Hyperemesis Gravidarum: Biological Mechanisms, Maternal and Fetal Complications, Clinical Interventions, and Gender Disparities in Reproductive Healthcare

Zainab Usman

Abstract

Hyperemesis Gravidarum (HG) is a severe pregnancy-related disorder characterized by persistent nausea, vomiting, dehydration, and significant weight loss. This paper evaluates the biological mechanisms, maternal and fetal complications, clinical treatment studies, and gender disparities associated with HG. Current research demonstrates that hormonal and genetic factors play a significant role in the development of HG, particularly elevated human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG), estrogen sensitivity, and Growth Differentiation Factor 15 (GDF15). Furthermore, HG has been associated with a range of adverse pregnancy outcomes, including miscarriage, low birth weight, small-for-gestational-age infants, and preterm birth — with infants born to mothers with HG weighing approximately 172 grams less on average than those born to unaffected mothers. This paper argues that HG should be understood as a multifactorial disorder shaped by hormonal, genetic, clinical, and social factors. Future research should prioritize standardized diagnostic criteria, larger randomized clinical trials, and improved recognition of women's reproductive health concerns in order to advance treatment effectiveness and reduce healthcare disparities for patients affected by HG.

Introduction

Hyperemesis Gravidarum, a severe form of nausea and vomiting during pregnancy, has been recognized for centuries, with early medical descriptions dating to Ancient Greek physicians who documented excessive vomiting in pregnant women. Over time, research expanded across Europe and eventually the United States, gradually bringing greater clinical attention to this condition. Nausea and vomiting affect a significant proportion of pregnant women; yet for a clinically distinct subset of patients, this experience extends far beyond typical morning sickness. HG typically

manifests between 4 and 6 weeks of gestation and affects approximately 0.3 to 3% of pregnancies worldwide. Characterized by persistent vomiting, significant weight loss, dehydration, and electrolyte imbalances, HG can severely interfere with a woman's ability to maintain normal daily life and functioning.

In most cases, affected women are unable to maintain adequate nutrition or hydration, frequently necessitating immediate hospital care or prolonged hospitalization. Beyond the physical effects during pregnancy, HG can also produce lasting consequences including anxiety, depression, and a markedly reduced quality of life. Due to the serious potential complications for both the mother and the fetus, early recognition and appropriate medical intervention are essential for improving outcomes. This research publication examines the biological mechanisms and causes of HG, the influence of HG on pregnancy loss and fetal health, the current state of clinical trials targeting HG treatments, and the broader issue of gender bias in clinical research for women's reproductive health.

Discussion

Biological Mechanisms and Causes of HG: Hormonal Factors and Genetic Predisposition

Current research has established that hormonal factors and genetic predisposition play a central role in susceptibility to Hyperemesis Gravidarum. Elevated human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG) and estrogen levels have both been associated with HG onset: hCG can stimulate the thyroid gland, contributing to transient hyperthyroidism that worsens nausea and vomiting, while elevated estrogen may slow gastric emptying and heighten the sensitivity of the brain's vomiting center (Gabra, 2019). A third and increasingly recognized hormonal driver is Growth Differentiation Factor 15 (GDF15), a hormone produced by the placenta that acts on brain regions governing nausea and appetite regulation. Biological evidence suggests that HG occurs when women are exposed to higher levels of GDF15 than their bodies are accustomed to prior to conception, with women who have low baseline GDF15 before pregnancy being particularly vulnerable to developing the condition.

Genetic predisposition has also emerged as a significant contributor, with HG demonstrating clear familial aggregation: sisters of affected women carry a 17-fold higher risk of developing the condition (Zhang et al., 2011). This pattern indicates a heritable biological susceptibility that extends beyond environmental causes alone. Key genes implicated in this predisposition include GDF15, IGFBP7, and GFRAL — the latter encoding receptors in brainstem regions associated with nausea signaling — all of which influence both hormone production and sensitivity to nausea

stimuli (Fejzo et al., 2023). Taken together, these findings support the interpretation of HG as a gene-hormone interaction disorder, where genetic predisposition shapes a woman's baseline hormonal environment and physiological sensitivity. This understanding calls for moving beyond single-cause models toward a more systems-based approach to pregnancy-related nausea disorders.

Influence of HG on Pregnancy Loss, Miscarriage, and Fetal Complications

Hyperemesis Gravidarum is estimated to affect between 0.3% and 1.5% of all live births and is associated with a range of serious maternal and fetal complications (Koudijs et al., 2016). Among the most consistently documented fetal risks is low birth weight: researchers have found that infants born to mothers with HG weigh approximately 172 grams less on average than infants born to unaffected mothers. Additional fetal complications include small-for-gestational-age (SGA) status — defined as birth weight below the 10th percentile for gestational age — and preterm birth, defined as delivery before 37 completed weeks of pregnancy. These outcomes reflect the downstream consequences of prolonged maternal malnutrition, dehydration, and metabolic disturbance.

Pregnancy loss represents one of the most serious potential complications associated with HG. Among pregnancies diagnosed with HG, 299 cases resulted in miscarriage, and 24% of patients required hospital readmission during the first or early second trimester — typically presenting with more severe disease, longer symptom duration, and greater antibiotic utilization (Nurmi et al., 2022). The role of hCG in mediating these outcomes is also notable: hCG levels peak at approximately 9 weeks of gestation, closely mirroring the timing of peak HG symptom severity. While mildly elevated hCG reflects a healthy placenta, extremely high levels have been correlated with adverse fetal outcomes and an increased risk of miscarriage (Moberg et al., 2023). These findings collectively highlight the clinical urgency of early HG identification and intervention.

Evaluation of Clinical Studies Targeting HG

A significant challenge across the clinical literature on HG is the absence of consistent diagnostic definitions and outcome measures. Recent systematic reviews have found that studies evaluating HG treatments are relatively limited in number, and that the certainty of evidence for many interventions is rated as low or very low. Clinical trials have evaluated the effectiveness of antihistamines, metoclopramide, ondansetron, corticosteroids, and acupressure as targeted treatments; however, findings have been inconsistent and often mixed, suggesting possible benefits for specific patients without establishing universal effectiveness. These results underscore that HG management should be individualized based on symptom severity, maternal hydration and

nutritional status, and medication response (Nelson-Piercy, 2001).

A key contributor to this evidential inconsistency is the variable definition of HG across studies. Some trials define HG by persistent vomiting and dehydration alone, while others require additional criteria such as greater than 5% pre-pregnancy weight loss, ketonuria, electrolyte imbalance, or hospitalization (SA et al., 2019). Small sample sizes and heterogeneous outcome measures further limit the comparability and generalizability of existing data. Standardizing outcomes across PUQE scores, hospitalization rates, maternal weight change, electrolyte correction, and fetal health indicators would allow for more meaningful synthesis of results across trials — and ultimately enable clinicians to determine with greater confidence which treatments are safest and most effective for the HG patient population.

Gender Bias in Clinical Research for Women's Reproductive Health

Research on Hyperemesis Gravidarum has revealed a broader pattern of gender bias within clinical research and healthcare delivery that has meaningfully delayed progress in understanding and treating the condition. Researchers have documented that the chronic underrepresentation of women in clinical studies — including the historical exclusion of pregnant women from biomedical research — has produced significant gaps in knowledge about women's health (Rothenberg, 1996). In the context of HG, some clinical studies investigating miscarriage and pregnancy complications have excluded pregnant women from participation entirely, compounding delays in diagnosis and treatment. A 1994 National Academy of Medicine report formally recognized this deficit, affirming that pregnant women should be presumed eligible to participate in biomedical research; yet today, an estimated 80% of therapies regularly prescribed to pregnant women remain untested in pregnant populations (Mastroianni, Faden & Federman, 1994).

Beyond exclusion from research, women with HG have also contended with a persistent cultural misconception that frames the condition as a psychological or behavioral disorder rather than a physiological one. Women experiencing HG have been blamed for their illness or characterized as emotionally unstable, generating biological and psychological controversies that have undermined appropriate clinical care (Rothenberg, 1996). Research has further highlighted how healthcare systems have inadequately acknowledged the emotional and physical burden of HG, focusing disproportionately on hospitalization data while neglecting patients' lived experiences (Munch, 2002). The normalization of severe pregnancy-related suffering and the stigma attached to it have prevented many women from feeling understood and supported during treatment (Browne, 2023). Addressing these structural disparities — through earlier intervention, improved primary care

recognition, and more compassionate clinical frameworks — is essential to reducing the harm caused by delayed and insufficient HG care.

Ethics, Discussion, and Limitations

Research on Hyperemesis Gravidarum surfaces important ethical considerations regarding the duty of care owed to pregnant patients. The principle of beneficence — requiring healthcare providers to act in the best interest of their patients — is particularly salient when some providers continue to attribute the severity of HG to psychological rather than physiological causes, potentially delaying essential treatment (Varkey, 2020). When suffering is severe, early and decisive clinical intervention is not only medically warranted but ethically required. Informed consent presents an additional ethical dimension: pharmacological interventions used in HG management, such as corticosteroids and ondansetron, carry potential fetal risks that must be thoroughly disclosed to patients prior to treatment, ensuring that women can make fully informed decisions about their care.

The systematic exclusion of pregnant women from clinical trials also raises significant ethical concerns about justice and equitable research representation. As noted, approximately 80% of therapies routinely prescribed to pregnant women have not been tested in pregnant populations — a gap that not only limits clinical knowledge but places patients in the position of receiving undertested interventions without adequate evidence of safety or efficacy (Mastroianni, Faden & Federman, 1994). Data privacy concerns represent an additional consideration, particularly as diagnostic technologies generate sensitive reproductive health data that may be used for secondary analysis or algorithm development without explicit patient consent. Future research should prioritize longitudinal cohort studies with standardized diagnostic criteria, diverse and inclusive participant populations, and rigorous ethical oversight to ensure that advances in HG research are both scientifically valid and equitably distributed.

Conclusion

Hyperemesis Gravidarum is a complex and multifactorial pregnancy disorder shaped by an interaction of hormonal, genetic, clinical, and social forces. Its hallmark symptoms of severe nausea and vomiting can profoundly disrupt a pregnant woman's physical health, daily functioning, and psychological well-being, with documented associations to serious maternal and fetal complications including dehydration, hospitalization, miscarriage, low birth weight, and preterm birth. In more severe cases, HG contributes to long-term anxiety, depression, and diminished quality of life.

Despite ongoing research progress, significant limitations persist — most notably the inconsistent diagnostic criteria that constrain the comparability and clinical utility of existing trial data. The identification of GDF15 as a central hormonal driver represents a meaningful advance, and promising therapeutic strategies currently under investigation — including non-IgG immunotherapies, small peptide and molecule antagonists, and novel delivery methods such as transdermal patches — offer a path toward more targeted treatment. However, realizing the full potential of these advances will require a commitment to standardized research frameworks, the meaningful inclusion of pregnant women in clinical trials, and a concerted effort to dismantle the gender biases that have historically undermined the diagnosis and treatment of women's reproductive health conditions. The future of HG research and care depends on integrating biological precision with equity, compassion, and evidence-based clinical practice.

References

Browne, T. K. (2023). The far-reaching burden of hyperemesis gravidarum: An exploration of women's experiences and perceptions of healthcare support. *Women & Health, 63*(6), 423–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/03630242.2023.2219749

Dean, C. R., Bannigan, K., & Marsden, J. (2018). Reviewing the effect of hyperemesis gravidarum on women's lives and mental health. *British Journal of Midwifery, 26*(2), 109–119. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjom.2018.26.2.109

Fejzo, M., Rocha, N., Cimino, I., Lockhart, S. M., Petry, C. J., Kay, R. G., … O'Rahilly, S. (2024). GDF15 linked to maternal risk of nausea and vomiting during pregnancy. *Nature, 625*(7996), 760–767. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06921-9

Fejzo, M., Pujol-Gualdo, N., Laisk, T., MacGibbon, K., Wang, X., & Mancuso, N. (2023). Genome-wide association study meta-analysis of hyperemesis gravidarum confirms GDF15 and identifies additional risk loci. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 228*(1), S185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2022.11.349

Fejzo, M., Trovik, J., Grooten, I. J., Sinha, C., Painter, R. C., Vikanes, Å., Williamson, C., & Mullin, P. M. (2019). Nausea and vomiting of pregnancy and hyperemesis gravidarum. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers, 5*(1), 62. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-019-0110-3

Fejzo, M. (2024). Hyperemesis gravidarum theories dispelled by recent research: A paradigm change for better care and outcomes. *Trends in Molecular Medicine, 30*(7), 617–627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmed.2024.05.002

Gabra, A. (2019). Hyperemesis gravidarum: Diagnosis and pathogenesis. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331706123

Grooten, I. J., Painter, R. C., Pontesilli, M., van der Post, J. A. M., Mol, B. W., van Eijsden, M., Vrijkotte, T. G. M., & Roseboom, T. J. (2016). Weight loss in pregnancy and cardiometabolic profile in childhood. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 124*(8), 1265–1274. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.14021

Koudijs, H. M., Savitri, A. I., Browne, J. L., Amelia, D., Baharuddin, M., Grobbee, D. E., & Uiterwaal, C. S. P. M. (2016). Hyperemesis gravidarum and placental dysfunction disorders. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 16*, 374. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-016-1174-7

Mastroianni, A. C., Faden, R., & Federman, D. (Eds.). (1994). *Women and health research: Ethical and legal issues of including women in clinical studies*. National Academies Press.

Mitchell-Jones, N., Gallos, I., Farren, J., Tobias, A., Bottomley, C., & Bourne, T. (2017). Psychological morbidity associated with hyperemesis gravidarum: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 124*(1), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.14180

Moberg, L. J., Laisk, T., Pujol-Gualdo, N., Sandin, S., Trovik, J., Fejzo, M., & Vikanes, Å. (2023). Hyperemesis gravidarum — new insights from a large Nordic registry-based cohort. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 23*, 179. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-023-05691-6

Munch, S. (2002). Women's experiences with a pregnancy complication: Causal explanations of hyperemesis gravidarum. *Social Work in Health Care, 36*(1), 59–76. https://doi.org/10.1300/J010v36n01_05

Nana, M., Tydeman, F., Bevan, G., Wood, R., & Nelson-Piercy, C. (2021). Hyperemesis gravidarum is associated with increased rates of termination of pregnancy and suicidal ideation. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 224*(6), 629–631. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2020.12.1210

Nana, M., Haggar, T., Boulding, H., Pow, R., Nelson-Piercy, C., & Williamson, C. (2025). Advancing the women's health strategy: A policy lab aimed at improving effective management of hyperemesis gravidarum. *Health Research Policy and Systems, 23*, 121. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-025-01384-y

Nelson-Piercy, C. (2001). Treatment of nausea and vomiting in pregnancy: When should it be treated and what can be safely taken? *Drug Safety, 24*(7), 483–486. https://doi.org/10.2165/00002018-200124070-00001

Nurmi, M., Rautava, P., Gissler, M., Vahlberg, T., & Polo-Kantola, P. (2022). Recurrence patterns of hyperemesis gravidarum. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 22*, 409. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-023-05691-6

Power, Z., Thomson, A. M., & Waterman, H. (2010). Understanding the stigma of hyperemesis gravidarum: Qualitative findings from an action research study. *Birth, 37*(3), 237–244. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-536X.2010.00411.x

Rothenberg, K. H. (1996). Gender matters: Implications for clinical research and women's health care. *Houston Law Review, 32*(5), 1201–1272.

SA, M., Grooten, I. J., Painter, R. C., & Roseboom, T. J. (2019). Interventions for treating hyperemesis gravidarum: A Cochrane systematic review. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858

Shields, K. E., & Lyerly, A. D. (2013). Exclusion of pregnant women from industry-sponsored clinical trials. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, *122*(5), 1077–1081. https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182a9ca67

Thygerson, J., Oyler, D., Thomas, J., Muse, B., Brooks, B. D., & Pullan, J. E. (2024). GDF15 targeting for treatment of hyperemesis gravidarum. *Medicines*, *11*(7), 17. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicines11070017

van der Graaf, R., & van Delden, J. J. M. (2018). Fair inclusion of pregnant women in clinical trials: An integrated scientific and ethical approach. *Trials*, *19*, 78. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-017-2402-9

Varkey, B. (2020). Principles of clinical ethics and their application to practice. *Medical Principles and Practice*, *30*(1), 17–28. https://doi.org/10.1159/000509119

Vikanes, Å., Grjibovski, A. M., Vangen, S., & Magnus, P. (2012). Hyperemesis gravidarum and long-term mortality: A population-based cohort study. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, *120*(3), 332–337. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.12060

Zhang, Y., Cantor, R. M., MacGibbon, K., Romero, R., Goodwin, T. M., Mullin, P. M., & Fejzo, M. S. (2011). Familial aggregation of hyperemesis gravidarum. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, *204*(3), 230.e1–230.e7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2010.09.018