# Universal late pregnancy ultrasound screening to predict adverse outcomes in nulliparous women: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis

Gordon CS Smith,<sup>1\*</sup> Alexandros A Moraitis,<sup>1</sup> David Wastlund,<sup>2</sup> Jim G Thornton,<sup>3</sup> Aris Papageorghiou,<sup>4</sup> Julia Sanders,<sup>5</sup> Alexander EP Heazell,<sup>6</sup> Stephen C Robson,<sup>7</sup> Ulla Sovio,<sup>1</sup> Peter Brocklehurst<sup>8</sup> and Edward CF Wilson<sup>2,9</sup>

- <sup>1</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
- <sup>2</sup>The Primary Care Unit, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
- <sup>3</sup>Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
- <sup>4</sup>Nuffield Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK <sup>5</sup>School of Healthcare Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK
- <sup>6</sup>Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, School of Medical Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- <sup>7</sup>Reproductive and Vascular Biology Group, The Medical School, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
- <sup>8</sup>Birmingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- <sup>9</sup>Health Economics Group, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

**Declared competing interests of authors:** Gordon CS Smith reports grants from the Medical Research Council, National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Technology Assessment (HTA), the Wellcome Trust and Wellbeing of Women (London, UK); grants and personal fees from GlaxoSmithKline Research and Development Ltd (GlaxoSmithKline plc, Brentford, UK), grants from Sera Prognostics Inc. (Salt Lake City, UT), non-financial support from Illumina Inc. (San Diego, CA), and personal fees from Roche Diagnostics Ltd (Basel, Switzerland) outside the submitted work. Jim G Thornton is a member of the NIHR HTA and Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation Editorial Board. Aris Papageorghiou reports personal fees from educational events/lectures, clinical services in the private sector and consultancy via Oxford University Innovation, royalties from published works, and editorial work for *Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology* and *British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* outside the submitted work. Ulla Sovio reports grants from the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre during the conduct of the study. Peter Brocklehurst reports grants and personal fees from the Medical Research Council, grants from the NIHR Health Services and Delivery Research programme, the NIHR HTA programme and the Wellcome Trust, and personal fees from AG Biotest (Dreieich, Germany) outside the submitted work. In addition, Gordon CS Smith and Ulla Sovio have a patent in preparation for a novel predictive test for fetal growth restriction pending.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author gcss2@cam.ac.uk

Published February 2021 DOI: 10.3310/hta25150

# **Plain English summary**

Late pregnancy ultrasound screening to predict adverse outcomes Health Technology Assessment 2021; Vol. 25: No. 15

DOI: 10.3310/hta25150

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

# **Plain English summary**

Itrasound scans allow doctors to check on the health of an unborn infant. Usually, all pregnant women receive a scan at about 3 months and about 5 months of pregnancy. After that, women are offered a scan during birth only if they have risk factors or if a problem develops. Problems can arise in the later stages of pregnancy, including issues with the infant's growth or whether or not the infant is breech. Some of these problems may be prevented if a scan is carried out, but scans can also be inaccurate. When they are, a woman may receive unnecessary treatment, which could even harm her or her infant.

In this study we set out to review previous research about how good ultrasound scanning is at detecting infants who may be born with a condition. This study focused on detecting if the infant was too big or too small. Unfortunately, much of the previous research was not carried out to a high standard. Scanning can detect the size of a infant relatively well, but it is much less clear if scanning can predict complications that may harm the infant during birth. We also studied the costs and outcomes of scanning. We calculated the extra cost required to scan every woman and compared this with the extra benefits from preventing complications. One thing that ultrasound scans detect is whether the infant is presenting head first or bottom first (a 'breech presentation'), as infants presenting breech have high risks of complications. Scanning all women to check whether or not their infant is presenting breech seems to be cost-effective and the cost savings may even be higher than the cost of implementation, although this depends on how much the scan would cost.

Whether or not it is worthwhile scanning all infants to see if they are above or below the thresholds for normal size is less clear. A larger research study could provide more reliable numbers from which to draw a conclusion. We show how such a study could be designed, so that a single study could tell us both how well scans can predict adverse outcomes and how helpful this information is.

## **Health Technology Assessment**

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.370

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, the Cochrane Library and Clarivate Analytics Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

### Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

### **HTA** programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

### This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 15/105/01. The contractual start date was in March 2017. The draft report began editorial review in August 2019 and was accepted for publication in March 2020. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Copyright © 2021 Smith et al. This work was produced by Smith et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaption in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

### NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

### **NIHR Journals Library Editors**

**Professor John Powell** Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Professor of Digital Health Care, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

**Professor Andrée Le May** Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

**Professor Matthias Beck** Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Senior Scientific Adviser (Evidence Use), Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Emeritus Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

**Professor James Raftery** Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

**Professor Helen Snooks** Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

**Professor Jim Thornton** Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk