

Resting Energy Expenditure Relationship with Macronutrients and Gestational Weight Gain: A Pilot Study

Kiley B. Vander Wyst

Arizona State University

Matthew P. Buman

Arizona State University

Gabriel Q. Shaibi

Arizona State University

Megan E. Petrov

Arizona State University

Elizabeth Reifsnider

Arizona State University

Corrie M Whisner (✉ cwhisner@asu.edu)

Arizona State University <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3888-6348>

Research article

Keywords: obesity, diet, basal metabolic rate

Posted Date: November 1st, 2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.16720/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: Resting energy expenditure (REE) comprises 60% of total energy expenditure and variations may be associated with gestational weight gain (GWG) or maternal diet. The objective of this study was to examine the impact of ambulatory metabolic tracking on GWG and the association with maternal macronutrient composition during mid-pregnancy. Methods: Pregnant women aged 29.8 ± 4.9 yr (78.6% non-Hispanic, White) with gestational ages (GA) < 17 wk were randomized to Breezing™ (N=16) or control (N=12) groups for 13 wks. REE by Breezing™ indirect calorimetry, anthropometrics and dietary intake were collected every two weeks. Early (GA weeks 14-21), late (GA weeks 21-28), and overall (GA week 14-28) changes in macronutrients and GWG were calculated. Results: Overall total and rate of GWG did not differ by group but Breezing™ women had lower rate and total GWG in the beginning of the second trimester but gained significantly more weight [$F(1,24)=5.29$, $p=0.03$] in the latter half. Independent of group assignment, early increases in REE were associated with an increased rate of GWG later in pregnancy ($r=0.53$, $p=0.05$). Dietary intake did not differ by group at baseline; however, overall energy (-144 ± 339 vs. 192 ± 422 , $p=0.03$) and protein (-10 ± 24 vs. 13 ± 31 , $p=0.05$) intake were significantly lower for the Breezing than the control women which primarily occurred in the latter half of the second trimester. Conclusion: Regular metabolism tracking alone did not have an impact on GWG. Assessment of REE during pregnancy in conjunction with nutritional counseling or education may result in improvements in GWG.

Background

Overweight and obesity now affect 60% and 35% of reproductive-aged women, respectively.(1) While gestational weight gain (GWG) is a normal part of pregnancy, 47% of women gain more than the recommended amount of weight.(2) Excessive GWG is associated with a multitude of complications that impact both maternal and neonatal health. These adverse short- and long-term health consequences include preeclampsia, gestational diabetes, postpartum weight retention, fetal macrosomia, neonatal hypoglycemia, and admittance to the neonatal intensive care unit.(3,4) Previous research has demonstrated that greater increases in GWG are associated with decreased physical activity, increased energy intake, higher pre-pregnancy BMI, race/ethnicity, and maternal education.(5,6) Recently, research has focused on the evaluation of resting energy expenditure (REE) across pregnancy to better account for the physiological variability in metabolic adaptations to pregnancy that may also impact GWG.(7–11)

REE is the amount of energy expended needed to maintain basic organ function, respiration, and circulation which accounts for 60-70% of total daily energy expenditure. Real-time, mobile tracking of REE has become increasingly popular but few devices are able to accurately estimate caloric needs;(12) further, they have rarely been used in pregnant populations.(13,14) Variations in REE during pregnancy have demonstrated an overall increase in caloric needs(8,11,15–17) ranging from 13-35%; however, results remain heterogeneous. Recently, the Breezing™ device, a hand-held, Bluetooth-enabled metabolism tracker, that uses indirect calorimetry to measure REE was developed and validated against the laboratory-based Douglas Bag Method.(18) A previously conducted case series of pregnant women that utilized the Breezing™ device demonstrated improved knowledge and awareness of metabolism, weight

gain, and caloric intake during pregnancy.(19) This study found unique changes in REE across the participants that were not consistent with predictive equations.(19) It is apparent that REE is a highly variable measure that is impacted by numerous biological (disease status)(20,21) and behavioral (activity level,(9) nutrition,(10) and sleep(22)) factors. Without consideration of REE, dietary and GWG recommendations are based on inaccurate, non-specific predictive equations that may lead to under- or over-nutrition during a critical period of growth and development.

REE has a strong, positive correlation with total energy, protein, fat, carbohydrates, cholesterol, sugar, and fiber.(10) Total energy intake during pregnancy has been reported to range from approximately 1860 to 2550 kcal/day.(23–27) A recent meta-analysis found that the mean reported intake for total energy, protein, fat, and carbohydrate increased by 184 ± 86 kcal/day, 5.9 gms/day, 10.1 gms/day, and 17.8 gms/day, respectively, from the first to the third trimesters.(27) Although self-reported macronutrient compositions vary among pregnant women,(24–26,28) an estimated 51% of pregnant women have total energy intakes that exceed daily recommendations, with 19% not meeting carbohydrate and 38% exceeding fat recommendations.(29) It is well known that a high quality diet during pregnancy is related to better pregnancy outcomes;(30,31) however, there is a paucity of research investigating not only changes in REE during pregnancy but also how REE is influenced by maternal diet and its impact on rate of weight gain.

Obesity during pregnancy has a negative impact on women their offspring. Because more women are entering pregnancy at higher weights, greater efforts are needed to minimize excessive GWG. Assessing and tracking REE throughout pregnancy might provide better insight into factors that impact maternal health, including fluctuations in GWG. The purpose of this study was to evaluate how awareness of REE during the second trimester impacted GWG and how variations in REE were associated with maternal macronutrient consumption.

Methods

Study Participants and Procedures

This pilot study was a randomized controlled observational trial of pregnant women (n=28). Women were recruited from Obstetrics and Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) at Adelante Healthcare clinics, social media advertising, and word of mouth referral throughout the greater Phoenix metro area (**Figure 1**) beginning September 2017 through October 2018. Participants were randomized to the Breezing™ (n=16) or the control (n=12) groups and followed for 13 weeks. Device use did not allow for blinding of participants or research staff. Seven home visits were conducted by study staff for data collection. Informed consent and demographic data were obtained at the first in-home study visit. All data were compiled in a secure REDCap database. During the duration of the study, study staff frequently contacted participants by phone or text message to check in, answer any questions or address concerns, and to remind them of upcoming appointments.

Pregnant women with a gestational age ≤ 17 weeks and aged ≥ 18 years old were eligible to participate. High-risk pregnancies that included the following diseases or conditions were excluded: multiple gestations, fetal growth problems, hypertension, gastrointestinal disorders, malabsorptive diseases, hyper or hypo-parathyroid conditions, HIV, diabetes, asthma/lung disease, cardiac diseases and conditions, current smoker (i.e. women who have smoked 100 cigarettes in their lifetime and now smoke every day or some days), and history of eating disorders.

Instruments

Demographic & Health Data. Demographic data collected included, occupation, date of birth, age (calculated as current date minus date of birth), marital status, race/ethnicity, and education. A health history questionnaire was completed at each study visit that contained questions about health history and behaviors. Health history items included current gestational age, past medical history, and current use of prescribed or over-the-counter medications and supplements. Health behavior items included current exercise level, dieting status, average per day meal consumption, consumption of caffeinated beverages, average drinks per week for caffeinated beverages, and alcohol consumption.

Anthropometric Data. Anthropometrics were collected at every study visit for both groups. Research staff collected height using a portable stadiometer (Seca 213) at the first study visit and weight using a portable scale (Seca 876) at each study visit. These measurements were used to calculate body mass index (BMI) as kg/m^2 . Total weight gain was determined as the difference between the participant's weight at Study Visit 7 and Study Visit 1. Study visit 1 occurred during the first trimester where gestational weight gain is minimal. Rate of weight gain was calculated as the total weight gain in kilograms divided by the number of weeks the participant was followed.

Resting Energy Expenditure. REE (Breezing™ group only) was determined using the Breezing™ device. REE measurements were obtained every two weeks during the 13-week study to capture variation in metabolic rate. Prior to obtainment of this measurement, participants rested in a seated position for 30 minutes to reduce the impact of recent physical activity on the REE measurement. The participant remained in a seated position when the measurement was being obtained. They were instructed to breathe in and out of the device for two continuous minutes. The Breezing™ device measures oxygen uptake and carbon dioxide production in order to determine REE. Data were loaded onto an accompanying electronic tablet using a corresponding software application and transmitted electronically to the study investigators. If the device indicated irregular breathing, the study participant would perform the measurement for a second time and the average values were used as the final measurement. After the study participant successfully completed the measurement, study staff reviewed the results with them by showing them the data from the Breezing™ device mobile app. The control participants received the same study visits minus use of the Breezing™ device. No dietary or behavioral counseling or medically-relevant support were provided by study staff to either Breezing™ or control group participants.

Dietary Data. Dietary assessments were completed by study staff using the 24-hour dietary recalls(32) at each visit to assess habitual dietary intake during the previous 24-hour period. The 24-hour dietary recall captures detailed information about all foods and beverages consumed by participants. It allows for collection of more detailed information including brands, cooking methods, etc. and probes for commonly forgotten foods, beverages and condiments.(32) Each of the 24-hour dietary recalls were entered into the Nutrition Data System for Research (NDSR) by the same researcher. NDSR is a dietary analysis program designed to collect and analyze data from 24-hour dietary recalls.(33)

Statistical Analyses. All statistical procedures were performed using SPSS (SPSS 25, Chicago, IL, USA). Demographic characteristics and baseline factors were summarized using counts and percentages for categorical variables, and the mean and standard deviation or median and interquartile range were reported for continuous measures. Overall rate of GWG was calculated as the overall GWG divided by the total study duration in weeks. Early and late rate of GWG were calculated as the difference in GWG between study visits 4 and 1, and 7 and 4, respectively, divided by the total study duration during each respective time period. Changes in REE, energy and macronutrient (fat, carbohydrates, and protein) consumption were calculated in the same manner. The overall, early, and late changes in rate of and total GWG, and macronutrients were compared between Breezing™ and control groups using a one-way ANCOVA with gestational age at study start and maternal education level as covariates. Adherence to Institute of Medicine rate of GWG recommendations were determined by calculating the number of women who gained the appropriate rate of GWG for second trimester using BMI at the first study visit. BMI at first study visit was used as a proxy for pre-pregnancy BMI since GWG during the first trimester is relatively low. Correlations between the early, late, and overall changes in REE and GWG (total and rate) and macronutrient consumption were estimated using the Pearson Correlation coefficient after controlling for maternal education and initial BMI. All statistical tests were two-sided with significance evaluated at $p < 0.05$.

Results

Demographic and Baseline Data. Of the 34 women who were eligible for the study, 28 were randomized to study groups (16 in the Breezing™ and 12 in the Control groups; **Figure 1**). All 28 women completed the entire study. The median study duration for the control and Breezing™ groups was 13.4 (12.9, 14.0) and 13.4 (IQR: 13.3, 14.8) weeks, respectively (Kruskal-Wallis H test, $\chi^2 = 1.2$, $p = 0.27$). The mean gestational age was 14.8 ± 2.3 weeks at study visit 1, 17.9 ± 2.7 weeks at study visit 2, 20.2 ± 2.5 weeks at study visit 3, 22.4 ± 2.4 weeks at study visit 4, 24.3 ± 2.7 weeks at study visit 5, 26.7 ± 2.8 weeks at study visit 6, and 28.9 ± 2.6 weeks at study visit 7. Complete demographic data and baseline data are provided in **Table 1**. Body mass index (BMI) categories of the women at the initial study visit were equally distributed with 35.7% ($n = 10$) classified as normal weight, 35.7% ($n = 10$) as overweight, and 28.6% ($n = 8$) as obese. The distribution across groups by BMI category did not differ ($\chi^2 = 3.5$, $p = 0.17$). **Figure 2** provides the distribution of initial study visit BMI category for the two study groups and the entire cohort.

Intervention Effect on GWG. **Table 2** summarizes the rate and total GWG for the study participants. Despite the Breezing™ group having a greater initial weight, both groups experienced similar overall rates of [F(1,24)=-2.0, p=0.17] and total [F(1,24)=1.6, p=0.22] GWG. Compared to the control group, the Breezing™ group had a significantly higher rate of GWG during the second half of the study (F(1,24)=8.15, p=0.01), but not during the early half of the study [F(1,24)=0.56, p=0.46]. There was no difference between groups in total GWG during the first half of the study [F(1,24)=0.38, p=0.54]; however, the Breezing™ group gained significantly more (total GWG) than the Control group during the second half of the study [F(1,24)=5.1, p=0.03].

REE. Data obtained from the Breezing™ device are presented in **Table 3**. There were non-significant variations in REE throughout the study [F(6,60)=0.14, p=0.99]. 80% (n=12/15) of women had an increase in REE between the second and third study visit (mean GA: 18 to 20 weeks) with increases in REE ranging from 10 to 350 kcal/day. The differences between the remaining study visits were almost evenly split among women who experienced an increase (range: 53-63%) or a decrease (range: 38-50%) in REE. Early changes in REE (72±211 kcals) were relatively small but late changes (128±294 kcals) were nearly twice that of early changes. The mean overall change in REE was 200±316 (range: -340 to 950) kcals. There was an 11.5% increase in total REE between the first and last study visits among the Breezing™ group participants.

Association between REE and Rate of GWG. Early changes in REE were not associated with early changes in the rate of GWG (r=-0.26, p=0.33). Similarly, there was no association between late changes in REE and late changes in GWG (r=-0.18, p=0.55). Likewise, there was no relationship between overall changes in REE and overall changes in GWG (r=0.01, p=0.96). However, there was a positive correlation between early changes in REE and late changes in the rate of GWG such that greater increases in REE early in the second trimester were related to greater rate of GWG in the latter half of the second trimester (r=0.54, p=0.03).

Macronutrient Composition. There were no statistically significant differences for any of the baseline dietary intake data (**Table 4**). The early, late, and overall changes in consumption of the macronutrients among the two study groups are provided in **Table 5**. Overall (mean diff=-349.1±150.8, 95% CI: -660.3 to -37.9, p=0.03) and late (mean diff=-379.9±143.9, 95% CI: -676.9 to -82.9, p=0.01) mean differences in changes in energy consumption were significantly different between the Breezing™ and Control groups. Overall changes in protein were mildly different between Breezing™ and Control group participants (mean diff=-22.5±11.0, 95% CI: -45.2 to 0.3, p=0.05). Likewise, late changes in protein decreased slightly more for the Breezing™ group when compared to the Control group (mean diff=-23.2±11.2, 95% CI: -46.3 to 0.0, p=0.05). Early changes in protein were marginally increased in the Breezing™ group relative to the Control group (mean diff=20.3±10.2, 95% CI: -0.7 to 41.3, p=0.06). There were no statistically or marginally significant differences for overall, late, and early changes in carbohydrates and fat.

Association between REE and Macronutrient Composition. Overall changes in REE were not correlated with overall changes in energy (r=0.24, p=0.38), fat (r=0.25, p=0.34), protein (r=0.36, p=0.17), or

carbohydrate ($r=0.03$, $p=0.91$) consumption. Evaluation of time-specific changes in macronutrients with time-specific changes in REE revealed significant correlations between early changes in REE and overall changes in carbohydrate intake ($r=0.58$, $p=0.02$) and a trending significant correlation with overall changes in energy intake ($r=0.46$, $p=0.07$).

Discussion

The current pilot study was designed to provide women awareness of actual caloric needs throughout pregnancy and evaluate whether exposure to this information impacted appropriate GWG. The women who used the Breezing™ device gained more weight throughout the 13-week study period when compared to the Control group; however, this difference was not statistically significant. This finding is similar to other studies among pregnant women that have had little to no effect on GWG.(34–38) Surprisingly, there were significant differences in the rate of GWG between study groups depending on study time. In the first half of the study, there was no difference in rate or total GWG between the Breezing™ and Control group participants. This changed in the latter half of the study with the Breezing™ group having a higher total and rate of weight gain. This may indicate that GWG during the second trimester might have initially been impacted by the metabolic tracking but that awareness of REE did not have a lasting impact given that late changes in total and rate of GWG among the Breezing™ group exceeded that of the Control group. Regardless of negligible findings regarding GWG, to our knowledge, this is the first study that has implemented the use of a real-time metabolism tracker among pregnant women to monitor REE and investigate the impact of REE monitoring on GWG.

In our study, there was an overall increase in REE throughout the study of 11.5%. This is similar to other studies that have assessed REE that found increases ranging from 13-35%.(8,11,15–17) The smaller increase in the current study could be explained by the shorter evaluation period. Unlike other studies that found a moderate negative correlation between REE in the 3rd trimester and total GWG,(11) we only found a positive correlation between early changes in REE and GWG in the latter half of the study. Our lack of a positive association across the entire study period may be due to the small sample size or large variations in REE at each study visit. Approximately 40% of the women had a decrease in REE which ranged from 10 to 620 kcal/d. Similarly, the women who had an increase in REE had substantial variations ranging from 10 to 350 kcal/d. The current body of work demonstrates the need for a more in-depth evaluation of energy needs during pregnancy and the potential relationship with GWG as some women might experience drastic fluctuations in REE, thereby increasing their risk for excessive GWG or other pregnancy-related health conditions. Future studies may benefit from more regular sampling of REE and monitoring of other behavioral factors (e.g. physical activity) across gestation to fully understand these fluctuations and how they relate to GWG.

The current study also assessed maternal diet composition during pregnancy. Baseline intakes of total fat (69 grams/day) for the entire study population were comparable to findings from other studies.(26–28,39–41) Despite percent fat (35.7%) being slightly above the Acceptable Macronutrient Distribution Range, the mean total energy consumption (1690 kcal/day) among our cohort was much lower than

other studies (1970-2480 kcal/day).(27,28,40,41) Likewise, energy from carbohydrates (48%) was slightly lower (31-62 grams/day less) than previous reports which ranged from 238-269 grams/day.(26–28,40,41) The percent of calories from protein (17%) was slightly higher than other studies which have reported a range from 14-16%.(26,27) However, total daily protein (68.3 grams) consumption among the current study participants was lower than the national average (78.1 grams) for pregnant women.(27) Despite these minor differences, the overall macronutrient composition of the current cohort of pregnant women resembles that of other studies. When assessing early, late, and overall changes in macronutrients, we observed an overall increase in energy and all macronutrients for the Control group whereas the Breezing™ group had an overall decrease; however, time-specific changes varied between groups. Previous studies have found inconsistent findings pertaining to changes in macronutrient intake throughout pregnancy.(39,42) A previous meta-analysis of 90 studies (n=126,242) demonstrated an increase of 184±86 kcal, 5.9 grams of protein, 10.1 grams of fat, and 17.8 grams of carbohydrates per day from the first to the third trimester.(39) The current study demonstrates the variation in maternal diet across pregnancy and the need to have better dietary assessment methods in order to capture accurate changes.

There are several strengths of the current study including the randomized controlled design and overall study adherence. Furthermore, the longitudinal collection of data allowed for evaluation of changes, providing a more complete picture of the fluctuations among these factors during pregnancy. The current study is not without limitations. A major limitation of this study was the small sample size which might have impacted our ability to find significant results. Furthermore, our sample consisted of primarily White, highly educated women which might not be generalizable to the broader population. Lastly, the time of REE measurement collection of may have been inaccurate. REE should be measured immediately upon waking prior to consumption of any food or before any exercise. However, this was not possible as the study visits were scheduled at the most convenient times for the study participants. In order to allow for this flexible but to adjust for potential inaccuracies from measuring REE at variable times, all participants were asked to sit at rest for a minimum of thirty minutes prior to obtaining REE measures.

Conclusions

Although both groups experienced similar overall and rate of GWG, the Breezing™ group had significantly greater total and rate of GWG during the second half of the study compared to the Control group. Further, the Breezing™ group had an increase in the overall and late changes in total energy expenditure and protein whereas the Control group had a decrease. This also study demonstrated substantial fluctuations in REE, with an approximate 11.5% increase, indicating the need to account for individualized physiological needs during pregnancy and evaluation of their impact on GWG. Early changes in REE correlated with late changes in the rate of GWG demonstrating that early shifts in energy requirements might impact GWG later in pregnancy. Next steps include exploring these relationships with a larger population during the entire course of a pregnancy and the feasibility of integration of the Breezing™ device into healthcare providers' offices to be used during well-woman and prenatal visits to stimulate discussion about nutritional needs and obtain REE information from preconception through postpartum.

Abbreviations

ANCOVA – analysis of covariance

BMI – body mass index

GWG – gestational weight gain

NDSR - Nutrition Data System for Research

SPSS – Statistical Package for Social Sciences

REE – resting energy expenditure

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Recruitment of participants began after Arizona State University Institutional Review Board approval was obtained. The date of approval was

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and analyzed in the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing Interests: None

Funding: Project HoneyBee (PHB) at Arizona State University provides funding for researchers that are investigating the utility of commercial devices used for monitoring various health parameters. PHB has no role in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data nor in writing the manuscript.

Author Contributions: KBV, ER, and CMW conceptualized and designed the study, obtained funding, coordinated and supervised data collection, and critically reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual content. MPB, GQS and MEP critically reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual content.

MPB supervised the initial analyses. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank the women in this study for volunteering to participate and for welcoming us into their homes. Additionally, we would like to thank the research assistants who helped with participant recruitment and data collection.

References

1. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Table 58. Normal weight, overweight, and obesity among adults aged 20 and over, by selected characteristics: United States, selected years 1988-1994 through 2013-2016. Health (Irvine Calif) [Internet]. 2017;1–9. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/hus/contents2017.htm#054>
2. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. ACOG Committee Opinion. Weight Gain During Pregnancy. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2013;121(1):210–2.
3. Institute of Medicine (IOM) and National Research Council (NRC). *Weight Gain During Pregnancy: Reexamining the Guidelines*. Rasmussen KM, Yaktine AL, editors. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press; 2009. 1250–1253 p.
4. Catalano PM, Shankar K. Obesity and pregnancy: Mechanisms of short term and long term adverse consequences for mother and child. *BMJ*. 2017;356:1–21.
5. Deputy N, Sharma AJ, Kim SY, Hinkle SN. Prevalence and Characteristics Associated With Gestational Weight Gain Adequacy. *Obs Gynecol*. 2015;125(4):773–81.
6. Ebrahimi F, Shariff ZM, Tabatabaei SZ, Fathollahi MS, Mun CY, Nazari M. Relationship between sociodemographics, dietary intake, and physical activity with gestational weight gain among pregnant women in Rafsanjan city, Iran. *J Heal Popul Nutr*. 2015;33(1):168–76.
7. Meng Y, Groth SW, Stewart P, Smith JA. An Exploration of the Determinants of Gestational Weight Gain in African American Women: Genetic Factors and Energy Expenditure. *Biol Res Nurs*. 2018;20(2):118–25.
8. Chihara H, Otsubo Y, Araki T. Resting Energy Expenditure in Pregnant Japanese Women. *J Nippon Med Sch*. 2002;69:373–5.
9. Melzer K, Schutz Y, Boulvain M, Kayser B. Pregnancy-related changes in activity energy expenditure and resting metabolic rate in Switzerland. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2009;63:1185–91.
10. Hronek M, Doubkova P, Hrnčiarikova D, Zadák Z. Dietary intake of energy and nutrients in relation to resting energy expenditure and anthropometric parameters of Czech pregnant women. *Eur J Nutr*. 2013;52:117–25.
11. Berggren EK, O'Tierney-Ginn P, Lewis S, Presley L, De-Mouzon SH, Catalano PM. Variations in resting energy expenditure: impact on gestational weight gain. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2017;217:445.e1-

12. Shcherbina A, Mattsson CM, Waggott D, Salisbury H, Christle JW, Hastie T, et al. Accuracy in wrist-worn, sensor-based measurements of heart rate and energy expenditure in a diverse cohort. *J Pers Med*. 2017;7(2):1–12.
13. Coughlin SS, Whitehead M, Sheats JQ, Mastromonico J, Hardy D, Smith SA. Smartphone Applications for Promoting Healthy Diet and Nutrition: A Literature Review. *J food Nutr [Internet]*. 2015;2(3):021–34.
14. Overdijkink SB, Velu A V, Rosman AN, van Beukering MD, Kok M, Steegers-Theunissen RP. The Usability and Effectiveness of Mobile Health Technology–Based Lifestyle and Medical Intervention Apps Supporting Health Care During Pregnancy: Systematic Review. *JMIR mHealth uHealth [Internet]*. 2018 Apr 24 [cited 2018 Aug 13];6(4):e109.
15. Byrne N, Groves AM, McIntyre HD, Callaway L, Group BAMBINO. Changes in resting and walking energy expenditure and walking speed during pregnancy in obese women. *Am J Clin Nutr [Internet]*. 2011;94:819–30.
16. Willommet L, Schutz Y, Whitehead R, Jequier E, Fern EB. Whole body protein metabolism and resting energy expenditure in pregnant Gambian women. *Am Physiol Soc*. 1992;263:E624–31.
17. Catalano PM, Roman-Drago NM, Amini SB, Sims EA. Longitudinal changes in body composition and energy balance in lean women with normal and abnormal glucose tolerance during pregnancy. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1998;179(1):156–65.
18. Breezing Metabolism Tracker Validation* [Internet]. [cited 2018 Aug 10]. Available from: www.breezing.com
19. Jackemeyer D, Forzani F, Whisner C. Study of Resting Energy Expenditure and Weight Changes during Pregnancy. *Glob J Obes Diabetes Metab Syndr [Internet]*. 2017;4(1):016–23. Available from: <http://doi.org/10.17352/2455-8583.000018>
20. Eto E, Maki J, Tamada S, Mitsui T, Hayata K, Hiramatsu Y, et al. Assessment of resting energy expenditure and body composition in Japanese pregnant women with diabetes. *J Diabetes Investig*. 2018;9:959–66.
21. Carneiro I, Elliott S, Siervo M, Padwal R, Bertoli S, Battezzati A, et al. Is Obesity Associated with Altered Energy Expenditure? *Adv Nutr An Int Rev J [Internet]*. 2016;7(3):476–87.
22. Spaeth A, Dinges DF, Goel N. Resting metabolic rate varies by race and by sleep duration. *Obes (Silver Spring)*. 2015;23(12):2349–56.
23. Murrin C, Shrivastava A, Kelleher C, Lifeways CCSSG. Maternal macronutrient intake during pregnancy and 5 years postpartum and associations with child weight status aged five. *Eur J Clin Nutr [Internet]*. 2013;67:670–9.
24. Chong MF-F, Chia A-R, Colega M, Tint M-T, Aris IM, Chong Y-S, et al. Maternal protein intake during pregnancy is not associated with offspring birth weight in a multiethnic Asian population. *J Nutr [Internet]*. 2015;145:1303–10.

25. Hrolfsdottir L, Halldorsson TI, Rytter D, Bech BH, Birgisdottir BE, Gunnarsdottir I, et al. Maternal Macronutrient Intake and Offspring Blood Pressure 20 Years Later. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2017;6:e005808.
26. Chen LW, Aris IM, Bernard JY, Tint MT, Colega M, Gluckman PD, et al. Associations of maternal macronutrient intake during pregnancy with infant BMI peak characteristics and childhood BMI. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2017;105:705–13.
27. Blumfield ML, Hure AJ, MacDonald-Wicks L, Smith R, Collins CE. A systematic review and meta-analysis of energy and macronutrient intakes during pregnancy in developed countries. *Nutr Rev*. 2012;70(6):322–36.
28. Crume TL, Brinton JT, Shapiro A, Kaar J, Glueck DH, Siega-Riz AM, et al. Maternal dietary intake during pregnancy and offspring body composition: The Healthy Start Study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* [Internet]. 2016;215:609.e1-609.e8.
29. Pereira-da-Silva L, Cabo C, Moreira A, Virella D, Guerra T, Camoes T, et al. The Adjusted Effect of Maternal Body Mass Index, Energy and Macronutrient Intakes during Pregnancy, and Gestational Weight Gain on Body Composition of Full-Term Neonates. *Am J Perinatol* [Internet]. 2014;31:875–82.
30. Rifas-Shiman SL, Rich-Edwards JW, Kleinman KP, Oken E, Gillman MW. Dietary Quality during Pregnancy Varies by Maternal Characteristics in Project Viva: A US Cohort. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2009;109(6):1004–11.
31. Ley S, Hanley AJ, Retnakaran R, Sermer M, Zinman B, O'Connor DL. Effect of macronutrient intake during the second trimester on glucose metabolism later in pregnancy. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2011;94:1232–40.
32. National Cancer Institute. 24-hour Dietary Recall (24HR) At a Glance | Dietary Assessment Primer [Internet]. [cited 2018 Aug 10].
33. University of Minnesota. NDSR Software - NCC: Nutrition Coordinating Center [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2019 Apr 5].
34. Dekker Nitert M, Barrett HL, Denny KJ, McIntyre HD, Callaway LK. Exercise in pregnancy does not alter gestational weight gain, MCP-1 or leptin in obese women. *Aust New Zeal J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2015;55:27–33.
35. Gilmore LA, Klempel MC, Martin CK, Myers CA, Burton JH, Sutton EF, et al. Personalized Mobile Health Intervention for Health and Weight Loss in Postpartum Women Receiving Women, Infants, and Children Benefit: A Randomized Controlled Pilot Study. *J Women's Heal* [Internet]. 2017;26(7):719–27.
36. Guelincks I, Devlieger R, Mullie P, Vansant G. Effect of lifestyle intervention on dietary habits, physical activity, and gestational weight gain in obese pregnant women: A randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* [Internet]. 2010;91:373–80.
37. Opie RS, Neff M, Tierney AC. A behavioural nutrition intervention for obese pregnant women: Effects on diet quality, weight gain and the incidence of gestational diabetes. *Aust New Zeal J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2016;56(4):364–73.

38. Szmeja MA, Cramp C, Grivell RM, Deussen AR, Yelland LN, Dodd JM. Use of a DVD to provide dietary and lifestyle information to pregnant women who are overweight or obese: A nested randomised trial. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2014;14(1):1–11.
39. Blumfield M, Hure A, MacDonald-Wicks L, Smith R, Simpson S, Raubenheimer D, et al. The association between the macronutrient content of maternal diet and the adequacy of micronutrients during pregnancy in the women and their children's health (WATCH) study. *Nutrients*. 2012;4(12):1958–76.
40. Shapiro AL, Kaar JL, Crume TL, Starling AP, Siega-Riz AM, Ringham BM, et al. Maternal diet quality in pregnancy and neonatal adiposity: The Healthy State Study. *Int J Obes*. 2016;40(7):1056–62.
41. Martin CL, Siega-Riz AM, Sotres-Alvarez D, Robinson WR, Daniels JL, Perrin EM, et al. Maternal Dietary Patterns during Pregnancy Are Associated with Child Growth in the First 3 Years of Life. *J Nutr [Internet]*. 2016;146:2281–8.
42. Talai Rad N, Ritterath C, Siegmund T, Wascher C, Siebert G, Henrich W, et al. Longitudinal analysis of changes in energy intake and macronutrient composition during pregnancy and 6 weeks post-partum. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2011;283:185–90.

Tables

Table 1. Participant Demographics and Baseline Anthropometrics, Behavioral, and Prenatal Data

	Total (n=28)	Control (n=12)	Breezing™ (n=16)	P-value
Maternal age, mean±SD	29.8±4.9	29.6±5.9	29.9±4.3	0.86
Race/Ethnicity, % (n)				0.36
Non-Hispanic Caucasian	78.6 (22)	75.0 (9)	81.3 (13)	----
Hispanic Caucasian	14.3 (4)	25.0 (3)	6.25 (1)	----
Asian	3.6 (1)	0 (0)	6.25 (1)	----
More than one race	3.6 (1)	0 (0)	6.25 (1)	----
Employment classification, % (n)				0.71
Service and sales workers	14.3 (4)	16.7 (2)	12.5 (2)	----
Managerial jobs	3.6 (1)	0 (0)	6.3 (1)	----
Professional	39.3 (11)	50.0 (6)	31.3 (5)	----
Clerical support workers	7.1 (2)	8.3 (1)	6.3 (1)	----
Stay at home mom	35.7 (10)	25.0 (3)	43.8 (7)	----
Marital Status, % (n)				0.62
Single	3.6 (1)	0 (0)	6.3 (1)	----
Married	85.7 (24)	91.7 (11)	81.3 (13)	----
Partnered/Significant Other	10.7 (3)	8.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	----
Education Level, % (n)				0.17
Less than 8 th grade	3.6 (1)	0 (0)	6.3 (1)	----
High School/GED	10.7 (3)	25.0 (3)	0 (0)	----
Two-year college	17.9 (5)	8.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	----
Four-year college	32.1 (9)	25.0 (3)	37.5 (6)	----
Post-graduate	35.7 (10)	41.7 (5)	31.3 (5)	----
Weight (kgs), mean±SD	73.7±16.0	70.3±15.8	76.2±16.2	0.35
Height (cms), mean±SD	164.1.5	163.5±6.6	164.4±6.6	0.72
Body Mass Index (kg/m ²), mean±SD	27.4±5.8	26.3±5.8	28.2±5.9	0.40
Gestational age (weeks), mean±SD	14.8±2.2	15.3±1.5	14.4±2.7	0.29
Exercise Level, % (n)				0.32
Sedentary	14.3 (4)	25.0 (3)	6.3 (1)	-----
Mild	57.1 (16)	50.0 (6)	63.5 (10)	-----
Occasional vigorous	21.4 (6)	25.0 (3)	18.8 (3)	-----
Regular vigorous	7.1 (2)	0 (0)	12.5 (2)	-----
Medication Use, % (n)				0.69
None	7.1 (2)	8.3 (1)	6.3 (1)	-----
1 to 3	71.4 (20)	66.7 (8)	75.0 (12)	-----
4 to 6	17.9 (5)	16.7 (2)	18.8 (3)	-----
More than 6	3.6 (1)	8.3 (1)	0 (0)	-----

Prenatal Vitamin Use, % (n)	82.1 (23)	83.3 (10)	81.3 (13)	0.89
-----------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------

Employment categories were determined using the International Standard Classification of Occupations-08. Exercise level were defined as the following: sedentary (no exercise), mild (climbing stairs, waking a few blocks, golfing), occasional vigorous (less than 4 times per week for 30 mins), and regular vigorous (at least 4 times per week for 30 mins or more). Medication use included both prescribed and over-the-counter medicines. Prenatal vitamin use was based off self-report and did not include multivitamin use. Independent t-tests were performed for all continuous variables to determine if there were statistically significant differences between groups and mean (SD) are reported. Chi-Square tests were evaluated for all baseline categorical variables to determine if there were statistically significant difference between groups. Abbreviations: SD= standard deviation;

Table 2. Mean±SD of Rate of and Total Gestational Weight Gain (GWG) Among Study Participants

	Control (n=12)	Breezing™ (n=16)	Total (n=28)	Cohen's d	P-Value
Rate of GWG					
Overall Changes	0.5±0.3	0.6±0.2	0.5±0.2	0.4	0.17
Early Changes	0.6±0.3	0.5±0.3	0.5±0.3	0.4	0.46
Late Changes	0.4±0.3	0.7±0.3	0.6±0.3	1.1	0.01
Total GWG					
Overall Changes	7.1±2.6	8.1±2.9	7.7±2.8	0.4	0.22
Early Changes	4.2±1.7	3.6±2.0	3.9±1.9	0.3	0.54
Late Changes	3.0±1.4	4.4±1.7	3.8±1.7	0.9	0.03

ANCOVA with maternal education and gestational at study start were performed to compare group differences in rate and total GWG and mean (SD) were reported. Cohen's d was calculated using means and SDs. Cohen's d= .2 is a small effect, =.5 is a moderate effect, =.8 is a large effect. Abbreviations: SD= standard deviation; GWG= gestational weight gain; IQR= interquartile range, defined as the difference between the third and first quartile.

Table 3. Mean±SD of Resting Energy Expenditure from Breezing™ Device

	Resting Energy Expenditure
Study Visit 1	1544±237
Study Visit 2	1511±220
Study Visit 3	1628±242
Study Visit 4	1616±253
Study Visit 5	1708±338
Study Visit 6	1706±367
Study Visit 7	1744±384

Comparisons between timepoints were assessed using repeated measures analysis of variance with covariates of maternal education level and gestational age at study start. All data are presented as mean±SD and were obtained from the Breezing™ device. Abbreviations: SD=standard deviation.

Table 4. Baseline Maternal Macronutrient, Fiber, Cholesterol, Caffeine, and Sugar Consumption at the Initial Study Visit

	Total (n=28)	Control (n=12)	Breezing™ (n=16)	P-Value
Total Energy (kcal)	1690.2±495.7	1751.1±493.8	1644.6±508.2	0.58
Total Fat (gm)	68.8±29.3	71.0±29.0	67.2±30.3	0.75
Saturated Fat (gm) ^a	22.2 (13.1, 33.4)	18.8 (11.3, 56.6)	26.1 (7.8, 40.7)	1.00
Monounsaturated Fat (gm)	56.7±25.3	27.3±14.3	23.8±12.2	0.49
Polyunsaturated Fat (gm)	28.5±13.0	12.5±5.7	13.4±8.0	0.73
Cholesterol (mg) ^a	178.9 (94.5, 283.3)	185.2 (89.4, 273.5)	166.1 (103.3, 292.0)	0.85
Total Carbohydrate (gm)	207.8±58.2	219.2±55.9	199.2±60.3	0.38
Total Dietary Fiber (gm)	19.6±9.6	22.1±11.2	17.7±8.1	0.23
Soluble Fiber (gm)	15.3±5.9	6.6±3.5	5.4±2.3	0.29
Insoluble Fiber (gm)	13.6±7.5	15.4±8.5	12.3±6.7	0.28
Total Protein (gm)	68.3±24.0	68.6±24.0	68.0±24.7	0.95
Caffeine (mg) ^a	3.1 (0.0, 47.4)	2.9 (0.0, 88.5)	3.5 (0.0, 44.5)	0.69
Total Sugars (gm) ^a	69.6 (51.7, 107.2)	78.7 (66.0, 104.5)	62.3 (42.9, 121.1)	0.33
Added Sugars (gm)	38.9±29.4	32.0±20.7	44.0±34.4	0.26

Independent samples t-tests were performed for all normally distributed data and mean (SD) were reported. ^a Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was performed for all non-normally distributed data and median (IQR) were reported. Abbreviations: SD= standard deviation; IQR= interquartile range, defined as the difference between the third and first quartile; kcal=kilocalories; mg=milligrams; gm=grams. All data are based on an interview conducted 24-hour dietary recall at the initial study visit.

Table 5. Mean±SD for Overall, Late, and Early Changes by Group (N=28)

Variable	Control (n=12)	Breezing™ (n=16)	Cohen's d	P-Value
Energy (kcal)				
Overall Changes	191.8±422.2	-143.8±339.2	0.18	0.03
Early Changes	-43.0±766.1	32.2±642.6	0.00	0.79
Late Changes	207.1±416.5	-155.3±309.22	0.23	0.01
Protein (gm)				
Overall Changes	13.3±31.0	-9.9±24.0	0.15	0.05
Early Changes	-9.9±19.9	7.4±30.8	0.14	0.06
Late Changes	13.4±33.0	-10.0±22.9	0.15	0.05
Carbohydrates (gm)				
Overall Changes	19.3±57.8	-14.5±58.7	0.10	0.12
Early Changes	-2.4±73.6	1.8±87.9	0.00	0.86
Late Changes	19.3±58.0	-14.4±55.8	0.11	0.11
Fat (gm)				
Overall Changes	7.4±25.5	-5.5±14.9	0.10	0.11
Early Changes	0.5±60.8	-0.4±28.0	0.00	0.87
Late Changes	7.8±25.2	-5.8±14.5	0.11	0.09

ANCOVA was performed with maternal education and gestational age at study start as covariates to test for group differences. Abbreviations: SD= standard deviation; kcal=kilocalories; gm=grams.

Figures

Figure 1. Study Consort Diagram




Figure 1

Figure 2. Distribution of Women by Weight Status Categorized by Body Mass Index (Normal Weight BMI: 18.5-24.9 kg/m²; Overweight BMI: 25-29.9 kg/m²; Obese BMI: >30 kg/m²) at the Initial Study Visit




Figure 2