

2 **Factors related to insomnia and sleepiness in the late third**
3 **trimester of pregnancy**

4 Ana M. Fernández-Alonso · Martina Trabalón ·
5 Peter Chedraui · Faustino R. Pérez-López

6 Received: 8 October 2011 / Accepted: 26 January 2012
7 © Springer-Verlag 2012

8 **Abstract**

9 *Objective* To assess the presence of insomnia and sleep-
10 iness and related factors in the late third trimester of
11 pregnancy.

12 *Methods* A total of 370 singleton gravids completed a
13 general questionnaire containing personal data, the
14 Insomnia Severity Index (ISI) and the Epworth Sleepiness
15 Scale (ESS). In addition, maternal anthropometry was
16 recorded upon survey.

17 *Results* Median [interquartile range] maternal age and
18 gestational age upon survey was of 31 [7.0] years and 39
19 [1.8] weeks, respectively. A 73.5% of women displayed
20 some degree of insomnia (Total ISI score 8–28) and 22.2%
21 sleepiness (Total ESS score ≥ 10). Determined rho Spear-
22 man coefficients showed significant correlations between
23 ISI scores and gestational age at survey and survey to birth
24 interval (weeks) and between ESS scores and maternal
25 weight and arm circumference at survey and neonatal birth
26 weight. Multiple linear regression analysis found that
27 smoking habit, higher blood pressure and shorter survey to
28 birth interval (weeks) significantly predicted higher ISI

scores, and hence a higher risk of insomnia. Employed 29
status, increased arm circumference and neonatal weight 30
predicted higher ESS scores (sleepiness). 31

Conclusion Insomnia and sleepiness were prevalent in 32
the late third trimester of pregnancy in which lifestyle 33
factors and maternal and neonatal body composition were 34
significant predictors. 35
36

Keywords Sleep disorders · Sleepiness · Pregnancy · 37
Insomnia Severity Index · Epworth Sleepiness Scale 38

Introduction 39

Sleep–wake cycle is regulated by genetic, physical, social, 40
psychological, behavior, and environmental factors [1, 2]. 41
Sleep and sleep disordered breathing are influenced by 42
female biological milestones: puberty, pregnancy or the 43
menopause [3–5]. Sleep characteristics may change very 44
early during pregnancy due to endocrine and anatomical 45
modifications. As pregnancy continues, sleep duration 46
decreases and the prevalence of insomnia, sleep-related 47
breathing disorders, restless leg syndrome and sleepiness 48
significantly increases [6–8]. Pregnancy may also aggra- 49
vate an existing sleep disorder [9]. Although excessive 50
daytime sleepiness is considered an indirect indicator of a 51
significant sleep disorder [10], daytime hypersomnolence 52
may in fact increase during pregnancy as consequence of 53
the aforementioned obstetrical modifications [11]. 54

Excessive body mass index (BMI) or weight gain during 55
pregnancy, have been associated to adverse obstetric out- 56
comes [12]. Studies assessing sleep problems and related 57
risk factors during pregnancy are few, confined to small 58
samples and carried out early in the first trimester or before 59
delivery [7, 13]. Hence, the purpose of the present study 60

A1 A. M. Fernández-Alonso · M. Trabalón
A2 Obstetrics and Gynecology Department, Hospital Torrecárdenas,
A3 Almería, Spain

A4 P. Chedraui
A5 Enrique C. Sotomayor Obstetrics and Gynecology Hospital,
A6 Facultad de Ciencias Médicas, Universidad Católica de Santiago
A7 de Guayaquil, Guayaquil, Ecuador

A8 F. R. Pérez-López (✉)
A9 Obstetrics and Gynecology Department, Facultad de Medicina,
A10 Universidad de Zaragoza, Hospital Clínico de Zaragoza,
A11 Domingo Miral s/n, 50009 Zaragoza, Spain
A12 e-mail: faustino.perez@unizar.es

61	was to assess the presence of insomnia and sleepiness and related factors at the end of pregnancy.	108
62		109
63	Materials and methods	110
64	Study design and participants	111
65	This cross-sectional study was carried out at the Obstetrics and Gynecology Department of the Torrecárdenas Hospital, Almería, Spain in order to assess the presence of insomnia and sleepiness and related factors among gravids in the late third trimester. This hospital is major referral center providing reproductive healthcare basically to the city of Almería and surrounding peripheral areas. During the year 2010, 3,571 deliveries were attended.	112
66		113
67		114
68		115
69		116
70		117
71		118
72		
73	Participants were recruited from the outpatient clinic during antenatal visits as a convenience sample over a 14-month period, from January 2010 to April 2011. Women refusing participation or incapable of understanding the items included in the questionnaires, and those with pre-gestational hypertension, hereditary or acquired thrombophilias or undergoing emergency procedures, were excluded. Prenatal care was performed among participants according to the recommendations of the Spanish Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology [14].	
74		
75		
76		
77		
78		
79		
80		
81		
82		
83	Research protocol of the study was reviewed and approved by the Research Committee of the Torrecárdenas Hospital, and carried out in accordance to the principles of the Helsinki Declaration. All participants were informed about the research and its purposes and written consent obtained.	
84		
85		
86		
87		
88		
89	Sample size calculation was based on the fact that 40% of pregnant women present sleeping problems in the third trimester [7]. Hence, a minimal sample of 358 gravids was calculated considering a 40% prevalence of insomnia with a 15% desired precision and a 99% confidence interval. Gravids completed a questionnaire containing socio-demographic data, the Insomnia Severity Index (ISI) [5, 15] and the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) [10, 16, 17]. Maternal weight, height and blood pressure measurements were also recorded upon survey. Further maternal pre-gestational weight, obstetrical history (labor and delivery characteristics) and neonatal information (neonatal weight [g], gender and Apgar scores) were obtained from gravids' medical charts.	
90		
91		
92		
93		
94		
95		
96		
97		
98		
99		
100		
101		
102		
103	Maternal variables included in the survey were age (years), place of residency (urban or rural), level of education, job status, church attendance, parity, pre-pregnancy BMI, neck circumference (cm), mid-upper arm circumference (cm), gestational age, weight gain during pregnancy, and current social habits (cigarette, alcohol, coffee, and/or isotonic drink consumption). Pre-pregnancy BMI was calculated as body weight (kg) divided by height (m) squared. BMI of participants were categorized according to internationally accepted cut-off points as low (<18.5 kg/m ²), normal (18.5–24.9 kg/m ²), or high (≥25 kg/m ²). Women with high BMI were further categorized as being overweight (25–29.99 kg/m ²) or obese (≥30 kg/m ²) [18]. Pregnancy weight gain was calculated as weight (kg) at survey minus pre-pregnancy weight. Blood pressure was obtained upon survey according to standard techniques.	108
104		109
105		110
106		111
107		112
		113
		114
		115
		116
		117
		118
	The Insomnia Severity Index	119
	The ISI includes seven items targeting sleep disturbance severity, sleep-related satisfaction and the degree of daytime functional impairment, impairment perception and distress and concern related to the sleeping problem. Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale (0–4) and summed up to provide a total score ranging from 0 to 28. Higher scores reveal more severe insomnia. Scores may be categorized as 0–7 (no clinically significant insomnia) or 8–28 (some degree of insomnia). The latter can be further divided into 8–14 (sub-threshold insomnia or mild); 15–21 (moderate insomnia) and 22–28 (severe insomnia) [5, 15]. The Spanish version of the ISI was used in this research which has shown adequate internal consistency in non-pregnant women [5].	120
		121
		122
		123
		124
		125
		126
		127
		128
		129
		130
		131
		132
		133
	The Epworth Sleepiness Scale	134
	The ESS is a patient rated 8-item instrument which quantifies on a 3-point scale the perceived severity of daytime sleepiness and insomnia-related interference with daytime functioning. A global score is obtained by summing the graded eight items. A score of 10 or more is considered as sleepy whereas 18 or more as very sleepy [10, 16]. The validated Spanish version of the ESS was used which has shown appropriate internal consistency, reliability, and evidenced measuring validity [17].	135
		136
		137
		138
		139
		140
		141
		142
		143
	Statistical analysis	144
	Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS statistical package (Version 18.0 for Windows, SPSS Inc, Chicago IL, USA). Data are expressed as medians, interquartile ranges [IQR], beta coefficients and 95% confidence intervals (CI). The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to determine the normality of data distribution. According to this, continuous non parametric data were compared using the Mann–Whitney test (two independent samples) or the Kruskal–	145
		146
		147
		148
		149
		150
		151
		152

153 Wallis test (various independent samples). Rho Spearman
154 coefficients were calculated to determine correlations
155 between ISI and ESS scores and various numeric variables
156 (bivariate analysis). Multiple linear regression analysis was
157 performed to obtain best fit model predicting total ISI and
158 ESS scores. A model was constructed for each scale (ISI
159 and the ESS) which included independent variables found
160 to be significant during bivariate analysis. A p value of
161 <0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

162 Results

163 During the study period a total of 370 singleton gravids were
164 surveyed. ISI and ESS total scores according to socio-
165 demographic and pregnancy characteristics of the studied
166 women are depicted on Table 1. Median [IQR] ISI total
167 score was 11.0 [8.0]. The tool identified 73.5% of women
168 with some degree of insomnia (Total ISI score 8–28) which
169 was further categorized as mild (score 8–14, 45.4%,
170 $n = 168$), moderate (score 15–21, 25.9%, $n = 96$) and
171 severe (scores 22–28, 2.2%, $n = 2$). Median [IQR] ESS total
172 score was 6.0 [5.0], with a 22.2% displaying scores sug-
173 gestive of sleepiness (ESS scores ≥ 10). In two cases
174 (0.5%) total ESS scores were 18 or more considered as very
175 sleepy.

176 Median [IQR] maternal age and gestational age upon
177 survey was of 31 [7.0] years and 39 [1.8] weeks, respec-
178 tively. A 28.1% of gravids came from a rural area, 31.1%
179 were unemployed housewives and 58.1% primigravid.
180 Median pre-pregnancy BMI was 23.0 [5.0] kg/m^2 , with
181 18.9% being overweight and 11.9% obese. Upon survey,
182 18.9% smoked and 0.8% consumed alcohol during preg-
183 nancy, presenting a median neck circumference, arm cir-
184 cumference and weight of 35.0 cm, 28.0 cm and 75.0 kg,
185 respectively. Median weight gain during pregnancy was 13
186 [7.0] kg.

187 Insomnia Severity Index scores were significantly
188 higher (higher risk of insomnia) among women who
189 smoked, were older, had a shorter survey to birth interval
190 (weeks) and had higher pre-pregnancy BMI values.
191 Employed women, with higher weight at survey, and
192 higher neonatal birth weight displayed higher ESS scores,
193 suggesting increased sleepiness. Pregnancy ended in a
194 cesarean section in 22.7% of surveyed women, who dis-
195 played significantly higher ESS scores.

196 Rho Spearman coefficients between ISI and ESS scores
197 and several numeric variables are displayed on Table 2.
198 Significant correlations were found between ISI scores and
199 gestational age at survey and survey to birth interval and
200 between ESS scores and maternal weight and arm cir-
201 cumference at survey and neonatal birth weight.

202 Final best reduced models predicting ISI and ESS scores
203 after multiple linear regression analysis are presented in
204 Table 3. Smoking habit, higher blood pressures and shorter
205 survey to birth interval significantly predicted higher ISI
206 scores, and hence a higher risk of insomnia. Employed
207 status, increased arm circumference and neonatal weight
208 predicted higher ESS scores (sleepiness).

Discussion

209
210 Pregnancy alters sleep characteristics from the very
211 beginning to the end of gestation. Although polysomno-
212 graphic methods allow the assessment of sleep architecture
213 [19] they are not applicable to large populations and in
214 many countries (i.e. Spain) pregnant women refuse their
215 use. Sleep diaries constitute the gold standards for research
216 [20], although they are difficult to be carried out in preg-
217 nant women. Updated studies relating to sleep disorders
218 carried out during the first and early third trimesters of
219 pregnancy do not give information about the validity or
220 reliability of the used tool [7]. Studies assessing sleep
221 characteristics just prior to birth among term pregnant
222 women are scarce or lacking. Facco et al. [7] studied
223 pregnant women at the beginning of the third trimester
224 whereas Higgins et al. [13] studied risk of sleep disordered
225 breathing just before delivery or in the puerperium. To the
226 best of our knowledge our series may be in fact the first to
227 specifically use two validated tools (the ISI and the ESS) in
228 the late third trimester (median 39 weeks) and find that
229 more than 70% of women have some degree of insomnia
230 and 22.2% had sleepiness. Both tools have previously been
231 used among mid-aged women [5, 17]. However, worth
232 mentioning is the fact that both tools have not been spe-
233 cifically validated among pregnant women.

234 The ISI is a simple, reliable and validated tool that
235 provides a quantitative index of perceived insomnia
236 severity. As mentioned, the tool identified 73.5% of women
237 with some degree of insomnia (ISI scores ≥ 8) further
238 classified as mild (50.5%), moderate (15.7%) and severe
239 (3.8%). Thus, mild degree insomnia is the most frequent
240 complaint at the end of pregnancy. One study performed by
241 Facco et al. [7] found that early in the third trimester of
242 pregnancy (gestational age 30.0 ± 2.2 weeks) short sleep
243 duration is affected in 39.9% of cases and that poor sleep
244 quality (as measured with the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality
245 Index) increased from 39.0% in the first trimester of
246 pregnancy to 53.5% in the early third trimester. Bivariate
247 analysis in our series found that higher ISI scores signifi-
248 cantly correlated to maternal age, smoking habit, shorter
249 survey to birth interval, and pre-pregnancy weight.
250 According to calculated rho Spearman coefficients, ISI

Table 1 ISI and EES total scores according to the characteristics of gravids

	ISI score	ESS score
Socio-demographic characteristics		
Age (years): 31.0 [7.0]		
<20 (<i>n</i> = 17)	9.0 [7.0]	6.0 [5.0]
20–30 (<i>n</i> = 163)	12.0 [7.0]	6.0 [6.0]
>30 (<i>n</i> = 190)	10.5 [9.0]	7.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i> *	0.04 ^a	0.62 ^a
Rural residency		
No (<i>n</i> = 266)	11.0 [8.0]	7.0 [5.0]
Yes (<i>n</i> = 104)	11.0 [7.0]	6.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.80 ^b	0.31 ^b
Level of education		
None (<i>n</i> = 4)	6.0 [6.0]	3.5 [3.0]
Elementary (<i>n</i> = 95)	12.0 [6.0]	6.0 [5.0]
High school (<i>n</i> = 129)	12.0 [7.0]	7.0 [5.0]
University (<i>n</i> = 142)	10.0 [9.0]	7.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.10 ^a	0.11 ^a
Employment status		
No (<i>n</i> = 115)	11.0 [6.0]	6.0 [6.0]
Yes (<i>n</i> = 255)	11.0 [8.0]	7.0 [4.0]
<i>p</i>	0.68 ^b	0.003 ^b
Church assistance		
No (<i>n</i> = 322)	11.0 [8.0]	6.5 [5.0]
Yes (<i>n</i> = 48)	10.0 [9.0]	6.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.72 ^b	0.69 ^b
Tobacco use		
No (<i>n</i> = 300)	10.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
Yes (<i>n</i> = 70)	13.0 [6.0]	6.0 [6.0]
<i>p</i>	0.02 ^b	0.47 ^b
Alcohol use		
No (<i>n</i> = 367)	11.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
Yes (<i>n</i> = 3)	17.0 [9.0]	8.0 [7.0]
<i>p</i>	0.09 ^b	0.93 ^b
Coffee consumption		
No (<i>n</i> = 226)	11.0 [8.0]	7.0 [5.0]
Yes (<i>n</i> = 144)	11.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.71 ^b	0.36 ^b
Isotonic drink consumption		
No (<i>n</i> = 204)	11.5 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
Yes (<i>n</i> = 166)	11.0 [8.0]	7.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.37 ^b	0.72 ^b
Obstetrical history and pregnancy clinical characteristics		
Parity 0.0 [1.0]		
0 (<i>n</i> = 215)	11.0 [8.0]	7.0 [5.0]
1 (<i>n</i> = 119)	11.0 [7.0]	6.0 [5.0]
≥2 (<i>n</i> = 36)	11.5 [9.0]	7.0 [4.0]
<i>p</i>	0.80 ^a	0.70 ^a
Gestational age at survey (weeks) 39.0 [1.8]		
<39 (<i>n</i> = 122)	11.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
≥39 (<i>n</i> = 248)	11.0 [7.0]	6.5 [5.0]

Table 1 continued

	ISI score	ESS score
<i>p</i>	0.09 ^b	0.87 ^b
Gestational age at birth (weeks) 40.0 [2.0]		
<40 (<i>n</i> = 102)	12.0 [8.0]	7.0 [4.0]
≥40 (<i>n</i> = 268)	11.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.38 ^b	0.56 ^b
Survey to birth interval (weeks) 0.5 [1.5]		
<0.5 (<i>n</i> = 179)	12.0 [7.0]	7.0 [6.0]
≥0.5 (<i>n</i> = 191)	10.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.01 ^b	0.42 ^b
Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²) 23.0 [5.0]		
<18.5 (<i>n</i> = 18)	9.0 [7.0]	7.0 [7.0]
18.5–24.99 (<i>n</i> = 238)	10.5 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
25.0–29.99 (<i>n</i> = 70)	12.0 [6.0]	6.0 [4.0]
≥30.0 (<i>n</i> = 44)	11.0 [7.0]	8.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.03 ^a	0.25 ^a
Weight (kg) at the time of survey 75.0 [15.0]		
<75 (<i>n</i> = 176)	10.0 [9.0]	6.0 [6.0]
≥75 (<i>n</i> = 194)	12.0 [7.0]	7.5 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.16 ^b	0.001 ^b
Weight gain during pregnancy (kg) 13.0 [7.0]		
<13 (<i>n</i> = 181)	10.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
≥13 (<i>n</i> = 189)	12.0 [8.0]	7.0 [6.0]
<i>p</i>	0.43 ^b	0.08 ^b
Neck circumference (cm) 35.0 [4.0]		
<35 (<i>n</i> = 166)	11.0 [8.0]	6.0 [6.0]
≥35 (<i>n</i> = 204)	11.0 [8.0]	7.0 [4.0]
<i>p</i>	0.67 ^b	0.17 ^b
Arm circumference (cm) 28.0 [5.0]		
<28 (<i>n</i> = 98)	10.0 [7.0]	6.0 [5.0]
≥28 (<i>n</i> = 272)	12.0 [7.0]	7.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.10 ^b	0.17 ^b
Systolic blood pressure at survey (mmHg) 113.5 [16.0]		
<113.5 (<i>n</i> = 185)	10.0 [9.0]	7.0 [5.0]
≥113.5 (<i>n</i> = 185)	12.0 [7.0]	6.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.09 ^b	0.79 ^b
Low birth weight (g) 3,310 [580]		
<3,310 (<i>n</i> = 184)	11.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
≥3,310 (<i>n</i> = 186)	11.0 [7.0]	7.0 [6.0]
<i>p</i>	0.92 ^b	0.01 ^b
Male fetal sex		
No (<i>n</i> = 181)	12.0 [8.0]	6.0 [5.0]
Yes (<i>n</i> = 189)	11.0 [8.0]	7.0 [5.0]
<i>p</i>	0.18 ^b	0.11 ^b

Data are presented as medians [interquartile range]

BMI body mass index

**p* values were determined with the Kruskal–Wallis test^a or the Mann–Whitney test^b

251 scores positively correlated to gestational age at survey and
252 inversely to the survey to birth interval.

253 Age and obesity have been associated to poor sleep in
254 both non-pregnant and pregnant women [5, 7, 21]. Multiple

linear regression analysis of the present study found a
positive correlation between ISI total scores and smoking
habit and systolic blood pressure levels. Scores inversely
correlated to survey to birth interval. In this model,

255
256
257
258

Table 2 Rho Spearman coefficient correlations between ISI and ESS scores and several numeric variables ($n = 370$)

	ISI	ESS
ISI	–	0.011 (0.83)
Maternal age	0.022 (0.66)	0.048 (0.35)
Educational level	0.021 (0.68)	0.069 (0.18)
Parity	0.031 (0.55)	–0.035 (0.50)
Pre-pregnancy BMI	0.062 (0.23)	0.067 (0.20)
Pre-pregnancy weight	0.056 (0.27)	0.081 (0.12)
Gestational age at survey	0.118 (0.02)	0.026 (0.62)
Survey to birth interval	–0.181 (0.0001)	–0.041 (0.42)
Weight at the time of survey	0.084 (0.10)	0.128 (0.01)
Weight gain during pregnancy	0.071 (0.17)	0.073 (0.16)
Neck circumference	0.038 (0.46)	0.118 (0.02)
Arm circumference	0.082 (0.11)	0.115 (0.03)
Systolic blood pressure	0.10 (0.05)	0.028 (0.59)
Diastolic blood pressure	0.054 (0.29)	–0.036 (0.49)
Gestational age at birth	–0.034 (0.51)	0.045 (0.39)
Neonatal birth weight	0.055 (0.29)	0.123 (0.02)

Values in parenthesis are p values

BMI body mass index

259 maternal age and BMI values were not significant corre-
 260 lates of ISI scores. Decreased sleeping hours is one of the
 261 most common causes of excessive daytime sleepiness,
 262 which can cause difficulty in performing daily tasks and
 263 causes irritability, moodiness and memory problems.
 264 Sleepiness, however, differs from fatigue or tiredness and
 265 has been reported in 12–34% of non-pregnant women
 266 [17, 22]. Moreover, reduced sleep duration has not only
 267 been associated to increased daytime sleepiness and
 268 decreased performance yet also to increased inflammatory
 269 cytokine production, insulin resistance and cardiovascular
 270 risk [23]. Associations between insomnia and maternal age,
 271 BMI values and employed status have been reported early
 272 in the third trimester of pregnancy [7].

273 The ESS has been reported to be a short and effective
 274 instrument used to assess excessive daytime sleepiness and
 275 screen for obstructive sleep-apnea [24]. Notwithstanding,
 276 some criticism has been raised in relation to its reliability
 277 [25]. Previous studies have reported daytime sleepiness in
 278 23–45% of pregnant women using the ESS [7, 11, 22, 26].
 279 The wide range in the prevalence of daytime pregnancy
 280 related sleepiness found with the ESS suggests that it may
 281 have some limitations. Finding no correlation between ISI
 282 and ESS scores in the present study seems to support this
 283 fact. Nevertheless, the prevalence of sleepiness in the
 284 present study was lower than that reported during the first
 285 (32.8%) and early third trimesters of pregnancy (30 weeks,
 286 38.1%) [7].

287 The prevalence of sleepiness during pregnancy may vary
 288 in relation to gestational age, study design, and maternal
 289 ethnical and socio-demographical background [7, 11]. In
 290 the present study, multiple linear regression analysis found
 291 that ESS scores significantly correlated to maternal
 292 employment status and arm circumference and neonatal
 293 birth weight. As others have observed [27, 28], an increased
 294 maternal arm circumference (indirect measure of gesta-
 295 tional weight gain) and neonatal birth weight may relate to
 296 an increased uterine fundus which exerts a ventilatory
 297 limitation that favors sleep disorders and sleepiness.

298 Finally as for the limitations of this study one can
 299 mention its cross-sectional nature and the use of a conven-
 300 ience sample obtained at the end of pregnancy. Sampling
 301 late in the third trimester is in fact a limitation, as it does
 302 not allow quantifying changes in the prevalence of sleep
 303 problems throughout pregnancy or determining the influ-
 304 ence of these changes over obstetrical outcome. Despite
 305 these limitations, the present study adds to the few found in
 306 the literature assessing insomnia and sleepiness in the late
 307 third trimester of pregnancy, in which both problems were
 308 prevalent and related to lifestyle factors and maternal–
 309 neonatal body composition. Further research is warranted
 310 in this regard to support the present findings.

Table 3 Final best reduced model predicting total ISI and ESS scores: multiple linear regression analysis ($n = 370$)

	Beta coefficient	Standard error	CI 95%	t	p value
Model for ISI scores					
Smoking	1.686	0.713	0.283–3.088	2.363	0.01
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	0.036	0.02	–0.003–0.074	1.819	0.07
Survey to birth interval (weeks)	–0.106	0.283	–1.616 to –0.504	–3.748	0.0001
Model for ESS scores					
Employed	1.198	0.407	0.397–1.998	2.943	0.003
Arm circumference (cm)	0.113	0.046	0.022–0.204	2.452	0.015
Neonatal birth weight	0.001	0.01	0.001–0.002	2.316	0.021

ISI score: $r^2 = 0.06$; adjusted
 $r^2 = 0.05$, $p = 0.001$; ESS
 score: $r^2 = 0.06$; adjusted
 $r^2 = 0.05$, $p = 0.001$

311 **Conflict of interest** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

312 **References**

- 313 1. Desai AV, Cherkas LF, Spector TD, Williams AJ (2004) Genetic
314 influences in self-reported symptoms of obstructive sleep apnoea
315 and restless legs: a twin study. *Twin Res* 7:589–595
- 316 2. Watson NF, Goldberg J, Arguelles L, Buchwald D (2006)
317 Genetic and environmental influences on insomnia, daytime
318 sleepiness, and obesity in twins. *Sleep* 29:645–649
- 319 3. Moline ML, Broch L, Zak R, Gross V (2003) Sleep in women
320 across the life cycle from adulthood through menopause. *Sleep*
321 *Med Rev* 7:155–177
- 322 4. Pérez-López FR (1992) Sleep disorders. In: *The menopause*.
323 *Temas de Hoy*, Madrid, pp 164–168
- 324 5. Arakane M, Castillo C, Rosero MF, Peñafiel R, Pérez-López FR,
325 Chedraui P (2011) Factors relating to insomnia during the men-
326 opausal transition as evaluated by the Insomnia Severity Index.
327 *Maturitas* 69:157–161
- 328 6. Ayrim A, Keskin EA, Ozol D, Onaran Y, Yüdirim Z, Kafali H
329 (2011) Influence of self-reported snoring and witnessed sleep
330 apnea on gestational hypertension and fetal outcome in pregn-
331 nancy. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 283:195–199
- 332 7. Facco FL, Kramer J, Ho KH, Zee PC, Grobman WA (2010) Sleep
333 disturbances in pregnancy. *Obstet Gynecol* 115:77–83
- 334 8. Kennelly MM, Fallon A, Farah N, Stuart B, Turner MJ (2011)
335 Effects of body mass index on sleep patterns during pregnancy.
336 *J Obstet Gynaecol* 31:125–127
- 337 9. Sahota PK, Jain SS, Dhand R (2003) Sleep disorders in pregn-
338 nancy. *Curr Opin Pulm Med* 9:477–483
- 339 10. Johns M, Hocking B (1997) Daytime sleepiness and sleep habits
340 of Australian workers. *Sleep* 20:844–849
- 341 11. Leung PL, Hui DS, Leung TN, Yuen PM, Lau TK (2005) Sleep
342 disturbances in Chinese pregnant women. *BJOG* 112:1568–1571
- 343 12. Vahratian A, Siega-Riz AM, Savitz DA, Zhang J (2005) Maternal
344 pre-pregnancy overweight and obesity and the risk of cesarean
345 delivery in nulliparous women. *Ann Epidemiol* 15:467–474
- 346 13. Higgins N, Leong E, Park CS, Facco FL, McCarthy RJ, Wong
347 CA (2011) The Berlin Questionnaire for assessment of sleep
348 disordered breathing risk in parturients and non-pregnant women.
349 *Int J Obstet Anesth* 20:22–25
- 350 14. SEGO (2002) Antenatal care during pregnancy. *Prog Obstet*
351 *Ginecol* 45:575–583
15. Bastien CH, Vallières A, Morin CM (2001) Validation of the
352 insomnia severity index as an outcome measure for insomnia
353 research. *Sleep Med* 2:297–307
16. Johns MW (1994) Sleepiness in different situations measured by
354 the Epworth sleepiness scale. *Sleep* 17:703–710
17. Chedraui P, Pérez-López FR, Mendoza M et al (2010) Factors
355 related to increased daytime sleepiness during the menopausal
356 transition as evaluated by the Epworth sleepiness scale. *Maturitas*
357 65:75–80
18. WHO (1995) Physical status: the use and interpretation of
358 anthropometry. WHO Technical Report Series 854, World Health
359 Organization, Geneva
19. Sahin FK, Koken G, Cosar E et al (2008) Obstructive sleep apnea
360 in pregnancy and fetal outcome. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 100:
361 141–146
20. Manber R, Ong JC, Carlyle E (2008) Diagnostic tools for
362 insomnia. In: Kushida CA (ed) *Handbook of sleep disorders*, 2nd
363 edn. Informa Healthcare, New York, pp 41–54
21. Sahlin C, Franklin KA, Stenlund H, Lindberg E (2009) Sleep in
364 women: normal values for sleep stages and position and the effect
365 of age, obesity, sleep apnea, smoking, alcohol and hypertension.
366 *Sleep Med* 10:1025–1030
22. Izci B, Martin SE, Dundas KC, Liston WA, Calder AA, Douglas
367 NJ (2005) Sleep complaints: snoring and daytime sleepiness in
368 pregnant and pre-eclamptic women. *Sleep Med* 6:163–169
23. Pérez-López FR, Chedraui P, Gilbert JJ, Pérez-Roncero G (2009)
369 Cardiovascular risk in menopausal women and prevalent related
370 co-morbid conditions: facing the post-Women's Health Initiative
371 era. *Fertil Steril* 92:1171–1186
24. Miletin MS, Hanly PJ (2003) Measurement properties of the
372 Epworth sleepiness scale. *Sleep Med* 4:195–199
25. Smith S, Sullivan KA (2007) A reliable change index (RCI) for
373 the Epworth sleepiness scale (ESS). *Sleep Med* 9:102
26. Pien GW, Schwab RJ (2004) Sleep disorders during pregnancy.
374 *Sleep* 27:1405–1417
27. López LB, Calvo EB, Poy MS, del Valle Balmaceda Y, Cámara
375 K (2011) Changes in skinfolds and mid-upper arm circumference
376 during pregnancy in Argentine women. *Matern Child Nutr* 7:
377 253–262
28. Luque V, Mendez G, Capdevila F et al (2009) Subcutaneous fat
378 stores related to weight in full-term neonates. *Ann Hum Biol*
379 36:88–97