IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Treatment For Hypertension In Pregnancy Condition

1**Tejasvini Laxmikant Jirewad,** 2**Radhika Ashok Shinde,** 3**Gajanan Ramesh Sapate ,** 4**Swaraj Sanjay Tawale,** 5**Mr.Nadim Khan**

1Student, 2Student, 3Student, 4Student, 5Assistant professor

[1]Pharm. D, [1]K. T. Patil Collage of Pharmacy, Dharashiv, India.

Abstract_

6% to 8% of pregnancies are complicated by hypertensive pregnancy disorders, which also significantly increase mother and foetal morbidity and mortality. Obstetricians continue to struggle with the unresolved and preventable issue of hypertensive disorders during pregnancy. In addition to the usual risks for cardiovascular disease, affected women have an elevated risk of developing the condition later in life. This review focuses on antihypertensive therapy as a specific therapeutic tactic for pregnant women with hypertension problems.

Keywords
Morbidity, Mortality, Foetal risk, edoema, Blood pressure

BACKGROUND—
The advantages and security of the therapy of gentle constant hypertension (pulse, <160/100 mm Hg) it are questionable to during pregnancy. The effectiveness of a strategy that focuses on lowering blood pressure to less than 140/90 mm Hg without compromising fetal growth is yet to be determined.

Resistant hypertension (RH) is defined as blood pressure (BP) that remains above goal (i.e., systolic blood pressure [SBP] ≥130 mm Hg and/or diastolic blood pressure [DBP] ≥80 mm Hg), despite adherence to a regimen of three or more optimally dosed antihypertensive medications of different classes, one of which is a diuretic.1 Although estimates vary, RH is believed to affect approximately 5% of the general population and 20–30% of hypertensive adults, with even higher rates among adults with risk factors for cardiovascular disease (CVD) such as diabetes or chronic kidney disease.2, 3 RH is a particularly important designation because it is associated with a higher prevalence of end-organ damage and a 50% greater risk for adverse CVD events, including stroke, myocardial infarction, and death, compared with controlled BP.4 Therefore, identifying effective treatments for lowering BP in patients with RH is timely and important.
The failure to lower BP adequately with established antihypertensive medications in RH patients has prompted the evaluation of medications not typically used for first-line therapy of hypertension, such as

spironolactone and amiloride,5, 6 and the development of device-based interventions, most notably renal denervation

METHODS—

In this open-label, multi-center, randomised trial, we randomly assigned pregnant women with mild chronic hypertension and singleton foetuses at a gestational age of less than 23 weeks to either receive antihypertensive medications recommended for use in pregnancy (active-treatment group) or to not receive any treatment at all unless severe hypertension (systolic pressure, 160 mm Hg; or diastolic pressure, 105 mm Hg) (control group). Preeclampsia with severe symptoms, medically indicated premature birth at less than 35 weeks' gestation, placental abruption, or foetal or neonatal death comprised the major result. Low birth weight for gestational age, below the 10th percentile, was the safety outcome. Secondary outcomes were preterm birth, preeclampsia, and combinations of significant neonatal or maternal problems.

To evaluate the benefits and safety of pharmacologic antihypertensive therapy during pregnancy, we designed a randomized trial involving women with mild chronic hypertension, a condition that is estimated to affect 70 to 80% of pregnant women with chronic hypertension. Our preliminary data suggested a stepwise increase in adverse pregnancy outcomes with increasing

blood pressure above 140/90 mm Hg during the first half of pregnancy.14 We hypothesized that a strategy of treating mild chronic hypertension during pregnancy with a blood-pressure goal of less than 140/90 mm Hg would result in a lower incidence of adverse maternal and perinatal outcomes than a strategy of with 2% or more of pregnancies result in CHRONIC HYPERTENSION. 1,2 African women are disproportionately affected by this syndrome, which increases the risk of preeclampsia, placental abruption, preterm birth, low birth weight for gestational age, and perinatal death by three to five times. 1,3,4 Moreover, the disease increases the risk of maternal mortality, heart failure, stroke, pulmonary edoema, and acute renal injury by 5 to 10 times. 1,3,4 Antihypertensive therapy is the standard of care for non-pregnant individuals with a blood pressure of 140/90 mm Hg or higher; however, treatment during pregnancy is disputed.

An increased risk of small-for-gestational-age newborns has been connected to it. refraining from therapy until the blood pressure was at least 160/105 mm Hg (a more conservative cutoff for severe hypertension that we used in the trial).

TRIAL DESIGN AND OVERSIGHT

A multicenter, pragmatic, open-label, randomised, controlled trial with more than 70 recruitment sites was carried out as part of the investigator-initiated Chronic Hypertension and Pregnancy (CHAP) initiative. The CHAP Trial Consortium, which includes clinical and data coordinating facilities, had a cooperative agreement with which the trial was run. The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) constituted a protocol review committee, and the institutional review board at each trial centre approved the study protocol (available with the full text of this publication at NEJM.org). A steering group and an independent data and safety monitoring board constituted by the NHLBI oversaw the trial. The correctness and completeness of the data are the responsibility of all write

ELIGIBILITY AND BLOOD-PRESSURE MEASUREMENT

The CHAP Trial Collaboration, which includes clinical and data coordinating facilities, and on the basis of which the trial was performed. The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) constituted a protocol review committee, and the institutional review board at each trial centre approved the study protocol (available with the full text of this publication at NEJM.org). A steering group and an independent data and safety monitoring board constituted by the NHLBI oversaw the trial. Each author is accountable for the data's fidelity, including its accuracy and completeness.

Changes in blood pressure, past or present antihypertensive therapy, lifestyle changes, etc.

The blood pressure levels necessary for randomization relied on whether the patient was currently on a prescription for antihypertensive medication and had been taking it as directed. It was necessary to have a systolic pressure between 140 and 159 mm Hg or a diastolic pressure between 90 and 104 mm Hg if the patient had not taken an antihypertensive medication within the previous 24 hours. A systolic pressure of less than 160 mm Hg and a diastolic pressure of less than 105 mm Hg were needed if the patient had been receiving antihypertensive therapy. Individuals who had blood pressure readings of less than 140 mm Hg systolic and 90 mm Hg diastolic were also qualified.

Severe hypertension or blood pressure levels requiring multiple antihypertensive medications (indicating the risk of severe hypertension), known secondary hypertension, multiple foetuses, prespecified high-risk coexisting illnesses or complications that may warrant treatment at a lower blood pressure level, obstetric conditions that increase foetal risk, and contraindications to first-line antihypertensive drugs were all included in the exclusion criteria.

INTERVENTIONS AND PROCEDURES

During clinic appointments, a protocol for precise, repeatable, and practical blood pressure monitoring was utilised for screening, enrollment, and to direct any modifications to medication. Clinical carers were uninformed of the blood pressure measures taken with an automated device (Omron HEM-907) at randomization for ancillary research purposes unless they had been used as the patient's blood pressure for clinical management (clinic blood pressure). To apply this strategy, research staff members had training and certification, and clinical staff also received regular orientation and direction. The blood pressure levels measured in the clinic and additional levels that were recorded (such as those taken during ER visits or hospital admissions) were used to determine study outcomes, including preeclampsia. (The Supplemental Appendix contains information on all study interventions and methods.)

Patients were randomised to receive either standard (control) treatment, in which antihypertensive therapy was withheld or stopped at randomization unless severe hypertension (systolic pressure, 160 mm Hg; or diastolic pressure, 105 mm Hg) developed, or to a blood pressure goal of less than 140/90 mm Hg (active treatment). If severe hypertension was found in the control group, a blood pressure target of less than 160/105 mm Hg was used for treatment.

Regardless of whether the patients were currently taking antihypertensive medication, trial-group assignments were made. SAS software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute), was used to create a Web-based randomization algorithm, and assignments were stratified by location with varying blocks of 2, 4, and 6 to hide the trial-group assignments.

A first-line antihypertensive medication for pregnancy (labetalol or extended-release nifedipine, provided by the trial investigators) was prescribed to patients in the active-treatment group. If the patient preferred another medication, they could also receive amlodipine or methyldopa. Before beginning a second medication (preferably nifedipine or labetalol if the first medication was started first), the dose was increased to the highest recommended dose that was not linked to intolerable side effects in order to reach the target blood pressure. Similar antihypertensive drugs were only given to the control group if severe hypertension manifested itself.

Before making any medication adjustments, patients were questioned about their compliance with their blood pressure regimen during clinic appointments. At the time of each refill, pill counts were done. other evaluations, such as the frequency of clinic visits, foetal ultrasound analysis.

OUTCOMES

The main outcome was a composite of foetal or neonatal death, placental abruption, medically indicated preterm birth before 35 weeks' gestation, or preeclampsia with severe features occurring up to 2 weeks after birth (i.e., because of maternal or foetal illness, not spontaneous labour or membrane rupture). The criteria used by ACOG to define preeclampsia. 3 It should be noted that a blood pressure reading of 160/100 mm Hg or more was insufficient to identify preeclampsia with severe characteristics in the absence of the condition's typical signs and symptoms, proteinuria, or laboratory abnormalities.

The primary outcome was evaluated in five predetermined subgroups based on the treatment status for hypertension at baseline (newly diagnosed, diagnosed and taking medication, or diagnosed but not taking medication), race or ethnic group, diabetes status, and gestational age at enrollment. Poor foetal growth, measured as birth weight below the 10th percentile for gestational age and infant sex using the Duryea population standard, was the main safety result. 16 A birth weight that was small-for-gestational-age and below the fifth percentile was also evaluated.

A composite of maternal death or serious complications (heart failure, stroke, or encephalopathy; myocardial infarction or angina; pulmonary edoema; admission to an intensive care unit [ICU] or intubation; or renal failure), any preterm birth (37 weeks' gestation), and a composite of serious neonatal complications were major secondary outcomes (bronchopulmonary dysplasia, retinopathy of prematurity, necrotizing enterocolitis, or intraventricular haemorrhage of grade 3 or 4). Other maternal outcomes included preeclampsia and worsening chronic hypertension (severe hypertension without preeclampsia), mean clinic blood-pressure, head size, index, and placental weight. (The Supplemental Appendix has specifics on all primary and secondary outcome definitions.)

Patients were monitored for six weeks following delivery. Patients suspected of having the primary or chosen secondary outcomes underwent blinded reviews by an outcome adjudication committee.

Blood pressure.—. The clinic SBP served as the main outcome indicator. JNC-7 recommendations were used to determine clinic-measured blood pressure. The initial reading from an Accutorr Plus blood pressure monitor (Datascope, Mahwah, New Jersey) was deleted after 5 minutes of calm rest in order to provide an average of 3 clinic blood pressure measurements each session. Following the 4-month interventions, the same clinic BP measurement methodology was repeated three times during a three- to four-week period. Therefore, the clinic blood pressure measurements were an average of nine readings over a 3-week period. Clinic DBP served as a supplemental outcome metric.

CVD and Metabolic Biomarkers.—

Secondary outcomes included BRS measurement to determine how much the baroreflex affected heart rate, PWV measurement to determine arterial stiffness, HF-HRV measurement to determine vagally mediated modulation of heart rate, FMD measurement to determine endothelial function, LVM and relative wall thickness measurement to determine the structure of the left ventricle, C-reactive protein measurement, and blood markers reflecting metabolic function (e.g., insulin, glucose, and lipids). For more information on the CVD biomarker assessment processes, see Expanded Methods.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The final sample size of 2404 (1202 per group), which was decreased from the initially anticipated enrolment of 4700 patients, was accepted by the data and safety monitoring board as being sufficient to detect a relative reduction of 33% in the occurrence of the composite primary-outcome events. Using 85% power and a two-sided alpha level of 0.05, we made the following estimates assuming a baseline incidence of primary outcome events of 16% in the control group, 10% nonadherence to the trial regimen or crossover, and 5% loss to follow-up. When 800 patients had completed the trial, a blinded reevaluation of

the sample size found that the incidence of the primary endpoint was at least 30%. As a result, we decided that 2404 patients would be enough to identify relative effect sizes of at least 25%. With a baseline incidence as low as 10%, this sample size would have more than 80% power to detect a relative difference of 35% or more in the incidence of small-for-gestational-age birth weight.
The intention-to-treat population served as the subject of the primary analysis. Multiple imputation techniques with five replicates were employed where the principal composite or birth-weight outcomes were uncertain (for example, when a participant withdrew from the experiment prior to delivery). The Supplemental Appendix includes more information on these analyses. 17 Each duplicated set was subjected to multivariable log-binomial models, and evaluations of treatment impact were aggregated. Calculations were made for adjusted risk ratios, 95% confidence intervals, and statistical significance tests. All patients with data on the primary outcome and small-for-gestational-age birth weight underwent complete-case analyses, and risk ratios and 95% confidence intervals were computed. We also calculated the 95% confidence interval and the number of patients who would need to get treatment in order to avert one primary outcome event.

SAS 9.4 was used to conduct all analyses. General linear models with post-treatment SBP as the outcome (4 months after treatment), treatment group assignment (C-LIFE vs SEPA) as a between-subjects factor, race, sex, age, diagnosis of diabetes or chronic kidney disease (CKD), baseline medication adherence, and pretreatment clinic SBP as covariates were used to analyse changes in the primary outcome, clinic SBP. Using logistic regression to estimate odds ratios in accordance with the predetermined statistical strategy, we reproduced the primary-outcome analyses. To account for the period that patients had been included in the study, we also performed per-protocol analyses (in which crossovers were included in the group as treated) and survival analyses; both analyses included patients who had been lost to follow-up.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PATIENTS

The characteristics of the patients were well balanced at baseline in the two groups (Table 1). A majority (56%) had known chronic h 29,772 women underwent screening from September 2015 to March 2021; 2419 women then underwent randomization at 61 sites (Fig. S1 in the Supplementary Appendix). A systolic blood pressure less than 140 mm Hg and a diastolic blood pressure less than 90 mm Hg in patients who had either not been prescribed antihypertensive treatment or had not complied with the prescribed regimen (in 39% of excluded patients) as well as advanced gestational age (in 32%) were the main reasons for exclusion. Before any data were recorded or ten participants were removed after randomization, one patient also revoked consent. With 1208 patients assigned to active treatment and 1200 to conventional (control) treatment, a total sample size of 2408 was used for analysis. 22% of people had recently been diagnosed with chronic hypertension, 22% had known chronic hypertension but weren't taking medication. Before randomization, the most popular antihypertensive medications were labetalol and nifedipine (Table S2). 48% of patients were non-Hispanic Black women, 20% were Hispanic women, and 28% were non-Hispanic White women. 16% of patients had diabetes mellitus, and 41% had gestational ages of under 14 weeks.

MEDICATION ADHERENCE

Labetalol (61.7%) or nifedipine (35.6%) were given to the patients in the active-treatment group; 2.7% got additional drugs (Table S3). 7717 patients in the group receiving active therapy attended the clinic out of a total of 15,010 visits. The patients reported taking their prescribed medications at 86% of these visits. Patients in the active-treatment group reported taking drugs more frequently than those in the control group at the most recent prenatal visit (88.9% vs. 24.4%). (Table S4). Between the time of randomization and delivery, the active-treatment group's mean blood pressure was lower than that of the control group

(systolic pressure, 129.5 mm Hg vs. 132.6 mm Hg, a difference of 3.1 mm Hg; and diastolic pressure, 79.1 mm Hg vs. 81.5 mm Hg, a difference of 2.3 mm Hg).

PRIMARY OUTCOME

A total of 83 patients—38 (3.1%) in the active-treatment group and 45 (3.8%) in the control group—were lost to follow-up. A primary outcome event occurred in the complete-case analysis in 353 of 1170 patients (30.2%) receiving active treatment and in 427 of 1155 (37.0%) receiving control treatment (risk ratio, 0.82; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.73 to 0.92; P0.001). The adjusted risk ratio for a primary outcome event was 0.82 (95% CI, 0.74 to 0.92; P0.001) following imputation (Table 2). To prevent one primary outcome event, 14.7 people would need to get treatment (95% CI: 9.4 to 33.7).

Regarding the elements of the primary outcome, there were 336 patients in the active-treatment group and 272 patients (23.3% each) who experienced preeclampsia with severe characteristics.

Medically indicated preterm birth occurred before 35 weeks of pregnancy in 143 patients (12.2%) and 193 patients (16.7%), respectively, in the control group. The adjusted risk ratios determined by imputation for these two components were 0.80 (95% CI, 0.70 to 0.92) and 0.73 (95% CI, 0.60 to 0.89), respectively, and were identical to the risk ratios for the complete-case analysis.

128 of 1146 infants (11.2%) with mothers in the active-treatment group and 117 of 1124 (10.4%) with mothers in the control group experienced the safety outcome of newborns with a birth weight that was below the 10th percentile for their gestational age (risk ratio, 1.07; 95% CI, 0.85 to 1.36; P=0.56). The between-group difference was similarly not statistically significant in the imputation analysis of this comparison (adjusted risk ratio, 1.04; 95% CI, 0.82 to 1.31; P = 0.76). With values of 5.1% and 5.5%, respectively, for neonates whose birth weight fell below the 5th percentile for their gestational age, similar findings were also found (risk ratio, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.65 to 1.30; P = 0.63).

SUBGROUP ANALYSE

displays the results of predetermined subgroup analysis for the main outcome. The risk ratios for newly diagnosed hypertension and for a body mass index of 40 or more were close to 1.00, but the 95% confidence intervals of the treatment effect on the primary outcome were consistent with the general results in all the subgroups.

NEONATAL AND SECONDARY MATERNAL OUTCOMES

Low rates of the maternal composite outcome were seen, and there were no significant differences between the two therapy groups (Table 3). In the active-treatment group, 436 of 1208 patients (36.1%) and 531 of 1200 patients (44.2%) both experienced severe maternal hypertension. Preeclampsia occurred in 295 patients (24.4%), 373 (31.1%), or neither with severe symptoms.

Preterm birth occurred before 37 weeks of pregnancy in 332 of 1208 infants (27.5%) in the active-treatment group and in 377 of 1200 (31.4%) in the control group among neonatal outcomes. 232 newborns (19.2%) and 277 (23.1%) had low birth weights (2500 g), respectively (Table 4). The frequency of outcomes from NICU admission and serious newborn problems did not seem to vary significantly between the two groups. Reports of unfavourable incidents are given.

ADDITIONAL ANALYSES

The outcomes of multiple additional analyses, including those with computed odds ratios (Table S6), per-protocol analyses (Table S7), survival analyses (Fig. S2), and sensitivity analyses, were in agreement with the original results (Tables S8, S9, and S10).

DISCUSSION

Until the systolic blood pressure was 160 mm Hg or higher or the diastolic pressure was 105 mm Hg or higher, active therapy with a blood pressure target of less than 140/90 mm Hg was related with better pregnancy outcomes in pregnant women with mild chronic hypertension.

Women who received active therapy had a decreased risk of one or more primary outcome events, including severe preeclampsia, medically indicated preterm birth at or below 35 weeks' gestation, placental abruption, or foetal or neonatal death. Estimates for the primary outcome's components and the majority of secondary outcomes, such as composites for serious maternal or neonatal problems, preeclampsia, and preterm birth, were in line with the findings of the primary study. It was calculated that in order to stop one primary outcome event, 14–15 individuals would need to undergo active treatment. The safety outcome of neonates who were below either the 10th percentile or the 5th percentile for gestational age weight did not differ significantly across groups.The between-group difference in mean blood pressure after randomization was seemingly small.

In this study, we discovered that antihypertensive medication used actively enhanced pregnancy outcomes without causing any obvious harm. The point estimates for the risk ratio for patients with newly diagnosed chronic hypertension and for patients with a body mass index of 40 or higher were approximately 1.00 in prespecified subgroup analyses of the primary outcome, but the 95% confidence intervals were large and consistent with the overall treatment effect. The experiment lacked sufficient power to compare treatment effects across subgroups. It may be instructive to conduct additional therapy effect analysis in individuals with newly diagnosed hypertension or a body mass index of 40 or above. Our findings are similar with the findings of earlier trials and a systematic analysis of antihypertensive therapy for moderate chronic hypertension in pregnancy in that they imply that the incidence of severe hypertension was reduced among patients who received active treatment. 7,18,19 Previous studies that concentrated on moderate chronic hypertension lacked sufficient power to detect pregnancy outcomes, even if their point estimates agreed with our conclusions. 7,18 The primary outcome of NICU admission or pregnancy loss did not differ between groups in the Control of Hypertension in Pregnancy Study (CHIPS), which compared "tight versus less-tight" antihypertensive treatment in women with mild or severe chronic or pregnancy-associated hypertension who were enrolled at 14 to 33 weeks' gestation. Our results support the findings from CHIPS, which indicated that there was no significant between-group difference in NICU admission. 19 In CHIPS, the proportion of patients in the overall sample with newborns whose weight was below the 10th percentile for gestational age was 16.1% in the group with less-tight blood-pressure control and 19.7% in the group with tight control (adjusted odds ratio, 0.78; 95% confidence interval, 0.56 to 1.08); in the subgroup with chronic hypertension (75% of the trial population), the percentages were 13.9% and 19.7%, respectively (adjusted odds ratio, 0. 9,19 The use of various entry criteria, treatment philosophies, sample sizes, and trial results is likely to be the cause of the discrepancies between our findings and those of earlier trials. In our trial, the mean between-group differences in both systolic blood pressure (3.1 mm Hg) and diastolic pressure (2.3 mm Hg) were unadjusted for the time after randomization and appear to mask larger differences in blood pressure over several weeks (Fig. 1). Moreover, improvements in cardiovascular end points have been linked to similar drops in blood pressure. 20,21 Our findings could have been influenced by the active-treatment group's improved blood pressure management. In our trial, the prevalence of caesarean births (49%) was in line with the prevalence that is normal for women with chronic hypertension. 19 In post hoc analysis, aspirin usage at baseline (around 45% of patients) did not

appear to affect the treatment benefit for the primary outcome; however, aspirin use during delivery was substantially greater (76–77% in both groups).
Large sample size, various trial centres, thorough supervision by an independent data and safety monitoring board, and use of centralised blinded adjudication to confirm key outcomes are all advantages of our experiment. The trial population had a similar age distribution and racial and ethnic variety as American women with chronic hypertension who are giving birth, with a larger percentage of Black and Hispanic women22 (Table S11). The open-label strategy used in the experiment, which was thought to be suitable given the logistical and ethical difficulties involved in delivering blinded treatments, was one of its limitations. Concerns about the generalizability of our findings may arise due to the high ratio of 12 patients who received screening for every patient who was randomly assigned. Nevertheless, the characteristics of the screened population and the enrolled population were comparable (Table S12), and more than 60% of the patients who were excluded were either older than the enrollment cutoff for gestational age or had a history of known or suspected chronic hypertension but had a blood pressure below the entry threshold; the physiologic drop in blood pressure during pregnancy may have contributed to this factor. It's important to note that the trial protocol did not include an analysis of blood pressure readings obtained at home.

In our experiment, treating moderate chronic hypertension reduced the risk of negative pregnancy outcomes without raising the risk of low birth weight for gestational age compared to delaying therapy until hypertension became severe. Our results back up the treatment of pregnant women with chronic hypertension, including the maintenance of their current antihypertensive medicine, with a blood pressure target of less than 140/90 mm Hg. The significance of antihypertensive therapy may be further clarified by studies on the long-term effects of antihypertensive treatment on cardiovascular and other outcomes in pregnant women with moderate chronic hypertension and their offspring.

Result :

. As shown in the data after first contacting 506 patients and screening 266 of them, 140 of them met the eligibility requirements and were randomly assigned to one of the therapies. The BP requirement for inclusion was decreased to clinic SBP 130 mm Hg or DBP 80 mm Hg for 67 of the 140 randomly assigned participants after the 2017 ACC/AHA BP guidelines were announced; 21 of them would not have qualified under the earlier BP criteria. The allocation of 50 people to SEPA and 90 people to C-LIFE was random. Throughout the experiment, just four patients discontinued (all from SEPA). Nevertheless, three SEPA participants were unable to complete the in-person laboratory biomarker measurements required for their post-treatment assessments as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. For these patients, ambulatory BP devices were delivered to participants for self-application and monitoring, and clinic BPs were collected remotely from home measures. All 140 participants were included in the final analysis using intention-to-treat analyses.

References:

1. N English j med Author manuscript; available in PMC 2022 November 12 ; published in final edited form as: N Engl J med, 2022 May 12; 386(19); 1792-1792, doi. 1056/NEJMoa2201295.
2. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Method for estimating due date: committeeopinion no. 611. Obstet Gynecol 2014;124:863-6. [PubMed: 25244460]
3. Duryea El., Hawkins JS, McIntire DD, Casey BM, Leveno KJ. A revised birth weight reference for the United States. Obstet Gynecol 2014;124:16-22. [PubMed: 24901276)
4. Sterne JAC, White IR, Carlin JB, et al. Multiple imputation for missing data in epidemiological and clinical research: potential and pitfalls. BMJ 2009,338 62393. [PubMed: 19564179]
5. Sibai BM, Mabie WC, Shamsa F, Villar MA, Anderson GD. A comparison of no medicationversus methyldopa or labetalol in chronic hypertension during pregnancy. Am J Obstet Gynecol1990:162:960-[PubMed: 2183619]
6. Magee LA, von Dadelszen P. Rey E, et al. Less-tight versus tight control of hypertension in pregnancy. N Engl J Med 2015;372:407-17. [PubMed: 25629739]
7. Thomopoulos C. Parati G, Zanchetti A. Effects of blood pressure lowering on outcome incidence in hypertension. 1. Overview, meta-analyses, and meta-regression analyses of randomized trials. J Hypertension 2014:32:2285-95. [PubMed: 25255397]
8. Hardy ST, Loehr LR, Butler KR, et al. Reducing the blood pressure-related burden of cardiovascular disease: impact of achievable improvements in blood pressure prevention and control. J Am Heart Assoc 2015;4(10):e002276. [PubMed: 26508742]
9. Grover S, Brandt JS, Reddy UM, Ananth CV. Chronic hypertension, perinatal mortality and the impact of preterm delivery: a population-based study. BJOG 2022:129: 572-9. [PubMed:34536318]
10. Bateman BT, Bansil P. Hernandez-Diaz S. Mhyre JM, Callaghan WM. Kuklina EV Prevalence trends, and outcomes of chronic hypertension: a nationwide sample of delivery admissions. Am 1 Obstet Gynecol 2012;206(2):134 el-8. (PubMed: 22177190)
11. Ananth CV, Duzyj CM, Yadava S, Schwebel M. Tita ATN, Joseph KS. Changes in the prevalence of chronic hypertension in pregnancy, United States, 1970 to 2010. Hypertension 2019:74:1089-95[PubMed: 31495278]
12. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Hypertension in pregnancy: report of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists Task Force on Hypertension in Pregnancy Obstet Gynecol 2013;122:1122-31. (PubMed: 241500271)
13. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists Committee on Practice Bulletins- Obstetrics. ACOG practice bulletin no, 203: chronic hypertension in pregnancy. Obstet Gynecol 2019;133(1):e26-e50. [PubMed: 30575676].
14. James PA, Oparil S, Carter BL, et al. 2014 evidence-based guideline for the management of high blood pressure in adults: report from the panel members appointed to the Eighth Joint National Committee (JNC 8). JAMA 2014:311:507-20. [PubMed: 24352797]
15. Whelton PK, Carey RM, Aronow WS, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA guideline for the prevention, detection, evaluation, and management of high blood pressure in adults: a report of the American College of Cardiology American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. J Am Coll Cardiol 2018:71(19):e127-e248.
16. Magee LA. Ornstein MP, von Dadelszen P. Fortnightly review: management of hypertension in pregnancy. BMJ 1999:318:1332-6. [PubMed: 10323823]

17. Abalos E, Duley L, Steyn DW, Giakdini C. Antihypertensive drug therapy for mild to moderate hypertension during pregnancy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2018:10:CD002252. [PubMed30277556]
18. American College of O. Gynecologists, Task Force on Hypertension in P. Hypertension in pregnancy. Report of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Task Force on Hypertension in Pregnancy. Obstetrics and gynecology. 2013;122(5):1122-1131. [PubMed]
19. Mancia G, Fagard R, Narkiewicz K, Redon J, Zanchetti A. Bohm M, et al. 2013 ESH/ESC Guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension: the Task Force for the management of arterial hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension (ESH) and of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Journal of hypertension. 2013;31(7):1281- 1357. [PubMed]
20. Anderson GD, Carr DB. Effect of pregnancy on the pharmacokinetics of antihypertensive drugs. Clinical pharmacokinetics. 2009;48(3):159-168. [PubMed]
21. Podymow T, August P. Update on the use of antihypertensive drugs in pregnancy. Hypertension. 2008;51(4):960-969. [PubMed]
22. James PR, Nelson-Piercy C. Management of hypertension before, during, and after pregnancy. Heart. 2004;90(12):1499-1504.
23. Cockburn J, Moar VA, Ounsted M, Redman CW. Final report of study on hypertension during pregnancy: the effects of specific treatment on the growth and development of the children. Lancet. 1982;1(8273):647-649.
24. Horvath JS, Phippard A, Korda A. Henderson-Smart DJ, Child A. Tiller DJ. Clonidine hydrochloride--a safe and effective antihypertensive agent in pregnancy. Obstetrics and gynecology. 1985;66(5):634-638. [PubMed]
25. Butters L. Kennedy S, Rubin PC. Atenolol in essential hypertension during pregnancy. Bmj. 1990;301(6752):587-589. [PubMed]
26. Magee LA. Cham C, Waterman EJ, Ohlsson A, von Dadelszen P. Hydralazine for treatment of severe hypertension in pregnancy: meta- analysis. Bmj. 2003;327(7421):955-960. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
27. Abalos E, Duley L, Steyn DW, Henderson- Smart DJ. Antihypertensive drug therapy for mild to moderate hypertension during pregnancy. Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2007;(1) CD002252. [PubMed]