



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Fetal umbilical artery Doppler pulsatility index and childhood neurocognitive outcome at 12 years

Mone, F., McConnell, B., Thompson, A., Segurado, R., Hepper, P., Stewart, M. C., Dornan, J. C., Ong, S., McAuliffe, F. M., & Shields, M. D. (2016). Fetal umbilical artery Doppler pulsatility index and childhood neurocognitive outcome at 12 years. *BMJ Open*, 6(6). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008916>

Published in:
BMJ Open

Document Version:
Early version, also known as pre-print

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights
Copyright 2016 The Authors

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Title of Manuscript: Fetal Umbilical Artery Doppler Pulsatility Index and Childhood Neurocognitive Outcome at 12 years

Fionnuala MONE^{1,2}, Barbara McCONNELL³, Andrew THOMPSON⁴, Ricardo SEGURADO⁵, Peter HEPPER⁶, Moira C STEWART⁴, James C DORNAN⁷, Stephen ONG⁷
Fionnuala M McAULIFFE^{1,2}, Michael D SHIELDS^{4,8}

Affiliations:

¹ UCD Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine and Medical Sciences, University College Dublin, National Maternity Hospital, Dublin Ireland

² Department of Fetal Medicine, National Maternity Hospital, Dublin, Ireland

³ Department of Early Childhood Studies, Stranmillis University College, Belfast, UK

⁴ Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children, Belfast Health & Social Care Trust, Northern Ireland, UK

⁵ CSTAR, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science, University College Dublin, Ireland

⁶ Department of Psychology, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK

⁷ Department of Fetal Medicine, Royal Maternity Hospital, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK

⁸ Centre for Infection & Immunity, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK

Address correspondence to: Michael D Shields. Centre for Infection & Immunity, Health sciences Building, 97 Lisburn Road, BT 9 7AE, N Ireland, UK. Tel number: 0044(0)2890972155 Email: m.shields@qub.ac.uk

Keywords: Umbilical Artery Doppler; Pulsatility Index; Neurodevelopment; Cognition; Behaviour

Word Count: 3,492

ABSTRACT

Objective

To determine if an elevated fetal umbilical artery Doppler (UAD) pulsatility index (PI) at 28-weeks gestation, in the absence of fetal growth restriction (FGR) and prematurity, is associated with adverse neurocognitive outcome in children aged twelve.

Methods

Prospective cohort study, comparing children with a normal fetal UAD PI (<90th centile) (n=110) and those with an elevated PI (\geq 90th centile) (n=40). UAD was performed at 28-, 32- and 34-weeks gestation. At 12 years of age all children were assessed under standardized conditions in Queen's University, Belfast, UK to determine cognitive and behavioural outcomes using the British Ability Scale-II and Achenbach Child Behavioural Checklist Parent Rated Version under standardized conditions. Regression analysis was performed, controlling for confounders of gender, socioeconomic status, and age at assessment.

Results

The mean age of follow up was 12.4 years (+/- 0.5 SD) with 44% of children male (n=63). When UAD was assessed at 28-weeks' the elevated fetal UAD group had lower scores in cognitive assessments of information processing and memory. Parameters included (i) Recall of objects immediate verbal (p=0.002), (ii) delayed verbal (p=0.008) and (iii) recall of objects immediate spatial (p=0.0016). There were no significant differences between the Doppler groups at 32 or 34 weeks' gestation.

Conclusion

An elevated UAD PI at 28 weeks' gestation in the absence of FGR or prematurity is associated with poorer scores of declarative memory in children aged twelve years. A potential explanation for this is an element of placental insufficiency in the presence of the appropriately grown fetus, which impacts on development of the fetal hippocampus and information processing and memory long-term. These findings, however, had no impact upon overall academic ability, mental processing and reasoning or overall behavioural function.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Strengths

- Novel in concept/design
- Longest follow-up in a group of children with abnormal in-utero UAD measurements.
- Validity of methodology – standard investigation/same investigator who is blinded

Limitations

- Two rounds of recruitment in order to obtain adequate numbers led to uneven numbers in both groups
- Lack of placental and estimated fetal weight data

INTRODUCTION

The association between fetal growth in-utero and disease in later life was first proposed by Barker in the 1990's and is supported by further studies over past decades.¹⁻⁴ The fetal umbilical artery Doppler (UAD) pulsatility index (PI) measurement serves as a surrogate marker for the wellbeing of the fetus in-utero through assessing impedance within the fetoplacental circulation and is an indirect measure of resistance to flow within the placental vasculature. Typically, the PI is assessed using insonation of the fetal umbilical artery using pulsed wave colour Doppler ultrasonography and subsequent analysis can be performed to obtain gestation dependent centiles for the PI, with a PI of greater than the 90th or 95th centile signalling increased level of impedance in the majority of cases.⁵

While an abnormal UAD measurement is associated with perinatal death, its relationship with neurodevelopmental outcome is less clear. A recent Cochrane review of the application of the UAD concluded that there was no available evidence to assess the ability to predict substantive long-term outcomes, including neurodevelopment.⁶ In the presence of fetal growth restriction (FGR), an abnormal Doppler has an association with abnormal childhood neurodevelopment.⁷ An association between an abnormal UAD and neurological outcome in the apparently normally grown fetus has not been described to date.

The primary objective of this study is to compare childhood neurodevelopmental outcome in terms of (i) cognitive and (ii) behavioural performance in children at the age of 11 to 12 years that had elevated fetal UAD PI at 28-weeks' gestation compared to a control group with normal measurements, in the absence of FGR and pre-term delivery.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

In 1988, a prospective cohort study of 2097 consecutive non-growth restricted singleton pregnancies underwent serial UAD PI testing at 28, 34 and 38 weeks gestation to assess if the UAD PI could predict peri-natal outcome data.⁸

Patient Selection

The present study population included a nested case-control subset of patients from the aforementioned study aged 11-12 years⁸ that had had an in-utero UAD PI, randomly selected either above (abnormal) or below (normal) the 90th centile for gestational age at 28-weeks gestation as per pre-defined criteria,⁹ and alternatively defined as abnormal or normal on the PI centile at 34 and 38 weeks of gestation.¹⁰ A power calculation estimated that 100 subjects per group should be tested to detect a mean difference of 7.5 (standard deviation of 15) in the scores for components of the British Ability Score (BAS-II) assessments of cognitive function at 28 weeks, with a power of 94% at a significance level of 0.05. In the course of the study low response rates limited the sample to 180 with a 1:3.5 imbalance, however a post-hoc calculation indicated power was maintained at 79%. Results and assessments centred around UAD PI at 28-weeks due to the known association between Doppler status from 27-weeks and neurodevelopmental delay in pregnancies affected by FGR, high-lighting the significance of assessing at this gestation.¹¹ Anticipating the difficulties in locating and recruiting participants for follow up research, 724 names were initially selected and traced through the Central Services Agency. Following two rounds of recruitment, 204 subjects underwent psychological assessment. Subjects delivered pre-term (<37 weeks), with a small-for-gestational-age birth weight (<10th centile) or identifiable genetic syndromes were subsequently omitted, leaving an overall sample of 180 subjects. Following ethical approval from the Northern Ireland Research and Ethics committee, Queen's University Belfast, informed consent was obtained from parents and children for this study.

Assessments

In addition to physical assessment of cardiovascular and respiratory status,⁴ cognition and behaviour were tested under standardised conditions using validated questionnaires by a single child psychologist who was blinded to UAD PI category. Cognitive function was assessed using the BAS-II Questionnaire,¹² which is inclusive of (i) diagnostic scales; assessing information processing and memory, (ii) achievement scales; assessing academic performance and (iii) core scales which formulate the global conceptual ability score (GCA); assessing mental processing and reasoning. Behavioural function was assessed by a parent questionnaire through the Achenbach Child Behavioural Checklist Parent Rated Version (CBCL),¹³ which rates the presence of specific behaviours on a 3-point rating scale.

Statistical analysis

Number and percentages were derived for categorical characteristics, and means, standard deviations and medians and first and third quartiles (interquartile range) were calculated for continuous characteristics. Categorical characteristics were compared between the UAD PI groups using Student's t test after weighting for non-response. Several of the demographic and psychometric measures had a skew or other non-Normal distribution, and therefore the non-parametric Mann-Whitney tests were performed to compare the normal and elevated UAD PI groups. Outcomes of interest were carried forward to compare the normal and elevated UAD PI groups while adjusting for potential confounders including gender, age at assessment, and Townsend score as a proxy for socioeconomic status. These outcomes included all variables, which showed statistical significance at an alpha of 0.1 from the Mann-Whitney tests. Linear regression analyses were performed to adjust for confounders, and residuals closely inspected to verify assumptions were met. No correction for multiple testing was performed, and a p-value threshold of 0.05 was considered statistically significant in the final adjusted analyses. Psychometric scores with extreme non-Normal distributions were modelled using binary logistic regression after dichotomisation at the median, and adjusted for the same confounders. All analyses were performed in IBM SPSS v20, and weighted by the non-response rates in the respective recruitment cohorts and high/normal PI strata.

RESULTS

This study included 180 subjects; 40 with a UAD PI $\geq 90^{\text{th}}$ centile (elevated) and 140 with a UAD PI $< 90^{\text{th}}$ centile (normal). This accounts for 19.0% (40/210) and 7.4% (140/1887) of the original 2087 cohort respectively. The demographics of the study population at the time of assessment, delivery and during gestation are demonstrated in Table 1.

		UAD PI < 90 th centile N=140	UAD PI > 90 th centile N=40	All individuals N=180
Gender (male)		36 (54%)	27 (44%)	63 (49%)
Age of Child (yrs)		12.4 (0.5)	12.4 (0.4)	12.4 (0.5)
Age of mother (yrs)		40.5 (5.3)	39.9 (5.8)	40.2 (5.6)
Weight (kg)		44.1 (10.3)	45.5 (11.7)	44.9 (11.1)
Height(cm)		151.6 (7.7)	151.0 (7.6)	151.3 (7.6)
Townsend Score		1.66 (3.44)	1.66 (3.45)	1.66 (3.4)
Tanner public hair staging	1	32 (49%)	29 (48%)	61 (48%)
	2	15 (23%)	15 (25%)	30 (24%)
	3	5 (8%)	8 (13%)	13 (10%)
	4	13 (20%)	7 (12%)	20 (16%)
	5	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (2%)
I1+ grade = pass		39 (59%)	42 (69%)	81 (64%)
Maternal smoking		44 (33%)	15 (37%)	59 (34%)
Mode of delivery	Normal (SVD)	112 (81%)	31 (76%)	143 (79%)
	Assisted breech	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	2 (1%)
	Instrumental	15 (11%)	3 (7%)	18 (10%)
	Caesarean section	11 (8%)	6 (15%)	17 (9%)
Birth weight (g)		3679 (586)	3429 (426)	3532 (511)
Gestation (weeks+days)		40+3 (1+0)	40+1 (1+0)	40+2 (1+0)
APGAR 1 min		8 [7, 9]	8 [7, 9]	8 [7, 9]
APGAR 5 min		9 [9, 9]	9 [9, 9]	9 [9, 9]
Cord pH		7.29 (0.14)	7.30 (0.09)	7.29 (0.11)
PI 28 weeks		0.95 (0.06)	1.69 (0.29)	1.34 (0.43)
PI 34 weeks		0.96 (0.19)	1.06 (0.20)	1.02 (0.20)
PI 38 weeks		0.90 (0.20)	1.03 (0.15)	0.97 (0.18)

Table 1 – Demographic characteristics of study cohort at 28 weeks gestation in the normal (<90th centile) and elevated (>90th centile) umbilical artery Doppler (UAD) Pulsatility Index (PI) reported as mean with standard deviations (SD) or percentages respectively.

Following adjustment for potential confounders including gender, age at assessment, and Townsend score the findings between UAD PI groups (normal and elevated) were compared Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5. These findings are demonstrated for the variable aforementioned psychometric parameters assessed inclusive of the BAS II diagnostic scales (Table 2), achievement scales (Table 3), core scales (Table 4) and Achenbach CBCL (Table 5) for UAD performed at 28, 34 and 38 weeks respectively with associated p-values. The unadjusted version of this analysis is provided in Supplemental File 1.

Diagnostic Scale	Week 28 (1.73 threshold)			Week 34 (1.28 threshold)			Week 38 (1.17 threshold)		
	Normal	Elevated	p	Normal	Elevated	p	Normal	Elevated	p
	Recall of objects immediate verbal Mean (SD)	142.9 (1.9)	130.7 (3.3)	0.002	140.5 (1.8)	136.1 (5.3)	0.438	139.7 (2.0)	130.3 (6.2)
Recall of objects immediate spatial*Mean (SD)	0.48 (0.07)	0.69 (0.05)	0.016	0.53 (0.04)	0.58 (0.12)	0.731	0.59 (0.05)	0.46 (0.13)	0.380
Recall of objects delayed verbal Mean (SD)	15.6 (0.25)	14.3 (0.43)	0.008	15.3 (0.2)	14.6 (0.7)	0.298	15.1 (0.2)	14.1 (0.8)	0.206
Recall of objects delayed spatial* Mean (SD)	0.52 (0.05)	0.67 (0.07)	0.108	0.55 (0.04)	0.64 (0.12)	0.530	0.62 (0.04)	0.55 (0.13)	0.604
Speed of information processing - ability score Mean (SD)	163.2 (3.1)	157.9 (5.2)	0.389	163.0 (2.7)	154.6 (8.0)	0.323	160.0 (3.0)	163.1 (9.3)	0.750
Recall of digits forward - ability score Mean (SD)	151.5 (1.8)	150.4 (3.0)	0.761	150.9 (1.6)	150.1 (4.7)	0.872	150.7 (1.8)	150.2 (5.7)	0.941
Recall of pictures - ability score Mean (SD)	123.8 (1.2)	120.7 (2.1)	0.209	122.8 (1.1)	123.9 (3.3)	0.752	121.3 (1.3)	130.3 (3.9)	0.030
Recall of digits backwards - ability score Mean (SD)	129.8 (1.7)	124.1 (2.8)	0.087	128.6 (1.5)	126.4 (4.4)	0.634	128.6 (1.7)	125.4 (5.3)	0.564

Note: * logistic regression, mean in these cases refers to the odds of an abnormal (low) recall score for a child at the mean age (12.1 years) with a mean Townsend score (1.79).

Table 2 – Adjusted linear or logistic regression analysis for elevated (>90th centile) and normal (<90th centile) umbilical artery Doppler (UAD) pulsatility index (PI) for Validated British Ability Scales II diagnostic scale parameters at 28, 34 and 38 weeks expressed as mean and standard deviations (SD).

Achievement Scale									
	Week 28 (1.73 threshold)			Week 34 (1.28 threshold)			Week 38 (1.17 threshold)		
	Normal	Elevated	p	Normal	Elevated	p	Normal	Elevated	p
Number standard score Mean (SD)	111.6 (1.2)	108.1 (2.0)	0.143	110.8 (1.1)	108.5 (3.1)	0.484	110.1 (1.2)	104.9 (3.7)	0.188
Spelling standard score Mean (SD)	102.5 (1.3)	100.1 (2.2)	0.340	102.0 (1.2)	102.2 (3.4)	0.947	102.0 (1.3)	95.6 (3.9)	0.124
Reading standard score Mean (SD)	98.0 (1.2)	98.9 (2.0)	0.690	98.2 (1.1)	99.4 (3.3)	0.742	98.9 (1.2)	95.2 (3.7)	0.349

Table 3 – Adjusted linear and or logistic regression analysis for elevated (>90th centile) and normal (<90th centile) umbilical artery Doppler (UAD) pulsatility index (PI) for Validated British Ability Scales II achievement scale parameters at 28, 34 and 38 weeks respectively expressed as mean and standard deviations (SD)

GCA Scale	Week 28 (1.73 threshold)			Week 34 (1.28 threshold)			Week 38 (1.17 threshold)		
	Normal	Elevated	p	Normal	Elevated	p	Normal	Elevated	p
	Verbal sums of scores Mean (SD)	103.5 (1.6)	99.3 (2.6)	0.186	102.6 (1.5)	101.5 (4.3)	0.810	102.2 (1.6)	102.1 (5.0)
Non-Verbal Reasoning sums of scores Mean (SD)	97.5 (1.5)	93.9 (2.5)	0.230	96.0 (1.4)	99.9 (4.1)	0.363	96.0 (1.5)	94.5 (4.8)	0.766
Spatial sums of scores Mean (SD)	100.1 (1.4)	97.7 (2.4)	0.417	99.5 (1.4)	100.3 (4.0)	0.846	97.9 (1.4)	110.3 (4.4)	0.008
Standard Verbal ability scores Mean (SD)	102.7 (1.2)	99.5 (2.1)	0.193	102.0 (1.2)	101.1 (3.4)	0.803	101.7 (1.3)	101.8 (4.0)	0.978
Standard Non-verbal reasoning ability Mean (SD)	97.7 (1.3)	94.7 (2.1)	0.238	96.4 (1.2)	99.6 (3.4)	0.370	96.4 (1.3)	95.2 (4.0)	0.768
Standard Spatial ability Mean (SD)	99.5 (1.3)	97.4 (2.1)	0.409	98.9 (1.2)	99.6 (3.5)	0.845	97.6 (1.2)	108.6 (3.9)	0.008
Standard GCA Mean (SD)	99.9 (1.3)	96.4 (2.1)	0.175	98.8 (1.2)	100.1 (3.5)	0.737	98.2 (1.3)	101.9 (4.0)	0.385

Table 4 – Adjusted linear regression analysis for elevated (>90th centile) and normal (<90th centile) umbilical artery Doppler (UAD) pulsatility index (PI) for Validated British Ability Scales II General Conceptual Ability Score (GCA) scale parameters at 28, 34 and 38 weeks respectively expressed as mean and standard deviation (SD)

CBLC parameters									
	Week 28 (1.73 threshold)			Week 34 (1.28 threshold)			Week 38 (1.17 threshold)		
	Normal	Elevated	p	Normal	Elevated	p	Normal	Elevated	p
CBLC Withdrawn* Mean (SD)	0.40 (0.05)	0.38 (0.08)	0.889	0.40 (0.04)	0.36 (0.13)	0.770	0.41 (0.05)	0.27 (0.13)	0.310
CBLC Somatic problems* Mean (SD)	0.53 (0.05)	0.66 (0.08)	0.150	0.58 (0.04)	0.33 (0.12)	0.056	0.60 (0.05)	0.40 (0.14)	0.165
CBLC Anxious / Depressed* Mean (SD)	0.52 (0.05)	0.59 (0.08)	0.444	0.54 (0.04)	0.43 (0.13)	0.412	0.53 (0.05)	0.63 (0.13)	0.506
CBLC Social problems* Mean (SD)	0.52 (0.05)	0.54 (0.08)	0.803	0.52 (0.04)	0.39 (0.12)	0.317	0.50 (0.05)	0.40 (0.14)	0.484
CBLC Thought / Behaviour* Mean (SD)	0.57 (0.05)	0.57 (0.08)	0.930	0.59 (0.04)	0.34 (0.11)	0.063	0.56 (0.05)	0.49 (0.14)	0.659
CBLC Attention problems* Mean (SD)	0.50 (0.05)	0.58 (0.09)	0.466	0.54 (0.05)	0.34 (0.13)	0.169	0.56 (0.05)	0.26 (0.12)	0.056
CBLC Delinquent behaviour* Mean (SD)	0.70 (0.05)	0.88 (0.05)	0.021	0.76 (0.04)	0.57 (0.14)	0.139	0.73 (0.05)	0.75 (0.13)	0.884
CBLC Aggressive behaviour* Mean (SD)	0.49 (0.05)	0.56 (0.08)	0.517	0.49 (0.05)	0.41 (0.14)	0.597	0.46 (0.05)	0.66 (0.15)	0.179
CBLC Other problems* Mean (SD)	0.52 (0.05)	0.64 (0.08)	0.215	0.55 (0.04)	0.44 (0.13)	0.404	0.54 (0.05)	0.48 (0.15)	0.683
CBLC Internalizing* Mean (SD)	0.52 (0.05)	0.64 (0.08)	0.193	0.56 (0.04)	0.45 (0.13)	0.399	0.57 (0.05)	0.57 (0.14)	0.983
CBLC Externalizing* Mean (SD)	0.49 (0.05)	0.57 (0.08)	0.412	0.50 (0.05)	0.41 (0.14)	0.566	0.47 (0.05)	0.66 (0.15)	0.207
CBLC Internalizing Standard score Mean (SD)	52.0 (0.9)	51.4 (1.5)	0.759	51.7 (0.8)	54.2 (2.5)	0.331	51.7 (1.0)	53.6 (2.8)	0.523
CBLC Externalizing Standard score Mean (SD)	49.8 (0.9)	48.0 (1.5)	0.290	49.4 (0.8)	53.7 (2.3)	0.079	50.2 (0.9)	50.7 (2.7)	0.860
CBLC Total Standard Score Mean (SD)	45.2 (0.8)	44.0 (1.4)	0.464	44.8 (0.8)	49.0 (2.2)	0.074	45.3 (0.9)	46.6 (2.5)	0.642

Note: * logistic regression, mean in these cases refers to the odds of an abnormal (high) psychometric score for a child at the mean age (12.1 years) with a mean Townsend score (1.79).

Table 5 – Adjusted linear or logistic regression analysis for elevated (>90th centile) and normal (<90th centile) umbilical artery Doppler (UAD) pulsatility index (PI) for Achenbach child behaviour checklist parent rated version (CBLC) parameters at 28, 34 and 38 weeks respectively as expressed as mean with associated standard deviation (SD).

Scores of processing and memory; notably recall of objects immediate verbal, immediate spatial and delayed verbal in the diagnostic scale group were significantly lower in the elevated UAD PI group ($p= 0.002, 0.016$ and 0.008 respectively). This did not appear to be the case when UAD was measured in groups at later gestations. There were no significant differences between UAD PI groups in the achievement scales group, and in the GCA group, the overall GCA score was not significantly different between groups. In terms of the CBCL internalising and externalising parameters were not overall significantly different.

DISCUSSION

This study demonstrates that at 12-years of age, in the absence of FGR and prematurity, an elevated fetal UAD PI at 28 weeks' gestation is associated with significantly lower scores in parameters of cognitive function in the form of information processing and memory. There is no association between abnormal fetal UAD PI and overall academic ability, mental processing and reasoning or overall behavioural function of children at this age.

Existing research suggests that in FGR, the degree of neurodevelopmental abnormality in childhood is proportionally related to the impedance within the UAD⁷. Early-onset FGR is associated with impaired placental perfusion due to a reduction in the overall cross-sectional villous vascular area, which appears to impact upon UAD resistance when villous damage is greater than 30%.¹⁴ Our study agrees with existing research which demonstrates that there is an effect of abnormal UAD measurement in the co-existence of FGR in terms of impaired childhood neurodevelopment,^{7,15} yet our study is unique in assessing neurodevelopmental outcomes in children with abnormal UAD, but no associated FGR or pre-maturity. One explanation may lie in the definition of FGR; a topic much debated within the literature. Traditional definitions of FGR i.e. birth weights < 10th and < 3rd centile for gestational age which were used at the time of the original study are being replaced by histological placental evidence of impaired perfusion or 'placental disease'. Emerging studies demonstrate abnormal cerebral and placental blood flow distributions within appropriately grown fetuses as a marker of placental insufficiency and call for a revision of the diagnosis of fetuses 'failing to reach their growth potential'.¹⁶

The strength of this study is that the cohort is that it is unique in concept, for reasons previously described. In addition this study represents the longest follow-up in a group of children with abnormal in-utero UAD measurements.⁷ A recent study, which is the longest cohort study to date of extreme low-birthweight survivors, demonstrated that cases of babies born with a birthweight under 1000g were more likely to exhibit a psychiatric problem than their normal birth weight counterparts.¹⁷ However, Doppler status was not formally assessed within the methodology, likely because it's routine use predated the starting-date of the study.

Limitations of our study include the method of recruitment, which required two rounds of recruitment in order to obtain adequate numbers and led to uneven numbers either side (elevated UAD PI n=40, normal UAD PI n=140), which may have accounted for a skew in the demographic characteristics. Nevertheless, non-response was corrected for within the statistical analysis. Correction for confounders was included in multiple regression. In addition, an attempt to limit bias in the methodology was limited through blinding of the assessors to PI category. One must also note that significant findings were amongst a large number of outcome measures and hence results must be interpreted with caution.

Interestingly, the findings of this study also add information on the time point where the UAD PI assessment is critical in determining long-term impact on neurodevelopment. Assessments performed at 28-weeks appeared to have the most significant impact on cognitive outcome, notably on information processing and memory. However, this was not the case when UAD PI was assessed at later gestations. It is known that fetuses with FGR are more likely to exhibit long-term cognitive impairment and memory deficit, as has been demonstrated within this study.¹⁸ The assessments which demonstrated statistical significance in our study, recall of objects verbal-spatial are controlled by the hippocampal region of the brain which controls declarative memory, with children with elevated UAD PI in utero having poorer scores in these assessments. There were no cases of abnormal development within the study cohort as such cases were excluded at the selection process. What can be extrapolated clinically from this study is that the cohort of patients with an elevated UAD PI were more likely to have poorer but not abnormal scores in assessments of short-term and declarative memory function than their normal UAD PI peers, which may express itself as a child having executive-attention deficit and or mild learning difficulties, somewhat similar to that of children who had FGR in utero.¹⁸ It is important to note, however, that despite these changes they did not impact upon overall academic ability, mental processing and reasoning or overall behavioural function. The latter supports the theory that reduced placental blood flow, notably during the second half of pregnancy correlates with a reduction in the number of neurons within this area of the fetal brain; as correlated with the histological brains of primates and humans at this stage in addition to the fact that the hippocampus is vulnerable to injury in the prenatal period.^{19,20} This would certainly go some way to explaining why the earlier abnormal UAD assessment has a stronger association with the abnormal parameters. It is unclear as to why there was no significant difference in parameters at later gestations between groups.

Potential explanations are two-fold, primarily as fewer Doppler assessments were performed at these gestations and secondly, perhaps fetuses at 28-weeks have an altered vulnerability in terms of brain pathophysiology as a result of elevated UAD PI compared to later gestations.¹¹ The latter suggestion is supported by existing research which suggests that neurodevelopment is affected by increased impedance in the UAD and aortic indices in early FGR and by cerebral blood flow in late onset IUGR.¹¹

It is a challenge to determine the clinical implications of this study as one refers to a test which is not indicated for the general unselected pregnant population. Certainly if the definition of FGR was revised and the fetuses with elevated UAD PI were truly growth restricted and all of their placentae were retrospectively histopathologically examined, then perhaps this would support re-exploring the definition of FGR. Additionally in those children that had FGR, due to the demonstrated apparent deficit in short-term memory at childhood follow-up, a focus in such children should be made to facilitate orientation, and direct attention and reiteration of material to optimise learning performance.¹⁸

CONCLUSION

An elevated UAD PI at 28-weeks' gestation in the absence of fetal growth restriction or prematurity is associated with some adverse cognitive findings in children aged twelve years. A potential explanation for this phenomenon is an element of placental insufficiency in the presence of the appropriately grown fetus which impacts on development of the fetal hippocampus and this information processing and memory long-term further studies should be performed before firm conclusions or guidance can be drawn from the findings of this study.

Contribution Statement

Fionnuala Mone: Dr Mone analysed and interpreted the data, drafted, reviewed and revised the manuscript and approved the final version as submitted.

Barbara McConnell and Andrew Thompson: Drs McConnell and Thompson conceptualised and designed the study, acquired the data, carried out the initial analysis and revised the article critically for intellectual content and approved the final manuscript as submitted

Ricardo Segurado, Stephen Ong and Fionnuala M McAuliffe: Drs Segurado and Ong and Professor McAuliffe performed the final analysis and interpretation of the data, revised the article critically for intellectual content and approved the final manuscript as submitted

Peter Hepper, Moira C Stewart, James C Dornan and Michael D Shields: Professors Hepper, Dornan and Shields and Dr Stewart conceptualised and designed the study and data collection instruments, and coordinated and supervised data collection in addition to critically reviewing the manuscript and approving the final manuscript as submitted.

Competing Interests

Authors report no conflict of interest

Funding source

All phases of this study were funded by the Department of Health and Social Care, Northern Ireland UK and TinyLife (formerly NIMBA), UK

Data Sharing Statement

Further data from this study includes data on childhood respiratory function testing which is currently being analysed and will be published as a separate manuscript in due course

Acknowledgements

Dr Eoghan Mooney, Consultant Pathologist, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, National Maternity Hospital, Holles St, Dublin Ireland for contribution to construction of manuscript and theory.

REFERENCES

1. De Boo HA, Harding JE. The developmental origins of adult disease (Barker) hypothesis. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2006; 46(1): 4-14
2. Pinney SE. Intrauterine growth retardation – a developmental model of type 2 diabetes. *Drug Discovery today : Disease Models* 2013; 10(2): 71-77
3. Mu M, Ye S, Bai MJ, et al. Birth Weight and Subsequent Risk of Asthma: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Heart Lung & Circulation* 2014 doi: 10.1016/j.hlc.2013.11.018. [Epub ahead of print]
4. Mone F, Thompson A, Stewart M, et al. Fetal umbilical artery Doppler pulsatility index as a predictor of cardiovascular risk factors in children - a long-term follow up study. *Journal of Maternal Fetal and Neonatal Medicine* 2014 doi:10.3109/14767058.2013.871698. [Epub ahead of print]
5. Mone F, McAuliffe FM, Ong S. The clinical application of Doppler ultrasound in obstetrics. *The Obstetrician & Gynaecologist* 2014 DOI: 10.1111/tog.12152
6. Alfirevic Z, Stampalija T, Gyte JM. Fetal and umbilical Doppler ultrasound in normal pregnancy. *Cochrane Database Systematic Review* 2010 Aug 4;(8):CD001450. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD001450.pub3
7. Levine TA, Grunau RA, McAuliffe FM, et al. Early Childhood neurodevelopment after intrauterine growth restriction: a systematic review. *Pediatrics* 2015; 135(1): 126-41
8. Beattie RB. Evaluation of umbilical artery doppler ultrasound in human pregnancy. [Unpublished Thesis]. [Belfast (UK)]: Queen's University, Belfast; 1988
9. Fogarty, P, Beattie B, Harper A, et al. Continuous wave Doppler flow velocity waveforms from the umbilical artery in normal pregnancy. *Journal of Perinatal Medicine* 1990; 18(1); 51-57
10. Beattie RB, Dornan JC. Antenatal screening for intrauterine growth retardation with umbilical artery Doppler ultrasonography. *BMJ* 1989; 298(6674): 631-5
11. Baschat AA. Neurodevelopment following fetal growth restriction and its relationship with antepartum parameters of placental dysfunction. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2011; 37(5): 501-4
12. Elliott CD, Smith P, McCulloch P, editors. *Bas II Technical Manual*: NFER-Nelson Windsor: London; 1997

13. Achenbach TM, editor. Manual for the Child Behaviour checklist and revised child behaviour profile. Burlington: Queen city printers; 1991
14. Baschat AA. Fetal Growth restriction – from observation to intervention. *Journal of Perinatal Medicine* 2010; 38: 239-46
15. Wienerroither H, Steiner H, Tomaselli J, et al. Intrauterine blood flow and long-term intellectual, neurologic, and social development. *Obstetr Gynecol* 2001; 97(3): 449-53
16. Morales-Rosello J, Khalil A, Papageorgiou A, et al. Changes in fetal Doppler indices as a marker of failure to reach growth potential at term. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2014; 43(3): 303-10
17. Van Lieshout RJ, Boyle MH, Saigal S, et al. Mental health of extremely low birth weight survivors in their 30s. *Pediatrics* 2015 [E-pub ahead of print doi:10.1542/peds.2014-3143d]
18. Geva R, Eshel R, Leitner Y, et al. Memory functions of children born with asymmetric intrauterine growth restriction. *Brain Research* 2006; 1117(1): 186-94
19. Isaacs EB, Vargha-Khadem F, Watkins KE, et al. Developmental amnesia and its relationship to degree of hippocampal atrophy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2003; 28(100): 13060-3
20. Henver RF, Kinney HC. Reciprocal enthorhinal-hippocampal connections established by human fetal midgestation. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology* 1996; 372(3): 384-94