

Fetal Soft Markers in Obstetric Ultrasound

PRINCIPAL AUTHORS

Michiel C. Van den Hof, MD, Halifax NS
R. Douglas Wilson, MD, Philadelphia PA

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

DIAGNOSTIC IMAGING COMMITTEE

Stephen Bly, PhD, Health Canada Radiation Protection Bureau, Ottawa ON

Robert Gagnon, MD, London ON

Ms. Barbara Lewthwaite, MN, Winnipeg MB

Ken Lim, MD, Vancouver BC

Lucie Morin, MD, Montreal QC

Shia Salem, MD, Toronto ON

GENETICS COMMITTEE

Victoria Allen, MD, Halifax NS

Claire Blight, BN, Halifax NS

Gregory Davies, MD, Kingston ON

Valerie Desilets, MD, Montreal QC

Alain Gagnon, MD, Vancouver BC

Gregory Reid, MD, Winnipeg MB

Anne Summers, MD, North York ON

Phil Wyatt, MD, North York ON

David C. Young, MD, Halifax NS

Abstract

Objective: To evaluate ultrasound "soft markers" used in fetal genetic screening.

Options: Ultrasound screening at 16 to 20 weeks is one of the most common genetic screening and (or) diagnostic tests used during pregnancy. The practical concern for ultrasound screening is false-positive and false-negative (missed or not present) results. The use and understanding of ultrasound soft markers and their screening relative risks is an important option in the care of pregnant women. Currently, the presence of a "significant" ultrasound marker adds risk to the likelihood of fetal pathology, but the absence of soft markers, except in controlled situations, should not be used to reduce fetal risk.

Key Words: Ultrasound, soft marker, prenatal screening, fetus, aneuploidy, trisomy, genetic

Outcomes: The use of ultrasound in pregnancy has significant health and economic outcomes for families and the health care system, compared with no ultrasound use. The Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada (SOGC) recommends a single "routine" ultrasound evaluation at 16 to 20 weeks in all pregnancies. Patients need to be counselled about the positive and negative findings that ultrasound may reveal so they are prepared for unexpected pregnancy knowledge and the possibility of further testing options being offered.

Evidence: Committee members were asked to review specific soft marker ultrasound topics after consensus was reached on the most commonly published soft markers. Medline and PubMed databases were searched for peer-reviewed English articles published from 1985 to 2003. Reviews of each soft marker topic were written by committee members with quality of evidence and classification of recommendations. These reviews were then circulated and discussed by the combined committee. Final format for the guideline was completed by the committee chairpersons.

Values: The quality of evidence and classification of recommendations followed discussion and consensus by the combined committees of Diagnostic Imaging and Genetics of the SOGC.

Benefits, Harms, Costs: It is not possible at this time to determine the benefits, harms, and costs of the guideline because this would require health surveillance and research and health resources not presently available; however, these factors need to be evaluated in a prospective approach by provincial and tertiary initiatives. Consideration of these issues is in the options and outcome section of this abstract.

Recommendations:

1. The screening ultrasound at 16 to 20 weeks should evaluate 8 markers, 5 of which (thickened nuchal fold, echogenic bowel, mild ventriculomegaly, echogenic focus in the heart, and choroid plexus cyst) are associated with an increased risk of fetal aneuploidy, and in some cases with nonchromosomal problems, while 3 (single umbilical artery, enlarged cisterna magna, and pyelectasis) are only associated with an increased risk of nonchromosomal abnormalities when seen in isolation (II-2 B).
2. Identification of soft markers for fetal aneuploidy requires correlation with other risk factors, including history, maternal age, and maternal serum testing results (II-1 A).
3. Soft markers identify a significant increase in fetal risk for genetic disease. Timely referral for confirmation, counselling, and investigation is required to maximize management options (III-B).

Validation: Peer-reviewed guideline development is part of the committee process in addition to SOGC council and editorial review.

Sponsors: SOGC.

J Obstet Gynaecol Can 2005;27(6):592-612

These guidelines reflect emerging clinical and scientific advances as of the date issued and are subject to change. The information should not be construed as dictating an exclusive course of treatment or procedure to be followed. Local institutions can dictate amendments to these opinions. They should be well documented if modified at the local level. None of these contents may be reproduced in any form without prior written permission of the SOGC.