

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction during pregnancy

Doi: 10.36129/jog.2022.42

Mostafa A. Hamdy*, Omar A. Shawky*, Waleed A. Sayed Ahmed*, Amal M. Elshahat*,
Omima T. Taha*

*Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University,
Egypt.

Authors

Mostafa A. Hamdy, MD

Assistant professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology,
Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University

Email: drmustafa_ahmed@yahoo.com

Omar A. Shawky, MBBCh

A resident of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University.

email: teleb@ymail.com

Waleed A. Sayed Ahmed, MD MRCOG

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University.

email: waleed.asa@gmail.com

Amal M. Elshahat, MD

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University.

email: amalsh2@yahoo.com

Omima T. Taha, MD (Corresponding author)

Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology

Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University

Email: omimatharwat@yahoo.com

Tel: 002/01223423685

Manuscript accepted for publication

Abstract

Objective: To estimate the prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction during pregnancy in Egypt.

Methods: This was a cross-sectional observational study recruiting 861 pregnant women who attended the Obstetrics and Gynecology Department's outpatient clinic at Suez Canal University Hospitals from August 2016 to March 2020. Pain provocation tests were performed, including distraction test, Patrick Faber test, posterior pain provocation test, compression test, and active straight leg raising test. The reference criteria of three or more positive pain-provoking tests have high validity for the diagnosis. The primary outcome measurement was the prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction during pregnancy.

Result: 861 pregnant women were involved in this study, with 26.2 ± 6 years. The distraction test, Patrick Faber test, and posterior pain provocation test were the most positive tests (59.1%, 57.1%, and 51%, respectively). Three hundred twenty-four cases were found to have three or more positive pain provocation tests. The prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction was 37.6%.

Conclusion: Sacroiliac dysfunction commonly occurs among pregnant women in Egypt.

Keywords: Sacroiliac dysfunction; pain; pregnancy; prevalence.

Introduction:

Low back and pelvic pain are common complaints among pregnant ladies in many cultures [1, 2]. Most of them reported their first episode of low back pain during pregnancy, although the complaint is still underestimated [3, 4]. It results from mechanical changes and increased laxity of the sacroiliac ligaments during pregnancy due to the effect of the relaxin hormone. Sacroiliac dysfunction pain is the pain that arises from or around the sacroiliac joint and can affect the back, buttocks, groin, and lower limbs [5-7].

Despite recognizing the sacroiliac dysfunction as a primary cause of low back pain, diagnostic tools, and treatment options [8-10], it still has a prevalence of 35 to 98 % [11].

There is no reliable data about the prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction in Egypt, nor how to diagnose it during pregnancy. So, this work aimed to establish the prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction among pregnant women in Egypt.

Materials and Methods

This cross-sectional observational study was carried out at the Obstetrics and Gynecology department between August 2016 to March 2020. The study recruited (861) pregnant women according to predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria included: a) age from 18- 45, b) pregnant in singleton or multifetal gestation, c) pregnant in first, second or third trimesters, d) presented for antenatal care, e) primiparous or multiparous women, and f) mode of delivery either vaginal or cesarean delivery. Exclusion criteria were a) history of pelvic fractures or orthopedic pelvic surgeries, b) history of degenerative orthopedic diseases (osteoarthritis or rheumatoid arthritis), c) history of autoimmune diseases and d) refusal to participate in the study.

At the enrolment visit, complete medical history was obtained, including age, job, parity, gestational age in weeks, and evidence of chronic illness. Each participant was examined clinically using five clinical tests to assess pain. Pain provocation tests were performed, including distraction test, Patrick Faber test, posterior pain provocation test, compression test, and active straight leg raising test [12]. The reference criteria of three or more positive pain-

provoking tests have high validity (85-94% sensitivity, 76-78% specificity, and diagnostic odd's ratio 17.16) [13, 14].

In the posterior pelvic pain-provoking test, the woman lay supine on the table. Standing at the side of the table, the examiner flexed the ipsilateral leg to approximately 90° hip flexion while the knee remained relaxed. The examiner applied a graded force through the long axis of the femur, causing posterior shearing stress in the sacroiliac joint [10]. **Distraction test**; the examiner placed each hand over each anterior superior iliac spine. On the other hand, spread the ASIS apart to try and compress the sacroiliac joint. A test was considered positive when there was a pain in the sacroiliac joint. This test has 60% sensitivity and 81% specificity [12].

Compression test; the woman lay on her side, and the examiner remained in front of her. The pelvis applied pressure as the examiner compressed his hands against the upper iliac crest. The test was assumed to stretch the posterior sacroiliac ligaments or compress the anterior part of the sacroiliac joint—this test had a sensitivity of 14% and specificity of 100% [12].

Patrick's Faber test; the woman was in a supine position. One leg was flexed, abducted, and rotated out so that the heel rested on the opposite knee cap. If the test resulted in pain on the medial side of the knee and femur or in the inguinal region, this indicates the test was positive. Patrick's Fabere test has a 40% and 99% sensitivity and specificity, respectively [10].

Active straight leg raising test: widening the pubic symphyses as a forward rotation of the innominate on the side of the passively hanging leg is clear. The load transfer test or the active straight leg (ASLR) test has 87% Sensitivity and 94% Specificity [15].

The same physician performed these tests. After completing the five tests, an interview was done with the positive results of patients (participants with sacroiliac dysfunction) filling out a questionnaire for function assessment (**Roland and Morris questionnaire, RMQ**). It is a short and straightforward measurement tool designed to assess physical disability due to low back pain. It focuses on specific items of physical functions, such as walking, bending over, sitting,

lying down, dressing, sleeping, self-care, and daily activities [16]. We used the Arabic-validated version [17]. The scale is formed of 24 items, and the patient was instructed to mark only in front of an appropriate statement describing her condition. Add up the total number of determined statements to get a score ranging from 0- to 24 [18].

Data collection was done by one of the study researchers, who had interviews with each patient and was blinded to the results of pain provocation tests. Women were interviewed in a private room. The questionnaire was anonymous and without address to ensure confidentiality. The available researcher provided help and clarification for patients when needed. The average time for filling out the questionnaire was 15- 20 minutes.

The primary outcome was estimating the prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction among pregnant women.

Ethical approval: This study was conducted after approval of the research ethics committee at the faculty of medicine at Suez Canal University.

Informed consent: Was obtained from each participant in the study.

Statistical analysis:

Gathered data were processed using SPSS version 22 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Quantitative data were expressed as means \pm SD, while qualitative data were expressed as numbers and percentages (%). Student t-test was used to test the significance of difference for quantitative variables, and Chi-Square was used to test the significance of difference for qualitative variables. A probability value (p-value) < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results:

Nine hundred ninety- one women were eligible for the study. One hundred and thirty women declined to participate in the study, leaving a total number of 861 for the final analysis.

Age ranged from 16 to 50 years, with 26.2 ± 6.7 as the mean. Most of them were younger than 25 years (53.5%), not working (82.2%), had no evidence of chronic illness (96.5%), in the ^{second} trimester (38.7%), had a singleton pregnancy, multipara (82.2%) and delivered vaginally (54.9%) (**Table 1**).

The distraction test, Patrick Faber test, and posterior pain provocation test were the most positive tests reported during examination (59.1%, 57.1%, and 51%, respectively) (**Table 2**).

Since the diagnosis of sacroiliac dysfunction during pregnancy depends on the diagnostic criteria of 3 or more positive pain-provoking tests, 324 cases were found to have sacroiliac dysfunction. Accordingly, the prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction was 37.6 %.

Women with SID had advanced age, gestational age, and increased parity than those without (p -value < 0.001 for all) (**Table 3**).

Discussion:

The prevalence of SID was 37.6% in the current study. The prevalence of Sacroiliac dysfunction in the general population varies from 0.4% to 35% to 98 % [8, 19, 20]. Malmqvist found that (29 %) of pregnant women had experienced pelvic girdle pain in a study describing the association between pelvic girdle pain and sick leave during pregnancy [21]. Only (7%) of the studied population and 16.7% of sacroiliac dysfunction patients presented with low back pain as the primary complaint, while the great majority (53.4%) presented with regular antenatal care. It could be explained that low back pain was not the main problem for pregnant women in Egypt, and most of them were dealing with it as a usual manifestation of pregnancy.

Most of the patients diagnosed with SID were under 25 (42 %), while the prevalence was lowest in the age group above 35 years (20.4%). It agrees with previous studies documenting sacroiliac pain was associated with young maternal age [22-24]. Contradictory results showed that sacroiliac dysfunction increased with maternal age [25]. It may be due to the degenerative

changes occurring to the joints' articular parts, especially the sacroiliac joint, with increased age; the iliac facet is the most liable part for degenerative changes [26]. Such conflict could be explained by the small percentage of participants aged above 35 years versus a large group aged under 25.

Sixteen participants reported hypertension (chronic or gestational); seven of them had been diagnosed with sacroiliac dysfunction with a percent of (43.7% of hypertensive patients). It was agreed by other investigators who reported that venous congestion and hypoxia in the pelvic and lumbar spine during pregnancy, related to the pressure by the gravid uterus, exaggerated the low back pain experienced by pregnant women [27].

Twelve diabetic women had sacroiliac dysfunction (85.7%). It has been reported that pelvic girdle pain (including sacroiliac pain) was associated with some metabolic conditions such as diabetes. A mechanical factor could explain the correlation between diabetes mellitus and sacroiliac dysfunction during pregnancy by increased fetal weight (macrosomia) in diabetic pregnant women. Also, hormonal changes exerted by diabetes mellitus (increased insulin-like growth factors I, II, growth hormone, and relaxin hormone) have profound effects on connective tissues [28, 29].

There was a positive correlation between the prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction and the advance in the gestational age. This correlation could be explained by fast mechanical changes that happen in a short period (course of pregnancy), increasing the chance of developing sacroiliac dysfunction. Increasing fetal and maternal weight increases mechanical stress on the pelvis and lower back [30]. Laxity of the sacroiliac ligaments increased due to relaxin, which increased by ten folds in pregnancy, decreased rigidity of collagen, and increased softening of the sacroiliac joint's ligaments. As a result sacroiliac joint becomes less stable and more mobile [5 & 31].

The prevalence of sacroiliac dysfunction was higher in multiparous women. Many factors may explain it; 1st, the cumulative effect of previous pregnancies on the sacroiliac joints; 2nd, the effect of the advance in age associated with repeated pregnancies; 3rd, the associated medical and obstetric disorders related to the maternal age and multiparous or even grand multiparous

[29, 31]. Additionally, significant sacroiliac degenerative changes occurred in multiparous women; these changes were irreversible after delivery [32, 33].

Our study noted that 54.1 % of SID participants were delivered by cesarean section (CS). An earlier study found a high prevalence of pelvic girdle pain in women who had cesarean delivery than in those who had a vaginal delivery, but even that study recommended further research in this area to get definitive conclusions [34]. The resulting adhesions due to abdominal surgery could contribute to lower abdominal pain in the subsequent pregnancy [35].

Strength and Limitations: according to our knowledge, this was the first study to determine the prevalence of SID among pregnant women in Egypt. We depended on five pain provocation tests to diagnose SID. The sample size was large. However, the few comparable studies in the literature were a conflict with a detailed explanation.

Conclusions

Our study showed that sacroiliac dysfunction affected a large portion of the pregnant ladies in our community.

Author's participation

MA Hamdy: Data collection and management, Manuscript writing/editing.

WA Sayed Ahmed: Protocol/project development, Data collection.

AM Elshahat: Protocol/project development.

OA Shawky: Protocol/project development, Data collection.

OT Taha: Data management

Funding: self-funded research

Conflicts of interest: None

Data sharing: Data would be available when requested after approval of the research ethics committee.

References:

1. Gutke, A., Östgaard, H., Oberg, B. (2006). Pelvic girdle pain and lumbar pain in pregnancy: a cohort study of the consequences in terms of health and functioning. *Spine*, 31(5), E149-E155.
2. Skaggs, C. D., Prather, H., Gross, G., George, J. W., Thompson, P. A., & Nelson, D. M. (2007). Back and pelvic pain in an underserved United States pregnant population: a preliminary descriptive survey. *Journal of manipulative and physiological therapeutics*, 30(2), 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.impt.2006.12.008>
3. Orvieto, R., Achiron, A., Ben-Rafael, Z., Gelernter, I., & Achiron, R. (1994). Low-back pain of pregnancy. *Acta obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*, 73(3), 209–214. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00016349409023441>
4. Cohen, S., Chen, Y., and Neufeld, N. (2013). Sacroiliac joint pain: a comprehensive review of epidemiology, diagnosis and treatment. *Expert review of neurotherapeutics*, 13(1), 99-116.
5. Sabino, J. and Grauer, J. (2008). Pregnancy and low back pain. *Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine*, 1(2), 137–141.
6. Fortin, J., Dwyer, A., West, S., and Pier, J. (1994 A). Sacroiliac Joint: Pain Referral Maps upon Applying a New Injection/Arthrography Technique: Asymptomatic Volunteers. *Spine*, 19(13), 1475-1482.
7. Dreyfuss, P., Michaelsen, M., Pauza, K., McLarty, J., & Bogduk, N. (1996). The value of medical history and physical examination in diagnosing sacroiliac joint pain. *Spine*, 21(22), 2594–2602. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-199611150-00009>
8. Van der Wurff, P., Hagmeijer, R. and Meyne, W. (2000). Clinical tests of the sacroiliac joint: a systematic methodological review. Part 1: reliability. *Manual therapy*, 5(1), 30-36.
9. Bonder, J., and Fitzpatrick, L. (2015). Diagnosis of Pelvic Girdle Pain in pregnancy, *Musculoskeletal Health in Pregnancy and Postpartum*, 69-80.

10. Beales, D., O'Sullivan, P. and Briffa, N. (2010). The effects of manual pelvic compression on trunk motor control during an active straight leg raise in chronic pelvic girdle pain subjects. *Manual therapy*, 15(2), 190-199.
11. Shaw, J. (1992). The role of the sacroiliac joint as a cause of low back pain and dysfunction. *First interdisciplinary world congress on low back pain and its relation to the sacroiliac joint, San Diego, CA, 1992.p.* 67–80.
12. Laslett, M., Aprill, C., McDonald, B., and Young, S. (2005). Diagnosis of sacroiliac joint pain: validity of individual provocation tests and composites of tests. *Manual therapy*, 10(3), 207-218.
13. Van der Wurff, P., Buijs, E. and Groen, G. (2006). A multitest regimen of pain provocation tests as an aid to reduce unnecessary minimally invasive sacroiliac joint procedures. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*, 87(1), 10-14.
14. Szadek, K. M., van der Wurff, P., van Tulder, M. W., Zuurmond, W. W., & Perez, R. S. (2009). Diagnostic validity of criteria for sacroiliac joint pain: a systematic review. *The journal of pain*, 10(4), 354–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2008.09.014>
15. Mens, J. M., Vleeming, A., Snijders, C. J., Koes, B. W., & Stam, H. J. (2001). Reliability and validity of the active straight leg raise test in posterior pelvic pain since pregnancy. *Spine*, 26(10), 1167–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200105150-00015>
16. Roland, M. and Fairbank, J. (2000). The Roland–Morris disability questionnaire and the Oswestry disability questionnaire. *Spine*, 25(24), 3115-3124.
17. Al-Abbad H, Al-Howimel A (2015): Translation, Adaptation, and Reliability of Modern Standard Arabic Version of the Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire. *J Nov Physiother* 5:254. DOI: 10.4172/2165-7025.1000254
18. Stratford, P. W., Binkley, J., Solomon, P., Finch, E., Gill, C., & Moreland, J. (1996).

Defining the minimum level of detectable change for the Roland-Morris questionnaire. *Physical therapy*, 76(4), 359–368. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/76.4.359>

19. Ramirez, C., Sanchez, L., & Oliveira, B. (2018). Prevalence of sacroiliac joint dysfunction and sacroiliac pain-provoking tests in people with low back pain. *Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, 61, e152.
20. Arslan, A., Ahmad, A., Muhammad, S. B., & Asghar, M. (2021). Prevalence of Sacroiliac Joint Dysfunction Among Females In Lahore: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Pakistan Journal of Physical Therapy (PJPT)*.
21. Gausel, A. M., Kjærmann, I., Malmqvist, S., Dalen, I., Larsen, J. P., & Økland, I. (2016). Pelvic girdle pain 3-6 months after delivery in an unselected cohort of Norwegian women. *European spine journal : official publication of the European Spine Society, the European Spinal Deformity Society, and the European Section of the Cervical Spine Research Society*, 25(6), 1953–1959. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-015-3959-1>
22. Mogren I. and Pohjanen A. (2005) Low back pain and pelvic pain during pregnancy: prevalence and risk factors. *Spine*; 30:983-91.
23. Filipec, M., Jadanec, M., Kostovic-Srzentic, M., van der Vaart, H., & Matijevic, R. (2018). Incidence, pain, and mobility assessment of pregnant women with sacroiliac dysfunction. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*, 142(3), 283-287.
24. Albert, H., Godskesen, M., Korsholm, L. and Westergaard, J. (2006). Risk factors in developing pregnancy-related pelvic girdle pain. *Acta obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*, 85(5), 539-544.

25. Renson, T., de Hooge, M., De Craemer, A. S., Deroo, L., Lukasik, Z., Carron, P., ... & Elewaut, D. (2022). Progressive increase in sacroiliac joint and spinal MRI lesions in healthy individuals in relation to age. *Arthritis & Rheumatology*.
26. Irwin, R., Watson, T., Minick, R. and Ambrosius, W. (2007). Age, body mass index, and gender differences in sacroiliac joint pathology. *American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 86(1), 37.
27. Berthelot, J. M., Douane, F., Ploteau, S., Le Goff, B., & Darrieutort-Laffite, C. (2022). Venous congestion as a central mechanism of radiculopathies. *Joint bone spine*, 89(2), 105291.
28. Colao, A., Barkan, A. L., and Scarpa, R. (2005). Growth Hormone/Insulin-Like Growth Factor-I System and Connective Tissues: Basic Aspects and Clinical Implications. *Rheumatic Disease Clinics of North America*, 29-42
29. Eberhard-Gran, M. and Eskild, A. (2008). Diabetes mellitus and pelvic girdle syndrome in pregnancy—Is there an association. *Acta obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica*, 87(10), 1015-1019.
30. Saxena, A. K., Chilkoti, G. T., Singh, A., & Yadav, G. (2019). Pregnancy-induced low back pain in Indian women: Prevalence, risk factors, and correlation with serum calcium levels. *Anesthesia, Essays and Researches*, 13(2), 395.
31. Sneag, D. and Bendo, J. (2007). Pregnancy-related low back pain. *Orthopedics*, 30(10).
32. Juhl, M., Andersen, P., Olsen, J. and Andersen, A. (2005). Psychosocial and physical work environment, and risk of pelvic pain in pregnancy. A study within the Danish national birth cohort. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*.
33. Shibata, Y., Shirai, Y. and Miyamoto, M. (2002). The aging process in the sacroiliac

joint: helical computed tomography analysis. *Journal of orthopaedic science*, 7(1), 12-18.

34. Mukkannavar, P., Desai, B. R., Mohanty, U., Parvatikar, V., Karwa, D., & Daiwajna, S. (2013). Pelvic girdle pain after childbirth: the impact of mode of delivery. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*, 26(3), 281–290. <https://doi.org/10.3233/BMR-130378>

35. Betrán AP, Ye J, Moller A-B, Zhang J, Gülmezoglu AM, Torloni MR (2016) The Increasing Trend in Caesarean Section Rates: Global, Regional and National Estimates: 1990-2014. *PLoS ONE* 11(2): e0148343. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148343>

Table (I): Demographics.

Characteristic	Number (861)	Percent
Age in years		
< 25	461	53.5%
25 – 35	298	34.6%
> 35	102	11.8%
Occupation		
Not employed	708	82.2%
Employed	153	17.8%
Chronic illness		
No chronic illness	831	96.5%
Hypertension	16	1.9%
Diabetes mellitus	14	1.6%
Gestational age in weeks		
1 st trimester (\leq 14 weeks)	285	33.1%
2 nd trimester (> 14 weeks – 28 weeks)	333	38.7%
3 rd trimester (> 28 weeks)	243	28.2%
Number of fetuses		
Singleton pregnancy	842	97.8%
Multifetal pregnancy	19	2.2%
Parity		
Primigravida	153	17.8%
Multipara	708	82.2%
Mode of previous deliveries		
Normal vaginal delivery	389 (n=708)	54.9 %
Caesarian sections	319 (n=708)	45.1%

Table (II): Pain provocation and load transfer tests results (n = 861).

Test name	Negative test No. (%)	Positive test No. (%)
Posterior pain provocation test	422 (49%)	439 (51%)
Distraction test	352 (40.9%)	509 (59.1%)
Compression test	488 (56.7%)	373 (43.3%)
Patrick-Faber test	369 (42.9%)	492 (57.1%)
Active straight leg raising test	484 (56.2%)	377 (43.8%)

Table (III): Demographic data and sacroiliac dysfunction.

Characteristic	Sacroiliac dysfunction No. (%)	No sacroiliac dysfunction No. (%)	p-value
Age in years			
< 25	136 (42%)	325 (60.5%)	< 0.001 ^{1*}
25 – 35	122 (37.7%)	176 (32.8%)	
> 35	66 (20.4%)	36 (6.7%)	
Chronic Illness			
Hypertension	7 (43.7%)	9 (56.4%)	0.001
Diabetes mellitus	12 (85.7%)	2 (14.3%)	
Gestational age in weeks			
1 st trimester (< 14 weeks)	21 (6.5%)	264 (49.2%)	< 0.001 ^{1*}
2 nd trimester (>14 weeks – 28 weeks)	133 (41%)	200 (37.2%)	
3 rd trimester (>28 weeks)	170 (52.5%)	73 (13.6 %)	
Number of fetuses			
Singleton pregnancy	317 (97.8%)	525 (97.8%)	0.943 ¹
Multifetal pregnancy	7 (2.2 %)	12(2.2 %)	
Parity			
Primigravida	28 (8.6%)	125 (23.3%)	< 0.001 ^{1*}
Multipara	296 (91.4%)	412 (76.7%)	
Mode of last delivery			
	(n=294)	(n=414)	
Normal vaginal delivery	135 (45.9%)	254 (61.4%)	< 0.001 ^{1*}
Caesarian sections	159 (54.1%)	160 (38.6%)	