

# **Fractional Thigh Volume by Three Dimensional Ultrasonography for Birth Weight Prediction**

## ***Thesis***

Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree  
*in Obstetrics and Gynecology*

## ***Presented by***

**Engy Samy AbdelGawad**

M.B.B.CH – Ain Shams University-2005  
Fetal care unit-Ain Shams University

## ***Under Supervision of***

**Prof.Dr. Essam Eldin Mohamed Ammar**

*Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology*  
*Faculty of Medicine – Ain shams university*

**Dr. Tarek Aly Raafat**

*Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology*  
*Faculty of Medicine – Ain shams university*

**Ain shams university**  
**Faculty of Medicine**  
**2015**



## Acknowledgments

*First, and foremost, my deepest gratitude and thanks should be offered to 'ALLAH', the Most Kind and Most Merciful, for giving me the strength to complete this work,*

*I would like to express my sincere gratitude to **Prof. Dr./ Essam Eldin Mohamed Ammar**, professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for his continuous support and guidance for me to present this work. It really has been an honor to work under his generous supervision.*

*I acknowledge with much gratitude to **Dr. Tarek Aly Raafat**, Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his great supervision, efforts and unlimited help to provide all facilities in the whole work,*

*Last but not least, thanks to **my Parents and my Family**, for helping me to finish this work,*

*Engy Samy AbdelGawad*



# List of Contents

*Page No.*

|                                                               |            |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Introduction .....</b>                                     | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Aim of the work .....</b>                                  | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>Review of literature:</b>                                  |            |
| <b>Chapter 1: Fetal growth .....</b>                          | <b>4</b>   |
| <b>Chapter 2: Ultrasound and fetal weight estimation ....</b> | <b>34</b>  |
| <b>Patients and methods .....</b>                             | <b>61</b>  |
| <b>Results .....</b>                                          | <b>66</b>  |
| <b>Discussion .....</b>                                       | <b>96</b>  |
| <b>Summary and Conclusion .....</b>                           | <b>105</b> |
| <b>Recommendations .....</b>                                  | <b>109</b> |
| <b>References .....</b>                                       | <b>110</b> |
| <b>Arabic summary .....</b>                                   | <b>—</b>   |

# List of Figures

| <i><b>Figure No.</b></i> | <i><b>Title</b></i>                                                                   | <i><b>Page No.</b></i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Figure (1):</b>       | Fetal growth and weight among different categories .....                              | 13                     |
| <b>Figure (2):</b>       | Normal fetal growth curves and percentiles .....                                      | 13                     |
| <b>Figure (3)</b>        | Picture of IUGR baby .....                                                            | 16                     |
| <b>Figure (4):</b>       | Progressive umbilical artery wave form patterns .....                                 | 28                     |
| <b>Figure (5):</b>       | Normal and abnormal MCA wave forms .....                                              | 29                     |
| <b>Figure (6):</b>       | Picture of macrosomic baby .....                                                      | 33                     |
| <b>Figure (7):</b>       | Different Formulae used for estimation of birth weight by ultrasound .....            | 39                     |
| <b>Figure (8):</b>       | Transverse axial sonogram of the fetal head: measurement of biparietal diameter ..... | 41                     |
| <b>Figure (9):</b>       | Abdominal Circumference (AC) .....                                                    | 41                     |
| <b>Figure (10):</b>      | Longitudinal sonogram of the fetal femur length (FL) .....                            | 42                     |
| <b>Figure (11):</b>      | Fat mass measured at the level of middle arm .....                                    | 44                     |
| <b>Figure (12):</b>      | Abdominal fat thickness measured at the level of abdominal circumference .....        | 45                     |
| <b>Figure (13):</b>      | Ultrasonic view showing mid thigh circumference .....                                 | 46                     |

|                                                                                                                            |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Figure (14):</b> Fetal thigh volumetry analyzed using the multiplanar method .....                                      | 56 |
| <b>Figure (15):</b> Fetal thigh volumetry analyzed using the Virtual Organ Computer-aided Analysis (VOCAL) technique ..... | 57 |
| <b>Figure (16):</b> Fractional thigh (TVol) volume is based on 50% of the femoral diaphysis length .....                   | 59 |
| <b>Figure (17):</b> Fractional thigh volume (TVol) .....                                                                   | 60 |
| <b>Figure (18):</b> Bar-Chart showing Age Distribution in Included Women .....                                             | 67 |
| <b>Figure (19):</b> Pie-Chart showing Parity Distribution in Included Women .....                                          | 67 |
| <b>Figure (20):</b> Bar-Chart showing Weight Distribution in Included Women .....                                          | 68 |
| <b>Figure (21):</b> Bar-Chart showing BMI Distribution in Included Women .....                                             | 68 |
| <b>Figure (22):</b> Bar-Chart showing Gestational Age Distribution in Included Women .....                                 | 69 |
| <b>Figure (23):</b> Box-Plot Chart showing Sonographic Fetal Biometry in Included Women .....                              | 71 |
| <b>Figure (24):</b> Box-Plot Chart showing 3D Sonographic Thigh Volume in Included Women .....                             | 72 |

|                                                                                                                                                                                |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Figure (25):</b> Box-Plot Chart showing Actual Birth Weight and Estimated Fetal Weight using Different Formulas in Included Women .....                                     | 74 |
| <b>Figure (26):</b> Box-Plot Charts showing Errors between Actual Birth Weight and Estimated Fetal Weight using Different Formulas in Included Women .....                     | 76 |
| <b>Figure (27):</b> Box-Plot Charts showing Error Percentages between Actual Birth Weight and Estimated Fetal Weight using Different Formulas in Included Women .....          | 77 |
| <b>Figure (28):</b> Box-Plot Charts showing Absolute Errors between Actual Birth Weight and Estimated Fetal Weight using Different Formulas in Included Women .....            | 78 |
| <b>Figure (29):</b> Box-Plot Charts showing Absolute Error Percentages between Actual Birth Weight and Estimated Fetal Weight using Different Formulas in Included Women ..... | 79 |
| <b>Figure (30):</b> Scatter Plot showing Correlation between Actual Birth Weight and EFW using Hadlock's Formula ....                                                          | 83 |
| <b>Figure (31):</b> Scatter Plot showing Correlation between Actual Birth Weight and EFW using BPD, AC and TVol .....                                                          | 84 |

|                                                                                                                     |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Figure (32):</b> Scatter Plot showing Correlation between Actual Birth Weight and EFW using AC and TVol .....    | 85 |
| <b>Figure (33):</b> Scatter Plot showing Correlation between Actual Birth Weight and EFW using TVol .....           | 86 |
| <b>Figure (34):</b> Scatter Plot showing Correlation between Actual Birth Weight and TVol .....                     | 87 |
| <b>Figure (35):</b> ROC Curves for Fetal Biometry and EFW using different Formulas as Predictor of Macrosomia ..... | 89 |
| <b>Figure (36):</b> ROC Curves for Fetal Biometry and EFW using different Formulas as Predictor of LBW .....        | 93 |

# List of Tables

| <i>Table No.</i>  | <i>Title</i>                                                                                                   | <i>Page No.</i> |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Table (1):</b> | Sensitivity of ultrasonographic diameters for detecting IUGR .....                                             | 25              |
| <b>Table (2):</b> | Different ultrasound regression formulae for estimating fetal weight .....                                     | 40              |
| <b>Table (3):</b> | Demographic Data of Included Women .....                                                                       | 66              |
| <b>Table (4):</b> | Sonographic Fetal Biometry in Included Women .....                                                             | 70              |
| <b>Table (5):</b> | Actual Birth Weight and Estimated Fetal Weight using Different Formulas in Included Women .....                | 73              |
| <b>Table (6):</b> | Errors between Actual Birth Weight and Estimated Fetal Weight using Different Formulas in Included Women ..... | 75              |
| <b>Table (7):</b> | Differences regarding Errors between Estimated Fetal Weight using Different Formulas in Included Women .....   | 80              |
| <b>Table (8):</b> | Correlation between Actual Birth Weight and EFW using Various Formulas as well as Fetal Biometry .....         | 82              |
| <b>Table (9):</b> | Area under ROC Curves for Fetal Biometry and EFW using different Formulas as Predictor of Macrosomia .....     | 90              |

|                                                                                                                              |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Table (10):</b> Accuracy of Fetal Biometry and EFW using<br>different Formulas as Predictor of Macrosomia .....           | 91 |
| <b>Table (11):</b> Area under ROC Curves for Fetal Biometry and<br>EFW using different Formulas as Predictor of<br>LBW ..... | 94 |
| <b>Table (12):</b> Accuracy of Fetal Biometry and EFW using<br>different Formulas as Predictor of LBW .....                  | 95 |

## List of Abbreviations

|              |                                                   |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <b>2D US</b> | .....Two dimensional ultrasonography              |
| <b>3D US</b> | .....Three dimensional ultrasonography            |
| <b>ABW</b>   | .....Actual birth weight                          |
| <b>AC</b>    | .....Abdominal circumference                      |
| <b>AE</b>    | .....Absolute error                               |
| <b>AFI</b>   | .....Amniotic fluid index                         |
| <b>APE</b>   | .....Absolute percentage error                    |
| <b>AUC</b>   | .....Area under the curve                         |
| <b>BMI</b>   | .....Body mass index                              |
| <b>BPD</b>   | .....Biparietal diameter                          |
| <b>CI</b>    | .....Confidence interval                          |
| <b>E</b>     | .....Error                                        |
| <b>EFW</b>   | .....Estimated fetal weight                       |
| <b>EP</b>    | .....Error percentage                             |
| <b>FL</b>    | .....Femur length                                 |
| <b>GHV</b>   | .....Growth hormone variant                       |
| <b>HAPO</b>  | .....Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes |
| <b>HC</b>    | .....Head circumference                           |
| <b>HS</b>    | .....Highly significant                           |

**IGF-I and II** .....Insulin-like growth factor-I and II  
**IQR** .....Interquartile range  
**IUGR** .....Intrauterine growth restriction  
**LBW** .....Low birth weight  
**LGA** .....Large for gestational age  
**MCA** .....Middle cerebral artery  
**MPD** .....main paired difference  
**NS** .....Non-significant  
**PGH** .....Placental Growth Hormone  
**PI** .....Pulsatility index  
**PSV** .....Peak systolic velocity  
**r** .....Pearson's correlation coefficient  
**ROC** .....Receiver operator characteristics  
**S** .....Significant  
**SD** .....Standard deviation  
**SGA** .....Small for gestational age  
**TVol** .....Thigh volume  
**VOCAL** .....Virtual Organ Computer-aided Analysis

## INTRODUCTION

Estimation of fetal weight is essential in daily obstetric practice particularly close to term. It guides clinicians to finalize important obstetrical decisions. Low birth weight and excessive fetal weight at delivery both are associated with an increased risk of neonatal complications during labour and the puerperium. **(Owen *et al.*, 2003)**

Nowadays, ultrasound is the main diagnostic tool for fetal birth weight (BW) evaluation. The majority of birth weight prediction formulas rely on the fetal biometry data derived from 2-D ultrasound measurement. However, the precision of those conventional formulas remains unsatisfactory with a mean error of 7-10%. **(Schild *et al.*, 2007)**

The majority of the commonly used formulae for estimating fetal weight include measurements of the head, abdomen and femur both alone and in combination. None of these formulae pays attention to the soft tissue mass of the fetus. However, since fetal weight depends not only on head and body dimensions but also on extremity size, it seems reasonable to investigate the role of other body measurements in improving fetal weight estimates. **(Rizwan *et al.*, 2008)**

Considering that thigh and arm volumes are parameters that are well established as markers for fetal growth and

nutrition, several studies have utilized these limbs volume as a predictor for birth weight, with more reliable results than those from the traditional formulas utilized by 2D US (**Song et al., 2000**)

Initially, the fetal thigh volume (TVol) measurement was indirectly performed by means of two-dimensional ultrasound (2D US). However, 2D US cannot provide an accurate measurement of fetal limb volume. The majority of studies on fetal limbs volume evaluation by 2D US calculate the volume based on a cross sectional area in only one cutting plane that may not be the most appropriate, so the calculation is subject to error. (**Vintzileos et al., 1987**)

The arrival of the 3D US has allowed a more accurate volumetric assessment of several fetal organs, for an earlier and more precise diagnosis of fetal growth and developmental deviations. (**Edward et al, 2007**)

## **AIM OF THE WORK**

The aim of this study is to introduce fractional limb volume as a new ultrasonographic parameter, validate reliability of fractional limb volume measurements, develop new birth weight prediction models, and examine their practical utility for estimating fetal weight during late pregnancy.

## **FETAL GROWTH**

Human fetal growth is characterized by sequential patterns of tissue and organ growth, differentiation and maturation that are determined by maternal provision of substrate, placental transfer of these substrates, and fetal growth potential governed by the genome (**Cunningham et al., 2005**).

**The process of fetal growth comprises three consecutive and somewhat overlapping phases.**

*The first phase* is the phase of cellular hyperplasia and encompasses the first 16 weeks of gestation.

*The second phase*, known as the phase of concomitant hyperplasia and hypertrophy, occurs between the 16th and 32nd weeks and involves increases in cell size and number.

*The third and final phase*, called the phase of cellular hypertrophy, occurs between the 32nd week and term and is characterized by a rapid increase in cell size. Quantitatively, normal singleton fetal growth increases from approximately 5 g/day at 14 to 15 weeks of gestation to 10 g/day at 20 weeks and 30 to 35 g/day at 32 to 34 weeks, after which the growth rate decreases (**Chiesa et al., 2008**).

Although many factors have been implicated, the precise cellular and molecular mechanisms by which normal fetal