

1 Risk Factors for Spontaneous Preterm Birth are Mediated through Changes in 2 Cervical Length

3
4 Hope M. Wolf¹, Shawn J. Latendresse², Jerome F. Strauss III^{3,4}, Adi L. Tarca^{5,6,7}, Roberto
5 Romero^{5,8,9}, Sonia S. Hassan^{6,10,11}, Bradley T. Webb¹², Timothy P. York^{1,2}

6
7 ¹Department of Human and Molecular Genetics, Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine,
8 Richmond, Virginia, USA

9
10 ²Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Baylor University, Waco, Texas, USA

11
12 ³Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine, Richmond,
13 Virginia, USA

14
15 ⁴Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine,
16 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

17
18 ⁵Pregnancy Research Branch*, Division of Obstetrics and Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Division of Intramural
19 Research, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, U.S. Department
20 of Health and Human Services (NICHD/NIH/DHHS), Bethesda, MD, and Detroit, Michigan, USA

21
22 ⁶Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Wayne State University School of Medicine, Detroit, Michigan, USA

23
24 ⁷Department of Computer Science, Wayne State University College of Engineering, Detroit, Michigan, USA

25
26 ⁸Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

27
28 ⁹Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA

29
30 ¹⁰Office of Women's Health, Integrative Biosciences Center, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA

31
32 ¹¹Department of Physiology, Wayne State University School of Medicine, Detroit, Michigan, USA

33
34 ¹²GenOmics, Bioinformatics, and Translational Research Center, Biostatistics and Epidemiology Division, RTI
35 International, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA

36
37 *The Perinatology Research Branch, NICHD/NIH/DHHS, has been renamed as the Pregnancy Research Branch,
38 NICHD/NIH/DHHS.

39 40 41 **Correspondence:**

42 Dr. Timothy P. York

43 Virginia Commonwealth University

44 Box 980003

45 Richmond, Virginia 23298-0003

46 tpyork@vcu.edu

47

48 **Keywords:** cervical length, prematurity, parity, smoking, previous preterm birth, mediation analysis,
49 latent growth curve analysis, longitudinal

50

51

52

53 **ABSTRACT**

54 Although short cervical length in the mid-trimester of pregnancy is a one of the strongest predictors of
55 preterm birth (*i.e.*, parturition before 37 completed weeks), there is limited understanding of how the
56 dynamics of cervical remodeling (*i.e.*, changes in cervical length) leading up to labor and delivery can
57 inform obstetrical risk. In this study, latent growth curve analysis was applied to serial cervical length
58 measurements across pregnancy (median of 6; IQR = 3-8) to quantify characteristics of cervical change
59 in a cohort of 5,111 singleton pregnancies consisting predominantly of Black women. A conditional
60 mediation model including nine common maternal risk factors for spontaneous preterm birth as
61 exogenous predictors accounted for 26.5% of the variability in gestational age at delivery ($P < 0.001$).
62 This model provides insight into distinct mechanisms by which specific maternal risk factors influence
63 preterm birth. For instance, effects of maternal parity and smoking status were fully mediated through
64 cervical change parameters, whereas the influence of previous preterm birth was only partially
65 explained, suggesting alternative pathways could be involved. This study provides the first account of
66 the intermediary role of cervical dynamics in associations between known maternal risk factors and
67 gestational age at delivery.

68

69

70

71

72

73

74 INTRODUCTION

75 Preterm birth is the leading cause of neonatal morbidity and mortality worldwide (1), and babies born
76 prematurely are at higher risk for long-term health issues, such as intellectual, developmental, and
77 physical disabilities (1,2). A single mid-trimester cervical length measurement by transvaginal
78 ultrasound is the best available technique for predicting (3–18) and preventing preterm birth, when
79 paired with the administration of vaginal progesterone or cerclage in patients with a short cervix (18–
80 41). Despite promise as a diagnostic tool this measure is characterized by relatively low sensitivity
81 (9,42). Improvements in the predictive value may be achieved by taking into account the dynamic nature
82 of cervical change across gestation (42–46) and consideration of maternal characteristics (47–50).

83 The length of the cervix, defined as the distance between the internal and external os of the cervical
84 canal, is easily measured by transvaginal ultrasonography over the course of pregnancy (47,51).
85 Estimates for the mean length of the cervix in the mid-trimester vary between 35 and 45 mm, depending
86 on the population (52–54), with cervical lengths shorter than 25 mm before 24 weeks meeting the
87 clinical definition of a short cervix (28). A short cervix in the mid-trimester is associated with a six-fold
88 increase in the risk of preterm delivery (4), and the earlier in pregnancy that the shortening occurs, the
89 higher the risk for spontaneous preterm birth (3–18).

90 Cervical shortening is often thought of as the initial step of cervical ripening leading to the onset of labor
91 and can begin several weeks before parturition (44–46,55–65). In most uncomplicated full-term
92 pregnancies, the length of the cervix remains constant or gradually decreases beginning around 30
93 weeks (66,67). However, in some pregnancies rapid and progressive cervical shortening can occur
94 earlier (46,66,68,69), which is associated with an increased risk for many adverse pregnancy outcomes,
95 including preterm premature rupture of membranes (pPROM) (70,71), ascending infection (72–74),
96 preterm labor (75–77), and premature delivery (3–16,18).

97 Maternal characteristics, such as advanced maternal age (53), BMI > 25 (78,79), higher parity (48),
98 Black race/ethnicity (80), tobacco use (81), and history of cervical trauma (82) have all been associated
99 with an increased risk of a short cervix in the mid-trimester. In a recent study by Gudicha et al. an
100 adjustment of the threshold to define a short cervix in the mid-trimester or later in gestation to account
101 for maternal characteristics resulted in a substantial improvement in the sensitivity for prediction of
102 women at risk for spontaneous preterm delivery (35). Thus, insight into the mechanism describing how
103 maternal risk factors contribute to cervical shortening across pregnancy may provide an understanding
104 on how maternal risk factors influence preterm birth (69,83,84).

105 This study aimed to elucidate the etiological relationships between common maternal risk factors for
106 preterm birth and the physiological changes in cervical length occurring during pregnancy. A multi-
107 stage analytic strategy was employed to: 1) characterize changes in cervical length during pregnancy in
108 a cohort of 5111 singleton pregnancies consisting predominantly of Black women; 2) test maternal risk
109 factors for preterm birth, obstetric history and substance use domains as exogenous predictors of
110 gestational age at delivery (GAD) and; 3) examine the extent to which cervical change parameters
111 mediate associations between maternal risk factors and GAD. The underlying hypothesis was that
112 changes in cervical length during pregnancy would, in part, mediate the effects of maternal risk factors,
113 providing insight into etiologic mechanisms predisposing to preterm birth.

114

115 **METHODS**

116 **Cohort Description**

117 This study included women enrolled in a prospective cohort study of pregnant women at the Center for
118 Advanced Obstetrical Care and Research (CAOCR) at Hutzel Women's Hospital. The center was
119 affiliated with Wayne State University and the Detroit Medical Center and part of the Pregnancy
120 Research Branch (formerly Perinatology Research Branch) of The *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National
121 Institute of Child Health and Human Development (National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of
122 Health and Human Services). Clinical data collection was approved by the Institutional Review Boards
123 of Wayne State University (#110605MP2F) and NICHD/NIH/DHHS (OH97-CH-N067). All study
124 participants were enrolled between 2005 and 2017 and provided written informed consent.

125 From an initial cohort of 8226 pregnancies available with serial cervical length measurements, 5111
126 pregnancies were selected based on the following criteria: a singleton pregnancy, at least 2 cervical
127 length measurements performed between 8 and 40 weeks of gestation, and availability of relevant
128 demographic and clinical characteristics including self-identification as Black/African American.
129 Women with a medically induced preterm delivery for any reason, history of cervical trauma, any
130 serious medical conditions, or treatment with progesterone or cerclage during the study pregnancy were
131 excluded in order to estimate model parameters on naturally occurring cervical length measures.

132 Demographic characteristics, relevant medical history, and pregnancy outcome data were obtained for
133 each participant via medical record abstraction. Cervical length was measured in millimeters (mm) using
134 a transvaginal 12-3 MHz ultrasound endocavitary probe by shearwave elastography (85). Serial cervical

135 length measurements were obtained between 8 and 40 weeks of gestation when patients were seen for
136 prenatal care visits in the CAOCR clinic. GAD was measured from the first day of a woman's last
137 menstrual period and confirmed by ultrasound. The inter-observer correlation of transvaginal cervical
138 length was estimated based on 182 instances when a clinical and a research ultrasound evaluation were
139 conducted in the same day for the same patients. The inter-observer correlation was 77%, similar to 76%
140 reported elsewhere (47).

141 **Analytic Strategy**

142 All modeling and data analyses in the current study were conducted in *Mplus* (Version 8.3 for *Linux*)
143 (86) using robust maximum likelihood estimation, where path coefficients and standard errors were
144 computed while accounting for the non-independence of observations due to complex sampling (*i.e.*,
145 multiple pregnancies for the same woman, which accounted for 13.6% of pregnancies ($n = 693$)).

146 **Modeling Cervical Change Across Pregnancy**

147 Growth curve modeling (GCM) is a cross-disciplinary analytic approach that utilizes repeated
148 phenotypic measures to estimate intraindividual trajectories of phenotypic change, and interindividual
149 differences in the parameters defining those trajectories. Contemporary applications of GCM typically
150 derive from one of two distinct, but closely related methodological frameworks. The first, multilevel
151 modeling (MLM) (87) was explicitly developed to allow for the specification of fixed and random
152 effects in linear regression models where nested data structures are observed. The second, structural
153 equation modeling (SEM) (88), extends Sewall Wright's method of path coefficients (89) to test
154 hypothesized associations between manifest and latent variables. Within SEM, latent growth curve
155 analysis (LGCA) (90–92) characterizes the defining features of phenotypic trajectories via multiple
156 indicator latent growth parameters. Given adequate sample size, a sufficient number of observations for
157 each repeated measurement, and independence among study participants, univariate GCM conducted in
158 MLM and SEM can be specified to yield equivalent estimates of the relevant parameters for all linear,
159 and many nonlinear trajectories, including those conditioned on time-invariant and/or time-varying
160 covariates (93).

161 Still, there are relevant advantages to selecting each framework over the other. For example, MLM is the
162 preferable approach when the number and timing of repeated measures is highly variable across
163 individuals (94). Conversely, SEM offers greater flexibility for testing various hypotheses (*e.g.*,
164 homoscedasticity of residual variances) (94), yields indices with which to formally evaluate model fit
165 (95), and is more suitable for the analysis of complex mediation mechanisms (93). Moreover, since

166 growth parameters in SEM are modeled as latent variables, and thusly disaggregated from measurement
167 error, the approach is more psychometrically appealing (93). For these reasons, the method selected to
168 analyze changes in cervical length across pregnancy was LGCA.

169 All LGCA were predicated on nine possible assessments of cervical length, each spanning a four-week
170 window of observation with respect to the estimated date of conception (i.e., M2: 5-8 weeks; M3: 9-12
171 weeks; M4: 13-16 weeks; M5: 17-20 weeks; M6: 21-24 weeks; M7: 25-28 weeks; M8: 29-32 weeks;
172 M9: 33-36 weeks; M10: 37-40 weeks). For participants with two or more assessments of cervical length
173 within a given four-week window, the mean of those values was used at that timepoint. Binning within
174 temporal windows was necessary given sampling variability in the number and timing of individual
175 observations distributed across 225 discrete days and importantly, produced parameter estimates that
176 were comparable to those of MLM (Supplemental Table 1). As LGCA assumes a mean trajectory of
177 change within the sample, and individual differences expressed in terms of normal variability around the
178 specified growth parameters defining the level and shape of that change (90), a series of three nested
179 models were estimated to determine which best characterized change in cervical length across
180 pregnancy. The first, an intercept only or *no change* model, included a single latent growth parameter (I)
181 reflecting the estimated mean cervical length at a specified temporal reference point within the process.
182 In the present study, the intercept was set at M5 (i.e., 17-20 weeks gestation) to allow for comparison
183 with the “mid-trimester” transvaginal sonographic measurement commonly reported in the literature;
184 that is, after reproducible measurement is consistently possible (96), but before intervention for a short
185 cervix is typically initiated (28). The second, a *linear change* model, included an additional latent
186 growth parameter (L) reflecting the average change in cervical length per four weeks of gestation. The
187 last, a *nonlinear change* model, included the addition of a third, quadratic growth parameter (Q)
188 reflecting the mean rate of acceleration per four-week window of gestation. Figure 1 depicts a fully
189 parameterized nonlinear change model that can easily be modified to represent a more restrictive no
190 change or linear change model simply by fixing the factor loadings, variances, and covariances of the
191 latent growth factor(s) L and/or Q, respectively, to zero. Finally, to determine whether variance
192 components for the nine indicators of cervical length should be equated, as in MLM, models with and
193 without this equality constraint were compared.

194 Interindividual differences in the number of cervical length assessments were expected for two reasons.
195 First, measurements were obtained during regular prenatal care visits and without a prespecified
196 schedule for the number of total visits and spacing between visits. Second, normal variability in the
197 duration of gestation (i.e., term/preterm) was related to the participants’ time in the study, and thus the

198 total number of recorded measurements. Among those pregnancies included in the unconditional LGCA,
199 344 of a possible 512 (i.e., 2^9) data patterns were observed with respect to the nine monthly assessment
200 periods. To summarize, 1.6% ($n = 80$) had representative data at all nine assessment periods, 63.0% ($n =$
201 3221) had representative data at four to eight assessment periods (i.e., surpassing the minimum threshold
202 for non-linear analyses), and 35.4% ($n = 1810$) had representative data at one to three assessment
203 periods.

204 **Multiple Mediation Modeling**

205 A theoretically driven multiple mediation model was used to test the extent to which a set of known
206 maternal risk factors accounted for variability in GAD, both directly and indirectly, through the latent
207 growth factors described above, in order to characterize the intermediary role of changes in cervical
208 length across the period of pregnancy. To avoid limitations of the traditional causal steps approach
209 (97,98), a product of coefficients strategy (99,100) was implemented in *Mplus* to disaggregate the total
210 effect of an independent variable on a dependent variable (*c paths*) into direct (i.e., $X \rightarrow Y$, or *c' paths*)
211 and indirect, or mediated effects (i.e., $X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y$), all of which can be explicitly tested. In the case of
212 simple mediation analysis, when an $X \rightarrow Y$ association is mediated through a single variable, the *indirect*
213 *effect* is evaluated in relation to the *Z*-distribution, with the ratio of the product of the *a* (i.e., $X \rightarrow M$)
214 and *b* (i.e., $M \rightarrow Y$) path coefficients over the normal-theory standard error for that product. Likewise,
215 when an association is simultaneously mediated through multiple variables, the effect operating through
216 a given variable (i.e., a *specific indirect effect*) is evaluated this same way. In contrast, when assessing
217 the *total indirect effect* operating through multiple mediators, the sum of the products of the
218 corresponding *a* and *b* path coefficients taken over the square root of the asymptotic variance of the sum
219 of those products provides the ratio to be evaluated in relation to the *Z*-distribution.

220

221 **RESULTS**

222 The filtered study cohort was comprised of 4,474 Black/African American women carrying 5,111
223 singleton pregnancies (Table 1). Of the 5,111 pregnancies in the cohort, 679 pregnancies (13.3%) were
224 delivered preterm. Mid-trimester cervical length was measured between 18 and 24 weeks in 4,022
225 pregnancies (78.7%) and of these, 177 (4.40%) pregnancies met the clinical definition of a short cervix.

226

227 **Characterizing Changes in Cervical Length Across Pregnancy**

228 By way of LGCA, and standard practice for model selection within SEM (101), a combination of
229 complementary fit indices corresponding to *no change*, *linear change*, and *nonlinear change* models of
230 cervical length across pregnancy were compared (Table 2). The χ^2 test of model fit for all three growth
231 models exceeded significance thresholds for the specified degrees of freedom, yet this test alone was
232 likely insufficient to suggest poor model fit, particularly in such a large sample. In contrast, standard
233 thresholds for two sample size adjusted indices, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI > .95) (102) and the
234 Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA < .06) (101), suggested that the unconditional
235 nonlinear model unequivocally provides the best representation of cervical change across pregnancy
236 within this sample. Finally, to determine whether variance components across the nine indicators of
237 cervical length should be equated, as in MLM, nonlinear growth models with and without this constraint
238 were compared. A χ^2 difference test scaled to accommodate non-normal data distributions (103)
239 indicated that restricting the model in this way would lead to a significant decrement in model fit ($\chi^2 \Delta_{(4)}$
240 = 66.913, $p < .001$). As such, variances in the nine temporal indicators of cervical length were
241 independently estimated.

242 A set of significant parameter estimates resulting from the nonlinear change model indicated that, on
243 average: (1) cervical length during the fifth month of gestation (i.e., at the model intercept, from 17
244 through 20 weeks) was approximately 39.8 millimeters; (2) the change in cervical length across that
245 same four-week period in gestation evidenced a modest decrease of just over one-quarter of a millimeter
246 ($\mu_L = -.266$ mm); and (3) this rate of cervical shortening accelerated by one-third of a millimeter per
247 month post intercept ($\mu_Q = -.333$), beginning at the vertex of the trajectory (i.e., at $I - \frac{-.266}{2(-.333)}$ months),
248 around the nineteenth week of pregnancy, prior to which a commensurate monthly deceleration was
249 observed. Significant intraindividual variability was also observed in each of the growth parameters (all
250 at $P < .001$), making it possible to include them as endogenous and/or exogenous components in larger
251 structural models of association. Finally, significant intercorrelations among I , L , and Q suggest that
252 women with longer cervical measurements at 17-20 weeks gestation display slower rates of cervical
253 shortening at that point in gestation ($r_{IL} = .664$), but greater acceleration in that process across the
254 remainder of the pregnancy ($r_{IQ} = -.530$). Likewise, women with flatter rates of cervical shortening at
255 17-20 weeks gestation are likely to experience more rapid decreases over the remaining weeks of
256 pregnancy ($r_{LQ} = -.501$). For reference, the mean trajectory of accepted clinical preterm birth classes was
257 plotted over a background of the raw cervical length data to demonstrate the difference in the overall
258 functional forms of each trajectory compared to term births (Figure 2).

259 **Maternal Risk Factors Influencing GAD via Changes in Cervical Length**

260 The nonlinear model of change in cervical length across pregnancy was incorporated into a larger SEM
261 aimed at evaluating the influence of various maternal risk factors on GAD, both directly and indirectly,
262 through intermediary influences on the latent factors characterizing cervical change: *I*, *L*, and *Q*.
263 Representative variables from each of three broad domains of maternal characteristics commonly
264 associated with risk for preterm birth were included as nine exogenous predictors of GAD: maternal
265 health (*maternal age, maternal depression, pre-pregnancy BMI*), obstetric history (*parity, history of*
266 *preterm births, history of spontaneous and induced abortions*), and substance use (*alcohol use, smoking,*
267 *and other substance use*). Beyond regressing GAD onto the nine manifest indicators of maternal risk, it
268 was additionally regressed onto *I*, *L*, and *Q*, which were, in turn, all concurrently regressed onto the
269 maternal risk indicators. Figure 3 depicts the full, simultaneously estimated SEM, complete with
270 standardized conditional path coefficients for all the bivariate associations described above (i.e., *c'*, *a*,
271 and *b* paths). Overall, this model accounts for more than one-quarter of the sample variability in GAD
272 ($R^2 = .265$; $\chi^2_{(96)} = 265.147$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .019; CFI = .980).

273 Table 3 provides a summary of the total, direct, and indirect effects for each of the nine manifest
274 indicators of maternal risk in relation to GAD. Independent of cervical change, four of nine maternal
275 risk variables have overall (total) effects on GAD, with maternal depression ($B_c = -.062$, $Z = -3.128$, $p =$
276 0.002) and previous PTB ($B_c = -.204$, $Z = -10.416$, $p < 0.001$) both predictive of a shorter gestational
277 period, and parity ($B_c = .064$, $Z = 3.480$, $p = 0.001$) and smoking status (though somewhat less intuitive;
278 $B_c = .043$, $Z = 2.761$, $p = 0.006$) both associated with a longer period of gestation. Although the total
279 effect reflects the absolute influence of an exogenous predictor on an outcome conditional on other
280 predictors, it can be parsed into the influence which is directly attributable to the predictor (a direct
281 effect), and the influence of the predictor that is exerted indirectly, through one or more relevant
282 ‘mediating’ variables (indirect effects), such that the total effect is equal to the sum of the direct and
283 indirect effects. In the present model, only maternal age was shown to have neither direct nor indirect
284 effects on GAD.

285 In terms of the four maternal risk factors with significant total effects, two retained direct effects on
286 GAD in the presence of cervical change, with the influence of maternal depression slightly increasing in
287 magnitude ($B_{c'} = -.075$, $Z = -3.727$, $p < 0.001$), and that of previous PTB decreasing by more than half
288 ($B_{c'} = -.096$, $Z = -4.586$, $p < 0.001$). Although there was no significant overall indirect effect of maternal
289 depression on GAD through the combination of *I*, *L*, and *Q*, there was one specific pathway through

290 which GAD was modestly altered ($B_{a*b(Q)} = .032, Z = 2.132, p = 0.033$), that being the rate of
291 acceleration in cervical change in the latter stages of gestation. This was offset by even smaller,
292 nonsignificant changes in I and L . The effect of previous PTB on GAD was also mediated via changes in
293 cervical length, as evidenced by an overall indirect effect ($B_{a*b\ Total} = -.108, Z = -6.980, p < 0.001$) that
294 could be further disaggregated into three specific aspects of cervical change through which previous
295 PTB significantly influenced the length of gestation ($B_{a*b(I)} = -.017, Z = -2.135, p = 0.033$; $B_{a*b(L)} = -$
296 $.127, Z = -6.241, p < 0.001$; $B_{a*b(Q)} = .036, Z = 2.262, p = 0.024$). In contrast, the total effects of parity
297 and smoking appear to be wholly attributable to changes in cervical length, as direct effects for both
298 were nonsignificant. The indirect influence of parity via cervical change ($B_{a*b\ Total} = .082, Z = 6.076, p <$
299 0.001) was largely a function of variability in the length of the cervix and the expected rate of change at
300 the 20-23 weeks gestation ($B_{a*b(I)} = .024, Z = 2.179, p = 0.029$; $B_{a*b(L)} = .079, Z = 4.737, p < 0.001$). The
301 effect of maternal smoking status on GAD was best explained as operating indirectly through the overall
302 process of cervical change ($B_{a*b\ Total} = .022, Z = 2.200, p = 0.028$), and not explicitly via any specific
303 characteristic defining that process.

304 Four remaining indicators of maternal risk, none of which exhibited conditional overall (total) effects on
305 GAD, did show direct and/or indirect effects when accounting for changes in the cervix. Specifically,
306 direct effects emerged for both pre-pregnancy BMI ($B_{c'} = -.070, Z = -4.540, p < 0.001$) and alcohol use
307 ($B_{c'} = .035, Z = 2.121, p = 0.034$) in the presence of cervical change indicators, suggesting negative and
308 positive associations with GAD, respectively. The overall indirect effect of pre-pregnancy BMI ($B_{a*b\ Total}$
309 $= .074, Z = 7.250, p < 0.001$) via cervical change was largely driven by cervical length and expected rate
310 of change in cervical length at 20-23 weeks gestation ($B_{a*b(I)} = .010, Z = 2.072, p = 0.038$; $B_{a*b(L)} =$
311 $.080, Z = 5.962, p < 0.001$). The emergent direct effect of alcohol use on GAD can be explained, in part,
312 by a near significant overall indirect effect via general changes in the cervix across pregnancy ($B_{a*b\ Total}$
313 $= -.018, Z = 1.896, p = 0.058$), though not attributable to any specific aspects of that process. Although
314 neither total effects nor direct effects were observed in relation to previous abortions (spontaneous and
315 induced) and substance use, both risk factors were shown to exert influence on GAD indirectly, through
316 cervical change.

317

318 DISCUSSION

319 In this study, longitudinal measurements of cervical length provided a unique opportunity to examine
320 how changes in cervical length across pregnancy were related to common maternal risk factors of

321 preterm birth. Multiple cervical length measures across pregnancy were summarized using LGCA
322 methods to derive linear and non-linear indices of growth revealing unique associations with GAD.
323 Mediation analyses provided insight on whether cervical length growth parameters accounted for the
324 effect of maternal risk factors, not yet seen before in birth outcomes research. All analyses were
325 performed on a large sample of Black women who historically account for the highest rate of health
326 disparities in preterm birth and perinatal outcomes in the United States (104,105), have on average
327 shorter mid-trimester cervical lengths than other racial/ethnic groups (53,83,106–108), and are
328 represented by a disproportionately high burden of maternal risk factors (8,53,109,110).

329 As expected, the LGCA model including the nonlinear term provided the best fit to the data. Cervical
330 length growth patterns by the specified preterm birth classes displayed a more rapid decrease in cervical
331 length during pregnancy, while term births were associated with a gradual increase in cervical length
332 before 25 weeks, followed by a gradual decrease in cervical length until delivery. Note that this may not
333 reflect a physiological “lengthening” of the cervix, but rather changes in the structure, such as increased
334 hydration or swelling, that produce slightly longer cervical length measurements than earlier in
335 pregnancy (60). The mean estimate for cervical length at each timepoint also begins to differ
336 significantly between preterm birth classes (see Figure 2), around 16 weeks of gestation, which is
337 consistent with the literature for using mid-trimester cervical length between 18 and 24 weeks to predict
338 preterm birth (28).

339 The growth model intercept term was parameterized to correspond to the mean mid-trimester cervical
340 length, which is utilized clinically as a diagnostic criterion, along with other maternal risk factors, to
341 identify women at elevated preterm birth risk. These results demonstrated that other aspects of the cervix
342 during pregnancy can provide insight into the relationship between maternal risk factors and birth
343 outcomes. In fact, none of the maternal risk factors were mediated exclusively through the intercept
344 term, while maternal depression, substance use, and previous abortion were mediated via either the
345 linear and/or non-linear terms. These results suggest that cervical change across pregnancy was more
346 informative than a single mid-trimester cervical length measurement as a mediator of the relationship
347 between maternal characteristics and PTB risk.

348 For example, the total effect of parity was found to be fully mediated through the intercept and linear
349 change terms of the cervical length growth model. This result is consistent with the finding that parity is
350 associated with preterm birth (49,50,111) and provides context for future investigations. For instance,
351 the proper functioning of the cervix and mechanical support of the developing fetus early in pregnancy
352 might function as a rate limiting step as reflected in the importance of the growth model terms that

353 corresponded to the overall length of the cervix (*I*) and earlier cervical change (*S*). This contrasted with
354 the finding that a previous preterm birth (spontaneous or induced) was associated with lower GAD and
355 was only partially mediated through cervical change, albeit through all growth parameter terms. This
356 finding could imply that the effect of a previous early birth on GAD is not only mediated by cervical
357 dysfunction (e.g., cervical tissue damage) but may involve other pathways not related to cervical
358 function (e.g., vascular, hormonal, psychological stress pathways).

359 One potential study limitation was that the number and spacing of participant visits were influenced by
360 the prenatal care needs specific to each pregnancy. This lack of standardization in scheduling may have
361 affected study results in unknown ways. Not surprisingly, the number of participant observations was
362 associated with error variance in LGCA model parameters. Yet, only minimal differences in mean error
363 variance for *I*, *S*, and *Q* were observed, for instance, between term and preterm pregnancies (*I*: 9.22 vs
364 9.39; *S*: 2.96 vs 3.12; *Q*: 0.047 vs 0.054). Parameterization of the LGCA model was predicated on the
365 binning of cervical measurements into nine 4-week intervals which would necessarily exclude the last
366 bin (37-40 weeks), at minimum, from preterm births. Although the absence of observations for preterm
367 participants in the latter bins would not technically be considered missing, as they were not expected,
368 parameter estimates from LGCA models were still comparable to those from MLM which did not
369 require binning, as described previously (Supplemental Table 1). In addition, preterm birth status was
370 not associated with the absence of a cervical length measurement when a study visit could be expected
371 (Supplemental Figure 1). Another limitation was the racial composition of the study cohort, comprised
372 of women who self-identified as Black/African American, and although the findings of this study may
373 not be generalizable to women from other populations or ancestry groups, they could improve screening
374 and clinical care for a population of women who are disproportionately affected by health disparities in
375 preterm birth and other perinatal outcomes. Finally, mediation models can be conceptually used to
376 assess potential causal mechanisms yet by themselves do not prove the proposed causal pathway.

377 The unique data source used, reflecting several repeated measures across pregnancy, provided a rare
378 opportunity to identify etiologic pathways for the influence of preterm birth risk factors operating, at
379 least in part, through cervical length changes during pregnancy.

380

381 **ETHICS APPROVAL**

382 The Institutional Review Boards of Wayne State University and the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National
383 Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)/National Institutes of Health/U.S.

384 Department of Health and Human Services (Detroit, MI, USA) approved the study. Participants were
385 enrolled under the protocols Biological Markers of Disease in the Prediction of Preterm Delivery,
386 Preeclampsia and Intra-Uterine Growth Restriction: A Longitudinal Study (WSU IRB#110605MP2F
387 and NICHD/NIH# OH97-CH-N067). All participants provided written informed consent for the
388 collection of cervical length data and blood samples for future genetic research studies.

389

390 **FUNDING**

391 This research was supported, in part, by the Perinatology Research Branch, Division of Obstetrics and
392 Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Division of Intramural Research, *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of
393 Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, United States Department of
394 Health and Human Services (NICHD/NIH/DHHS); and, in part, by federal funds from
395 NICHD/NIH/DHHS (Contract No. HHSN275201300006C). RR has contributed to this work as part of
396 his official duties as an employee of the United States Federal Government. ALT and SSH were also
397 supported by the Wayne State University Perinatal Initiative in Maternal, Perinatal and Child Health.

398

399

400 **REFERENCES**

- 401 1. Blencowe H, Cousens S, Chou D, et al. Born Too Soon: The global epidemiology of 15 million
402 preterm births. *Reprod Health*. 2013;10(Suppl 1):S2.
- 403 2. Althabe F, Howson CP, Kinney M, et al. Born too soon: the global action report on preterm birth.
404 2012.
- 405 3. Andersen HF, Nugent CE, Wanty SD, et al. Prediction of risk for preterm delivery by
406 ultrasonographic measurement of cervical length. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*.
407 1990;163(3):859–867.
- 408 4. Iams JD, Goldenberg RL, Meis PJ, et al. The Length of the Cervix and the Risk of Spontaneous
409 Premature Delivery. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 1996;334(9):567–573.
- 410 5. Berghella V, Tolosa JE, Kuhlman K, et al. Cervical ultrasonography compared with manual
411 examination as a predictor of preterm delivery. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*.
412 1997;177(4):723–730.
- 413 6. Goldenberg RL, Iams JD, Mercer BM, et al. The preterm prediction study: the value of new vs
414 standard risk factors in predicting early and all spontaneous preterm births. NICHD MFMU
415 Network. *Am J Public Health*. 1998;88(2):233–238.

- 416 7. Guzman ER, Mellon C, Vintzileos AM, et al. Longitudinal assessment of endocervical canal length
417 between 15 and 24 weeks' gestation in women at risk for pregnancy loss or preterm birth. *Obstet*
418 *Gynecol.* 1998;92(1):31–37.
- 419 8. Heath VC, Southall TR, Souka AP, et al. Cervical length at 23 weeks of gestation: relation to
420 demographic characteristics and previous obstetric history. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.*
421 1998;12(5):304–311.
- 422 9. Hassan SS, Romero R, Berry SM, et al. Patients with an ultrasonographic cervical length ≤ 15 mm
423 have nearly a 50% risk of early spontaneous preterm delivery. *American Journal of Obstetrics &*
424 *Gynecology.* 2000;182(6):1458–1467.
- 425 10. Hibbard JU, Tart M, Moawad AH. Cervical length at 16–22 weeks' gestation and risk for preterm
426 delivery. *Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2000;96(6):972–978.
- 427 11. Owen J, Yost N, Berghella V, et al. Mid-Trimester Endovaginal Sonography in Women at High
428 Risk for Spontaneous Preterm Birth. *JAMA.* 2001;286(11):1340–1348.
- 429 12. Honest H, Bachmann LM, Coomarasamy A, et al. Accuracy of cervical transvaginal sonography in
430 predicting preterm birth: a systematic review. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology.*
431 2003;22(3):305–322.
- 432 13. Owen J, Yost N, Berghella V, et al. Can shortened midtrimester cervical length predict very early
433 spontaneous preterm birth? *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2004;191(1):298–
434 303.
- 435 14. To MS, Skentou CA, Royston P, et al. Prediction of patient-specific risk of early preterm delivery
436 using maternal history and sonographic measurement of cervical length: a population-based
437 prospective study. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2006;27(4):362–367.
- 438 15. Crane JMG, Hutchens D. Transvaginal sonographic measurement of cervical length to predict
439 preterm birth in asymptomatic women at increased risk: a systematic review. *Ultrasound in*
440 *Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2008;31(5):579–587.
- 441 16. Domin CM, Smith EJ, Terplan M. Transvaginal ultrasonographic measurement of cervical length
442 as a predictor of preterm birth: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Q.*
443 2010;26(4):241–248.
- 444 17. Vaisbuch E, Romero R, Erez O, et al. Clinical significance of early (< 20 weeks) vs. late (20–24
445 weeks) detection of sonographic short cervix in asymptomatic women in the mid-trimester.
446 *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2010;36(4):471–481.
- 447 18. Berghella V. Universal cervical length screening for prediction and prevention of preterm birth.
448 *Obstet Gynecol Surv.* 2012;67(10):653–658.
- 449 19. da Fonseca EB, Bittar RE, Carvalho MHB, et al. Prophylactic administration of progesterone by
450 vaginal suppository to reduce the incidence of spontaneous preterm birth in women at increased
451 risk: A randomized placebo-controlled double-blind study. *American Journal of Obstetrics and*
452 *Gynecology.* 2003;188(2):419–424.

- 453 20. Fonseca EB, Celik E, Parra M, et al. Progesterone and the risk of preterm birth among women with
454 a short cervix. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2007;357(5):462–469.
- 455 21. Cetingoz E, Cam C, Sakalli M, et al. Progesterone effects on preterm birth in high-risk
456 pregnancies: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Arch Gynecol Obstet.* 2011;283(3):423–429.
- 457 22. Hassan SS, Romero R, Vidyadhari D, et al. Vaginal progesterone reduces the rate of preterm birth
458 in women with a sonographic short cervix: a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-
459 controlled trial. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2011;38(1):18–31.
- 460 23. Combs CA. Vaginal progesterone for asymptomatic cervical shortening and the case for universal
461 screening of cervical length. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2012;206(2):101–
462 103.
- 463 24. Romero R, Nicolaides K, Conde-Agudelo A, et al. Vaginal progesterone in women with an
464 asymptomatic sonographic short cervix in the midtrimester decreases preterm delivery and
465 neonatal morbidity: a systematic review and metaanalysis of individual patient data. *American*
466 *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2012;206(2):124.e1-124.e19.
- 467 25. Practice Bulletin No. 130: Prediction and Prevention of Preterm Birth. *Obstetrics & Gynecology.*
468 2012;120(4):964–973.
- 469 26. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine Publications Committee. Progesterone and preterm birth
470 prevention: translating clinical trials data into clinical practice. *American Journal of Obstetrics and*
471 *Gynecology.* 2012;206(5):376–386.
- 472 27. Conde-Agudelo A, Romero R, Nicolaides K, et al. Vaginal progesterone vs cervical cerclage for
473 the prevention of preterm birth in women with a sonographic short cervix, previous preterm birth,
474 and singleton gestation: a systematic review and indirect comparison metaanalysis. *American*
475 *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2013;208(1):42.e1-42.e18.
- 476 28. Romero R, Yeo L, Miranda J, et al. A blueprint for the prevention of preterm birth: vaginal
477 progesterone in women with a short cervix. *Journal of Perinatal Medicine.* 2013;41(1):27–44.
- 478 29. Furcron A-E, Romero R, Plazyo O, et al. Vaginal progesterone, but not 17 α -hydroxyprogesterone
479 caproate, has antiinflammatory effects at the murine maternal-fetal interface. *American Journal of*
480 *Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2015;213(6):846.e1-846.e19.
- 481 30. Conde-Agudelo A, Romero R. Vaginal progesterone to prevent preterm birth in pregnant women
482 with a sonographic short cervix: clinical and public health implications. *American Journal of*
483 *Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2016;214(2):235–242.
- 484 31. Vintzileos AM, Visser GHA. Interventions for women with mid-trimester short cervix: which ones
485 work?: Editorial. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2017;49(3):295–300.
- 486 32. Conde-Agudelo A, Romero R, Da Fonseca E, et al. Vaginal progesterone is as effective as cervical
487 cerclage to prevent preterm birth in women with a singleton gestation, previous spontaneous
488 preterm birth, and a short cervix: updated indirect comparison meta-analysis. *American Journal of*
489 *Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2018;219(1):10–25.

- 490 33. Romero R, Conde-Agudelo A, Da Fonseca E, et al. Vaginal progesterone for preventing preterm
491 birth and adverse perinatal outcomes in singleton gestations with a short cervix: a meta-analysis of
492 individual patient data. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2018;218(2):161–180.
- 493 34. Berghella V, Rafael TJ, Szychowski JM, et al. Cerclage for Short Cervix on Ultrasonography in
494 Women With Singleton Gestations and Previous Preterm Birth: A Meta-Analysis. *Obstetrics &*
495 *Gynecology*. 2011;117(3):663–671.
- 496 35. Daskalakis G, Loutradis D, Antsaklis A, et al. A stepwise approach for the management of short
497 cervix: time to evolve beyond progesterone treatment in the presence of progressive
498 cervical shortening. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2019;220(4):404–405.
- 499 36. Roman A, Zork N, Haeri S, et al. Physical examination-indicated cerclage in twin pregnancy: a
500 randomized controlled trial. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;223(6):902.e1-902.e11.
- 501 37. Romero R, Espinoza J, Erez O, et al. The role of cervical cerclage in obstetric practice: can the
502 patient who could benefit from this procedure be identified? *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2006;194(1):1–
503 9.
- 504 38. Conde-Agudelo A, Romero R. Does vaginal progesterone prevent recurrent preterm birth in
505 women with a singleton gestation and a history of spontaneous preterm birth? Evidence from a
506 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;227(3):440-461.e2.
- 507 39. Conde-Agudelo A, Romero R. Vaginal progesterone does not prevent recurrent preterm birth in
508 women with a singleton gestation, a history of spontaneous preterm birth, and a midtrimester
509 cervical length >25 mm. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;227(6):923–926.
- 510 40. Conde-Agudelo A, Romero R. Vaginal progesterone for the prevention of preterm birth: who can
511 benefit and who cannot? Evidence-based recommendations for clinical use. *J Perinat Med*.
512 2023;51(1):125–134.
- 513 41. House M, Tadesse-Telila S, Norwitz ER, et al. Inhibitory Effect of Progesterone on Cervical Tissue
514 Formation in a Three-Dimensional Culture System with Human Cervical Fibroblasts. *Biol Reprod*.
515 2014;90(1):18.
- 516 42. Conde-Agudelo A, Romero R. Predictive accuracy of changes in transvaginal sonographic cervical
517 length over time for preterm birth: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *American Journal of*
518 *Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2015;213(6):789–801.
- 519 43. Wolf HM, Romero R, Strauss JF, et al. Study protocol to quantify the genetic architecture of
520 sonographic cervical length and its relationship to spontaneous preterm birth. *BMJ Open*.
521 2022;12(3):e053631.
- 522 44. Word RA, Li X-H, Hnat M, et al. Dynamics of Cervical Remodeling during Pregnancy and
523 Parturition: Mechanisms and Current Concepts. *Semin Reprod Med*. 2007;25(01):069–079.
- 524 45. House M, Kaplan DL, Socrate S. Relationships between Mechanical Properties and Extracellular
525 Matrix Constituents of the Cervical Stroma during Pregnancy. *Semin Perinatol*. 2009;33(5):300–
526 307.

- 527 46. Holt R, Timmons BC, Akgul Y, et al. The molecular mechanisms of cervical ripening differ
528 between term and preterm birth. *Endocrinology*. 2011;152(3):1036–1046.
- 529 47. Gudicha DW, Romero R, Kabiri D, et al. Personalized assessment of cervical length improves
530 prediction of spontaneous preterm birth: a standard and a percentile calculator. *American Journal*
531 *of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2021;224(3):288.e1-288.e17.
- 532 48. Rosenbloom JI, Raghuraman N, Temming LA, et al. Predictive Value of Midtrimester Universal
533 Cervical Length Screening Based on Parity. *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine*. 2020;39(1):147–
534 154.
- 535 49. Berkowitz GS, Blackmore-Prince C, Lapinski RH, et al. Risk Factors for Preterm Birth Subtypes.
536 *Epidemiology*. 1998;9(3):279.
- 537 50. Ananth CV, Peltier MR, Getahun D, et al. Primiparity: an “intermediate” risk group for
538 spontaneous and medically indicated preterm birth. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*.
539 2007;20(8):605–611.
- 540 51. Andersen HF. Transvaginal and transabdominal ultrasonography of the uterine cervix during
541 pregnancy. *J Clin Ultrasound*. 1991;19(2):77–83.
- 542 52. Petrović D, Novakov-Mikić A, Mandić V. Socio-demographic factors and cervical length in
543 pregnancy. *Med. Pregl*. 2008;61(9–10):443–451.
- 544 53. van der Ven AJ, van Os MA, Kleinrouweler CE, et al. Is cervical length associated with maternal
545 characteristics? *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*.
546 2015;188:12–16.
- 547 54. Berghella V, Roman A, Daskalakis C, et al. Gestational age at cervical length measurement and
548 incidence of preterm birth. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2007;110(2 Pt 1):311–317.
- 549 55. Timmons B, Akins M, Mahendroo M. Cervical Remodeling during Pregnancy and Parturition.
550 *Trends Endocrinol Metab*. 2010;21(6):353–361.
- 551 56. Hassan SS, Romero R, Tarca AL, et al. The transcriptome of cervical ripening in human pregnancy
552 before the onset of labor at term: identification of novel molecular functions involved in this
553 process. *J. Matern. Fetal. Neonatal. Med*. 2009;22(12):1183–1193.
- 554 57. Hassan SS, Romero R, Tarca AL, et al. The molecular basis for sonographic cervical shortening at
555 term: identification of differentially expressed genes and the epithelial-mesenchymal transition as a
556 function of cervical length. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2010;203(5):472.e1-
557 472.e14.
- 558 58. Timmons BC, Fairhurst A, Mahendroo MS. Temporal Changes in Myeloid Cells in the Cervix
559 during Pregnancy and Parturition. *J Immunol*. 2009;182(5):2700–2707.
- 560 59. Read CP, Word RA, Ruscheinsky MA, et al. Cervical remodeling during pregnancy and
561 parturition: molecular characterization of the softening phase in mice. *Reproduction*.
562 2007;134(2):327–340.

- 563 60. Myers KM, Hendon CP, Gan Y, et al. A continuous fiber distribution material model for human
564 cervical tissue. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2015;48(9):1533–1540.
- 565 61. Yoshida K, Jayyosi C, Lee N, et al. Mechanics of cervical remodelling: insights from rodent
566 models of pregnancy. *Interface Focus*. 2019;9(5):20190026.
- 567 62. Timmons BC, Mitchell SM, Gilpin C, et al. Dynamic changes in the cervical epithelial tight
568 junction complex and differentiation occur during cervical ripening and parturition. *Endocrinology*.
569 2007;148(3):1278–1287.
- 570 63. Parikh R, Patel A, Stack T, et al. How the cervix shortens: an anatomic study using 3-dimensional
571 transperineal sonography and image registration in singletons and twins. *J Ultrasound Med*.
572 2011;30(9):1197–1204.
- 573 64. House M, McCabe R, Socrate S. Using imaging-based, three-dimensional models of the cervix and
574 uterus for studies of cervical changes during pregnancy. *Clinical Anatomy*. 2013;26(1):97–104.
- 575 65. Myers KM, Feltovich H, Mazza E, et al. The mechanical role of the cervix in pregnancy. *J*
576 *Biomech*. 2015;48(9):1511–1523.
- 577 66. Moroz LA, Simhan HN. Rate of sonographic cervical shortening and the risk of spontaneous
578 preterm birth. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2012;206(3):234.e1-234.e5.
- 579 67. Salomon LJ, Diaz Garcia C, Bernard JP, et al. Reference range for cervical length throughout
580 pregnancy: non-parametric LMS-based model applied to a large sample. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics*
581 *& Gynecology*. 2009;33(4):459–464.
- 582 68. Bergelin I, Valentin L. Patterns of normal change in cervical length and width during pregnancy in
583 nulliparous women: a prospective, longitudinal ultrasound study. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*.
584 2001;18(3):217–222.
- 585 69. Bergelin I, Valentin L. Normal cervical changes in parous women during the second half of
586 pregnancy – a prospective, longitudinal ultrasound study. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica*
587 *Scandinavica*. 2002;81(1):31–38.
- 588 70. Mercer BM, Goldenberg RL, Meis PJ, et al. The Preterm Prediction Study: Prediction of preterm
589 premature rupture of membranes through clinical findings and ancillary testing. *American Journal*
590 *of Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2000;183(3):738–745.
- 591 71. Odibo AO, Berghella V, Reddy U, et al. Does transvaginal ultrasound of the cervix predict preterm
592 premature rupture of membranes in a high-risk population? *Ultrasound in Obstetrics &*
593 *Gynecology*. 2001;18(3):223–227.
- 594 72. Romero R, Gonzalez R, Sepulveda W, et al. Infection and labor: VIII. Microbial invasion of the
595 amniotic cavity in patients with suspected cervical incompetence: Prevalence and clinical
596 significance. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 1992;167(4, Part 1):1086–1091.
- 597 73. Meis PJ, Goldenberg RL, Mercer B, et al. The preterm prediction study: Significance of vaginal
598 infections. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 1995;173(4):1231–1235.

- 599 74. Hassan SS, Romero R, Hendler I, et al. A sonographic short cervix as the only clinical
600 manifestation of intra-amniotic infection. *J Perinat Med*. 2006;34(1):13–19.
- 601 75. Naim A, Haberman S, Burgess T, et al. Changes in cervical length and the risk of preterm labor.
602 *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2002;186(5):887–889.
- 603 76. Gomez R, Romero R, Nien JK, et al. A short cervix in women with preterm labor and intact
604 membranes: A risk factor for microbial invasion of the amniotic cavity. *American Journal of*
605 *Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2005;192(3):678–689.
- 606 77. Sotiriadis A, Papatheodorou S, Kavvadias A, et al. Transvaginal cervical length measurement for
607 prediction of preterm birth in women with threatened preterm labor: a meta-analysis. *Ultrasound in*
608 *Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2010;35(1):54–64.
- 609 78. Kandil M, Sanad Z, Sayyed T, et al. Body mass index is linked to cervical length and duration of
610 pregnancy: An observational study in low risk pregnancy. *J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2017;37(1):33–37.
- 611 79. Igel C, Dar P, Rosner M, et al. High Maternal BMI Associated With Cervical Shortening in
612 Women With Short Cervix on Second Trimester Anatomy Scan [27K]. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*.
613 2016;127:96S.
- 614 80. Buck JN, Orzechowski KM, Berghella V. Racial disparities in cervical length for prediction of
615 preterm birth in a low risk population. *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine*.
616 2017;30(15):1851–1854.
- 617 81. Findley J, Seybold DJ, Broce M, et al. Transvaginal Cervical Length and Tobacco Use in
618 Appalachian Women: Association with Increased Risk for Spontaneous Preterm Birth. *W V Med J*.
619 2015;111(3):22–28.
- 620 82. Cho S-H, Park KH, Jung EY, et al. Maternal Characteristics, Short Mid-Trimester Cervical Length,
621 and Preterm Delivery. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2017;32(3):488–494.
- 622 83. Harville EW, Knoepp LR, Wallace ME, et al. Cervical pathways for racial disparities in preterm
623 births: the Preterm Prediction Study. *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine*.
624 2018;0(0):1–7.
- 625 84. Brittain JJ, Wahl SE, Strauss JF, et al. Prior Spontaneous or Induced Abortion Is a Risk Factor for
626 Cervical Dysfunction in Pregnant Women: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Reprod Sci*.
627 2023;
- 628 85. Berghella V, Bega G, Tolosa JE, et al. Ultrasound Assessment of the Cervix. *Clinical Obstetrics*
629 *and Gynecology*. 2003;46(4):947.
- 630 86. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. Mplus User’s Guide. Eighth Edition.
631 2017;(https://www.statmodel.com/ugexcerpts.shtml). (Accessed October 7, 2019)
- 632 87. Goldstein H. Multilevel Models in Educational and Social Research. Oxford University Press,
633 London: 1987.

- 634 88. Hoyle RH. The structural equation modeling approach: Basic concepts and fundamental issues. In:
635 *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage
636 Publications, Inc; 1995:1–15.
- 637 89. Wright S. The method of path coefficients. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*. 1934;5:161–215.
- 638 90. McArdle JJ, Epstein D. Latent growth curves within developmental structural equation models.
639 *Child Dev*. 1987;58(1):110–133.
- 640 91. Meredith W, Tisak J. Latent curve analysis. *Psychometrika*. 1990;55:107–122.
- 641 92. Willett JB, Sayer AG. Using covariance structure analysis to detect correlates and predictors of
642 individual change over time. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1994;116:363–381.
- 643 93. Curran PJ. Have Multilevel Models Been Structural Equation Models All Along? *Multivariate*
644 *Behav Res*. 2003;38(4):529–569.
- 645 94. Stoel RD, van den Wittenboer G, Hox J. Analyzing Longitudinal Data using Multilevel Regression
646 and Latent Growth Curve Analysis. *Metodologia de las Ciencias del Comportamiento*. 2003;5:21–
647 42.
- 648 95. Chou C, Bentler PM, Pentz MA. Comparisons of two statistical approaches to study growth curves:
649 The multilevel model and the latent curve analysis. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*
650 *Multidisciplinary Journal*. 1998;5(3):247–266.
- 651 96. Berghella V, Talucci M, Desai A. Does transvaginal sonographic measurement of cervical length
652 before 14 weeks predict preterm delivery in high-risk pregnancies? *Ultrasound in Obstetrics &*
653 *Gynecology*. 2003;21(2):140–144.
- 654 97. Baron RM, Kenny DA. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological
655 research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social*
656 *psychology*. 1986;51(6):1173–1182.
- 657 98. Judd CM, Kenny DA. Process Analysis: Estimating Mediation in Treatment Evaluations. *Eval Rev*.
658 1981;5(5):602–619.
- 659 99. MacKinnon DP, Lockwood CM, Hoffman JM, et al. A comparison of methods to test mediation
660 and other intervening variable effects. *Psychol Methods*. 2002;7(1):83–104.
- 661 100. Preacher KJ, Hayes AF. SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple
662 mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments & Computers*. 2004;36:717–731.
- 663 101. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional
664 criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*.
665 1999;6(1):1–55.
- 666 102. Bentler PM. Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1990;107:238–
667 246.
- 668 103. Satorra A, Bentler PM. Ensuring Positiveness of the Scaled Difference Chi-square Test Statistic.
669 *Psychometrika*. 2010;75(2):243–248.

- 670 104. Culhane JF, Goldenberg RL. Racial Disparities in Preterm Birth. *Seminars in Perinatology*.
671 2011;35(4):234–239.
- 672 105. Spriggs AL. Racial disparities in preterm birth: the role of social determinants. *American Journal*
673 *of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2007;197(3):328.
- 674 106. Dijkstra K, Janssen HCJP, Kuczynski E, et al. Cervical length in uncomplicated pregnancy: A
675 study of sociodemographic predictors of cervical changes across gestation. *American Journal of*
676 *Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 1999;180(3):639–644.
- 677 107. Harville EW, Miller KS, Knoepf LR. Racial and social predictors of longitudinal cervical
678 measures: the Cervical Ultrasound Study. *Journal of Perinatology*. 2017;37(4):335–339.
- 679 108. Bligard K, Temming LA, Stout MJ, et al. 85: Performance of cervical length screening in african
680 american women. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2018;218(1, Supplement):S62–
681 S63.
- 682 109. Menon R. Spontaneous preterm birth, a clinical dilemma: Etiologic, pathophysiologic and genetic
683 heterogeneities and racial disparity. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*.
684 2008;87(6):590–600.
- 685 110. Menon R, Pearce B, Velez DR, et al. Racial disparity in pathophysiologic pathways of preterm
686 birth based on genetic variants. *Reproductive Biology and Endocrinology*. 2009;7:62.
- 687 111. Koullali B, van Zijl MD, Kazemier BM, et al. The association between parity and spontaneous
688 preterm birth: a population based study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2020;20(1):233.

689

690 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

691 **Figure 1.** Parameterized latent growth curve analysis (LGCA) model. The intercept was set at M5 (i.e.,
692 month 5, 17-20 weeks gestation) to allow for comparison with the typical clinical assessment of the mid-
693 trimester transvaginal sonographic measurement.

694

695 **Figure 2.** Longitudinal trajectories of cervical change by birth outcome class.


696

697 **Figure 3.** Full conditional mediation model with path coefficients. The total effects of individual
698 maternal health, obstetric history, and substance use variables on gestational age at delivery (GAD) are
699 unconditional with respect to the *I*, *L*, and *Q* factors characterizing cervical change, and not, therefore,
700 explicitly depicted.

701

702 **FIGURES**


703 **Figure 1.**



704
705
706
707

708 **Figure 2.**

709



710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720


721

722

723

724 **Figure 3.**

725



726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736 **TABLES**

737

738 **Table 1.** Cohort Characteristics in a Population Sample of Pregnant Women from Detroit, Michigan,
739 2005-2013

Variable	N	Overall, N = 4,824 ¹	Preterm, N = 675	Term, N = 4,149	p-value ²
Maternal Age, Median (IQR)	4,824	23.0 (20.0 – 27.0)	23.0 (20.0 – 28.0)	23.0 (20.0 – 27.0)	0.058
Depression, n (%)	4,824	140 (2.9)	20 (3.0)	120 (2.9)	0.92
Pre-pregnancy BMI, Median (IQR)	4,824	28 (23 – 34)	27 (22 – 34)	28 (23 – 34)	0.011
Parity, n (%)	4,022				0.12
0		1,701 (42)	245 (46)	1,456 (42)	
1		1,438 (36)	172 (32)	1,266 (36)	
2+		883 (22)	113 (21)	770 (22)	
Unknown		802	145	657	
Previous Preterm Birth, n (%)	4,760				<0.001
0		4,156 (87)	472 (74)	3,684 (89)	
1		504 (11)	125 (20)	379 (9.2)	
2+		100 (2.1)	39 (6.1)	61 (1.5)	
Unknown		64	39	25	
Previous Abortion, n (%)	4,317				0.38
0		2,365 (55)	315 (54)	2,050 (55)	
1		1,310 (30)	191 (33)	1,119 (30)	
2+		642 (15)	80 (14)	562 (15)	
Unknown		507	89	418	
Smoking, n (%)	4,810	922 (19)	153 (23)	769 (19)	0.011
Unknown		14	2	12	
Alcohol Use, n (%)	4,810	167 (3.5)	26 (3.9)	141 (3.4)	0.55
Unknown		14	2	12	
Substance Use, n (%)	4,815	1,383 (29)	175 (26)	1,208 (29)	0.088
Unknown		9	1	8	

¹ Median (IQR); n (%)

² Wilcoxon rank sum test; Pearson's Chi-squared test

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753 **Table 2.** Model fit and growth parameter characteristics for unconditional latent growth curve models
 754 in a Population Sample of Pregnant Women from Detroit, Michigan, 2005-2013
 755

	Model Fit					I		L		Q		Intercorrelations		
	χ^2	df	p-value	RMSEA	CFI	μ	σ^2	μ	σ^2	μ	σ^2	r_{IL}	r_{LQ}	r_{IQ}
No change	4184.366	43	<.0001	.137	.348	37.895	36.043	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Linear change	1274.635	40	<.0001	.078	.806	38.928	25.091	-1.047	1.697	--	--	.539	--	--
Nonlinear change	165.232	36	<.0001	.027	.980	39.813	28.245	-.266	2.452	-.333	.081	.664	-.501	-.530

756 *Note:* χ^2 = chi-square test of model fit; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; I =
 757 intercept (at 20-23 weeks gestation); L = linear slope; Q = quadratic slope (acceleration/deceleration); All growth parameter
 758 means, variances, and intercorrelations are significant at $p < .001$.
 759

760
761
762

Table 3. Conditional mediated effects of maternal risk factors on gestational age at delivery via cervical change in a Population Sample of Pregnant Women from Detroit, Michigan, 2005-2013

Maternal Risk	Direct Effect		Indirect Effect(s)		Total Effect	
	$B_{c'}(SE_{c'})$	Ratio	$B_{a*b}(SE_{a*b})$	Ratio	$B_c(SE_c)$	Ratio
<i>Maternal Age</i>	-.014 (.012)	-1.175	-.004 (.009)	-.420	-.018 (.012)	-1.475
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			-.002 (.002)	-1.030		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			.000 (.010)	-.007		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			-.002 (.008)	-.246		
<i>Maternal Depression</i>	-.075 (.020)	-3.727	.013 (.014)	.975	-.062 (.020)	-3.128
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			-.004 (.003)	-1.441		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			-.014 (.015)	-.950		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			.032 (.015)	2.132		
<i>Pre-pregnancy BMI</i>	-.070 (.015)	-4.540	.074 (.010)	7.250	.004 (.014)	.281
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			.010 (.005)	2.072		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			.080 (.013)	5.962		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			-.017 (.011)	-1.559		
<i>Parity</i>	-.018 (.019)	-.970	.082 (.013)	6.076	.064 (.018)	3.480
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			.024 (.011)	2.179		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			.079 (.017)	4.737		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			-.022 (.013)	-1.609		
<i>Previous PTB</i>	-.096 (.021)	-4.586	-.108 (.016)	-6.980	-.204 (.020)	-10.416
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			-.017 (.008)	-2.135		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			-.127 (.020)	-6.241		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			.036 (.016)	2.262		
<i>Previous Abortions</i>	.019 (.017)	1.147	-.039 (.013)	-2.889	-.020 (.016)	-1.214
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			-.004 (.003)	-1.539		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			-.067 (.015)	-4.533		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			.033 (.013)	2.517		
<i>Alcohol Use</i>	.035 (.016)	2.121	-.018 (.010)	-1.896	.017 (.018)	.923
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			.002 (.002)	.983		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			-.013 (.010)	-1.335		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			-.007 (.010)	-.662		
<i>Smoking Status</i>	.022 (.015)	1.415	.022 (.010)	2.200	.043 (.016)	2.761
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			.003 (.002)	1.326		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			.017 (.011)	1.503		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			.002 (.010)	.155		
<i>Substance Use</i>	.005 (.014)	.340	-.019 (.009)	-2.021	-.014 (.014)	-1.000
specific IE via I (a_I*b_I)			.004 (.002)	1.660		
specific IE via L (a_L*b_L)			-.021 (.011)	-1.977		
specific IE via Q (a_Q*b_Q)			-.002 (.010)	-.182		

763
764
765
766
767

Note: All standardized effect coefficients and associated standard errors are rounded to the nearest thousandth, with significance depicted in boldface type. Critical ratios (i.e., *Z-scores*) of 1.96, 2.58, and 3.29 correspond to *p*-values of .05, .01, and .001, respectively. Total indirect effects (IE) for each maternal risk factor (i.e., B_{a*b}) disaggregate into three specific indirect effects, each operating through a single latent growth factor: the intercept (I), linear rate of change (L), or acceleration/deceleration (Q).

768 **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

769

770

771 **Table S1.** Comparison of parameter estimates from Latent Growth Curve Analysis and Multilevel
 772 Models.

Modelling Method	I Estimate Median (Range)	L Estimate Median (Range)	Q Estimate Median (Range)
<i>Multilevel Model (R {lmer})</i> Non-binned data	35.9 (28.5, 43.9)	2.23 (-5.5, 8.8)	-0.35 (-1.09, 0.49)
<i>Multilevel Model (R {nlme})</i> Binned data	37.0 (31.8, 49.0)	1.87 (-9.05, 11.1)	-0.32 (-1.11, 0.79)
<i>Multilevel Model (Mplus)</i> Binned data	37.1 (31.2, 49.1)	1.88 (-10.3, 10.9)	-0.33 (-1.09, 0.57)
<i>Latent Growth Curve (Mplus)</i> Binned data	38.5 (30.9, 46.8)	1.30 (-9.98, 8.14)	-0.34 (-1.02, 0.66)

773

774


775

776

777

778

779 **Figure S1.** Relationship between the index pregnancy being delivered preterm and presence of
 780 cervical length measure at each gestational age. Increased odds ratios observed in M4 can be
 781 explained by parity status which was controlled for in all mediation models.
 782



783

784

785