1 Frequency Of pRenatal CAre viSiTs (FORCAST): study protocol to develop a core

- 2 outcome set for prenatal care schedules
- 3
- 4 Mark Turrentine, MD^1 , Buu-Hac Nguyen², Beth Choby, MD^3 , Susan Kendig, JD, WHNP-BC⁴,
- ⁵ Tekoa L. King, RN, MPH, CNM⁵, Milton Kotelchuck, MPH, PhD⁶, Tiffany A. Moore Simas,
- 6 MD, MPH, MEd⁷, Sindhu K. Srinivas, MD, MSCE⁸, Christopher M. Zahn, MD⁹, Alex Friedman
- 7 Peahl, MD, MSc^{10}
- 8
- ⁹ ¹Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Baylor College of Medicine, 6651 Main Street, Ste.
- 10 F1020, Houston, TX 77030 USA, <u>mark.turrentine@bcm.edu</u>
- ²University of Michigan College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, 500 S. State St., Ann
- 12 Arbor, MI 48109 USA, <u>bunguyen@umich.edu</u>
- ¹³ ³Department of Medical Education, Baptist Health Sciences University 1003 Monroe Ave.
- 14 Memphis, TN 38104 USA, <u>beth.choby@baptistu.edu</u>

⁴SSM Health-St. Louis Region, Maternal Services, 1191 Fortune Blvd., Shiloh, Il. 62269, USA,

- 16 <u>skendig@npwh.org</u>
- ⁵Department of Family Health Care Nursing, University of California, San Francisco School of
- 18 Nursing, 2 Koret Way, San Francisco, CA 94143 USA, tekoaking@gmail.com
- ⁶Department of Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School, 125 Nashua St., Boston, MA 02114 USA,
- 20 <u>mkotelchuck@mgh.harvard.edu</u>
- ⁷Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Pediatrics, Psychiatry, and Population & Quantitative
- 22 Health Sciences, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School/UMass Memorial Health,
- 23 119 Belmont St., Worcester, MA 01605 USA, <u>TiffanyA.MooreSimas@umassmemorial.org</u>
- ⁸Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Perelman School of Medicine, University of
- 25 Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104 USA, ssrinivas@pennmedicine.upenn.edu
- ⁹Clinical Practice and Health Equity and Quality, American College of Obstetricians and
- 27 Gynecologists, 409 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20024 USA, <u>czahn@acog.org</u>
- ¹⁰Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation,
- 29 University of Michigan, 2800 Plymouth Rd. Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA,
- 30 <u>alexfrie@med.umich.edu</u>

31 Corresponding Author:

- 32 Alex Friedman Peahl, MD, MSc
- 33 University of Michigan Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
- 34 2800 Plymouth Rd., Building 14
- 35 Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA
- 36 Phone: 803-479-7653
- 37 Fax: 734-647-9727
- 38 <u>alexfrie@med.umich.edu</u>
- 39

40 Abstract

41	Background: Prenatal care, one of the most common preventive care services in the United	
42	States, endeavors to improve pregnancy outcomes through evidence-based screenings and	
43	interventions. Despite the prevalence of prenatal care and its importance to maternal and infant	
44	health, there are several debates about the best methods of prenatal care delivery, including the	
45	most appropriate schedule frequency and content of prenatal visits. Current U.S. national	
46	guidelines recommend that low-risk individuals receive a standard schedule of 12 to 14 in-offic	
47	visits, a care delivery model that has remained unchanged for almost a century.	
48	Objectives: In early 2020, to mitigate individuals' exposure to the SARS-CoV-2 virus, prenatal	
49	care providers implemented new paradigms that altered the schedule frequency, interval, and	
50	modality (e.g., telemedicine) of how prenatal care services were offered. In this manuscript, we	
51	describe development of a core outcome set (COS) that can be used to evaluate the effect of the	
52	frequency of prenatal care schedules on maternal and infant outcomes.	
53	Methods: We will systematically review the literature to identify previously reported outcomes	
54	important to individuals who receive prenatal care and the people who care for them.	
55	Stakeholders with expertise in prenatal care delivery (i.e., patients/family members, healthcare	
56	providers, and public health professionals and policymakers) will rate the importance of	
57	identified outcomes in an online survey using a three-round Delphi process. A virtual consensus	
58	meeting will be held for a group of stakeholder representatives to discuss and vote on the	
59	outcomes to include in the final COS.	
60	Results:	

The Delphi survey was initiated in July 2022 with 71 stakeholders invited. A virtual consensus

62 conference was conducted on October 11, 2022. Data is currently under analysis.

63	Conclusions: More research about the optimal schedule frequency and modality for prenatal
64	care delivery is needed. Standardizing outcomes that are measured and reported in evaluations of
65	the recommended prenatal care schedules will assist evidence synthesis and results reported in
66	systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Overall, this COS will expand the consistency and
67	patient-centeredness of reported outcomes for various prenatal care delivery schedules and
68	modalities, hopefully improving the overall efficacy of recommended care delivery for pregnant
69	people and their families.
70	Trial Registration: This study was registered in the Core Outcome Measures for Effectiveness
71	(COMET) database on January 18, 2022, registration #2021 http://www.comet-
72	initiative.org/Studies/Details/2021.
73	

74 Keywords: Core outcome set, Delphi, prenatal care schedules, telemedicine

75 Introduction

76	Prenatal care, one of the most common preventive care services in the United States, endeavors
77	to improve pregnancy outcomes through evidence-based screenings and interventions [1].
78	Despite the prevalence of prenatal care and its importance to maternal and infant health, there are
79	several debates about the best methods of prenatal care delivery, including the most appropriate
80	schedule frequency and content of prenatal visits [2]. Current U.S. national guidelines
81	recommend that low-risk individuals receive a standard 12 to 14 in-office visit schedule, a care
82	delivery model that has remained unchanged for almost a century. Other guidelines from peer
83	countries, as well as national consensus panels, have recommended a reduced visit schedule
84	based on recommended prenatal care services for average-risk people [3-5].
85	
86	In early 2020, to mitigate individuals' exposure to the SARS-CoV-2 virus, prenatal care
87	providers implemented new paradigms that altered the schedule frequency, interval, and
88	modality (e.g., telemedicine) of how prenatal care services were offered. COVID-19 pandemic-
89	related changes to how prenatal care was provided accelerated existing plans of the American
90	College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) to redesign prenatal care for low-risk
91	pregnant people. ACOG urgently convened a multidisciplinary panel to review how prenatal care
92	was administered to the average-risk individual [5]. The panel provided recommendations for: 1)
93	prenatal visit schedules (care initiation, visit timing and frequency); 2) integration of
94	telemedicine (virtual visits and home devices); and 3) care individualization. However, it was
95	recognized that there were significant gaps in evidence needed to guide national policy change
96	on prenatal visit schedules, including visit frequency and modality. Meta-analyses of studies that
97	addressed the prenatal care visit schedules and the effects on maternal or infant outcomes have

98	noted inconsistencies in which outcomes are routinely collected and reported [6-9]. There is a		
99	need for consistent reporting of maternal and infant outcomes in future clinical trials that		
100	compare the traditional 12 to 14 in-office visit approach with new models of prenatal care		
101	schedules that incorporate different frequency of visits and use of telemedicine.		
102			
103	Core outcome sets (COS) are key tools for ensuring consistent, homogenous reporting of		
104	outcomes across studies. Use of COS can result in improved clinical practice via standardization		
105	of outcomes across studies, thereby making it easier to compare outcomes. Furthermore, use of		
106	COS can reduce the risk of outcome-reporting preference, ensuring that all trials contribute		
107	functional information [10]. The objective of this study is to develop a COS to standardize		
108	outcome selection, collection, and reporting for future studies that compare prenatal care		
109	schedules with different frequencies of prenatal visits delivered across any modality (e.g., in-		
110	office care, group prenatal care, or telemedicine).		
111			
112	Methods		
113	Steering Committee		
114	This study has been prospectively registered with the Core Outcome Measures in Effectiveness		
115	Trials (COMET) initiative website, registration number 2021. We will follow reporting		
116	guidelines for developing core outcome sets, as outlined by the Core Outcome Set-STAndards		
117	for Development (COS-STAD) and follow the Core Outcome Set-STAndardised Protocol Items		
118	statement (COS-STAP) [11, 12]. A steering group including prenatal care providers, clinical		
119	researchers, and obstetric healthcare policymakers has been formed to guide the development of		
120	this COS. Members of the steering group were selected to represent various disciplines,		

geographical areas, and expertise. Within the steering committee, a study advisory board has
been established, consisting of a study coordinator (BN) and two members of the steering
committee (MT and AP) who will conduct the day-to-day management of the study.

124

125 **Definitions**

The steering committee recommended that the COS should apply to clinical studies evaluating 126 127 the frequency of prenatal care schedules for average-risk individuals receiving prenatal care when compared to current U.S. national guideline recommendations of a 12 to 14 in-office visit 128 129 schedule. Average-risk was defined broadly using a prior consensus committee definition and 130 includes all pregnant individuals seen by maternity care providers (e.g., obstetrician gynecologists, family medicine physicians, nurse practitioners, certified nurse-midwives), 131 132 without significant comorbidities requiring exclusive care by a maternal fetal medicine physician [5]. The potential intervention(s) covered by the COS could include the recommended frequency 133 of prenatal care visits in several modalities: 1) traditional 12 to 14 in-office appointments versus 134 135 reduced number of in-office visits; 2) method of delivery of the frequency of various types of prenatal care visit recommendations (traditional 12 to 14 in-office visits versus a reduced number 136 of visits provided by a hybrid of in-office combined with telemedicine modalities); and 137 potentially 3) other innovative models of prenatal care schedule recommendations (traditional 12 138 to 14 in-office visits compared to a reduced number of scheduled visits using care delivery 139 140 models such as group prenatal care or pregnancy medical homes that incorporate either in-office only or a hybrid of in-office and telemedicine. 141

142

143 Study Overview

This study will be divided into three separate phases: 1) ascertaining potential core outcomes; 2)defining core outcomes for inclusion; and 3) consensus meeting.

146

147 Phase One: Developing a Preliminary Core Measurement Outcome Set

Two systematic reviews were recently commissioned for evaluating the effect of varying the 148 149 frequency of prenatal care visit schedule recommendations on maternal and infant outcomes [5, 150 9]. To identify any additional outcome measures published in the literature, we will supplement 151 these systematic reviews with an electronic investigation with no date or language boundary 152 using the databases of MEDLINE via the PubMed interface, Web of Science, Embase (Excerpta 153 Medica Database), and CENTRAL (Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials) to identify outcome measures in systematic reviews that reported on the effect of different frequency of 154 155 prenatal visit recommendations on maternal and infant outcomes. We will evaluate unpublished 156 collected works (i.e., "gray literature") by searching Google Scholar and screening the first 100 157 results as is commonly done, based on the assumption that the most applicable results would 158 emerge first.

159

We will also identify potentially relevant outcome measures from the medical literature to inform the consensus process. Data sources that may be considered are systematic reviews of published studies and reviews of published qualitative work that have evaluated the effect of the recommended frequency of scheduled prenatal visits on maternal and infant outcomes. A list of outcomes from published studies will be supplemented by a review of qualitative research studies investigating patients' opinions regarding the frequency of prenatal care visits.

166

167 Steering group members will be provided with a preliminary outcome list, as well as a summary 168 of the systematic review(s) and the strength of evidence for each outcome (based on either the 169 Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [13] or the Grading of 170 Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) [14]). The list of core outcomes will be piloted and adjusted by the steering group, incorporating both professional 171 172 expertise and public member perspectives, before finalizing. The steering group members will be 173 asked to "From the following list choose the 'minimum standard outcomes' that you think are 174 important when developing a core outcome set for the Frequency Of pRenatal CAre viSiTs 175 (FORCAST) recommended schedule." Each respondent will be given the option to include, 176 exclude, or combine each outcome with other outcomes that have similar clinical definitions (e.g., combining gestational age at birth and preterm birth into a single outcome) to limit the 177 178 number of COS outcomes and increase the likelihood that the COS is applied in future research. 179 Steering group members will also be given the opportunity to add outcomes they believe are 180 critical for the COS. Steering group members will be encouraged to base their COS decisions on 181 the strength of evidence reported in the medical and public health literature. Steering group 182 member responses will be tabulated into an outcome inventory spreadsheet. Responses to the survey will be reviewed independently by the advisory board members, duplicate suggestions 183 will be removed, and the remaining responses will be grouped into domains of Maternal or Infant 184 outcomes. Additional outcomes proposed by the steering committee will be added to the COS if 185 186 at least two members write in the outcome, per specifications of the COMET Handbook [10]. 187 The steering committee will then review the domains and finalize a comprehensive list of outcomes. Following the steering group's consensus, the list of outcomes will then be prepared 188 189 for the Delphi survey [10]. All language for the COS will be developed using definitions from

190 professional organizations and patient-facing resources tested across diverse populations where 191 possible. Definitions will be piloted with three public members to confirm readability and 192 comprehension.

193

Phase Two: Conducting a Delphi Survey to Gain Consensus Opinion on Items to Include in a Standardized COS

196 We will conduct a Delphi panel to develop the stakeholder-informed COS (10). In a COS structure, this method is used for attaining convergence of opinion from stakeholders on the 197 198 importance of different outcomes in sequential questionnaires sent electronically. We will utilize sequential online questionnaires with participant feedback between rounds to incorporate the 199 perspectives of diverse stakeholders who contribute to and receive prenatal care, including: 1) 200 public members: persons who are currently using prenatal care, have utilized prenatal care in the 201 past year, or provide non-medical support to pregnant and postpartum people (e.g., pregnant and 202 203 postpartum people, family members); 2) prenatal care providers and researchers: healthcare 204 providers who administer prenatal care (e.g., obstetrician/gynecologists, family medicine physicians, neonatologists, advanced practice practitioners, nurses) with representation from both 205 academic and community health settings and investigators involved in perinatal research (e.g., 206 207 clinical researchers, health services researchers); 3) public policy members: individuals involved in development of guidelines, regulation, and payment for pregnancy and postpartum care (e.g., 208 209 clinical guideline developers, public health representatives, medical insurance payer 210 representatives).

211

212 *Recruitment:* Potential participants will be invited to participate in the Delphi survey with a 213 personalized email describing the project. Baseline demographic information (age, gender, race, 214 ethnicity) and baseline practice information (if a prenatal care provider) will be obtained for each 215 participant at the beginning of the survey. Participants will be asked to complete the survey in seven days, with a reminder email sent at the end of 14 days to prompt completion. Participation 216 217 will be optional and consent to participate will be implied if a contributor responds to the survey. 218 We aim to recruit a minimum of 20 public members, 20 providers and researchers (including a 219 mixture of academic and community providers), and 20 public health and public policy 220 members, with balanced representation across identities, including race and U.S. geographic regions. 221

222

223 Delphi Procedures: Before starting the survey, participants will be assigned a unique identifier to anonymize their responses and allow identification and linkage of individual responses in rounds 224 225 of the Delphi exercise and feedback. Participants will be invited to provide their name and 226 consent to be acknowledged as a member of the Delphi panel in the publication arising from this research. We anticipate a three-round survey; however, the round two results will be reviewed by 227 228 the steering committee to consider the need for a further Delphi survey round. All participants 229 who complete the first round of the Delphi exercise will be invited to participate in the second. All participants who complete the second round will be invited to participate in the third. The 230 231 first-round survey will include scoring of core outcome measurement items informed by the 232 preliminary list from phase one. Outcomes will be ranked on a 1-9 Likert scale ranging from least important to critical importance (1-3 is of limited importance, 4-6 is important but not 233 234 critical, and 7-9 is critical) [14]. In round 1, participants can suggest new items to be included in

the second round. If two or more participants suggest an additional core outcome measure, it will
be reviewed by the steering group and unique outcomes will be entered into round 2. All core
outcome measures from round 1 will be carried forward to round 2. Participants will also be
given the opportunity to share explanations for their ratings through online message boards.

Following round 1, the study advisory board will calculate the median and range of scores for 240 241 each round 1 outcome by the stakeholder group, as well as the pooled median and range for all 242 participants. Explanations shared through message boards will also be collated and shared with 243 scoring summaries. For each round, the number of participants who were invited but do not participate (i.e., attrition rate) will be calculated and shown in the final publication of the COS. 244 Prior to completing round 2, each participant will receive their own score on each potential core 245 246 outcome measure, as well as the scores by stakeholder group and overall. Participants will be 247 asked to reflect on their own scores and on the scores of other participants before re-scoring each 248 individual outcome. After the round 2 survey has closed, the percentage of participants scoring 249 each outcome will be calculated and tabulated for each individual, the stakeholder groups, and 250 the overall pooled group. If 70% of the core outcomes have reached a consensus to be either 251 included and/or excluded (as defined below) after round 2 of the Delphi survey, the third round 252 of the Delphi will be omitted, and the group will proceed to the consensus meeting. If participants have not come to consensus at the conclusion of round 2, similar procedures will be 253 254 repeated for round 3.

255

256 Consensus for inclusion will be defined as when \geq 70% of participants scored the outcome

257 "critical" for decision-making (a score of 7-9) and <15% of participants in the stakeholder group

258 scored the outcome of "limited importance for decision-making" (a score of 1-3). Consensus for 259 an outcome to be excluded from the COS will be defined when $\geq 70\%$ of participants in the stakeholder group scored the outcome of "limited importance for decision-making" (a score of 1-260 261 3) and <15% of participants in the stakeholder group scored the outcome as "critical for decision-making" (a score of 7-9) [10]. Though there is no consensus regarding the ideal number 262 of outcomes to include in a COS, based on existing literature and expert opinion, the steering 263 committee has established a preset goal of 10 outcomes for the COS to enable implementation 264 265 and use of the COS [15]. Items that reach consensus to be included (as defined above) for all 266 three stakeholder groups will be automatically included in the final set of FORCAST COS 267 recommendations, even if there are more than 10 core outcomes. Items that reach consensus to be excluded (as defined above) by all three stakeholder groups will be removed. If after the final 268 269 round of the Delphi survey, no core outcome measures are excluded, the steering committee will 270 determine outcomes to be brought forward to the consensus meeting using at least one of the 271 following three criteria: 1) the mean outcome measure is scored as critical (a score of 7-9) by 272 \geq 70% of all participants included in the Delphi survey; 2) the top 10 outcome measures from the three different stakeholder groups (public members, prenatal care providers and researchers, and 273 public policy members); or 3) outcome measures considered critically important by \geq 70% of one 274 275 or more of the different stakeholder groups [15].

276

277 Phase Three: Holding a Consensus Meeting to Identify the Main Items to be Included in the 278 COS

A virtual consensus meeting will be held to review outcomes without consensus, resolve

remaining discrepancies, and approve a final COS for the frequency of scheduled prenatal care

281 visits. The consensus meeting will include at least seven of the nine steering committee members 282 and three representatives from each of the three stakeholder groups (nine members), selected to 283 maximize diversity, as voting members. Additionally, any participant who completed all three 284 rounds of the Delphi survey will be invited to observe and provide their perspective in 285 discussions. The meeting will begin with an initial briefing on the purpose and scope of the 286 meeting, including a summary of the results from the initial rounds of the Delphi, outcomes with 287 consensus for inclusion and exclusion, and outcomes where consensus has yet to be reached. The panel will begin with outcomes that reached consensus from all stakeholder groups for inclusion 288 289 or exclusion, to approve those results. The panel will next consider items that did not reach consensus. These items will be the focus of the meeting. All consensus meeting participants will 290 be given an opportunity to discuss each item and share their perspective on why it should or 291 292 should not be included in the final COS. Members of the steering group and the three representatives from each stakeholder group will receive a summary of the results and be asked 293 294 to independently consider items remaining that did not reach consensus to be either 295 automatically included or excluded. The steering committee and stakeholder representatives will 296 then take a majority vote as to whether or not the core outcome measure should be included in 297 the final COS. While the preset goal of the consensus meeting is to encompass no more than 10 298 outcomes, if it is determined that more than 10 outcomes are necessary, these additional outcomes will be included. A summary of this process and the voting results will be published 299 300 with the final report. Those outcomes excluded will be listed in the final publication. The final 301 COS will be sent to all participants who participated in the three Delphi rounds in order to give them the opportunity to comment on the final results. The steering committee will draft the 302 303 FORCAST COS guideline for publication and dissemination.

304

305 Ethics Approval

306 The study was determined exempt by the University of Michigan institutional review board, as it

307 was deemed non-human subject research (HUM00217486).

308

309 **Results**

- The Delphi survey was initiated in July 2022 with 71 stakeholders invited. A virtual consensus
- 311 conference was conducted on October 11, 2022. Data is currently under analysis.

312

313 Discussion

- Applying a COS for the frequency of recommended scheduled prenatal care visits and mode of visit interaction is needed to assist forthcoming clinical studies, systematic reviews, and evidence-based clinical guidance to decide which prenatal care approach has the strongest
- 317 efficacy and clinical utility, and for whom. Many prenatal care interventions, including
- 318 laboratory tests, vaccinations, and routine screenings, are supported by robust randomized
- 319 controlled trial evidence with consistent outcomes demonstrated through meta-analyses.
- However, schedules and methods of prenatal care delivery recommendations overall have not yet

321 been subjected to these rigorous standards of assessment.

322

Maternity care stakeholders, including healthcare providers, health systems leaders, and payers, have numerous methods of prenatal care delivery to choose from, including the traditional visit schedule (visits every four weeks until 28 weeks, every two weeks until 36 weeks, and weekly until delivery); reduced visit schedules (8 to 9 visits based on necessary prenatal services);

327	telemedicine; group prenatal care; and others. Establishing this COS may potentially generate a
328	set of measures for assessing the relationship, effect, and magnitude of prenatal care visit
329	schedules on maternal and infant health outcomes and help stakeholders to determine the
330	comparative value of recommended prenatal care visit schedules. Establishing a COS is
331	paramount to ensure pregnant individuals have access to the most effective prenatal care
332	recommendations, delivered through the most efficient care delivery model.
333	
334	Acknowledgements:
335	We wish to thank Lamiya Ahmed and Megan McReynolds from the American College of
336	Obstetricians and Gynecologists for organizational support of this project and providing lay
337	person feedback for core outcome set definitions as well as editing of the manuscript as public
338	member representatives. We also wish to thank Sarah Block for her assistance with the
339	preparation of this manuscript.
340	Data Availability:
341	All datasets used and/or analyzed during the FORCAST study will be held by the FORCAST
342	team at alexfrie@med.umich.edu.
343	Disclaimer:
344	None
345	Authors' Contributions:
346	MT and AFP are the Chief Investigators; they conceived the study, led the proposal and protocol
347	development. All authors (MT, BN, BC, SK, TK, MK, TMS, SS, CZ, AFP) made substantial
348	contributions to the conception and design of the Core Outcome Set study. BN was the lead trial
349	methodologist. MT and AFP drafted the manuscript. All authors commented on revisions to draft

- versions of the manuscript, read, commented on, and approved the final manuscript. All authors
- are members of the overall FORCAST study team.

352 **Conflicts of Interest:**

- 353 Dr. Peahl is a consultant for Maven. Dr. Moore Simas is a consultant to MCPAP for Moms as
- obstetric engagement liaison which is supported via Beacon Health Options via the
- 355 Massachusetts Department of Mental Health and medical director of Lifeline for Moms through
- UMass Chan Medical School; both focus on perinatal mental health. Dr. Moore Simas has
- 357 received speaker honorarium from Miller Medical Communications. The remaining authors
- declare that they have no competing interests.

359 Abbreviations:

- 360 FORCAST=Frequency Of pRenatal CAre viSiTs
- 361 COS=core outcome set
- 362 COMET=Core Outcome Measures for Effectiveness
- 363 ACOG=American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

364 **References**

365	1.	Kilpatrick SJ, Papile L, Macones GA. Guidelines for Perinatal Care. 8th ed. Elk Grove
-----	----	---

- Village, IL/Washington, D.C.: American Academy of Pediatrics/The American College of
- 367 Obstetricians and Gynecologists; 2017.
- 368 2. Osterman MJK, Martin JA. Timing and Adequacy of Prenatal Care in the United States,
- 369 2016. Natl Vital Stat Rep. 2018;67(3):1-14. PMID: 29874159.
- 370 3. Rosen MG, Merkatz IR, Hill JG. Caring for our future: a report by the expert panel on the
- 371 content of prenatal care. Obstet Gynecol. 1991;77(5):782-7. PMID: 2014096.
- 4. Peahl AF, Smith RD, Moniz MH. Prenatal care redesign: creating flexible maternity care

models through virtual care. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2020;223(3):389 e1- e10. doi:

- 10.1016/j.ajog.2020.05.029. PMID: 32425200.
- 5. Peahl AF, Zahn CM, Turrentine M, Barfield W, Blackwell SD, Roberts SJ, et al. The
- 376 Michigan Plan for Appropriate Tailored Health Care in Pregnancy Prenatal Care

Recommendations. Obstet Gynecol. 2021;138(4):593-602. doi:

378 10.1097/AOG.000000000004531. PMID: 34352810.

379 6. Dowswell T, Carroli G, Duley L, Gates S, Gulmezoglu AM, Khan-Neelofur D, et al.

380 Alternative versus standard packages of antenatal care for low-risk pregnancy. Cochrane

381 Database Syst Rev. 2015(7):CD000934. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000934.pub3. PMID:

382 26184394.

World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive
pregnancy experience 2016 [28 July 2022]. Available from:

- 385 https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal perinatal health/anc-positive-
- 386 pregnancy-experience/en/.
- 8. Barrera CM, Powell AR, Biermann CR, Siden Y, Nguyen BH, Roberts SJ, et al. A
- 388 Review of Prenatal Care Delivery to Inform the Michigan Plan for Appropriate Tailored Health
- Care in Pregnancy Panel. Obstet Gynecol. 2021;138 (4):603-15. doi:
- 390 10.1097/AOG.00000000004535. PMID: 34352841.
- 391 9. Balk EM, Konnyu KJ, Cao W, Bhuma MR, Danilack VA, Adam GP, et al. Schedule of
- 392 Visits and Televisits for Routine Antenatal Care: A Systematic Review. Comparative
- 393 Effectiveness Review No. 257. (Prepared by the Brown Evidence-based Practice Center under
- 394 Contract No. 75Q80120D00001.) AHRQ Publication No. 22-EHC031 2022 [28 July 2022].

395 Available from: <u>https://www.doi.org/10.23970/AHRQEPCCER257</u>.

- 10. Williamson PR, Altman DG, Bagley H, Barnes KL, Blazeby JM, Brookes ST, et al. The
- COMET Handbook: version 1.0. Trials. 2017;18(Suppl 3):280. doi: 10.1186/s13063-017-1978-4.
 PMID: 28681707.
- 11. Kirkham JJ, Davis K, Altman DG, Blazeby JM, Clarke M, Tunis S, et al. Core Outcome
- 400 Set-STAndards for Development: The COS-STAD recommendations. PLoS Med.
- 401 2017;14(11):e1002447. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002447. PMID: 29145404.
- 402 12. Kirkham JJ, Gorst S, Altman DG, Blazeby JM, Clarke M, Tunis S, et al. Core Outcome
- 403 Set-STAndardised Protocol Items: the COS-STAP Statement. Trials. 2019;20(1):116. doi:
- 404 10.1186/s13063-019-3230-x. PMID: 30744706.

- 405 13. Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.
- 406 Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell; 2008.
- 407 14. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines:
- 408 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology.
- 409 2011;64(4):395-400. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.09.012. PMID: 21194891.
- 410 15. Hellberg C, Osterberg M, Jonsson AK, Fundell S, Tronnberg F, Jonsson M, et al.
- 411 Important research outcomes for treatment studies of perinatal depression: systematic overview
- 412 and development of a core outcome set. BJOG. 2021;128(13):2141-9. doi: 10.1111/1471-
- 413 0528.16780. PMID: 34047454.