

1 **The effect of prone positioning on maternal haemodynamics and fetal wellbeing in the third**  
2 **trimester – A primary cohort study with a scoping review**

3  
4 Laura Ormesher,<sup>1,2</sup> Jessica Catchpole,<sup>1</sup> Linda Peacock,<sup>2</sup> Heather Pitt,<sup>2</sup> Anastasia Fabian-Hunt,<sup>1</sup>  
5 Dexter Hayes,<sup>1</sup> Claudia Popp,<sup>3</sup> Jason M. Carson,<sup>3</sup> Raoul van Loon,<sup>3</sup> Lynne Warrander,<sup>1</sup> Karli  
6 Büchling,<sup>4</sup> Alexander E P Heazell.<sup>1,2</sup>

7  
8 1. Maternal and Fetal Health Research Centre, Division of Developmental Biology and Medicine,  
9 School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester,  
10 UK.

11 2. Saint Mary's Hospital, Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK

12 3. Department of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Swansea University

13 4. Natal Comforts, the Cotswolds, UK

14

15 **Corresponding Author**

16 Dr Laura Ormesher, Maternal and Fetal Health Research Centre, 5th floor (Research), Saint  
17 Mary's Hospital, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9WL

18 Telephone - 0161 7016960

19 Email – [laura.ormesher@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:laura.ormesher@manchester.ac.uk)

20

21 This trial was registered at [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT04586283).

22

23 **Abstract**

24 *Introduction*

25 Supine sleep position is associated with stillbirth, likely secondary to inferior vena cava  
26 compression, and a reduction in cardiac output (CO) and uteroplacental perfusion. Evidence for  
27 the effects of prone position in pregnancy is less clear. This study aimed to determine the effect  
28 maternal prone position on maternal haemodynamics and fetal heart rate, compared with left  
29 lateral position.

30

31 *Methods*

32 Twenty-one women >28 weeks' gestation underwent non-invasive CO monitoring (Cheetah)  
33 every 5 minutes and continuous fetal heart rate monitoring (MONICA) in left lateral (20 minutes),  
34 prone (30 minutes), followed by left lateral (20 minutes). Anxiety and comfort were assessed by  
35 questionnaires. Regression analyses (adjusted for time) compared variables between positions.  
36 The information derived from the primary study was used in an existing mathematical model of  
37 maternal circulation in pregnancy, to determine whether occlusion of the inferior vena cava  
38 could account for the observed effects. In addition, a scoping review was performed to identify  
39 reported clinical, haemodynamic and fetal effects of maternal prone position; studies were  
40 included if they reported clinical outcomes or effects of maternal prone position in pregnancy.  
41 Study records were grouped by publication type for ease of data synthesis and critical analysis.  
42 Meta-analysis was performed where there were sufficient studies.

43

44 *Results*

45 Maternal blood pressure (BP) and total vascular resistance (TVR) were increased in prone (sBP  
46 109 vs 104 mmHg,  $p=0.03$ ; dBP 74 vs 67 mmHg,  $p=0.003$ ; TVR 1302 vs 1075  $\text{dyne}\cdot\text{s}\cdot\text{cm}^{-5}$ ,  
47  $p=0.03$ ). CO was reduced in prone 5.7 vs 7.1 mL/minute,  $p=0.003$ ). Fetal heart rate, variability  
48 and decelerations were unaltered. However, fetal accelerations were less common in prone  
49 position (86% vs 95%,  $p=0.03$ ). Anxiety was reduced after the procedure, compared to  
50 beforehand ( $p=0.002$ ), despite a marginal decline in comfort ( $p=0.04$ ).The model predicted that  
51 if occlusion of the inferior vena cava occurred, the sBP, dBP and CO would generally decrease.  
52 However, the TVR remained relatively consistent, which implies that the MAP and CO decrease  
53 at a similar rate when occlusion occurs. The scoping review found that maternal and fetal  
54 outcomes from 47 included case reports of prone positioning during pregnancy were generally  
55 favourable. Meta-analysis of three prospective studies investigating maternal haemodynamic  
56 effects of prone position found an increase in sBP and maternal heart rate, but no effect on  
57 respiratory rate, oxygen saturation or baseline fetal heart rate (though there was significant  
58 heterogeneity between studies).

59

60 *Conclusion*

61 Prone position was associated with a reduction in CO but an uncertain effect on fetal wellbeing.  
62 The decline in CO may be due to caval compression, as supported by the computational model.  
63 Further work is needed to optimise the safety of prone positioning in pregnancy.

## 64 Introduction

65 The association between maternal position and cardiac output (CO) has been known for many  
66 years (1). More recently, studies have demonstrated an association between both the position  
67 in which a mother goes to sleep (2–6), and the frequency of daytime naps (2,3) and risk of late  
68 stillbirth (after 28 weeks). This association is hypothesised to be due to frequent exposure to a  
69 supine sleeping position. When a mother lies flat there is a reduction in CO and consequent  
70 uterine blood flow, this is due to compression of the inferior vena cava by the gravid uterus (1,7).  
71 These changes are associated with alterations in fetal behaviour consistent with a reduction in  
72 fetal oxygenation (8). Whilst sleep is associated with extended periods spent in specific positions,  
73 little is known about the effect of maternal position for other purposes in late pregnancy.

74  
75 One study of maternal position exposed 33 Brazilian women to supine, lateral and prone  
76 positions in a random sequence (9). To maintain a prone position, woman used a specially  
77 designed concave stretcher. This study adopted each position for 6 minutes following a 10-  
78 minute period of adjustment to the experimental surroundings. This study found no differences  
79 in maternal heart rate (HR), diastolic blood pressure (dBp), oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>) or fetal HR  
80 between supine, lateral and prone positions (9). However, there was a reduction in maternal  
81 respiratory rate (RR) and systolic blood pressure (sBP) when laid prone. Nevertheless, all the  
82 women reported feeling comfortable lying flat (on a bent surface).

83  
84 Another study of 65 pregnant women from Australia, 15 of whom had pre-eclampsia found that  
85 lying in a prone position for 5 minutes was associated with a 2 mmHg reduction in sBP in healthy

86 women but a larger 6 mmHg fall in women with pre-eclampsia. this was associated with a  
87 compensatory increase in HR (10). These cardiovascular effects merit further exploration.  
88 Importantly, there have been no studies investigating a more clinically meaningful timeframe of  
89 exposure to prone position for physical therapies e.g. 30 minutes.

90

91 Clearly, maintaining a prone position for physical therapies in late pregnancy is difficult due to  
92 the gravid uterus. The Anna cushion (Supplementary Figure 1) was developed to support mothers  
93 in a prone position. The concave Anna cushion is specifically moulded from a medical grade,  
94 medium density, closed cell foam, which has been covered in a double layer of cotton lycra fabric.  
95 It is deliberately shaped to accommodate for the pregnant abdomen up until the end of  
96 pregnancy.

97 This study aimed to describe the cardiorespiratory effects of a mother maintaining a prone  
98 position supported by the device (Anna cushion) for a period of 30 minutes. In addition, we aimed  
99 to determine whether maintaining a prone position is associated with any effects on the fetal HR,  
100 and to determine whether using a device to support a prone position is comfortable for the  
101 mother. We used the primary data from the clinical study to inform a mathematical model to  
102 determine whether compression of the inferior vena cava could explain our observations. We  
103 also conducted a scoping review to synthesise data regarding the clinical and haemodynamic  
104 effects of maternal prone positioning. This study was based on the primary hypothesis that prone  
105 positioning, with support of the Anna cushion, would be acceptable to pregnant women and  
106 associated with a decline in maternal blood pressure (BP), compared with left lateral position.

107

108 **Material and methods**

109 *Primary Study*

110 This single-centre prospective observational feasibility study was conducted at the Maternal and  
111 Fetal Health Research Centre, Saint Mary's Hospital, Manchester, UK. Recruitment (via referral)  
112 and follow-up were from 13<sup>th</sup> July 2021 to 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2022. Women were approached to  
113 participate in the study if they met the following inclusion criteria: aged 16 to 50 with a viable  
114 singleton pregnancy at over 28 weeks' gestation, and ability to read written English. Exclusion  
115 criteria were: evidence of fetal compromise or existing fetal anomaly, pre-existing maternal  
116 conditions that could influence the cardiovascular system, and maternal contraindications to  
117 lying prone (such as severe pain or spinal disease). Participants were offered a small sum (£25)  
118 as thanks for their participation in the study. Any unexpected adverse outcome that resulted in  
119 deviation from the study protocol automatically prompted termination of the study and  
120 immediate clinical assessment. Eligible and willing participants gave written consent to  
121 participate in the study. Data were collected onto case report forms.

122

123 Prior to commencing the experimental protocol, ultrasound examination was performed (if one  
124 had not been performed in the preceding two weeks) and baseline haemodynamic  
125 measurements were recorded. The pre-study questionnaire included questions regarding the  
126 women's current physical comfort, their pregnancy symptoms and treatment, and their pre-  
127 pregnancy and current sleeping positions. It then went on to measure the women's self-reported  
128 anxiety levels using the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI).

129

130 Once the required maternal and fetal monitoring equipment was attached, all women began by  
131 resting in the left lateral position for twenty minutes. Participants were then asked to lie in the  
132 prone position for a further thirty minutes, supported by the Anna cushion. They then returned  
133 to the left lateral position for a final twenty minutes.

134

135 Maternal and fetal haemodynamic variables were recorded at five-minute intervals throughout  
136 the positional sequence. Timing was monitored using a digital stopwatch. Maternal  
137 haemodynamics were measured using a Non-Invasive CO Monitor (NICOM, Cheetah), a monitor  
138 that uses bioreactance to estimate cardiovascular parameters. Maternal sBP and dBP were  
139 monitored using an electronic sphygmomanometer (Omron M3) placed on the right upper arm.  
140 SpO<sub>2</sub> was measured using a digital pulse oximeter placed on the left index finger. RR was  
141 measured visually by an investigator. Fetal HR was monitored using a Monica AN24 device. Fetal  
142 behavioural state was assessed on the Monica AN24 traces by two observers blinded to maternal  
143 position during the time period covered by the recording according to the fetal behavioural states  
144 described by Pillai *et al.* (11).

145

146 The post-study questionnaire was administered upon completion of the maternal positional  
147 sequence. It included questions regarding maternal comfort acceptability of the Anna cushion  
148 and study protocol. Post-study anxiety levels were then reassessed using the state component of  
149 the STAI. Only those in the primary clinical team (HP, LP, LO, AH) had access to information that  
150 could identify individual participants.

151

152 *Primary and secondary outcomes*

153 The primary outcome was maternal cardiac output. Secondary outcomes were maternal cardio-  
154 respiratory status (including heart rate, blood pressure, respiratory rate and oxygenation via  
155 pulse oximetry), fetal wellbeing (including baseline heart rate, variability, the presence of  
156 accelerations or decelerations, and acceptability (including maternal anxiety and comfort).

157

158 *Statistical analysis*

159 All statistical analyses were conducted in Stata (Version 14, STACORP, TX, USA). The alpha level  
160 for statistical significance was set at 0.05. Skewness of continuous variables was assessed using  
161 the Jarque-Bera skewness-kurtosis test and histograms. Parametric data were presented as mean  
162  $\pm$  standard deviation and non-parametric data as median (interquartile range). Categorical  
163 variables were presented as absolute frequencies (%). Comfort and state anxiety scores before  
164 and after the study protocol underwent paired analysis using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test.  
165 Multivariable regression analyses compared continuous variables between positions, having  
166 adjusted for time. Categorical variables were compared between positions using Chi-square test.

167

168 The sample size for this study was calculated to determine whether maternal CO (the primary  
169 outcome measure) decreases in the prone position compared to left lateral position. Milsom *et*  
170 *al.* (1) demonstrated a mean CO of 6.6L/min in left lateral position, 5.9L/min in right lateral  
171 position and 5.5L/min in a supine position, with a standard deviation of 1.0L/min. To have 80%  
172 power to detect a fall from 6.6L/min (the level reported for left lateral position) to 5.7 L/min (the



173 midpoint between right lateral and supine positions), 20 participants would be required in each  
174 group using  $\alpha=0.05$ .

175

### 176 *Mathematical Modelling*

177 A mathematical model of the cardiovascular system in pregnancy was implemented to  
178 investigate the mechanical impact of inferior vena cava occlusion and the consequent effects on  
179 systemic arterial pressure and CO. The framework utilised has been previously described (12,13).

180 The cardiovascular network model contains 513 blood vessels including: the major systemic  
181 arteries, systemic veins, pulmonary arteries, and pulmonary veins. The model also includes the  
182 major organs, including the brain, lungs, liver, kidneys, spleen, intestines, uterus, and stomach.

183 The mathematical system of equations is solved using a sub-domain collocation scheme, which  
184 is described in Carson and Van Loon's study (14). In order to personalise the cardiovascular  
185 model, patient measurement data is incorporated into the framework through a parameter  
186 optimisation technique. The patient sBP and dBP, HR, stroke volume (SV), and height (H) are used  
187 to estimate the total vascular resistance (TVR), total arterial compliance, and vessel lengths.

188 When of interest, pulse wave velocity (PWV) can be utilised to estimate major vessel diameters,  
189 and the maximum and minimum uterine artery blood velocities measured from Doppler  
190 ultrasound can also be incorporated into the framework (13).

191

192 In order to investigate the impact of occlusion of the inferior vena cava, the patient  
193 measurements of sBP, dBP, CO, HR, and H from the prone position cohort were used in the  
194 parameter estimation. Initially, the model was simulated until convergence to the measurement

195 values with no inferior vena cava occlusion present. Once convergence was achieved the  
196 optimisation algorithm was switched off, meaning the model parameters of resistance,  
197 compliance, and blood volume were kept constant in any subsequent simulations. An external  
198 pressure was then incrementally applied to the outer wall of the inferior vena cava causing  
199 various levels of occlusion. The model-predicted values for sBP, dBP, and CO were then recorded  
200 for these different percentages of inferior vena cava occlusion. The occlusion occurred in inferior  
201 vena cava III in the network, which is located just below the level of the hepatic veins. This was  
202 chosen in order to cause the minimum effective dose of occlusion and to investigate the effect.  
203 If more of the venous return pathway of the inferior vena cava was occluded, the effect on flow  
204 reduction would be even greater. It was decided to avoid compressing the abdominal aorta (AA)  
205 as well, due to observations in studies that suggest AA occlusion either rarely occurs (15), or has  
206 much less compression compared to the veins (16).

207

### 208 *Scoping Review and Meta-analysis*

209 A literature search was performed (by JC, DH and AH in collaboration with an information  
210 specialist) on the 18th of June 2022 using the following primary databases: Cochrane (Database  
211 of Systematic Reviews; Central Register of Controlled Trials), Medline and Embase. A grey  
212 literature search was also carried out of the databases BASE and OpenGrey using the same search  
213 terms and criteria; the search strategies were supplemented by hand searching from reference  
214 lists. In order to broaden the scope of the results, the initial search had no exclusion criteria. The  
215 search strategy consisted of the three main concepts of pregnancy, cardiorespiratory status, and

216 the prone position. Keywords, medical subject headings (MeSH terms) and truncations were used  
217 where applicable (a summary of the search terms is available in Supplementary file 1).

218

219 After results from each database were combined, duplicate records were removed. Screening

220 was performed manually by a single reviewer (JC or AFH) with queries resolved by discussion with

221 a second person (AH). Records were initially screened by title and abstract and excluded if they

222 were not relevant to the prone position in pregnancy (for example infant prone position and

223 SIDS). Full text-assessment was then performed on the remaining 132 records. Records were

224 excluded by the following pre-determined criteria: lack of information or outcome data available

225 in the text regarding the use of the prone position during pregnancy; prone position discussed

226 but not utilised; prone position utilised in postpartum period. Study records were grouped by

227 publication type for ease of data synthesis and critical analysis. As case reports and case series

228 were the most common, these were presented in a summary table and assessed for

229 methodological quality using a tool modified from Murad *et al.* (17). This tool awarded each case

230 report a validity score, using a six-point framework based on the four following domains:

231 selection, ascertainment, causality and reporting. For the purpose of case report evaluation, the

232 primary outcome measures of interest were livebirth and lack of fetal distress during maternal

233 prone positioning. Adequate length of follow-up was defined as follow-up until birth or

234 thereafter. A case report was considered adequately detailed if it provided information on the

235 reason for use of the prone position, the method of prone positioning, and maternal and fetal

236 outcomes.

237

238 Where quantitative synthesis was possible, random effects meta-analysis was performed using  
239 the command *metan* in STATA (Version 14). Heterogeneity was assessed using the  $I^2$  statistic.

240

#### 241 *Ethics Statement*

242 This study was approved by the Health Research Authority (IRAS ID: 240072) and North East -  
243 Newcastle & North Tyneside 1 Research Ethics Committee (20/NE/0261). The study was  
244 registered on [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT04586283,  
245 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04586283>). Initial participant enrolment was on  
246 13/07/21.

247

#### 248 **Results**

##### 249 *Primary Study*

250 Thirty-seven women were approached to participate in the study; 21 women participated in the  
251 experimental protocol; one woman had a fetal bradycardia resulting in early termination of the  
252 protocol (Figure 1). Complete data were therefore available for 20 women. The demographic  
253 characteristics of the participants are summarised in Table 1. Mean gestation at participation was  
254 32 weeks + 6 days. Table 2 summarises the pregnancy outcomes of the cohort.

255

256 **Figure 1:** Consort diagram.

257

258

259

260 **Table 1:** Demographic characteristics of participants

Characteristic		Distribution (Median (range) or n (%))
Maternal Age		32 (26-42)
Ethnicity	Black African	1 (5)
	Mixed ethnicity	1 (5)
	South Asian	2 (10)
	White British	15 (71)
	White Other	2 (10)
Booking Body Mass Index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )		25.3 (19.4-36.2)
Gravidity		2 (1-5)
Parity		1 (0-2)
Booking blood pressure (mmHg)		112 (98-129) / 67 (45-79)
Cigarette smoker		2 (10)
Gestation at participation (weeks + days)		32 <sup>+0</sup> (28 <sup>+6</sup> -37 <sup>+5</sup> )
Body Mass Index at participation		28.3 (22.0-37.3)
Maternal abdominal circumference (cm)		106 (91-140)

261

262 **Table 2:** Pregnancy outcomes of participants

Pregnancy outcomes		Median (range) or N (%)
Gestation at delivery*		273 (267 – 278)
Birthweight		3383.9 ± 602.4
Birthweight centile		44.9 ± 29.8
Mode of delivery	Emergency Caesarean Section	5 (24%)
	Elective Caesarean Section	3 (14%)
	Instrumental Vaginal Birth	3 (14%)
	Spontaneous Vaginal Birth	10 (48%)
Hypertensive disorder of pregnancy		1 (5%)
Small for Gestational Age (<10 <sup>th</sup> centile)		4 (19%)
Fetal Growth Restriction (<3 <sup>rd</sup> centile)		1 (5%)
Perinatal mortality		0 (0%)
Female sex		11 (52%)

263 There was a small reduction in the median state anxiety scores (38 vs 30,  $p=0.002$ ; Figure 2) from  
264 before to after the experimental protocol. However, there was no difference in comfort scores  
265 (2 vs 2,  $p=0.13$ ) before and after the protocol. There was a small reduction in anxiety score  
266 between left lateral and prone (2 vs 1,  $p=0.04$ ), despite a reduction in comfort (2 vs 1,  $p=0.04$ ).

267

268 **Figure 2:** Acceptability scores before and after lying in the prone position.

269

270 Table 3 summarises maternal haemodynamics by maternal position. Maternal BP and TVR were  
271 increased in prone (sBP adjusted difference 6.0 mmHg [95% C.I. 0.6 - 11.5],  $p=0.03$ ; dBp 7.0  
272 mmHg [2.4 - 11.6],  $p=0.003$ ; TVR 243.4  $\text{dyne}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-5}$  [29.7 - 457.0],  $p=0.03$ ; Figure 3). SV and CO  
273 were reduced in prone (SV adjusted difference -20.9 mL [-32.6 to -9.1],  $p=0.001$ ; CO -1.5  
274 mL/minute [-2.5 to -0.5],  $p=0.003$ ). Haemodynamic changes were consistent across the cohort  
275 (Figure 4). There were no changes in maternal RR and  $\text{spO}_2$  in prone position. Fetal HR, variability  
276 and decelerations were unaltered in prone position (Table 4). Fetal accelerations were less  
277 common in prone position (86% vs 95%,  $p=0.03$ ), although there was no difference in fetal  
278 behavioural state (Table 4). Figure 5 illustrates a lack of temporal relationship between maternal  
279 haemodynamics and fetal HR in the woman who experienced a fetal bradycardia.

280

281 **Figure 3:** Longitudinal maternal haemodynamics by maternal position.

282 Change in average haemodynamic measures over time. The line represents the mean  
283 (parametric) / median (non-parametric) and the bar represents standard error (parametric) /  
284 interquartile range (non-parametric). The dashed line indicates the timing of position change. P  
285 value is derived from multivariable regression analyses with position as the independent variable,  
286 adjusted for time.

287 LL, left lateral; mmHg, millimetres of mercury; bpm, beats per minute.

288

289 **Figure 4:** Mean positional maternal haemodynamics by individual.  
290 Mean haemodynamic measures are plotted for each woman (different colour) during the three  
291 position changes.  
292 LL, left lateral; mmHg, millimetres of mercury; bpm, beats per minute.  
293

294  
295 **Figure 5:** Relationship between maternal stroke volume index and fetal heart rate in the woman  
296 who required early termination of the protocol.  
297 The dashed line indicates the timing of position change.  
298 LL, left lateral; SVi, stroke volume indexed to body surface area; FH, fetal heart rate; bpm, beats  
299 per minute.  
300

301 **Table 3** - Maternal haemodynamic and respiratory indices in left lateral and prone positions.

	Left lateral 1	Prone	Left lateral 2	Position 1 to 2 (n=20)		Position 1 to 3 (n=20)	
				Adjusted difference	95% C.I.	Adjusted difference	95% C.I.
<b>sBP (mmHg)*</b>	104 (96 - 108.5)	109 (103 - 116.5)	105 (96.5 - 111.5)	6.0	0.6 - 11.5	0.2	-9.4 - 9.9
<b>dBp (mmHg)*</b>	67 (58.5 - 72.5)	74 (67.5 - 79)	63 (56 - 70)	7.0	2.4 - 11.6	-2.2	-10.3 - 5.8
<b>HR (bpm)</b>	84.0 ± 13.1	86.0 ± 14.6	80.6 ± 13.0	1.1	-5.2 - 7.5	-5.1	-16.3 - 6.0
<b>RR (bpm)*</b>	16.5 (16 - 18)	16 (16 - 18)	17 (16 - 18)	0.1	-0.8 - 0.9	0.7	-0.8 - 2.2
<b>O<sub>2</sub> saturation (%)*</b>	99 (98 - 99)	99 (98 - 99)	99 (98 - 99)	0.0	-0.5 - 0.4	-0.1	-0.8 - 0.7
<b>SV (mL)*</b>	88.4 (73.2 - 98.4)	71.3 (48.8 - 84.9)	85.4 (71.0 - 96.9)	-20.9	-32.6 - -9.1	-5.7	-26.4 - 15.1
<b>CO (L/min)*</b>	7.1 (5.7 - 8.0)	5.7 (4.3 - 6.8)	6.3 (5.6 - 7.6)	-1.5	-2.5 - -0.5	-0.5	-2.3 - 1.2
<b>TVR (dyne.s<sup>-1</sup>cm<sup>-5</sup>)*</b>	1075.3 (1013.2 - 1177.4)	1302.2 (1120.6 - 1614.6)	1228 (1063 - 1330)	243.4	29.7 - 457.0	43.4	-331.1 - 418.0
<b>SVI (mL/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	45.3 ± 13.4	36.0 ± 11.5	45.9 ± 10.7	-11.0	-16.4 - -5.5	-2.6	-12.2 - 7.1
<b>CI (L/min/m<sup>2</sup>)*</b>	3.7 (3.3 - 4.2)	3.0 (2.3 - 3.4)	3.5 (3.1 - 4.0)	-0.8	-1.2 - -0.4	-0.1	-0.9 - 0.6
<b>TVRI (dyne.s<sup>-1</sup>cm<sup>-5</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>)*</b>	2047.5 (1720 - 2294)	2621.6 (2225.4 - 2921.0)	2288 (1961 - 2640)	516.6	226.5 - 808.7	120.1	-401.6 - 641.8

302 Mean ± standard deviation

303 \*Median (range)

304 mmHg, millimetres of mercury; sBP, systolic blood pressure; dBp diastolic blood pressure; bpm, beats/breaths per minute; HR, heart rate; RR, respiratory rate; SV, stroke volume; CO, cardiac output; TVR, total vascular resistance; SVI, stroke volume indexed to body surface area; CI, cardiac output indexed to body surface area; TVRI, total vascular resistance indexed to body surface area.

307

308



309 **Table 4** – Fetal heart rate indices and behavioural state assessment showing the mean values for baseline heart rate and variability  
 310 and the proportion of cases in each fetal behavioural state per maternal position. \*Fisher’s exact test Left Lateral 1 vs. Prone = 0.45,  
 311 Prone vs. Left Lateral 2 = 0.55.

	<b>Left lateral 1</b>	<b>Prone</b>	<b>Left lateral 2</b>	<b>Position 1 to 2 (n=20)</b>		<b>Position 1 to 3 (n=20)</b>	
<b>Fetal heart rate (bpm)</b>	138.0 ± 8.2	139.6 ± 7.5	140.6 ± 9.6	1.5	-5.1 - 8.0	1.2	-10.3 - 12.7
<b>Variability (bpm)*</b>	13.9 (11.2 -15.8)	13.4 (11.1 - 15.0)	15 (10 - 18)	-0.2	-3.5 - 3.0	1.4	-4.2 - 7.1
<b>Fetal Behavioural State</b>							
1F	1 (4.8)	2 (9.5)	1 (4.8)	0.45*		0.55*	
2F	17 (81.0)	13 (61.9)	16 (76.2)				
3F	0 (0)	1 (4.8)	0 (0)				
4F	0 (0)	3 (14.3)	2 (9.5)				
Indeterminable	3 (14.3)	2 (9.5)	2 (9.5)				

312 bpm, beats per minute.

313

314

315 *Mathematical Modelling*

316 When comparing with the patient measurements, it was postulated that some of the differences  
317 in BP and CO between the left lateral position and prone position were caused by inferior vena  
318 cava occlusion (Figure 6). The expected behaviour would be that both the mean arterial pressure  
319 (MAP) and CO would decrease, as in supine hypotensive syndrome, secondary to uterine  
320 compression of the inferior vena cava.

321

322 **Figure 6:** Vena cava compression during prone position (top images). A representation of the  
323 computational cardiovascular network model (left bottom) and a zoomed in version showing IVC  
324 III as the location where compression was simulated (bottom right).

325

326 Figure 7 shows the model predicted trends of sBP, dBP, CO, and TVR for the study participants.  
327 The model predicted that if occlusion of the inferior vena cava occurred, the sBP, dBP and CO  
328 would generally decrease. However, the TVR remained relatively consistent, which implies that  
329 the MAP and CO decrease at a similar rate when occlusion occurs. Our model predicted that not  
330 all participants (4 of the 21) would follow this trend.

331

332 **Figure 7:** Effect of occluding the inferior vena cava on sBP, dBP, CO, and TVR using data from  
333 mathematical modelling. Error bars show the median values for each occlusion percentage and  
334 the interquartile range. TVR is shown in HRU/Woods units which is equivalent to mmHg\*min/L.  
335

336 *Scoping Review and Meta-Analysis*

337 Overall, 79 studies were included in the scoping review (Supplementary file 2), 47 were case  
338 reports; the mean quality score for each case report was 3.12 out of 6. Items which had higher  
339 scores were ascertainment of exposure (which was the use of the prone position during

340 pregnancy), length of follow-up, and detail of reporting. Domains which scored lowest included  
341 selection, causality, and reporting. These domains covered the presentation of a clear case  
342 selection method, explanation of alternative causes for observations, and adequate  
343 ascertainment of outcome (which was defined as livebirth and lack of fetal distress during  
344 proning). The selection method was unclear in all but two case reports. Lack of adequate  
345 ascertainment of outcome was usually due to insufficient duration of follow-up of birth  
346 outcomes, or due to lack of detail when reporting the outcome of fetal monitoring or livebirth.  
347 Case reports of women with COVID-19 infection were generally followed up for a shorter  
348 duration than their non-COVID-19 counterparts. In addition, most surgical case reports failed to  
349 report birthing outcomes or if fetal monitoring was conducted during the procedure.

350

351 Anecdotal reports of the prone position adopted during pregnancy accounted for over half of the  
352 evidence identified in this review, comprising a total of 75 individual cases. An overview of these  
353 case reports is shown in Supplementary file 3, including a summary of the method, monitoring  
354 and duration of proning, as well as the observed effect on various maternal and fetal outcome  
355 variables. The most common circumstance in which maternal proning was required was non-  
356 obstetric surgery, specifically that which required a posterior approach, such as brain or spinal  
357 surgery. The reported duration of prone positioning ranged between 1 and 6.5 hours. A surgical  
358 prone position was mostly achieved using variations of a traditional spinal operating frame. This  
359 generally comprised of sets of padded bolsters which were strategically placed to support the  
360 chest and hips whilst simultaneously freeing the pregnant abdomen. Care was taken to avoid

361 external pressure on the gravid uterus as much as possible, as it was thought the resulting  
362 aortocaval compression may lead to fetal compromise.

363

364 Gestational age at the time of surgical prone positioning varied greatly, between 8 and 34 weeks'  
365 gestation. The maximum gestation for adoption of the full prone position was 32 weeks' with  
366 two additional cases of the modified three-quarter prone and the semi-prone positions utilised  
367 at 32 and 34 weeks' gestation, respectively. Surgical prone positioning was mainly limited to the  
368 first and second trimesters due to the size of the gravid uterus in advanced pregnancy. As  
369 pregnancy progressed, delivery was commonly considered prior to surgical intervention, in order  
370 to avoid the logistical difficulties of performing prone surgery in advanced pregnancy.

371

372 The second most common indication for the maternal prone position was prone ventilation.  
373 Chest trauma, influenza infection, and COVID-19 infection were among the reported causes of  
374 respiratory distress which indicated the use prone ventilation in pregnant women. The duration  
375 of proning required per day ranged between 8 and 18 hours; often proning was required on  
376 consecutive days for above 16 hours at a time. As with spinal surgery, prone positioning was most  
377 commonly achieved using padded supports at the chest and hips which then allowed room for  
378 the pregnant abdomen. Notably, prone positioning was generally very successful in treating  
379 maternal refractory hypoxaemia, and in one case peripheral oxygen saturation  $spO_2$  was  
380 reportedly improved from 83% to 93% after just 30 minutes of prone ventilation. Regarding  
381 gestational age, cases of prone ventilation during pregnancy were generally limited to the first

382 and second trimesters, with the exception of one case at 34 weeks' gestation. After 34 weeks'  
383 gestation, caesarean section was usually performed prior to treatment.

384

385 Maternal and fetal outcomes within the included case reports of prone positioning during  
386 pregnancy were generally very favourable. No maternal deaths were reported. One instance of  
387 maternal hypotension was reported during surgical prone positioning (sBP fell over 20% from  
388 baseline into a range of 90 to 100 mmHg) which persisted despite intervention for the duration  
389 of the five-hour surgery.

390

391 Livebirths were almost always reported, although some data on birth outcome was not available  
392 from individual case reports due to insufficient follow-up (22/75 cases). Two cases did not end in  
393 live birth, one case of spontaneous miscarriage that was discovered on ultrasound following  
394 surgical prone positioning of a twin pregnancy (although it is not clear when exactly during the  
395 course of the pregnancy this occurred) and one instance of termination of pregnancy which was  
396 performed following surgery in early pregnancy. No cases reported evidence of fetal distress  
397 during maternal proning, although prior to 24 weeks' gestation fetal monitoring was often not  
398 deemed necessary due to lack of fetal viability. Gestational age at birth varied greatly, from 25  
399 weeks 4 days to 40 weeks' gestation, although birth outcome data was not always available.  
400 Preterm birth was relatively common in the included case reports (13/53, 24%), although this  
401 was more likely to be related to the critical illness experienced during these pregnancies than the  
402 prone position itself.

403

404 Characteristics of included larger-scale interventional studies are shown in Table 5. Meta-analysis  
405 of the three studies of maternal haemodynamic indices suggested an increase in sBP, but not  
406 dBP, though both analyses showed significant heterogeneity ( $I^2$  79.8 and 76.2% respectively).  
407 Maternal HR increased in prone position. There were no changes in RR, oxygen saturation or fetal  
408 HR (Figure 8).

409

410 **Figure 8:** Forest plots of maternal haemodynamic characteristics and baseline fetal heart rate.  
411 Bold line demonstrates line of no effect. Blue diamond is the pooled effect with 95% confidence  
412 intervals.

413

414

415 **Table 5** - Characteristics of included studies for the meta-analysis of observational and  
 416 interventional studies of altered maternal position.  
 417

<i><b>First Author/ Year/ Country</b></i>	<i><b>Study Type</b></i>	<i><b>Study population</b></i>	<i><b>Data extracted</b></i>	<i><b>Exposure</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Findings</b></i>
Dennis 2018 Australia (10)	Prospective observational study	50 healthy term pregnant women and 15 women with preeclampsia.	sSBP, dBP, MHR, SpO <sub>2</sub> , RR, FHR and comfort levels.	Data obtained in Left Lateral and Prone Position (using specialised pillow) after 5 minutes rest in each position.	No change in healthy women. sBP reduced in prone position in pre-eclamptic women, and in 33% of these women it was by over 10mmHg. Around half of women preferred prone position.
Oliveira 2017 Brazil (9)	Randomised controlled trial	33 healthy pregnant women	MHR, SpO <sub>2</sub> , sBP, dBP, RR, FHR, comfort.	Two different sequences of positions held for 6 minutes each. Sequence 1: Fowler's position, Prone Position, Supine Position, Left Lateral, Fowler's position and repeat. Sequence 2: Fowler's position, Prone Position, Left Lateral, Supine Position, Fowler's position. Prone position held using specialised stretcher.	sBP and RR were decreased in prone position compared to left lateral and a decrease in DBP and increase in SpO <sub>2</sub> in prone position compared to other positions. All parameters were in normal limits, all women report comfort in all positions.
Current study 2023 United Kingdom	Prospective observational study	21 healthy pregnant women	sBP, dBP, MHR, SpO <sub>2</sub> , RR, FHR comfort.	Left lateral position for 20 minutes, Prone position for 30 minutes, returned to left lateral position for 20 minutes using a supportive cushion.	sBP, dBP increased in prone position. No change in MHR, RR or FHR.

418 sBP = Systolic Blood Pressure, dBP = Diastolic Blood Pressure, MHR = Maternal Heart Rate, SpO<sub>2</sub> =  
 419 Oxygen Saturation, RR = Respiratory Rate, FHR = Fetal Heart Rate

420 **Discussion**

421 Prone position was associated with a reduction in maternal CO, largely attributable to reduced  
422 SV. The mechanism behind this remains uncertain, but could be a result of reduced venous  
423 return. This could be due to upward compression from the Anna cushion on the inferior vena  
424 cava or gravitational pooling of blood in the uteroplacental circulation. Alternatively, it could be  
425 due to thoracic compression in prone position; this has been postulated to increase left  
426 ventricular resistance, thereby reducing SV (18,19). Maternal haemodynamics returned to  
427 baseline when moved back into left lateral, indicating a transient rather than lasting positional  
428 effect. The scoping review found minimal clinical adverse effects of maternal prone positioning  
429 at various stages of pregnancy.

430

431 If the decline in venous return were due to upward compression of the inferior vena cava, one  
432 would expect a decline in both CO and BP, as seen in supine hypotensive syndrome. The  
433 computational model predicted this trend, however, the patient measurements only  
434 demonstrated a decrease in CO; instead there was an increase in BP in prone position. This could  
435 in part be due to auto-regulatory mechanisms in the body. However, this discrepancy could also  
436 be attributed to the effect of gravity. The gravitational effect on BP with respect to body position  
437 is well understood (20). BP increases/decreases by approximately 7 mmHg for every 10 cm  
438 distance below/above the heart. As the difference between the heart and the right upper arm is  
439 approximately 20 cm, it would be expected that the BP recording in the left lateral position would  
440 be approximately 15 mmHg lower than what was measured in the prone position, from the effect  
441 of gravity alone. It is also important to remember that the brachial cuff BP is actually attempting



442 to estimate the pressure in the aorta; this is why the protocol of cuff BP measurement requires  
443 the patient to have their arm supported at heart level (it is typically raised and rested on a table).  
444 This is also particularly important when other parameters are calculated, such as TVR, which is  
445 typically calculated as  $MAP=TVR*CO$  (as mean venous pressure is often wrongly assumed to be  
446 0 mmHg). MAP and CO should be taken at the same location in the arterial system, and as the  
447 CO measurement is restricted to the aorta (by virtue of the fact flow splits into other blood  
448 vessels), the BP also needs to be measured/estimated at the aorta to be a reliable measure of  
449 resistance. This could explain the discrepancies in the patient measurement trends, as the aortic  
450 BP estimates from the brachial cuff measure will be approximately 15 mmHg lower than the  
451 actual aortic pressure, and this means the TVR calculation will not be reliable in the left lateral  
452 position as it is being calculated using an incorrect pressure estimate of the aorta. If 15 mmHg is  
453 added to the left lateral position estimate of aortic BP, the expected and the model predicted  
454 trend, would be observed. In this way, prone position could actually reduce aortic pressure when  
455 compared to left lateral.

456  
457 The inconsistency of the model predictions across the group is likely due to a lack of information  
458 on pressures in the systemic veins, pulmonary system arteries and veins, and autoregulatory  
459 mechanisms in the body. Not everyone is affected equally in the prone position with not  
460 everyone developing supine hypotensive syndrome. Some of the individual variation might be  
461 due to the blood being redirected to the heart alternatively via the azygos vein. The patients that  
462 develop supine hypotensive syndrome tend to have less flow increase in the azygos vein

463 compared to those individuals that remain normotensive (21); the location of compression along  
464 the inferior vena cava plays a key role in this.

465  
466 A similar decline in SV and increase in vascular resistance have been demonstrated in previous  
467 non-pregnant prone positioning studies (18,19). On the other hand, our findings differed from  
468 previous studies in pregnancy (9,10), which did not demonstrate an increase in maternal BP. As  
469 explained above, this could be attributed to varying cuff positions and therefore gravitational  
470 effects on BP. Alternatively, the cardiovascular regulatory mechanisms from neural, renal and  
471 endocrine systems impact on maternal haemodynamics within different timeframes. It is  
472 therefore plausible that differences seen between studies reflect different phases of  
473 cardiovascular adjustment due to varying protocol timings (18). Previous maternal studies only  
474 maintained position changes for 5 to 6 minutes (9,10), compared with 30 minutes in this study.

475  
476 The impact of these positional haemodynamic changes on fetal wellbeing remain uncertain.  
477 Although fetal HR, decelerations and variability were unaltered by maternal position,  
478 accelerations were reduced in prone position and one woman had a fetal bradycardia. On review  
479 of this woman's simultaneous haemodynamic measures there appeared to be no temporal  
480 relationship between maternal haemodynamic alterations and her fetal bradycardia. This  
481 suggests that this was unlikely due to prone-induced altered maternal haemodynamics. The  
482 significance of reduced fetal accelerations in prone position is uncertain.

483

484 To our knowledge, this is the first study to simultaneously investigate the maternal  
485 cardiorespiratory effects of prolonged prone positioning in late pregnancy, whilst continuously  
486 monitoring fetal HR. The multimodal approach combined with a scoping review adds strength to  
487 this evaluation of the clinical consequences of prone positioning. Finally, the scoping review  
488 included all available evidence, recognising that the clinical evidence is mostly individual cases.  
489 The main limitation of this study is the comparatively small sample size, making it difficult to  
490 determine whether the witnessed bradycardia was a random occurrence or a consequence of  
491 prone positioning. Limitations of the scoping review were that high quality studies evaluating the  
492 effects of prone positioning were scarce and a significant proportion of the case reports omitted  
493 information about maternal or fetal outcomes. There is also the possibility that there is a  
494 publication bias towards healthy outcomes for mother and baby. In addition, there was a wide  
495 variation in gestation in this cohort. Further work is needed to explore any differences in  
496 positional haemodynamics at varying gestations. This could facilitate exploration into the impact  
497 of differing abdominal girth and uteroplacental circulation on maternal haemodynamics, thereby  
498 providing insight into the mechanism linking prone position and altered maternal  
499 haemodynamics. Furthermore, development of the cushion, in terms of shape and consistency,  
500 could provide insight into the effect of varying degrees of vena caval compression on maternal  
501 haemodynamics. If vena caval compression is the key mechanism linking prone position and  
502 reduced maternal CO, further development of the cushion has the potential to optimise prone  
503 position safety for mother and fetus.

504

505

506 **Conclusion**

507 Prone position was associated with a reduction in CO, however the impact on fetal wellbeing  
508 remains uncertain. It is therefore unclear from our data whether extended periods of prone  
509 positioning of up to 30 minutes (i.e. during physical therapy) are safe in late pregnancy. Although  
510 comfort was not altered from the start to finish of the protocol, anxiety scores were marginally  
511 reduced. Further work is needed to optimise the safety of prone positioning in pregnancy.

512

513 ***Acknowledgments***

514 This study was funded by the Dowager Countess Eleanor Peel Medical Research Trust. The  
515 authors are grateful to Professor Peter Stone and Professor Jane Warland for their advice and  
516 expertise during the planning, conduct and analysis of this study.

517

518 ***Author contributions***

519 AH and KB conceived the overall study and applied for funding. JC, LP, HP and AH recruited  
520 participants and conducted the experimental protocol. LO and LW undertook the fetal  
521 behavioural assessment. LO and AH undertook the statistical analysis. JC, AF-H, DH and AH  
522 conducted the scoping review. CP, JMC, RvL undertook the mathematical modelling. LO produced  
523 the first draft of the manuscript; all authors contributed to the submitted version.

524

525 **References**

- 526 1. Milsom I, Forssman L. Factors influencing aortocaval compression in late pregnancy. *Am J*  
527 *Obstet Gynecol.* 1984 Mar 15;148(6):764–71.
- 528 2. Heazell AEP, Li M, Budd J, Thompson JMD, Stacey T, Cronin RS, et al. Association between  
529 maternal sleep practices and late stillbirth – findings from a stillbirth case-control study.  
530 *Bjog.* 2018 Jan 1;125(2):254.
- 531 3. Stacey T, Thompson JMD, Mitchell EA, Ekeroma AJ, Zuccollo JM, McCowan LME.  
532 Association between maternal sleep practices and risk of late stillbirth: a case-control  
533 study. *BMJ.* 2011 Jun 18;342(7811).
- 534 4. Gordon A, Raynes-Greenow C, Bond D, Morris J, Rawlinson W, Jeffery H. Sleep position,  
535 fetal growth restriction, and late-pregnancy stillbirth: The sydney stillbirth study. *Obstet*  
536 *Gynecol.* 2015 Feb 6;125(2):347–55.
- 537 5. Owusu JT, Anderson FJ, Coleman J, Oppong S, Seffah JD, Aikins A, et al. Association of  
538 maternal sleep practices with pre-eclampsia, low birth weight, and stillbirth among  
539 Ghanaian women. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet.* 2013;121(3):261.
- 540 6. McCowan LME, Thompson JMD, Cronin RS, Li M, Stacey T, Stone PR, et al. Going to sleep  
541 in the supine position is a modifiable risk factor for late pregnancy stillbirth; Findings  
542 from the New Zealand multicentre stillbirth case-control study. *PLoS One.* 2017 Jun  
543 1;12(6).
- 544 7. Humphries A, Mirjalili SA, Tarr GP, Thompson JMD, Stone P. The effect of supine  
545 positioning on maternal hemodynamics during late pregnancy.  
546 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1476705820181478958>. 2018 Dec 2;32(23):3923–30.

- 547 8. Stone PR, Burgess W, McIntyre J, Gunn AJ, Lear CA, Bennet L, et al. An investigation of  
548 fetal behavioural states during maternal sleep in healthy late gestation pregnancy: an  
549 observational study. *J Physiol*. 2017 Dec 12;595(24):7441.
- 550 9. Oliveira C, Lopes MAB, Rodrigues AS, Zugaib M, Francisc RPV. Influence of the prone  
551 position on a stretcher for pregnant women on maternal and fetal hemodynamic  
552 parameters and comfort in pregnancy. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*. 2017;72(6):325–32.
- 553 10. Dennis AT, Hardy L, Leeton L. The prone position in healthy pregnant women and in  
554 women with preeclampsia - a pilot study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2018 Nov 16;18(1).
- 555 11. Pillai M, James D. Behavioural states in normal mature human fetuses. *Arch Dis Child*.  
556 1990;65(1 Spec No):39–43.
- 557 12. Carson J, Lewis M, Rassi D, Van Loon R. A data-driven model to study utero-ovarian blood  
558 flow physiology during pregnancy. *Biomech Model Mechanobiol* 2019 184. 2019 Mar  
559 5;18(4):1155–76.
- 560 13. Carson J, Warrander L, Johnstone E, van Loon R. Personalising cardiovascular network  
561 models in pregnancy: A two-tiered parameter estimation approach. *Int j numer method*  
562 *biomed eng*. 2021 Nov 1;37(11):e3267.
- 563 14. Carson J, Van Loon R. An implicit solver for 1D arterial network models. *Int j numer*  
564 *method biomed eng*. 2017 Jul 1;33(7):e2837.
- 565 15. Lee SWY, Khaw KS, Ngan Kee WD, Leung TY, Critchley LAH. Haemodynamic effects from  
566 aortocaval compression at different angles of lateral tilt in non-labouring term pregnant  
567 women. *Br J Anaesth*. 2012;109(6):950–6.
- 568 16. Humphries A, Mirjalili SA, Tarr GP, Thompson JMD, Stone P. The effect of supine

- 569 positioning on maternal hemodynamics during late pregnancy. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal*  
570 *Med.* 2019 Dec 2;32(23):3923–30.
- 571 17. Murad MH, Sultan S, Haffar S, Bazerbachi F. Methodological quality and synthesis of case  
572 series and case reports. *BMJ evidence-based Med.* 2018 Apr 1;23(2):60–3.
- 573 18. Watanabe N, Reece J, Polus BI. Effects of body position on autonomic regulation of  
574 cardiovascular function in young, healthy adults. *Chiropr Osteopat.* 2007 Nov 28;15:19.
- 575 19. Pump B, Talleruphuus U, Christensen NJ, Warberg J, Norsk P. Effects of supine, prone,  
576 and lateral positions on cardiovascular and renal variables in humans. *Am J Physiol -*  
577 *Regul Integr Comp Physiol.* 2002;283(1 52-1).
- 578 20. Hinghofer-Szalkay H. Gravity, the hydrostatic indifference concept and the cardiovascular  
579 system. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2011 Feb;111(2):163–74.
- 580 21. Humphries A, Mirjalili SA, Tarr GP, Thompson JMD, Stone P. Hemodynamic changes in  
581 women with symptoms of supine hypotensive syndrome. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.*  
582 2020 May 1;99(5):631–6.








Figure 1

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.15.23291473>; this version posted June 20, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Figure 2









Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5






Figure 6

# Effect of occluding inferior vena cava on major haemodynamic parameters






Figure 7




### Systolic blood pressure




### Maternal Respiratory Rate



### Diastolic blood pressure



### Maternal oxygen saturation



### Maternal heart rate



### Baseline fetal heart rate




Figure 8