Maternal prenatal depression is associated with decreased placental expression of the imprinted gene *PEG3*

A. B. Janssen¹, L. E. Capron², K. O'Donnell³, S. J. Tunster¹, P. G. Ramchandani², A. E. P. Heazell⁴, V. Glover⁵ and R. M. John¹*

¹Cardiff School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff CF10 3AX, UK

² Centre for Mental Health, Imperial College, Hammersmith Campus, London W12 0NN, UK

³ Douglas Mental Health University Institute, 6875 La Salle Boulevard, Verdun, Quebec H4H 1R3, Canada

⁴ Maternal and Fetal Health Research Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

⁵ Institute of Reproductive and Developmental Biology, Imperial College London, Hammersmith Campus, Du Cane Road, London W12 0NN, UK

Background. Maternal prenatal stress during pregnancy is associated with fetal growth restriction and adverse neurodevelopmental outcomes, which may be mediated by impaired placental function. Imprinted genes control fetal growth, placental development, adult behaviour (including maternal behaviour) and placental lactogen production. This study examined whether maternal prenatal depression was associated with aberrant placental expression of the imprinted genes paternally expressed gene 3 (*PEG3*), paternally expressed gene 10 (*PEG10*), pleckstrin homology-like domain family a member 2 (*PHLDA2*) and cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor 1C (*CDKN1C*), and resulting impaired placental human placental lactogen (*hPL*) expression.

Method. A diagnosis of depression during pregnancy was recorded from Manchester cohort participants' medical notes (n=75). Queen Charlotte's (n=40) and My Baby and Me study (MBAM) (n=81) cohort participants completed the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale self-rating psychometric questionnaire. Villous trophoblast tissue samples were analysed for gene expression.

Results. In a pilot study, diagnosed depression during pregnancy was associated with a significant reduction in placental *PEG3* expression (41%, p = 0.02). In two further independent cohorts, the Queen Charlotte's and MBAM cohorts, placental *PEG3* expression was also inversely associated with maternal depression scores, an association that was significant in male but not female placentas. Finally, *hPL* expression was significantly decreased in women with clinically diagnosed depression (44%, p < 0.05) and in those with high depression scores (31% and 21%, respectively).

Conclusions. This study provides the first evidence that maternal prenatal depression is associated with changes in the placental expression of *PEG3*, co-incident with decreased expression of *hPL*. This aberrant placental gene expression could provide a possible mechanistic explanation for the co-occurrence of maternal depression, fetal growth restriction, impaired maternal behaviour and poorer offspring outcomes.

Received 22 September 2015; Revised 10 June 2016; Accepted 16 June 2016; First published online 15 August 2016

Key words: Human placental lactogen, PEG3, prenatal depression.

Introduction

Maternal psychological stress (or prenatal stress) during pregnancy, such as symptoms of anxiety and/or depression, has been associated with fetal programming of adverse long-term consequences for the child including an increased risk of fetal growth restriction (for example, Steer *et al.* 1992; Rondo *et al.* 2003; Khashan *et al.* 2008; Liu *et al.* 2012), emotional and behavioural problems, learning difficulties, cognitive

(Email: JohnRM@cardiff.ac.uk)

impairment and psychopathology (for reviews, see Van den Bergh *et al.* 2005; Talge *et al.* 2007). In addition, there is evidence that prenatal depression can impair the normal development of postnatal maternal behaviour and mother–infant interactions (Pearson *et al.* 2012).

Located at the boundary between the maternal and fetal environments, the placenta supports fetal growth and development through numerous functions including transport of nutrients and oxygen and the production and metabolism of hormones (Gude *et al.* 2004). The placenta has been proposed as a potential mechanism mediating the association between maternal prenatal stress and adverse infant outcomes (O'Donnell

This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creative commons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

^{*} Address for correspondence: R. M. John, Cardiff School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff CF10 3AX, UK.

et al. 2009; Janssen *et al.* 2016). Consistent with this hypothesis, prenatal stress has previously been associated with altered placental function in both animal models (Mairesse *et al.* 2007; Jensen Pena *et al.* 2012) and in humans (O'Donnell *et al.* 2012; Blakeley *et al.* 2013; Reynolds *et al.* 2015).

Imprinted genes, which are monoallelically expressed with expression depending on the parent of origin (Surani, 1998), are regulated by epigenetic marks that may respond to in utero environmental stimuli. These genes have been suggested as potential mediators of adverse infant outcomes because of their well-established roles in controlling fetal growth, placental development, adult behaviour and metabolism (Lefebvre et al. 1998; Li et al. 1999; Curley et al. 2005; Smith et al. 2006; Tunster et al. 2013; Jensen et al. 2014; McNamara & Isles, 2014). Aberrant expression of imprinted genes in the placenta has also been demonstrated to be associated with impaired infant neurobehavioural development in humans (Green et al. 2015). Recent studies demonstrate that a subset of imprinted genes converge on the endocrine lineages of the mouse placenta to regulate placental hormone production (John, 2013). This may be of particular relevance to maternal prenatal stress as the placenta is a significant source of hormones, such as placental lactogens (Glynn & Sandman, 2011). These lactogenic hormones act on the maternal brain, priming the mother for pregnancy and postnatal care (Bridges et al. 1985, 1990, 1997; Bridges & Freemark, 1995; Glynn & Sandman, 2011). In addition, impaired placental lactogen production has been associated with adverse infant outcomes such as fetal growth restriction (Roh et al. 2005; Dutton et al. 2012). Thus, it is possible that aberrant placental imprinted gene expression and resulting impaired placental lactogen production mediate the association between maternal prenatal stress and adverse infant outcomes. In support of such a hypothesis, epigenetic changes in cord blood DNA at imprinted loci have been associated with both depressed maternal mood (Liu et al. 2012) and maternal stress (Vidal et al. 2014). The expression of imprinted genes in the placenta has not previously been examined in relation to maternal prenatal stress.

In this study we examined the expression levels of the paternally expressed gene 3 (*PEG3*), paternally expressed gene 10 (*PEG10*), pleckstrin homology-like domain family a member 2 (*PHLDA2*) and cyclindependent kinase inhibitor 1C (*CDKN1C*). These four imprinted genes were chosen based on the conserved imprinting status between mouse and human and their predicted role in regulating the production of placental hormones, including the placental lactogens, known to induce physiological changes in pregnant women (John, 2013). Expression of these genes was first analysed in a pilot cohort of women (the Manchester cohort) with clinically diagnosed depression during pregnancy, with results suggesting a significant alteration in placental *PEG3*. Based on these results, we further analysed placental *PEG3* expression in two additional independent cohorts of mothers reporting prenatal symptoms of depression. Finally, given the proposed link between *PEG3* expression and placental hormones, we quantified expression of human placental lactogen (*hPL*, also known as chorionic somatomammotropins; CSH) in all three cohorts.

Method

Manchester cohort

Placental gene expression was first analysed in a pilot cohort. Women (n = 75) presenting with maternal perception of reduced fetal movements (RFM) at St Mary's Hospital (Manchester, UK) were approached to participate in the study as previously described (Dutton *et al.* 2012; Warrander *et al.* 2012). Written informed consent was obtained and the study approved by Oldham and Greater Manchester North Research Ethics Committees (REC no. 08/1011/83 and 11/NW/0664). A diagnosis of depression during pregnancy, including any treatment prescribed, was recorded from the participant's medical notes.

Queen Charlotte's and My Baby and Me study (MBAM) cohorts

For both cohorts, women awaiting an elective Caesarean section (with no known complications of pregnancy) were recruited from Queen Charlotte's maternity hospital, London. Participants in the Queen Charlotte's cohort (n = 40) were recruited between 2010 and 2011, while an independent cohort of women participating in the MBAM (n = 81) were recruited in 2014. Written informed consent was obtained. The Queen Charlotte's study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Hammersmith and Queen Charlotte's Hospital, London (REC no. 08/H0708/126) and MBAM was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of London (Chelsea) (REC no. 13/LO/1436).

At the time of recruitment, maternal prenatal depressive symptoms were measured using the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS). This questionnaire has been validated for use during pregnancy (Cox *et al.* 1996), with total EPDS scores ranging from 0 (low depression) to 30 (high depression). An EPDS score ≥ 13 is used to identify women at risk of a depressive disorder (Cox *et al.* 1987).

Placental dissection

All placentas were collected immediately after delivery and sampled within 1 h (O'Donnell *et al.* 2012; Warrander *et al.* 2012). Villous trophoblast tissue samples were taken from the maternal surface of the placenta, midway between the cord and distal edge. Sampling methods were comparable across all three independent cohorts. Tissue samples were washed in phosphate-buffered saline to remove maternal blood and stored in RNA*later* (Sigma-Aldrich, UK) prior to storage at -80° C.

Gene expression analysis

Total RNA was extracted from the placental tissue samples from the Manchester and MBAM cohorts using the GenElute Mammalian Total RNA Miniprep Kit (Sigma-Aldrich, UK). RNA quantity and quality (based on the 260:280 absorbance ratio) were assessed using a NanoDrop ND-1000 spectrophotometer. From the Queen Charlotte's cohort, RNA was extracted from placental tissue samples using RNeasy Mini Kits (Qiagen, UK). In addition, for this cohort RNA integrity was examined using a Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent, UK), according to the protocol for a RNA 6000 Nano Assay; samples with a RNA integrity number (RIN) value of \geq 5 were considered of sufficient quality for reverse transcription and quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR).

For the Manchester cohort, $5 \mu g$ of RNA were reverse transcribed using M-MuLV reverse transcriptase (Promega, UK) with random hexamers, according to the manufacturer's instructions. For both the Queen Charlotte's and MBAM cohorts, $2 \mu g$ of RNA were reverse transcribed using the Superscript II first strand complementary DNA (cDNA) synthesis system (Invitrogen, UK), according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Quantitative RT-PCR was performed using a Chromo 4 Four Colour Real Time Detector (MJ Research) in a 20 μ l reaction containing 5 μ l of cDNA (diluted 1 in 50), 1X Buffer 2 mM MgCl₂, 2 mM deoxy-nucleotides (dNTPs), 0.65 units Taq [Fermentas (Thermo), UK], 1 μ M of each primer (Sigma-Aldrich, UK) and 0.12X Sybr Green (Invitrogen, UK). All samples were run in triplicate and duplicate plates were performed for MBAM. Conditions for amplification were: (1) 15 min at 94°C; (2) 30 s at 94°C; (3) 30 s at 60°C; (4) 30 s at 72°C; and (5) 30 s 75°C, with steps 2–5 repeated for a total of 40 cycles. Melt Curve was performed from 70 to 94°C, reading every 0.5°C and holding for 2 s.

Primer sequences were as follows: *YWHAZ* forward: TTCTTGATCCCCAATGCTTC and reverse: AGTTAA GGGCCAGACCCAGT; *PEG3* forward: CTCACAACA CAATCCAGGAC and reverse: TAGACCTCGACTGGT GCTTG (Feng et al. 2008); PEG10 forward: AAATTGCCTGACATGAAGAGGAGTCTA and reverse:AAGCCTAGTCACCACTTCAAAACACACTAAA (Diplas et al. 2009); PHLDA2 forward: GAGCGCAC GGGCAAGTA and reverse: CAGCGGAAGTC GATCTCCTT (Apostolidou et al. 2007); CDKN1C forward: CCCATCTAGCTTGCAGTCTCTT and reverse: CAGACGGCTCAGGAACCATT (Diplas et al. 2009); hPL forward: CATGACTCCCAGACCTCCTTC and reverse: TGCGGAGCAGCTCTAGATTG (Dutton et al. 2012). hPL primers were designed to analyse the expression of CSH1/hPL-A and CSH2/hPL-B, from which the majority of circulating placental lactogens is derived (Newbern & Freemark, 2011). Primer specificity was assessed based on gel electrophoresis product band size and qPCR melt curves.

Gene expression data are presented as the Δ CT (target gene expression relative to the housekeeping gene *YWHAZ*) and as the fold change in expression, calculated using the $2^{-\Delta\Delta CT}$ (Livak & Schmittgen, 2001) where the $\Delta\Delta$ CT is the target gene expression relative to expression in the control group. The housekeeping gene *YWHAZ* has previously been demonstrated to be stably expressed in the human placenta (Meller *et al.* 2005; Murthi *et al.* 2008; Cleal *et al.* 2009, 2010). Furthermore, we found no significant difference in *YWHAZ* expression between control and depressed participants in the Manchester cohort (p = 0.76) in an initial pilot study.

Data analysis

Placental gene expression and maternal EPDS data were normally distributed and parametric statistical tests were used to analyse the data. Placental gene expression data were not significantly associated with any maternal demographics listed in Table 1. The effect of potential confounders (infant birth weight, sex and gestational age) was examined using multiple linear regression analysis. To ease interpretation, Δ CT values representing gene expression values have been inverted [x(-1)] such that lower values represent decreasing gene expression. Mediation analysis was carried out in IBM SPSS Statistics Version 20 and PROCESS for SPSS version 2.15 (Hayes, 2013). Bootstrap confidence intervals (CIs) were used to assess statistical significance of the indirect effect (Hayes, 2013).

Results

Manchester cohort

In an initial pilot study, expression of the imprinted genes *PEG3*, *PEG10*, *PHLDA2* and *CDKN1C* was analysed in a cohort of placentas (n = 75), which included a subset of women (n = 7) who had diagnosed

Table 1. Participant characteristics of the Manchester, Queen Charlotte's and MBAM cohort

Birth outcomes Ffet1 sex, n % Male 37 (49) 22 (55) 44 (54) Mane 38 (31) 18 (45) 37 (46) Mean gestational age, weeks (5.0.)/range 40 (1.18)/364-42 39 (0.55)/364-1 39 (0.78)/37-41 Mean birth weight, g (5.0.)/range 604 (13)/251-686 3451 (421)/2640-4700 3384 (415)/2212-4392 Mean Apgar score: 1 mi (5.0.)/range 60 (13)/351-683 461 (9) (134)/357-932 564 (111)/239-473 Mean Apgar score: 1 mi (5.0.)/range 10 (0.12)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 Mede of delivery, n (%) Elective Casarcan section 6 (8) 40 (100) 81 (100) Emergency Casarcan section 9 (22) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Ethnicity, n (%) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 10 (12) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Ethnicity, n (%) Caucasian 50 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (7.5) 4 (5) 57 (58) 67 (7) </th <th></th> <th>Manchester cohort</th> <th>Queen Charlotte's cohort</th> <th>MBAM cohort</th>		Manchester cohort	Queen Charlotte's cohort	MBAM cohort			
Fearale 37 (49) 22 (55) 44 (54) Male 37 (46) 18 (45) 37 (46) Mean picth weight, g (s.n.)/range 40 (1.18)/36–42 39 (0.55)/38–41 39 (0.75)/37-71 Mean picth weight, g (s.n.)/range 604 (13)/354–854 614 (14)/357–932 564 (11)/259–273 Mean Appar score: 5 min (s.n.)/range 604 (13)/354–854 619 (134)/357–03 96 (65)/5710 Mean Appar score: 5 min (s.n.)/range 10 (0.12)/9–10 10 (0.34)/9–10 10 (0.34)/9–10 Mean Appar score: 5 min (s.n.)/range 9 (12) 0 (0) 81 (100) Elective Casarcan section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) Instrumental 21 (28) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics E E E Ethnicity, r (%) C 6 (7) 14 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistan/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistan/Bangladeshi 13 (17)	Birth outcomes						
Male 37 (49) 22 (55) 44 (54) Fenale 38 (51) 18 (45) 37 (46) Mean gestational age, weeks (s.t.)/range 40 (1.18)/36-42 39 (0.57)/38-41 39 (0.78)/37-41 Mean birth weight, g (s.t.)/range 3382 (461)/2350-460 3451 (421)/2246-4700 3384 (415)/2212-4392 Mean Apgar score: 1 min (s.t.)/range 9 (0.97)/6-10 9 (0.48)/8-10 9 (0.68)/6-10 Mean Apgar score: 5 min (s.t.)/range 9 (0.97)/6-10 9 (0.49)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 Mode of delivery, r (%) E E E 10 (0.34)/9-10 0 (0.04)/9-10 Mode of delivery, r (%) C E 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakisani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 0 (0) 2 (5) 10 (12) D ont vish to say 0 (0) 2 (25) 10 (12) 0 (0) GCSEPO level Not recorded 3 (7.5) 3 (4) 12 (5) 10 (12)	Fetal sex, <i>n</i> %						
Ferale 38 (c1) 18 (d5) 37 (d6) Mean gestational age, weeks (s.b)/range 40 (1.18)/36-42 39 (0.55)/34.1 39 (0.78)/74.1 Mean brith weight, g (s.b.)/range 3382 (d61)/2350-4680 3451 (d21)/2460-4700 3384 (d15)/2212-4392 Mean Apgar score: 1 mi (s.b.)/range 60 (13)/351-831 619 (134)/387-932 56 (111)/299-873 Mean Apgar score: 1 mi (s.b.)/range 10 (0.12)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 Mode of delivery, n (%) E E E Elective Casarcan section 6 (8) 40 (100) 81 (100) Maternal characteristics E E E Ehnicity, n (%) Z (2s) 0 (0) 0 (0) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistan/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Maternal characteristics E E E Left before CCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (0) 2 (5) Do not vish to say 0 (0)	Male	37 (49)	22 (55)	44 (54)			
$\begin{array}{ccccc} Maan gestational age, weeks (s.n.)/range 40 (1.158)/36-42 39 (0.55)/38-41 39 (0.78)/37-41 Mean birth weight, g (s.n.)/range 3382 (461)/2350-4680 3451 (421)/2640-4700 3384 (415)/2212-4392 Mean Apgar score: 1 min (s.n.)/range 9 (0.97)/6-10 9 (0.48)/8-10 9 (0.68)/5-10 Mean Apgar score: 5 min (s.n.)/range 10 (0.12)9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 Mode of delivery, n (%) Elective Caesarean section 6 (8) 40 (100) 81 (100) Emergency Caesarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Elemental 21 (28) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Elemental 79 (9 (27)) 7 (10) (25) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 10 (12) O (10) Caesarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 2 (2.5) 3 (4) O (12) O ther 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) O ther 3 (5) 10 (12) O ther 3 (5) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (12) 10 (13) 10 (12) 10 (1$	Female	38 (51)	18 (45)	37 (46)			
Mean birth weight g (s.n.)(range 3382 (461)/2350-4680 3451 (421)/2640-4700 3384 (415)/2121-4392 Mean page score: 1 mi (s.n.)/range 604 (131)/354-854 619 (134)/387-932 564 (111)/299-873 Mean Apgar score: 5 min (s.n.)/range 10 (0.12)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 90 (0.86)/5-10 90 (0.86)/5-10 Mean Apgar score: 5 min (s.n.)/range 10 (0.12)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 Mode of delivery, n (%) Elective Caesarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) Elective Caesarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Elbnicity, n (%) Catucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 4 (5) Catucasian 7 (9) 2 (5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) I (2.5) 3 (4) Left before CCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) University degree Not recorde	Mean gestational age, weeks (s.p.)/range	40 (1.18)/36-42	39 (0.55)/38–41	39 (0.78)/37-41			
Mean placental weight, g (s.n.)/range 604 (131)(354-854 619 (134)(357-932 564 (111)/299-873 Mean Apgar score: 5 mi (s.n.)/range 9 (0.57)/6-10 9 (0.48)/8-10 10 (0.24)/9-10 Mede Apgar score: 5 mi (s.n.)/range 9 (0.57)/6-10 9 (0.48)/8-10 10 (0.24)/9-10 Mode of delivery, n (%) Elective Casarean section 6 (8) 40 (100) 81 (100) Emergency Casarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Instrumental 21 (28) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics E E Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 10 (12) 0 (0) 2 (5.5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 2 (75.5) 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say Not recorded 1 (2.5) 6 (7) A (4) 2 (5) 10 (0) A (5)	Mean birth weight, g (s.p.)/range	3382 (461)/2350-4680	3451 (421)/2640-4700	3384 (415)/2212-4392			
Mean Apgar score: 1 min (s.D./range 9 (0.97)/6-10 9 (0.48)/8-10 9 (0.68)/5-10 Mean Apgar score: 5 min (s.D./range 10 (0.12)/9-10 10 (0.24)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 Mode of delivery, n (%) Image (0.12)/9-10 10 (0.24)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 Elective Caesarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) Yaginal 39 (52) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Image (0.67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) Attican/Atro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistan/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Midelle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Left before CSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 0 (0) Atternal education, n (%) Image (0.0) 4 (5) 10 (12) Left before CSE/O level Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5)	Mean placental weight, g (s.p.)/range	604 (131)/354-854	619 (134)/387–932	564 (111)/299-873			
Mean Apgar score: 5 min (s.n.)/range 10 (0.12)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 10 (0.34)/9-10 Mode of delivery, n (%) Elective Casarean section 6 (8) 40 (100) 81 (100) Emergency Casarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Vaginal 39 (52) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Instrumental 21 (28) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Ethnicity, n (%) 47 (58) 47 (58) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 4 (5) Far Eastern 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 1 (2.5) 0 (0) CSEV/O level Not recorded 1 (40) 4 (52) <t< td=""><td>Mean Apgar score: 1 min (s.p.)/range</td><td>9 (0.97)/6–10</td><td>9 (0.48)/8–10</td><td>9 (0.68)/5–10</td></t<>	Mean Apgar score: 1 min (s.p.)/range	9 (0.97)/6–10	9 (0.48)/8–10	9 (0.68)/5–10			
Mode of delivery, n (%) Iterative Constraints Iterative Constraints Iterative Constraints Elective Caesarean section 6 (8) 40 (100) 81 (100) Emergency Caesarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) Vaginal 39 (52) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Ethnicity, n (%) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) Artican/Aracteristics Ethnicity, n (%) Caucasian 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Midule Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 1 (2.5) 0 (0) GCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) 1 (10) 1 (2.5) 1 (12) University degree Not recorded 3 (7.5) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 9 (22.5) 1 9 (24) Do not wish to say Not	Mean Apgar score: 5 min (s.p.)/range	10 (0.12)/9–10	10 (0.34)/9–10	10 (0.34)/9–10			
Elective Cassarean section 6 (8) 40 (100) 81 (100) Emergency Cassarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) Vaginal 39 (52) 0 (0) 0 (0) Instrumental 21 (28) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics E E E Ethnicity, (%) 7 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Piksistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 4 (5) Far Eastern 0 (0) 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not vish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 6 (7) Maternal education, n (%) Left before GCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 0 (0) CSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) 10 University degree Not recorded 6 (15) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 9 (12.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say <td>Mode of delivery, <i>n</i> (%)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Mode of delivery, <i>n</i> (%)						
Emergency Cassarean section 9 (12) 0 (0) 0 (0) Vaginal 39 (52) 0 (0) 0 (0) Instrumental 21 (28) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Ethnicity, n (%) (28) 0 (0) 0 (0) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) (7) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 4 (10) (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) (2) (10) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 0 (0) (25) 0 (0) (25) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 6 (7) (4) (5) It the fore CCSE/O level Not recorded 3 (7.5) 6 (7) (4) (5) University degree Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) (5) (7) Vocational training Not recorded 9 (12.5) 19 (24) (6) (4) (5) <t< td=""><td>Elective Caesarean section</td><td>6 (8)</td><td>40 (100)</td><td>81 (100)</td></t<>	Elective Caesarean section	6 (8)	40 (100)	81 (100)			
Vaginal 39 (52) 0 (0) 0 (0) Instrumental 21 (28) 0 (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Ethnicity, n (%) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 4 (5) Far Eastern 0 (0) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) Left before CCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) 1 (10) Vocational training Not recorded 6 (15) 6 (7) University degree Not recorded 16 (40) 42 (52) Higher degree Not recorded 9 (21.5) 1 (15) Uo not wish to say Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) 518-25000 per year	Emergency Caesarean section	9 (12)	0 (0)	0 (0)			
Instrumental D (2) D (0) 0 (0) Maternal characteristics Ethnicity, n (%) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 4 (5) Far Eastern 0 (0) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Left before GCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) Vocational training Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 1 (2.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 9 (21.5) 1 (3) Ibler 5000 per year Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) Edwold income, n (%) $ 3 (4) 4 (25) $	Vaginal	39 (52)	0(0)	0(0)			
Maternal characteristics Ethnicity, n (%) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (2.5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) Left before CCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 0 (0) GCSE/O level Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 1 (2.5) 9 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 9 (2.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 9 (2.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) f.18-25000 per year Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) f.18-25000 per year Not recorded 8 (20) 24 (29)/2-41 Mean materen	Instrumental	21 (28)	0(0)	0(0)			
Bilinicity, n (%) Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) U 1 (2.5) 6 (7) Left before CCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 9 (22.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) flae-25000 per year Not recorded 3 (7.5) 3 (4) $425-33000$ per year Not recorded 8 (20) 8 (10) 543000 per year Not recorded 8 (20) 24 (28)/26-41	Maternal characteristics	== (==)	0 (0)	0 (0)			
Caucasian 50 (67) 29 (72.5) 47 (58) African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 0 (0) 2 (2.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) Image: Construct of the conded the condet the con	Fthnicity n (%)						
African/Afro-Caribbean 7 (9) 2 (5) 6 (7) Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi 13 (17) 1 (2.5) 8 (10) Middle Eastern 2 (3) 1 (2.5) 4 (5) Far Eastern 0 (0) 2 (2.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) Left before GCSE/O level Not recorded 3 (7.5) 6 (7) A levels Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 6 (15) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 9 (22.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 9 (22.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) flaber25000 per year Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) flaber25000 per year Not recorded 3 (20) 8 (10) $< 218 000$ per year Not recorded <	Caucasian	50 (67)	29 (72 5)	47 (58)			
Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi1 (1)1 (2.5)8 (10)Middle Eastern2 (3)1 (2.5)4 (5)Far Eastern0 (0)2 (2.5)3 (4)Other3 (4)2 (5)10 (12)Do not wish to say0 (0)3 (7.5)3 (4)Maternal education, n (%)Left before GCSE/O levelNot recorded1 (2.5)6 (7)A levelsNot recorded3 (7.5)6 (7)A levelsNot recorded5 (12.5)4 (5)University degreeNot recorded16 (40)42 (52)Higher degreeNot recorded9 (22.5)19 (24)Do not wish to sayNot recorded3 (7.5)9 (11)F18-2500 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)9 (11)£18-2500 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)3 (4)£25-43000 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)3 (4)£25-43000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43000 per yearNot recorded18 (45)37 (46)Do not wish to sayNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.b.)/range25 (5.5)/17-423 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.b.)/range25 (4.16)/19-3824.26 (4.08)/19-38Not recordedMoen74 (99)32 (80)76 (94)1-5 units/week1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.b.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18Nore74 (99) <t< td=""><td>African/Afro-Caribbean</td><td>7 (9)</td><td>2 (5)</td><td>6 (7)</td></t<>	African/Afro-Caribbean	7 (9)	2 (5)	6 (7)			
Middle Eastern 10 (17) 1 (2.5) 3 (16) Middle Eastern 0 (0) 2 (2.5) 3 (4) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) Image: Constraint of the say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 6 (7) Left before GCSE/O level Not recorded 3 (7.5) 6 (7) A levels Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 16 (40) 42 (52) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) E18-25 D00 per year Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) 11 (15) 3 (7.5) 9 (11) E18-25 D00 per year Not recorded 8 (20) 8 (10) > 24 (29) Mean age, years (s.b.)/range 29 (5.50)/17-42 35 (4.48)/26-42 34 (3.86)/26-41 Mean age, years (s.b.)/range 11 (15) 3 (7.5) 2 (2) No Mean age, years (s.b.)/range 11 (15) 3 (7.5) 2 (2) No Mean age, years (s.b.)/range 11 (15) 3 (7.5) 2 (2) <t< td=""><td>Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi</td><td>13 (17)</td><td>$\frac{1}{2}(0)$</td><td>8 (10)</td></t<>	Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi	13 (17)	$\frac{1}{2}(0)$	8 (10)			
Induct Laterin1 (a)1 (b)1 (b)Far Eastern0 (0)2 (2.5)3 (4)Other3 (4)2 (5)10 (12)Do not wish to say0 (0)3 (7.5)3 (4)Maternal education, n (%)Left before GCSE/O levelNot recorded1 (2.5)0 (0)GCSE/O levelNot recorded6 (15)6 (7)A levelsNot recorded6 (12.5)4 (5)University degreeNot recorded16 (40)42 (52)Higher degreeNot recorded9 (22.5)19 (24)Do not wish to sayNot recorded0 (0)4 (5)Household income, n (%)< <td><<td><<td>S (7.5)9 (11)£18-25 000 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)9 (11)£18-25 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.b.)/range29 (5.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BML kg/m² (s.b.)/range21 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%)2 (2)NoYes11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)NoNo64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)Not seconded8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/</td><td>Middle Fastern</td><td>2(3)</td><td>1(2.5)</td><td>4 (5)</td></td></td>	< <td><<td>S (7.5)9 (11)£18-25 000 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)9 (11)£18-25 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.b.)/range29 (5.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BML kg/m² (s.b.)/range21 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%)2 (2)NoYes11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)NoNo64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)Not seconded8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/</td><td>Middle Fastern</td><td>2(3)</td><td>1(2.5)</td><td>4 (5)</td></td>	< <td>S (7.5)9 (11)£18-25 000 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)9 (11)£18-25 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.b.)/range29 (5.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BML kg/m² (s.b.)/range21 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%)2 (2)NoYes11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)NoNo64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)Not seconded8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/</td> <td>Middle Fastern</td> <td>2(3)</td> <td>1(2.5)</td> <td>4 (5)</td>	S (7.5)9 (11)£18-25 000 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)9 (11)£18-25 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.b.)/range29 (5.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BML kg/m² (s.b.)/range21 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%)2 (2)NoYes11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)NoNo64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)Not seconded8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/	Middle Fastern	2(3)	1(2.5)	4 (5)
In Luserin 0 (b) 2 (b) 0 (t) Other 3 (4) 2 (5) 10 (12) Do not wish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) Left before GCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 0 (0) GCSE/O level Not recorded 3 (7.5) 6 (7) A levels Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 16 (40) 42 (52) Higher degree Not recorded 9 (22.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 0 (0) 4 (5) Household income, n (%) <£18 000 per year	Far Fastern	2(0)	2(2.5)	$\frac{1}{3}(4)$			
Do not vish to say 0 (0) 3 (7.5) 3 (4) Maternal education, n (%) 1 2.5) 3 (4) Left before GCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 0 (0) GCSE/O level Not recorded 6 (15) 6 (7) A levels Not recorded 6 (15) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 16 (40) 42 (52) Higher degree Not recorded 9 (22.5) 19 (24) Do not vish to say Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) fals-25 000 per year Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) fals-25 000 per year Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) fals-25 000 per year Not recorded 8 (20) 8 (10) >243 000 per year Not recorded 8 (20) 24 (29) Mean age, years (s.d.)/range 29 (5.50)/17-42 35 (4.48)/26-42 34 (3.86)/26-41 Mean maternal BMI, kg/m ² (s.d.)/range 2 (1.13)/0-5 1 (1.45)/0-9 2 (1.80)/0-10 Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) Yes 11 (15) 3 (7.5) 2 (2) No 64 (85) 37 (92.5) <	Other	3(4)	2(2.3)	$\frac{5}{(4)}$			
Do not wish to say $5 (r)$ $5 (r)$ $5 (r)$ Maternal education, n (%) Left before GCSE/O level Not recorded $1 (2.5)$ $0 (0)$ GCSE/O level Not recorded $3 (7.5)$ $6 (7)$ A levels Not recorded $5 (12.5)$ $4 (5)$ University degree Not recorded $1 (40)$ $42 (52)$ Higher degree Not recorded $0 (0)$ $4 (5)$ Do not wish to say Not recorded $0 (0)$ $4 (5)$ Household income, $n (\%)$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $4 \le 18 000$ per year Not recorded $3 (7.5)$ $9 (11)$ $4 \ge 25 000$ per year Not recorded $3 (7.5)$ $3 (4)$ $4 \ge 25 43 000$ per year Not recorded $8 (20)$ $8 (10)$ $> \le 43 000$ per year Not recorded $8 (20)$ $2 4 (29)$ Mean adge, years (s.b.)/range $2 9 (5.5)/17-42$ $3 5 (4.48)/26-42$ $3 4 (3.86)/26-41$ Mean maternal BML, kg/m ² (s.b.)/range $2 9 (5.50)/17-42$ $3 (4.48)/26-42$ $3 4 (3.86)/26-41$ Mean maternal BML, kg/m ² (s.b.)/range $2 (1.6)/19-38$ $2 4 (29)$	Do not wish to say	0(4)	2(0)	3(4)			
Mathem Federation (* 10%) Left before GCSE/O level Not recorded 1 (2.5) 0 (0) GCSE/O level Not recorded 3 (7.5) 6 (7) A levels Not recorded 6 (15) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 16 (40) 42 (52) Higher degree Not recorded 9 (22.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) f18-25 000 per year Not recorded 3 (7.5) 3 (4) f25-43 000 per year Not recorded 8 (20) 8 (10) >£43 000 per year Not recorded 8 (20) 24 (29) Mean age, years (s.D.)/range 29 (5.50)/17-42 35 (4.48)/26-42 34 (3.86)/26-41 Mean maternal BML kg/m ² (s.D.)/range 2 (4.16)/19-38 24.26 (4.08)/19-38 Not recorded Mean parity (s.D.)/range 1 (1.13)/0-5 1 (1.45)/0-9 2 (1.80)/0-10 Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) Yes 37 (99) 32 (80) 76 (94) <	Maternal education μ (%)	0 (0)	5 (7.5)	5 (4)			
GCSE/O levelNot recorded3 (7.5)6 (7)A levelsNot recorded6 (15)6 (7)Vocational trainingNot recorded5 (12.5)4 (5)University degreeNot recorded16 (40)42 (52)Higher degreeNot recorded9 (22.5)19 (24)Do not wish to sayNot recorded3 (7.5)3 (4)4252-43 000 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)3 (4) $252-43 000 per year$ Not recorded18 (45)37 (46)Do not wish to sayNot recorded18 (45)37 (46)Do not wish to sayNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)#43 000 per yearNot recorded18 (45)37 (46)Do not wish to sayNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.D.)/range29 (5.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BMI, kg/m ² (s.D.)/range25 (4.16)/19-3824.26 (4.08)/19-38Not recordedMean parity (s.D.)/range11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)NoSooking during pregnancy, n (%)W32 (80)76 (94)1-5 units/week1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a Not assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18None74 (99)32 (80)76 (94)1.66)/0-18100Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/range68 (91)40 (100)Not recorded<	L oft boforo CCSE/O lovol	Not recorded	1 (2 5)	0 (0)			
A levelsNot recorded5 (7.3)6 (7)A levelsNot recorded6 (15)6 (7)Vocational trainingNot recorded5 (12.5)4 (5)University degreeNot recorded16 (40)42 (52)Higher degreeNot recorded9 (22.5)19 (24)Do not wish to sayNot recorded0 (0)4 (5)Household income, n (%)	CCSE/O loval	Not recorded	1(2.3)	0 (0) 6 (7)			
Net recorded 6 (15) 6 (7) Vocational training Not recorded 5 (12.5) 4 (5) University degree Not recorded 16 (40) 42 (52) Higher degree Not recorded 9 (22.5) 19 (24) Do not wish to say Not recorded 0 (0) 4 (5) Household income, n (%) - - - <£18 000 per year		Not recorded	6 (15)	0 (7) 6 (7)			
Vocational rankingNot recorded $3 (12.5)$ $4 (5)$ University degreeNot recorded $16 (40)$ $42 (52)$ Higher degreeNot recorded $9 (22.5)$ $19 (24)$ Do not wish to sayNot recorded $0 (0)$ $4 (5)$ Household income, $n (\%)$ <£18 000 per year	A levels	Not recorded	5 (12 5)	0(7)			
Higher degreeNot recorded10 (40)42 (2)Higher degreeNot recorded9 (22.5)19 (24)Do not wish to sayNot recorded0 (0)4 (5)Household income, n (%) $< < < > < < < < < < < < < < < < < < < $	University degree	Not recorded	5 (12.5) 16 (40)	4 (5)			
Inglier degreeNot recorded9 (22.3)19 (24)Do not wish to sayNot recorded0 (0)4 (5)Household income, n (%)<£18 000 per year	Lisber degree	Not recorded	10(40)	42 (32)			
Do not wish to sayNot recorded0 (0)4 (3)Household income, n (%)<£18 000 per year	Figher degree	Not recorded	9 (22.3)	19 (24)			
Flousehold income, $h(x_0)$ $< \pounds 18 000 \text{ per year}$ Not recorded $3(7.5)$ $9(11)$ $\pounds 18-25 000 \text{ per year}$ Not recorded $3(7.5)$ $3(4)$ $\pounds 25-43 000 \text{ per year}$ Not recorded $8(20)$ $8(10)$ $> \pounds 43 000 \text{ per year}$ Not recorded $18(45)$ $37(46)$ Do not wish to sayNot recorded $8(20)$ $24(29)$ Mean age, years (s.D.)/range $29(5.50)/17-42$ $35(4.48)/26-42$ $34(3.86)/26-41$ Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.D.)/range $25(4.16)/19-38$ $24.26(4.08)/19-38$ Not recordedMean parity (s.D.)/range $1(1.13)/0-5$ $1(1.45)/0-9$ $2(1.80)/0-10$ Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) Yes $11(15)$ $3(7.5)$ $2(2)$ No $64(85)$ $37(92.5)$ $79(98)$ Alcohol consumption, n (%) Not assessed $8.9(5.46)/0-25$ $7.3(4.66)/0-18$ Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a V V V No $68(91)$ $40(100)$ Not recordedYes $7(9)$ $0(0)$ Not recorded	Lo not wish to say	Not recorded	0 (0)	4 (5)			
< 2.18000 per yearNot recorded 3 (7.5) 9 (11) $f.18-25000$ per yearNot recorded 3 (7.5) 3 (4) $f.25-43000$ per yearNot recorded 8 (20) 8 (10) $> f.43000$ per yearNot recorded 18 (45) 37 (46)Do not wish to sayNot recorded 8 (20) 24 (29)Mean age, years (s.D.)/range 29 (5.50)/17–42 35 (4.48)/26–42 34 (3.86)/26–41Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.D.)/range 25 (4.16)/19–38 24.26 (4.08)/19–38Not recordedMean parity (s.D.)/range 1 (1.13)/0–5 1 (1.45)/0–9 2 (1.80)/0–10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) Yes 11 (15) 3 (7.5) 2 (2)No 64 (85) 37 (92.5) 79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%) Yes 1 (1) 8 (20) 5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/rangeNot assessed 8.9 (5.46)/0–25 7.3 (4.66)/0–18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) Yes 7 (9) 0 (0)Not recorded	Household income, n (%)	NT (11		0 (11)			
L18-25 000 per yearNot recorded3 (7.5)3 (4)£25-43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded18 (45)37 (46)Do not wish to sayNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.b.)/range29 (5.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.b.)/range25 (4.16)/19-3824.26 (4.08)/19-38Not recordedMean parity (s.b.)/range1 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) V V V Yes11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%) V V V None74 (99)32 (80)76 (94)1-5 units/week1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (5.D.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a V V V No68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedYes7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	<£18 000 per year	Not recorded	3 (7.5)	9 (11)			
L23-43 000 per yearNot recorded8 (20)8 (10)>£43 000 per yearNot recorded18 (45)37 (46)Do not wish to sayNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.D.)/range29 (5.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.D.)/range25 (4.16)/19-3824.26 (4.08)/19-38Not recordedMean parity (s.D.)/range1 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%)Yes11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)None74 (99)32 (80)76 (94)1-5 units/week1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a Not assessed7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	£18–25 000 per year	Not recorded	3 (7.5)	3 (4)			
>£43 000 per yearNot recorded18 (45) 37 (46)Do not wish to sayNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.D.)/range29 (5.50)/17–4235 (4.48)/26–4234 (3.86)/26–41Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.D.)/range25 (4.16)/19–3824.26 (4.08)/19–38Not recordedMean parity (s.D.)/range1 (1.13)/0–51 (1.45)/0–92 (1.80)/0–10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) Yes 11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%) $Y4$ (99)32 (80)76 (94)1–5 units/week1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0–257.3 (4.66)/0–18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a Not recorded8.9 (1)40 (100)Not recordedNo68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedNot recorded16	£25–43 000 per year	Not recorded	8 (20)	8 (10)			
Do not wish to sayNot recorded8 (20)24 (29)Mean age, years (s.D.)/range29 (5.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.D.)/range25 (4.16)/19-3824.26 (4.08)/19-38Not recordedMean parity (s.D.)/range1 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) Yes 11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%) Yeg 1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a Yeg 40 (100)Not recordedNo68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedYes7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	>£43 000 per year	Not recorded	18 (45)	37 (46)			
Mean age, years (s.D.)/range29 (s.50)/17-4235 (4.48)/26-4234 (3.86)/26-41Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.D.)/range25 (4.16)/19-3824.26 (4.08)/19-38Not recordedMean parity (s.D.)/range1 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%)74 (95)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)74 (99)32 (80)76 (94)None74 (99)32 (80)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%)a68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedNo68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedYes7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	Do not wish to say	Not recorded	8 (20)	24 (29)			
Mean maternal BMI, kg/m² (s.b.)/range $25 (4.16)/19-38$ $24.26 (4.08)/19-38$ Not recordedMean parity (s.b.)/range1 (1.13)/0-51 (1.45)/0-92 (1.80)/0-10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) $11 (15)$ 3 (7.5)2 (2)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%) $11 (1)$ 8 (20)5 (6)None74 (99)32 (80)76 (94)1-5 units/week1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.b.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a $10 (100)$ Not recordedNo68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedYes7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	Mean age, years (s.D.)/range	29 (5.50)/17-42	35 (4.48)/26-42	34 (3.86)/26–41			
Mean parity (s.b.)/range1 (1.13)/0–51 (1.45)/0–92 (1.80)/0–10Smoking during pregnancy, n (%)Yes11 (15)3 (7.5)2 (2)No64 (85)37 (92.5)79 (98)Alcohol consumption, n (%)None74 (99)32 (80)76 (94)1–5 units/week1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.b.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0–257.3 (4.66)/0–18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a Not recordedYes7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	Mean maternal BMI, kg/m ⁻ (s.D.)/range	25 (4.16)/19–38	24.26 (4.08)/19–38	Not recorded			
Smoking during pregnancy, n (%) Yes 11 (15) 3 (7.5) 2 (2) No 64 (85) 37 (92.5) 79 (98) Alcohol consumption, n (%) None 74 (99) 32 (80) 76 (94) 1–5 units/week 1 (1) 8 (20) 5 (6) Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.p.)/range Not assessed 8.9 (5.46)/0–25 7.3 (4.66)/0–18 Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a No 68 (91) 40 (100) Not recorded Yes 7 (9) 0 (0) Not recorded	Mean parity (s.p.)/range	1 (1.13)/0–5	1 (1.45)/0–9	2 (1.80)/0–10			
Yes 11 (15) 3 (7.5) 2 (2) No 64 (85) 37 (92.5) 79 (98) Alcohol consumption, n (%)	Smoking during pregnancy, n (%)						
No 64 (85) 37 (92.5) 79 (98) Alcohol consumption, n (%)	Yes	11 (15)	3 (7.5)	2 (2)			
Alcohol consumption, n (%) None 74 (99) 32 (80) 76 (94) 1–5 units/week 1 (1) 8 (20) 5 (6) Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/range Not assessed 8.9 (5.46)/0–25 7.3 (4.66)/0–18 Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a 68 (91) 40 (100) Not recorded Yes 7 (9) 0 (0) Not recorded	No	64 (85)	37 (92.5)	79 (98)			
None 74 (99) 32 (80) 76 (94) 1-5 units/week 1 (1) 8 (20) 5 (6) Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.d.)/range Not assessed 8.9 (5.46)/0-25 7.3 (4.66)/0-18 Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a - - - - No 68 (91) 40 (100) Not recorded Yes 7 (9) 0 (0) Not recorded	Alcohol consumption, n (%)						
1-5 units/week1 (1)8 (20)5 (6)Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0-257.3 (4.66)/0-18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a 68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedNo68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedYes7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	None	74 (99)	32 (80)	76 (94)			
Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.b.)/rangeNot assessed8.9 (5.46)/0–257.3 (4.66)/0–18Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a 68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedNo68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedYes7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	1–5 units/week	1 (1)	8 (20)	5 (6)			
Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a No68 (91)40 (100)Not recordedYes7 (9)0 (0)Not recorded	Mean maternal EPDS score, total (s.D.)/range	Not assessed	8.9 (5.46)/0-25	7.3 (4.66)/0–18			
No 68 (91) 40 (100) Not recorded Yes 7 (9) 0 (0) Not recorded	Clinical depression during pregnancy, n (%) ^a						
Yes 7 (9) 0 (0) Not recorded	No	68 (91)	40 (100)	Not recorded			
	Yes	7 (9)	0 (0)	Not recorded			

MBAM, My Baby and Me study; s.D., standard deviation; GCSE, General Certificate of Secondary Education; O level, Ordinary level; A level, Advanced level; BMI, body mass index; EPDS, Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale.

^a A diagnosis of clinical depression was recorded from participants' medical notes.



Fig. 1. Manchester cohort – maternal diagnosed depression and placental gene expression. (*a*) There was a significant decrease in paternally expressed gene 3 (*PEG3*) expression in women with diagnosed depression during pregnancy. Placental paternally expressed gene 10 (*PEG10*), pleckstrin homology-like domain family a member 2 (*PHLDA2*) and cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor 1C (*CDKN1C*) expression was not significantly altered. (*b*) Human placental lactogen (*hPL*) expression was also significantly reduced in depressed participants. Values are means of fold gene expression, with standard errors represented by vertical bars. * p < 0.05.

depression during pregnancy. Characteristics of the study participants in the Manchester cohort are shown in Table 1. Participants with diagnosed depression did not differ significantly in terms of maternal demographics from control participants (results not shown).

There was no significant alteration in the expression of *PEG10, PHLDA2* or *CDKN1C* in association with maternal depression (Fig. 1*a*). However, placental *PEG3* expression was significantly decreased (by 41%) in placentas from depressed participants compared with controls (Fig. 1*a*). The association between placental *PEG3* expression and maternal diagnosed depression remained significant after controlling for infant birth weight, offspring sex and gestational age ($F_{4,73}$ = 3.43, p = 0.01, R^2 = 0.16), with only maternal depression diagnosis significantly predicting placental *PEG3* expression (p = 0.003). Three participants reported prescribed anti-depressant use during pregnancy; the observed decrease in placental *PEG3* expression remained significant with the exclusion of these participants (p = 0.02, n = 75).

Given the proposed regulation of placental lactogens by *PEG3*, expression of *hPL* was also analysed in this cohort. Placental *PEG3* and *hPL* expression were significantly positively correlated (r = 0.26, p = 0.03, n = 75). There was a significant 44% decrease in placental *hPL* expression in depressed participants compared with controls (Fig. 1*b*).

Queen Charlotte's cohort

Results from the pilot study indicated a significant decrease in placental PEG3 and hPL expression in a small number of women with clinically diagnosed depression during pregnancy. To determine whether more general symptoms of prenatal depression were similarly associated with aberrant placental gene expression of these two genes, we made use of a second independent cohort (the Queen Charlotte's cohort; n = 40) with information on maternal prenatal depression symptoms. The characteristics of the study participants in the Queen Charlotte's cohort are shown in Table 1. Indication for elective Caesarean section (ELCS) included previous section (n = 26, 65%), breech presentation (n = 7, 18%), maternal request (n = 2, 5%) and other (e.g. previous tear, low-lying placenta, n=5, 12%). No participant reported prescribed antidepressant use during pregnancy.

Despite promising pilot data, the modest correlation between placental PEG3 expression and maternal prenatal EPDS scores (r = -0.23, p = 0.16, n = 40) failed to reach statistical significance. Placental PEG3 expression does not differ between male and female placentas from normal, uncomplicated pregnancies (Janssen et al. 2015) but male and female human fetuses are known to respond differently to an adverse intrauterine environment (Clifton, 2010). Therefore, the association between placental PEG3 expression and maternal depression was also analysed independently in male and female pregnancies. When the PEG3 expression data were analysed according to fetal sex, this revealed a significant negative association between placental PEG3 expression and maternal EPDS scores in males (p=0.048) but not females (p=0.74) (Fig. 2a) and b). A 13% decrease in PEG3 expression was observed in placentas from participants with an EPDS score \geq 13, highlighting them as at risk of a depressive disorder, although this difference did not reach statistical significance (p = 0.16) possibly due to the relatively small number of women scoring above this cut-off (n =9). However, when participants in the current study were grouped into lowest (mean EPDS 2.7, n = 15) and highest (mean EPDS 14.5, n = 15) EPDS scorers there was a significant 15% decrease (p = 0.03) in PEG3 expression in placentas from the highest EPDS scorers compared with the lowest EPDS scorers (Fig. 2c).

Placental *hPL* expression was also negatively correlated with maternal EPDS scores (r = -0.27, p = 0.13, n = 40) but without statistical significance in the full cohort or when analysed independently in male

(r = -0.25, p = 0.25, n = 22) and female (r = -0.29, p = 0.26, n = 17) placentas. However, as with *PEG3*, a significant 31% decrease (p = 0.03) in placental *hPL* expression was observed in the highest EPDS scorers compared with the lowest EPDS scorers (Fig. 2*d*). There was no significant correlation between placental *PEG3* and *hPL* expression (r = -0.13, p = 0.43, n = 40).

MBAM cohort

We next sought to replicate these findings in the MBAM cohort (n=81), a larger independent cohort of samples with similar information on maternal prenatal depression symptoms. Characteristics of the study participants in the MBAM cohort are shown in Table 1. Indication for ELCS included previous Caesarean section (n=43, 53%), breech presentation (n=15, 19%), maternal request (n=11, 14%), placenta previa (n=6, 7%) and obstetric history (n=6, 7%).

Placental PEG3 expression was significantly inversely associated with maternal prenatal EPDS scores (r = -0.32, p = 0.003, n = 81). As with the Queen Charlotte's cohort, when gene expression was analysed according to fetal sex, there was a significant inverse association between PEG3 expression and maternal EPDS scores in male (r = -0.42, p = 0.005, n = 44) but not female placentas (r = -0.22, p = 0.19, n = 37) (Fig. 3a and b). Multiple linear regression analysis showed that the association between placental PEG3 expression and maternal depression symptoms remained significant after controlling for infant birth weight, offspring sex and gestational age ($F_{4.76} = 2.45$, p = 0.05, $R^2 = 0.11$), with only maternal prenatal EPDS scores significantly predicting placental PEG3 expression (p = 0.005). Only two participants reported prescribed anti-depressant use during pregnancy; the association between placental PEG3 expression and maternal EPDS scores remained significant with the exclusion of these participants (r = -0.30, p =0.006, n = 79). Finally, a significant 22% decrease in PEG3 expression was observed in placentas from participants with EPDS scores ≥ 13 , highlighting them as at risk of a depressive disorder (Fig. 3c).

Placental *hPL* expression was also significantly inversely associated with maternal prenatal EPDS scores (r = -0.36, p = 0.001, n = 81) in the overall cohort. As with *PEG3*, this association was sex specific, being significant in male (r = -0.51, p < 0.001, n = 44) but not female (r = -0.11, p = 0.53, n = 37) placentas. There was also a significant 21% decrease in *hPL* expression in placentas from participants with EPDS scores ≥ 13 (Fig. 3*d*). Finally, there was a positive correlation between placental *PEG3* and *hPL* expression although this was not statistically significant in the overall cohort (r = 0.20, p = 0.08, n = 81), being significant in



Fig. 2. Queen Charlotte's cohort – maternal depression symptoms and placental gene expression. The association between maternal depression and placental paternally expressed gene 3 (*PEG3*) expression appears to be sex specific with a significant inverse association between Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) scores and *PEG3* expression in male (*a*) but not female (*b*) placentas. There was a significant decrease in *PEG3* (*c*) and human placental lactogen (*hPL*) (*d*) expression between 15 participants with the lowest and highest EPDS scores. Values are means of fold gene expression, with standard errors represented by vertical bars. * p < 0.05.

male (r = 0.39, p = 0.01, n = 44) but not female placentas (r = -0.26, p = 0.12, n = 37).

Mediation analysis

Mediation analysis determines the effect of an independent variable on a dependent variable via a third mediating variable and is typically conducted in larger cohort sizes of >100 participants (Fritz & Mackinnon, 2007). In this study mediation analysis was carried out in the two largest cohorts (Manchester and MBAM) with the hypothesis that the association between placental *PEG3* and maternal EPDS scores is mediated by placental *hPL* expression. In the Manchester cohort (n = 75) the indirect effect of placental *PEG3* expression on maternal EPDS scores mediated by placental *hPL* expression was not statistically significant in the overall cohort (B = 0.29, 95% CI -0.08 to 1.13) or when only male placentas were analysed (B = 0.91, 95% CI -0.64 to 5.20). Similarly,

in the MBAM cohort (n = 81) the indirect effect of placental *PEG3* expression was not statistically significant in the overall cohort (B = -0.53, 95% CI -1.71 to 0.46) or when only male placentas were analysed (B = 1.35, 95% CI -0.26 to 3.64).

Maternal depression and birth weight

Maternal stress is known to be associated with an increased risk of fetal growth restriction (Steer *et al.* 1992; Rondo *et al.* 2003; Khashan *et al.* 2008; Liu *et al.* 2012) and therefore we analysed birth weight in relation to maternal depression in the three cohorts. Birth weight was not significantly altered in women with diagnosed depression (3.30 kg *v.* 3.09 kg, p = 0.41, n = 75) in the Manchester cohort. There was also no significant association between maternal prenatal EPDS scores and birth weight in the Queen Charlotte's (r = -0.17, p = 0.28, n = 40) or MBAM (r = 0.12, p = 0.28, n = 81) cohorts. Reduced expression of *Peg3* in mice



Fig. 3. My Baby and Me Study (MBAM) cohort – maternal depression symptoms and placental gene expression. The inverse association between paternally expressed gene 3 (*PEG3*) expression and maternal depression was significant in male (*a*) but not female (*b*) placentas. There was a significant decrease in *PEG3* (*c*) and human placental lactogen (*hPL*) (*d*) expression in participants with Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) scores \geq 13 (cut-off for clinical depression). Values are means of fold gene expression, with standard errors represented by vertical bars. * *p* < 0.05.

has also been linked to fetal growth restriction (Li *et al.* 1999). There was no significant association between placental *PEG3* expression and birth weight in the Manchester (r = 0.05, p = 0.70, n = 75), Queen Charlotte's (r = 0.09, p = 0.58, n = 40) or MBAM (r = -0.02, p = 0.84, n = 81) cohorts. However, it should be noted that for the Queen Charlotte's and MBAM cohorts women with complications of pregnancy (including fetal growth restriction) were excluded and that previous studies demonstrating an association between maternal prenatal stress and fetal growth restriction examined substantially larger cohorts (Talge *et al.* 2007).

Discussion

This study has identified a novel association between maternal prenatal depression and decreased placental expression of the imprinted gene *PEG3*. In our pilot study, placental expression of the imprinted genes *PEG3*, *PEG10*, *PHLDA2* and *CDKN1C* was examined in relation to clinically diagnosed depression. Despite the small number of participants, there was a clear significant reduction in placental *PEG3* expression but no alteration in expression of the other three imprinted genes examined. Importantly, placental *PEG3* expression was also significantly inversely associated with symptoms of maternal prenatal depression in two further independent cohorts, the Queen Charlotte's and MBAM cohorts. This is the first report linking abnormal expression of this imprinted gene in the placenta with maternal depression during pregnancy, which may inform our understanding of the mechanisms underlying the association between prenatal depression and adverse offspring outcomes.

PEG3 exemplifies all the known functions of imprinted genes; it acts to regulate fetal growth, placental development, behaviour and metabolism in mice (Li *et al.* 1999; Curley *et al.* 2005; Champagne *et al.* 2009; Chiavegatto *et al.* 2012; Kim *et al.* 2013). We did not observe reduced birth weight in this study, probably as a result of the small study numbers

and exclusion of growth-restricted infants. However, it is possible that reduced expression of *PEG3* in human pregnancy could contribute to fetal growth restriction, either directly or indirectly via a placental defect, and therefore mediate the previously reported association between maternal prenatal stress and impaired fetal growth.

In this study we also demonstrated a significant inverse association between placental hPL expression and maternal prenatal depression in all three cohorts. hPL is a lactogenic hormone, produced in large quantities by the placenta, and is important for maternal glucose management during pregnancy and fetal growth (Newbern & Freemark, 2011). Maternal serum hPL levels and placental hPL expression have previously been demonstrated to be significantly reduced in pregnancies complicated by fetal growth restriction (Roh et al. 2005; Dutton et al. 2012). Placental lactogens are closely related to pituitary prolactin (Haig, 2008). This hormone family is known to be important for driving the maternal physiological adaptations to pregnancy (John, 2013) but studies in rodents suggest that these hormones may also be important for psychological adaptation to pregnancy. Both prolactin and placental lactogen can induce maternal behaviour in non-pregnant rodents (Bridges et al. 1985, 1990, 1997; Bridges & Freemark, 1995) and prolactin plays an important role in pregnancy-related neurogenesis (Bridges & Grattan, 2003; Shingo et al. 2003; Walker et al. 2012). There has not yet been a comprehensive examination of serum hPL levels in relation to maternal mood in humans. However, decreased maternal serum levels of prolactin have been reported in human mothers with postnatal depression symptoms (Abou-Saleh et al. 1998; Ingram et al. 2003; Groer & Morgan, 2007) and increased levels in mothers with low anxiety scores during pregnancy (Asher et al. 1995). Prolactin contributes to a suppression of anxiety-related behaviours during pregnancy via binding to prolactin receptors, which are also known to bind the placental lactogens (Torner et al. 2001). As with reduced expression of PEG3, reduced placental lactogen production could contribute to a suboptimal pregnancy.

PEG3 has been proposed to regulate the production of placental hormones (John, 2013). We observed a significant correlation between placental *PEG3* and *hPL* expression in the two largest cohorts (Manchester and MBAM). Mediation analysis was carried out in these two cohorts with the hypothesis that the association between placental *PEG3* and maternal depression is mediated by placental *hPL* expression. The indirect effect of placental *PEG3* expression on maternal depression mediated by placental *hPL* expression was not statistically significant in either cohort. However, it should be noted that the sample sizes used in this analysis (Manchester cohort n = 75 and MBAM n = 81) are relatively low given that mediation analysis is typically conducted in studies of >100 participants (Fritz & Mackinnon, 2007). While it is possible that the gene expression changes observed are independently related to maternal prenatal depression, studies in the mouse placenta demonstrate reduced expression of *Peg3* drives reduced expression of *Prls* (mouse placental lactogens) (Broad & Keverne, 2011; Kim *et al.* 2013). Future studies employing mediation analysis will probably be more informative in larger cohorts and will be crucial in determining the relationship between *PEG3* and *hPL* in the human placenta.

The association between maternal prenatal depression symptoms and placental PEG3 and hPL expression showed a sex bias for both genes, in both cohorts, with the effect more marked with male fetuses. This result is of interest as previous studies suggest sexual dimorphism in infant outcomes following maternal prenatal stress (for a review, see Glover & Hill, 2012). Boys, but not girls, are at an increased risk of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (Li et al. 2010), schizophrenia (van Os & Selten, 1998) and impaired motor development (Gerardin et al. 2011). There is also some preliminary evidence to suggest that women who give birth to boys are more likely to suffer from postpartum depression than those having girls (de Tychey et al. 2008; Lagerberg & Magnusson, 2012). It will therefore be important to establish whether there is an association between placental PEG3 and hPL expression, fetal sex, infant outcomes and maternal postnatal depression.

This study was not designed to establish cause-oreffect relationships. Prenatal depression, or other factors associated with prenatal depression, may drive reduced expression of placental PEG3 and hPL in the placenta (Fig. 4: model 1). Peg3 in the rodent placenta is known to be responsive to environmental stimuli, such as maternal diet (Broad & Keverne, 2011; Radford et al. 2012). Alternatively, reduced PEG3 may contribute to or even initiate prenatal depression (Fig. 4: model 2). Loss of function of Peg3 in mice results in abnormal maternal behaviour (Li et al. 1999; Champagne et al. 2009; Chiavegatto et al. 2012). However, in this scenario it is the dams that are mutant for Peg3 and not the placenta. Rather, aberrant placental PEG3 expression may contribute to abnormal maternal mood in human pregnancies, via impaired placental production of hPL (Janssen et al. 2016). It is also possible that both models are correct. A suboptimal maternal environment, which may include maternal prenatal stress, could misprogramme placental expression of PEG3, which in turn may alter placental



Fig. 4. Paternally expressed gene 3 (*PEG3*), human placental lactogen (*hPL*) signalling and maternal psychological adaptation to pregnancy. Model 1: prenatal depression causes reduced *PEG3* and reduced *hPL* expression. Model 2: reduced *PEG3* initiates prenatal depression through regulation of placental lactogen production. Model 3: an adverse intra-uterine environment causes reduced *PEG3* expression limiting placental signalling and establishing a cycle of aberrant placental gene expression, aberrant signalling and abnormal maternal mood.

signalling via *hPL*, thereby further contributing to the depressed mood (Fig. 4: model 3).

There are limitations to this study, primarily in the number of participants. However, this is countered by the reproducibility of these findings in three independent studies. Also, in the Queen Charlotte's and MBAM cohorts, maternal prenatal depression symptoms were assessed 1 day prior to elective Caesarean section when mothers may be particularly anxious. Ideally, future studies would involve assessment of maternal mood at different time points throughout pregnancy in a larger number of participants to provide a better indication of maternal prenatal stress during pregnancy. Another study limitation is that participants in the Manchester cohort suffered from RFM before delivery and so are not representative of uncomplicated pregnancies. However, both controls and women with depression during pregnancy experienced RFM and therefore this was not causative of the differences in gene expression observed. Finally, as depression diagnosis in the Manchester cohort was based solely on a diagnosis reported within clinical records, we cannot exclude the presence of depression symptoms in the control cases. Future studies with measures of depression for all participants (as with the Queen Charlotte's and MBAM cohorts) as well as more detailed information on the nature of depression and medication during pregnancy will be important in confirming the association between aberrant placental gene expression and diagnosed depression.

Conclusions

In summary, this study is the first to report reduced expression of both PEG3 and hPL in the human placenta in relation to adverse maternal mood. Substantial indirect data from rodent models suggest that this relationship is pathologically relevant and may indeed be causal. Animal studies will be important in further establishing cause-and-effect relationships. Meanwhile, it will be important to validate our findings in a larger study cohort and, importantly, to examine the outcomes of pregnancies with reduced PEG3 expression, both for the child and for the mother. Measuring maternal serum levels of hPL will be instrumental in determining whether reduced placental hPL expression in the term placenta reflects reduced hormone serum level during pregnancy. This is of clinical relevance since it may be possible to use maternal serum hPL levels as a biomarker in combination with self-report questionnaires to identify mothers at high risk of maternal depression. Finally, our current findings are of broader interest as reduced expression of PEG3 could provide a mechanistic explanation for the

co-occurrence of maternal depression, low birth weight and poorer outcomes for the offspring, a finding that will lead to a greater understanding of both the causes and consequences of prenatal depression.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge all the women who participated in this study and the midwives at St Mary's Hospital and Queen Charlotte's Hospital for their help with sample collection. The Manchester cohort was supported by Manchester National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research. The Oueen Charlotte's cohort was supported by the Medical Research Council (MRC) (Eurostress), National Institutes of Health (R01MH073842) and the Genesis Research Trust. The MBAM cohort was supported by the Genesis Research Trust. A.B.J. was supported by a Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) Doctoral Training Grants (DTG) studentship and subsequently MRC project grant MR/M013960/1. S.J.T. was supported by BBSRC project grant BB/J015156/1. L.E.C. was supported by an Imperial College London Ph.D. studentship and both L.E.C. and P.G.R were supported by the NIHR Imperial Biomedical Research Centre.

Declaration of Interest

None.

References

- Abou-Saleh MT, Ghubash R, Karim L, Krymski M, Bhai I (1998). Hormonal aspects of postpartum depression. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **23**, 465–475.
- Apostolidou S, Abu-Amero S, O'Donoghue K, Frost J, Olafsdottir O, Chavele K, Whittaker J, Loughna P, Stanier P, Moore G (2007). Elevated placental expression of the imprinted *PHLDA2* gene is associated with low birth weight. *Journal of Molecular Medicine* 85, 379–387.
- Asher I, Kaplan B, Modai I, Neri A, Valevski A, Weizman A (1995). Mood and hormonal changes during late pregnancy and puerperium. *Clinical and Experimental Obstetrics and Gynecology* 22, 321–325.
- Blakeley PM, Capron LE, Jensen AB, O'Donnell KJ, Glover V (2013). Maternal prenatal symptoms of depression and down regulation of placental monoamine oxidase A expression. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 75, 341–345.
- Bridges RS, DiBiase R, Loundes DD, Doherty PC (1985). Prolactin stimulation of maternal behavior in female rats. *Science* 227, 782–784.
- Bridges RS, Freemark MS (1995). Human placental lactogen infusions into the medial preoptic area stimulate maternal

behavior in steroid-primed, nulliparous female rats. *Hormones and Behaviour* **29**, 216–226.

- Bridges RS, Grattan DR (2003). Prolactin-induced neurogenesis in the maternal brain. *Trends in Endocrinology and Metabolism* **14**, 199–201.
- Bridges RS, Numan M, Ronsheim PM, Mann PE, Lupini CE (1990). Central prolactin infusions stimulate maternal behavior in steroid-treated, nulliparous female rats. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 87, 8003–8007.
- Bridges RS, Robertson MC, Shiu RP, Sturgis JD, Henriquez BM, Mann PE (1997). Central lactogenic regulation of maternal behavior in rats: steroid dependence, hormone specificity, and behavioral potencies of rat prolactin and rat placental lactogen I. *Endocrinology* 138, 756–763.
- Broad KD, Keverne EB (2011). Placental protection of the fetal brain during short-term food deprivation. *Proceedings* of the National Academy of Sciences USA **108**, 15237–15241.
- Champagne FA, Curley J, Swaney W, Hasen N, Keverne EB (2009). Paternal influence on female behavior: the role of *Peg3* in exploration, olfaction, and neuroendocrine regulation of maternal behavior of female mice. *Behavioral Neuroscience* **123**, 469–480.
- Chiavegatto S, Sauce B, Ambar G, Cheverud JM, Peripato AC (2012). Hypothalamic expression of *Peg3* gene is associated with maternal care differences between SM/J and LG/J mouse strains. *Brain and Behavior* **2**, 365–376.
- Cleal JK, Day P, Hanson MA, Lewis RM (2009). Measurement of housekeeping genes in human placenta. *Placenta* **30**, 1002–1003.
- Cleal JK, Day PL, Hanson MA, Lewis RM (2010). Sex differences in the mRNA levels of housekeeping genes in human placenta. *Placenta* **31**, 556–557.
- Clifton VL (2010). Review: Sex and the human placenta: mediating differential strategies of fetal growth and survival. *Placenta* **31** (Suppl.), S33–S39.
- Cox JL, Chapman G, Murray D, Jones P (1996). Validation of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) in non-postnatal women. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 39, 185–189.
- Cox JL, Holden JM, Sagovsky R (1987). Detection of postnatal depression. Development of the 10-item Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 150, 782–786.
- Curley JP, Pinnock SB, Dickson SL, Thresher R, Miyoshi N, Surani MA, Keverne EB (2005). Increased body fat in mice with a targeted mutation of the paternally expressed imprinted gene *Peg3. FASEB Journal* **19**, 1302–1304.
- de Tychey C, Briancon S, Lighezzolo J, Spitz E, Kabuth B, de Luigi V, Messembourg C, Girvan F, Rosati A, Thockler A, Vincent S (2008). Quality of life, postnatal depression and baby gender. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 17, 312–322.
- Diplas AI, Lambertini L, Lee M-J, Sperling R, Lee YL, Wetmur JG, Chen J (2009). Differential expression of imprinted genes in normal and IUGR human placentas. *Epigenetics* 4, 235–240.
- Dutton PJ, Warrander LK, Roberts SA, Bernatavicius G, Byrd LM, Gaze D, Kroll J, Jones RL, Sibley CP, Froen JF, Heazell AE (2012). Predictors of poor perinatal outcome

following maternal perception of reduced fetal movements – a prospective cohort study. *PLOS ONE* **7**, e39784.

Feng W, Marquez RT, Lu Z, Liu J, Lu KH, Issa JP, Fishman DM, Yu Y, Bast Jr. RC (2008). Imprinted tumor suppressor genes ARHI and PEG3 are the most frequently down-regulated in human ovarian cancers by loss of heterozygosity and promoter methylation. Cancer 112, 1489–1502.

Fritz MS, Mackinnon DP (2007). Required sample size to detect the mediated effect. Psychological Science 18, 233–239.

Gerardin P, Wendland J, Bodeau N, Galin A, Bialobos S, Tordjman S, Mazet P, Darbois Y, Nizard J, Dommergues M, Cohen D (2011). Depression during pregnancy: is the developmental impact earlier in boys? A prospective case– control study. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 72, 378–387.

Glover V, Hill J (2012). Sex differences in the programming effects of prenatal stress on psychopathology and stress responses: an evolutionary perspective. *Physiology and Behavior* **106**, 736–740.

Glynn LM, Sandman CA (2011). Prenatal origins of neurological development: a critical period for fetus and mother. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* **20**, 384– 389.

Green BB, Kappil M, Lambertini L, Armstrong DA, Guerin DJ, Sharp AJ, Lester BM, Chen J, Marsit CJ (2015). Expression of imprinted genes in placenta is associated with infant neurobehavioral development. *Epigenetics* **10**, 834–841.

Groer MW, Morgan K (2007). Immune, health and endocrine characteristics of depressed postpartum mothers. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **32**, 133–139.

Gude NM, Roberts CT, Kalionis B, King RG (2004). Growth and function of the normal human placenta. *Thrombosis Research* **114**, 397–407.

Haig D (2008). Placental growth hormone-related proteins and prolactin-related proteins. *Placenta* 29 (Suppl. A), S36–S41.

Hayes A (2013). Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-based Approach. Guilford Press: New York.

Ingram J, Greenwood R, Woolridge M (2003). Hormonal predictors of postnatal depression at 6 months in breastfeeding women. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology* **21**, 61–68.

Janssen AB, Kertes DA, McNamara GI, Braithwaite EC, Creeth HD, Glover VI, John RM (2016). A role for the placenta in programming maternal mood and childhood behavioural disorders. *Journal of Neuroendocrinology*. Published online 2 February 2016. doi:10.1111/jne.12373.

Janssen AB, Tunster SJ, Savory N, Holmes A, Beasley J, Parveen SA, Penketh RJ, John RM (2015). Placental expression of imprinted genes varies with sampling site and mode of delivery. *Placenta* **36**, 790–795.

Jensen AB, Tunster SJ, John RM (2014). The significance of elevated placental PHLDA2 in human growth restricted pregnancies. *Placenta* **35**, 528–532.

Jensen Pena C, Monk C, Champagne FA (2012). Epigenetic effects of prenatal stress on 11β-hydroxysteroid dehydrogenase-2 in the placenta and fetal brain. *PLOS ONE* 7, e39791.

John RM (2013). Epigenetic regulation of placental endocrine lineages and complications of pregnancy. *Biochemical Society Transactions* 41, 701–709.

Khashan AS, McNamee R, Abel KM, Pedersen MG, Webb RT, Kenny LC, Mortensen PB, Baker PN (2008). Reduced infant birthweight consequent upon maternal exposure to severe life events. *Psychosomatic Medicine* **70**, 688–694.

Kim J, Frey WD, He H, Kim H, Ekram MB, Bakshi A, Faisal M, Perera BP, Ye A, Teruyama R (2013). *Peg3* mutational effects on reproduction and placenta-specific gene families. *PLOS ONE* **8**, e83359.

Lagerberg D, Magnusson M (2012). Infant gender and postpartum sadness in the light of region of birth and some other factors: a contribution to the knowledge of postpartum depression. *Archives of Women's Mental Health* 15, 121–130.

Lefebvre L, Viville S, Barton SC, Ishino F, Keverne EB, Surani MA (1998). Abnormal maternal behaviour and growth retardation associated with loss of the imprinted gene *Mest. Nature Genetics* **20**, 163–169.

Li J, Olsen J, Vestergaard M, Obel C (2010). Attention-deficit/ hyperactivity disorder in the offspring following prenatal maternal bereavement: a nationwide follow-up study in Denmark. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* **19**, 747– 753.

Li LL, Keverne EB, Aparicio SA, Ishino F, Barton SC, Surani MA (1999). Regulation of maternal behavior and offspring growth by paternally expressed *Peg3*. *Science* **284**, 330–334.

Liu Y, Murphy SK, Murtha AP, Fuemmeler BF, Schildkraut J, Huang Z, Overcash F, Kurtzberg J, Jirtle R, Iversen ES, Forman MR, Hoyo C (2012). Depression in pregnancy, infant birth weight and DNA methylation of imprint regulatory elements. *Epigenetics* 7, 735–746.

Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD (2001). Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time quantitative PCR and the 2 (-delta delta C(T)) method. *Methods* 25, 402–408.

Mairesse J, Lesage J, Breton C, Breant B, Hahn T,
Darnaudery M, Dickson SL, Seckl J, Blondeau B, Vieau
D, Maccari S, Viltart O (2007). Maternal stress alters
endocrine function of the feto-placental unit in rats.
American Journal of Physiology. Endocrinology and Metabolism
292, E1526–E1533.

McNamara GI, Isles AR (2014). Influencing the social group: the role of imprinted genes. *Advances in Genetics* 86, 107–134.

Meller M, Vadachkoria S, Luthy DA, Williams MA (2005). Evaluation of housekeeping genes in placental comparative expression studies. *Placenta* **26**, 601–607.

Murthi P, Fitzpatrick E, Borg AJ, Donath S, Brennecke SP, Kalionis B (2008). *GAPDH*, *18S* rRNA and *YWHAZ* are suitable endogenous reference genes for relative gene expression studies in placental tissues from human idiopathic fetal growth restriction. *Placenta* **29**, 798–801.

Newbern D, Freemark M (2011). Placental hormones and the control of maternal metabolism and fetal growth. *Current Opinion in Endocrinology, Diabetes and Obesity* 18, 409–416.

O'Donnell K, O'Connor TG, Glover V (2009). Prenatal stress and neurodevelopment of the child: focus on the HPA axis and role of the placenta. *Developmental Neuroscience* **31**, 285–292.

O'Donnell KJ, Bugge Jensen A, Freeman L, Khalife N, O'Connor TG, Glover V (2012). Maternal prenatal anxiety and downregulation of placental 11β-HSD2. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **37**, 818–826.

Pearson RM, Melotti R, Heron J, Joinson C, Stein A, Ramchandani PG, Evans J (2012). Disruption to the development of maternal responsiveness? The impact of prenatal depression on mother–infant interactions. *Infant Behavior and Development* 35, 613–626.

Radford EJ, Isganaitis E, Jimenez-Chillaron J, Schroeder J, Molla M, Andrews S, Didier N, Charalambous M, McEwen K, Marazzi G, Sassoon D, Patti ME, Ferguson-Smith AC (2012). An unbiased assessment of the role of imprinted genes in an intergenerational model of developmental programming. *PLoS Genetics* 8, e1002605.

Reynolds RM, Pesonen AK, O'Reilly JR, Tuovinen S, Lahti M, Kajantie E, Villa PM, Laivuori H, Hamalainen E, Seckl JR, Raikkonen K (2015). Maternal depressive symptoms throughout pregnancy are associated with increased placental glucocorticoid sensitivity. *Psychological Medicine* 45, 2023–2030.

Roh CR, Budhraja V, Kim HS, Nelson DM, Sadovsky Y (2005). Microarray-based identification of differentially expressed genes in hypoxic term human trophoblasts and in placental villi of pregnancies with growth restricted fetuses. *Placenta* **26**, 319–328.

Rondo PHC, Ferreira RF, Nogueira F, Ribeiro MCN, Lobert H, Artes R (2003). Maternal psychological stress and distress as predictors of low birth weight, prematurity and intrauterine growth retardation. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition* **57**, 266–272.

Shingo T, Gregg C, Enwere E, Fujikawa H, Hassam R, Geary C, Cross JC, Weiss S (2003). Pregnancy-stimulated neurogenesis in the adult female forebrain mediated by prolactin. *Science* 299, 117–120.

Smith FM, Garfield AS, Ward A (2006). Regulation of growth and metabolism by imprinted genes. *Cytogenetic and Genome Research* 113, 279–291. Steer RA, Scholl TO, Hediger ML, Fischer RL (1992). Self-reported depression and negative pregnancy outcomes. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 45, 1093–1099.

Surani MA (1998). Imprinting and the initiation of gene silencing in the germ line. *Cell* **93**, 309–312.

Talge NM, Neal C, Glover V (2007). Antenatal maternal stress and long-term effects on child neurodevelopment: how and why? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 48, 245–261.

Torner L, Toschi N, Pohlinger A, Landgraf R, Neumann ID (2001). Anxiolytic and anti-stress effects of brain prolactin: improved efficacy of antisense targeting of the prolactin receptor by molecular modeling. *Journal of Neuroscience* **21**, 3207–3214.

Tunster SJ, Jensen AB, John RM (2013). Imprinted genes in mouse placental development and the regulation of fetal energy stores. *Reproduction* 145, R117–R137.

Van den Bergh BR, Mulder EJ, Mennes M, Glover V (2005). Antenatal maternal anxiety and stress and the neurobehavioural development of the fetus and child: links and possible mechanisms. A review. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* **29**, 237–258.

van Os J, Selten JP (1998). Prenatal exposure to maternal stress and subsequent schizophrenia. The May 1940 invasion of The Netherlands. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 172, 324–326.

Vidal AC, Benjamin Neelon SE, Liu Y, Tuli AM, Fuemmeler BF, Hoyo C, Murtha AP, Huang Z, Schildkraut J, Overcash F, Kurtzberg J, Jirtle RL, Iversen ES, Murphy SK (2014). Maternal stress, preterm birth, and DNA methylation at imprint regulatory sequences in humans. *Genetics and Epigenetics* 6, 37–44.

Walker TL, Vukovic J, Koudijs MM, Blackmore DG, Mackay EW, Sykes AM, Overall RW, Hamlin AS, Bartlett PF (2012). Prolactin stimulates precursor cells in the adult mouse hippocampus. *PLOS ONE* 7, e44371.

Warrander LK, Batra G, Bernatavicius G, Greenwood SL, Dutton P, Jones RL, Sibley CP, Heazell AE (2012). Maternal perception of reduced fetal movements is associated with altered placental structure and function. *PLOS ONE* 7, e34851.