

Correspondence

## The fetuses-at-risk approach: Clarification of semantic and conceptual misapprehension

K S Joseph

Address: Perinatal Epidemiology Research Unit, Departments of Obstetrics & Gynaecology and Pediatrics, Dalhousie University and the IWK Health Centre, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

Email: K S Joseph - [ksjoseph@dal.ca](mailto:ksjoseph@dal.ca)

Published: 26 March 2008

Received: 30 January 2008

*BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2008, **8**:11 doi:10.1186/1471-2393-8-11

Accepted: 26 March 2008

This article is available from: <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2393/8/11>

© 2008 Joseph; licensee BioMed Central Ltd.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

### Abstract

**Background:** Although proponents of the fetuses-at-risk approach describe it as a causal model that resolves various conundrums, several areas of semantic and conceptual misapprehension remain. Differences in terminology include use of denominators such as 'ongoing pregnancies' and the need for an ad hoc 'correction factor' in order to calculate gestational age-specific rates. Further, there is conceptual disagreement regarding the proper candidates for neonatal death and related phenomena. Perhaps the most egregious misconception is the belief that rising rates of gestational age-specific perinatal mortality observed under the fetuses-at-risk model automatically imply the need for indiscriminate increases in iatrogenic preterm delivery.

**Discussion:** The term 'fetuses at risk' addresses the plurality of candidates for stillbirth in a multi-fetal pregnancy, while the use of standard terminology such as 'cumulative incidence' and 'incidence density' harmonizes the language of perinatal epidemiology with that used in the general epidemiologic literature. On the conceptual side, it is necessary to integrate clinical insights regarding latent periods into models of neonatal morbidity and mortality. The contention that the fetuses-at-risk approach implies the need for indiscriminate iatrogenic preterm delivery is a non-sequitur (just as rising age-specific cancer death rates do not imply the need for routine chemotherapy and radiation for all middle aged people). Finally, the traditional and fetuses-at-risk models are better viewed in terms of function as prognostic (non-causal) and causal models, respectively.

**Conclusion:** A careful examination of terms and concepts helps situate the traditional perinatal and the fetuses-at-risk approaches within the broader context of non-causal and causal models within general epidemiology.

### Background

A recent *Commentary* [1] in the *Journal* addressed methodologic issues related to gestational age and contested several points discussed in my recent paper on obstetric theory [2]. Whereas this debate has served to focus attention on several key issues in perinatology, some areas of semantic confusion and conceptual misapprehension remain.

### Semantic issues

The *Commentary* advocated using 'ongoing pregnancies' as the denominator for calculating the antepartum risk of stillbirth. An alternative term is 'fetuses at risk' for antepartum stillbirth [3-5]. The difference between the two denominators is minor, though the distinction, which recognizes the plurality of candidates for antepartum still-

birth within multi-fetal pregnancies, is necessary from an epidemiologic perspective.

A second semantic issue relates to the details of risk quantification. The number of fetuses at risk for antepartum stillbirth decreases from the beginning to the end of each gestational week and the pattern of this decrease varies before and after 40 weeks gestation. The *Commentary* [1] addressed this by highlighting the need for an ad hoc 'correction factor' [6]. We choose to address the same issue by invoking standard epidemiologic terminology [5], namely, cumulative incidence (the proportion of a fixed population that develops the outcome of interest over a specified time period) and incidence density (the ratio of the number of new cases of the outcome of interest to the person-time at risk) [7].

With these epidemiologic terms defined, it becomes evident that the 'prospective risk of stillbirth' [8] at any gestation is a cumulative incidence, with the duration over which incidence is measured left open ended (similar to the lifetime cumulative incidence of breast cancer). Alternatively, the cumulative incidence of stillbirth at any gestation can be estimated within a specific time window. From an obstetric perspective, a meaningful length for the time interval would encompass the period after a clinical examination during which fetal/maternal status is expected to be stable, with the specific duration dependent on the risk status and gestation of the pregnancy and the clinical assessment in question. With medically indicated early delivery predicated on the short-term risks of serious events, it becomes evident that quantification of an open ended prospective risk of stillbirth is not central to the practice of obstetrics.

### Conceptual issues

The extension of the fetuses-at-risk approach to encompass perinatal death and other phenomena is criticised in the *Commentary* [1] because many such events, exemplified by death in the neonatal period, do not occur among fetuses. Such criticisms can be countered on clinical and epidemiological grounds. The focus in modern obstetrics extends well beyond fetal outcomes and encompasses concerns regarding neonatal death, serious neonatal morbidity and even neuro-developmental disability at 2 years of age [9,10]. This extended focus reflects an appreciation of latent periods (i.e., the time interval between disease occurrence and detection [7]). For instance, it is well recognized that the neurologic injury that characterizes cerebral palsy is typically sustained in utero, despite becoming clinically evident a year or more after birth [11,12]. The extended fetuses-at-risk model therefore proposes that the gestational age-specific rates of outcomes such as cerebral palsy are more appropriately calculated using fetuses as the candidates for cerebral palsy [13]. The same argument

applies to neonatal death – the pathological events that result in neonatal death typically occur during the intrauterine period. From an epidemiologic standpoint as well, it is commonplace to estimate cancer and other cause-specific mortality rates by age, and in the perinatal realm, calculations of cause-specific infant mortality (e.g., rate of infant deaths due to congenital anomalies) use all live births in the denominator [14].

Perhaps the single, most serious misunderstanding regarding the fetuses-at-risk approach in the *Commentary* [1] relates to the issue of rising gestational age-specific perinatal mortality rates and the consequent implications for iatrogenic preterm delivery. Although perinatal mortality rates do increase with increasing gestation in fetuses-at-risk models, it is a profound misconception to state that such a pattern automatically implies the need for indiscriminate increases in preterm induction or preterm cesarean delivery. This non-sequitur is analogous to suggesting that those who document the age related rise in cancer mortality advocate routine chemotherapy and radiation for the middle aged.

Selective, carefully-timed, early delivery given fetal compromise (or maternal indication) is the cornerstone of modern obstetrics. Whether early delivery at any gestation can save a compromised fetus depends on the gestational age of the fetus, the degree of compromise and the technologic package available for effecting early delivery and caring for the newborn. Iatrogenic early delivery is carried out at preterm gestation only if the overall risks to the fetus of a continuing pregnancy are judged to exceed those of early delivery and supportive neonatal care. This judgement involves an informal or formal balancing of harms versus benefits [2,5].

The *Commentary* [1] provides a listing of outcomes whose rates are judged to require particular denominators. Our alternative viewpoint posits that the choice of denominator depends on whether one seeks to build a causal or prognostic (non-causal) model [5,13,15]. Fundamental caveats in this context include whether

- 1) gestational age is to be treated as survival time (causal model) or as just another determinant (prognostic model)
- 2) the entire biologic continuum from fetus to infant needs to be represented (causal model) or whether a truncated period will suffice (prognostic model)
- 3) a restrictive approach to variable selection, which avoids variables in the causal pathway, is deemed appropriate (causal model) or whether a more liberal approach is considered appropriate (prognostic model).

Thus models that predict neonatal death among live born infants and use determinants such as gestational age can be valid for prognostic purposes and can serve an important social/medical purpose. On the other hand, such models lead to awkward paradoxical phenomena, for example, by consistently showing that preterm infants of smokers have lower mortality rates than preterm infants of non-smokers. These and other conundrums require a causal model for explication [5].

This debate highlights the dichotomy that prevails in the use of fundamental epidemiologic constructs within perinatal epidemiology versus other epidemiologic domains. A careful examination of terms and concepts helps situate the traditional perinatal and the fetuses-at-risk models within the broader context of causal and non-causal models in general epidemiology.

### Competing interests

The author(s) declare that they have no competing interests.

### Acknowledgements

The author is indebted to the Canadian Perinatal Surveillance System – many of these concepts are based on previously published work carried out with colleagues in the Canadian Perinatal Surveillance System. Dr. Joseph is supported by a Peter Lougheed New Investigator award from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

### References

1. Caughey AB: **Measuring perinatal complications: methodologic issues related to gestational age.** *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2007, **7**:18.
2. Joseph KS: **Theory of obstetrics: an epidemiologic framework for justifying medically indicated early delivery.** *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2007, **7**:4.
3. Yudkin PL, Wood L, Redman CW: **Risk of unexplained stillbirth at different gestational ages.** *Lancet* 1987, **1(8543)**:1192-1194.
4. Kramer MS, Liu S, Luo Z, Yuan H, Platt RW, Joseph KS: **Analysis of perinatal mortality and its components: time for a change?** *Am J Epidemiol* 2002, **156**:493-7.
5. Joseph KS: **Incidence-based measures of birth, growth restriction and death can free perinatal epidemiology from erroneous concepts of risk.** *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004, **57**:889-97.
6. Smith GC: **Life-table analysis of the risk of perinatal death at term and post term in singleton pregnancies.** *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2001, **184**:489-96.
7. Rothman KJ, Greenland S: **Measures of disease frequency.** In *Modern epidemiology* Second edition. Edited by: Rothman KJ, Greenland S. Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven Publishers; 1998:29-46.
8. Cotzias CS, Paterson-Brown S, Fisk NM: **Prospective risk of unexplained stillbirth in singleton pregnancies at term: population-based analysis.** *BMJ* 1999, **319**:287-8.
9. Crowther CA, Doyle LW, Haslam RR, Hiller JE, Harding JE, Robinson JS, ACTORDS Study Group: **Outcomes at 2 years of age after repeat doses of antenatal corticosteroids.** *N Engl J Med* 2007, **357**:1179-89.
10. Wapner RJ, Sorokin Y, Mele L, Johnson F, Dudley DJ, Spong CY, Peaceman AM, Leveno KJ, Malone F, Caritis SN, Mercer B, Harper M, Rouse DJ, Thorp JM, Ramin S, Carpenter MW, Gabbe SG, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units Network: **Long-term outcomes after repeat doses of antenatal corticosteroids.** *N Engl J Med* 2007, **357(12)**:1190-8.
11. Nelson KB, Grether JK: **Causes of cerebral palsy.** *Curr Opin Pediatr* 1999, **11**:487-491.
12. Croen LA, Grether JK, Curry CJ, Nelson KB: **Congenital abnormalities among children with cerebral palsy: more evidence for prenatal antecedents.** *J Pediatr* 2001, **138**:804-810.
13. Joseph KS, Allen AC, Lutfi S, Murphy-Kaulbeck L, Vincer MJ, Wood E: **Does the risk of cerebral palsy increase or decrease with increasing gestational age?** *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2003, **3**:8.
14. Health Canada: **Canadian Perinatal Health Report 2003.** Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada; 2003.
15. Miettinen OS: **Theoretical epidemiology: Principles of occurrence research in medicine.** John Wiley & Sons Toronto; 1985:11-12.

### Pre-publication history

The pre-publication history for this paper can be accessed here:

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2393/8/11/prepub>

Publish with **BioMed Central** and every scientist can read your work free of charge

"BioMed Central will be the most significant development for disseminating the results of biomedical research in our lifetime."

Sir Paul Nurse, Cancer Research UK

Your research papers will be:

- available free of charge to the entire biomedical community
- peer reviewed and published immediately upon acceptance
- cited in PubMed and archived on PubMed Central
- yours — you keep the copyright

Submit your manuscript here:  
[http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/publishing\\_adv.asp](http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/publishing_adv.asp)

