ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Impact of metformin versus dietary interventions on placental morphology in women with gestational diabetes mellitus.

Amber Salman¹, Momna Riaz², Shireen Hamid³, Sadia Alam⁴, Faiza Hanif⁵, Sana Fatima⁶

Article Citation: Salman A, Riaz M, Hamid S, Alam S, Hanif F, Fatima S. Impact of metformin versus dietary interventions on placental morphology in women with gestational diabetes mellitus. Professional Med J 2025; 32(05):577-582. https://doi.org/10.29309/TPMJ/2025.32.05.8829

ABSTRACT... Objective: To evaluate the effects of dietary control and Metformin on placental morphology in women with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM). Study Design: Clinical study. Setting: Services Hospital Lahore and Shaikh Zaved Hospital Lahore. Period: June 2023 till June 24. Methods: A total of 56 women with GDM were enrolled after providing informed consent. Of these, 28 women with blood sugar levels of 140 mg/dl or less were assigned to Group B (2500-3000 kcal/day diet and 30-minute walks three times a week) and were placed on dietary e remaining 28 women with blood sugar levels greater than 140 mg/dl were assigned to Group C, where t' aged with a diet and veis Plac Metformin (500 mg TDS). A control group (Group A) consisted of 25 healthy pregnant I tissue samples were collected and analyzed for morphology after delivery. Results: Group B exhibite s with more extensive villous immaturity, charangoids, and syncytial knots. In contrast, Group C showe acrosis and calcification. Significant differences in placental and cord widths were observed in Group up A, while only cord width differed significantly in Group C compared to Group A in gross morpho py revealed the presence of charangoids, infarction, and syncytial loops in Group B, along with in villou urity. Charangoids and syncytial knots were observed in Group B compared to Group C, with minim between Group C and Group A in placental width. Conclusion: Metformin demonstrated more favor cts Intal morphology compared to dietary control, with results comparable to those observed in normal pr ancies

Key words: Gestational Diabetes Mellitus, Metformir Place

INTRODUCTION

Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM а disorder characterized by glucose ce identified usually during the secon pregnancy, primarily caused by * . Je. effects of placental hormones ne (l₁in resistance.1,2 GDM offers ICa. 3 for *i*cations both mother and fetus. during pregnancy ar sbally, the prevalence of GDV whereas in Inc Asian community er 11.7%.5 Poor outcomes are furthe -rbated by limited healthcare access and Judequate awareness, emphasizing the need tor timely diagnosis and effective management.6

The placenta is a vital organ in pregnancy, necessary for provision of nutrient and oxygen

fetus.⁷ Structurally, it is a discoid-shaped an housing villi containing blood vessels and mesenchymal tissues.⁸ Maternal metabolic environment has profound influenced on its development and function. In diabetes, including GDM, placental morphology undergoes significant gross and microscopic changes, such as increased stromal density, trophoblastic proliferation and enhanced villous capillary formation, driven primarily by elevated fetal insulin levels.⁹

gy.

Hypoxia is a crucial factor contributing to these alterations.¹⁰ As fetal demands increase, oxygen delivery to the placenta becomes inadequate, leading to structural adaptations such as increased placental size, thickness, and glucose deposition. Microscopic examination of GDM

Correspondence Address: Dr. Amber Salman Department of Anatomy University Medical & Dental College, Faisalabad. dr.ambersalman2@gmail.com

 Article received on:
 19/12/2024

 Accepted for publication:
 26/02/2025

^{1.} Ph.D (Anatomy), Associate Professor Anatomy, University Medical & Dental College, Faisalabad. 2. M.Phil (Anatomy), Assistant Professor Anatomy, University Medical & Dental College, Faisalabad.

FCPS (Histopathology), Assistant Professor Pathology, Aziz Fatima Medical and Dental College, Faisalabad.

^{4.} M.Phil, FCPS (Histopathology), Assistant Professor Pathology, Akhter Saeed Medical and Dental College, Lahore.

^{5.} MBBS, M.Phil, Senior Demonstrator Anatomy, King Edward Medical University, Lahore.

^{6.} MBBS, Senior Demonstrator Anatomy, University Medical & Dental College, Faisalabad.

placentas reveals increase in hypoxic markers and vascular changes, which are associated with adverse outcomes like preterm delivery, macrosomia and stillbirth.^{11,12}

The management of GDM involves not only lifestyle modifications but pharmacological interventions too to control the blood glucose level.¹³ Insulin has long been the standard therapy that can effectively lower the blood glucose levels. However, it is associated with complications such as maternal weight gain, placental hypoxic alterations, which exacerbate pregnancy risks.¹⁴

In contrast to the past, when oral anti-diabetic drugs were generally considered teratogenic, Metformin, a category B drug, has recently gained acceptance as a safe and effective alternative. It improves insulin sensitivity, reduces hepatic glucose production, and enhances glucose uptake, thereby achieving euglycemia.¹⁵ Additionally, it improves the endothelial function and reduces the frequency of diabetes related micro and macrovascular complications.

The placental morphology is significantly affected by the diabetes, with hyperglycemia profound structural and functional Therefore, this study was designed role of Metformin counteracting and offering a protective influence and offering a protective influence agent in managing GDM, i.

METHODS

This clinical study was considered from June 2023 till June 24 at Services Ho. Al Lahore and Shaikh Zayed Hospital Lahore after ethical approval (Letter No. F-38/NHRC/AQMIN/FRB/205). Fasting blood sugar (FBS) and random blood sugar (RBS) levels of pregnant women enrolled in this clinical trial were monitored during their prenatal visits. Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM) was initially diagnosed using a glucometer and later on confirmed through laboratory testing, with FBS > 110 mg/dl and RBS > 130 mg/dl serving as diagnostic criteria. In high risk patients, like those with prior history of GDM or poor obstetric history, a 55 gm oral glucose challenge test (value RBS 150mg/dl) was used to make the diagnosis, which was later verified by oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT).

Nonprobability sampling method was used to include the participant. A total of 25 pregnant females with no concomitant disorders were selected for control (Group A). Furthermore, 56 GDM females were registered for the research after their fully informed and signed consent. These GDM females were equally divided into two groups, with 28 participants in each: Group B (managed through c' ontrol) and Group C (administered Met ses ranging from ain 500 to 1600 mg) females of group n llow the provided A and B were વા diet chart t' J calories intake per les per week for almost day and ' The cipant of Group C were 30 m[;] Metformin tablets in parallel adr TE sunden Jd management comprising of v calc sintake per day besides 30 minutes : three times in a week. Initially 500 С .etformin was administered orally and Jing on the glycemic as well as tolerance is of patient, the dose of drug was gradually creased up to 1600 mg. invariably, these participants were kept under surveillance at the prenatal hospitals until their term. On every visit, all the participant s were examined for their general health (weight gain, temperature, blood pressure and RBS). The pregnant females of Group B & C were especially looked for their blood sugar level and any adverse effects like weight gain, body swelling and infections. Additionally, the Metformin dose of Group C was carefully monitored, all necessary and desirable management was reiterated. 2 participants of group B and 3 from group C were excluded from this clinical trial as these individuals either received insulin as part of their treatment or gave birth somewhere else. Placentas of these females were collected within an hour after birth and were kept in 10% formalin in labeled containers.

Placentas were grossly observed for morphological features (Table-I, II A, II B). To prepare slides for histopathology, samples of the tissue were taken from center, at 7 o'clock position and at 12 o'clock. Then these samples were treated well with alcohol along with xylene and get embedded in paraffin wax. By using a manual microtome, 4μ m thin sections of the embedded tissue were cut. The slides stained with hematoxylin and eosin stain were observed under a light microscope to look for hypoxic changes (Table-III).

For analysis of data SPSS version 22 was used. The results were considered statistically significant with the P value of less than 0.05. The Dependent t test was used to evaluate mean of quantitative variables, however chi square tests was applied to categorical variables for evaluating percentages. The Fisher exact test was applied where cell counts was low in lieu of chi square test.

RESULTS

Groups A showed significant differences in umbilical cord width with Group B (p=0.001) and Groups C (p=0.01) whereas this difference w insignificant between Group B and C. Similarly statistically significant difference was observed in placental width of Groups B with A and C (p=0.001) whereas this difference was insignificant between Group A and C. All the other parameters differed insignificantly among the three Groups A, B and C (normal control, diet-controlled GDM, and metformin-treated GDM (Table-I, II A & B).

Histologically, villous immaturity, chorangiosis, infarction, and syncytial knots, were observed significantly different among Groups A and B, p= 0.05, 0.04, 0.04, and 0.003, respectively (Table-III). This difference remained statistically insignificant between Groups A and C (Table-III). Statically notable nces were noted in chorangiosis (p= syncytial knot (p= 1)、 0.04) when Gro npared with C but ้าร remained ins In all other groups. ۹r،

Sr #	Groups				aracteristics			
		Placental	Placer	دا م	Placental	Cord	Cord	Cord
		size1(cm)	si7	width	weight (gm)	length (cm)	width (cm)	vessels (n)
1	A	16.34 ± 2.37	- Jt	57.ري	577.6 ± 128.9	41.97±7.87	1.44 ± 0.46	3±0
2	В	15.77±3.31	1 80	+±0.72	598±157.9	42.86±7.5	1.74 ± 0.35	3±0
3	С	15.62±2.35		2.26±0.53	656.4 ± 142.6	45.44±7.47	1.69 ± 0.46	3±0
P value	9							
1	B v/s A			0.001*	0.53	0.61	0.001*	N/A
2	C v/s A		9	0.61	0.12	0.1	0.01*	N/A
3	B v/s C	0	0.13	0.001*	0.37	0.21	0.17	N/A
	Table-I	Comparis	(narameter	rs of Placentas	within and betwe	en arouns (N	-75 n-25 n	er group)

Comparise f parameters of Placentas within and between groups (N=75; n=25 per group)

Sr #	Groups	Characteristics									
		Placental Consistancy		Placental Shape		Color of I	Nembrane	Cord Insertion			
		Soft	Hard	Discoid	Other	Blue	pale	central	Peripheral		
1	А	18(72%)	7(28%)	19 (76%)	6 (24%)	9(36%)	16 (64%)	8 (32%)	17 (68%)		
2	В	17(68%)	8(32%)	18 (72%)	7 (28%)	11 (44%)	14 (56%)	9 (36%)	16 (64%)		
3	С	16 (64%)	9 (36%)	16(64%)	9(36%)	11 (44%)	14 (56%)	11 (44%)	14 (56%)		
	p Value										
4	B v/s A	0.76		>0.99		0.38		0.76			
5	C v/s A	0.77		0.53		0.39		0.38			
6	B v/s C	>0.99		0.52		>0.99		0.6			

Table-II (A). Comparison of gross parameters of placentas within and between groups (N=75; n=25 per group)

Sr #	Groups	Characteristics									
		Cord	Knots	Cord S	Stricture	Cord Hematoma					
		Р	Α	Р	Α	Р	Α				
1	A	2 (8%)	23 (92%)	1(4%)	24 (96%)	9 (36%)	16 (64%)				
2	В	7 (28%)	18 (72%)	7 (28%)	18 (72%)	5 (20%)	20(80%)				
3	С	4 (16%)	21 (84%)	6 (24%)	19 (76%)	10(40%)	15 (60%)				
	p Value										
4	B v/s A	0.	26	0.	.08	0.4					
5	C v/s A	>0.99		0.	.09	0.75					
6	B v/s C	0.48		>().99	0.15					
Table II (B). Comparison of gross parameters of Placentes within and between groups $(N-75)$, $n-25$ per group)											

Table-II (B). Comparison of gross parameters of Placentas within and between groups (N=75; n=25 per group)

Sr #	Groups	Characteristics											
		Villous Immaturity		Chorangiosis		Infarction		Villous fibrinoid necrosis		Calcification		Syncitial Knot	
		Р	Α	Р	Α	Р	Α	Р	Α			Р	Α
1	А	5 (20%)	20 (80%)	7 (28%)	18 (72%)	8 (32%)	16 (64%)	19 (76%)	r	(4	(%ر	4 (16%)	21 (84%)
2	В	11 (44%)	14 (56%)	14 (56%)	11 (44%)	15 (60%)	10 (40%)	20 (80′			13 (62%)	14 (56%)	11 (44%)
3	С	6 (24%)	19 (76%)	5 (20%)	20 (80%)	9 (36%)	16 (64%՝	Sil.	3 - 90	، 6 (64%)	9 (36%)	7 (28%)	18 (72%)
	p Value												
4	B v/s A	0.05*		0.04*		0.04*			7.	0.	74	0.0	03*
5	C v/s A	>0.9		0.73		0.52		16		0.26		0.3	
6	B v/s C	0.	12	0.0)1*			0.:	25	0.	15	0.0)4*
Table	Table III. Comparison of microscopic percentage of plant and hot year groups (NI 75, p. 05 per groups)												

Table-III. Comparison of microscopic parameters of place

nd between groups (N=75; n=25 per group)

		Age	W N	11/		HbAIC	HbAIC					
		(years)		.g/dl)	(mg/dl)	1	2					
Sr #	Groups	Mean ± S.D	ν. ± τ	🥜 Jean ± S.D	Mean ± S.D	%	%					
1	A	29.1±4.47	-9.8⁻	73.24±9.35	128.8±36.8	4.74	4.98					
2	В	30.07±3	72	90.9±16.7	149.72±37.9	5.43	5.84					
3	С	29.86		105.4±13.12	172±38.44	5.29	5.44					
	p-value											
1	B v/s A		J.058	< 0.001*	0.02*	<0.001*	< 0.001*					
2	C v/s A		0.11	< 0.001*	0.00*	0.001*	0.00*					
3	B v/s C		0.76	< 0.001*	0.04*	0.683	0.01*					
	Table-IV. Compay atternal parameters within and between groups (N=75: n=25 per group											



Figure-1. Histology of placenta; A; normal control B; Diet control, C; Metformin-treated

DISCUSSION

Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) is linked with structural and functional alterations in the placenta, the key tissue facilitating communication between the mother and the developing fetus.^{3,9} These changes in the placental morphology can be seen at both macroscopic and microscopic levels which can lead to fetal hypoxia, illness and even stillbirth. Hypoxia-induced placental changes in GDM include ischemia, villous immaturity and areas of villous fibrosis and necrosis. Other observed abnormalities include chorangiosis, the formation of syncytial knots and calcification.9 Variations from normal placental morphology in GDM cases are marked by villous immaturity, infarction, chorangiosis, and an increase in syncytial knots. Our findings of edema, fibrosis, ischemic alterations, increased syncytial knots and fibrinoid necrosis observed in placentae from GDM cases managed with diet alone are consistent with the study conducted by Verma et al. (2010).¹⁶ In contrast, placentae treated with metformin exhibited no significant differences in gross morphology compared ' normal controls, except for cord width. Oth gross and microscopic markers of hypoxic remained insignificantly different acros^r S, suggesting near to normal control cr

However, light microscopic analy metry treated placentae exhibited ാed thickness, chorangiosis, svn knot formation compared t J cases. Additionally, the rem? c indicators، ٦, of hypoxia were ιv uticantly lower in the metformin 🚽 the diet control group.17 These finding from a case report presented by Campbe (2009) who observed villous dysmaturity, chorangiosis, and villous fibrosis in GDM patient with preeclampsia treated with Metformin.¹⁸ However, it remains unclear whether these placental changes were solely attributable to GDM or the combined effects of GDM and hypertension.¹⁸ This could be due to the fact reported by numerous in-vivo and invitro studies that Metformin primarily reduces gluconeogenesis by inhibiting lactate uptake in adipocytes. Another key mechanism observed is a decrease in actin polymerization in hepatocytes,

leading to reduced glucose production from glycogen in liver cells. Additionally, Metformin interferes with the mitochondrial respiratory chain in hepatocytes, affecting cellular oxidation processes. Metformin significantly lowers HbA1c levels. As illustrated in Figure-1, Metformin-treated placentae may play a role in its beneficial effects for cases with GDM.¹⁹ The multifaceted actions of Metformin on diabetic cells likely explain its positive impact on placental function compared to diet management alone.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this demonstrates that Metformin posi+ enced placental morphologyan estational Diabetes ЭS Mellitus (GΓ gluconeogenesis, lowers H[▶] es placental structure arkers, offering favorable by red bep/ nanagement alone. These r d, Metformin's potential as an fir tronuent for GDM, though further зсп\6 needed to explore its long-term effects earci al and fetal outcomes.

↓FLICT OF INTEREST

le authors declare no conflict of interest.

SOURCE OF FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Copyright© 26 Feb, 2025.

REFERENCES

- Ara I, Maqbool M, Gani I. Role of insulin resistance in gestational diabetes mellitus: A literature review. Chettinad Health City Medical Journal. (E-2278-2044 & P-2277-8845). 2022 Jun 30; 11(2):69-74.
- Modzelewski R, Stefanowicz-Rutkowska MM, Matuszewski W, Bandurska-Stankiewicz EM. Gestational diabetes mellitus—recent literature review. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2022 Sep 28; 11(19):5736.
- Farahvar S, Walfisch A, Sheiner E. Gestational diabetes risk factors and long-term consequences for both mother and offspring: A literature review. Expert Review of Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2019 Jan 2; 14(1):63-74.

5

- 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 Research and Clinical Practice. 2022 Jan 1; 183:109050.
- Lee KW, Ching SM, Ramachandran V, Yee A, Hoo FK, Chia YC, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of gestational diabetes mellitus in Asia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2018 Dec; 18:1-20.
- Makasheva A, Yermukhanova L, Kudabayeva K, Tazhbenova S, Nogayeva M, Tautanova A, et al. Primary Care for Gestational Diabetes: A Bibliometric Analysis of Publications from 1991 to 2024. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2024 Oct 24; 21(11):1405.
- Burton GJ, Jauniaux E. The human placenta: new perspectives on its formation and function during early pregnancy. Proceedings of the Royal Society B. 2023 Apr 26; 290(1997):20230191.
- Acuña F, Portiansky EL, Miglino MA, Flamini MA, Barbeito CG. Embryonic-placental relationship in Lagostomus maximus as compared to other hystricognath rodents and eutherian mammals. Zoology. 2023 Jun 1; 158:126082.
- Abdelhalim NY, Shehata MH, Gadallah HN, Sovied WM, Othman AA. Morphological and ultrar changes in the placenta of the diabe^{**} Egyptian women. Acta Histochemicr 120(5):490-503.
- 10. Mahmoud EA, Al-Bakri NA, Qasir changes of placenta complicated with pregest Pharmaceutical Science 2 10(11):2952-9.

- El Sawy NA, Iqbal MS, Alkushi AG, EL Sawy N, Iqbal M, Alkushi A. Histomorphological study of placenta in gestational diabetes mellitus. Int. J. Morphol. 2018 Jun 1; 36(2):687-92.
- Rasmussen L, Poulsen CW, Kampmann U, Smedegaard SB, Ovesen PG, Fuglsang J. Diet and healthy lifestyle in the management of gestational diabetes mellitus. Nutrients. 2020 Oct 6; 12(10):3050.
- Oskovi-Kaplan ZA, Ozgu-Erdinc AS. Management of gestational diabetes mellitus. Diabetes: From Research to Clinical Practice: 2021; 4:257-72.
- 14. Akram S, Bibi S. **Review on pharmacological therapies for management of gestational diabetes.** International Journal of Pharmaceut^{ic} res and Developmental Research. 2023 Ser
- 15. Bao LX, Shi W⁷ gestational analysis Medici⁷ , r (in versus insulin for atic review and metaaternal-Fetal & Neonatal (16):2741-53.
- 16. V , aul JM. Cellular changes in the ancies complicated with diabetes. at J Mer br J10 Mar 1; 28(1):259-64.
 - and metformin on placental morphology in rational diabetes mellitus. Pakistan Journal of dical Sciences. 2016 Nov; 32(6):1522.
 - J. Campbell IW, Duncan C, Urquhart R, Evans M. Placental dysfunction and stillbirth in gestational diabetes mellitus. The British Journal of Diabetes & Vascular Disease. 2009 Jan; 9(1):38-40.
- Kirpichnikov D, McFarlane SI, Sowers JR. Metformin: An update. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2002 Jul 2; 137(1):25-33.