

1 **Title:** Procedure related risk of miscarriage from chorionic villus sampling and amniocentesis

2

3 **Short title:** Procedure-related risk of miscarriage

4

5 **Authors:** Jaroslaw Beta¹, Wei Zhang¹, Samar Geris¹, Vira Kostiv¹, Ranjit Akolekar^{1,2}

6

7 1. Fetal Medicine Unit, Medway NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

8 2. Institute of Medical Sciences, Canterbury Christ Church University, Rowan William's Court,

9 Kent, United Kingdom.

10

11 **Corresponding author:**

12 Professor R Akolekar, MD, MRCOG

13 Institute of Medical Sciences,

14 Canterbury Christ Church University,

15 Rowan William's Court,

16 Chatham, Kent ME4 4UF

17 Email: ranjit.akolekar@canterbury.ac.uk

18

19 **Key words:** Procedure-related risk, chorionic villus sampling, amniocentesis, miscarriage, fetal

20 demise

21 **Abstract**

22 Objective:

23 The objective of our study was to estimate the procedure-related risks of miscarriage following
24 CVS and amniocentesis in a large unselected screened and to determine whether these risks
25 are consistent with those reported in systematic reviews and meta-analysis.

26 Methods:

27 This was a retrospective cohort study undertaken at a large Fetal Medicine Unit in the United
28 Kingdom during the period of January 2009 to May 2018. We included all singleton pregnancies
29 that booked at our unit before 20 weeks after excluding those with multiple pregnancies, major
30 fetal defects, terminations and lost to follow-up. We estimated the risk of miscarriage in those
31 that had a CVS or amniocentesis as well as those that did not have any invasive procedure, to
32 estimate the procedure-related risk as a risk-difference (95% confidence interval [CI]). Univariate
33 and multivariate regression analysis was used to derive odds ratios (OR) (95%CI) and determine
34 which maternal and pregnancy characteristics provided a significant contribution in prediction of
35 miscarriage and whether CVS or amniocentesis provided a significant independent.

36 Results:

37 During the study period, there were 45,120 singleton pregnancies, including 1,546 that had an
38 invasive procedure. We excluded 1,429 pregnancies (3.2%), due to fetal defects, termination of
39 pregnancy or those with missing outcomes. In pregnancies that underwent CVS, the risk of
40 miscarriage was 1.5% (13/861), compared to 1.2% (476/39,152) in pregnancies that did not
41 have a procedure (p=0.437). In pregnancies that underwent an amniocentesis, the risk of
42 miscarriage was 0.8% (3/375), compared to 1.2% (491/42,463) in those that did not (p=0.520).
43 Univariate and multivariate regression analysis demonstrated that there was no significant
44 prediction to the risk of miscarriage from CVS (p=0.399; p=0.592, respectively) or amniocentesis
45 (p=0.543; p=0.550, respectively). The risk of procedure-related loss attributed to CVS was
46 0.29% (95%CI: -0.53-1.12) and that following amniocentesis was -0.36% (95%CI: -1.26-0.55),
47 which was not significantly different from those that did not have any procedure.

48 Conclusion:

49 The procedure-related risks of miscarriage following CVS and amniocentesis are considerably
50 lower than currently quoted. The estimates of risks based on our study are 0.29% for CVS and -
51 0.36 for amniocentesis.

52 **Introduction**

53
54 Amniocentesis and chorionic villus sampling (CVS) are invasive procedures carried out for
55 prenatal diagnosis. It is essential that women are provided with accurate evidence-based
56 information regarding risks of miscarriage from these invasive procedures. However, there is still
57 considerable variation in recommendations from professional bodies regarding procedure-
58 related risks of miscarriage quoted to women, with some reporting that the additional risk
59 following a CVS is up to 1-2% and that following an amniocentesis is 1%¹⁻⁵. There are recent
60 systematic reviews and meta-analysis, as well as large population and cohort studies, which
61 report that the procedure-related risks of miscarriage following invasive procedures carried out
62 by specialists in Fetal Medicine Centres are much lower than currently reported⁶⁻¹¹. There is a
63 need to update and standardise information provided to women to allow them to make informed
64 decisions based on accurate figures.

65
66 The objective of our study was to estimate the procedure-related risks of miscarriage following
67 CVS and amniocentesis in a large unselected screened population in large specialist Fetal
68 Medicine Unit and to determine whether these risks are consistent with those reported in
69 systematic reviews and meta-analysis.

70
71
72 **Materials and Methods**

73
74 Study population

75 This was a retrospective cohort study undertaken at the Fetal Medicine Centre at Medway NHS
76 Foundation Trust, in the United Kingdom during the period of 1st January 2009 to 31st May 2018.
77 In our unit, all women booking for their pregnancy care prior to 14 weeks' gestation are offered
78 an appointment at 11-13 weeks' for dating of the pregnancy by measurement of fetal crown-
79 rump length (CRL), assessment of fetal anatomy and combined screening for trisomies 13,18
80 and 21. The assessment of risk for aneuploidies from combined screening is based on maternal
81 age, measurement of fetal nuchal translucency (NT) thickness and maternal serum free β -
82 human chorionic gonadotrophin (β -hCG) and pregnancy associated plasma protein-A (PAPP-A)
83 ¹²⁻¹⁴. Women booking after 14 weeks' are offered scan to date the pregnancy, assess fetal
84 anatomy and assessment of risk of fetal aneuploidies from second trimester serum biochemical

85 testing¹⁵. At each of these visits, we record maternal demographic characteristics and medical
86 history on an electronic database (Viewpoint version 5.6; General Electric Company).

87

88 Invasive procedures

89 Women who were deemed to be at high-risk for fetal aneuploidies or those with major defects
90 were offered the option of an invasive prenatal diagnosis. CVS is offered as the procedure of
91 choice up to 15 weeks' gestation and amniocentesis is offered after this gestational age. All
92 procedures were either carried out either by a specialist in Fetal Medicine or by trainees under
93 direct supervision of the specialist. All procedures were carried out transabdominally under direct
94 ultrasound guidance with a free-hand technique and using standard antiseptic precautions for
95 outpatient procedures with no routine use of antibiotic prophylaxis before or after the procedure.
96 The CVS procedures were carried out with 17G x 17cm linear echo CVS needle (Rocket® LX™
97 Chorionic Villus Sampling Set, Rocket Medical PLC, Tyne and Wear, NE38 9BZ, United
98 Kingdom). The amniocentesis procedures were carried out with 22G x 15 cm EchoTip®
99 amniocentesis needle, Cook Medical, Bloomington, USA).

100

101 Inclusion criteria

102 The inclusion criteria were all singleton pregnancies which booked at our hospital and Fetal
103 Medicine Centre for their pregnancy care before 20 week's gestation. We excluded multiple
104 pregnancies, pregnancies with major fetal defects, termination of pregnancies and those lost to
105 follow-up. All pregnancies meeting the inclusion criteria were divided into two groups: invasive
106 group, which had either a CVS or an amniocentesis and a group that did not have any invasive
107 procedures. Miscarriage was defined as a pregnancy loss prior to 24 weeks' gestation. We
108 compared the risks of miscarriage in pregnancies undergoing CVS and amniocentesis and
109 compared them to those that did not have any invasive procedure. The procedure-related risk of
110 pregnancy loss following any invasive procedure was calculated as a risk-difference between
111 the two groups.

112

113 Statistical analysis

114 Comparison of the maternal and pregnancy characteristics in the outcome groups was by the χ^2 -
115 square test and Fisher's exact test for categorical variables and Mann-Whitney U-test for
116 continuous variables, respectively. Significance was assumed at 5% and *post hoc* Bonferroni
117 correction was used to adjust for multiple comparisons where necessary.

118

119 Data for risks of miscarriage were entered into contingency tables and absolute risks were
120 estimated by determining the prevalence of miscarriage in the study groups. Univariate and
121 multivariate logistic regression analysis was used to determine which of the maternal and
122 pregnancy characteristics provided a significant contribution in prediction of miscarriage. To
123 determine whether either CVS or an amniocentesis had any significant independent prediction of
124 miscarriage, we estimated unadjusted and adjusted odds from univariate and multivariate
125 regression analysis to derive odds ratio (OR) (95% confidence intervals [CI]). The estimates of
126 procedure-related risks of miscarriage from CVS or amniocentesis were calculated as a risk-
127 difference (95%CI).

128
129 The statistical package SPSS 24.0 (IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0, Armonk,
130 NY: IBM Corp; 2016) was used for data analyses.

131

132

133 **Results**

134

135 Study population

136 During the study period of 1st January 2009 to 31st May 2018, 45,120 singleton pregnancies
137 were booked for their pregnancy care at our hospital. In this population, there were 43,574
138 (96.6%) who did not any invasive procedures and 1,546 (3.4%) who had an invasive procedure
139 prenatal diagnosis, including 1142 (73.9%) who had CVS and 419 (27.1%) who had an
140 amniocentesis. We excluded 1,429 pregnancies (3.2%), due to major fetal defects or those that
141 ended in termination of pregnancies (n=475) and those with missing follow-up data for the
142 pregnancy (n=954). The study population therefore included 43,691 singleton pregnancies with
143 complete outcome data, including 507 (1.2%) that ended in miscarriage prior to 24 weeks'
144 gestation and 43,184 (98.8%) that delivered a phenotypically normal neonate. Out of the study
145 population of 43,691 pregnancies, there were 40,013 (91.6%) that had first-trimester combined
146 screening and 3,678 (8.4%) pregnancies that booked late between 14 and 24 weeks' gestation.
147 In these study groups, we carried out 1,228 invasive procedures, including 861 (70.1%) that had
148 CVS and 375 (30.5%) that had an amniocentesis, including 8 (0.7%) that had both a CVS and
149 amniocentesis.

150

151 The maternal and pregnancy characteristics in the study groups are compared in Table 1. In
152 pregnancies that ended in miscarriage compared to those that did not, the median maternal

153 height was smaller, there were more women with Afro-Caribbean, South Asian, East Asian and
154 Mixed racial origin, more women who conceived following assisted conception and and higher
155 prevalence of pregnancies with chronic hypertension. The maternal characteristics in
156 pregnancies that underwent a CVS or an amniocentesis, compared to those that did not are
157 compared in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2.

158

159 Factors predicting risk of miscarriage in study population

160 The maternal and pregnancy characteristics associated with risk of miscarriage were examined
161 with univariate and multivariate regression analysis (Table 2). After adjustment for confounding
162 factors in multivariate analysis, the maternal characteristics associated with a subsequent risk of
163 miscarriage following a first trimester scan at 11-14 week's gestation were advanced maternal
164 age, weight and height, racial origin, method of conception and parity and chronic hypertension
165 but not cigarette smoking or other medical disorders such as diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, asthma
166 or thyroid disorders. These maternal characteristics providing a significant contribution in the
167 multivariate analysis formed the *a-priori* risk for miscarriage. The components of first trimester
168 combined screening which provided a significant contribution in prediction of miscarriage were
169 \log_{10} *a-priori* risk, an increased fetal NT \geq 95th percentile, serum PAPP-A MoM \leq 0.3 and a
170 reversed a-wave in the ductus venosus but not serum free β -HCG MoM ($p=0.913$).

171

172 Procedure-related risk of miscarriage after CVS and amniocentesis

173 In the study population, the risk of miscarriage following invasive prenatal diagnostic procedures
174 was 1.3% (16/1228) compared to 1.2% (491/42,463) in pregnancies that did not have any
175 invasive procedure ($p=0.636$). Univariate regression analysis demonstrated that there was no
176 significant prediction to the risk of miscarriage from invasive procedures ($p=0.636$). Multivariate
177 regression analysis demonstrated that the addition of invasive procedures to the combination of
178 \log_{10} *a-priori* risk from maternal factors and components of first trimester combined screening
179 including fetal NT, serum PAPP-A MoM and flow in ductus venosus, did not provide any
180 significant contribution ($p=0.415$) to the prediction of miscarriage. The risk of procedure-related
181 loss attributed to any invasive procedure was 0.1% (95%CI: -0.5 to 0.8), which was not
182 significantly different from those that did not have any procedure.

183

184 In pregnancies that underwent CVS, the risk of miscarriage was 1.5% (13/861), compared to
185 1.2% (476/39,152) in pregnancies that had first trimester combined screening and no invasive
186 procedure ($p=0.437$). Univariate regression analysis demonstrated that there was no significant

187 prediction to the risk of miscarriage from CVS ($p=0.399$). Multivariate regression analysis
188 demonstrated that the addition of CVS to the combination of \log_{10} *a-priori* risk from maternal
189 factors and components of first trimester combined screening including fetal NT, serum PAPP-A
190 MoM and flow in ductus venosus, did not provide any significant contribution ($p=0.592$) to the
191 prediction of miscarriage. The risk of procedure-related loss attributed to CVS was 0.29%
192 (95%CI: -0.53 to 1.12; $p=0.483$), which was not significantly different from those that did not
193 have any procedure.

194
195 In pregnancies that underwent an amniocentesis, the risk of miscarriage was 0.8% (3/375),
196 compared to 1.2% (491/42,463) in pregnancies that did not have any invasive procedure during
197 the pregnancy ($p=0.520$). Univariate regression analysis demonstrated that there was no
198 significant prediction to the risk of miscarriage from amniocentesis ($p=0.543$). Multivariate
199 regression analysis demonstrated that the addition of amniocentesis to the combination of \log_{10}
200 *a-priori* risk from maternal factors, did not provide any significant contribution ($p=0.550$) to the
201 prediction of miscarriage. The risk of procedure-related loss attributed to amniocentesis was -
202 0.36% (95%CI: -1.26 to 0.55; $p=0.442$), which was not significantly different from those that did
203 not have any procedure.

204

205

206 **Discussion**

207

208 Principal findings of the study

209 The findings our study demonstrate that first, there is no significant increase in risks of
210 miscarriage following a CVS or amniocentesis compared to pregnancies that had no invasive
211 procedure; second, our findings confirm the association of miscarriage with maternal and
212 pregnancy characteristics and third, the estimate of procedure-related risk of miscarriage from
213 CVS is 0.29% (95%CI -0.53 to 1.12) and from amniocentesis is -0.36% (95%CI: -1.26 to 0.55).

214

215 Strengths and limitations

216 The strengths of the study are first, examination of a large unselected cohort of consecutively
217 screened pregnancies in a large specialist Fetal Medicine Unit; second, procedures were either
218 carried out or directly supervised by specialist Fetal Medicine Consultants; and third, accurate
219 ascertainment of maternal and pregnancy characteristics along with pregnancy outcomes to
220 ensure valid estimation of risks of miscarriage.

221
222 The limitations of our study relate to the retrospective study design but we accounted for the
223 potential biases due to this by ensuring that the study population was an unselected screened
224 cohort over a fixed period of time, thus avoiding any selection bias in choosing any cases or
225 controls. Similarly, the possibility of recall bias was unlikely in our study as the risk factors
226 associated with the adverse outcome were recorded systematically in our database before the
227 occurrence of the invasive procedure and pregnancy outcome. Thirdly, all our procedures were
228 carried out transabdominally and therefore the estimates of risks only relate to procedures
229 carried out transabdominally.

230
231 Comparison with other studies

232 The findings of our study are consistent with results of systematic reviews and meta-analysis
233 which report that the procedure-related risk of miscarriage from invasive procedures is much
234 lower than currently quoted⁶⁻¹¹. A large nationwide population-based study of 147,987 women
235 with a singleton pregnancy including 5,072 who underwent CVS and 1,809 who underwent
236 amniocentesis, reported that the procedure-related risk of miscarriage at 21 days following CVS
237 was -0.21% and that at 28 days following amniocentesis was 0.56%⁷. A recent meta-analysis of
238 large controlled studies, which took into account the results of the large Danish population-
239 based study, reported that there were 623 losses in 64,901 women who underwent
240 amniocentesis and 327 losses in 19,000 women who underwent CVS and the procedure-related
241 risks of miscarriage, after taking into account the miscarriage rate in controls that did not have
242 an invasive procedure, was about 0.35% and 0.30%, respectively.⁸ The findings of our study are
243 also consistent with a previous study reporting that the characteristics that are significantly
244 associated with risks of miscarriage, such as increased fetal NT, decreased serum PAPP-A and
245 reversed a-wave in ductus venosus, are the very factors that are associated with increased risk
246 for aneuploidies and therefore an update of a CVS⁹. Therefore, in estimation of procedure-
247 related risk of invasive procedures, it is necessary to adjust for these confounding factors. The
248 findings our study based, on a large unselected cohort of more than 45,000 pregnancies, are
249 consistent with the results from the systematic reviews and meta-analysis, confirming that the
250 procedure-related risks of miscarriage from invasive procedures are considerably lower than
251 what are currently recommended by professional bodies^{6,8}.

252
253 Implications for clinical practice

254 The main clinical implication from our study is that the procedure-related risks of miscarriage are
255 considerably lower than those currently informed to women and in view of these results as well
256 as those from meta-analysis^{6,8}, the procedure-related risks associated with CVS and
257 amniocentesis should be revised and made uniform across all recommendations and guidelines.
258 It is important to note that the results from our study are those from a specialist Fetal Medicine
259 Centre, where all the procedures in the study were either undertaken or directly supervised by
260 Fetal Medicine specialists. The results of the meta-analysis also emphasise this point as the
261 studies that were included in the analysis were those that were done by experts in large
262 specialist centres and therefore, the reported procedure-related risks are those from expert
263 operators⁶. There is also evidence from other studies highlighting the fact that the risk of
264 miscarriage from invasive procedures is related to the skill and experience of the operator.
265 Therefore, it may be worthwhile to consider that invasive prenatal diagnostic procedures should
266 be undertaken by skilled operators in specialist centres to ensure low procedure-related
267 complications, as reported in studies, rather than the procedures being carried out by operators
268 who do these procedures infrequently, in which case the procedure-related risks may well be
269 higher.

270

271 Conclusion

272 The procedure-related risks of miscarriage following CVS and amniocentesis in our study are
273 considerably lower than currently quoted and consistent with the estimates of such risks
274 reported from systematic reviews and meta-analysis.

275

276 **Conflicts of interest**

277 No conflict of interest to report

278 **References**

- 279
- 280 1. Chorionic villus sampling (CVS) and amniocentesis: information for parents. FASP88.
281 <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk>. 2017.
- 282 2. Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. Amniocentesis and Chorionic Villus
283 Sampling. Green Top Guideline No.8. London: RCOG, 2010.
- 284 3. Chorionic villus sampling and amniocentesis – Information for you: Royal College of
285 Obstetricians and Gynaecologists: RCOG press, London September 2011.
286 [http://www.rcog.org.uk/womens-health/clinical-guidance/amniocentesis-chorionic-villus-](http://www.rcog.org.uk/womens-health/clinical-guidance/amniocentesis-chorionic-villus-sampling-cvs-what-you-need-know)
287 [sampling-cvs-what-you-need-know](http://www.rcog.org.uk/womens-health/clinical-guidance/amniocentesis-chorionic-villus-sampling-cvs-what-you-need-know).
- 288 4. Invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 88, December 2007.
289 American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. *Obstet Gynecol* 2007;110: 1459-
290 1467.
- 291 5. Wilson RD, Langlois S, Johnson JA. Mid-trimester amniocentesis fetal loss rate: Society of
292 Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* 2007;29:586-595.
- 293 6. Akolekar R, Beta J, Picciarelli G, Ogilvie C, D'Antonio F. Procedure-related risk of
294 miscarriage following amniocentesis and chorionic villus sampling: a systematic review and
295 meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;45:16-26.
- 296 7. Wulff CB, Gerds TA, Rode L, Ekelund CK, Petersen OB, Tabor A; Danish Fetal Medicine
297 Study Group. Risk of fetal loss associated with invasive testing following combined first-
298 trimester screening for Down syndrome: a national cohort of 147,987 singleton pregnancies.
299 *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;47: 38-44.
- 300 8. Beta J, Lesmes-Heredia C, Bedetti C, Akolekar R. Risk of miscarriage following
301 amniocentesis and chorionic villus sampling: a systematic review of the literature. *Minerva*
302 *Ginecol*. 2018;70:215-219.
- 303 9. Akolekar R, Bower S, Flack N, Bilardo CM, Nicolaides KH. Prediction of miscarriage and
304 stillbirth at 11-13 weeks and the contribution of chorionic villus sampling. *Prenat Diagn*
305 2011;31: 38-45.
- 306 10. Odibo AO, Gray DL, Dicke JM, Stamilio DM, Macones GA, Crane JP. Revisiting the fetal
307 loss rate after second-trimester genetic amniocentesis: a single center's 16-year experience.
308 *Obstet Gynecol* 2008;111: 589-595.
- 309 11. Odibo AO, Dicke JM, Gray DL, Oberle B, Stamilio DM, Macones GA, Crane JP. Evaluating
310 the rate and risk factors for fetal loss after chorionic villus sampling. *Obstet Gynecol*
311 2008;112: 813-819.

- 312 12. Robinson HP, Fleming JE. 1975. A critical evaluation of sonar crown rump length
313 measurements. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 182: 702-710.
- 314 13. Snijders RJ, Noble P, Sebire N, Souka A, Nicolaides KH. Fetal Medicine Foundation First
315 Trimester Screening Group. 1998. UK multicentre project on assessment of risk of trisomy
316 21 by maternal age and fetal nuchal-translucency thickness at 10-14 weeks of gestation.
317 *Lancet* 352: 343-346.
- 318 14. Kagan KO, Wright D, Baker A, Sahota D, Nicolaides KH. 2008. Screening for trisomy 21 by
319 maternal age, fetal nuchal translucency thickness, free beta-human chorionic gonadotropin,
320 and pregnancy associated plasma protein-A. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 31: 618-624.
- 321 15. NHS Fetal anomaly Screening Programme Handbook. PHE publications 2018.
322 <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/2018>.
- 323 16. Wijnberger LDE, van der Schouw YT, Christiaens GCML. Learning in medicine: chorionic
324 villus sampling. *Prenat Diagn* 2000; 20:241–246.
- 325 17. Tabor A, Vestergaard CH, Lidegaard O. Fetal loss rate after chorionic villus sampling and
326 amniocentesis: an 11-year national registry study. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2009; 34:19-
327 24.

328 **Table 1.** Maternal and pregnancy characteristics in pregnancies that miscarried compared to
 329 those that did not.

Maternal and pregnancy characteristics	No miscarriage	Miscarriage
Sample size	(n=43,184)	(n=507)
Maternal age in years, median (IQR)	28.1 (24.3-32.0)	28.0 (24.1-33.0)
Maternal weight in kg, median (IQR)	68.8 (59.7-81.1)	69.6 (59.1-85.0)
Maternal height in mt, median (IQR)	1.64 (1.60-1.69)	1.63 (1.59-1.67)**
Racial origin		
Caucasian (Reference), n (%)	39,615 (91.7)	427 (84.2)
Afro-Caribbean, n (%)	1,342 (3.1)	26 (5.1)*
South Asian, n (%)	1,860 (4.3)	40 (7.9)**
East Asian, n (%)	147 (0.3)	6 (1.2)**
Mixed, n (%)	220 (0.5)	8 (1.6)*
Conception		
Spontaneous (Reference), n (%)	42,497 (98.4)	489 (96.4)
Assisted conception, n (%)	687 (1.6)	18 (3.6)**
Cigarette smoking, n (%)	6,558 (15.2)	86 (17.0)
History of medical disorders		
Chronic hypertension, n (%)	375 (0.9)	14 (2.8)**
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	316 (0.7)	6 (1.2)
Connective tissue disorders, n (%)	63 (0.1)	0
Thrombophilia, n (%)	43 (0.1)	0
Asthma, n (%)	2,223 (5.1)	33 (6.5)
Epilepsy, n (%)	254 (0.6)	3 (0.6)
Nulliparous	20,104 (46.6)	209 (41.2)*

330 IQR = interquartile range; Significance level p ** p<0.0001; *p<0.01.

331

332 **Table 2.** Univariate and multivariate regression analysis in prediction of miscarriage and
 333 contribution of chorionic villus sampling and amniocentesis
 334

Variable	Univariate OR (95% CI)	P value	Multivariate OR (95%CI)	P value
Maternal characteristics				
Maternal age ≥ 40 years	2.48 (1.65-3.74)**	<0.001	1.92 (1.26-2.93)*	0.001
Maternal weight in kg	1.00 (1.00-1.01)	0.225	1.01 (1.00-1.01)*	0.005
Maternal height in cm	0.96 (0.95-0.98)**	<0.001	0.96 (0.95-0.98)**	<0.001
Racial origin				
Caucasian (Reference)	1.00		1.00	
Afro-Caribbean	2.00 (1.35-2.97)*	0.001	1.74 (1.16-2.60)*	0.006
South Asian	2.07 (1.49-2.89)**	<0.001	1.80 (1.28-5.54)*	0.001
East Asian	4.11 (1.80-9.37)*	0.001	3.31 (1.43-7.65)*	0.006
Mixed	3.83 (1.88-7.82)**	<0.001	3.77 (1.84-7.73)**	<0.001
Method of conception				
Spontaneous (Reference)	1.00		1.00	
Assisted conception	2.06 (1.27-3.37)	0.004	1.92 (1.16-3.19)*	0.023
Cigarette smoking	1.20 (0.95-1.52)	0.128	-	-
History of medical disorders				
Chronic hypertension	3.34 (1.95-5.74)**	<0.001	2.70 (1.55-4.71)**	<0.001
Diabetes mellitus	1.40 (0.57-3.39)	0.462	-	-
Asthma	1.31 (0.92-1.87)	0.137	-	-
Epilepsy	1.03 (0.33-3.23)	0.960	-	-
Maternal / pregnancy characteristics				
Maternal characteristics (Log_{10} <i>a-priori</i>)	10.61 (6.94-16.23)**	<0.001	10.56 (6.66-16.64)**	<0.001
Fetal NT $\geq 95^{\text{th}}$ percentile	3.34 (2.18-5.11)**	<0.001	2.91 (1.75-4.86)**	<0.001
Reversed a-wave in ductus venosus	2.58 (1.53-4.35)**	<0.001	2.22 (1.24-4.00)*	0.008
Serum free β -HCG MoM ≤ 0.3 MoM	1.59 (0.82-3.10)	0.171	-	-
Serum PAPP-A MoM ≤ 0.3 MoM	2.63 (1.70-4.06)**	<0.001	2.46 (1.59-3.81)**	<0.001
Invasive procedure				
Chorionic villus sampling	1.27 (0.73-2.21)	0.399	-	-
Amniocentesis	0.69 (0.22-2.16)	0.543	-	-

335

336 Significance level ** $p < 0.0001$; * $p < 0.01$

337 **Supplementary Table 1.** Maternal and pregnancy characteristics in pregnancies undergoing
 338 chorionic villus sampling compared to those that did not have an invasive procedure.

Maternal and pregnancy characteristics	No invasive procedure	Chorionic villus sampling
Sample size	(n=37,152)	(n=861)
Maternal age in years, median (IQR)	28.1 (24.3-32.0)	33.2 (28.1-37.4)**
Maternal weight in kg, median (IQR)	69.0 (59.9-81.5)	69.0 (59.9-81.5)
Maternal height in mt, median (IQR)	1.64 (1.60-1.69)	1.64 (1.60-1.69)
Racial origin		
Caucasian, n (%)	36,082 (92.2)	755 (87.7)
Afro-Caribbean, n (%)	1,137 (2.9)	46 (5.3)**
South Asian, n (%)	1,635 (4.2)	41 (4.8)
East Asian, n (%)	118 (0.3)	12 (1.4)**
Mixed, n (%)	180 (0.5)	7 (0.8)
Method of conception		
Spontaneous (Reference), n (%)	38,468 (98.3)	848 (98.5)
Assisted conception, n (%)	684 (1.7)	13 (1.5)
Cigarette smoking, n (%)	5,802 (14.8)	110 (12.8)
History of medical disorders		
Chronic hypertension, n (%)	345 (0.9)	18 (2.1)**
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	285 (0.7)	13 (1.5)*
Connective tissue disorders, n (%)	59 (0.2)	0
Thrombophilia, n (%)	42 (0.1)	1 (0.1)
Asthma, n (%)	2,101 (5.4)	28 (3.3)*
Epilepsy, n (%)	234 (0.6)	4 (0.5)
Nulliparous	17,840 (45.6)	310 (36.0)**
First trimester combined screening		
Fetal crown-rump length in mm, median (IQR)	64.8 (59.3-71.0)	68.3 (61.3-74.3)*
Fetal nuchal translucency \geq 95 th percentile, n (%)	365 (0.9)	201 (25.3)**
Reversed a-wave in ductus venosus, n (%)	417 (1.1)	55 (6.9)**
Serum free β -HCG MoM, median (IQR)	1.03 (0.70-1.53)	1.42 (0.84-2.34)
Serum PAPP-A MoM, median (IQR)	0.99 (0.69-1.41)	0.57 (0.35-0.96)
Pregnancy outcome		
Gestation age at delivery in weeks, median (IQR)	39.6 (38.6-40.5)	39.2 (38.1-40.3)*
Birthweight in grams, median (IQR)	3420 (3075-3760)	3345 (2970-3710)*

339 IQR = interquartile range; PAPP-A = pregnancy associated plasma protein-A; MoM = Multiple of
 340 expected median; Significance level p ** p<0.0001; *p<0.01.

341 **Supplementary Table 2.** Maternal and pregnancy characteristics in pregnancies undergoing
 342 amniocentesis compared to those that did not have an invasive procedure.

Maternal and pregnancy characteristics	No invasive procedure	Amniocentesis
Sample size	(n=42,463)	(n=375)
Maternal age in years, median (IQR)	28.1 (24.2-32.0)	29.0 (23.6-35.0)
Maternal weight in kg, median (IQR)	68.8 (59.7-81.2)	67.0 (60.4-79.0)
Maternal height in mt, median (IQR)	1.64 (1.60-1.69)	1.64 (1.59-1.67)
Racial origin		
Caucasian (Reference), n (%)	38,958 (91.7)	337 (89.9)
Afro-Caribbean, n (%)	1,307 (3.1)	15 (4.0)
South Asian, n (%)	1,838 (4.3)	21 (5.6)
East Asian, n (%)	140 (0.3)	1 (0.3)
Mixed, n (%)	220 (0.5)	1 (0.3)
Conception		
Spontaneous (Reference), n (%)	41,773 (98.4)	372 (99.2)
Assisted conception, n (%)	690 (1.6)	3 (0.8)
Cigarette smoking, n (%)	6,469 (15.2)	66 (17.6)
History of medical disorders		
Chronic hypertension, n (%)	369 (0.9)	2 (0.5)
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	303 (0.7)	6 (1.6)
Connective tissue disorders, n (%)	61 (0.1)	2 (0.5)
Thrombophilia, n (%)	42 (0.1)	0
Asthma, n (%)	2,208 (5.2)	20 (5.3)
Epilepsy, n (%)	250 (0.6)	3 (0.8)
Nulliparous	19,844 (46.7)	162 (43.2)
Pregnancy outcome		
Gestation age at delivery in weeks, median (IQR)	39.6 (38.5-40.5)	39.1 (37.5-40.3)
Birthweight in grams, median (IQR)	3415 (3070-3750)	3170 (2682-3630)

343 IQR = interquartile range; Significance level p ** p<0.0001; *p<0.01.