

Scott A. Rivkees, MD State Surgeon General

Vision: To be the Healthiest State in the Nation

# Assessment of the 2018 Florida Current Prenatal Risk Screening

Updated by Leticia Hernandez, PhD, MS July 15, 2020

## Introduction and Background

Enacted in June 1991 and implemented in April 1992, Florida's Healthy Start initiative includes Florida Department of Health (FDOH) universal prenatal and infant risk screening to identify pregnant women and infants at risk for adverse birth, health and developmental outcomes. Section 383.14(a), Florida Statute, states: "The FDOH shall develop a multilevel screening process that includes a risk assessment instrument to identify women at risk for a preterm birth or other high-risk condition." The original prenatal risk screen instrument was developed in 1991 by the FDOH in collaboration with the Healthy Start Advisory Committee, which included representatives from Florida's county health departments, universities, the Florida Legislature and the private health care sector. The prenatal risk screen was designed to identify pregnant women at a higher risk for having an adverse birth outcome, including preterm birth and low birth weight, so that those women could be targeted for intervention and risk-reduction services.

The prenatal risk screening criteria were revised in 1994 and, although the design of the screening form was changed in the interim, the screening criteria were not revised again until July 2008. FDOH staff in collaboration with perinatal health professionals and experts from Florida's county health departments, Healthy Start coalitions, and universities were involved in developing the revised screening criteria. The first evaluation of the new 2008 prenatal screen, *Healthy Start Prenatal Screening: Sensitivity and Positive Rate Compared for the Revised 2008 Prenatal Screening Criteria Versus the 1994 Prenatal Screening Criteria*, is available at: <a href="http://www.floridahealth.gov/programs-and-services/childrens-health/healthy-start/healthy-start-docs/hsprenatalscreen-whitepaper-2010.pdf">http://www.floridahealth.gov/programs-and-services/childrens-health/healthy-start/healthy-start-docs/hsprenatalscreen-whitepaper-2010.pdf</a>

The purpose of this analysis is to assess the performance of the prenatal screening in its ability to accurately detect high-risk pregnancies and to determine if substantial improvement in screening performance could be achieved by changing the screening criteria. In this analysis, adverse birth outcomes include preterm births (medically defined as less than 37 weeks of gestation) and low birth weight (less than 5.5 pounds). These two factors can lead to higher rates of illness and infection for newborns, as well as long-term neurological and health problems. More information can be found at: America's Children and the Environment: <a href="http://www.epa.gov/ace">www.epa.gov/ace</a>

### Methods

The data used in this analysis were 2018 and 2019 Florida resident singleton birth records linked to prenatal screening records for the year 2018. Multiple births were excluded from the analysis because they tend to have risk factors for low birthweight and preterm birth that are different from the risk factors for singleton births. There were 154,870 prenatal screening records for the calendar year 2018. The screening records were unduplicated so that each woman was represented by only one record in the data file, as some women may be screened more than once during a pregnancy or may be pregnant

Florida Department of Health Division of Community Health Promotion 4052 Bald Cypress Way, Bin A-13 • Tallahassee, FL 32399 PHONE: 850/245-4100 • FAX: 850/414-6091 FloridaHealth.gov



B Public Health Accreditation Board

more than once in a single year. When more than one screening record was detected for the same woman, the record with the earliest screening date was selected. Screening records were then linked to birth records in two ways. The first linking process used the mother's Social Security number to link the records. The second linking process used the first five letters of the mother's first name and the birth date to link the records. The linked records were checked for invalid time spans between the screening date and birth date. Time spans of less than 1 day and more than 280 days were excluded.

After both linking processes were completed and exclusions for invalid time spans and multiple births were made, there were 104,679 prenatal screening records during the year 2018 linked to 2018-2019 singleton births. Approximately 49 percent of singleton births could be linked to prenatal screening records. Some of the prenatal screening records did not link to birth records because the pregnancies did not end with live births. In some cases, live births may have occurred in another state if the pregnant woman relocated after the screening, but before the birth. Also, some prenatal screening records did not link to birth records due to a failure of the linking process. With the data available for this analysis, it was not possible to determine what proportions of the non-linked records were attributable to each of these factors.

All statistical analysis was performed using Stata 15. Multifactorial generalized linear model (GLM) regression was used to examine the association between adverse birth outcomes (AO) and each of the screening factors. AO were defined as births at less than 37 weeks gestation and births weighing less than 2500 grams. GLM techniques were also used to construct an optimal screening criterion that could be compared to the performance of the current criteria by using GLM results to compute the probability of AO for every woman in the data set. All screening factors were used to compute these probabilities, and women with the highest computed probability of AO were classified as positive. Comparatively, the current screening criteria is based only on scored screening factors and women are classified positive using a simple additive point system. The positive percentage for the current screening was 25%, so this was used as the cutoff for the optimal screening. Thus, the top 25% of the women, based on the computed probability of AO, were classified as positive on the optimal screening. Since the positive percentage was identical for the current and optimal screenings, the performance of the two screenings could be directly compared.

### Results

Table 1 shows the percentage of AO for all screening factors on the prenatal screening form. The scored factors are used in computing the risk screening score. The number of points for each factor is also shown in Table 1. A score of six or more is classified as a positive screening. The unscored factors are used for assessment purposes but are not used in computing the screening score.

The AO percentage for all women in the analysis is 11.0%. Factor-specific AO percentages are generally higher than the overall AO percentage of 11.0%. For example, the AO percentage for the "Low birth weight previous birth outcome" factor is 27.4% and for the "Smoked in the last month" factor the AO percentage is 16.6%.

Table 2 shows the adjusted risk ratios of AO for all screening factors. For example, women who had an education level less than high school (the first factor in Table 2) were 1.1 times more likely to have an AO when compared to women who had education levels of high school or more. This is after adjusting for the influence of associations between this factor and all the other factors in the table.

Table 3 compares the performance of the optimal screening with the performance of the current screening. The positive percentage for both screenings is very close at 25.2% for the current screening and 24.6% for the optimal screening. Since the positive percentages are very close, the sensitivity of the two screens can be directly compared without adjusting for differences in the positive percentages. The sensitivity of the current and optimal screening is 41.8% and 43.3%, respectively. This indicates that the optimal screening is not substantially more sensitive than the current screen. Although some

unscored factors are associated with relatively high percentages of AO, they may not improve the accuracy of predicting AO in the context of the scored factors. After the risk of AO is assessed using the scored factors, the information provided by the unscored factors may be highly correlated with the scored factors to the point where the unscored factors do not increase the predictive power of the screening.

## Discussion

The purpose of this analysis was to assess the performance of the prenatal screening and determine if substantial improvement in screening performance could be achieved by modifying the screening criteria. Additionally, this analysis quantified the relationship between the factors on the prenatal screening form and the risk of adverse birth outcomes, including preterm birth and/or low birth weight.

In summary, the current prenatal screen has a sensitivity of 41.8%, meaning that 41.8% of preterm and low birth weight births were classified as positive on the screening. This result is consistent with the results of the analysis performed in 2017 entitled Assessment of the 2017 Florida Current Prenatal Risk Screening Implemented in 2013 Linked to Birth Records, available at: http://www.floridahealth.gov/programs-and-services/childrens-health/healthy-start/healthy-startdocs/ documents/prenatal-screen-evaluation-2017.pdf

The results of this analysis indicate that including all prenatal screening factors and changing the risk scoring system would not result in substantial improvement of the sensitivity of the screening. This is evident from the small improvement in the sensitivity of the optimal screening compared to the sensitivity of the current screening (43.3% versus 41.8%, respectively).

Some previous prenatal screening analyses have been successful in improving the predictability of the screening criteria. In 2006, a similar analysis was done which concluded that the screening could be substantially improved by adding risk factors and changing the scoring system. This led to a statewide effort to revise the screening and a revised prenatal screening was implemented in 2008. Thus, the FDOH continues to perform this analysis on an annual basis to ensure performance of the screening is maintained and to assess the potential for improvement. A decision to revise the screening in the future would be based upon strong analytic evidence that proposed modifications would yield substantial improvement in the ability of the screening to detect true high-risk pregnancies. While all efforts are made to ensure that revisions improve the screening, when a new screening is implemented it will not be known if it is an improvement until the screening has been in use for at least a year and has been evaluated as described in this paper.

### Limitations

One potential limitation of this analysis is the accuracy of the linking between prenatal screening and birth records. Another limitation is the accuracy of the birth record data. If the data on the birth record used to classify the births as preterm or low birth weight are incorrect, then infants could be incorrectly classified regarding low weight or preterm births.

# Table 1. Percentage of Adverse1 Birth Outcomes for Factors on Florida's Prenatal ScreeningBased on 104,679 Prenatal Screening in 2018 Linked to Birth

Screen Question Number	Risk Factor	Risk Score Points	Adverse <sup>1</sup> Birth Outcome	Births	Adverse <sup>1</sup> Birth Outcome Percentage	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
	Scored Factors						
1	Education less than high school	1	1,917	15,055	12.70%	12.20%	13.30%
2	Unmarried	1	6,935	56,759	12.20%	11.90%	12.50%
6	Depression last month	1	1,710	13,212	12.90%	12.40%	13.50%
11	Race Black	3	3,890	25,183	15.40%	15.00%	15.90%
12	Used alcohol in last month	1	592	5,489	10.80%	10.00%	11.60%
13	Smoked in the last month	1	1,184	7,145	16.60%	15.70%	17.50%
14	Unwanted pregnancy	1	1,406	10,039	14.00%	13.30%	14.70%
15	First pregnancy	2	3,813	34,248	11.10%	10.80%	11.50%
16	Stillbirth previous birth outcome	3	652	3,751	17.40%	16.20%	18.60%
16	Premature previous birth outcome	3	2,123	8,611	24.70%	23.70%	25.60%
16	Low birthweight previous birth outcome	3	1,535	5,600	27.40%	26.20%	28.60%
17	Age less than 18	1	221	1,728	12.80%	11.20%	14.40%
18	BMI less than 19.8	1	1,092	8,150	13.40%	12.70%	14.20%
18	BMI more than 35.0	2	1,894	14,350	13.20%	12.60%	13.80%
19	Pregnancy interval less than 18 months	1	1,904	16,766	11.40%	10.90%	11.80%
20	2nd trimester at first prenatal visit	1	2,721	22,720	12.00%	11.60%	12.40%
21	Illness that requires ongoing medical care	2	1,893	11,420	16.60%	15.90%	17.30%
	Un-Scored Factors						
3	Children at home younger than 5 years old	0	4,581	45,713	10.00%	9.70%	10.30%
4	Children at home with medical or special needs	0	673	4,444	15.10%	14.10%	16.20%
5	Not a good time to get pregnant	0	1,319	9,702	13.60%	12.90%	14.30%
7	In the last month, felt alone when facing problems	0	1,120	8,143	13.80%	13.00%	14.50%
8	Have received medical services or counseling	0	1,927	16,537	11.70%	11.20%	12.10%
9	In the last year, someone you know tried to hurt or threaten you	0	193	1,498	12.90%	11.20%	14.60%
10	Have troubled paying bills	0	1,907	15,403	12.40%	11.90%	12.90%
17	Age higher than 35	0	1,600	11,628	13.80%	13.10%	14.40%
No number	Medicaid payer	0	5,696	45,368	12.60%	12.30%	12.90%
	All		11,513	104,679	11.00%	10.80%	11.20%
	<sup>1</sup> Birth weight less than 2,500 grams and/or gestation than 37 weeks	onal age less					

# Table 2. Association Between Factors on Florida's Prenatal Screening and Risk of Adverse BirthOutcomes Based on 104,679 Prenatal Screening in 2018 Linked to Births

				95% Confid	ence Interval				
Screen Question Number	Risk Factor	Adjusted <sup>1</sup> Risk Ratio Adverse <sup>2</sup> Birth Outcome		Lower	Upper				
	Scored Factors								
1	Education less than high school	1.08	*	1.02	1.14				
2	Unmarried	1.08	*	1.04	1.13				
6	Depression last month	1.02		0.96	1.09				
11	Race Black	1.48	*	1.42	1.54				
12	Used alcohol in last month	0.93		0.85	1.01				
13	Smoked in the last month	1.40	*	1.31	1.49				
14	Unwanted pregnancy	1.04		0.98	1.10				
15	First pregnancy	1.22	*	1.16	1.28				
16	Stillbirth previous birth outcome	1.26	*	1.16	1.36				
16	Premature previous birth outcome	2.01	*	1.89	2.14				
16	Low birthweight previous birth outcome	1.58	*	1.47	1.69				
17	Age less than 18	1.02		0.89	1.18				
18	BMI less than 19.8	1.26	*	1.22	1.36				
18	BMI more than 35.0	1.13	*	1.07	1.19				
19	Pregnancy interval less than 18 months	1.03		0.98	1.09				
20	2nd trimester at first prenatal visit	1.02		0.97	1.06				
21	Illness that requires ongoing medical care	1.38	*	1.31	1.45				
	Un-Scored Factors								
3	Children at home younger than 5 years old	0.81	*	0.78	0.85				
4	Children at home with medical or special needs	1.13	*	1.04	1.22				
	Not a good time to get pregnant	0.99		0.93	1.06				
7	In the last month, felt alone when facing problems	1.02		0.95	1.10				
8	Have received medical services or counseling	0.99		0.94	1.04				
9	In the last year, someone you know tried to hurt or threaten you	0.90		0.77	1.04				
10	Have troubled paying bills	1.01		0.96	1.07				
17	Age higher than 35	1.29	*	1.22	1.36				
No number	Medicaid payer	1.07	*	1.03	1.12				
	* Statistically significant risk factor (alpha $\leq$ 0.05)								
	<sup>1</sup> Adjusted for all factors in the table								
	<sup>2</sup> Birth weight less than 2,500 grams and/or gestational age less than 37 weeks								

Table 3. Florida Prenatal Screening Results Compared for Current and Optimal ScreeningCriteria Based on 104,679 Prenatal Screening in 2018 Linked to Births 2018–2019, Florida 2018

Categories	Current Screen	Optimized Screen	Optimized Minus Current			
Women Screened	104,679	104,679	0			
Positive Screens	26,416	25,801	-615			
Percent Positive	25.2%	24.6%	-0.59%			
AO <sup>1</sup> with positive screens	4,813	4,990	177			
AO <sup>1</sup> with negative screens	6,700	6,523	-177			
AO <sup>1</sup> sensitivity	41.8%	43.3%	1.54%			
<sup>1</sup> Adverse Outcome: birth before 37 weeks gestation and/or under 2500 grams						