

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®**

Clinical Condition: Growth Disturbances — Risk of Intrauterine Growth Restriction

Variant 1: Risk of IUGR initial evaluation.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US pregnant uterus	9	Assessment of fetal measurement, growth, amniotic fluid, fetal anatomic survey, and activity patterns is appropriate.	O
US pregnant uterus biophysical profile	4	Assessment of biophysical profile is of indeterminate appropriateness. Biophysical profile components: 1) fetal heart-rate reactivity; 2) fetal breathing movements; 3) fetal movement; 4) fetal tone; and 5) amniotic fluid volume.	O
US pregnant uterus with Doppler	4	Assessment of umbilical and uterine arteries of indeterminate appropriateness. Evaluation of cerebral to umbilical artery ratio, cerebral arteries, and venous Doppler velocimetry are not appropriate.	O
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 2: Small fetus, low or low normal fluid, follow-up studies.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US pregnant uterus	9	Optimal follow-up interval is 2-4 weeks. As the pregnancy enters the third trimester and approaches the time of possible (urgent) delivery, shorter scanning intervals may be indicated.	O
US pregnant uterus biophysical profile	8	Assessment of biophysical profile is appropriate. Biophysical profile components: 1) fetal heart-rate reactivity; 2) fetal breathing movements; 3) fetal movement; 4) fetal tone; and 5) amniotic fluid volume.	O
US pregnant uterus with Doppler	8	Interrogation of uterine artery, umbilical artery, middle cerebral artery, and venous Doppler velocimetry may provide important ancillary data to the BPP but is not, in general, a stand-alone test.	O
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Clinical Condition: Growth Disturbances — Risk of Intrauterine Growth Restriction

Variant 3: Normal-sized fetus, low or absent fluid, follow-up studies.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US pregnant uterus	9	Optimal follow-up interval is 2 weeks.	O
US pregnant uterus biophysical profile	9	Assessment of biophysical profile is appropriate. Biophysical profile components: 1) fetal heart-rate reactivity; 2) fetal breathing movements; 3) fetal movement; 4) fetal tone; and 5) amniotic fluid volume.	O
US pregnant uterus with Doppler	8	Doppler velocimetry may provide important ancillary data to the BPP but is not, in general, a stand-alone test.	O
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

GROWTH DISTURBANCES — RISK OF INTRAUTERINE GROWTH RESTRICTION

Expert Panel on Women’s Imaging: Carolyn M. Zelop, MD¹; Marcia C. Javitt, MD²; Phyllis Glanc, MD³; Theodore Dubinsky, MD⁴; Mukesh G. Harisinghani, MD⁵; Robert D. Harris, MD, MPH⁶; Nadia J. Khati, MD⁷; Donald G. Mitchell, MD⁸; Pari V. Pandharipande, MD, MPH⁹; Harpreet K. Pannu, MD¹⁰; Ann E. Podrasky, MD¹¹; Thomas D. Shipp, MD¹²; Cary Lynn Siegel, MD¹³; Lynn Simpson, MD¹⁴; Darci J. Wall, MD¹⁵; Jade J. Wong-You-Cheong, MD.¹⁶

Summary of Literature Review

Intrauterine growth restriction (IUGR) is an important complication of pregnancy. It can be associated with significant risks of perinatal morbidity and mortality. One of the primary mechanisms of IUGR is uteroplacental insufficiency, which may occur in a variety of maternal or placental conditions. The major concern in IUGR is not the small size of the fetus per se, but the possibility of life-threatening fetal compromise. IUGR is usually characterized as a small-for-gestational-age (SGA) fetus whose estimated fetal weight (EFW) is below the 10th percentile for that gestational age according to a reference population. However, some SGA fetuses are constitutionally small and not jeopardized by unfavorable placental health. Some growth-restricted fetuses may measure at or above the 10%, yet still be compromised by suboptimal rate of growth [1].

When clinically suspected, IUGR can be confirmed as probably present by sonographic fetal measurements and weight estimation, but both false-negative and false-positive cases can be anticipated. Findings that should prompt an ultrasound (US) examination include maternal size smaller than dates (lag of the fundal height on physical examination of >3 cm) or otherwise anticipated from a prior US, poor maternal weight gain, maternal hypertension, or pre-eclampsia. Other maternal conditions such as lupus erythematosus or a history of previous birth of a growth-restricted infant may also warrant evaluation.

The greater the risk of IUGR based on the clinical findings, the greater is the positive predictive value of US, but the likelihood of IUGR also increases even when US predicts a normal weight, and the risk of IUGR persists when the clinical suspicion is high, even when US does not detect a fetus with an EFW less than the 10th percentile [2]. EFW and abdominal circumference are equivalently better than the ratio between femur length and abdominal circumference in predicting IUGR, and biometry performed within 2 weeks of delivery is more predictive than when performed at 26-34 weeks [3]. Dashe et al [4] found that among SGA fetuses with no anatomic abnormalities, only those that were asymmetrically small (abdomen small in proportion to head) were associated with increased pregnancy-induced maternal hypertension before 32 weeks and cesarean delivery for abnormal heart rate patterns compared with those of fetuses average for gestational age (AGA). Additionally, asymmetric SGA fetuses sustained more adverse neonatal composite outcomes compared to symmetric SGA or AGA fetuses.

Once a probability of IUGR has been established, and uteroplacental insufficiency is considered to be a likely mechanism based on US findings and clinical setting, there are a series of possible therapeutic interventions that can be used to improve fetal growth and try to prevent fetal compromise. Assessment of fetal well-being is essential to the management of such pregnancies. This testing is aimed at determining if there is life-threatening fetal compromise and whether urgent premature delivery would offer a better chance of survival and avoidance of morbidity than would continue exposure to an increasingly hostile intrauterine environment [5,6].

Periodic fetal biometry, evaluation of amniotic fluid volume, use of the biophysical profile (BPP) or a selected subset of its component tests, Doppler US, fetal heart-rate monitoring, and fetal movement counting can all contribute to the determination of fetal compensation or compromise. It is beyond the scope of this guideline to

¹Principal Author, Valley Hospital, Ridgewood, New Jersey, American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology. ²Panel Chair, Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland. ³Panel Vice-chair, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Bayview Campus, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. ⁴University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, Washington. ⁵Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston Massachusetts. ⁶Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, New Hampshire. ⁷George Washington University Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia. ⁸Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. ⁹Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston Massachusetts. ¹⁰Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, New York. ¹¹Baptist Hospital of Miami/South Miami Center for Women and Infants, Miami, Florida. ¹²Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology. ¹³Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, St. Louis, Missouri. ¹⁴Columbia University, New York, New York, American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology. ¹⁵Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota. ¹⁶University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland.

The American College of Radiology seeks and encourages collaboration with other organizations on the development of the ACR Appropriateness Criteria through society representation on expert panels. Participation by representatives from collaborating societies on the expert panel does not necessarily imply individual or society endorsement of the final document.

Reprint requests to: publications@acr.org

compare these methods and rate the relative effectiveness of the many individual parameters testable alone or in various combinations. Instead, the guideline ranks the relative utility of these broad categories of fetal assessment once a risk of IUGR and potential fetal compromise has been established.

Biophysical Profile

The BPP has been and remains the mainstay of fetal well-being evaluation. It consists of four parameters variably sensitive to the acute exposure of the fetus to hypoxemia: fetal breathing movements, fetal limb and body movements, fetal tone, and amniotic fluid volume as an indicator of chronic hypoxemia. The nonstress test (NST), which is sometimes included with the BPP as a fifth component, can be used alone as a test of acute status, but it is often coupled with amniotic fluid measurement, a valuable reflection of fetal hypoxemic exposure over the previous week. Each of the four or five components of the BPP receives a score of 0 or 2, hence, a maximum score of eight (or 10). Scores of 8-10 on the BPP are strong indicators of a well-compensated fetus, but there are many false positives when the fetus fails one or two of the acute marker tests [7]. Reduced amniotic fluid volume is an important predictor of intrapartum fetal distress, much of which is attributable to umbilical cord compression events, and the fluid volume should be periodically checked in pregnancies suspected to have IUGR [8]. Testing strategies usually evaluate one or more of the fetal well-being parameters at least weekly, and often twice weekly, from the point of potential postnatal viability onward. Amniotic fluid is usually assessed weekly, but more often if it is approaching severely low levels. Daily or even more frequent testing by BPP or NST may be indicated in critical situations.

Doppler Ultrasound Evaluation

Extensive research on Doppler US analysis of uterine, umbilical, and various intrafetal vessels confirms a strong correlation between high-resistance arterial waveform patterns (eg, low, absent, or reversed diastolic flow in the umbilical artery) and subsequent IUGR, hypoxemic fetal morbidity, and mortality [9]. The correlation is greatest in high-risk pregnancies but insufficiently predictive in general, low-risk populations to be useful as a primary screening test [10,11].

Some have argued that since Doppler US appears to be applicable primarily in a population already defined as high risk, the clinical decisions as to when a fetus is compromised and requires emergent delivery will be based on the BPP and heart-rate monitoring, making the Doppler US assessment superfluous. A meta-analysis of 20 controlled trials of Doppler US ultrasonography, however, found “compelling evidence” that knowledge of the Doppler US evaluation findings improved perinatal outcome in high-risk pregnancies, reducing antenatal admissions, inductions of labor, and cesarean sections for fetal distress, and reducing the odds of perinatal death by 38% [12].

Studies correlating Doppler US evaluation findings with the BPP, amniotic fluid volume, NST, US fetal weight estimates, and maternal blood pressure have shown that predictabilities of IUGR and fetal compromise are, to some extent, additive [13-17]. Doppler US waveform abnormalities may precede clinical recognition of less-than-expected abdominal enlargement, with abnormal BPP an even later finding [18]. A review by Morris et al [19] summarizes many of these concepts about the sonographic assessment of IUGR. Dubinsky et al [20] found that decreased amniotic fluid and abnormal umbilical cord arterial Doppler US waveforms were independent predictors of poor neonatal outcomes. A retrospective study by Ott [21] found that SGA singleton pregnancies with abnormal umbilical artery blood flow patterns had higher cesarean section rates for fetal nonreassuring status, increased neonatal intensive care unit stays, and increased neonatal morbidity. Those SGA fetuses with normal umbilical Doppler US patterns were unassociated with these complications, suggesting that they were constitutionally small babies rather than being growth-restricted [20]. As the degree of fetal compromise progresses, there is a transition from a high-resistance middle cerebral artery (MCA) Doppler US pattern to a low-resistance pattern, so-called cephalization of blood flow to protect the brain [9].

In addition to arterial Doppler US evaluation, the fetal venous system can also be interrogated as a surrogate for forward cardiac blood flow or preserved cardiac output [22]. In a recent study of fetuses with early-onset placental dysfunction, Baschat et al [23] demonstrated that ductus venosus Doppler US parameters emerge as the primary cardiovascular factor in predicting neonatal outcome.

Fetal Movement Counting

An additional test of value in IUGR and other high-risk pregnancies is daily (or even more frequent) fetal movement counting by the mother. Frequent and vigorous fetal movements are evidence of well-being, providing

reassurance to the mother, while diminishing fetal activity can provide an early warning of a deteriorating fetal status. The testing is easy and inexpensive but provides benefit in addition to the formal fetal surveillance protocols.

The specific variant conditions included in this Appropriateness Criteria[®] topic require several additional comments.

A fetus small for dates compared with an earlier US study in which amniotic fluid volume was low or low normal is the typical setting in which uteroplacental insufficiency is the most likely mechanism for IUGR. Repeat US for biometry is indicated, with the frequency adjusted by the severity of the growth restriction and the gestational age. Mild growth lag prior to 28-30 weeks can be remeasured in 4 weeks, while severe IUGR after 33 weeks may be best remeasured in 2 weeks. Some formal testing protocol for fetal well-being should be initiated on a weekly or twice-weekly schedule. Daily fetal movement counts are indicated.

IUGR caused by uteroplacental insufficiency is unusual when a normal amniotic fluid volume is present with a small or very small fetus. A first consideration should be the possibility of inaccurate dating of the pregnancy. This can be confirmed by follow-up US biometry that demonstrates appropriate interval growth of the fetal measurement parameters for the number of weeks intervening between the first and second examination. With a symmetrically very small fetus for dates, however, particularly if detected in the second or even first trimester, the possibility of aneuploidy, especially trisomy 18, trisomy 13, and triploidy, must be considered [24]. Needless to say, the presence of fetal anomalies will raise the concern for chromosomal abnormality considerably. Diagnosis is generally accomplished by amniocentesis, but if a rapid karyotype is needed (eg, to avoid a cesarean section because of compromise of a fetus with a lethal condition), cordocentesis or placental biopsy can often provide an answer in 48-72 hours. FISH (florescent in situ hybridization) from amniocentesis is first line, with cordocentesis and placental biopsy as other options.

When there is low or absent amniotic fluid with a normally grown fetus, causes of oligohydramnios other than IUGR must be considered. These include obstruction or nonfunction of the fetal urinary tract, premature rupture of membranes, and tocolysis of preterm labor by nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents. Regardless of its etiology, oligohydramnios is an important risk factor for perinatal morbidity and mortality, due largely to umbilical cord compression but also, in cases of early and long-standing oligohydramnios, to the possible occurrence of pulmonary hypoplasia. Close monitoring of fetal condition is indicated along with periodic imaging evaluation of the fetus to check growth and chest configuration for degree of lung compression.

Summary

- IUGR, with its inherent risks of fetal morbidity and mortality from the hypoxemia of inadequate uteroplacental function, must be considered a major abnormality of pregnancy.
- When it is suspected on the basis of clinical and sonographic findings, urgent management decisions may be necessary, including the possibility of emergent preterm delivery.
- A protocol of frequent fetal surveillance is indicated to guide patient management and the timing of delivery.

Safety Considerations in Pregnant Patients

Imaging of the pregnant patient can be challenging, particularly with respect to minimizing radiation exposure and risk. For further information and guidance, see the following ACR documents:

- [ACR Practice Guideline for Imaging Pregnant or Potentially Pregnant Adolescents and Women with Ionizing Radiation](#)
- [ACR-ACOG-AIUM Practice Guideline for the Performance of Obstetrical Ultrasound](#)
- [ACR Manual on Contrast Media](#)
- [ACR Guidance Document for Safe MR Practices](#)

Relative Radiation Level Information

Potential adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure are an important factor to consider when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, a relative radiation level (RRL) indication has been included for each imaging examination. The RRLs are based on effective dose, which is a radiation dose quantity that is used to estimate population total radiation risk associated with an imaging procedure. Patients in the pediatric age group are at inherently higher risk from exposure, both because of organ sensitivity and longer life expectancy (relevant to the

long latency that appears to accompany radiation exposure). For these reasons, the RRL dose estimate ranges for pediatric examinations are lower as compared to those specified for adults (see Table below). Additional information regarding radiation dose assessment for imaging examinations can be found in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® [Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction](#) document.

Relative Radiation Level Designations		
Relative Radiation Level*	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range
○	0 mSv	0 mSv
⊛	<0.1 mSv	<0.03 mSv
⊛ ⊛	0.1-1 mSv	0.03-0.3 mSv
⊛ ⊛ ⊛	1-10 mSv	0.3-3 mSv
⊛ ⊛ ⊛ ⊛	10-30 mSv	3-10 mSv
⊛ ⊛ ⊛ ⊛ ⊛	30-100 mSv	10-30 mSv

*RRL assignments for some of the examinations cannot be made, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors (eg, region of the body exposed to ionizing radiation, the imaging guidance that is used). The RRLs for these examinations are designated as “Varies”.

Supporting Documents

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents go to www.acr.org/ac.

References

1. Zhang J, Merialdi M, Platt LD, Kramer MS. Defining normal and abnormal fetal growth: promises and challenges. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2010;202(6):522-528.
2. Simon NV, Surosky BA, Shearer DM, Levitsky JS. Effect of the pretest probability of intrauterine growth retardation on the predictiveness of sonographic estimated fetal weight in detecting IUGR: a clinical application of Bayes' theorem. *J Clin Ultrasound*. 1990;18(3):145-153.
3. Skovron ML, Berkowitz GS, Lapinski RH, Kim JM, Chitkara U. Evaluation of early third-trimester ultrasound screening for intrauterine growth retardation. *J Ultrasound Med*. 1991;10(3):153-159.
4. Dashe JS, McIntire DD, Lucas MJ, Leveno KJ. Effects of symmetric and asymmetric fetal growth on pregnancy outcomes. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2000;96(3):321-327.
5. A randomised trial of timed delivery for the compromised preterm fetus: short term outcomes and Bayesian interpretation. *BJOG*. 2003;110(1):27-32.
6. Thornton JG, Hornbuckle J, Vail A, Spiegelhalter DJ, Levene M. Infant wellbeing at 2 years of age in the Growth Restriction Intervention Trial (GRIT): multicentred randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2004;364(9433):513-520.
7. Manning FA. The use of sonography in the evaluation of the high-risk pregnancy. *Radiol Clin North Am*. 1990;28(1):205-216.
8. Tongsong T, Srisomboon J. Amniotic fluid volume as a predictor of fetal distress in intrauterine growth retardation. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 1993;40(2):131-134.
9. Cosmi E, Ambrosini G, D'Antona D, Saccardi C, Mari G. Doppler, cardiotocography, and biophysical profile changes in growth-restricted fetuses. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2005;106(6):1240-1245.
10. Bewley S, Cooper D, Campbell S. Doppler investigation of uteroplacental blood flow resistance in the second trimester: a screening study for pre-eclampsia and intrauterine growth retardation. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol*. 1991;98(9):871-879.
11. Newnham JP, Patterson LL, James IR, Diepeveen DA, Reid SE. An evaluation of the efficacy of Doppler flow velocity waveform analysis as a screening test in pregnancy. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1990;162(2):403-410.
12. Alfirevic Z, Neilson JP. Doppler ultrasonography in high-risk pregnancies: systematic review with meta-analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1995;172(5):1379-1387.

13. Benson CB, Belville JS, Lentini JF, Saltzman DH, Doubilet PM. Intrauterine growth retardation: diagnosis based on multiple parameters--a prospective study. *Radiology*. 1990;177(2):499-502.
14. Ferrazzi E, Vegni C, Bellotti M, Borboni A, Della Peruta S, Barbera A. Role of umbilical Doppler velocimetry in the biophysical assessment of the growth-retarded fetus. Answers from neonatal morbidity and mortality. *J Ultrasound Med*. 1991;10(6):309-315.
15. Lombardi SJ, Rosemond R, Ball R, Entman SS, Boehm FH. Umbilical artery velocimetry as a predictor of adverse outcome in pregnancies complicated by oligohydramnios. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1989;74(3 Pt 1):338-341.
16. Rochelson B, Bracero LA, Porte J, Farmakides G. Diagnosis of intrauterine growth retardation as a two-step process with morphometric ultrasound and Doppler umbilical artery velocimetry. *J Reprod Med*. 1992;37(11):925-929.
17. Tyrrell SN, Lilford RJ, Macdonald HN, Nelson EJ, Porter J, Gupta JK. Randomized comparison of routine vs highly selective use of Doppler ultrasound and biophysical scoring to investigate high risk pregnancies. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol*. 1990;97(10):909-916.
18. James DK, Parker MJ, Smoleniec JS. Comprehensive fetal assessment with three ultrasonographic characteristics. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1992;166(5):1486-1495.
19. Morris JM, Trudinger BJ. Sonographic evaluation of intrauterine growth retardation. *Curr Opin Radiol*. 1992;4(2):102-110.
20. Dubinsky T, Lau M, Powell F, et al. Predicting poor neonatal outcome: a comparative study of noninvasive antenatal testing methods. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1997;168(3):827-831.
21. Ott WJ. Intrauterine growth restriction and Doppler ultrasonography. *J Ultrasound Med*. 2000;19(10):661-665; quiz 667.
22. Rizzo G, Capponi A, Talone PE, Arduini D, Romanini C. Doppler indices from inferior vena cava and ductus venosus in predicting pH and oxygen tension in umbilical blood at cordocentesis in growth-retarded fetuses. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 1996;7(6):401-410.
23. Baschat AA, Cosmi E, Bilardo CM, et al. Predictors of neonatal outcome in early-onset placental dysfunction. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2007;109(2 Pt 1):253-261.
24. Snijders RJ, Sherrod C, Gosden CM, Nicolaides KH. Fetal growth retardation: associated malformations and chromosomal abnormalities. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1993;168(2):547-555.

The ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those examinations generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

Appendix 1.

Entry Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size smaller than dates by last menstrual period (LMP) or prior sonogram
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor maternal weight gain
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maternal hypertension or pre-eclampsia
Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entry criteria apply individually to any one or more fetuses of a multiple pregnancy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use multiple pregnancy guidelines
Initial Evaluation: Obstetrical Sonogram
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scan for size and dates and determine interval growth if there has been a previous scan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate amniotic fluid volume (qualitative, largest pocket AP diameter, amniotic fluid index)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note fetal activity patterns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey anatomy

Appendix 2. Guideline: Growth Disturbances/Growth Restriction

Outcomes					
Normal size Normal fluid	Small size Normal fluid	Small size Asymmetrical Symmetrical Fluid low normal or low	Very small size Normal fluid	Normal size Low or absent fluid	
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	
Normal	Inaccurate dates	Growth restriction	Possible aneuploidy and/or growth restriction	Urinary tract Abnormal rupture of membranes	
Additional Studies					
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	
None	None	Biophysical profile Nonstress test Doppler flow studies	Detailed anatomic survey Karyotype- amniocentesis Cordocentesis Biophysical profile Nonstress test Doppler flow studies	Detailed anatomic survey Clinical exam for leaking fluid Amnioinfusion with dye to check for leakage and to improve anatomic survey	
Follow-up Studies					
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
None	Same	US scan for growth ≤27 wk – f/u in 4 wks 28-32 wk – f/u in 3 wks ≥33 wk – f/u in 2 wks plus BPP, NST, Doppler US Fetal movement counting	Same	Urinary non- function Clinical manage- ment	PROM Clinical manage- ment