

Development and validation of prediction models for fetal growth restriction and birthweight: an individual participant data meta-analysis

John Allotey,^{1*} Lucinda Archer,² Dyuti Coomar,¹ Kym IE Snell,² Melanie Smuk,³ Lucy Oakey,¹ Sadia Haqnawaz,⁴ Ana Pilar Betrán,⁵ Lucy C Chappell,⁶ Wessel Ganzevoort,⁷ Sanne Gordijn,⁸ Asma Khalil,⁹ Ben W Mol,^{10,11} Rachel K Morris,¹² Jenny Myers,¹³ Aris T Papageorghiou,⁹ Basky Thilaganathan,^{9,14} Fabricio Da Silva Costa,¹⁵ Fabio Facchinetti,¹⁶ Arri Coomarasamy,¹ Akihide Ohkuchi,¹⁷ Anne Eskild,¹⁸ Javier Arenas Ramírez,¹⁹ Alberto Galindo,²⁰ Ignacio Herraiz,²¹ Federico Prefumo,²² Shigeru Saito,²³ Line Sletner,²⁴ Jose Guilherme Cecatti,²⁵ Rinat Gabbay-Benziv,²⁶ Francois Goffinet,^{27,28} Ahmet A Baschat,²⁹ Renato T Souza,²⁵ Fionnuala Mone,³⁰ Diane Farrar,³¹ Seppo Heinonen,³² Kjell Å Salvesen,³³ Luc JM Smits,³⁴ Sohinee Bhattacharya,¹¹ Chie Nagata,³⁵ Satoru Takeda,³⁶ Marleen MHJ van Gelder,³⁷ Dewi Anggraini,³⁸ SeonAe Yeo,³⁹ Jane West,³¹ Javier Zamora,^{1,40} Hema Mistry,⁴¹ Richard D Riley² and Shakila Thangaratinam^{1,42} for the IPPIC Collaborative Network

¹WHO Collaborating Centre for Global Women's Health, Institute of Metabolism and Systems Research, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

²Centre for Prognosis Research, School of Medicine, Keele University, Keele, UK

³Blizard Institute, Centre for Genomics and Child Health, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK

⁴The Hildas, Dame Hilda Lloyd Network, WHO Collaborating Centre for Global Women's Health, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

⁵Department of Reproductive and Health Research, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

- ⁶Department of Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College London, London, UK
- ⁷Department of Obstetrics, Amsterdam UMC University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- ⁸Faculty of Medical Sciences, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands
- ⁹Fetal Medicine Unit, St George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Molecular and Clinical Sciences Research Institute, St George's University of London, London, UK
- ¹⁰Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Monash University, Monash Medical Centre, Clayton, Victoria, Australia
- ¹¹Aberdeen Centre for Women's Health Research, Institute of Applied Health Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK
- ¹²Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- ¹³Maternal and Fetal Health Research Centre, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Central Manchester NHS Trust, Manchester, UK
- ¹⁴Tommy's National Centre for Maternity Improvement, Royal College of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, London, UK
- ¹⁵Maternal Fetal Medicine Unit, Gold Coast University Hospital and School of Medicine, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia
- ¹⁶Mother-Infant Department, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Emilia-Romagna, Italy
- ¹⁷Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Jichi Medical University School of Medicine, Shimotsuke-shi, Tochigi, Japan
- ¹⁸Akershus University Hospital, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- ¹⁹Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Gijón, Spain
- ²⁰Fetal Medicine Unit, Maternal and Child Health and Development Network (SAMID), Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Hospital Universitario, Instituto de Investigación Hospital, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain
- ²¹Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Hospital Universitario, Madrid, Spain
- ²²Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Italy
- ²³Department Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Toyama, Toyama, Japan
- ²⁴Department of Pediatric and Adolescents Medicine, Akershus University Hospital, Sykehusveien, Norway
- ²⁵Obstetric Unit, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Campinas, Campinas, Sao Paulo, Brazil
- ²⁶Maternal Fetal Medicine Unit, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Hillel Yaffe Medical Center Hadera, Affiliated to the Ruth and Bruce Rappaport School of Medicine, Technion, Haifa, Israel
- ²⁷Maternité Port-Royal, AP-HP, APHP, Centre-Université de Paris, FHU PREMA, Paris, France
- ²⁸Université de Paris, INSERM U1153, Equipe de recherche en Epidémiologie Obstétricale, Périnatale et Pédiatrique (EPOPé), Centre de Recherche Epidémiologie et Biostatistique Sorbonne Paris Cité (CRESS), Paris, France
- ²⁹Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, MD, USA
- ³⁰Centre for Public Health, Queen's University, Belfast, UK
- ³¹Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford, UK

- ³²Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
- ³³Department of Laboratory Medicine, Children's and Women's Health, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway
- ³⁴Care and Public Health Research Institute, Maastricht University Medical Centre, Maastricht, the Netherlands
- ³⁵Center for Postgraduate Education and Training, National Center for Child Health and Development, Tokyo, Japan
- ³⁶Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Juntendo University, Tokyo, Japan
- ³⁷Department for Health Evidence, Radboud Institute for Health Sciences, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands
- ³⁸Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Lambung Mangkurat University, South Kalimantan, Indonesia
- ³⁹University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, School of Nursing, NC, USA
- ⁴⁰Clinical Biostatistics Unit, Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal (IRYCIS), Madrid, Spain
- ⁴¹Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Warwick, UK
- ⁴²Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK

*Corresponding author j.allotey.1@bham.ac.uk

Disclosure of interests

Full disclosure of interests: Completed ICMJE forms for all authors, including all related interests, are available in the toolkit on the NIHR Journals Library report publication page at <https://doi.org/10.3310/DABW4814>.

Primary conflicts of interest: Basky Thilaganathan reports funding from Tommy's Fund award and iPLACENTA. Fabricio Da Silva Costa is a member of the International Society of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology (ISUOG). Lucy C Chappell is Chief Executive Officer of the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). Asma Khalil is a member of the NIHR Funding Committee, an ISUOG trustee and Obstetric Lead at the National Maternity and Perinatal Audit (NMPA). Rachel K Morris is lead developer for Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG) guideline on fetal growth restriction and a member of the Saving Babies Care Bundle steering group. Richard D Riley reports payment for Statistical Reviews for the *BMJ* and occasionally other journals, guest lecturer at McGill and royalties for textbooks edited. Ben W Mol is supported by a NHMRC Investigator grant (GNT1176437), reports consultancy for ObsEva and has received research funding from Ferring and Merck. Aris T Papageorghiou is supported by the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). SeonAe Yeo reports grants from National Institute of Nursing Research (NINR). Alberto Galindo reports grants from Instituto de Salud Carlos III (Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness) and payment from Roche Diagnostics for lectures and expert advisory board membership. Ignacio Herraiz reports grants from Instituto de Salud Carlos III (Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness) and payment from Roche Diagnostics and Thermo-Fischer for lectures and expert advisory board membership. Sanne Gordijn reports payment from Roche as in-kind supply of sFLt/PLGF for fetal growth restriction studies CEPRA and grant from ZonMw. Arri Coomarasamy is a Funding Committee Member for EME.

Other authors do not report any competing interests.

Published August 2024
DOI: 10.3310/DABW4814

Plain language summary

Development and validation of prediction models for fetal growth restriction and birthweight: an individual participant data meta-analysis

Health Technology Assessment 2024; Vol. 28: No. 47
DOI: 10.3310/DABW4814

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

Plain language summary

One in ten babies is born small for their age. A third of such small babies are considered to be 'growth-restricted' as they have complications such as dying in the womb (stillbirth) or after birth (newborn death), cerebral palsy, or needing long stays in hospital. When growth restriction is suspected in fetuses, they are closely monitored and often delivered early to avoid complications. Hence, it is important that we identify growth-restricted babies early to plan care.

Our goal was to provide personalised and accurate estimates of the mother's chances of having a growth-restricted baby and predict the baby's weight if delivered at various time points in pregnancy. To do so, first we tested how accurate existing risk calculators ('prediction models') were in predicting growth restriction and birthweight. We then developed new risk-calculators and studied their clinical and economic benefits. We did so by accessing the data from individual pregnant women and their babies in our large database library (International Prediction of Pregnancy Complications).

Published risk-calculators had various definitions of growth restriction and none predicted the chances of having a growth-restricted baby using our definition. One predicted baby's birthweight. This risk-calculator performed well, but underpredicted the birthweight by up to 143 g.

We developed two new risk-calculators to predict growth-restricted babies (International Prediction of Pregnancy Complications-fetal growth restriction) and birthweight (International Prediction of Pregnancy Complications-birthweight). Both calculators accurately predicted the chances of the baby being born with growth restriction, and its birthweight. The birthweight was underpredicted by <9.7 g. The calculators performed well in both mothers predicted to be low and high risk.

Further research is needed to determine the impact of using these calculators in practice, and challenges to implementing them in practice. Both International Prediction of Pregnancy Complications-fetal growth restriction and International Prediction of Pregnancy Complications-birthweight risk calculators will inform healthcare professionals and empower parents make informed decisions on monitoring and timing of delivery.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.6

A list of Journals Library editors can be found on the [NIHR Journals Library website](#)

Launched in 1997, *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) has an impact factor of 3.6 and is ranked 32nd (out of 105 titles) in the 'Health Care Sciences & Services' category of the Clarivate 2022 Journal Citation Reports (Science Edition). It is also indexed by MEDLINE, CINAHL (EBSCO Information Services, Ipswich, MA, USA), EMBASE (Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands), NCBI Bookshelf, DOAJ, Europe PMC, the Cochrane Library (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), INAHTA, the British Nursing Index (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), Ulrichsweb™ (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) and the Science Citation Index Expanded™ (Clarivate™, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

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.

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Technology Assessment* journal

Manuscripts 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 article

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as award number 17/148/07. The contractual start date was in May 2019. The draft manuscript began editorial review in January 2022 and was accepted for publication in September 2022. 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' manuscript 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 article.

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care 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, 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, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

This article was published based on current knowledge at the time and date of publication. NIHR is committed to being inclusive and will continually monitor best practice and guidance in relation to terminology and language to ensure that we remain relevant to our stakeholders.

Copyright © 2024 Allotey *et al.* This work was produced by Allotey *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 adaptation 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 Newgen Digitalworks Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India (www.newgen.co).

