

**Assessment of Accuracy of two dimensions
ultrasonography of fetal thigh soft tissue
versus Hadlock's formula in estimation of
fetal weight: Comparative study**

Thesis

Submitted for partial fulfillment of master degree
in Obstetrics and Gynecology

By

Mohamed Abdel Aziz El Sayed El Zeiny

M.B.,B.Ch; Ain Shams University 2012

Resident of Obstetrics & Gynecology in Dar Elshefa Hospital

Supervised by

Dr. Adel Shafik Salah El-Din

Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology

Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Dr. Mohamed Abdel Fattah Elsenity

Lecturer of Obstetrics & Gynecology

Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

**Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
2020**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

لسببائك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدقة الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢



Acknowledgments

*First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **Allah**, the **Most Beneficent** and **Merciful** Who gave me the strength to accomplish this work,*

*I would like to express my deepest respect and gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Adel Shafik Salah El-Din**, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his over lasting encouragement and meticulous help. His wide experience, precious instructions and kind supervision helped me to achieve this work. It was an honor to work under his guidance.*

*I am deeply grateful to **Prof. Dr. Mohamed Abdel Fattah Elsenity**, Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of medicine Ain Shams University, for his endless help, precise interpretation and continuous comments throughout the performance of this work. His kind care and sincere efforts and instructions helped a lot to continue this work.*

I would like to thank the doctors and workers at the fetal care unit in Ain Shams University Maternity Hospital, for their help.

*Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to all members of my family especially my **wife** for help, care, support and encouragement helped me to accomplish this work.*

*✍ **Mohamed Abdel Aziz El Sayed El Zeiny***

List of Contents

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
List of Abbreviations.....	i
List of Tables.....	ii
List of Figures	vii
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	3
Review of Literature	
Some Notes about the ultrasound	4
Fetal Biometry.....	11
Factors affecting the accuracy of estimated fetal weight by ultrasound.....	19
Accuracy of the Different Formulae that estimate fetal weight by ultrasound	25
Patient and Methods	33
Results.....	38
Discussion	56
Summary	63
Conclusions	66
Recommendations	67
References	68
Arabic Summary	—

List of Abbreviations

<i>Abbr.</i>	<i>Full-term</i>
AC	: Abdominal circumference
FL	: Femur length (FL)
BPD	: Biparietal diameter
HC	: Head circumference
GB	: Gigabyte
DVD	: Digital versatile disc
CRL	: Crown–rump length
SGA	: Small for gestational age
AGA	: Appropriate for gestational age
LGA	: Large for gestational age
TC	: Thoracic circumference
EFW	: Estimated fetal weight
ABW	: Actual birth weight

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Classification of formulae grouped according to the combination of biometric indices.....	26
Table (2):	Initial Characteristics of Included Women	38
Table (3):	EFW and Birth Weight in Included Women.....	42
Table (4):	Agreement between Categories of EFW using Different Formulas and Categories of Birth Weight in Included Women	44
Table (5):	Paired Differences between Birth Weight and EFW using Different Formulas in Included Women.....	47
Table (6):	Difference between Errors using Different Formulas in Included Women	48
Table (7):	Difference between Error Percentage using Different Formulas in Included Women	50
Table (8):	Difference between Errors using Different Formulas in Included Women with LBW Neonates and Women with Breech Presentation.....	52
Table (9):	Difference between Errors using Different Formulas in Included Women with LBW Neonates and Women with Breech Presentation.....	53

List of Figures

<i>Figure No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
Figure (1):	Transverse section of the fetal head demonstrating the landmarks required to measure the BPD using the thalami view.....	13
Figure (2):	Measurement of the fetal femur length (FL) by U/S.....	14
Figure (3):	Measurement of the fetal abdominal circumference (AC).....	15
Figure (4):	Abdominal circumference by TAD & APAD.....	22
Figure (5):	Abdominal circumference by tracing method.....	22
Figure (6):	Abdominal circumference by ellipse method.....	22
Figure (7):	Box-and-Whisker Plot Chart showing Age Distribution in Included Women	39
Figure (8):	Doughnut-Chart showing Parity Distribution in Included Women	39
Figure (9):	Box-and-Whisker Plot Chart showing Gestational Age Distribution in Included Women.....	40
Figure (10):	Doughnut-Chart showing Distribution of Fetal Presentation in Included Women	40
Figure (11):	Box-and-Whisker Plot Chart showing AFI Distribution in Included Women	41

Figure (12): Doughnut-Chart showing Distribution of Fetal Sex in Included Women	41
Figure (13): Box-and-Whisker Plot Chart showing Birth Weight and EFW using Different Formulas in Included Women	43
Figure (14): Bar-Chart showing Categories of Birth Weight and EFW using Different Formulas in Included Women	43
Figure (15): Clustered Bar-Chart showing Agreement between Categories of EFW using Hadlock's Formula and Categories of Birth Weight in Included Women	45
Figure (16): Pie-Chart showing Agreement between Categories of EFW using TSS Formula and Categories of Birth Weight in Included Women.....	45
Figure (17): Pie-Chart showing Agreement between Categories of EFW using MTSS Formula and Categories of Birth Weight in Included Women.....	46
Figure (18): Dot-Chart showing Difference between Errors using Different Formulas in Included Women.....	49
Figure (19): Dot-Chart showing Difference between Error Percentages using Different Formulas in Included Women	51
Figure (20): Dot-Chart showing Difference between Errors using Different Formulas in Included Women with LBW Neonates	54

Figure (21): Dot-Chart showing Difference between Errors using Different Formulas in Included Women with Breech Presentation	54
Figure (22): Dot-Chart showing Difference between Error Percentages using Different Formulas in Included Women with LBW Neonates	55
Figure (23): Dot-Chart showing Difference between Error Percentages using Different Formulas in Included Women with Breech Presentation	55

Abstract

Objective:

The current study aims to compare between mid-thigh soft tissue formula and modified mid-thigh soft tissue formula with Hadlock formula in estimation of fetal weight.

Materials and methods:

Two hundred full term pregnant women attending Ain Shams Maternity Hospital in the period from April 2018 and April 2019 were included in this comparative study. Whole study group (200 women) had 2D ultrasonography using Hadlock's formula, thigh soft tissue formula and Modified thigh soft tissue formula.

Results:

In our current study Hadlock's formula was better than thigh soft tissue and modified thigh soft tissue formula in estimation of fetal weight.

Conclusions:

Fetal mid-thigh SST is a simple, useful, and easily applicable parameter for fetal weight estimation .

Keywords: Fetal weight estimation _ Mid-thigh soft tissue thickness

Introduction

The ultrasound estimation of fetal weight in term pregnancies is used to determine fetal growth, and this may affect the timing and route of delivery (*Bamberg and Kalache, 2004, Conway, 2002*).

Although antenatal care has focused more on the diagnosis of fetal growth restriction and fetal macrosomia, the delivery of macrosomic infants is associated with higher rates of adverse outcomes for both mother and infant in comparison to the delivery of normal weight infants. Increased risks to the large infant include shoulder dystocia, brachial plexus injury, perinatal asphyxia, and neonatal death (*Stotland et al., 2004*). Adverse maternal outcomes include prolonged labour, genital tract trauma, postpartum haemorrhage, and a higher rate of caesarean delivery (*Jolly et al., 2003*).

Macrosomia has variously been defined as birth weight >4000 g, >4500 g or >90th centile for weight by gestation (*Coomarasamy et al., 2005*) one of the main causes of fetal macrosomia is maternal diabetes. Stotland NE et al 2004, (*Abramowicz and Ahn, 2006*) so ultrasound of fetal weight estimations is undertaken as part of the routine antenatal care of pregnant women, accurate estimation of fetal weight now has an important role in routine antenatal care and for detection of fetal growth abnormalities, for this

reason, researchers have invested much effort in creating formulae that would accurately predict fetal weight. These formulae are mainly based on different combinations of sonographically measured fetal biometric indices, mainly abdominal circumference (AC), femur length (FL), biparietal diameter (BPD), and head circumference (HC).

Although some formulae include only 1 or 2 fetal indices, other models, in an effort to improve accuracy, incorporated either 3 or all 4 fetal indices.

Aim of the Work

The current study aims to compare between mid-thigh soft tissue formula and modified mid-thigh soft tissue formula with Hadlock formula in estimation of fetal weight.

Some Notes about the ultrasound

Introduction:

Ultrasound is an important tool in diagnosis and assessment of treatment in obstetrics and gynecology.

Sound is mechanical vibrations travelling in a physical medium such as air, water, metal or even human tissue. Whether the airborne vibrations come directly from the source or are reflected, they produce impressions on the eardrums of our vestibular organs.

Sound may be categorized according to various frequency levels:

- **Infrasound** (0–20 Hz)
- **Audible sound** (20–20 kHz)
- **Ultrasound** (>20 kHz)
- **Diagnostic ultrasound** (1–20 MHz)

Humans do not hear the infrasound but other species as whales, dolphins, elephants, hippopotamuses and rhinoceros do. The higher frequency limit for humans is 20 kHz. Frequencies above 20 kHz are called ultrasound. Some species may hear sound frequencies which for humans are categorized as ultrasound, for example mice (10–70 kHz), dogs (40–60 kHz) and bats (20–200 kHz) (**Watts, 2009**).

History of the Development of Ultrasound in Medicine:

After the *Titanic* ship hit an iceberg on its maiden trip in 1912, the Physicists took an interest in using sound to detect large objects submerged in water, initially their researches actually failed.

During World War I, the French physicist Paul Langevin was responsible for developing the hydrophones needed to detect submarines; this underwater sonar technology resulted in the first sinking of a German submarine in 1916. In 1917, Langevin invented the quartz sandwich transducer which served as the basis for the modern ultrasonic era. Between World War I and World War II, the development of sonar (Sound Navigation and Ranging System) and radar (Radio Detection and Ranging) took place. The latter technique used electromagnetic waves rather than ultrasound. The next important step was the use of ultrasound to detect flaws in metal using high frequency ultrasound. The metal flaw detectors became increasingly important as World War II was approaching, but were reported after the war, (**Desch et al., 1946, Firestone, 1946**).

After World War II, Howry and Bliss, in Denver, started to experiment with sonar equipment and amplifiers from the navy (**Howry and Bliss, 1952**).

They developed a pulse-echo technique in 1948–49, and later produced cross-sectional images of a human partly