“Prevalence, Natural History, and Clinical Outcome of Mild to Moderate Ventriculomegaly”
(Farah Sethna, MBBS, Peter W.G. Tennant, MSc, Judith Rankin, PhD, and Stephen C. Robson, MD)
April 2011 – Volume 117 – Issue 4 – 867–76

Click Here to Read the Full Article

1. Describe the study design. What its strengths and limitations? Is there another design that would provide better results? Why or why not?

2. The objective of the study is “to estimate the prevalence, associated anomalies, progression, and clinical outcome in fetuses diagnosed with mild to moderate ventriculomegaly at 18–24 weeks of pregnancy.”
   a. How is prevalence defined, and how is it different from incidence?
   b. How do you define mild to moderate ventriculomegaly? What is the standard definition, and how were those standards determined?
   c. Why did the authors use the gestational age window of 18 to 24 weeks? Would you have chosen the same time frame? Why or why not? How might altering the gestational age window affect the study findings?

3. The time frame of the study was 1994 to 2008. Is there any concern for a 14-year study? Might there be any differences for fetuses diagnosed in 1994 versus those diagnosed in 2008? How might this affect the findings of the study?

4. Review the European Surveillance of Congenital Anomalies (EUROCAT) guidelines for the diagnosis of congenital anomalies. Why would using this system be helpful for this study?

5. The authors state that differences were evaluated by either Fisher’s exact test or Mann-Whitney U test. Review these two statistical methods. When is one appropriate, and the other not?

6. How is a test for trend analyzed? The authors used the chi-square test for trend to evaluate for changes in prevalence. Review “trend” and the ability to statistically evaluate for a trend. Discuss the fact that a P-value that is close to significance should not be considered a “trend”.

7. The authors found a prevalence of 7.8 per 10,000 registered births for mild to moderate ventriculomegaly. How does this compare to your practice?

8. Review the preferred diagnostic technique for assessing ventriculomegaly. If possible, project some images of the fetal brain at the level of the atria, frontal horns, and cavum septi pellucidi in the axial plane to demonstrate the optimal measurement of the diameter of the lateral ventricles.

9. Review the UpToDate topic titled “Fetal ventriculomegaly.” Do any of the recommendations need updating, given the findings of this manuscript?

10. Will the findings from this manuscript alter your practice? What changes, if any, will you make?