



Gestational TSH and FT4 Reference Intervals in Chinese Women: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Xiaotong Gao¹, Yongze Li¹, Jiashu Li¹, Aihua Liu¹, Wei Sun², Weiping Teng¹ and Zhongyan Shan^{1*}

¹ Department of Endocrinology and Metabolism, Institute of Endocrinology, Liaoning Provincial Key Laboratory of Endocrine Diseases, The First Affiliated Hospital of China Medical University, China Medical University, Shenyang, China, ² Department of Thyroid Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of China Medical University, China Medical University, Shenyang, China

Background: Serum thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH) and free thyroxine (FT4) change dynamically during pregnancy. Differences in geographic regions, populations, and manufacturer's methodologies can affect the reference intervals for thyroid function tests. The 2017 guidelines of the American Thyroid Association (ATA) recommended 4.0 mU/L as the cut-off point for the upper limit of serum TSH in early pregnancy. A systematic review is called for to establish practical, gestational-specific TSH and FT4 reference intervals for pregnant Chinese women and to explore whether the criteria are suitable for China.

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Alex Stewart Stagnaro-Green, University of Illinois at Chicago, United States

Reviewed by:

Tim I. M. Korevaar, Erasmus Medical Center, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands Salvatore Benvenga, Università degli Studi di Messina, Italy

> *Correspondence: Zhongyan Shan shanzhongyan@medmail.com.cn

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Thyroid Endocrinology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Endocrinology

Received: 09 May 2018 **Accepted:** 13 July 2018 **Published:** 03 August 2018

Citation:

Gao X, Li Y, Li J, Liu A, Sun W, Teng W and Shan Z (2018) Gestational TSH and FT4 Reference Intervals in Chinese Women: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Endocrinol. 9:432. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2018.00432 **Methods:** English and Chinese articles published from inception to Aug 2017 were searched in the PubMed, EMBASE, and SCIE English-language databases and the CNKI, WanFang, and CQVIP Chinese databases. The relative descent or ascent rates of serum TSH and FT4 were calculated, after which Comprehensive Meta-Analysis V2.0 software was used to analyze the data.

Results: Eleven studies (6 in English and 5 in Chinese), five kits and 11,629 Chinese women from nine cities were considered in this meta-analysis. Compared with the reference ranges provided by manufacturers, serum TSH decreased in the first trimester, with the upper limit declining by 21.7% (5.0–36.6%), to a value close to 4.0 mU/L, and the lower limit declining by 85.7% (73.5–97.1%). It continued decreasing in the second trimester, with the upper limit declining by 24.0% (6.4–40.9%) and the lower limit declining by 40.7% (9.0–85.7%). For FT4, the upper limit fluctuated slightly, and the lower limit increased by 6.8% (1.0–14.6%) in the first trimester. Serum FT4 dropped gradually, with the upper limit declining by 21.8% (2.5–31.8%) and the lower limit declining by 12.7% (2.6–19.6%) in the second trimester. During the third trimester, the upper limit decreased by 25.1% (12.7–35.0%), while the lower limit decreased by 20.9% (14.8–27.3%).

Conclusions: Various regions, kits and test methods affect the gestational TSH and FT4 levels. The non-pregnant serum TSH upper limit minus 22% is very close to 4.0 mU/L, which can be used as a sub-optimal approach to represent the cut-off value for pregnant Chinese women in the first trimester.

Keywords: TSH, FT4, pregnancy, reference range, Chinese women

INTRODUCTION

Thyroid hormone is essential for the growth and development of the human body. It plays a vital role in promoting the development of the skeletal, nervous, and reproductive systems (1). Pregnancy affects the thyroid gland and its function profoundly. Human chorionic gonadotrophin (hCG) significantly increases in early pregnancy, sharing the same alpha-subunits and 80%-homologous beta-subunits with TSH. Therefore, hCG can stimulate thyroid hormonogenesis, which is the negative-feedback system to TSH secretion, causing the serum TSH level to decline during early pregnancy (2, 3).

Serum TSH and FT4 vary with gestational age. Several studies and guidelines have indicated that non-pregnant reference intervals of serum TSH and FT4 are not applicable for diagnosing thyroid diseases during pregnancy. By contrast, trimester- and method-specific reference ranges for thyroid testing have been strongly recommended because of their higher accuracy (3-6). Nevertheless, the formulation of gestational reference ranges is affected by many factors, limiting their feasibility (7, 8). The 2011 guidelines of the American Thyroid Association (ATA) suggested a specific upper limit cut-off (2.5 mU/L) for serum TSH in the first trimester of pregnancy (4). However, there are large differences in TSH and FT4 reference ranges between various populations, with 90% of the relevant studies having higher TSH upper limits than the TSH cut-off point of 2.5 mU/L. These inconsistencies could increase the misdiagnosis rate of overt and subclinical hypothyroidism in pregnancy (9). The 2017 ATA guidelines noted that if internal or transferable pregnancy-specific TSH reference intervals are unavailable, an upper reference limit of 4.0 mU/L may be used, representing the non-pregnant TSH upper limit minus 0.5 mU/L (5). However, it is uncertain whether this cut-off is appropriate for pregnant Chinese women. Similarly, gestational- and method-specific criteria are also recommended for serum FT4 (5), but the criteria for serum FT4 are as inconvenient as those of TSH to diagnose gestational hypothyroxinemia in clinical practice.

The aim of the current study was to systematically assess and summarize gestational- and method-specific serum TSH and FT4 reference ranges in various regions in China and determine their trends in early, middle and late pregnancy. We compared the differences between the reference ranges of Chinese pregnant women and the 2017 ATA guidelines recommendation of 4.0 mU/L. Finally, we aimed to provide feasible and practical reference intervals to diagnose hypothyroidism and hypothyroxinemia in pregnancy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

A systematic literature search (PubMed, EMBASE, SCIE, Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure, Chinese Scientific Journals Full-text Database, Wanfang) was performed from inception to Aug 2017. The keywords "TSH" and "FT4" combined with the terms "reference range" or "reference interval," "pregnant," or "gestational," and "China" or "Chinese" were used to search for potentially relevant studies in English and Chinese. The following is an example for PubMed: (((((#TSH AND #FT4))) AND ((#pregan* OR #gestation*)) AND ((#China OR #Chinese)) AND ((#reference range* OR #reference interval*)). To identify additional studies and expand our search, the reference lists of the retrieved articles were scanned.

The studies included in the meta-analysis conformed with the following conditions: All subjects were pregnant Chinese women. The study recruitment standards met the National Academy of Clinical Biochemistry (NACB) recommendations: (1) more than 120 subjects; (2) no TPOAb or TGAb positivity; (3) no family or personal history of thyroid disease; (4) no goiter; and (5) no medical history influencing thyroid function (except use of estrogens) (6).

Exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) subjects came from iodine-excessive or iodine-deficient regions; (2) the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale (NOS) quality score was <6 (10); (3) serum TSH- and FT4-related information could not be extracted; and (4) the study was a repeat of an earlier study. In addition, Li et al. (11) declared that the reference intervals for non-pregnant women should be used from 4 to 6 gestational weeks. Therefore, studies including 0–6 gestational weeks or average gestational week <9.3 weeks in the first trimester were excluded to improve the accuracy of the meta-analysis.

Quality Assessment

The NOS was selected to assess the quality of the included studies using the "star system." Information regarding selection, comparability, and outcomes was evaluated with a maximum of 4 stars, 2 stars, and 3 stars, respectively. The total full score = 9. A study graded \geq 6 stars was considered a high-quality study (10).

Data Extraction

Two reviewers (Gao XT and Li YZ) abstracted the following data from all eligible studies independently: first author; publication year and journal; region(s) and hospital(s) of study; sample size; pregnancy stages; medians and percentiles (2.5th and 97.5th) of serum TSH and FT4; manufacturers; inter- and intra-assay coefficients of variation (CV) in the laboratory; normal range of the detection kit; normal range of the control group; and iodine status of the region.

Statistical Analysis

We summarized the lower reference limits (2.5th) and the upper reference limits (97.5th) of serum TSH and FT4 in early, middle and late pregnancy. We calculated the relative descent or ascent rate of serum TSH and FT4 and compared these with the normal reference ranges provided by manufacturers involved in each enrolled study. The calculation formula can be written as:

Relative descent rate of lower limit = $(2.5^{\text{th}} \text{ in non-pregnancy}-2.5^{\text{th}} \text{ in pregnancy})/2.5^{\text{th}} \text{ in non-pregnancy} \times 100\%;$

Relative descent rate of upper limit = $(97.5^{\text{th}} \text{ non-pregnancy} - 97.5^{\text{th}} \text{ in pregnancy})/97.5^{\text{th}} \text{ non-pregnancy} \times 100\%.$

The meta-analysis of the relative descent and ascent rates for the gestational reference intervals was accomplished

using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software (V2.0, Biostat, Englewood, NJ). The Z test was used to compare the difference between 0 and the relative change rates of TSH and FT4 reference intervals (p < 0.05, 0.05 < p < 0.1 and p > 0.1 indicated high, medium, and no difference between relative change rate and 0, respectively).

Factors affecting gestational TSH and FT4 were age, iodine nutrition status, ethnicity, sex, and hour of the day, in addition to the conditions referred to in the NACB (12). Our meta-analysis included pregnant women of appropriate age who came from adequate-iodine regions of China, and the blood samples were taken in morning in the fasting state.

RESULTS

Literature Search and Study Characteristics

A total of 265 studies were initially considered for inclusion, of which 4 were excluded due to duplication, and 219 articles were excluded after screening the titles and abstracts. After more detailed evaluation of the remaining 42 articles, 31 articles were excluded. Finally, the remaining 11 studies (6 published in English and 5 in Chinese) involving 5 types of kits and including 11,629 Chinese women met the inclusion criteria and were included in this meta-analysis (Figure 1). There were 4 studies on the application of Roche e600/601 with 1,920 pregnant Chinese women; 3 studies using the Baver ADVIA Centaur with 3,441 pregnant Chinese women; 4 studies using the Beckman with 2,350 pregnant Chinese women; 2 studies using the Abbott Architect I 2,000 with 1,223 pregnant Chinese women, and 2 studies using the DPC Immulite 1,000 with 1,189 pregnant Chinese women. The qualified studies were published from 2008 to 2016 and proved to be of good quality in accordance with the NOS scoring system (Supplementary Table 1).

Gestational-Specific Serum TSH and FT4 Alterations

Table 1 displays the basic characteristics of the included studies regarding serum TSH. According to the median, serum TSH decreased in early pregnancy and showed an upward trend during middle and late pregnancy (**Figure 2A**).

Table 2 shows the basic characteristics of the included studies regarding serum FT4. In the first trimester, no obvious rule was derived for the serum FT4 upper limit (lower than the non-pregnant levels in six studies; higher than the non-pregnant levels in the other five studies). However, the lower limits were higher than those in non-pregnancy. In the second and third trimesters, both the upper and lower limits of serum FT4 were lower than those in non-pregnancy. The gestational serum FT4 medians exhibited a downward trend (**Figure 2B**).

We used the random-effects model to summarize the descending rule of serum TSH in early pregnancy and the descending and ascending rules of serum FT4 in each gestational stage by meta-analysis.

Comparison of the Serum TSH Upper and Lower Limits Between Pregnancy and Non-pregnancy

Variations in the Serum TSH Reference Ranges in Early Pregnancy

Figure 3A shows the summarized relative descent rate [85.7%, 95% confidence interval (CI): 84.5, 86.8%] for the serum TSH lower limit in the first trimester from 2008 to 2016. The relative descent rate in each study ranged from 73.5% (95% CI: 68.3, 78.2%) to 97.1% (95% CI: 94.5, 98.5%). This suggested that the lower limit of serum TSH decreased in the first trimester compared with that in non-pregnancy, and the descent rate was 85.7% (73.5–97.1%).

Figure 3B shows the summarized relative descent rate (21.7%, 95% CI: 20.4, 23.1%) for the serum TSH upper limit in the first trimester. The relative descent rate in individual studies ranged from 5.0% (95% CI: 2.9, 8.5%) to 36.6% (95% CI: 29.2, 44.8%), suggesting that, compared to the non-pregnant levels, the serum TSH upper limit decreased in early pregnancy, and the descent rate was 21.7% (5.0–36.6%).

Comparison of Serum TSH Upper Reference Limits Under Different Conditions

Figure 4 shows the comparison of the serum TSH upper limits acquired in different conditions. If we subtract 0.5 mU/L from the upper limits provided by manufacturers (97.5th in non-pregnancy), the gestational TSH upper limits obtained (97.5th in non-pregnancy–0.5), which ranged from 3.45 to 5.14 mU/L, varied greatly, and the gaps around 4.0 mU/L, which ranged from -0.55 to 1.14 mU/L, were different from each other. The absolute values of the gaps were >1, suggesting that the fluctuation around 4.0 mU/L was obvious.

By contrast, if we compare 4.0 mU/L with the gestational TSH upper limit, which was 22% lower than the non-pregnant upper limit, $[(1-22\%) \times 97.5$ th in non-pregnancy], ranging from 3.12 to 4.40 mU/L, the gaps ranging from -0.88 to 0.40 mU/L were narrower than those of "97.5th in non-pregnancy – 0.5" ranging from -0.55 to 1.14 mU/L. Similarly, if we replace 22% with the relative descent rate of each kit (Roche, Bayer, Abbott, DPC and Beckman were 22.7, 18.3, 24.8, 17.6 and 25.5%, respectively) listed in Supplementary Table 2, the gestational upper limits obtained [(1-descent rate) \times 97.5th in non-pregnancy] ranged from 3.30 to 4.36 mU/L. The gaps between 4.0 mU/L and '(1descent rate)×97.5th in non-pregnancy' were much narrower, which ranged from -0.70 to 0.36 mU/L. The absolute values of the gaps in both groups were less than 1, suggesting that the nonpregnant upper limit that declined by its relative descent rate was much closer to 4.0 mU/L.

Figure 4 also shows that the comparison between 4.0 mU/L and the TSH upper limits of the first trimester in Chinese women (97.5th in T1). If we subtract "97.5th in T1" from 4.0 mU/L, the gaps ranged from -0.85 to 1.0 mU/L. The absolute values of the gaps were ≤ 1 . These results suggest that regardless of efforts to standardize the reference ranges, there were still differences in comparison to the real TSH upper limits of pregnant Chinese women, while the differences were not very significant.



Variations in the Serum TSH Reference Ranges in Middle Pregnancy

Figure 5A shows the summarized relative descent rate (40.7%, 95% CI: 38.9, 42.5%) for the serum TSH lower limit in the second trimester. The relative descent rate in each study ranged from 9.0% (95% CI: 7.3, 10.9%) to 85.7% (95% CI: 81.3, 89.2%). This suggests that the lower limit of serum TSH decreased in the second trimester compared with that in non-pregnancy, and the descent rate was 40.7% (9.0–85.7%).

Figure 5B shows the summarized relative descent rate (24.0%, 95% CI: 22.6, 25.5%) for the serum TSH upper limit in the second trimester. The relative descent rate in individual studies ranged from 6.4% (95% CI: 5.0, 8.1%) to 40.9% (95% CI: 35.5, 46.5%), suggesting that, compared to the non-pregnant levels, the serum TSH upper limit decreased in middle pregnancy, and the descent rate was 24.0% (6.4–40.9%).

Variations in the Serum TSH Reference Ranges in Late Pregnancy

 Table 1 lists the changing characteristics of the serum TSH lower
 limit in the third trimester. Seven studies showed that the lower

 limit increased compared with non-pregnant levels. By contrast,

the lower limit decreased in the other 5 studies. The fluctuation range varied from down by 51.43% to up by 120.59%. Therefore, there was no definite change rule regarding the TSH lower limit in late pregnancy, and the fluctuation range was wide.

Table 1 also lists the changing characteristics of the serum TSH upper limit in late pregnancy. Five studies showed that the upper limit increased compared with non-pregnant levels. By contrast, the upper limit decreased in the other 7 studies. The fluctuation range varied from down by 34.46% to up by 27.33%. Therefore, there was no definite change rule regarding the TSH upper limit in the third trimester, and the fluctuation range was wide.

Comparison of the Serum FT4 Upper and Lower Limits Between Pregnancy and Non-pregnancy

Variations in the Serum FT4 Reference Ranges in Early Pregnancy

Figure 6 shows the summarized relative ascent rate (6.8%, 95% CI: 5.9, 7.7%) for the serum FT4 lower limit in the first trimester. The relative ascent rate in all studies ranged from 1.0% (95%)

Manufacturer	References	Location	Gestational weeks, samples	Median, perce	ntiles (2.5th and	97.5th), mU/L	Ξ.	the first, sec	Relative d	escent rate rimesters of	pregnancy, %	
				F	T2	Т3	° T1, 2.5th	° T2, 2.5th	T3, 2.5th	° T1, 97.5th	° T2, 97.5th	° T3, 97.5th
Roche E600/601 0.69–5.64 ^a	Liu et al. (28)	Shenyang	T1 (8-12wk): 144 T2 (12-27wk): 304 T3 (27-40wk): 331	1.47 (0.09–4.52)	1.93 (0.45–4.32)	2.25 (0.71–5.46)	86.96	34.78	-2.90	19.86	23.40	3.19
mu/L	Wang et al. (29)	Changzhou	T1 (10-14wk): 301 T2 (20-24wk): 301 T3 (30-34wk): 301	1.00 (0.02–3.65)	1.26 (0.36–3.46)	1.5 (0.44–5.04)	97.10	47.83	36.23	35.28	38.65	10.64
	Fan et al. (30)	Shanghai	T1 (9–12wk): 200 T2 (16–24wk): 200 T3 (32–36wk): 200	1.35 (0.08–4.12)	1.79 (0.43–4.04)	2.18 (0.67–5.65)	88.41	37.68	2.90	27.08	28.37	-0.18
	Li et al. (11)	Shenyang	T1 (7-12wk): 640	1.47 (0.10-4.34)	I	I	85.51	I	I	23.05	I	I
Bayer ADVIA Centaur 0.55–4.78 ^b	Duan et al. (31)	Sichuan	T1 (10–14wk): 963 T2 (20–24wk): 981 T3 (30–34wk): 792	1.41 (0.05–4.49)	2.21 (0.61–4.97)	2.10 (0.65–4.63)	92.54	8.96	2.99	15.44	6.40	12.81
mU/L	Fan et al. (30)	Shanghai	T1 (9–12wk): 200 T2 (16–24wk): 200 T3 (32–36wk): 200	1.19 (0.07–3.38)	1.56 (0.33–3.34)	1.88 (0.59–4.88)	87.27	40.00	-7.27	29.29	30.13	-2.09
Abbott Architect I 2000	Liu et al. (28)	Shenyang	T1 (8-12wk): 144 T2 (12-27wk): 304 T3 (27-40wk): 331	1.50 (0.03–3.83)	1.51 (0.05–3.71)	1.97 (0.47–6.29)	91.43	85.71	-34.29	22.47	24.90	-27.33
0.35-4.94 ^b mU/L	Fan et al. (32)	Shanghai	T1 (9–13wk): 140 T2 (16–28wk): 184 T3 (28–40wk): 120	0.91 (0.03–3.60)	1.35 (0.14–3.61)	1.39 (0.17–3.59)	91.43	00.09	51.43	27.13	26.92	27.33
DPC Immulite 1000 0.40-4.00 ^b	Li et al. (33)	Shenyang	T1 (8-12wk): 249 T2 (13-24wk): 375 T3 (24-40wk): 365	1.16 (0.09–3.8)	1.30 (0.26–3.50)	1.55 (0.42–3.85)	77.50	35.00	-5.00	5.00	12.50	3.75
mU/L	Xu et al. (30)	Shanghai	T1 (9–12wk): 200 T2 (16–24wk): 200 T3 (32–36wk): 200	0.99 (0.08–3.00)	1.35 (0.31–2.97)	1.56 (0.49–4.95)	80.00	22.50	-22.50	25.00	25.75	-23.75
Beckman UniCel DX I 800 0.34–5.60 ^b	Liu et al. (28)	Shenyang	T1 (8–12wk): 144 T2 (12–27wk): 304 T3 (27–40wk): 331	1.24 (0.05–3.55)	1.51 (0.21–3.31)	1.84 (0.62–5.06)	85.29	38.24	-82.35	36.61	40.89	9.64
mU/L	Chen and Wang (34)	Zhejiang	T1 (9–12wk): 281 T2 (16–24wk): 281 T3 (12–36wk): 281	1.44 (0.05–3.97)	1.63 (0.12 -4.28)	2.35 (0.30–6.01)	85.29	64.71	11.76	29.11	23.57	-7.32
	Chen et al. (35)	Chongqing	T1 (10–13wk+6): 303 T2 (14–27wk+6): 158 T3 (30–34wk): 132	1.3 (0.09-4.85)	1.80 (0.11–5.13)	1.98 (0.75–3.67)	73.53	67.65	-120.59	13.21	8.39	34.46
T1, the first trimeste	ir of pregnancy; T2, the	second trimest	er of pregnancy; T3, the t	hird trimester of preg	mancy; 2.5th, the k	ower reference limit	; 97.5th, the u	ipper referenc	e limit; TSH,	thyroid stimulat	ting hormone.	

TABLE 1 | Gestational TSH reference intervals and relative descent or ascent rate compared with non-pregnancy in Chinese women.

Frontiers in Endocrinology | www.frontiersin.org

^aThe TSH reference range provided by Roche was 0.27–4.20 mU/L, lower than the reference ranges tested for normal populations in included studies: 0.51–5.40 mU/L in Liu et al. (28), 0.75–5.28 mU/L in Wang et al. (29), and 0.69–5.64 mU/L in Liu et al. (11), respectively. This suggested that the reference range provided by Roche was not suitable for Chinese populations. In our study, 0.69–5.64 mU/L in Li et al. (11) was used as the non-pregnant reference range for mU/L in Li et al. (11), respectively. Roche.

°T1, 2.5th means the relative descent rate of serum TSH lower limit in the first trimester of pregnancy. The calculation formula can be written as:

(2.5th in non-pregnancy-2.5th in pregnancy)/2.5th in non-pregnancy × 100%. The same formula was applied in the second and third trimesters of pregnancy

11, 97.5th means the relative descent rate of serum TSH upper limit in the first trimester of pregnancy. The calculation formula can be written as:

(97.5th in non-pregnancy–97.5th in pregnancy)/97.5th in non-pregnancy × 100%. The same formula was applied in the second and third trimesters of pregnancy



third trimester of pregnancy. (A) The trend of median gestational serum TSH in each study (3 studies with Roche kits; 2 studies with Bayer kits; 2 studies with Beckman kits). (B) The trend of gestational serum FT4 median in each study (2 studies with Roche kits; 2 studies with Roche kits; 3 studies with DPC kits; 3 studies with Beckman kits).

CI: 0.2, 4.9%) to 14.6% (95% CI: 9.7, 21.4%), suggesting that the serum FT4 lower limit increased in early gestation compared to the non-pregnant levels, and the ascent rate was 6.8% (1.0–14.6%).

Table 2 lists the changing characteristics of the serum FT4 upper limit in the first trimester. Six studies showed that the upper limit decreased compared with non-pregnant levels. By contrast, the upper limit increased in the other 5 studies. The fluctuation range varied from down by 16.65% to up by 8.76%. Therefore, there was no definite change rule regarding the FT4 upper limit in early pregnancy, and the fluctuation range was small.

Variations in the Serum FT4 Reference Ranges in Middle Pregnancy

Figure 7A summarizes the relative descent rate (12.7%, 95% CI: 11.5, 14.0%) with regard to the serum FT4 lower limit during the second trimester. The relative descent rate in the included studies ranged from 2.6% (95% CI: 1.4, 4.8%) to 19.6% (95% CI: 15.5, 24.4%). This suggested that the serum FT4 lower limit decreased in middle pregnancy compared with non-pregnant levels, and the descent rate was 12.7% (2.6–19.6%).

Figure 7B summarizes the relative descent rate (21.8%, 95% CI: 20.3, 23.5%) for the serum FT4 upper limit in the second trimester. The relative descent rate in the included studies ranged from 2.5% (95% CI: 1.0, 6.5%) to 31.8% (95% CI: 28.9, 34.7%). This suggested that the serum FT4 upper limit decreased in middle pregnancy compared with the non-pregnant levels, and the descent rate was 21.8% (2.5–31.8%).

Variations in the Serum FT4 Reference Ranges in Late Pregnancy

Figure 8A shows the summarized relative descent rate (20.9%, 95% CI: 19.5, 22.3%) for the serum FT4 lower limit in the third trimester. The relative descent rate in the included studies ranged from 14.8% (95% CI: 11.5, 18.8%) to 27.3% (95% CI: 22.8, 32.4%). This suggested that the lower limit of serum FT4 decreased in the

third trimester of pregnancy compared with the non-pregnant levels, and the descent rate was 20.9% (14.8–27.3%).

Figure 8B shows the summarized relative descent rate (25.1%, 95% CI: 23.6, 26.7%) for the serum FT4 upper limit in the third trimester. The relative descent rate in all studies ranged from 12.7% (95% CI: 9.5, 16.7%) to 35.0% (95% CI: 28.7, 41.8%), suggesting that the serum FT4 upper limit declined in late gestation compared with non-pregnant levels, and the descent rate was 25.1% (12.7–35.0%).

DISCUSSION

Compared with the non-pregnant reference ranges provided by manufacturers, serum TSH showed a downward trend during early pregnancy, with the upper limit decreasing by 21.7% and the lower limit decreasing by 85.7%. It maintained this descending trend in middle pregnancy, with the upper limit decreasing by 24.0% and the lower limit decreasing by 40.7%. Then, in late pregnancy, serum TSH gradually increased to non-pregnant levels. For serum FT4, the upper limit changed slightly, with the lower limit increasing by 6.8% compared to non-pregnant levels in early pregnancy. Then, serum FT4 gradually declined, with the upper limit decreasing by 21.8% and the lower limit decreasing by 12.7% in the second trimester. It kept decreasing in the third trimester, with the upper limit decreasing by 25.1% and the lower limit decreasing by 20.9%.

Pregnancy causes increases in renal iodine excretion, thyroxine binding proteins, and thyroid hormone production. A healthy thyroid adjusts thyroid hormone metabolism, iodine uptake, and the hypothalamic-pituitary-thyroid axis to mediate such changes. The peak rise in hCG also occurs during early pregnancy (13, 14). Maternal hCG plays a direct role in stimulating the TSH receptor to produce thyroid hormone, resulting in a decrease in serum TSH. Thus, serum hCG increases in association with a corresponding reduction in serum TSH (2, 3). Starting at gestational 6–8 weeks, maternal serum estrogens increase progressively until term, which is accompanied by total T4 increasing, FT4 decreasing, and

Manufacturer	First author, published year	Location	Gestational weeks, samples	Median, perc	entiles (2.5th and 97	.5th), pmol/L		n the first,	Relativ second, th	/e descent ird trimeste	rate ers of pregna	ncy, %
				F	21	T3	° T1, 2.5th	° T2, 2.5th	° ТЗ, 2.5th ^c	T1, 97.5th	° T2, 97.5th	° T3, 97.5th
Roche E600/601 12 00-22 00ª	Liu et al. (28)	Shenyang	T1 (8-12wk): 144 T2 (12-27wk): 304 T3 (77-40wk): 331	17.02 (13.15–20.78)	13.64 (9.77–18.89)	11.97 (8.72–15.37)	-9.58	18.58	27.33	5.55	14.14	30.14
pmol/L	Li et al. (11)	Shanghai	T1 (9-12wk): 200 T2 (16-24wk): 200 T3 (32-36wk): 200	15.82 (12.90–19.88)	13.23 (10.40–15.91)	11.77 (9.46–14.31)	-7.50	13.33	21.17	9.64	27.68	34.95
	Li et al. (11)	Shenyang	T1 (7-12wk): 640	15.80 (12.30–20.88)	I	I	-2.50	I	I	5.09	I	I
Bayer ADVIA Centaur 11.48–22.70 ^a	Yan et al. (36)	Tianjin + Beijing	T1 9.5 (5–12wk): 168 T2 (13–27wk): 168 T3 (28–41wk): 169	15.30 (11.80–21.0)	13.80 (10.60–17.60)	12.10 (9.20–16.70)	-2.61	7.83	20.00	7.49	22.47	26.43
pmol/L	Duan et al. (31)	Sichuan	T1 (1014wk): 963 T2 (2024wk): 981 T3 (3034wk): 792	14.96 (12.29–18.92)	12.82 (10.97–15.49)	12.53 (9.49–16.25)	-7.06	4.44	17.33	16.65	31.76	28.41
Abbott Architect 2000 12.25–18.8 pmol/L	I Liu et al. (28) 7 ^b	Shenyang	T1 (8–12wk): 144 T2 (12–27wk): 304 T3 (27–40wk): 331	15.30 (12.37–19.09)	12.90 (9.85–18.05)	11.59 (9.12–14.91)	-0.98	19.59	25.55	-0.05	4.35	20.99
	Fan et al. (32)	Shanghai	T1 (9–12wk): 200 T2 (16–24wk): 200 T3 (32–36wk): 200	15.25 (12.77–18.55)	13.13 (10.49–15.30)	11.79 (9.57–14.28)	-4.24	14.37	21.88	1.70	18.92	24.32
DPC Immulite 1000 11.5–22.7 ^a pmol/L	Li et al. (33)	Shenyang	T1 (8–12wk): 249 T2 (13–24wk): 375 T3 (24–40wk): 365	17.60 (12.00–23.34)	15.1 (11.20–21.46)	13.5 (9.80–18.20)	-4.35	2.61	14.78	-2.82	5,46	19.82
Beckman UniCel DX I 800 7.86–14.61 ^a	Chen et al. (35)	Shenyang	T1 (8-12wk): 144 T2 (12-27wk): 304 T3 (27-40wk): 331	11.67 (9.01–15.89)	9.46 (6.62–13.51)	8.61 (5.88–12.76)	-14.63	15.78	25.19	-8.76	7.53	12.66
pmol/L	Chen et al. (35)	Chongqing	T1 (10–13wk+6): 303 T2 (14–27wk+6): 158 T3 (30–34wk): 132	11.24 (8.42–15.75)	9.43 (6.50–14.24)	8.37 (6.12–11.69)	-7.12	17.30	22.14	-7.80	2.53	19.99
	Yu et al. (37)	Shenzhen	T1 (10–13W): 334 T2 (14–26W): 272 T3 (27–42W): 271	11.01 (8.52–14.68)	9.29 (6.84–11.91)	8.55 (6.65–10.96)	-8.40	12.98	15.39	-0.48	18.48	24.98
T1, the first trimes ^a Normal serum F1 ^b Abbott offered a of normal populati	iter of pregnancy; T2, T4 reference range pr. FT4 reference range ion provided bv Liu ei	the second trimester (ovided by manufacture of 9.01–19.05 pmol/L, t al. (28) of 12.25–18.5	of pregnancy; T3, the third ss. , which lower limit was litt 37 pmol/L. Thus, the refer	d trimester of pregnanc. le than the gestational i ence range offered by	y; 2.5th, the lower refe lower limits in Liu et al. Abbott was not suitab	rence limit; 97.5th, th (28) of 12.37 pmol/L e for Chinese popula	e upper refer and Fan et i tion. and we	ence limit; F al. (32) of 12 use 12.25-	-74, free 74. 2.77 pmol/L. 18.87 pmol/L.	Moreover, it L as the nor	also lower thai -pregnant refe	the lower limit ence range for

TABLE 2 | Gestational FT4 reference intervals and relative descent or ascent rate compared with non-pregnancy in Chinese women.

7

(2.5th in non-pregnancy-2.5th in pregnancy)/2.5th in non-pregnancy × 100%. The same formula was applied in the second and third timesters of pregnancy. T1, 97.5th means the relative descent rate of serum FT4 upper limit in the first trimester of pregnancy. The calculation formula can be written as: (97.5th in n non-pregnancy-97.5th in pregnancy)/97.5th in non-pregnancy × 100%. The same formula was applied in the second and third trimesters of pregnancy.

° T1, 2.5th means the relative descent rate of serum FT4 lower limit in the first trimester of pregnancy. The calculation formula can be written as:

Abbott.

Belative rate Upper limit Upper limit Z-Value p-Value Liu JH,2016,Roche 87.0% 915% 7.667 0.000 + Liu JH,2016,Roche 19.9% 14.1% 27.2% 6.679 0.000 + Liu JH,2016,Roche 97.1% 94.5% 915% 7.667 0.000 + Wang QW,2011,Roche 19.9% 15.7% 24.8% 9.668 0.000 + Liu YL,2016,Roche 85.7% 82.6% 9.15.808 0.000 + Lic Y.2014,Roche 23.1% 13.3% 17.9% -6.627 0.000 + Liu YL,2016,Roche 85.7% 82.6% 88.0% 15.808 0.000 + Lic Y.2014,Roche 23.1% 13.3% 17.9% -6.623 0.000 + Duan YF,2015,Bayer 97.3% 81.9% 91.2% 9.74 0.000 + Enu JL/2016,Abott 22.5% 12.84 0.000 + Liu JL/2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.6% 95.1% 7.842 0.000 + <td< th=""><th>Study name</th><th></th><th>Statistics</th><th>for each</th><th>study</th><th></th><th>Relative descent rate and 95% Cl</th><th>Study name</th><th></th><th>Statistics</th><th>for each</th><th>study</th><th></th><th>Relative descent rate and 95% C</th></td<>	Study name		Statistics	for each	study		Relative descent rate and 95% Cl	Study name		Statistics	for each	study		Relative descent rate and 95% C
Liu JH.2016,Roche 87.0% 80.4% 915% 7.667 0.000 + Liu JH.2016,Roche 19.9% 14.1% 27.2% -6.679 0.000 + Wang QW.2011,Roche 97.1% 94.5% 96.5% 10.222 0.000 + Wang QW.2011,Roche 19.9% 15.7% 24.8% -9.656 0.000 + Li CY.2014,Roche 85.5% 82.6% 88.0% 15.808 0.000 + Ear JX.2015,Roche 23.1% 19.9% 15.7% -6.672 0.000 + Li CY.2014,Roche 85.5% 82.6% 88.0% 15.808 0.000 + Duan YF.2015,Bayer 15.4% 13.3% 17.9% -19.068 0.000 + Fan JX.2015,Bayer 87.3% 81.9% 95.0% 7.952 0.000 + Ear JX.2015,Bayer 23.4% 36.0% -5.203 0.000 + Liu JH.2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.841 0.000 + Ear JX.2013,Abbott 22.5% 16.4%		Relative descent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value			Relative descent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value	
Wang QW,2011,Roche 97.1% 94.5% 98.5% 10.222 0.000 4 Wang QW,2011,Roche 19.9% 15.7% 24.8% -96.56 0.000 + au X,2015,Roche 84.84 83.2% 92.5% 91.0% 0.000 + Fan JX,2015,Roche 23.1% 19.9% 26.5% -12.84 0.000 + Juan YE,2015,Bayer 92.5% 90.7% 94.0% 20.531 0.000 + Duan YF,2015,Bayer 15.4% 13.3% 17.9% -19.086 0.000 + jua JL,2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.6% 95.0% 7.952 0.000 + Fan JX,2015,Bayer 15.4% 13.3% 17.9% -19.08 0.000 + au JX,2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.6% 95.0% 7.841 0.000 + Liu JH,2016,Abbott 22.5% 16.4% 30.0% -6.023 0.000 + au JX,2015,Bayer 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.841 0.000 + Liu J,20.08,DPC 20.5% 16	iu JH,2016,Roche	87.0%	80.4%	91.5%	7.667	0.000	+	Liu JH,2016,Roche	19.9%	14.1%	27.2%	-6.679	0.000	+
Fan JX 2015, Roche 884% 832% 922% 9.18% 0.000 + Fan JX 2015, Roche 27.1% 21.4% 33.7% -6.225 0.000 + Li CY.2014, Roche 85.5% 82.6% 88.0% 15.808 0.000 + Li CY.2014, Roche 23.1% 19.9% 26.5% -12.844 0.000 + Juan YF.2015, Bayer 92.5% 90.7% 94.0% 20.531 0.000 + Duan YF.2015, Bayer 23.3% 17.9% -19.068 0.000 + Fan JX.2015, Bayer 87.3% 81.9% 91.2% 9.074 0.000 + Fan JX.2015, Bayer 23.3% 23.4% 36.0% -5.672 0.000 + Jul J2.016, Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.841 0.000 + Fan JX.2015, Bayer 29.3% 23.4% 36.0% -5.672 0.000 + Jul J2.016, Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.841 0.000 + Liu JJ.2016, Abbott 22.5% 16.4%	Nang QW,2011,Roche	97.1%	94.5%	98.5%	10.222	0.000		Wang QW,2011,Roche	19.9%	15.7%	24.8%	-9.656	0.000	+
Li CY.2014,Roche 85.5% 82.6% 88.0% 15.808 0.000 + Li CY.2014,Roche 23.1% 19.9% 26.5% -12.844 0.000 + Li CY.2014,Roche 23.1% 19.9% 26.5% -12.844 0.000 + Li CY.2015,Bayer 87.3% 81.9% 91.2% 9.074 0.000 + Duan YF.2015,Bayer 15.4% 13.3% 17.9% -19.068 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.852 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.852 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 22.5% 16.4% 30.0% -5.23 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.852 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 22.5% 16.4% 30.0% -5.138 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.842 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 22.5% 16.4% 30.0% -5.138 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.842 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 91.6% 35.1% -5.138 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.842 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Abbott 91.6% 80.5% -10.126 0.000 + Li UJ.2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 89.0% 10.435 0.000 + Chen Q.2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 89.0% 10.435 0.000 + Chen Q.2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 99.0% 10.435 0.000 + Chen Q.2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7	an JX,2015,Roche	88.4%	83.2%	92.2%	9.198	0.000	+	Fan JX,2015,Roche	27.1%	21.4%	33.7%	-6.225	0.000	+
Duan YF.2015,Bayer 92.5% 90.7% 94.0% 20.53 0.000 4 Duan YF.2015,Bayer 15.4% 13.3% 17.9% -19.068 0.000 + an JX.2015,Bayer 87.4% 81.9% 91.2% 9.07% 0.000 + Fan JX.2015,Bayer 15.4% 13.3% 17.9% -19.068 0.000 + an JX.2015,Bayer 91.4% 85.6% 95.0% 7.952 0.000 + Liu JH.2016,Abbott 22.5% 16.4% 30.0% -6.203 0.000 + an JX.2015,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.844 0.000 + Fan JX.2013,Abbott 27.1% 20.4% 35.1% -5.198 0.000 + an JX.2015,DPC 80.0% 7.39% 85.0% 7.842 0.000 + Fan JX.2015,DPC 25.0% 0.5% 0.128 0.000 + an JX.2015,DPC 80.0% 7.38% 85.0% 7.842 0.000 + Fan JX.2015,DPC 25.0% 15.5% 3.174	i CY,2014,Roche	85.5%	82.6%	88.0%	15.808	0.000	+	Li CY,2014,Roche	23.1%	19.9%	26.5%	-12.844	0.000	+
Fan JX 2015, Bayer 87.3% 819% 912% 9.074 0.000 + Fan JX 2015, Bayer 23.3% 23.4% 36.0% -5.672 0.000 + Liu JH, 2016, Abbott 91.4% 85.6% 95.0% 7.952 0.000 + Liu JH, 2016, Abbott 22.5% 16.4% 30.0% -6.672 0.000 + an JX, 2013, Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.841 0.000 + Fan JX, 2013, Abbott 22.5% 16.4% 30.0% -6.203 0.000 + an JX, 2013, Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.841 0.000 + Hiu JH, 2016, Abbott 22.5% 16.4% 30.0% -6.023 0.000 + Fan JX, 2015, DPC 77.5% 71.9% 82.3% 8.149 0.000 + Hiu JH, 2016, Beckman 85.3% 31.5% -6.728 0.000 + Ear JX, 2015, DPC 80.0% 78.5% 90.2% 7.470 0.000 + Liu JH, 2016, Beckman 85.6% -5.778 0.000 + UH, 2016, Beckman 85.3% 78.5% <td< td=""><td>Duan YF,2015,Bayer</td><td>92.5%</td><td>90.7%</td><td>94.0%</td><td>20.531</td><td>0.000</td><td>+</td><td>Duan YF,2015,Bayer</td><td>15.4%</td><td>13.3%</td><td>17.9%</td><td>-19.068</td><td>0.000</td><td>+</td></td<>	Duan YF,2015,Bayer	92.5%	90.7%	94.0%	20.531	0.000	+	Duan YF,2015,Bayer	15.4%	13.3%	17.9%	-19.068	0.000	+
iu JH.2016 Abbott 914% 856% 951% 7.952 0.000 + Liu JH.2016 Abbott 225% 164% 30.0% -6.203 0.000 + in JX.2013 Abbott 914% 855% 951% 7.841 0.000 + Fan JX.2013 Abbott 271% 204% 351% -5.198 0.000 + i J.2008,DPC 77.5% 719% 82.3% 8.149 0.000 + Li J.2008,DPC 27.1% 204% 351% -6.728 0.000 + an JX.2015,DPC 80.0% 7.842 0.000 + Fan JX.2016,DPC 25.0% 19.5% 31.5% -6.728 0.000 + u JH.2016,Beckman 85.3% 78.5% 0.000 + Fan JX.2015,DPC 25.0% 19.5% 31.7% -6.728 0.000 + U J.H.2016,Beckman 85.3% 78.5% 10.4% 0.000 + Chen Q.2016,Beckman 28.1% -4.1% 34.7% -6.728 0.000 + Then Q.2016,Be	an JX,2015,Bayer	87.3%	81.9%	91.2%	9.074	0.000	+	Fan JX,2015,Bayer	29.3%	23.4%	36.0%	-5.672	0.000	+
'an JX_2013,Abbott 91.4% 85.5% 95.1% 7.841 0.000 + 'i J_2008,DPC 77.5% 71.9% 82.3% 8.149 0.000 + 'i J_2008,DPC 77.5% 71.9% 82.3% 8.149 0.000 + 'i J_2008,DPC 80.0% 7.88 0.000 + Li J_2008,DPC 05.0% 02.9% 08.5% -10.126 0.000 + 'i u JH_2016,Beckman 85.3% 78.5% 90.2% 7.470 0.000 + Heiu JH_2016,Beckman 36.6% 29.2% 44.8% -3.174 0.002 + 'then QQ_2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 10.4% 0.000 + Chard Q040B Beckman 29.1% 24.1% 34.7% -6.778 0.000 +	iu JH,2016,Abbott	91.4%	85.6%	95.0%	7.952	0.000	+	Liu JH,2016,Abbott	22.5%	16.4%	30.0%	-6.203	0.000	+
j.j2000,DPC 77.5% 71.9% 82.3% 8.149 0.000 + Li.j.2008,DPC 05.0% 0.2.9% 08.5% -10.126 0.000 + an JX,2015,DPC 80.0% 7.842 0.000 + Fan JX,2015,DPC 25.0% 19.5% 31.5% -6.728 0.000 + uH_2016,Beckman 85.3% 78.5% 90.2% 7.470 0.000 + Liu H_2016,Beckman 28.1% -3.174 0.002 + then Q0.2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 10.425 0.000 + Chen Q0.2016,Beckman 29.1% 24.1% 34.7% -6.778 0.000 +	an JX,2013,Abbott	91.4%	85.5%	95.1%	7.841	0.000	+	Fan JX,2013,Abbott	27.1%	20.4%	35.1%	-5.198	0.000	+
an JX 2015,DPC 80.0% 73.9% 85.0% 7.842 0.000 + Fan JX 2015,DPC 25.0% 19.5% 31.5% 6.728 0.000 + Ui JH 2016,Beckman 85.3% 78.5% 90.2% 7.470 0.000 + Liu JH 2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 89.0% 10.435 0.000 + Chen QQ 2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 89.0% 10.435 0.000 + Chen QQ 2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 90.0% 7.842 0.000 + Chen QQ 2016,Beckman 85.3% 7.842 0.000 + Chen QQ 2016,Beckman 85.3% 7.842 0.000 + Chen QQ 2016,Beckman 85.3% 7.842 0.000 + Chen Q	i J,2008,DPC	77.5%	71.9%	82.3%	8.149	0.000	+	Li J,2008,DPC	05.0%	02.9%	08.5%	-10.126	0.000	+
iu JH,2016,Beckman 853% 785% 902% 7.470 0.000 + Liu JH,2016,Beckman 36.6% 292% 44.8% -3.174 0.002 + hen QQ,2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 89.0% 10.435 0.000 + Chen QQ,2016,Beckman 29.1% 24.1% 34.7% -6.778 0.000 + Chen QQ,2016,Beckman 29.1% 24.1% 34.1% 24	an JX,2015,DPC	80.0 %	73.9%	85.0%	7.842	0.000	+	Fan JX,2015,DPC	25.0%	19.5 %	31.5%	-6.728	0.000	+
Chen QQ.2016,Beckman 85.3% 80.7% 89.0% 10.435 0.000 + Chen QQ.2016,Beckman 29.1% 24.1% 34.7% -6.778 0.000 + Chen QQ.2016,Beckman 29.1% 24.1\% 24.	iu JH,2016,Beckman	85.3 %	78.5%	90.2%	7.470	0.000	+	Liu JH,2016,Beckman	36.6 %	29.2%	44.8%	-3.174	0.002	+
than 2016 Baskman 7259/ 6929/ 7929/ 7946 0.000 + Charl 2016 Baskman 1229/ 0029/ 1759/ 11.005 0.000 +	hen QQ,2016,Beckman	85.3 %	80.7 %	89.0%	10.435	0.000	+	Chen QQ,2016,Beckmai	29.1 %	24.1%	34.7 %	-6.778	0.000	+
nen L,2010,Beckman 73.5 % 68.5 % 78.2 % 7.846 0.000 + Chen L,2010,Beckman 13.2 % 09.6 % 17.5 % -11.095 0.000 +	Chen L,2016,Beckman	73.5 %	68.3 %	78.2%	7.846	0.000	+ .	Chen L,2016,Beckman	13.2 %	09.8 %	17.5%	-11.095	0.000	+
85.7 % 84.5 % 86.8 % 36.845 0.000 21.7 % 20.4 % 23.1 % -31.943 0.000		85.7 %	84.5 %	86.8 %	36.845	0.000	1 1 1		21.7 %	20.4 %	23.1%	-31.943	0.000	
0.50 1.00 0.00 0.							0.50 1.00							0.00 0.50

FIGURE 3 | Meta-analysis of the relative descent rate of TSH lower (A) and upper (B) reference limits in early pregnancy. Figure shows unadjusted relative descent rate of TSH lower (A) and upper (B) limit estimates in early pregnancy with 95% confidence limits for each study selected. Pooled relative descent rate estimates are represented as diamonds in this plot.



TSH progressively increasing throughout the pregnancy (15). Therefore, the non-pregnant reference ranges for thyroid function tests are not applicable to pregnant women. National guidelines throughout the world have recommended the use of gestational- and population-specific serum TSH and FT4 reference ranges to diagnose thyroid disease during pregnancy (4, 5) (16–20). According to the 2017 ATA guidelines, 2.5 mU/L was no longer used as the serum TSH upper limit cut-off value to

udy name	5	Statistics	for each	study		Relative descent	t rate and	95% CI	Study name	l:	Statistics	for each	study		Relative descent rate and 95% C
	Relative descent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					Relative descent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value	
u JH,2016,Roche	34.8%	29.6%	40.3%	-5.221	0.000	+			Liu JH,2016,Roche	23.4%	19.0%	28.5%	-8.754	0.000	+
ang QW,2011,Roche	47.8%	42.2%	53.5%	-0.753	0.452		+ I		Wang QW,2011,Roche	38.7%	33,3%	44.3%	-3.903	0.000	+
an JX,2015,Roche	37.7%	31.2%	44.6%	-3.448	0.001	+			Fan JX,2015,Roche	28.4%	22.6%	35.0%	-5.905	0.000	+
uan YF,2015,Bayer	9.0%	7.3%	10.9%	-20.740	0.000	+			Duan YF,2015,Bayer	6.4%	5.0%	8.1%	-20.566	0.000	+
an JX,2015,Bayer	40.0%	33.4%	46.9%	-2.809	0.005	+			Fan JX,2015,Bayer	30.1%	24.2%	36.8%	-5.458	0.000	+
JH,2016,Abbott	85.7%	81.3%	89.2%	10.931	0.000		+		Liu JH,2016,Abbott	24.9%	20.4%	30.1%	-8.324	0.000	+
in JX,2013,Abbott	60.0%	52.8%	66.8%	2.694	0.007		+		Fan JX,2013,Abbott	26.9%	21.0%	33.8%	-6.009	0.000	+
J,2008,DPC	35.0%	30.3%	40.0%	-5.718	0.000	+			Li J,2008,DPC	12.5%	09.5%	16.2%	-12.462	0.000	+
an JX,2015,DPC	22.5%	17.2%	28.8%	-7.304	0.000	+			Fan JX,2015,DPC	25.8%	20.2%	32.3%	-6.549	0.000	+
u JH,2016,Beckman	382%	32.9%	43.8 %	-4.062	0.000	+			Liu JH,2016,Beckman	40.9%	35.5%	46.5%	-3.159	0.002	+
nen QQ,2016,Beckman	64.7%	58.9%	70.1%	4.857	0.000		+		Chen QQ,2016,Beckman	23.6%	19.0%	28.9%	-8.370	0.000	+
nen L,2016,Beckman	67.7 %	60.0 %	74.5%	4.338	0.000		+		Chen L,2016,Beckman	8.4 %	5.0%	13.8%	-8.330	0.000	+
	40.7 %	38.9 %	42.5%	-9.884	0.000	•				24.0%	22.6%	25.5%	-27.634	0.000	
						0.00 0.	.50 1.0	10							0.00 0.50

FIGURE 5 | Meta-analysis of relative descent rate of TSH lower (A) and upper (B) reference limits in middle pregnancy. Figure shows unadjusted relative descent rate of TSH lower (A) and upper (B) limit estimates in middle pregnancy with 95% confidence limits for each study selected. Pooled relative descent rate estimates are represented as diamonds in this plot.

Study name		Statistic	s for eac	h study		Relative ascent rate and 95% Cl
	Relative ascent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value	
Liu JH,2016,Roche	9.6%	5.7%	15.6%	-7.928	0.000	+
Fan JX,2015,Roche	7.5%	4.6%	12.1%	-9.358	0.000	+
Li CY,2014,Roche	2.5%	1.5%	4.0%	-14.470	0.000	•
Yan YQ,2011,Bayer	2.6%	1.0%	6.5%	-7.479	0.000	+
Duan YF,2015,Bayer	7.1%	5.6%	8.9%	-20.489	0.000	+
Liu JH,2016,Abbott	1.0%	0.2%	4.9%	-5.456	0.000	▶
Fan JX,2015,Abbott	4.2%	2.2%	8.1%	-8.883	0.000	+
Li J,2008,DPC	4.4%	2.4%	7.7%	-9.948	0.000	+
Liu JH,2016,Beckman	14.6%	9.7%	21.4%	-7.481	0.000	+
Chen L,2016,Beckman	7.1%	4.7%	10.6%	-11.497	0.000	+
Yu L,2014,Beckman	8.4%	5.9%	11.9%	-12.112	0.000	<u>+</u>
	6.8%	5.9%	7.7%	-36.473	0.000	11 1
						0.00 0.50

estimates in early pregnancy with 95% confidence limits for each study selected. Pooled relative ascent rate estimates are represented as diamonds in this plot.

diagnose hypothyroidism in early pregnancy, and 4.0 mU/L was recommended when internal or transferable pregnancy-specific TSH reference intervals were unavailable (5). Since the serum TSH upper limit in the American general population is usually 4.5 mU/L, it generally decreased by 0.5 mU/L in the first trimester, resulting in the cut-off value of 4.0 mU/L (6).

Although the 2017 ATA guidelines provided a convenient and feasible method for determining the serum TSH upper limit in early pregnancy, whether 4.0 mU/L is suitable for pregnant Chinese women needs to be explored. First, serum TSH reference ranges vary among different ethnicities due to cultural, environmental, geographic and genetic factors (21–23). Second, sex differences exist in TSH circadian rhythms. Third, serum TSH values change throughout the 24-h cycle and progressively increase with age (12). Fourth, iodine is the main ingredient in the synthesis of thyroid hormones. Since the implementation of mandatory universal salt iodization in 1996, China has eliminated iodine deficiency and become an iodinesufficient country (24). Epidemiological studies also found that the resident's average serum TSH level has risen due to the effects of increased iodine intake (25). A similar epidemiological survey reported by Korea showed that there was high iodine intake in Korea, resulting in serum TSH exhibiting a right-shifted distribution in that population (26).

TSH is regarded as one of the principal indicators to diagnose primary hyperthyroidism and hypothyroidism. Our study compared the gestational upper and lower limits for serum TSH with the non-pregnant reference intervals provided

tudy name		Statistics	s for eacl	n study		Relative descent rate and 95% CI	Study name		Statistics	for each	study		Relative descent rate and 95% C
	Relative descent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value			Relative descent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value	
u JH,2016,Roche	18.6%	14.6%	23.4%	-10.020	0.000	+	Liu JH,2016,Roche	14.1%	10.7%	18.5%	-10.958	0.000	+
an JX,2015,Roche	13.3%	9.3%	18.8%	-8.999	0.000	+	Fan JX,2015,Roche	27.7%	21.9%	34.3%	-6.077	0.000	+
an YQ,2011,Bayer	7.8%	4.6%	13.0%	-8.586	0.000	+	Yan YQ,2011,Bayer	22.5%	16.8%	29.4%	-6.700	0.000	+
uan YF,2015,Bayer	4.4 %	3.3%	05.9%	-19.800	0.000	•	Duan YF,2015,Bayer	31.8%	28.9%	34.7 %	-11.152	0.000	+
u JH,2016,Abbott	19.6%	15.5%	24.4%	-9.772	0.000	+	Liu JH,2016,Abbott	4.4%	2.6%	7.3%	-10.991	0.000	+
an JX,2015,Abbott	14.4%	10.2%	19.9%	-8.855	0.000	+	Fan JX,2015,Abbott	18.9%	14.1%	24.9%	-8.060	0.000	+
J,2008,DPC	2.6%	1.4%	4.8%	-11.174	0.000	+	Li J,2008,DPC	5.5%	3.6%	08.3%	-12.546	0.000	+
iu JH,2016,Beckmai	15.8%	12.1%	20.3%	-10.645	0.000	+	Liu JH,2016,Beckman	7.5%	5.0%	11.1%	-11.539	0.000	+
hen L,2016,Beckma	17.3%	12.2%	24.0%	-7.438	0.000	+	Chen L,2016,Beckmai	2.5%	1.0%	6.5%	-7.207	0.000	+
u L,2014,Beckman	13.0%	9.5%	17.5%	-10.546	0.000	+	Yu L,2014,Beckman	18.5%	14.3%	23.5%	-9.501	0.000	+
	12.7%	11.5%	14.0%	-33.355	0.000	14 1		21.8%	20.3%	23.5%	-26.988	0.000	
						0.00 0.50							0.00 0.50

FIGURE 7 | Meta-analysis of relative descent rate of FT4 lower (A) and upper (B) reference limits in middle pregnancy. Figure shows unadjusted relative descent rate of FT4 lower (A) and upper (B) limit estimates in middle pregnancy with 95% confidence limits for each study selected. Pooled relative descent rate estimates are represented as diamonds in this plot.

tudy name		Statistics	for each	study		Relative descent rate	and 95% Cl	Study name		Statistics	for each	study		Relative descent rate	and 95% CI
	Relative descent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value				Relative descent rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value		
iu JH,2016,Roche	27.3%	22.8%	32.4%	-7.929	0.000	+	ſ.	Liu JH,2016,Roche	30.1%	25.4%	35.3%	-7.018	0.000	+	
an JX,2015,Roche	21.2%	16.1%	27.4%	-7.595	0.000	+		Fan JX,2015,Roche	35.0%	28.7%	41.8%	-4.189	0.000	+	
an YQ,2011,Bayer	20.0%	14.6%	26.7%	-7.209	0.000	+		Yan YQ,2011,Bayer	26.4%	20.3%	33.6%	-5.869	0.000	+	
Duan YF,2015,Bayer	17.3%	14.8%	20.1%	-16.643	0.000	+		Duan YF,2015,Bayer	28.4%	25.4%	31.7%	-11.730	0.000	+	
iu JH,2016,Abbott	25.6%	21.1%	30.5%	-8.486	0.000	+		Liu JH,2016,Abbott	21.0%	16.9%	25.7%	-9.821	0.000	+	
an JX,2015,Abbott	21.9%	16.7%	28.1%	-7.441	0.000	+		Fan JX,2015,Abbott	24.3%	18.9%	30.7%	-6.888	0.000	+	
i J,2008,DPC	14.8%	11.5%	18.8%	-11.879	0.000	+		Li J,2008,DPC	19.8%	16.0%	24.2%	-10.644	0.000	+	
iu JH,2016,Beckman	25.2%	20.8%	30.1%	-8.597	0.000	+		Liu JH,2016,Beckman	12.7%	09.5%	16.7%	-11.684	0.000	+	
Chen L,2016,Beckman	22.1%	15.9%	30.0%	-5.999	0.000	+		Chen L,2016,Beckma	n 20.0%	14.0%	27.7%	-6.373	0.000	+	
u L,2014,Beckman	15.4%	11.6%	20.2%	-10.124	0.000	+		Yu L,2014,Beckman	25.0%	20.2%	30.5%	-7.837	0.000	+	
	20.9%	19.5%	22.3%	-29.913	0.000				25.1%	23.6%	26.7%	-26.063	0.000		
						0.00 0.	50							0.00 0.	50

FIGURE 8 | Meta-analysis of relative descent rate of FT4 lower (A) and upper (B) reference limits in late pregnancy. Figure shows unadjusted relative descent rate of FT4 lower (A) and upper (B) limit estimates in late pregnancy with 95% confidence limits for each study selected. Pooled relative descent rate estimates are represented as diamonds in this plot.

by the test manufacturers. We found that regardless the kind of kit or test method, the serum TSH upper limit decreased by \sim 22% and the lower limit decreased by \sim 85% in early pregnancy. What we found especially interesting was that the non-pregnant upper limit declined by 22% was very close to 4.0 mU/L. However, the difference between 4.0 mU/L and the nonpregnant TSH upper limit minus 0.5 mU/L, according to the 2017 ATA guideline's recommendation (5), was obvious. Although the difference between 4.0 mU/L and the real TSH upper limits of pregnant Chinese women cannot be eliminated, the difference was not significant. Our findings further suggest that if we use 4.0 mU/L as a sub-optimal approach to identify serum TSH upper limit in early pregnancy, this limit represents a relative descent rate in the non-pregnant TSH upper reference limit of 22% rather than a reduction of \sim 0.5 mU/L.

However, we must stress that the population of a local institute or laboratory and pregnancy-specific serum TSH reference ranges should optimally define the gestational-specific serum TSH reference range. If unavailable, pregnancy-specific TSH reference ranges obtained from similar patient populations and detected by similar test assays should be the alternatives. If the above two conditions are not available, 4.0 mU/L or the serum TSH upper limit, which is 22% lower than the non-pregnant level, may be used as a sub-optimal approach to identify the serum TSH reference ranges in pregnancy for diagnosing gestational thyroid diseases.

T4 is considered an important index for the diagnosis of overt gestational hypothyroidism and hypothyroxinemia. At present, serum FT4 is used as a diagnostic indicator for hypothyroidism and hypothyroxinemia in the majority of clinical laboratories. The 2017 ATA guidelines declared that the accuracy of detecting serum FT4 by indirect analog immunoassays was influenced by pregnancy and manufacturer diversity. Gestational- and method-specific serum FT4 reference ranges should be established, but they are difficult to implement (5). According to the studies we included, serum FT4 showed an upward trend in the first trimester compared to non-pregnant levels. The upper limit fluctuated slightly, while the lower limit increased by \sim 7.0%.

Serum FT4 decreased in the second trimester, with the upper limit decreasing by \sim 20% and the lower limit decreasing by \sim 15%. Subsequently, serum FT4 declined more profoundly in the third trimester, with the upper limit decreasing by \sim 25% and the lower limit decreasing by \sim 20%. Thus, by comparing with the non-pregnant reference ranges provided by manufacturers or measurements in the local population, we can diagnose hypothyroxinemia once the serum FT4 lower limit decreases by more than 15% in middle pregnancy and 20% in late pregnancy.

Our analysis of the included studies found that the gestational TSH reference ranges are broader than those of the non-pregnant population, mainly because the serum TSH upper limit decreased less than the lower limit. One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that women with subclinical hypothyroidism have an impaired thyroidal response to hCG stimulation, and women with a lower thyroid functional capacity may already have high-normal TSH concentrations going into pregnancy (27). So, in the whole population, the TSH upper limit probably does not decrease steeply. The upper and lower limit of serum FT4 almost synchronously declined in pregnancy, resulting in no obvious change in the breadth of the reference range.

LIMITATIONS

Our study had some limitations. We only included the studies from China, without considering other countries or ethnic groups. Our study represented the serum TSH and FT4 reference ranges of a pregnant Chinese population; due to the paucity of studies calculating good population-based reference ranges for non-pregnancy, we did not acquire accurate normal TSH and FT4 reference ranges, which can be seen as the gold standard for comparison (8). In addition, our meta-analysis only included kits published and meeting inclusion criteria. Kits such as the Bayer ASC 180, LIAISON, and TOSOH were not included because of few or no publications; A minimum of approximately 400 women is required, due to the high interindividual variability and skewness for TSH but also to some extent FT4 (9). In our metaanalysis, the number of women included in most of the studies was lower than 400.

CONCLUSION

Our meta-analysis found that serum TSH decreased in the first and second trimesters of pregnancy and exhibited an upward

REFERENCES

- 1. Huang SA, Neves LADC. *Thyroid Hormone Metabolism*: Dekker, New York, NY: Chemical Rubber Company Press (1986).
- 2. Glinoer D. What happens to the normal thyroid during pregnancy? *Thyroid Offic J Am Thyr Assoc.* (1999) 9:631.
- Glinoer D. The regulation of thyroid function in pregnancy: pathways of endocrine adaptation from physiology to pathology. *Endocr Rev.* (1997) 18:404. doi: 10.1210/edrv.18.3.0300
- 4. StagnaroGreen A, Abalovich M, Alexander E, Azizi F, Mestman J, Negro R, et al. Guidelines of the American thyroid association for the diagnosis and management of thyroid disease during pregnancy

trend to non-pregnant levels in the third trimester. Furthermore, serum FT4 increased slightly in the first trimester and decreased gradually in the second and third trimesters. The relative descent or ascent rate compared with the non-pregnant reference intervals may explain the change rules of gestational serum TSH and FT4. In the first trimester, using 4.0 mU/L as the cut-off point of the serum TSH upper limit is a sub-optimal approach for pregnant Chinese women. Generally, this limit represents a relative descent rate in the non-pregnant TSH upper reference limit of 22%.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

XG and YL: Conceived and designed the meta-analysis; XG, JL, and AL: Performed the meta-analysis; XG: Analyzed the data, wrote the manuscript, statistical analyses and paper writing; WS: Contributed material/analysis tools; XG and YL: Reference collection and data management; XG, ZS, and WT: Study design.

FUNDING

This work was supported by Chinese National Natural Science Foundation (grant number 81570709, grant number 81170730); The National Science and technology support program (grant number 2014BAI06B02); Research Foundation of Key laboratory of endocrine diseases, Department of education in Liaoning Province China (grant number LZ2014035); Key platform foundation of science and technology for the universities in Liaoning Province (grant number 16010) and Health and Medicine Research Foundation, Shenyang City (grant number 17-230-9-02).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge Haoyu Wang, Xun Gong, Qingling Guo, Yuanyuan Hou for providing technical assistance to the meta-analysis.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fendo. 2018.00432/full#supplementary-material

and postpartum. *Thyroid* (2011) 21:1081. doi: 10.1089/thy.201 1.0087

- Alexander EK, Pearce EN, Brent GA, Brown RS, Chen H, Dosiou C, et al. 2017 Guidelines of the American Thyroid Association for the diagnosis and management of thyroid disease during pregnancy and the postpartum. *Thyroid* (2017) 27:315–89. doi: 10.1089/thy.2016.0457
- Demers LM, Spencer CA. Laboratory medicine practice guidelines: laboratory support for the diagnosis and monitoring of thyroid disease. *Clin Endocrinol.* (2003) 58:138–40. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2265.2003.01681.x
- Springer D, Bartos V, Zima T. Reference intervals for thyroid markers in early pregnancy determined by 7 different analytical systems. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest.* (2014) 74:95–101. doi: 10.3109/00365513.2013.860617

- Korevaar TIM, Chaker L, Peeters RP. Improving the clinical impact of randomised trials in thyroidology. *Lancet Diabet Endocrinol.* (2017) 6:523–5. doi: 10.1016/S2213-8587(17)30316-9
- Medici M, Korevaar TI, Visser WE, Visser TJ, Peeters RP. Thyroid function in pregnancy: what is normal? *Clin Chem* (2015) 61:704-13. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2014.236646
- Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *Eur J Epidemiol.* (2010) 25:603–5. doi: 10.1007/s10654-010-9491-z
- Li C, Shan Z, Mao J, Wang W, Xie X, Zhou W, et al. Assessment of thyroid function during first-trimester pregnancy: what is the rational upper limit of serum TSH during the first trimester in Chinese pregnant women? *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* (2014) 99:73–9. doi: 10.1210/jc.2013-1674
- Ehrenkranz J, Bach PR, Snow GL, Schneider A, Lee JL, Ilstrup S, et al. Circadian and circannual rhythms in thyroid hormones: determining the TSH and free T4 reference intervals based upon time of day, age, and sex. *Thyroid* (2015) 25:954–61. doi: 10.1089/thy.2014.0589
- 13. Carr SR. Medical complications during pregnancy. *JAMA* (1995) 274:1247. doi: 10.1001/jama.1995.03530150071041
- 14. Robbins J. Thyroxine-binding proteins. Prog Clin Biol Res (1976) 1:331-55.
- Benvenga S, Di Bari F, Granese R, Borrielli I, Giorgianni G, Grasso L, et al. Circulating thyrotropin is upregulated by estradiol. *J Clin Transl Endocrinol.* (2018) 11:11–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jcte.2018.02.002
- Maji R, Nath S, Lahiri S, Das MS, Bhattacharyya AR, Das HN. Establishment of trimester-specific reference intervals of serum TSH & fT4 in a Pregnant Indian population at North Kolkata. *Indian J Clin Biochem.* (2014) 29:167–73. doi: 10.1007/s12291-013-0332-1
- Moon HW, Chung HJ, Park CM, Hur M, Yun YM. Establishment of trimesterspecific reference intervals for thyroid hormones in Korean pregnant women. *Ann Lab Med.* (2015) 35:198–204. doi: 10.3343/alm.2015.35.2.198
- Bestwick JP, John R, Maina A, Guaraldo V, Joomun M, Wald NJ, et al. Thyroid stimulating hormone and free thyroxine in pregnancy: expressing concentrations as multiples of the median (MoMs). *Clin Chim Acta* (2014) 430:33–7. doi: 10.1016/j.cca.2013.12.030
- Tuazon MA, van Raaij JM, Hautvast JG, Barba CV. Energy requirements of pregnancy in the Philippines. *Lancet* (1987) 2:1129–31.
- Bocos-Terraz JP, Izquierdo-Álvarez S, Bancalero-Flores JL, Álvarez-Lahuerta R, Aznar-Sauca A, Real-López E, et al. Thyroid hormones according to gestational age in pregnant Spanish women. *BMC Res Notes* (2009) 2:1–9. doi: 10.1186/1756-0500-2-237
- 21. Price A, Obel O, Cresswell J, Catch I, Rutter S, Barik S, et al. Comparison of thyroid function in pregnant and non-pregnant Asian and western Caucasian women. *Clin Chim Acta* (2001) 308:91-8. doi: 10.1016/S0009-8981(01)00470-3
- Surks MI, Boucai L. Age- and race-based serum thyrotropin reference limits. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. (2010) 95:496. doi: 10.1210/jc.2009-1845
- Korevaar TI, Medici M, de Rijke YB, Visser W, Sm KS, Jaddoe VW, et al. Ethnic differences in maternal thyroid parameters during pregnancy: the Generation R study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* (2013) 98:3678–86. doi: 10.1210/jc.2013-2005
- 24. Shan Z, Chen L, Lian X, Liu C, Shi B, Shi L, et al. Iodine status and prevalence of thyroid disorders after introduction of mandatory universal salt iodization for 16 years in china: a cross-sectional study in 10 cities. *Thyroid* (2016) 26:1125. doi: 10.1089/thy.2015.0613
- Liu P, Liu L, Shen H, Jia Q, Wang J, Zheng H, et al. The standard, intervention measures and health risk for high water iodine areas. *PLoS ONE* (2014) 9:e89608. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0089608
- 26. Jeon M, Kim WG, Kwon H, Kim M, Park S, Oh HS, et al. Excessive iodine intake and TSH reference interval: data from the Korean National

Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Thyroid* (2017) 27:967-72. doi: 10.1089/thy.2017.0078

- 27. Korevaar TI, Steegers EA, de Rijke YB, Visser WE, Jaddoe VW, Visser TJ, et al. Placental angiogenic factors are associated with maternal thyroid function and modify hCG-mediated FT4 stimulation. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* (2015) 100:E1328-34. doi: 10.1210/jc.2015-2553
- 28. Liu J, Yu X, Xia M, Cai H, Cheng G, Wu L, et al. Development of gestationspecific reference intervals for thyroid hormones in normal pregnant Northeast Chinese women: What is the rational division of gestation stages for establishing reference intervals for pregnancy women? *Clin Biochem* (2017) 50:309-17. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2016.11.036
- 29. Wang Q, Yu B, Huang R, Cao F, Zhu Z, Sun D, et al. Assessment of thyroid function during pregnancy: the advantage of self-sequential longitudinal reference intervals. *Arch Med Sci Ams* (2011) 7:679–84. doi: 10.5114/aoms.2011.24139
- Xu SJ, Fan JX, Yang S, Tao J, Qian W, Han M, et al. Variations in different thyroid stimulating hormone and free thyroxine detection kits for evaluating thyroid function during pregnancy. *Chinese J Perinat Med.* (2015) 18:81–6. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1007-9408.2015.02.001
- Duan Y, Peng L, Cui Y, Jiang Y. Reference Intervals for Thyroid Function and the Negative Correlation between FT4 and HbA1c in Pregnant Women of West China. *Clin Lab.* (2015) 61:777–83. doi: 10.7754/Clin.Lab.2015.141235
- 32. Fan JX, Han M, Tao J, Luo J, Song MF, Yang S, et al. Reference intervals for common thyroid function tests, during different stages of pregnancy in Chinese women. *Chin Med J.* (2013) 126:2710–4. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0366-6999.20130767
- 33. Li J, Teng WP, Shan ZY, Li CY, Zhou WW, Gao B, et al. Gestational monthspecific reference ranges for TSH and thyroxine in Han nationality women in iodine sufficient area of China. *Chinese J Endocrinol Metab.* (2008) 24:605–8. doi: 10.3321/j.issn:1000-6699.2008.06.004
- Chen QQ, Wang ZC. Establishment of reference intervals of thyroid hormones in pregnant women for Ningbo city. *Chinese J Gen Pract.* (2016) 14:1013–6. doi: 10.16766/j.cnki.issn.1674-4152.2016.06.043
- 35. Chen L, Chang K, Pu XY, Luo SF, Peng ZY, Chen M, et al. Gestation-specific reference intervals for thyroid function tests and the clinical significance for thyroid function monitoring through different periods of pregnancy. *Chinese J Lab Med.* (2016) 39:511–5. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1009-9158.2016.07.010
- 36. Yan YQ, Dong ZL, Dong L, Wang FR, Yang XM, Jin XY, et al. Trimesterand method-specific reference intervals for thyroid tests in pregnant Chinese women: methodology, euthyroid definition and iodine status can influence the setting of reference intervals. *Clin Endocrinol.* (2011) 74:262–9. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2265.2010.03910.x
- 37. Yu L, Yuan HK, Lin HY, Wu WY. Reference interval in preliminary investigation of maternal thyroid function during pregnancy in Shenzhen China. *Natl Med J China* (2014):3175–8. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0376-2491.2014.40.014

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2018 Gao, Li, Li, Liu, Sun, Teng and Shan. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.