurse specialist home care for women with high-risk pregnancies: outcomes and costs. Am J Manag Care. 2001;7(8):793-803.

35. Burkart W, Hanker JP, Schneider HP. Complications and fetal outcome in diabetic pregnancy. Intensified conventional versus insulin pump therapy. Gynecol Obstet Invest. 1988;26(2):104-12.

36. Caritis S, Sibai B, Hauth J, Lindheimer MD, Klebanoff M, Thom E, et al. Low-dose aspirin to prevent preeclampsia in women at high risk. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Network of Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units. N Engl J Med. 1998;338(11):701-5.

37. Cordua S, Secher AL, Ringholm L, Damm P, Mathiesen ER. Real-time continuous glucose monitoring during labour and delivery in women with Type 1 diabetes - observations from a randomized controlled trial. Diabet Med. 2013;30(11):1374-81.

38. Demarini S, Mimouni F, Tsang RC, Khoury J, Hertzberg V. Impact of metabolic control of diabetes during pregnancy on neonatal hypocalcemia: a randomized study. Obstet Gynecol. 1994;83(6):918-22.

39. di Biase N, Napoli A, Sabbatini A, Borrello E, Buongiorno AM, Fallucca F. Telemedicine in the treatment of diabetic pregnancy. Ann Ist Super Sanita. 1997;33(3):347-51.

40. Dieb AS. Effect of Adding Metformin to Insulin Therapy on Pregnancy Outcomes in Women With Uncontrolled Type I Diabetes. In: Mahmoud AKAAGMA, editor.: https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03928340; 2019.
41. Feghali MN. Metformin for Preeclampsia Prevention in Pregnant Women With Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus. https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03570632; 2019.
42. Feig DS, Murphy K, Asztalos E, Tomlinson G, Sanchez J, Zinman B, et al. Metformin in women with type 2 diabetes in pregnancy (MiTy): a multi-center randomized controlled trial. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2016;16(1):173.
43. Finnegan C, Breathnach F, Dicker P, Fernandez E, Tully E, Higgins M, et al. Investigating the role of early low-dose aspirin in diabetes: A phase III multicentre double-blinded placebo-controlled randomised trial of aspirin therapy initiated in the first trimester of diabetes pregnancy. Contemp Clin Trials Commun. 2019;16:100465.
44. Forster DA, Moorhead AM, Jacobs SE, Davis PG, Walker SP, McEgan KM, et al. Advising women with diabetes in pregnancy to express breastmilk in late pregnancy (Diabetes and Antenatal Milk Expressing [DAME]): a multicentre, unblinded, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2017;389(10085):2204-13.
45. Garmy G. Effect of Intrapartum Glucose With Compared to Without Constant Intravenous Insulin on Neonatal Hypoglycemia Among Diabetic Women. A Randomized Controlled Trial. https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03273881; 2017.
46. Gray L. Utilizing mHealth to Improve Diabetes in an Obstetric Population. https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03504592; 2018.
47. Hanson U, Persson B, Enochsson E, Lennerhagen P, Lindgren F, Lundstrom V, et al. Self-monitoring of blood glucose by diabetic women during the third trimester of pregnancy. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1984;150(7):817-21.
48. Hayden T, Perantie DC, Nix BD, Barnes LD, Mostello DJ, Holcomb WL, et al. Treating prepartum depression to improve infant developmental outcomes: a study of diabetes in pregnancy. J Clin Psychol Med Settings. 2012;19(3):285-92.
49. Herrera KM, Rosenn BM, Foroutan J, Bimson BE, Al Ibraheemi Z, Moshier EL, et al. Randomized controlled trial of insulin detemir versus NPH for the treatment of pregnant women with diabetes. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2015;213(3):426 e1-7.
50. Hickman MA, McBride R, Boggess KA, Strauss R. Metformin compared with insulin in the treatment of pregnant women with overt diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. Am J Perinatol. 2013;30(6):483-90.

51. Hod M, Damm P, Kaaja R, Visser GH, Dunne F, Demidova I, et al. Fetal and perinatal outcomes in type 1 diabetes pregnancy: a randomized study comparing insulin aspart with human insulin in 322 subjects. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2008;198(2):186 e1-7.

52. Horvaticek M, Djelmis J, Ivanisevic M, Oreskovic S, Herman M. Effect of eicosapentaenoic acid and docosahexaenoic acid supplementation on C-peptide preservation in pregnant women with type-1 diabetes: randomized placebo controlled clinical trial. Eur J Clin Nutr. 2017;71(8):968-72.

53. Ibrahim MI, Hamdy A, Shafik A, Taha S, Anwar M, Faris M. The role of adding metformin in insulin-resistant diabetic pregnant women: a randomized controlled trial. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2014;289(5):959-65.

54. Incerpi MH, Fassett MJ, Kjos SL, Tran SH, Wing DA. Vaginally administered misoprostol for outpatient cervical ripening in pregnancies complicated by diabetes mellitus. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2001;185(4):916-9.

55. Jovanovic-Peterson L, Kitzmiller JL, Peterson CM. Randomized trial of human versus animal species insulin in diabetic pregnant women: improved glycemic control, not fewer antibodies to insulin, influences birth weight. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1992;167(5):1325-30.

56. Kjos SL, Henry OA, Montoro M, Buchanan TA, Mestman JH. Insulin-requiring diabetes in pregnancy: a randomized trial of active induction of labor and expectant management. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1993;169(3):611-5.

57. Laatikainen L, Teramo K, Hieta-Heikurainen H, Koivisto V, Pelkonen R. A controlled study of the influence of continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion treatment on diabetic retinopathy during pregnancy. Acta Med Scand. 1987;221(4):367-76.

58. Lin L, Zhu Y, Li B, Yang H, Group AS. Low-dose aspirin in the prevention of pre-eclampsia in China (APPEC study): protocol for a multicentre randomized controlled trial. Trials. 2018;19(1):608.

59. Manderson JG, Patterson CC, Hadden DR, Traub AI, Ennis C, McCance DR. Preprandial versus postprandial blood glucose monitoring in type 1 diabetic pregnancy: a randomized controlled clinical trial. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2003;189(2):507-12.

60. Mathiesen ER, Hod M, Ivanisevic M, Duran Garcia S, Brondsted L, Jovanovic L, et al. Maternal efficacy and safety outcomes in a randomized, controlled trial comparing insulin detemir with NPH insulin in 310 pregnant women with type 1 diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2012;35(10):2012-7.

61. Mathiesen ER, Kinsley B, Amiel SA, Heller S, McCance D, Duran S, et al. Maternal glycemic control and hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetic pregnancy: a randomized trial of insulin aspart versus human insulin in 322 pregnant women. Diabetes Care. 2007;30(4):771-6.

62. McCance DR, Holmes VA, Maresh MJ, Patterson CC, Walker JD, Pearson DW, et al. Vitamins C and E for prevention of pre-eclampsia in women with type 1 diabetes (DAPIT): a randomised placebo-controlled trial. Lancet. 2010;376(9737):259-66.

63. Mimouni F, Miodovnik M, Whitsett JA, Holroyde JC, Siddiqi TA, Tsang RC. Respiratory distress syndrome in infants of diabetic mothers in the 1980s: no direct adverse effect of maternal diabetes with modern management. Obstet Gynecol. 1987;69(2):191-5.

64. Min Y, Djahanbakhch O, Hutchinson J, Bhullar AS, Raveendran M, Hallot A, et al. Effect of docosahexaenoic acid-enriched fish oil supplementation in pregnant women with Type 2 diabetes on membrane fatty acids and fetal body composition--double-blinded randomized placebo-controlled trial. Diabet Med. 2014;31(11):1331-40.

65. Monincx WM, Zondervan HA, Birnie E, Ris M, Bossuyt PM. High risk pregnancy monitored antenatally at home. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 1997;75(2):147-53.

66. Murphy HR, Rayman G, Lewis K, Kelly S, Johal B, Duffield K, et al. Effectiveness of continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with diabetes: randomised clinical trial. BMJ. 2008;337:a1680.

67. Nachum Z, Ben-Shlomo I, Weiner E, Shalev E. Twice daily versus four times daily insulin dose regimens for diabetes in pregnancy: randomised controlled trial. BMJ. 1999;319(7219):1223-7.

68. Ney D, Hollingsworth DR, Cousins L. Decreased insulin requirement and improved control of diabetes in pregnant women given a high-carbohydrate, high-fiber, low-fat diet. Diabetes Care. 1982;5(5):529-33.

69. Nor Azlin MI, Nor NA, Sufian SS, Mustafa N, Jamil MA, Kamaruddin NA. Comparative study of two insulin regimes in pregnancy complicated by diabetes mellitus. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2007;86(4):407-8.

70. Notelovitz M. Sulphonylurea therapy in the treatment of the pregnant diabetic. S Afr Med J. 1971;45(9):226-9.

71. Perichart-Perera O, Balas-Nakash M, Rodriguez-Cano A, Legorreta-Legorreta J, Parra-Covarrubias A, Vadillo-Ortega F. Low Glycemic Index Carbohydrates versus All Types of Carbohydrates for Treating Diabetes in Pregnancy: A Randomized Clinical Trial to Evaluate the Effect of Glycemic Control. Int J Endocrinol. 2012;2012:296017.

72. Persson B, Swahn ML, Hjertberg R, Hanson U, Nord E, Nordlander E, et al. Insulin lispro therapy in pregnancies complicated by type 1 diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2002;58(2):115-21.

73. Petrovski G, Dimitrovski C, Bogoev M, Milenkovic T, Ahmeti I, Bitovska I. Is there a difference in pregnancy and glycemic outcome in patients with type 1 diabetes on insulin pump with constant or intermittent glucose monitoring? A pilot study. Diabetes Technol Ther. 2011;13(11):1109-13.

74. Polsky S. Pregnancy Intervention With a Closed-Loop System (PICLS) Study. https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03774186; 2019.
75. Refuerzo JS, Gowen R, Pedroza C, Hutchinson M, Blackwell SC, Ramin S. A pilot randomized, controlled trial of metformin versus insulin in women with type 2 diabetes mellitus during pregnancy. Am J Perinatol. 2015;30(2):163-70.
76. Ringholm L. Insulin Fiasp vs. Insulin Novorapid During Pregnancy and Laction in Women With Pre-existing Diabetes. https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03770767; 2019.
77. Rosenberg VA, Eglinton GS, Rauch ER, Skupski DW. Intrapartum maternal glycemic control in women with insulin requiring diabetes: a randomized clinical trial of rotating fluids versus insulin drip. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2006;195(4):1095-9.
78. Sacks DA, Feig DS, Liu IL, Wolde-Tsadik G. Managing type I diabetes in pregnancy: how near normal is necessary? J Perinatol. 2006;26(8):458-62.
79. Secher AL, Ringholm L, Andersen HU, Damm P, Mathiesen ER. The effect of real-time continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. Diabetes Care. 2013;36(7):1877-83.
80. Stewart ZA, Wilinska ME, Hartnell S, Temple RC, Rayman G, Stanley KP, et al. Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery during Pregnancy in Women with Type 1 Diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(7):644-54.
81. Varner MW. Efficacy of home glucose monitoring in diabetic pregnancy. Am J Med. 1983;75(4):592-6.
82. Voormolen DN, DeVries JH, Sanson RME, Heringa MP, de Valk HW, Kok M, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring during diabetic pregnancy (GlucoMOMS): A multicentre randomized controlled trial. Diabetes Obes Metab. 2018;20(8):1894-902.
83. Wen SW, White RR, Rybak N, Gaudet LM, Robson S, Hague W, et al. Effect of high dose folic acid supplementation in pregnancy on pre-eclampsia (FACT): double blind, phase III, randomised controlled, international, multicentre trial. BMJ. 2018;362:k3478.
84. Wojcicki JM, Ladyzynski P, Krzymien J, Jozwicka E, Blachowicz J, Janczewska E, et al. What we can really expect from telemedicine in intensive diabetes treatment: results from 3-year study on type 1 pregnant diabetic women. Diabetes Technol Ther. 2001;3(4):581-9.
85. Wright TE, Martin D, Qualls C, Curet LB. Effects of intrapartum administration of invert sugar and D5LR on neonatal blood glucose levels. J Perinatol. 2000;20(4):217-8.
86. York R, Brown LP, Samuels P, Finkler SA, Jacobsen B, Persely CA, et al. A randomized trial of early discharge and nurse specialist transitional follow-up care of high-risk childbearing women. Nurs Res. 1997;46(5):254-61.

87. NovoNordisk. A Trial Comparing the Effect and Safety of Insulin Degludec Versus Insulin Detemir, Both in Combination With Insulin Aspart, in the Treatment of Pregnant Women With Type 1 Diabetes. https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03377699; 2017.

88. Egan AM, Bogdanet D, Griffin TP, Kgosidialwa O, Cervar-Zivkovic M, Dempsey E, et al. A core outcome set for studies of gestational diabetes mellitus prevention and treatment. Diabetologia. 2020.

89. Bogdanet D, Reddin C, Macken E, Griffin TP, Fhelelboom N, Biesty L, et al. Follow-up at 1 year and beyond of women with gestational diabetes treated with insulin and/or oral glucose-lowering agents: a core outcome set using a Delphi survey. Diabetologia. 2019;62(11):2007-16.

90. Young AE, Brookes ST, Avery KNL, Davies A, Metcalfe C, Blazeby JM. A systematic review of core outcome set development studies demonstrates difficulties in defining unique outcomes. J Clin Epidemiol. 2019;115:14-24.

91. Egan AM, Bogdanet D, Biesty L, Kgosidialwa O, McDonagh C, O'Shea C, et al. Core Outcome Sets for Studies of Diabetes in Pregnancy: A Review. Diabetes Care. 2020;43(12):3129-35.

92. Young B, Bagley H. Including patients in core outcome set development: issues to consider based on three workshops with around 100 international delegates. Res Involv Engagem. 2016;2:25.

93. Davis K, Gorst SL, Harman N, Smith V, Gargon E, Altman DG, et al. Choosing important health outcomes for comparative effectiveness research: An updated systematic review and involvement of low and middle income countries. PLoS One. 2018;13(2):e0190695.

94. Wooldridge G, Murthy S, Kissoon N. Core outcome set in paediatric sepsis in low- and middle-income countries: a study protocol. BMJ Open. 2020;10(4):e034960.

Table 1: List of trials included in the systematic review.

	Article
1	Ainuddin JA et al (2015)[25]
2	Bartal MF et al (2018) ǂ [30]
3	Bartholomew ML et al (2015)[27]
4	Beazley D et al (2005)[31]
5	Berry DC et al (2018) *[32]
6	Beyuo T et al (2015)[33]
7	Brooten D et al (2001)[34]
8	Burkart W et al (1988) [35]
9	Caritis Set al (1998)[36]
10	Carr KJE et al (2004)[26]
11	Cordua et al (2013)[37]
12	Demarini S et al (1994)[38]
13	Di Biase N et al (1997)[39]
14	Dieb AS et al (2019) ǂ[40]

15	Feghali MN et al (2018) ǂ[41]
16	Feig DS et al (2017)[29]
17	Feig DS et al (2016) *[42]
18	Finnegan C et al (2019) *[43]
19	Forster DA et al (2017)[44]
20	Garmy G et al (2017) ǂ[45]
21	Gray L et al (2018) ǂ[46]
22	Hanson U et al (1984)[47]
23	Hayden T et al (2012)[48]
24	Herrera KM et al (2015)[49]
25	Hickman MA et al (2013)[50]
26	Hod M et al (2008)[51]
27	Hod M et al (2014)[17]
28	Horvaticek M et al (2017)[52]
29	Ibrahim MI et al (2014)[53]
30	Incerpi MH et al (2001)[54]
31	Jovanovic-Peterson L et al (1992)
32	Kjos SL et al (1993)[56]
33	Laatikainen L et al (1987)[57]
34	Lin L et al (2018) *[58]
35	Linden K et al (2018)[23]
36	Manderson JG et al (2003)[59]
37	Mathiesen ER et al (2012)[60]
38	Mathiesen ER et al (2007)[61]
39	McCance DR et al (2010)[62]
40	Mimouni F et al (1987)[63]
41	Min Y et al (2014)[64]
42	Monincx WM et al (1997)[65]
43	Mostello D et al (2017) ǂ[24]
44	Murphy HR et al (2008)[66]
45	Murphy HR et al (2011)[28]
46	Nachum et al (1999)[67]
47	Ney D et al (1982)[68]
48	Nor Azlin MI et al (2007)[69]
49	Notelovitz M (1971)[70]
50	Perichart-Perera O et al (2012)[71]
51	Persson B et al (2002)[72]
52	Petrovski G et al (2013)[73]
53	Polsky S et al. (2019) ǂ[74]
54	Refuerzo JS et al (2015)[75]
55	Ringholm L et al (2018) ǂ[76]
56	Rosenberg VA et al (2006)[77]
57	Sacks DA et al (2006)[78]
58	Secher AL et al (2013)[79]
59	Stewart ZA et al. (2018)[16]
60	Stewart ZA et al. (2016)[80]
61	Varner MW (1983)[81]
62	Voormolen DN et al (2018)[82]
63	Wen SW et al (2018)[83]
64	Wojcicki JM et al (2001)[84]
65	Wright TE et al (2000)[85]
66	York R et al (1997)[86]

67	Novo Nordisk (2017) [87]

Table 2: Maternal outcomes progression from round 2 of eDelphi to end of consensus meeting.

	Outcomes	Round 2 Consensus →	Round 3 Consensus →	Consensus Meeting Consensus
	Blood/urine parameters and monitoring outcomes			
1.	Trimester specific fasting blood glucose	IN	IN	OUT
2.	Trimester specific pre-prandial blood glucose	IN	OUT	-
3.	Trimester specific post-prandial blood glucose	IN	OUT	-
4.	Duration of hypoglycemia	IN	IN	OUT
5.	Trimester specific C-peptide	OUT	-	-
6.	Time above glycaemic target	IN	IN	OUT
7.	Time above glycaemic target during labour	OUT	-	-
8.	24 hr urinary loss of glucose	OUT	-	-
9.	Glycaemic control	IN	IN	OUT
10.	Homeostatic model assessment- Insulin resistance	OUT	-	-
11.	Self-measured 8-point plasma glucose profile	OUT	-	-
12.	Trimester specific HbA1c	IN	IN	IN
13.	HbA1c, change from baseline to last measured or as stated	IN	OUT	OUT
14.	HbA1c, at the time of the birth of the baby	OUT	-	-
15.	Maternal blood glucose levels following first three milk expressing episodes	OUT	-	-
16.	Trimester specific fructosamine	OUT	-	-
17.	Fructosamine, change from baseline to last measured or as stated	OUT	-	-
18.	Fructosamine level, at the time of the birth of the baby	OUT	-	-
19.	Time in range	IN	IN	OUT
20.	Glycaemic variability	IN	OUT	-
21.	Proteinuria	IN	IN	OUT
	Complications Outcomes			
22.	Ectopic pregnancy	OUT	-	
23.	Miscarriage	IN	IN	IN
24.	Pregnancy termination	OUT	-	-
25.	Maternal hypoglycaemia	IN	IN	OUT
26.	Severe hypoglycaemic events	IN	IN	IN
27.	Nocturnal hypoglycaemia	IN	IN	OUT
28.	Pharmacological induction of labour	OUT	-	-
29.	Complications of labour induction	IN	IN	OUT
30.	Antepartum haemorrhage (APH)	IN	OUT	-
31.	Postpartum haemorrhage (PPH)	IN	OUT	-
32.	Polyhydramnios	IN	IN	OUT
33.	Diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA)	IN	IN	IN
34.	Progression of retinopathy	IN	IN	OUT
35.	Premature rupture of membranes (PPROM)	IN	IN	OUT
36.	Maternal adverse effects associated with the treatment	IN	IN	OUT
37.	Maternal renal failure	IN	IN	OUT
38.	Placental dysfunction	IN	IN	OUT
39.	Pre-eclampsia (PET)	IN	IN	IN
40.	Haemolysis, elevated liver enzymes, and a low platelet count (HELLP) syndrome	IN	IN	OUT
41.	Placenta praevia	OUT	-	-
42.	Placental abruption	IN	IN	OUT
43.	Pregnancy (gestational) induced hypertension (PIH)	IN	IN	IN
44.	Worsening chronic hypertension	IN	IN	OUT
45.	Pulmonary oedema	IN	OUT	-
46.	Cardiovascular complications*	IN	IN	OUT
47.	Excessive maternal weight gain during pregnancy#	IN	IN	IN

48.	Maternal death	IN	IN	IN
49.	Prolonged labour	OUT	-	-
50.	Maternal infection	IN	OUT	-
51.	Insulin treated in labour	IN	OUT	-
52.	Maternal intensive care unit (ICU) admission	IN	IN	OUT
53.	Pulmonary embolus	IN	OUT	-
	Life Impact/ Psychological Outcomes			
54.	Improvement in maternal affect	OUT	-	-
55.	Post-partum depression*	OUT	-	-
56.	Improvement in fear of hypoglycaemia	OUT	-	-
57.	Diabetes distress	OUT	-	-
58.	Diabetes burnout*	OUT	-	-
59.	Improved self-efficacy of diabetes management	OUT	-	-
60.	Satisfaction with intervention	OUT	-	-
61.	Health related quality of life	OUT	-	-
62.	Return to normal activities	OUT	-	-
63.	Views and experiences of women	OUT	-	-
64.	Successful breastfeeding	IN	OUT	-
65.	Duration of breastfeeding*	OUT	-	-
	Miscellaneous			
66.	Trimester specific insulin dose	IN	OUT	-
67.	Insulin dose at time of birth of the baby	OUT	-	-
68.	Compliance with intervention	IN	IN	OUT
69.	Compliance with glucose testing	IN	IN	OUT
70.	Number and/or duration of antepartum hospitalisation	OUT	-	-
71.	Number and/or duration of postpartum hospitalisation	OUT	-	-
72.	Onset of labour	OUT	-	-
73.	Hypoglycaemic awareness	IN	IN	OUT

***** Outcome suggested by more than one participant in round 1.

Outcome rephrased to 'maternal weight gain during pregnancy' at the consensus meeting

Table 3: Fetal/Infant and Other outcomes progression from round 2 of eDelphi to end of consensus meeting.

Fetal/ Infant Outcomes		**Round 2 Consensus →**	**Round 3 Consensus →**	**Consensus Meeting Consensus**
	Laboratory Measures Outcomes			
1.	Insulin antibodies in cord blood	OUT	-	-
2.	Cord insulin like growth factor 1 (IGF-1)	OUT	-	-
3.	Cord insulin	OUT	-	-
4.	Cord C-peptide	OUT	-	-
5.	Glucose in umbilical vein	OUT	-	-
6.	Neonatal blood glucose	IN	IN	OUT
7.	First glucose level after birth	IN	IN	OUT
	Biometrics and Anthropometrics Outcomes			
8.	Birth weight	IN	IN	IN
9.	Infant weight at 6 months	OUT	-	-
10.	Long bone measurements	OUT	-	-
11.	Neonatal length	OUT	-	-
12.	Abdominal circumference	IN	IN	OUT
13.	Infant fat mass	OUT	-	-
14.	Infant lean mass	OUT	-	-
15.	Shoulder circumference	OUT	-	
16.	Head circumference	IN	IN	

	Complications Outcomes			
17.	Neonatal polycythaemia	OUT	-	-
18.	Intestinal perforation	OUT	-	-
19.	Necrotising enterocolitis	OUT	-	-
20.	Intraventricular haemorrhage	IN	OUT	-
21.	Periventricular leukomalacia	OUT	-	-
22.	Reduced fetal movement requiring hospitalisation	IN	OUT	-
23.	Stillbirth	IN	IN	IN
24.	Neonatal death	IN	IN	IN
25.	Neonatal infection	IN	IN	OUT
26.	Congenital malformations	IN	IN	IN
27.	Hypotension	OUT	-	-
28.	Hearing impairment	OUT	-	-
29.	Acute respiratory problems	IN	IN	OUT
30.	Apnoea	IN	IN	OUT
31.	Hypoxic ischaemic encephalopathy	IN	IN	OUT
32.	Chronic lung disease	OUT	-	-
33.	Neonatal oxygen and/or ventilatory support	IN	IN	OUT
34.	QTc prolongation	OUT	-	-
35.	Heart arrhythmia	OUT	-	-
36.	Shoulder dystocia	IN	IN	IN
37.	Birth trauma	IN	IN	OUT
38.	Feeding problems	OUT	-	-
39.	Large for gestational age (LGA)	IN	IN	IN
40.	Fetal macrosomia	IN	IN	OUT
41.	Appropriate for gestational age (AGA)	IN	IN	OUT
42.	Small for gestational age (SGA)	IN	IN	IN
43.	Low birth weight	IN	IN	OUT
44.	Retinopathy of prematurity	IN	OUT	-
45.	Neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) admissions	IN	IN	OUT
46.	Length of stay in neonatal intensive care unit	IN	IN	OUT
47.	Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia	IN	IN	OUT
48.	Seizures	IN	IN	OUT
49.	Neonatal hypocalcaemia	IN	OUT	-
50.	Preterm birth	IN	IN	IN
51.	Neonatal hypoglycaemia	IN	IN	IN
52.	Treated neonatal hypoglycaemia	IN	IN	OUT
53.	Offspring incidence of diabetes*	IN	OUT	-
	Miscellaneous Outcomes			
54.	Apgar 1 min	IN	OUT	-
55.	Apgar 5 min	IN	IN	OUT
56.	Gestational age at birth	IN	IN	IN
57.	Mode of birth	IN	IN	IN
58.	Live birth	IN	IN	OUT
59.	Infant psychomotor development	OUT	-	-
60.	Infants receiving exclusive breast milk	OUT	-	-
61.	Length and/or duration of hospitalisation	IN	OUT	-
62.	Neonatal neurological optimality score	OUT	-	-
	Other Outcomes	**Round 2 Consensus →**	**Round 3 Consensus →**	**Consensus Meeting Consensus**
1.	Healthcare cost	OUT	-	-
2.	Out of pocket cost of treatment*	IN	OUT	-

***** Outcome suggested by more than one participant in round 1.

Table 4: Final list of outcomes to be included in a COS of all future studies of treatment interventions in pregnant women with pregestational diabetes.

Domain	**Outcome**
Maternal Outcomes	Trimester specific HbA1c
	Maternal weight gain during pregnancy*
	Severe hypoglycaemia
	Diabetic ketoacidosis
	Miscarriage
	Pregnancy induced hypertension
	Pre-eclampsia
	Maternal death
Fetal/infant Outcomes	Birth weight
	Large for gestational age
	Small for gestational age
	Gestational age at birth
	Preterm birth
	Mode of birth
	Shoulder dystocia
	Neonatal hypoglycaemia
	Congenital malformations
	Stillbirth
	Neonatal death

HbA1c Glycated haemoglobin.

*Rephrased from 'Excessive maternal weight gain during pregnancy'.