

# **Research Article**

Ankara Med J, 2021;(1):35-48 // @10.5505/amj.2021.46693

# AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF URINARY INCONTINENCE AND FATIGUE LEVEL AND SLEEP QUALITY IN PREGNANCY GEBELIKTE ÜRINER INKONTINANSIN YORGUNLUK

DÜZEYİ VE UYKU KALİTESİ İLE İLİŞKİSİNİN İNCELENMESİ

Hacer Alan Dikmen<sup>1</sup>, Hamide Yildirim<sup>2</sup>, Kamile Marakoğlu<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Midwifery, Selcuk University, Konya <sup>2</sup>Institude of Health Sciences, Selcuk University, Konya <sup>3</sup>Department of Family Medicine, Selcuk University, Konya

Yazışma Adresi / Correspondence: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hacer Alan Dikmen (e-mail: alanhacer@selcuk.edu.tr)

Geliş Tarihi (Submitted): 24.09.2020 // Kabul Tarihi (Accepted): 15.12.2020



Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University Faculty of Medicine Department of Family Medicine



# Öz

**Amaç:** Bu çalışmanın amacı, gebelikte yaşanan üriner inkontinans ile yorgunluk düzeyi ve uyku kalitesi arasındaki ilişkiyi incelenmektir.

**Materyal ve Metot:** Tanımlayıcı ve kesitsel türde yapılan çalışmanın verileri, Ocak-Mart 2020 tarihleri arasında, bir kadın doğum hastanesinin gebe polikliniğine başvuran 311 gebeden (okur-yazar, 18-49 yaş aralığında, tek fetüse sahip, iletişim kurulabilen, infertilite tedavisi sonucu gebe olmayan, idrar yolu enfeksiyonu ve herhangi bir kronik hastalığı olmayan), kişisel bilgi formu, İnkontinans Şiddet İndeksi (İŞİ), Pittsburgh Uyku Kalitesi İndeksi (PUKİ) ve Yorgunluk Şiddeti Ölçeği (YŞÖ) ile toplanmıştır.

**Bulgular:** Çalışmamızda gebelerin yaş ortalaması 27,25±5,64, gebelik haftası ortalaması 29,46±9,58'di. Gebelerin %61,10'unda (190) üriner inkontinans şikâyeti vardı, %68,80'inin (214) uyku kalitesi kötüydü. Gebelerin %46,60'ı (145) "yorgundu." Çalışmamızda gebelerin İŞİ ve PUKİ puan ortalaması arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı, pozitif yönde ve düşük düzeyde (r= 0,209; p<0,001) ilişki saptanırken, YŞÖ ile istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki saptanımadı (p=0,184).

**Sonuç:** Çalışmamızda gebelerin üriner inkontinans düzeyi arttıkça kötü uyku kalitesi artmaktaydı. Gebelerin üriner inkontinans düzeyi ile yorgunluk düzeyleri arasında ise bir ilişki yoktu. Sağlık profesyonelleri antenatal izlemlerde, gebelerin üriner inkontinans, uyku ve yorgunluk düzeylerini mutlaka değerlendirmeli ve inkontinans varlığı saptanan gebelerde baş etme ve tedavi noktasında gerekli bakım uygulamaları önerilmelidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gebelik, üriner inkontinans, yorgunluk, uyku.

### Abstract

**Objectives:** This study aimed to investigate the relationship between urinary incontinence and fatigue level and sleep quality during pregnancy.

**Materials and Methods:** This descriptive and cross-sectional study was conducted in 311 pregnant women (literate, in an age range of 18-49 years, singleton pregnant, able to communicate, did not get pregnant as a result of infertility treatment, without a urinary tract infection or a chronic disease) who were presented to the pregnant polyclinic of a maternity hospital between January and March 2020. The data were collected using a personal information form, Incontinence Severity Index (ISI), Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI), and Fatigue Severity Scale (FSS).

**Results:** In our study, the mean age of the participants was  $27.25\pm5.641$  years, and the mean gestational week was  $29.46\pm9.581$ . 61.10% of the pregnant women (190) had urinary incontinence; sleep quality of them was "bad" in 68.80% (214). 46.60% (145) of the pregnant women were "fatigued". In our study, there was a significant positive and low-level correlation between the ISI and the PSQI mean scores (r=0.209; p <0.001); no significant correlation was found between ISI and the YSS (p=0.184).

**Conclusion:** In our study, as the urinary incontinence level increased, poor sleep quality increased. There was no relationship between urinary incontinence and fatigue levels in pregnant women. During antenatal, health care professionals should evaluate the urinary incontinence, sleep quality, and fatigue levels of pregnant women, and require care practices should be offered involving coping strategies and treatment modalities in pregnant women with incontinence.

**Keywords:** Pregnancy, urinary incontinence, fatigue, sleep.



# Introduction

Although pregnancy is a natural process, it is a period in which many physiological, anatomical, psychological, and emotional changes occur.<sup>1</sup> Anatomical and physiological changes occur during pregnancy in the urinary system similar to many other body systems. Due to the growing uterus during pregnancy, intra-abdominal pressure increases, and pelvic organs are pushed downward. This change gets the pelvic floor muscles to be strained and causes a mechanical condition where pelvic support is negatively affected. Urinary incontinence may develop as a result of this strain.<sup>2,3</sup>

The International Continence Society (ICS) defined urinary incontinence as "the complaint of involuntary urine loss".<sup>4</sup> Obesity, pelvic surgery for colon, cervical, or ovarian cancer, lower urinary tract infections, smoking, chronic coughing, consumption of alcohol and caffeinated beverages, chronic constipation, pregnancy, and birth trauma are among the risk factors for urinary incontinence.<sup>2, 5</sup> Physiological changes during pregnancy may predispose to urinary incontinence as well as exacerbate existing urinary incontinence complaints. The global prevalence of urinary incontinence during pregnancy has been reported to be in a range from 18.90% to 75.25%.<sup>2,6,7</sup>

Although urinary incontinence is a common problem in pregnancy, the possibility of intervention decreases in women due to denial, hiding, non-acceptance, guilt, and shame they experience.<sup>8</sup> Ongoing feeling of wetness- and irritation-related discomfort in women cause isolation from social life, depression, anxiety, decrease in self-esteem, and limitation in daily activities.<sup>9</sup> In addition, due to urinary incontinence, pregnant women frequently visit the toilet, change their underwear, and interrupt their night sleep, all of which can increase their fatigue levels and reduce their sleep quality. Sleep disorders during pregnancy can lead to obstetric complications, preterm birth, premature rupture of membranes, increased cesarean rates, and adverse effects on glucose tolerance and blood pressure.<sup>10,11</sup>

As pregnant women's sleep quality decreases, the level of effect of daily activities on them increases. There is a relationship between sleep disturbance of pregnant women with general fatigue and the influence of daily activities on their lives.<sup>12</sup> In other words, as sleep disorder increases, fatigue and the effects of daily activities on their lives increase, and it is reported that there is a positive relationship between daily dysfunction and fatigue levels of pregnant women.<sup>12-14</sup>

In the literature, there is no study examining the relationship between pregnant women's urinary incontinence status and their fatigue level and sleep quality. For this reason, it is thought that the present study will contribute to the nursing and midwifery literature. Nurses and midwives need to define the presence of urinary incontinence, fatigue, and sleep quality, determine the relationship between them, and



plan care practices in order to increase the quality of care in pregnant women. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between urinary incontinence experienced during pregnancy with fatigue level and sleep quality. In line with this purpose, the research questions were: "Is there a relationship between urinary incontinence and sleep quality during pregnancy?" and "Is there a relationship between urinary incontinence and fatigue level during pregnancy?"

# **Materials and Methods**

### Study Design

This study was designed as "descriptive and cross-sectional". The study was conducted in the pregnancy outpatient clinic of a maternity and pediatric hospital in Konya city center. Data were collected between January and March 2020. The pregnant women were informed about the study and verbal consents were obtained from those who agreed to participate in the study. They filled the data collection forms in 10-15 minutes. Data were collected in privacy in a private room. The room in which the data was collected was warm and bright, and nobody other than the researcher and the participant was allowed to enter the room.

#### Sampling

Pregnant women who were presented to the pregnancy outpatient clinic of the hospital and met the research criteria were the universe of the study. In the literature, pregnancy urinary incontinence ranges between 18.90% and 72.20%, <sup>2,6,7</sup> and it is reported as 27% in a study conducted in Turkey.<sup>15</sup> When calculating the sample size with the G \* Power 3.1.9.4 program, the prevalence of the study conducted by Kocaöz et al. (2010) was taken into account, and the sample size was calculated as 287 pregnant women with a known prevalence of 27%, a margin of error of 5%, and power of 95%.<sup>16</sup> We aimed to reach 315 people by taking 28 more pregnant women, 10% more than the sample calculated considering the possible loss of cases. We recruited 315 pregnant women, but data belonging to 311 women were included in statistical analyses because 4 women submitted incomplete/incorrect data collection forms.

#### Inclusion criteria

- Being literate,
- Being in an age range of 18-49 years,
- Being singleton pregnant,
- Being able to communicate (no mental problems, no visual/hearing impairment)



#### Exclusion criteria

- Being pregnant as a result of infertility treatment,
- Being a urinary tract infection,
- Having a chronic disease (hypertension, diabetes, acute complications requiring monitoring or followup).

### Measurements

The data were collected using a Personal Information Form, which was created based on a literature review, <sup>17-19</sup> the Incontinence Severity Index (ISI), the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI), and the Fatigue Severity Scale (FSS).

### Personal Information Form

The personal information form includes 28 questions evaluating the socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics of the pregnant women, such as age, spouse's age, family type, income status (17 items), and urinary incontinence status (11 items).

### Incontinence Severity Index (ISI)

ISI is a universally accepted, easy-to-apply, short, and simple index developed by Sandwik et al. (1993).<sup>20</sup> Its Turkish validity and reliability study was carried out by Hazar and Şirin (2008). The scale consists of 2 items: frequency and severity. A score is obtained by multiplying frequency (how often do you lose urine?) and severity (how much urine do you lose each time?). In this way, the following classifications are achieved: 1-2 points "mild incontinence", 3-6 points "moderate incontinence", 8-9 points "severe incontinence", and 10-12 points "very severe incontinence". In the internal consistency analysis performed to determine the reliability of the ISI, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found to be 0.67.<sup>21</sup> In this study, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found to be 0.67.<sup>21</sup> In this study, the Cronbach alpha

### Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI)

The PSQI was developed by Buysse et al.<sup>22</sup> and its Turkish validity and reliability were verified by Agargun et al.<sup>23</sup> The PSQI provides information on sleep quality and the type and severity of sleep disturbances that occurred in the previous month. Eighteen questions are scored on the scale, which consists of 24 questions in total. The scale includes 7 sub-dimensions that provide information about the individual's Subjective Sleep Quality, Sleep Latency, Sleep Duration, Habitual Sleep Efficiency, Sleep Disturbances, Use of Sleep Medication,



and Daytime Drowsiness. Each sub-dimension is evaluated on a score of 0-3 (0 = no distress - 3 = serious distress). The scores obtained from all subdimensions give the total score of the scale (min-max = 0-21). A total score greater than 5 indicates "poor sleep quality". In the Turkish validity and reliability study of the scale, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was reported as  $0.80.^{23}$  In this study, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was reported as  $0.80.^{23}$  In this study, the Cronbach alpha

#### Fatigue Severity Scale (FSS)

The FSS was developed by Krupp et al. (1989).<sup>24</sup> The Turkish validity and reliability of the scale were established by Armutlu et al. (2007). The scale examines the fatigue status in the previous month including the day it was filled in. Each item is scored between 1 and 7 (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = totally agree). It consists of nine items that patients self-report, and the total score is calculated by taking the average of nine items. The cut-off value for pathological fatigue was set at 4 and above. Lower total scores indicate less fatigue.<sup>25</sup> In the Turkish validity and reliability study of the scale, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was reported as 0.94.<sup>25</sup> In this study, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was calculated as 0.93.

#### Statistical Analysis

SPSS 20.0 was used for the analysis of the statistical data. In our sample distribution, whose Skewness and Kurtosis values varied between -1.5 and +1.5, descriptive statistics (percentage, mean and standard deviation, median) as well as the Student's t-test and Pearson correlation analysis, as parametric tests, were used. Correlation coefficients were interpreted as: 0.01-0.29 = low level relationship, 0.30-0.70 = moderate relationship, 0.71-0.99 = high level relationship, and 1.00 = perfect relationship. The independent variables of the study were socio-demographic, obstetric, and urinary incontinence characteristics of the pregnant women. Dependent variables were fatigue and sleep levels of the pregnant women.

## Results

The average age of the pregnant women participating in our study was  $27.25 \pm 5.5.64$  years, and the mean week of gestation was  $29.46 \pm 9.58$ . We found that 83.30% of the pregnant women's pregnancy was planned (Table 1). We found that 28.00% of the pregnant women stated that they had urinary incontinence before reaching the toilet, 47.30% stated that they had urine incontinence in situations such as laughing, coughing, and sneezing, 15.80% stated that they used incontinence pads, and 5.80% stated that they restricted their fluid intake due to urinary incontinence (Table 2).



**Table 1.** Socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics of the pregnant women (n=311)

Age (year)         27.25±5.64           Spouse's age (year)         6.06±5.13           Cestation week         29.46±9.58           Number of pregnancies         2.33±1.33           Number of iving children         0.95±1.01           Socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics         n         %           Education status         134         43.00           High school         114         36.70           University on higher         63         20.30           Spouse's age         147         47.30           Literate/Primary school         147         47.30           High school         95         30.50           University on higher         69         22.20           Employed         252         81.00           University or higher         59         19.00           University or higher         59         19.00           University or higher         59         19.00           Spouse's age         10         32.20           Employed         252         81.00           Moderate         59         16.70           Porce of ricome level         234         75.20           Poor         10         3.20		Mea	Mean±SD	
Spose's age (year)         30.95±6.22           Duration of marrage (year)         6.06±1.13           Gestation week         29.46±9.58           Number of pregnancies         2.33±1.33           Number of living children         0.95±1.01           Socio-demographic and obsetric characteristics         n         %           Education status         114         43.00           High school         114         36.70           University or higher         63         20.30           Spose's age         1141         36.70           University or higher         63         20.30           Spose's age         1447         47.30           High school         147         47.30           High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employed         59         19.00           Unemployed         59         19.00           Unemployed         59         19.00           Barbayement status         252         81.00           Family type         253         83.30           Extended         52         16.70           Perception of income level         234         75.20<	Age (year)	27.25	27.25±5.64	
Duration of marriage (year)         6.06±5.13           Gestation week         2946649,58           Number of pregnancies         2.33±1.33           Number of living children         0.95±1.01           Socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics         n         %           Education status         134         43.00           Literate/Primary school         114         36.70           University or higher         63         20.30           Spouse's age         1147         47.30           Literate/Primary school         147         47.30           High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employed         259         81.00           Macleus         259         83.30           Extended         52         16.70           Parception of income level         67         21.50           Moderate         254         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         216         69.50           Willage/District         145         46.60           City center         146         53.40           Harmony with the spouse	Spouse's age (year)	30.95	5±6.22	
Gestation week         29.46±9.58           Number of pregnancies         0.95±1.01           Socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics         n         %           Education status	Duration of marriage (year)	6.06	±5.13	
Number of pregnancies         2.33±1.33           Number of living children         0.95±1.01           Socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics         n         %           Education status         134         43.00           High school         114         36.70           University or higher         63         20.30           Spouse's age         147         47.30           High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employment status         59         19.00           Employed         59         19.00           Unemployed         252         81.00           Family type	Gestation week	29.46	5±9.58	
Number of living children         0.95±1.01           Socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics         n         %           Education status	Number of pregnancies	2.33	±1.33	
Socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics         n         %           Education status	Number of living children	0.95	±1.01	
Education status         Image: Constraint of the status           Literate/Primary school         134         43.00           High school         114         36.70           University or higher         63         20.30           Spouse's age         147         47.30           Literate/Primary school         147         47.30           High school         195         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employment status         10         259         83.30           Extended         259         83.30         10.70           Family type         259         83.30         10.70           Perception of income level         259         83.30         10.70           Good         67         21.50         23.4         75.20           Poor         10         3.20         10         3.20           Place of residence         10         3.20         10         3.20           Village/District         145         46.60         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         90         28.90         30.50           Moderate         92         30.50         34         10.90	Socio-demographic and obstetric characteristics	n	%	
Literate/Primary school         134         43.00           High school         114         36.70           University or higher         63         20.30           Spouse's age         1147         47.30           Literate/Primary school         147         47.30           High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employment status         1147         47.30           Employed         59         19.00           Unemployed         52         81.00           Family type	Education status		70	
High school         114         36.70           University or higher         63         20.30           Spouse's age         1147         47.30           Literate/Primary school         147         47.30           High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employment status         69         22.20           Employded         252         81.00           Family type         75         30.50           Nucleus         259         83.30           Extended         52         16.70           Perception of income level         52         16.70           Good         67         21.50           Moderate         234         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         104         3.20           Village/District         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         2216         69.50           Moderate         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         221         71.10 <td>Literate/Primary school</td> <td>134</td> <td>43.00</td>	Literate/Primary school	134	43.00	
University or higher         63         20.30           Spouse's age         -         -           Literate/Primary school         147         47.30           High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employment status         69         22.20           Employed         59         19.00           Unemployed         59         81.30           Extended         252         81.00           Partity type	High school	114	36.70	
Spouse's age         147         47.30           Literate/Primary school         95         30.50           High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employment status         59         19.00           Employded         252         81.00           Family type         252         81.00           Nucleus         259         83.30           Extended         52         16.70           Perception of income level         67         21.50           Good         67         21.50           Moderate         234         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         100         3.20           Village/District         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         216         69.50           Good         216         69.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curetage history         221         71.10           Yes         90         28.90           No         341         10.90	University or higher	63	20.30	
Literate/Primary school         147         47.30           High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employment status         69         22.20           Employment status         59         19.00           Unemployed         59         19.00           Versitive of the status         252         81.00           Family type         52         16.70           Nucleus         259         83.30           Extended         52         16.70           Perception of income level         67         21.50           Good         67         21.50           Moderate         234         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         166         53.40           Village/District         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         95         30.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         221         71.10           Vanted pregnancy         221         71.10           Yes         277 <td>Spouse's age</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Spouse's age			
High school         95         30.50           University or higher         69         22.20           Employed         59         19.00           Unemployed         252         81.00           Family type         252         83.30           Nucleus         259         83.30           Extended         52         16.70           Perception of income level         67         21.50           Moderate         234         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         10         3.20           Village/District         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         600         216         69.50           Good         216         69.50         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         7         89.10           No         221         71.10         71.10           Watted pregnancy         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         52         16.70           Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Heatth problems during preg	Literate/Primary school	147	47.30	
University or higher         6.9         22.20           Employment status         5.9         19.00           Employed         5.9         19.00           Unemployed         25.2         81.00           Family type         25.2         16.70           Nucleus         25.9         83.30           Extended         5.2         16.70           Perception of income level         67         21.50           Moderate         23.4         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         10         3.20           Village/District         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         95         30.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Moderate         99         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Plannet pregnancy         52         16.70	High school	95	30.50	
Employment status         59         19.00           Employed         59         19.00           Unemployed         252         81.00           Family type	University or higher	69	22.20	
Employed         59         19.00           Unemployed         252         81.00           Family type	Employment status			
Unemployed         252         81.00           Family type	Employed	59	19.00	
Family type         259         83.30           Extended         52         16.70           Perception of income level         52         16.70           Good         67         21.50           Moderate         234         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         10         3.20           Village/District         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         95         30.50           Good         216         69.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90           Yes         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10           Yes         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planed pregnancy         259         83.30           Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         52         16.70           Yes (such	Unemployed	252	81.00	
Nucleus         259         83.30           Extended         52         16.70           Perception of income level	Family type			
Extended         52         16.70           Perception of income level         67         21.50           Good         67         21.50           Moderate         234         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         10         3.20           Village/District         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         95         30.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90           Yes         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10           Yes         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         259         83.30           Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         447         79.40           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40 <td>Nucleus</td> <td>259</td> <td>83.30</td>	Nucleus	259	83.30	
Perception of income level         67         21.50           Good         67         21.50           Moderate         234         75.20           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence             Village/District         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         216         69.50           Good         216         69.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history          221         71.10           Yes         90         28.90         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         277         89.10         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         259         83.30         52         16.70           Yes         259         83.30         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         247         79.40           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         311         100.00         311	Extended	52	16.70	
Good Moderate Poor         67 234 75.20 10         21.50 75.20 10           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         10         3.20           Village/District City center         145 166         46.60 53.40           Harmony with the spouse         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         95         30.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90 221           Yes No         90         28.90 221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10 34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         259         83.30 52         16.70           Yes No         259         83.30 52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         259         83.30 52         16.70           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60 247         247           Yes         311         100.00         311	Perception of income level			
Moderate Poor         234         75.20 10           Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence         10         3.20           Village/District City center         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         216         69.50           Good Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90           Yes         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10           Yes         24         10.90           Planned pregnancy         259         83.30           Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         259         83.30           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	Good	67	21.50	
Poor         10         3.20           Place of residence	Moderate	234	75.20	
Place of residence           Village/District         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         600         216         69.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90           Yes         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10           Yes         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         259         83.30           Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         79.40           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40	Poor	10	3.20	
Village/District City center         145         46.60           City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse         216         69.50           Good         216         69.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         34         10.90           Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         247         79.40           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         311         100.00	Place of residence			
City center         166         53.40           Harmony with the spouse             Good         216         69.50           Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history             Yes         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy             Yes         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy             Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy             Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00 <td>Village/District</td> <td>145</td> <td>46.60</td>	Village/District	145	46.60	
Harmony with the spouse         Good         216         69.50         69.50         30.50         Abortion/curettage history         95         30.50         Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90         221         71.10         Marked pregnancy         221         71.10         Marked pregnancy         90         28.90         221         71.10         Marked pregnancy         221         71.10         Marked pregnancy         90         28.90         200	City center	166	53.40	
Good Moderate         216 95         69.50 30.50           Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90           Yes         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10           Yes         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         247         79.40           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain) No         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	Harmony with the spouse			
Moderate         95         30.50           Abortion/curettage history         90         28.90           Yes         90         28.90           No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         71.10         90         28.90           Yes         277         89.10         34         10.90           No         34         10.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         28.90         90         29.90         89.10         31.90         <	Good	216	69.50	
Abortion/curettage history       90       28.90         Yes       90       28.90         No       221       71.10         Wanted pregnancy       277       89.10         Yes       277       89.10         No       34       10.90         Planned pregnancy       259       83.30         Yes       259       83.30         No       52       16.70         Health problems during pregnancy       247       79.40         No       247       79.40         Total       311       100.00	Moderate	95	30.50	
Yes       90       28.90         No       221       71.10         Wanted pregnancy       277       89.10         Yes       277       89.10         No       34       10.90         Planned pregnancy       34       10.90         Yes       259       83.30         No       52       16.70         Health problems during pregnancy       247       79.40         Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)       64       20.60         No       247       79.40         Total       311       100.00	Abortion/curettage history			
No         221         71.10           Wanted pregnancy         277         89.10           Yes         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         247         79.40           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	Yes	90	28.90	
Wanted pregnancy           Yes         277         89.10           No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         247         79.40           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	No	221	71.10	
Yes       277       89.10         No       34       10.90         Planned pregnancy       259       83.30         No       52       16.70         Health problems during pregnancy       52       16.70         Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)       64       20.60         No       247       79.40         Total       311       100.00	Wanted pregnancy	1		
No         34         10.90           Planned pregnancy             Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy             Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	Yes	277	89.10	
Planned pregnancy           Yes         259         83.30           No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         Ves         Second Sec	No	34	10.90	
Yes     259     83.30       No     52     16.70       Health problems during pregnancy     52     10.70       Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)     64     20.60       No     247     79.40       Total     311     100.00	Planned pregnancy			
No         52         16.70           Health problems during pregnancy         52         16.70           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	Yes	259	83.30	
Health problems during pregnancy           Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	No	52	16.70	
Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)         64         20.60           No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	Health problems during pregnancy	1		
No         247         79.40           Total         311         100.00	Yes (such as nausea-vomiting, pain)	64	20.60	
<b>Total</b> 311 100.00	No	247	79.40	
	Total	311	100.00	

<sup>a</sup>None of the pregnant women answered "bad"



**Table 2.** Urinary incontinence characteristics of pregnant women (n=311)

Urinary incontinence characteristics	n	%	
Rushing to the toilet to urinate			
Yes	183	58.80	
No	128	41.20	
Urinary incontinence before reaching the toilet			
Yes	87	28.00	
No	224	72.00	
Incontinence due to laughing, coughing, sneezing, etc.			
Yes	147	47.30	
No	164	52.70	
Feeling of the full bladder after urination	• 	·	
Yes	145	46.60	
No	166	53.40	
It takes too long to urinate			
Yes	76	24.40	
No	235	75.60	
Feeling of wetness in undergarment without the feeling of a full bladder	1	1	
Yes	103	33.10	
No	208	66.90	
Going to toilet without the urge to urinate	1	1	
Yes	72	23.20	
NO	239	76.80	
Use of daily pads due to incontinence	40	45.00	
Yes	49	15.80	
Limitation of daily activities due to incontinence	202	04.20	
Yes	19	6.10	
	292	93.90	
Limitation of liquid intake due to incontinence			
Yes	18	5.80	
NO	293	94.20	
Incontinence during sleep			
Yes	39	12.50	
	272	87.50	
Total	311	100.00	

The mean ISI score of the pregnant women was  $1.81 \pm 2.51$ , the mean PSQI score was  $6.01 \pm 2.61$ , and the mean FSS score was  $3.70 \pm 1.83$ . According to the ISI, 38.90% of the pregnant women had no urinary incontinence complaints, while 34.10% had "mild", 22.50% had "moderate", 2.60% had "severe", and 1.90% had "very severe" incontinence issues. According to the PSQI, 68.80% of the pregnant women had "poor" sleep quality, and according to the FSS, 46.60% of the pregnant women felt "fatigued" (Table 3).



There was a statistically significant difference between the average PSQI score and the following parameters: pregnant women not rushing to reach the toilet to urinate (p = 0.009), urinary incontinence before reaching the toilet (p = 0.011), incontinence due to laughing, coughing, sneezing, etc. (p = 0.008), feeling of fullness of the bladder after urinating (p < 0.001), wet feeling in underwear without feeling full bladder (p = 0.001), and the state of going to the toilet without an urge to urinate (p = 0.001). A statistically significant difference was found between the mean FSS score and the feeling of wetness in underwear (p = 0.001) and the complaint of urinary incontinence during sleep (p < 0.001) (Table 4).

In our study, while there was a significant, positive, low-level (r = 0.209; p < 0.001) relationship between ISI and PSQI mean scores of the pregnant women, no significant correlation was found between the ISI and the FSS (p = 0.184). A significant, positive, moderate (r = 0.329; p < 0.001) correlation was found between FSS and PSQI mean scores (Table 5).

	Mean±SD	Minimum	Maximum
ISI	1.81±2.515	0	12
PSQI	6.01±2.61	1	16
FSS	3.70±1.83	0	7
ISI Incontinence Le	vels	n	%
None (0) Mild (1-2) Moderate (3-6) Severe (8-9) Very Severe (10-12)		121 106 70 8 6	38.90 34.10 22.50 2.60 1.90
Total		311	100.00
PSQI Sleep Quality	Levels	n	%
Good Sleep Quality Poor Sleep Quality Total		97 214 311	31.20 68.80 100.00
FSS Fatigue Level		n	%
No Yes		166 145	53.40 46.60
Total		311	100.00

Table 3. Urinary incontinence, sleep, and fatigue levels of the pregnant women (n=311)

ISI: Incontinence Severity Index, PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, FSS: Fatigue Severity Index



**Table 4.** Comparison of urinary incontinence characteristics of the pregnant women with their PSQI and FSS mean scores (n=311)

Urinary Incontinence Characteristics	PSQI Mean±SD	Analysis	FSS Mean±SD	Analysis
Rushing to the toilet to urinate				
Yes	6.33±2.54	t=2.620	3.80±1.73	t=1.142
No	$5.55 \pm 2.64$	p=0.009	3.56±1.96	p=0.254
Urinary incontinence before reaching the toilet				
Yes	6.61±2.89	t=2.559	3.87±1.83	t=0.964
No	5.77±2.26	p=0.011	3.64±1.83	p=0.336
Incontinence due to laughing, coughing, sneezing, e	etc.			
Yes	6.42±2.76	t=2.682	3.59±1.81	t=-1.087
No	5.63±2.41	p=0.008	3.81±1.85	p=0.278
Feeling of the full bladder after urination				
Yes	6.57±2.62	t=3.596	3.79±1.84	t=0.787
No	5.52±2.50	p<0.001	3.63±1.82	p=0.432
It takes too long to urinate				
Yes	6.36±2.76	t=1.341	3.35±1.83	t=-1.945
No	5.89±2.55	p=0.181	3.82±1.82	p=0.053
Feeling of wetness in undergarment without the fee	eling of a full	bladder		
Yes	6.68±2.74	t=3.248	4.03±1.80	t=2.244
No	5.67±2.48	p=0.001	3.54±1.83	p=0.026
Going to the toilet without the urge to urinate				
Yes	6.86±2.98	t=3.215	3.89±1.75	t=0.984
No	5.75±2.43	p=0.001	3.65±1.86	p=0.326
Use of daily pads due to incontinence	1			
Yes	6.18±2.84	t=0.517	4.05±1.77	t=1.433
No	5.97±2.56	p=0.606	3.64±1.84	p=0.153
Limitation of daily activities due to incontinence	1		1	
Yes	7.11±2.92	t=1.901	3.81±1.88	t=0.266
NO	5.93±2.57	p=0.058	3.70±1.83	p=0.790
Limitation of liquid intake due to incontinence				
Yes	6.39±3.013	t=0.640	4.22±1.68	t=1.235
No	5.98±2.58	p=0.523	3.67±1.84	p=0.218
Incontinence during sleep				
Yes	6.08±2.25	t=0.180	2.21±1.31	t=-5.723
NO	6.00±2.66	p=0.857	3.92±1.80	p<0.001

SD: Standard Deviation, t= Independent sample t-test.



**Table 5.** The relation between pregnant women's urinary continence, sleep, and fatigue levels (n=311)

		PSQI	FSS
ISI	r	0.209	0.075
	<b>p</b> *	<0.001	0.184
PSQI	r	-	0.329
	p*	-	<0.001

\*Pearson correlation analysis, ISI: Incontinence Severity Index, PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, FSS: Fatigue Severity Scale.

# Discussion

The aim of our study was to investigate the relationship between urinary incontinence and fatigue level and sleep quality during pregnancy. When evaluated in line with our aim, as the level of incontinence increased in pregnant women, poor sleep quality increased. The presence of urinary incontinence during pregnancy causes pregnant women to have poor sleep quality. Frequent urge for voiding due to urinary incontinence complaints and the interruption of day and night sleep may affect the sleep quality of pregnant women. Therefore, nurses and midwives need to cope with sleep problems during pregnancy. Nurses and midwives should explain the effects of qualified and restful sleep on pregnancy and determine the factors that impair sleep quality. Besides, pregnant women should be informed that fluid intake should be restricted at least two hours before bedtime and that they should go to the toilet before going to bed.

Anatomical and physiological changes during pregnancy cause a deterioration in the pelvic structure, and it is stated in studies that the prevalence of urinary incontinence increases during this period.<sup>15,17,26</sup> In our study, 62.10% of the pregnant women had mild to very severe urinary incontinence. In the literature, the frequency of urinary incontinence in pregnant women varies between 16% and 60%.<sup>15,17,26</sup> In our study, poor sleep quality was found in approximately one out of ten pregnant women. Studies conducted in Turkey<sup>13,18,19</sup> and around the world<sup>27,28</sup> support the outcome that pregnant women have poor sleep quality. Sleep problems during pregnancy are serious. Coping with sleep problems is important for improving maternal and fetal health.<sup>10</sup> Women's health nurses and midwives should definitely evaluate pregnant women's sleep quality as part of the antenatal care services.

In our study, the mean FSS score of the pregnant women with complaints of a feeling of wetness in underwear without feeling that the bladder is full and urinary incontinence during sleep was significantly higher than those without these complaints. In our study, as the fatigue level of the pregnant women increases, their sleep quality level decreases, but no relationship was found between the severity of urinary



incontinence and the severity of fatigue. Since the complaint of urinary incontinence during sleep causes an interruption in the sleep of pregnant women, it may cause inadequate rest and increased fatigue levels. Our study results also support this outcome. In addition, the feeling of wetness in underwear can cause pregnant women to change underwear frequently and increase their fatigue levels by causing physical and psychological discomfort. Çoban and Yanıkkerem (2010) found that sleep disorders in pregnant women increase their fatigue levels and negatively affect their daily work.<sup>12</sup> It is important for pregnant women to cope with urinary incontinence complaints in order to increase their sleep quality and reduce their fatigue levels.

In our study, fatigue was found in approximately half of the pregnant women. Depending on the questionnaires used in studies and the countries in which those studies have been conducted, very different fatigue rates during pregnancy have been reported. Mortazavi and Brozoee (2019) reported a mean fatigue rate of 93% in pregnant women,<sup>29</sup> and Yehia et al. (2020) stated that 67.40% of the pregnant women experienced fatigue.<sup>30</sup> Physiological and psychological changes during pregnancy cause some undesirable symptoms, and fatigue and sleep are the leading symptoms.<sup>12,15</sup> Therefore, factors that cause sleep problems and fatigue in pregnant women should be evaluated during prenatal visits. Urinary incontinence, which is our present subject, should not be overlooked as mentioned above.

In our study, the frequency of urinary incontinence, poor sleep quality, and fatigue in pregnant women was found to be high. As the severity of urinary incontinence increases in pregnant women, poor sleep quality increases. In addition, the lower the level of sleep quality, the higher the level of fatigue. According to these results, we can say that the complaint of urinary incontinence in pregnant women negatively affects their sleep quality, and sleep quality decreases and fatigue increases together. Family practitioners, nurses, and midwives should definitely evaluate urinary incontinence, sleep problems, and fatigue levels of pregnant women with urinary incontinence complaints to enable them to prevent these complaints or cope with them. Pregnant women with persisting complaints should be referred to a urologist. The sleep habits of pregnant women should be made to enable them to cope with these problems.

#### Limitations

Study findings are limited to the sample group and cannot be generalized to the general public. Since the data are based on self-report, the severity of urinary incontinence, sleep quality, and fatigue levels of the pregnant women are subjective data. Another limitation is that illiterate pregnant women were not included in the study.



### Ethical Considerations

Before the study, permission was obtained from the ethics committee (Date; 2019 / Decision No; 14632) and also from the hospital where the study was conducted (Date; 12.01.2020 / Decision No; 86737044-806.01.03). All pregnant women participating in the study were informed about the study and their consent was obtained.

### Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.



# References

- 1. Soma-Pillay P, Catherine NP, Tolppanen H, Mebazaa A, Tolppanen H, Mebazaa, A. Physiological changes in pregnancy. Cardiovasc J Afr 2016;27:89-94.
- 2. Wesnes SL, Rortveit G, Bø K, Hunskaar S. Urinary incontinence during pregnancy. Obstet Gynecol 2007;109:922-8.
- 3. Helli A, DolapçıoğluK, Çekiç Ç. Gebelikte üriner sistemde meydana gelen anatomic ve fizyolojik değişiklikler. Turk Urol Sem2011;2:121-3.
- International Continence Society: ICS. Urinary incontinence. [İnternet]; Available from https://www.ics.org/glossary/symptom/urinaryincontinence?q=incontinence (Erişim tarihi: 16.06.2020).
- 5. Othman JAM, Åkervall S, Milsom I, Gyhagen M. Urinary incontinence in nulliparous women aged 25-64 years: a national survey. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2017;216:1-11.
- 6. Sangsawang B, Sangsawang N. Stress urinary incontinence in pregnant women: a review of prevalence, pathophysiology, and treatment. Int Urogynecol J 2013; 24:901-12.
- Nigam A, Ahmad A, Gaur D, Elahi AA, Batra S. Prevalence and risk factors for urinary incontinence in pregnant women during late third trimester. Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol 2017;5:2187-91.
- Southall K, Tuazon JR, Djokhdem AH, van den Heuvel EA, Wittich W, Jutai JW. Assessing the stigma content of urinary incontinence intervention outcome measures. J Rehabil Assist Technol Eng 2017;4:1-13.
- 9. Uğurlucan FG, Comba C, Emegil Ş, Yalçın Ö. Thoughts and attitudes toward urinary incontinence in Turkey. İst Tıp Fak Derg 2017;79:141-6.
- 10. Chang JJ, Pien GW, Duntley SP, Macones GA. Sleep deprivation during pregnancy and maternal and fetal outcomes: is there a relationship? Sleep Med. Rev 2010;14:107-14.
- 11. Li R, Zhang J, Zhou R, et al. Sleep disturbances during pregnancy are associated with cesarean delivery and preterm birth. J Matern-Fetal Neo M 2017;30:733-8.
- Çoban A, Yanıkkerem UE. Gebelerde uyku kalitesi ve yorgunluk düzeyi. Ege Tıp Dergisi 2010;49:87-94.
- 13. Köybaşı EŞ, Oskay ÜY. Gebelik sürecinin uyku kalitesine etkisi. Gulhane Med J 2017;59:1-5.
- 14. Palagini L, Gemignani A, Banti S, Manconi M, Mauri M, Riemann D. Chronic sleep loss during pregnancy as a determinant of stress: impact on pregnancy outcome. Sleep Med 2014;15:853-9.
- 15. Kocaöz S, Talas MS, Atabekoğlu CS. Urinary incontinence in pregnant women and their quality of life. J. Clin. Nurs 2010;19:3314-23.



- 16. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang AG, Buchner A. G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. Behav. Res. Methods 2007;39:175–191.
- Franco EM, Parés D, Colomé NL, Paredes JRM, Tardiu LA. Urinary incontinence during pregnancy. Is there a difference between first and third trimester? Eur. J. Obstet. Gynecol. Reprod. Biol 2014;182:86-90.
- 18. Çelik F, Köse M. Gebelikte uyku kalitesinin trimestır ile ilişkisi. KocatepeTıp Dergisi 2017;18(3):85-8.
- 19. Alan Dikmen H. Gebelerde huzursuz bacak sendromunun uyku kalitesi ve kaygı düzeyi üzerine etkisi. ACU Sağlık Bil Derg 2020; 1-7 (doi: 10.31067/0.2020.282).
- 20. Sandwik H, Hunskaar S, Seim A, Hermstad R, VanvikA, Bratt H. Validation of a severity index in female urinary incontinence and its implementation in an epidemiological survey. J Epidemiol Commun H 1993;47:497-9.
- 21. Hazar HU, Şirin A. Inkontinans şiddet indeksinin geçerlik ve güvenirliği çalışması. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi 2008;9:5-8.
- 22. Buysse DJ, Reynolds III CF, Monk TH Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The Pittsburg Sleep Quality Index: a new instrument for psychiatric and research. Psychiatry Res 1989;28:193-213.
- 23. Agargun M. Pitsburgh uyku kalitesinin geçerliliği ve güvenirliği. Turk Psikiyatri Derg 1996;7:107-5.
- 24. Krupp LB, LaRocca NG, Muir-Nash J, Steinberg AD. The Fatigue Severity Scale. Application to Patients with Multiple Sclerosis and Systemic Lupus Erythematosus. Arch Neurol 1989;46:1121–3.
- 25. Armutlu K, Korkmaz NC, Keser I, Sumbuloglu V, Akbıyık DI, Guney Z, Karabudak R. The validity and reliability of the fatigue severity scale in Turkish multiple sclerosis patients. Int J Rehabil Res 2007;30:81-5.
- 26. Wesnes SL, Lose G. Preventing urinary incontinence during pregnancy and postpartum: a review. Int Urogynecol J 2013;24:889-99.
- 27. Mindell JA, Cook RA, Nikolovski J. Sleep patterns and sleep disturbances across pregnancy. Sleep Med 2015;16(4):483-8.
- 28. Yang Y, Maoa J, Yeb Z, Zengc X, Zhaoa H, Liua Y, Li J. Determinants of sleep quality among pregnant women in China: a cross-sectional survey. J Matern-Fetal Neo M 2017;31(22):2980-5.
- 29. Mortazavi F, Borzoee F. Fear of childbirth, fatigue, and well-being in pregnant women. JOGCR 2019;4:45-50.
- 30. Yehia DBM, Malak MZ, Al-Thwabih NN, et al. Psychosocial factors correlate with fatigue among pregnant women in Jordan. Perspect Psychiatr Care 2020;56:46-53.