

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<sup>1</sup>, Buu-Hac Nguyen<sup>2</sup>, Beth Choby, MD<sup>3</sup>, Susan Kendig, JD, WHNP-BC<sup>4</sup>,  
5 Tekoa L. King, RN, MPH, CNM<sup>5</sup>, Milton Kotelchuck, MPH, PhD<sup>6</sup>, Tiffany A. Moore Simas,  
6 MD, MPH, MEd<sup>7</sup>, Sindhu K. Srinivas, MD, MSCE<sup>8</sup>, Christopher M. Zahn, MD<sup>9</sup>, Alex Friedman  
7 Peahl, MD, MSc<sup>10</sup>

8  
9 <sup>1</sup>Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Baylor College of Medicine, 6651 Main Street, Ste.  
10 F1020, Houston, TX 77030 USA, [mark.turrentine@bcm.edu](mailto:mark.turrentine@bcm.edu)

11 <sup>2</sup>University of Michigan College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, 500 S. State St., Ann  
12 Arbor, MI 48109 USA, [bunguyen@umich.edu](mailto:bunguyen@umich.edu)

13 <sup>3</sup>Department of Medical Education, Baptist Health Sciences University 1003 Monroe Ave.  
14 Memphis, TN 38104 USA, [beth.choby@baptistu.edu](mailto:beth.choby@baptistu.edu)

15 <sup>4</sup>SSM Health-St. Louis Region, Maternal Services, 1191 Fortune Blvd., Shiloh, IL 62269, USA,  
16 [skendig@npwh.org](mailto:skendig@npwh.org)

17 <sup>5</sup>Department 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](mailto:tekoaking@gmail.com)

19 <sup>6</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School, 125 Nashua St., Boston, MA 02114 USA,  
20 [mkotelchuck@mgh.harvard.edu](mailto:mkotelchuck@mgh.harvard.edu)

21 <sup>7</sup>Department 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, [TiffanyA.MooreSimas@umassmemorial.org](mailto:TiffanyA.MooreSimas@umassmemorial.org)

24 <sup>8</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Perelman School of Medicine, University of  
25 Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104 USA, [ssrinivas@pennmedicine.upenn.edu](mailto:ssrinivas@pennmedicine.upenn.edu)

26 <sup>9</sup>Clinical Practice and Health Equity and Quality, American College of Obstetricians and  
27 Gynecologists, 409 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Washington, DC 20024 USA, [czahn@acog.org](mailto:czahn@acog.org)

28 <sup>10</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation,  
29 University of Michigan, 2800 Plymouth Rd. Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA,  
30 [alexfrie@med.umich.edu](mailto:alexfrie@med.umich.edu)

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 [alexfrie@med.umich.edu](mailto:alexfrie@med.umich.edu)

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-office  
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:**

61 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-](http://www.comet-initiative.org/Studies/Details/2021)  
72 [initiative.org/Studies/Details/2021](http://www.comet-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

108 noted inconsistencies in which outcomes are routinely collected and reported [6-9]. There is a  
109 need for consistent reporting of maternal and infant outcomes in future clinical trials that  
110 compare the traditional 12 to 14 in-office visit approach with new models of prenatal care  
111 schedules that incorporate different frequency of visits and use of telemedicine.

112  
113 Core outcome sets (COS) are key tools for ensuring consistent, homogenous reporting of  
114 outcomes across studies. Use of COS can result in improved clinical practice via standardization  
115 of outcomes across studies, thereby making it easier to compare outcomes. Furthermore, use of  
116 COS can reduce the risk of outcome-reporting preference, ensuring that all trials contribute  
117 functional information [10]. The objective of this study is to develop a COS to standardize  
118 outcome selection, collection, and reporting for future studies that compare prenatal care  
119 schedules with different frequencies of prenatal visits delivered across any modality (e.g., in-  
120 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,

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

124

## 125 **Definitions**

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

142

## 143 **Study Overview**

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

146

147 ***Phase One: Developing a Preliminary Core Measurement Outcome Set***

148 Two systematic reviews were recently commissioned for evaluating the effect of varying the  
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  
154 outcome measures in systematic reviews that reported on the effect of different frequency of  
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

160 We will also identify potentially relevant outcome measures from the medical literature to  
161 inform the consensus process. Data sources that may be considered are systematic reviews of  
162 published studies and reviews of published qualitative work that have evaluated the effect of the  
163 recommended frequency of scheduled prenatal visits on maternal and infant outcomes. A list of  
164 outcomes from published studies will be supplemented by a review of qualitative research  
165 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  
171 outcomes will be piloted and adjusted by the steering group, incorporating both professional  
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  
177 (e.g., combining gestational age at birth and preterm birth into a single outcome) to limit the  
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  
183 survey will be reviewed independently by the advisory board members, duplicate suggestions  
184 will be removed, and the remaining responses will be grouped into domains of Maternal or Infant  
185 outcomes. Additional outcomes proposed by the steering committee will be added to the COS if  
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  
188 outcomes. Following the steering group’s consensus, the list of outcomes will then be prepared  
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

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

196 We will conduct a Delphi panel to develop the stakeholder-informed COS (10). In a COS  
197 structure, this method is used for attaining convergence of opinion from stakeholders on the  
198 importance of different outcomes in sequential questionnaires sent electronically. We will utilize  
199 sequential online questionnaires with participant feedback between rounds to incorporate the  
200 perspectives of diverse stakeholders who contribute to and receive prenatal care, including: 1)  
201 public members: persons who are currently using prenatal care, have utilized prenatal care in the  
202 past year, or provide non-medical support to pregnant and postpartum people (e.g., pregnant and  
203 postpartum people, family members); 2) prenatal care providers and researchers: healthcare  
204 providers who administer prenatal care (e.g., obstetrician/gynecologists, family medicine  
205 physicians, neonatologists, advanced practice practitioners, nurses) with representation from both  
206 academic and community health settings and investigators involved in perinatal research (e.g.,  
207 clinical researchers, health services researchers); 3) public policy members: individuals involved  
208 in development of guidelines, regulation, and payment for pregnancy and postpartum care (e.g.,  
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  
216 seven days, with a reminder email sent at the end of 14 days to prompt completion. Participation  
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  
221 regions.

222  
223 *Delphi Procedures:* Before starting the survey, participants will be assigned a unique identifier to  
224 anonymize their responses and allow identification and linkage of individual responses in rounds  
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  
227 research. We anticipate a three-round survey; however, the round two results will be reviewed by  
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.  
230 All participants who complete the second round will be invited to participate in the third. The  
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  
233 least important to critical importance (1-3 is of limited importance, 4-6 is important but not  
234 critical, and 7-9 is critical) [14]. In round 1, participants can suggest new items to be included in

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

239  
240 Following round 1, the study advisory board will calculate the median and range of scores for  
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  
244 participate (i.e., attrition rate) will be calculated and shown in the final publication of the COS.  
245 Prior to completing round 2, each participant will receive their own score on each potential core  
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  
253 participants have not come to consensus at the conclusion of round 2, similar procedures will be  
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  
260 stakeholder group scored the outcome of “limited importance for decision-making” (a score of 1-  
261 3) and  $< 15\%$  of participants in the stakeholder group scored the outcome as “critical for  
262 decision-making” (a score of 7-9) [10]. Though there is no consensus regarding the ideal number  
263 of outcomes to include in a COS, based on existing literature and expert opinion, the steering  
264 committee has established a preset goal of 10 outcomes for the COS to enable implementation  
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  
268 be excluded (as defined above) by all three stakeholder groups will be removed. If after the final  
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  
273 three different stakeholder groups (public members, prenatal care providers and researchers, and  
274 public policy members); or 3) outcome measures considered critically important by  $\geq 70\%$  of one  
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***

279 A virtual consensus meeting will be held to review outcomes without consensus, resolve  
280 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  
288 panel will begin with outcomes that reached consensus from all stakeholder groups for inclusion  
289 or exclusion, to approve those results. The panel will next consider items that did not reach  
290 consensus. These items will be the focus of the meeting. All consensus meeting participants will  
291 be given an opportunity to discuss each item and share their perspective on why it should or  
292 should not be included in the final COS. Members of the steering group and the three  
293 representatives from each stakeholder group will receive a summary of the results and be asked  
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  
299 outcomes will be included. A summary of this process and the voting results will be published  
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  
302 them the opportunity to comment on the final results. The steering committee will draft the  
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**

310 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**

314 Applying a COS for the frequency of recommended scheduled prenatal care visits and mode of  
315 visit interaction is needed to assist forthcoming clinical studies, systematic reviews, and  
316 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.  
320 However, schedules and methods of prenatal care delivery recommendations overall have not yet  
321 been subjected to these rigorous standards of assessment.

322

323 Maternity care stakeholders, including healthcare providers, health systems leaders, and payers,  
324 have numerous methods of prenatal care delivery to choose from, including the traditional visit  
325 schedule (visits every four weeks until 28 weeks, every two weeks until 36 weeks, and weekly  
326 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

350 versions of the manuscript, read, commented on, and approved the final manuscript. All authors  
351 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  
354 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  
356 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  
358 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  
366 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.
- 372 4. Peahl AF, Smith RD, Moniz MH. Prenatal care redesign: creating flexible maternity care  
373 models through virtual care. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2020;223(3):389 e1- e10. doi:  
374 10.1016/j.ajog.2020.05.029. PMID: 32425200.
- 375 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  
377 Recommendations. Obstet Gynecol. 2021;138(4):593-602. doi:  
378 10.1097/AOG.0000000000004531. 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.
- 383 7. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive  
384 pregnancy experience 2016 [28 July 2022]. Available from:

385 [https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal\\_perinatal\\_health/anc-positive-](https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal_perinatal_health/anc-positive-pregnancy-experience/en/)  
386 [pregnancy-experience/en/](https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal_perinatal_health/anc-positive-pregnancy-experience/en/).

387 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  
389 Care in Pregnancy Panel. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2021;138 (4):603-15. doi:  
390 10.1097/AOG.0000000000004535. 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: <https://www.doi.org/10.23970/AHRQEPCCER257>.

396 10. Williamson PR, Altman DG, Bagley H, Barnes KL, Blazeby JM, Brookes ST, et al. The  
397 COMET Handbook: version 1.0. *Trials.* 2017;18(Suppl 3):280. doi: 10.1186/s13063-017-1978-4.  
398 PMID: 28681707.

399 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.

414