

1 **Placental Growth Factor Informed Management of Suspected Pre-eclampsia or**  
2 **Fetal Growth Restriction: The MAPPLE Cohort Study**

3  
4 Andrew SHARP<sup>1\*</sup>, Lucy C. CHAPPELL<sup>2\*</sup>, Gustaaf DEKKER<sup>3</sup>, Sanja PELLETIER<sup>4</sup>, Yves GARNIER<sup>4</sup>, Onur  
5 ZEREN<sup>4</sup>, Katharina M. HILLERER<sup>5</sup>, Thorsten FISCHER<sup>5</sup>, Paul T. SEED<sup>2</sup>, Mark TURNER<sup>1</sup>, Andrew H.  
6 SHENNAN<sup>2</sup>, Zarko ALFIREVIC<sup>1</sup>

7  
8 **Affiliations:**

- 9 1. Department of Women's and Children's Health Research, University of Liverpool, United  
10 Kingdom  
11 2. Women's Health Academic Centre, King's College London, United Kingdom  
12 3. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Lyell McEwin Hospital, University of Adelaide,  
13 Australia  
14 4. Klinik für Frauenheilkunde und Geburtshilfe, Klinikum Osnabrück, Lehrkrankenhaus der  
15 Universität Münster, Germany  
16 5. Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria.

17  
18 \*joint senior authors

19  
20 **Correspondence:**

21 Dr Andrew Sharp

22 Department of Women's and Children's Health Research, University of Liverpool, Liverpool  
23 Women's Hospital, Crown Street, Liverpool, L8 7SS, United Kingdom.

24 Tel: +44 151 795 9560

25  
26 Email: [asharp@liv.ac.uk](mailto:asharp@liv.ac.uk)

27

28 **Abstract**

29 **Objectives**

30 Placental Growth Factor (PIGF) has been shown to be beneficial in diagnosing pre-eclampsia. We performed  
31 a prospective cohort study of revealed PIGF in standard clinical use in four teaching hospitals in UK,  
32 Germany, Austria and Australia.

33

34 **Study Design**

35 Clinical data from women with suspected pre-eclampsia or fetal growth restriction < 35 weeks' gestation  
36 with revealed PIGF measurement were collected (MAPPLE study).

37

38 **Main Outcome Measures**

39 Data were compared to the PELICAN study (PIGF concealed). Pre-specified outcomes were compared using  
40 standard statistical tests (median difference or Risk Ratio). The results were further categorised by PIGF  
41 concentration: i) very low (<12pg/ml), ii) low (12-100pg/ml), iii) normal (>100pg/ml).

42

43 **Results**

44 396 women managed with revealed PIGF (MAPPLE) were compared with 287 women with concealed PIGF  
45 (PELICAN). Revealed PIGF led to delivery 1.4 weeks earlier (-2.0 to -0.9, 34.9 weeks vs 36.7 weeks). There  
46 were no significant differences in maternal adverse outcomes (11.9% vs 10.1%, Risk Ratio (RR) 1.17, 95%CI  
47 0.76-1.82) or caesarean sections (73.8% vs 64.5%; RR 1.14, 95%CI 1.03 to 1.26). Revealed PIGF led to fewer  
48 perinatal deaths (2 vs 9; RR 0.16, 95%CI 0.03 to 0.74) and fewer babies with birthweight <3<sup>rd</sup> centile (28.9%  
49 vs 36.1%; RR 0.80, (0.65 to 0.99), but with more neonatal adverse outcomes (30.4% vs 17.1%; RR 1.78, 95%CI  
50 1.32 to 2.41).

51

52 **Conclusions**

53 Revealed PIGF may be associated with lower perinatal mortality and birthweight <3<sup>rd</sup> centile but appears to  
54 lead to earlier delivery with more neonatal respiratory morbidity. Randomised trials with adequate power  
55 for clinical outcomes are needed.

56

57 **Funding**

58 Financial assistance was received from Alere to support the running of the MAPPLE database. Alere had no  
59 access to the information or control over the database itself.

60

61 **Keywords**

62 Placental Growth Factor, Pre-eclampsia, Pregnancy Outcome, Small for Gestational Age Fetus, Stillbirth

63

64 **Highlights**

- 65 • We report PIGF-led management of pregnant women as part of routine clinical care
- 66 • We compared our revealed PIGF cohort to a previous cohort with concealed PIGF results
- 67 • Revealed PIGF leads to earlier delivery by 1.4 weeks
- 68 • Revealed PIGF leads to fewer perinatal deaths and babies <3<sup>rd</sup> centile at birth
- 69 • Revealed PIGF increased neonatal morbidity, predominantly due to respiratory causes

70

71 **Introduction**

72 Pre-eclampsia is a multisystem disorder affecting 3-5% of pregnancies and is associated with abnormal  
73 placentation and placental dysfunction (1). The detection of pre-eclampsia is a major focus of maternity care  
74 as it remains a significant cause of maternal and perinatal morbidity and mortality (1). The only treatment  
75 for pre-eclampsia currently available is delivery and therefore accurate diagnosis with the aid of a biomarker  
76 could allow adjustment to clinical care.

77  
78 Placental Growth Factor (PlGF) is one of several biomarkers which have been shown to have a predictive  
79 capacity for the screening and detection of pre-eclampsia (2, 3). PlGF is produced by the syncytiotrophoblast  
80 and is identifiable in maternal blood from as early as 12 weeks (4) with concentrations increasing with  
81 gestation until around 30 weeks before declining until birth (5). A decline in PlGF appears to represent a  
82 negative syncytiotrophoblast stress response to a variety of insults ranging from hypoxia (6), inflammation,  
83 oxidative stress(7) and is as such also seen as part of syncytiotrophoblast aging. PlGF concentrations are  
84 lower in pre-eclampsia (2), and extremely low in severe early-onset pre-eclampsia (8). Recently it has also  
85 been suggested that low PlGF concentrations are associated with fetal growth restriction (FGR) (9) and  
86 placental dysfunction (10).

87  
88 Currently the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) (11) recommends the use of two  
89 platforms for PlGF assessment in pregnancy, produced by Alere (2) and Roche (12). The Alere platform uses  
90 antibodies against PlGF isoform-1, with some cross-reactivity for isoform-2, and has a moderate body of  
91 evidence for its clinical effectiveness at determining pre-eclampsia requiring delivery within 14 days  
92 (PELICAN study) (2, 13). The Roche platform, which measures soluble FMS-like tyrosine kinase-1 (sFlt-1)  
93 relative to PlGF also has a developing body of evidence (PROGNOSIS study) (12). Both tests have been  
94 endorsed by NICE for the investigation of hypertension in pregnancy, to 'rule out' a diagnosis of pre-  
95 eclampsia (11). Economic benefits, with savings of approximately £500 per patient, have also been  
96 suggested to be achievable if a PlGF based management pathway for women with hypertension in  
97 pregnancy is instigated (13).

98  
99  
100 To date there have not been any published randomised controlled trials of the use of PlGF as a diagnostic  
101 test in women with hypertension in pregnancy. The best estimates of cost-effectiveness and clinical utility  
102 will come from randomised controlled trials such as the PARROT study (14). However, until these are  
103 available comparative cohort studies may offer an insight into the clinical impact of PlGF, when used as a  
104 diagnostic test in women presenting with suspected pre-eclampsia. The objective of the MAPPLE study was

105 to report clinical outcomes in women managed with revealed PIGF results and to compare those outcomes  
106 with those of the PELICAN study (2) in which clinicians were not informed of the PIGF result. This would  
107 identify the potential clinical implications of revealing PIGF results to the clinician.

108

## 109 **Methods**

110 The Management of pregnancy complications with PIGF testing (MAPPLE) registry was established as a  
111 prospective cohort of women managed with revealed PIGF results according to local guidelines as part of  
112 clinical service evaluation. Four maternity units agreed to compile data on women with pregnancies  
113 complicated by suspected pre-eclampsia or fetal growth restriction managed with revealed PIGF as part of  
114 standard maternity care and funded from within maternity budgets. Participating units were located in the  
115 United Kingdom (Liverpool), Austria (Salzburg), Germany (Osnabrück) and Australia (Adelaide).

116 A single 2.5ml whole blood sample was taken from each women into bottles containing ethylenediamine  
117 tetra-acetic acid. The plasma derived after centrifugation at 3000rpm for 5 mins was tested for PIGF  
118 concentration, using the Triage system (Alere, San Diego, CA), according to the manufacturer's instructions.  
119 All meters were programmed throughout to produce a revealed PIGF result available immediately to  
120 laboratory and clinical staff. The assay uses fluorescently labelled recombinant murine monoclonal  
121 antibodies targeted to PIGF, which provide a quantifiable result within the range 12 to 3000pg/mL, within  
122 approximately 15 minutes. The manufacturer states a limit of detection of 9-3000pg/ml (11).

123

124 Women presenting prior to 35 weeks' gestation attending their local hospital with suspected pre-eclampsia  
125 or fetal growth restriction were offered PIGF testing in line with local hospital policy. No consent was  
126 required as PIGF informed management constituted routine care in these units. Clinicians were aware of the  
127 PIGF result and were expected to adjust care accordingly. An example of the PIGF guideline used at Liverpool  
128 Women's Hospital can be found in Supplementary Text 1.

129

130 Anonymised clinical data were entered onto a dedicated study case report form. A data transfer agreement  
131 was in place at each site before uploading to a secure database (Simplified Clinical Data Systems,  
132 Portsmouth, NH). The uploaded data were assessed for completeness by the lead author. Ethical permission  
133 was not required as no identifiable patient data were used.

134

135 Data for clinical outcomes were compared, where possible, between revealed (MAPPLE) and concealed  
136 (PELICAN) cohorts (2) using median differences or risk ratios. Only the initial PIGF assessment was used even  
137 if more than one sample was taken to maintain consistency with the PELICAN study.

138

139 The study is essentially a comparison of two cohorts of pregnant women, selected under different  
140 circumstances and for different reasons. Accordingly, we decided to conduct an unadjusted comparison  
141 between the studies, which reported on all the important measures, and estimated the size of the  
142 differences and then to adjust comparisons for the principal differences between the women prior to PIGF  
143 testing. Adjustment was made for maternal age, BMI, nulliparity, and proteinuria. For the adjusted analysis,  
144 women with twin pregnancies were excluded, as were women where key predictors were missing.  
145 When comparing event rates (e.g. perinatal deaths, perinatal adverse outcomes, results were expressed as  
146 odds ratios, with 95% confidence intervals. For the main continuous measures birthweight and gestational  
147 age at delivery, differences in the mean were calculated. For additional measures, either means (with SD) or  
148 medians (with quartiles) were presented. Data are presented in the previously derived ranges of <12pg/ml  
149 (very low), 12-100pg/ml (low; representing <5<sup>th</sup> percentile of normal) and >100pg/ml (normal) (2, 10).  
150 Birthweights are presented as customised fetal weight centiles (15). We examined whether apparent  
151 differences in infant outcomes could be due to confounding at baseline (maternal age, singleton pregnancy,  
152 ethnicity, pre-gestational diabetes, APS/SLE, previous pregnancy complications, new hypertension,  
153 suspected FGR and proteinuria) using multiple regression. We also compared the unadjusted and adjusted  
154 impact of revealed PIGF on management of pregnant women (antenatal steroid use, induction of labour,  
155 Caesarean section) using an interaction test.

156

## 157 **Results**

158 Between April 2014 and March 2016, clinical outcomes were obtained from 396 women presenting prior to  
159 35 weeks' gestation with a known PIGF result and complete outcome dataset. The clinical datasets included  
160 for analysis came from Liverpool: 241 women; Osnabrück: 115 women; Salzburg: 26 women; Adelaide 14  
161 women.

162

163 The MAPPLE cohort varied from the PELICAN cohort in a number of demographic features (maternal age,  
164 twin status, ethnicity, pre-gestational diabetes, APS/SLE, and complications of previous pregnancies) as  
165 shown in Table 1. The distribution of PIGF sub-groups at first sampling were similar.

166

167 There were no significant differences in maternal adverse outcomes between women in the MAPPLE cohort  
168 compared to those in the PELICAN study (11.9% vs 10.1%, Risk Ratio 1.17; 95% confidence intervals 0.76 to  
169 1.82) with the majority of complications related to hepatic and renal dysfunction (Table 2).

170

171 There were 433 babies in the MAPPLE cohort and 299 in PELICAN (Table 2). There was a single stillbirth  
172 within the MAPPLE cohort, in a woman with chronic hypertension with superimposed pre-eclampsia and

173 severe early-onset FGR who withdrew from clinical care before presenting two weeks later with an  
174 intrauterine fetal death. There were significantly fewer perinatal deaths in the MAPPLE cohort (n=2, 0.5%)  
175 compared to those in the PELICAN study (n=9; 3.0%; Odds Ratio 0.16 (0.03 to 0.74). More babies  
176 experienced a composite perinatal adverse outcome in MAPPLE (n=133, 30.7%) than in PELICAN (n=61;  
177 20.4%; Risk Ratio 1.51 (1.15 to 1.98), Neonatal adverse outcomes were more common in the MAPPLE cohort  
178 (n=131; 30.4% vs. n=51; 17.1%; Risk Ratio 1.78 (1.32 to 2.41); these were dominated by respiratory  
179 morbidity including respiratory distress syndrome (RDS) and bronchopulmonary dysplasia (BPD). A higher  
180 proportion of babies in the MAPPLE cohort were admitted to the neonatal unit compared to those in the  
181 PELICAN study (n=190; 45.5% vs n=117; 39.8%; Risk Ratio 1.14 (0.95 to 1.37).

182

183 The time between first PIGF test and delivery was shorter when PIGF result was revealed to the clinician with  
184 a mean difference of 6 days (-2.0 to -10.0; 24 days vs 29 days) (Table 3). A greater proportion of women with  
185 revealed PIGF (n=236; 59.9%) received antenatal steroids for fetal lung maturation compared to PELICAN  
186 (n=88; 30.1%; Risk Ratio 1.95; 1.61-2.37).

187

188 Fewer women had fetal ultrasound assessment performed after PIGF sampling when PIGF was revealed  
189 (89.1% vs 98.7%; Risk ratio 0.90; 0.87 to 0.94) but the proportion of women with estimated fetal weight  
190 (EFW) <10<sup>th</sup> centile or abnormal fetal Doppler (absent or reversed end diastolic flow in the umbilical artery)  
191 was similar in both studies. There was no evidence of revealed PIGF testing affecting decisions to give  
192 steroids (p=0.09), induction of labour (0.13) or Caesarean section (0.18) assessed using interaction tests.  
193 Women with revealed PIGF results were delivered at an earlier gestation with a mean difference of 1.4  
194 weeks (-2.0 to -0.9, 34.9 weeks vs 36.7 weeks). There was an increased likelihood of the fetus being  
195 delivered by caesarean section in the MAPPLE cohort compared to the PELICAN cohort (73.8% vs 64.5%; Risk  
196 Ratio 1.14, 1.03 to 1.26). In women managed with revealed PIGF results, there was a significantly lower risk  
197 of women delivering a small for gestational age (SGA) infant <3<sup>rd</sup> centile (Risk Ratio 0.80; 0.65 to 0.99)  
198 compared to those managed with concealed PIGF results.

199

200 Evaluation of principal outcomes in women with a singleton pregnancy (n=356 in MAPPLE; n=275 in  
201 PELICAN) with adjustment for baseline confounders did not substantially change the findings: mean  
202 gestation at delivery 34.4 (SD 3.6) vs. 36.0 (3.8) weeks; unadjusted median difference -1.33 (-1.89 to -0.77)  
203 and adjusted median difference -0.95 (-1.60 to -0.31) weeks; perinatal adverse outcomes 28.4% vs. 18.9%;  
204 uOR 1.74 (1.20 to 2.51) and aOR 1.51 (0.93 to 2.43). When analysis was restricted to singleton pregnancies,  
205 the increase in Caesarean sections was of borderline significance (uOR 1.39; 1.00 to 1.95) and the odds

206 reduced (and not significant) when adjusted for baseline confounders between the cohorts (aOR 1.33; 0.85  
207 to 2.07).

208

209 Tables 4 and 5 report maternal and perinatal outcomes for women managed with revealed and concealed  
210 testing by PIGF sub-group (<12, 12-100 and >100pg/ml). A greater proportion of women in the very low PIGF  
211 group in both cohorts had maternal adverse outcomes (compared to the other groups) and the interval from  
212 sampling to delivery was shortest in this group. As these two cohorts are not from a randomised  
213 comparison, and the cohort has been further divided, further statistical testing has not been undertaken.  
214 All stillbirths and perinatal deaths in revealed and concealed cohorts occurred in singleton pregnancies with  
215 abnormal PIGF concentrations (low or very low) (Table 5). Gestation at delivery was earliest in women with  
216 lowest PIGF concentrations, whether the result was revealed or concealed.

217

## 218 **Discussion**

219 In women managed with revealed PIGF results, there were fewer perinatal deaths; this may be due to  
220 modifications in surveillance and monitoring of these pregnancies than if the PIGF result were unknown.  
221 Previous observational cohorts have demonstrated a correlation between low PIGF concentrations at 19-24  
222 weeks' gestation and subsequent stillbirth (16). Whilst around 25% of fetuses in both cohorts were identified  
223 as having an estimated fetal weight <10<sup>th</sup> centile on ultrasound at presentation, there were significantly  
224 fewer infants born small for gestational age (<3<sup>rd</sup> centile) in those managed with revealed PIGF results, even  
225 after adjustment for baseline predictors, suggesting that earlier delivery due to revealed PIGF may have  
226 prevented a slowing of fetal growth in utero. Revealing PIGF was associated with a shorter diagnosis to  
227 delivery interval and an earlier gestation at delivery. We observed a similar rate of antenatal diagnosis of  
228 SGA as the 15% observed in the sFlt1:PIGF study by Zeisler et al. (12).

229

230 The revealing of PLGF to the clinical team was associated with a significant reduction in perinatal mortality.  
231 Not surprisingly this gain comes at the cost of increased neonatal unit admissions and perinatal morbidity, in  
232 particular respiratory complications. This higher prevalence of respiratory morbidity in the MAPPLE cohort  
233 may be related to the earlier gestation at delivery or increased use of caesarean delivery and was not  
234 ameliorated by an increased use of antenatal steroids. Diagnosis of respiratory distress syndrome and  
235 bronchopulmonary dysplasia was similar across centres within the MAPPLE study; it was higher than that in  
236 the PELICAN study and the 10% observed in the TRUFFLE cohort of growth restricted fetuses (who share  
237 many features with women in the PIGF <12pg/ml subgroup) (17).

238



239 Around 10% of women in both cohorts had maternal adverse outcomes, similar to previous observations (2),  
240 with the majority of adverse outcomes other than abnormal biochemistry in women with very low PIGF  
241 concentrations. There was less preeclampsia in the revealed cohort perhaps suggesting that earlier  
242 intervention prevented a worsening of the maternal condition. However, women managed with revealed  
243 PIGF results required frequent attendance at antenatal clinic and admission, possibly due to the persistence  
244 of hypertension and other risk factors.

245

246 This is the largest cohort study to date assessing the impact of PIGF informed care on pregnancy outcome  
247 and provides generalisable 'real life' data applicable across healthcare systems. At present these data  
248 provide the best information about the consequences of PIGF results in pregnancy. Outcomes have been  
249 compared between women managed with revealed results (MAPPLE) and those managed with concealed  
250 results (PELICAN) and variation in practice, differences in multiple pregnancy numbers or ethnicity between  
251 different countries could influence some of the outcomes. Statistical comparison was limited to those least  
252 influenced by possible variations in practice.

253

254 Our findings are confirmed by the much smaller study by Cetin et al. (18), which assessed just 57 women  
255 with pre-eclampsia and 16 with fetal growth restriction.

256

## 257 **Conclusion**

258 Implication for practice

259 Our data demonstrate that PIGF-informed management of high-risk pregnancies is feasible within standard  
260 clinical care. This study was not designed to demonstrate cost-effectiveness or perform an economic analysis  
261 of the use of PIGF, but previous assessments have suggested cost savings with PIGF use. Overall, our study  
262 suggests that early intervention with PIGF-led management may prevent worsening of fetal health but at the  
263 expense of earlier delivery and increased neonatal complications, almost exclusively due to respiratory  
264 morbidity, despite increased use of antenatal steroids. This may be offset by lower perinatal mortality and  
265 fewer small for gestational age babies.

266

267 The statistically significant reduction in stillbirths between revealed and concealed PIGF led care is of interest  
268 but there should be caution in interpreting these data in light of the methodological differences between  
269 these two cohorts. Further evidence from randomised controlled trials will assist in interpretation of these  
270 findings. However, studies powered for stillbirth and perinatal death as an outcome are difficult to perform.  
271 The pattern of earlier delivery suggests that clinicians consider optimal management and timing of delivery  
272 in response to the knowledge of PIGF. However, earlier delivery (by six days) was also associated with

273 worsened short-term neonatal outcomes; this may have been influenced by a lower gestation at enrolment  
274 in the revealed cohort and by the overall earlier gestation at delivery of 1.4 weeks. Education of obstetric  
275 teams and increased confidence in PIGF assessment over time to ensure that PIGF use leads to increased  
276 surveillance rather than precipitating delivery may optimise the benefit (i.e. reduced perinatal death) while  
277 limiting iatrogenic delivery. Likewise, the mode of delivery should be determined by accepted obstetrical  
278 indications rather than PIGF result alone. This should be considered when planning to introduce a new tests  
279 in a high risk population.

280

281 Implications for research

282 The nature of this study, with different cohorts, precludes more detailed interpretation of the results in table  
283 4 and 5. The true picture of potential clinical benefit or harm from PIGF-led management will only come  
284 from further randomised studies of its use as well as full cost-effectiveness assessment. Until the results of  
285 these studies are available, caution should be exercised before moving to PIGF-led management for all high-  
286 risk women. Ongoing and future randomised studies should have adequate power to confirm or refute our  
287 findings.

288

289 **Disclosure of Interests**

290 A Sharp and Z Alfirevic received financial assistance from Alere to support the running of the MAPPLE  
291 database. Alere had no access to the information or control over the database itself.

292 A Shennan has been paid as a consultant for and received honoraria from Alere and has also been paid as a  
293 consultant for Roche and Perkin Elmer.

294 All other authors declare no conflict of interests.

295

296 **Contribution to authorship**

297 A Sharp and ZA conceived the idea and performed the analysis and wrote the manuscript. LC and A Shennan  
298 provided data from the PELICAN study and wrote the manuscript. PS performed statistical analysis. TF, KH,  
299 SP, ZO, YG, MT and GD all provided data and reviewed the manuscript.

300

301 **Ethics approval**

302 Ethical permission was not required as no identifiable patient data were used.

303

304 **Funding**

305 This study was funded by financial assistance from Alere to support the running of the MAPPLE database.

306 Alere had no access to the information or control over the database itself.

307

308  
309  
310

**Table 1: Demographic data and clinical characteristics at enrolment for women in MAPPLE (revealed PIGF testing) and PELICAN (concealed PIGF testing) cohort studies presenting prior to 35 weeks' gestation.**

	<b>MAPPLE (revealed PIGF testing)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed PIGF testing)</b>	<b>Risk Ratio</b>
	<b>n=396</b>	<b>n=287</b>	
Age (years; median, quartiles)	31 (27-35)	32 (27-36)	-1.3 (-0.4 to -2.3)
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ; median, quartiles)	27 (24-32)	29 (24-34)	-0.8 (-0.1 to -1.8)
Nulliparous	208 (52.7)	164 (57.1)	0.92 (0.80 to 1.06)
Singleton pregnancy	360 (90.9)	275 (95.8)	0.95 (0.91 to 0.99)
Current Smoking	43 (11.3)	24 (8.6)	1.32 (0.82 to 2.12)
Ethnicity: White	357 (91.1%)	187 (65.6%)	
Ethnicity: Black	12 (3.1%)	70 (24.6%)	0.12 (0.07 to 0.22)
Ethnicity: Asian	8 (2.0%)	19 (6.7%)	0.24 (0.11 to 0.53)
Ethnicity: Other	19 (4.8%)	11 (3.8%)	
<b>Previous Medical History</b>			
Previous Preeclampsia	87 (22.0)	55 (19.2)	1.15 (0.85 to 1.55)
Chronic Hypertension	55 (14.4)	45 (15.7)	0.83 (0.58 to 1.19)
Systemic Lupus Erythematosus/ Antiphospholipid syndrome	6 (1.5)	12 (4.2)	0.34 (0.13 to 0.89)
Pre-gestational diabetes	37 (9.3)	6 (2.2)	4.19 (1.79 to 9.79)
Renal Disease	14 (3.5)	19 (6.6)	0.50 (0.26 to 0.98)
Previous hypertensive disorder of pregnancy (excluding preeclampsia)	7 (1.8)	15 (5.6)	0.32 (0.13 to 0.77)
<b>Indication for PIGF testing (non-exclusive)</b>			
New onset of hypertension	314 (79.5)	155 (54.0)	1.47 (1.31 to 1.66)
Persistent epigastric/ right upper quadrant pain	12 (3.0)	18 (6.3)	0.48 (0.24 to 0.99)
Suspected fetal growth restriction	66 (16.7)	25 (8.7)	1.92 (1.24 to 2.96)
Proteinuria	59 (14.9)	161 (56.1)	0.27 (0.21 to 0.34)
Gestational age at sampling, (weeks; median, quartiles)	30.7 (27.7-33.1)	31.0 (27.9-33.4)	-0.1 (0.3 to -0.7)
<b>PIGF result at first testing</b>			
PIGF <12	117 (29.5)	69 (24.0)	
PIGF 12-100	136 (34.3)	97 (33.8)	
PIGF >100	144 (36.3)	121 (42.2)	

311  
312

313 **Table 2: Maternal and perinatal adverse outcomes for women in MAPPLE (revealed PIGF testing) and**  
 314 **PELICAN (concealed PIGF testing) cohort studies presenting prior to 35 weeks' gestation with comparisons**  
 315 **for major outcomes.**

	<b>MAPPLE (revealed PIGF testing)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed PIGF testing);</b>	<b>Risk ratio</b>
	<b>n=396</b>	<b>n=287</b>	
<b>Final diagnosis of pre-eclampsia (n, %)</b>	193 (52.9)	176 (61.3)	0.86 (0.75 to 0.99)
<b>Women with maternal adverse outcomes (n, %)</b>	47 (11.9)	29 (10.1)	1.17 (0.76 to 1.82)
<b>Maternal adverse outcomes (non-exclusive) (n)</b>	55	36	-
<b>Maternal death</b>	0	0	-
<b>Central nervous system</b>			
Eclampsia	0	1	-
Stroke; hypertensive encephalopathy	0	0	-
Cortical blindness or retinal detachment	0	0	-
<b>Cardiovascular/ respiratory</b>			
Myocardial infarction	0	0	-
Intubation (other than for caesarean section)	0	1	-
Pulmonary oedema	2	2	-
<b>Haematological</b>			
Platelets <50×10 <sup>9</sup> /L (without transfusion)	2	2	-
Disseminated intravascular coagulation	1	1	-
Thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura/ haemolytic uraemic syndrome	0	0	-
<b>Hepatic</b>			
Dysfunction (Alanine transaminase ≥70IU/L)	38	23	
Haematoma; rupture; acute fatty liver of pregnancy	1	0	-
<b>Renal</b>			
Creatinine >150 µmol/L	7	2	-
Dialysis	2	0	-
<b>Obstetric</b>			
Placental abruption	1	4	-
<b>Number of infants</b>	<b>n=433</b>	<b>n=299</b>	<b>Risk Ratio</b>
<b>Infants with composite perinatal adverse outcome (perinatal death or neonatal adverse outcome) (n, %)</b>	131 (30.4)	60 (20.1)	1.51 (1.15 to 1.98)
<b>Perinatal death (n, %)</b>	2 (0.5)	9 (3.0)	0.16 (0.03 to 0.74)
Stillbirth (n, %)	1 (0.2)	7 (2.3)	-
Early neonatal death (n, %)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.7)	-
<b>Infants with neonatal adverse outcomes (n, %)</b>	131 (30.4)	51 (17.1)	1.78 (1.32 to 2.41)
<b>Neonatal adverse outcomes (non-exclusive) (n)</b>	178	62	-
Respiratory distress syndrome (n)	128 (30.5)	46 (15.4)	-

Bronchopulmonary dysplasia (n)	28 (6.7)	6 (2.0)	-
Intraventricular haemorrhage (Grade 3 or 4) (n)	4 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	-
Necrotising enterocolitis (n)	7 (1.7)	4 (1.3)	-
Retinopathy of prematurity (n)	11 (2.6)	6 (2.0)	-
<b>Infants admitted to neonatal unit (n, %)</b>	<b>190 (45.5)</b>	<b>117 (39.8)</b>	<b>1.14 (0.95 to 1.37)</b>

316

317

318  
319

**Table 3: Impact of PLGF testing of the pregnancy management in women in MAPPLE (revealed PIGF testing) and PELICAN (concealed PIGF testing) cohort studies presenting prior to 35 weeks' gestation**

	<b>MAPPLE (revealed PIGF testing)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed PIGF testing)</b>	<b>Median Difference/ Risk Ratio</b>
<b>Maternal</b>	<b>n=397</b>	<b>n=287</b>	
Interval from first test to delivery (days; median, quartiles)	24 (4 to 52)	29 (11 to 59)	-6.0 (-2.0 to -10.0)
Antenatal steroids (n, %)	236 (59.9)	88 (30.7)	1.95 (1.61 to 2.37)
Induction of labour (n, %)	97 (24.5)	108 (37.6)	0.66 (0.52 to 0.82)
<b>Fetal</b>	<b>n=433</b>	<b>n=299</b>	
Ultrasound scans (n, %)	384 (89.1)	295 (98.7)	0.90 (0.87 to 0.94)
Estimated fetal weight <10th centile (n/N, %)	80/375 (21.3)	83/285 (29.1)	0.73 (0.56 to 0.96)
Absent or reduced end diastolic flow (umbilical artery Doppler (n/N, %))	52/384 (13.5)	37/285 (13.1)	1.04 (0.70 to 1.54)
<b>Perinatal</b>	<b>n=433</b>	<b>n=299</b>	
Gestational age at delivery (weeks; median, quartiles)	34.9 (32.0-37.1)	36.7 (33.6–38.6)	-1.4 (-0.9 to -2.0)
Caesarean section (n, %)	318 (73.8)	193 (64.5)	1.14 (1.03 to 1.26)
Birthweight (grams; median, quartiles)	2280 (1490-2960)	2420 (1620–3125)	-160 (-15 to -310)
Small for gestational age infant <10th centile (n, %)	181 (42.2)	145 (48.5)	0.87 (0.74 to 1.02)
Small for gestational age infant <3rd centile (n, %)	124 (28.9)	108 (36.1)	0.80 (0.65 to 0.99)

320  
321

322  
323  
324

**Table 4: Maternal and fetal outcomes in women in MAPPLE (revealed PIGF testing) and PELICAN (concealed PIGF testing) cohort studies presenting prior to 35 weeks' gestation presented by PIGF results at enrolment.**

	<b>MAPPLE (revealed)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed)</b>	<b>MAPPLE (revealed)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed)</b>	<b>MAPPLE (revealed)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed)</b>
	<b>PIGF &lt;12</b>	<b>PIGF &lt;12</b>	<b>PIGF 12-100</b>	<b>PIGF 12-100</b>	<b>PIGF &gt;100</b>	<b>PIGF &gt;100</b>
<b>Maternal</b>	<b>n=116</b>	<b>n=69</b>	<b>n=137</b>	<b>n=97</b>	<b>n=143</b>	<b>n=121</b>
Final diagnosis of pre-eclampsia (n, %)	51 (48.6)	67 (97.1)	69 (53.1)	72 ( 74.2)	73 (56.2)	37 (30.6)
Women with any maternal adverse outcome (n, %)	25 (21.6)	12 (17.4)	16 (11.7)	8 (8.2)	6 (4.2)	9 (7.4)
Eclampsia	0	0	0	1	0	0
Intubation	0	1	0	0	0	0
Pulmonary oedema	1	2	1	0	0	0
Platelets <50×10 <sup>9</sup> /L	2	1	1	0	0	1
Disseminated intravascular coagulation	1	1	0	0	0	0
Dysfunction (Alanine transaminase ≥70IU/L)	23	9	11	7	4	7
Creatinine >150 µmol/L	1	2	4	0	2	0
Dialysis	0	0	1	0	1	0
Placental abruption	1	3	0	0	0	1
Interval from first test to delivery (median, quartiles)	3 (1 to 13)	9 (3 to 16)	19 (6 to 43)	23 (11 to 40)	48 (32 to 69)	61 (37 to 90)
Antenatal steroids for fetal lung maturity (n, %)	103 (89.6)	41 (59.4)	81 (59.6)	34 (35.1)	52 (36.4)	13 (10.7)
Induction of labour (n, %)	10 (8.6)	13 (18.8)	35 (25.5)	44 (45.4)	52 (36.4)	51 (42.1)
Antenatal clinic or assessment unit visits (mean, SD)	2.5 (5.5)	N/A	3.7 (5.3)	N/A	5.2 (5.5)	N/A
Antenatal inpatient nights (mean, SD)	2.3 (4.8)	N/A	2.4 (5.8)	N/A	3.8 (5.7)	N/A
<b>Fetal</b>	<b>n=122</b>	<b>n=69</b>	<b>n=158</b>	<b>n=105</b>	<b>n=151</b>	<b>n=125</b>
Number with ultrasound scans (n, %)	111 (91.0)	68 (98.6)	146 (92.4)	104 (98.4)	127 (84.1)	123 (90.6)
Estimated fetal weight <10th centile (n/N, %)	50/109 (45.9)	43/68 (63.2)	17/142 (12.0)	28/99 (28.3)	13/124 (10.5)	12/118 (10.2)
Absent or reduced end diastolic flow in umbilical artery - Doppler (n/N, %)	36/111 (32.4)	24/68 (35.3)	12/146 (8.2)	9/99 (9.1)	4/127 (3.1)	4/118 (3.4)

325  
326



327  
328

**Table 5: Perinatal outcomes in MAPPLE (revealed PIGF testing) and PELICAN (concealed PIGF testing) cohort studies presenting prior to 35 weeks' gestation presented by PIGF results at enrolment.**

	<b>MAPPLE (revealed)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed)</b>	<b>MAPPLE (revealed)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed)</b>	<b>MAPPLE (revealed)</b>	<b>PELICAN (concealed)</b>
	<b>PIGF &lt;12</b>	<b>PIGF &lt;12</b>	<b>PIGF 12-100</b>	<b>PIGF 12-100</b>	<b>PIGF &gt;100</b>	<b>PIGF &gt;100</b>
<b>Perinatal</b>	<b>n=124</b>	<b>n=69</b>	<b>n=158</b>	<b>n=105</b>	<b>n=151</b>	<b>n=125</b>
Stillbirth (n, %)	1 (0.8)	4 (5.8)	0	3 (2.9)	0	0
Neonatal death (n, %)	1 (0.8)	2 (2.9)	0	0	0	0
Gestational age at delivery (weeks; median, quartiles)	31.2 (29.0-33.4)	31.9 (29.3-34.1)	35.0 (33.3-36.8)	35.7 (34.1-37.9)	37.4 (36.1-38.4)	38.4 (37-39.9)
Delivery <37 weeks (n, %)	120 (100)	65 (94.2)	126 (79.7)	64 (60.1)	58 (38.4)	29 (23.2)
Delivery <34 weeks (n, %)	97 (80.8)	50 (72.5)	48 (30.4)	23 (21.9)	22 (14.6)	10 (8.0)
Caesarean section (n, %)	115 (94.3)	57 (82.6)	120 (75.9)	74 (70.5)	83 (55.0)	62 (49.6)
Birthweight (grams; mean, SD)	1360 (970-1650)	1280 (862-1678)	2290 (1810-2740)	2270 (1757-2830)	2990 (2590-3355)	3100 (2672-3505)
Small for gestational age infant <10th centile (n, %)	92 (76.7)	57 (82.6)	65 (41.1)	59 (56.2)	24 (15.9)	29 (23.2)
Small for gestational age infant <3rd centile (n, %)	71 (59.2)	50 (72.5)	44 (27.8)	46 (43.8)	9 (6.0)	12 (9.6)
Neonatal unit admission (n, %)	94 (81.7)	53 (82.8)	71 (46.4)	46 (43.8)	25 (16.7)	18 (14.4)
Infants with neonatal adverse outcomes (n, %)	74 (60.7)	27 (39.1)	37 (23.4)	14 (13.3)	20 (13.2)	10 (8.0)
Respiratory distress syndrome (n, %)	72 (62.1)	23 (33.3)	36 (23.4)	14 (13.3)	20 (13.3)	9 (7.2)
Bronchopulmonary dysplasia (n, %)	19 (16.4)	6 (8.7)	4 (2.6)	0	5 (3.3)	0
Intraventricular haemorrhage (Grade 3/4) (n, %)	2 (1.6)	0	2 (1.3)	0	0	0
Necrotising enterocolitis (n, %)	4 (3.4)	3 (4.3)	2 (1.3)	0	1 (0.7)	1 (0.8)
Retinopathy of prematurity (n, %)	7 (6.0)	5 (7.2)	3 (1.9)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.7)	0

329  
330

331 **References**

- 332 1. Mol BW, Roberts CT, Thangaratinam S, Magee LA, de Groot CJ, Hofmeyr GJ. Pre-eclampsia. *Lancet*.  
333 2016;387(10022):999-1011.
- 334 2. Chappell LC, Duckworth S, Seed PT, Griffin M, Myers J, Mackillop L, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of  
335 placental growth factor in women with suspected preeclampsia: a prospective multicenter study. *Circulation*.  
336 2013;128(19):2121-31.
- 337 3. Sharp AN, Alfirevic Z. First trimester screening can predict adverse pregnancy outcomes. *Prenat*  
338 *Diagn*. 2014;34(7):660-7.
- 339 4. Poon LC, Nicolaides KH. First-trimester maternal factors and biomarker screening for preeclampsia.  
340 *Prenat Diagn*. 2014;34(7):618-27.
- 341 5. Knudsen UB, Kronborg CS, von Dadelszen P, Kupfer K, Lee SW, Vittinghus E, et al. A single rapid  
342 point-of-care placental growth factor determination as an aid in the diagnosis of preeclampsia. *Pregnancy*  
343 *Hypertens*. 2012;2(1):8-15.
- 344 6. Shore VH, Wang TH, Wang CL, Torry RJ, Caudle MR, Torry DS. Vascular endothelial growth factor,  
345 placenta growth factor and their receptors in isolated human trophoblast. *Placenta*. 1997;18(8):657-65.
- 346 7. Charnock-Jones DS. Placental hypoxia, endoplasmic reticulum stress and maternal endothelial  
347 sensitisation by sFLT1 in pre-eclampsia. *J Reprod Immunol*. 2016;114:81-5.
- 348 8. Robinson CJ, Johnson DD, Chang EY, Armstrong DM, Wang W. Evaluation of placenta growth factor  
349 and soluble Fms-like tyrosine kinase 1 receptor levels in mild and severe preeclampsia. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*.  
350 2006;195(1):255-9.
- 351 9. Molvarec A, Gullai N, Stenczer B, Fugedi G, Nagy B, Rigo J, Jr. Comparison of placental growth factor  
352 and fetal flow Doppler ultrasonography to identify fetal adverse outcomes in women with hypertensive  
353 disorders of pregnancy: an observational study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2013;13:161.
- 354 10. Benton SJ, McCowan LM, Heazell AE, Grynspan D, Hutcheon JA, Senger C, et al. Placental growth  
355 factor as a marker of fetal growth restriction caused by placental dysfunction. *Placenta*. 2016;42:1-8.
- 356 11. (NICE) NifHaCE. PlGF-based testing to help diagnose suspected pre-eclampsia 2016;NICE Diagnostic  
357 Guidance [DG 23](DG 23).
- 358 12. Zeisler H, Llurba E, Chantraine F, Vatish M, Staff AC, Sennstrom M, et al. Predictive Value of the sFlt-  
359 1:PlGF Ratio in Women with Suspected Preeclampsia. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374(1):13-22.
- 360 13. Duckworth S, Chappell LC, Seed PT, Mackillop L, Shennan AH, Hunter R. Placental Growth Factor  
361 (PlGF) in Women with Suspected Pre-Eclampsia Prior to 35 Weeks' Gestation: A Budget Impact Analysis. *PLoS*  
362 *One*. 2016;11(10):e0164276.
- 363 14. Benincasa T, King E, Rimer B, Bloom H, Balshem A, James J, et al. Results of an office-based training  
364 program in clinical breast examination for primary care physicians. *J Cancer Educ*. 1996;11; 25-31.
- 365 15. Gardosi J, Francis A. Adverse pregnancy outcome and association with small for gestational age  
366 birthweight by customized and population-based percentiles. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2009;201(1):28 e1-8.
- 367 16. Aupont JE, Akolekar R, Illian A, Neonakis S, Nicolaides KH. Prediction of stillbirth by placental growth  
368 factor at 19-24 weeks' gestation. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2016.
- 369 17. Lees C, Marlow N, Arabin B, Bilardo CM, Brezinka C, Derks JB, et al. Perinatal morbidity and mortality  
370 in early-onset fetal growth restriction: cohort outcomes of the trial of randomized umbilical and fetal flow in  
371 Europe (TRUFFLE). *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2013;42(4):400-8.
- 372 18. Cetin I, Mazzocco MI, Giardini V, Cardellicchio M, Calabrese S, Algeri P, et al. PlGF in a clinical setting  
373 of pregnancies at risk of preeclampsia and/or intrauterine growth restriction. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*.  
374 2016:1-6.

375