BMJ Open

Attendance at a specialised antenatal clinic for obesity is associated with reduced rates of stillbirth and low birthweight and improved detection of gestational diabetes: a retrospective case-note analysis.

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-015218
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Nov-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Denison, Fiona; The University of Edinburgh , MRC Centre for Reproductive Healht MacGregor, Heather; University of Edinburgh Queen's Medical Research Institute Stirrat, Laura; University of Edinburgh Queen's Medical Research Institute Stevenson, Kerrie; University of Edinburgh Queen's Medical Research Institute Norman, Jane; University of Edinburgh Reynolds, Rebecca; University of Edinburgh,
Primary Subject Heading :	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	Obesity, Stillbirth, low birthweight

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

Pag	e 1	of	27

1 2	1	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Attendance at a specialised antenatal clinic for obesity is associated with reduced rates of stillbirth and					
3 4	2	low birthweight and improved detection of gestational diabetes: a retrospective case-note analysis.					
5 6	3						
7 8	4	Denison FC [*] , MacGregor H, Stirrat LI, Stevenson, KJ, Norman JE, Reynolds RM					
9 10	5						
11 12 13	6	Denison FC: Reader and Honorary Consultant in Maternal and Fetal Health, Tommy's Centre for					
14 15	7	Maternal and Fetal Health, University of Edinburgh MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, Queen's					
16 17	8	Medical Research Institute, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TY					
18 19	9						
20 21	10	MacGregor H: Medical Student, University of Edinburgh					
22 23 24	11						
25 26	12	Stirrat LI: Clinical Research Fellow, Tommy's Centre for Maternal and Fetal Health, University of					
27 28	13	Edinburgh MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, Queen's Medical Research Institute, 47 Little France					
29 30	14	Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TY					
31 32 33	15						
34 35	16	Stevenson, KJ: Medical Student, University of Edinburgh					
36 37	17						
38 39	18	Norman JE: Professor of Maternal and Fetal Health, Tommy's Centre for Maternal and Fetal Health,					
40 41 42	19	University of Edinburgh MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, Queen's Medical Research Institute, 47					
42 43 44	20	Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TY					
45 46	21						
47 48	22	Reynolds RM: Professor of Metabolic Medicine, British Heart Foundation Centre for Cardiovascular					
49 50	23	Science, Queen's Medical Research Institute, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TY					
51 52 53	24						
54 55	25	Corresponding author:					
56 57	26	Dr Fiona Denison					
58 59	27	Tommy's Centre for Maternal and Fetal Health					
60							

1 2	28	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity MRC Centre for Reproductive Health
- 3 4	29	Queen's Medical Research Institute
5 6	30	Edinburgh
7 8	31	0131 242 6449
9 10 11	32	Fiona.Denison@ed.ac.uk
$\begin{array}{c} 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 5\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 0\\ 1\\ 2\\ 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\ 2\\$	33	

Page 3 of 27

1 2	34	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Abstract					
- 3 4	35						
5 6	36	Objectives: To determine whether attendance at a specialised multidisciplinary antenatal clinic for women					
7 8 9	37	with Class III obesity $(BMI>40kg/m^2)$ is associated with improved clinical outcomes compared to women					
9 10 11	38	receiving standard antenatal care					
12 13	39						
14 15	40	Design: Retrospective cohort study using routinely collected data from electronic patient record (TRAK)					
16 17 18	41						
19 20	42	Setting: Community or hospital based antenatal care					
21 22	43						
23 24	44	Participants: Women with a singleton pregnancy with Class III obesity who booked for antenatal care and					
25 26 27	45	delivered in one of two hospitals in NHS Lothian, Scotland, UK between 2008 – 2014. Maternal and					
27 28 29	46	offspring outcomes were compared in women who attended a specialised obesity clinic (attenders;					
30 31	0 47 n=511) compared to those who received standard antenatal care (non-attenders; n=502).						
32 33	48						
34 35	49	Main Outcome Measures: Outcomes including stillbirth, low birthweight, gestational diabetes, indu					
36 37 38	50	of labour and caesarean section.					
39 40	51						
41 42	52	Results: Compared to non-attenders, attenders were less likely to have a stillbirth (Odds Ratio (OR), 95%					
43 44 45	53	Confidence Interval (CI) 0.12, 0.06-0.97) and a low birthweight baby (OR, 95% CI 0.57, 0.33-0.99) and					
45 46 47	54	more likely to be screened for (100% vs 73.6%; <0.001) and diagnosed with (26.0% vs 12.5%; p<0.001)					
48 49	55	gestational diabetes, to require induction of labour (38.4% vs 29.9%, p=0.009), an elective (20.3% vs					
50 51	56	17.7%; p<0.001) and emergency (23.9% vs 20.3%; p<0.001) caesarean section and attend antenatal triage					
52 53	57	one or more times during pregnancy (77.7% vs 53.1%; p<0.001). Attenders had a higher BMI (44.5% vs					
54 55 56	58	43.2%; p<0.001) and were more likely to be nulliparous (46.0% vs 24.9%; p<0.001). There were no other					
50 57 58	59	differences in maternal demographic or maternal and offspring outcomes between attenders and non-					
59 60	60	attenders.					

1	61	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity				
2 3 4 5 6	62	Conclusions: Attendance at a specialised antenatal clinic for obesity is associated with reduced rates of				
	63	stillbirth and low birthweight and improved detection of gestational diabetes. The improvement in clinical				
7 8	64	outcomes is associated with an increase in healthcare attendance to obstetric triage and clinical				
9 10 11	65	interventions including induction of labour and caesarean section.				
12 13	66					
14 15	67	Keywords				
16 17	68	Obesity, stillbirth, low birthweight				
$\begin{array}{c} 18\\ 19\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 78\\ 29\\ 03\\ 12\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 67\\ 89\\ 04\\ 14\\ 23\\ 44\\ 56\\ 78\\ 90\\ 12\\ 33\\ 45\\ 55\\ 55\\ 57\\ 56\\ 57\\ \end{array}$	69	Obesity, stillbirth, low birthweight				

Page 5 of 27

1	70	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	70 71 72	Article Summary - Strengths and limitations of this study					
	73	• This study compares maternal and offspring outcomes in women with Class III obesity who attend					
7 8 9	74	a specialist obesity antenatal clinic compared to those who do not.					
10 11	75	• A strength of our study is that we were able to compare important clinical outcomes in women					
12 13	76	and offspring such as stillbirth and low birthweight.					
14 15	77	• The use of routinely collected clinical data means that our results are relevant to clinical practice					
16 17 18	78	in which multiple different care pathways exist.					
19 20	79	• The stillbirth findings and causality need to be interpreted with caution due to the small sample					
21 22	80	size and attenuation of findings in adjusted analyses.					
23 24	81	• As a retrospective cohort study using routinely collected data from electronic patient record,					
25 26 27	82	results must be interpreted with caution because of potential bias from confounding.					
28 29	83						
30 31	84						
32 33	85						
34 35 36							
00							

1 2	86	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Introduction					
- 3 4	87	Maternal obesity is the most common co-morbidity of pregnancy. In the UK, approximately 20% of					
5 6	88	pregnant women are obese and 2% have very severe obesity (Class III obesity, body mass index BMI \geq					
7 8 9	89	40 kg/m ²) [1]. Maternal obesity is associated with increased risks for adverse maternal and offspring					
9 10 11	90	health including gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), thromboembolic and hypertensive complications					
12 13	91	caesarean section, macrosomia and stillbirth [2-5]. Managing these complications has significant cost					
14 15	92	implications for delivery of antenatal care [2, 4] [6].					
16 17	93						
18 19 20	94	There is recognition that obstetric management of the obese should be consultant led and involve a multi-					
20 21 22	95	disciplinary team to improve outcome [7, 8]. These recommendations are embedded in clinical guidelines					
23 24	96	and standards of care produced by a number of countries [8-13]. However, there is a paucity of evidence					
25 26	97	demonstrating that multidisciplinary care and adherence to guidelines results in improved maternal and					
27 28 29	98	offspring outcomes in maternal obesity. There is also less consensus about how multidisciplinary care					
30 31	99	should be delivered, and a concern that in areas of high obesity prevalence specialist obesity clinics are					
32 33	100	unlikely to be feasible due to cost and the numbers of women who would potentially need to be seen [13].					
34 35	101						
36 37	102	Women with Class III obesity are at particularly high risk of adverse maternal and offspring outcome					
38 39 40	103	[14]. In 2008 we therefore set up a specialist antenatal clinic for women with Class III obesity living in					
41 42	104	Edinburgh and the surrounding Lothian area with the aim of improving maternal and offspring outcomes.					
43 44	105	At their first antenatal appointment, which is generally prior to 12 weeks gestation, women with a BMI					
45 46	106	>40kg/m ² are offered referral to the specialist clinic or can choose to continue to receive standard					
47 48 49	107	antenatal care. We have a pan-Lothian guideline for clinical management of pregnancies in women with					
50 51	108	obesity (Class I, II and III) so that the same care pathway is offered, regardless of who or where it is					
52 53	109	delivered. All women with Class III obesity should therefore receive the same standard of care. We					
54 55	110	hypothesised that maternal and offspring outcomes would be better in women who had their antenatal					
56 57 58	111	care provided by a multidisciplinary specialist clinic as opposed to receiving standard antenatal care. To					
59 60	112	test this hypothesis, we undertook a retrospective case-note review of all women with a BMI>40kg/m ²					

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 7 of 27

BMJ Open

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

- who delivered in Lothian between 2008 and 2014 and compared clinical outcomes in women who
- attended for specialist antenatal care compared to those who received standard antenatal care.
- 6
- Methods
- Study population

We performed a retrospective case-note review of all women with Class III obesity with a singleton pregnancy who booked for antenatal care and delivered in either of two hospitals in NHS Lothian trust between 2008 and 2014. The Simpson Centre for Reproductive Health at the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh is a tertiary referral centre with more than 6,500 deliveries per annum. St John's Hospital, Livingston, is a district general hospital with approximately 2,600 deliveries per annum. Women were excluded if they had not delivered by the end of December 2014, had a multiple pregnancy (n=28), or booked later than 20 weeks gestation (n=18) because this meant they would have missed the gestational window for early screening for GDM [15]. This study was an approved by our local audit committee.

Clinical care pathway

Women attending the specialist clinic at the Simpson Centre for Reproductive Health, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh receive multidisciplinary consultant-led care throughout pregnancy from obstetricians. specialist midwives, diabetologists, anaesthetists, dieticians and other specialists as clinically indicated. At their first appointment (~10-16 weeks gestation), women are reviewed individually by a dietician with specialist expertise in weight management during pregnancy and given tailored advice about healthy eating and weight management during pregnancy. They are advised to have early screening for GDM with a fasting blood glucose between 12-16 weeks and late screening using a 75g oral glucose tolerance test between 24-28 weeks, as per the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines [15]. If a woman has pre-existing Type 2 diabetes or is diagnosed with GDM during pregnancy, her care remains within the specialist clinic. At each visit, women are weighed, counselled about the maternal and offspring risks associated

BMJ Open Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity with maternal obesity, and their blood pressure is measured with appropriate sized cuffs. Women are commenced on 75mg aspirin if they have additional risk factors for pre-eclampsia such as a blood pressure of >140/90 mmHg at antenatal booking or primiparity as per national guidelines [16]. All women have postnatal thromboprophylaxis with low molecular weight heparin, with antenatal thromboprophylaxis being commenced if additional risk factors develop [16]. Fetal growth is monitored by serial growth scans at 28, 32 and 36 weeks. All women receive a personalised delivery plan and an anaesthetic review in the third trimester to discuss intrapartum pain management with specific consideration given to obesity related co-morbidities with implications for analgesia and anaesthesia. Women who do not attend the specialist clinic receive guideline based consultant led care in hospital or community based antenatal clinics. The main difference in care between women who attend the specialist clinic and those who do not, is that if non-attenders develop a complication such as gestational diabetes or needs anaesthetic review, they need to attend a separate specialist clinic to receive this additional care. For women who attend the obesity clinic, this care is centralised in a single multi-professional clinic. To compare maternal and offspring outcomes by antenatal care setting, women were categorised as 'attenders' if they attended for two or more appointments at the specialist clinic with the first appointment being before 20 weeks. The rationale for this was that such women would have received early dietary advice and counselling about the importance of attending for early screening for GDM. Data Collection Maternal and offspring data were acquired from the maternity electronic patient records database TRAK (supplied by Intersystems), clinical biochemistry database APEX (ApexHealthware) and the neonatal unit electronic patient records database BadgerNet (supplied by Clevermed) systems. The following data were collected from the maternal record at booking: maternal age, BMI (kg/m^2), ethnicity (white, other), parity (P0, P1, P2 or more), smoking status (current, former, never), deprivation

6

Page 9 of 27

1 2	167	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity quintile (a postcode based Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation from 2012 with five groups ranging				
3 4 5 6	168	from most deprived index (1) to least deprived index (5)][17] and systolic and diastolic blood pressure				
	169	(mmHg).				
7 8	170					
9 10 11	171	Maternal outcomes collected were hypertension (pre-existing, gestational, pre-eclampsia), diabetes (pre-				
11 12 13	172	existing, GDM), onset of labour (no labour, spontaneous onset, induced), delivery method (elective				
14 15	173	caesarean, emergency caesarean, instrumental, spontaneous vaginal), blood loss at delivery and antenatal				
16 17	174	obstetric attendances. The prevalence of GDM was determined according to (i) the rates of GDM from				
18 19	175	diagnoses entered into the electronic patient record and (ii) evaluating whether blood glucose values				
20 21 22	176	found on the electronic databases conferred a diagnosis of GDM. Diagnostic accuracy of GDM was				
23 24	177	determined according to Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines which utilised the World Health Organisation				
25 26	178	(WHO) recommended thresholds [18] until March 2010 when updated thresholds were published based				
27 28	179	on the International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups [19].				
29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	180					
	181	Offspring outcomes collected were gender, birthweight, birthweight centile [20], macrosomia (defined as				
	182	a birthweight \geq 4000g), low birthweight (defined as a birthweight \leq 2500g), gestation of delivery, preterm				
	183	birth (defined as birth <259 days gestation) and outcome (livebirth, stillbirth).				
	184					
	185	All data were anonymised with personal identifiers removed before analysis. To maximize accuracy and				
43 44	186	to minimise missing data all records were reviewed by HM and LS, glucose data was reviewed by KS and				
45 46	187	LS with any discrepancies reviewed by FD, RR. For stillbirths, a perinatal pathologist examined placental				
47 48	188	pathology as is routine clinical practice. HM and LS independently identified risk factors and categorised				
49 50 51	189	the likely causality of the stillbirths. Stillbirth causation was checked and verified by a third investigator				
52 53	190	(FD). All investigators were blinded to whether a woman did or did not attend the specialist clinic until				
54 55	191	risk factors and likely causality was agreed for all stillbirths.				
56 57	192					
58 59 60	193	Statistical Analysis				
00		0				

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 21. Differences in the characteristics and clinical outcomes between the women who attended the specialist obesity clinic and those who received standard care were tested using the student's t-test if the variable was continuous or the chi-squared test for categorical variables. Logistic regression was used to adjust for BMI and parity. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Results Demographics Maternal demographics are demonstrated in Table 1. Compared to non-attenders, women who attended the specialist clinic had a higher BMI, and were more likely to be primiparous. There were no differences in age, ethnicity, smoking status, deprivation quintile and systolic or diastolic blood pressure at booking between attenders and non-attenders. Maternal outcomes Maternal outcomes are demonstrated in Table 2. After excluding women with pre-existing Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes, all women who attended the specialist clinic had a screening test with sufficient information being collected to confirm or exclude a diagnosis of GDM. In contrast, 26.4% (128/484) of non-attenders either had no screening test for GDM or insufficient information was collected for a diagnosis of GDM to be made. The clinical diagnosis of GDM from the patient record matched the diagnosis from blood glucose levels in all women who attended the specialist clinic. In contrast, in non-attenders, when the notes and actual blood glucose values were compared, the 'wrong' diagnosis was made in 17 women. One woman was incorrectly diagnosed with GDM when her screening test for GDM was normal. A further 16 woman had a positive diagnostic test for GDM according to glucose values obtained during a glucose tolerance test but the diagnosis was missed and these women were incorrectly labelled as not having GDM (and did not therefore receive treatment).

6

Page 11 of 27

BMJ Open

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Compared to non-attenders, women who attended the specialist clinic were more likely to have their labour induced, to have a caesarean or instrumental vaginal delivery. Specialist clinic attenders had a higher blood loss at delivery than non-attenders even after adjusting for mode of delivery, BMI, age and parity (p=0.02). They were also more likely to attend obstetric triage one or more times during pregnancy. Rates of pre-existing chronic hypertension and hypertensive complications (gestational hypertension and pre-eclampsia) were low in both attenders and non-attenders. Rates of Type 2 diabetes were higher in non-attenders compared to attenders. Offspring outcomes The clinical details for the offspring outcomes are demonstrated in Table 3. Compared to non-attenders, attenders were less likely to have a stillbirth (Odds Ratio (OR), 95% Confidence Interval (CI) 0.12, 0.06-0.97) and a low birthweight baby (OR, 95% CI 0.57, 0.33-0.99). The lower stillbirth outcomes in attenders were attenuated in analyses adjusting for BMI and parity (adjusted OR (AOR), 95% CI 0.14, 0.02-1.17) but the lower risk of having a low birthweight baby (in the attendees) was strengthened in adjusted analyses (AOR, 95% CI 0.52, 0.29-0.93). The clinical details of the women who had a stillbirth are demonstrated in Table 4. In non-attenders, an additional risk factor for stillbirth was identified in 7 women and a probable cause for stillbirth was identified in all 8 women. No additional risk factors or

cause was identified in the one woman who had a stillbirth who attended the specialist clinic.

Discussion

In this retrospective case-note review, we demonstrated that women with Class III obesity who attended a specialist multidisciplinary antenatal clinic were less likely to have a stillbirth and low birthweight infant and more likely to be tested, correctly diagnosed with and treated for GDM, and to have an induction of labour, caesarean section and higher blood loss at delivery compared to those receiving standard antenatal care. These differences in outcomes were accompanied by increased attendance at obstetric triage.

Main Findings

6

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity A key study finding was that rates of stillbirth and low birthweight were lower in women who attended the clinic compared to those who did. Compared to non-attenders, women who attended the specialist clinic had a higher BMI, and were more likely to be primiparous. Given that primiparity and higher BMI are independently associated with increased risk of stillbirth and low birthweight [21-23], we expected that rates of stillbirth and low birthweight would be higher in attenders compared to non-attenders. However, we found the converse to be the case, with fewer stillborn and low birthweight babies being born to attenders, even after adjusting for parity and BMI. The stillbirth rate in women who attended the specialist clinic was 2 per 1000 compared to a rate of 7 per 1000 for women with a BMI>40kg/m² who delivered in Scotland in 2011 - 2012 [24]. To validate this finding, three investigators who were blinded to whether women did or did not attend the clinic independently checked the stillbirth data. It was striking that additional risk factors were identified in 7 and a cause for stillbirth identified in all 8 non-attenders who had a stillbirth but no additional risk factors or cause was identified in the one woman who had a stillbirth who did attend the clinic. We accept that rates of unexplained stillbirth are generally reported as being 20 - 25% which is much higher than what we found in our study. We therefore acknowledge the stillbirth findings and causality need to be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size and attenuation of findings in adjusted analyses. However it is tempting to speculate that the continuity of care together with the education of women by the multidisciplinary clinic team raised increased awareness of the importance of risk factors such as reduced fetal movements amongst attenders and this may have led to them presenting earlier and being delivered prior to stillbirth occurring. Future studies such as the AFFIRM clinical trial (NCTT01777022, due to complete in 2017) are designed to address this in the general antenatal population. Strengths and Limitations A strength of our study is that we were able to compare important clinical outcomes in women and offspring such as stillbirth. We also used routinely collected clinical data meaning that our results are relevant to clinical practice in which multiple different care pathways exist. We accept that a limitation of

6

BMJ Open

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

our study is that this was a retrospective case-note review and our sample size was therefore limited by the study population. For the majority of data fields, other than smoking status (43.8% missing), there was a relatively low proportion of missing data. For the smoking variable, this was due to smoking status not being a mandatory field for recording on the electronic clinical record prior to 2012. The study was also not randomised, so women could choose whether to attend the specialist clinic. However, apart from differences in maternal BMI and primiparity between attenders and non-attenders, all other demographic factors were comparable between groups. Given that the clinical outcomes were better in women attending the specialist clinic who were arguably at higher risk than the non-attenders due to their higher BMI and more likely to be primiparous, we believe that our finding that multidisciplinary care improves clinical outcomes in pregnant women with Class III obesity compared to standard care is clinically

important.

Interpretation

In other general and high-risk populations, pregnancy outcomes tend to be worse in women who either under- or do not attend for any antenatal care [25]. However, although we categorised women into attenders or non-attenders, this was only in relation to whether they attended the specialist clinic for antenatal care. In 1993, the landmark Changing Childbirth Report [26], which was built on the 1992 Winterton Report, reversed the official policy that hospital is always the safest place for birth and emphasised the importance of maternal choice, control and continuity of carer for women. These recommendations, which were made over 20 years ago are still as relevant today, and frame the rhetoric and delivery of antenatal care across the UK [27-30]. In Lothian, all women receiving community-led care have a named midwife who coordinates their care. This midwife is part of a community team which has a defined case-load. This model ensures that there is continuity of care for a woman at both the individual midwife and midwifery team-level. If a woman is deemed high risk (such as would be the case in women with Class III obesity), she is also designated a named Consultant to oversee her care. Despite this model of continuity of care, our study demonstrates that maternal and offspring outcomes are better

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

in women who attend a hospital based specialist clinic compared to those who receive standard antenatal

care.

6 Although specialist clinics have been advocated as a way of improving maternal and offspring outcomes, there is currently a paucity of evidence from randomised controlled trials about the benefits and harms of 'specialist' antenatal clinics compared with 'standard' antenatal care for women [31]. For example, systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials have concluded that there is currently limited information to assess the role of 'specialist' antenatal clinics for women with a multiple pregnancy [32] and no clear evidence that 'specialist' clinics reduce the number of preterm births [33]. Given that the antenatal care pathway followed was the same in attenders compared to non-attenders, it is not clear why maternal and offspring outcomes were better in women who attended the specialist clinic compared to those who did not. A recent systematic review by Sandall et al. highlighted the importance of continuity of care, demonstrating that pregnant women receiving midwife-led continuity models of care had at least comparable clinical outcomes and were likely to experience less intervention [34]. It is therefore plausible that the continuity of care that the specialist multidisciplinary team provided enabled compromised pregnancies to be identified more accurately and interventions such as induction of labour to be targeted more appropriately compared to those women receiving standard care. Conclusion In summary, our study demonstrates that attendance at a multidisciplinary specialist antenatal clinic improves maternal and offspring outcomes in women with Class III obesity. This challenges current recommendations that women with very Class III obesity can be effectively managed outside a specialist service. Further research is needed to identify the most appropriate and economic model of care for women with Class III obesity to optimise maternal and offspring outcomes. Acknowledgements

Page 15 of 27

1 2	326	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity We would like to acknowledge Mr Allyn Dick for assistance in extracting the clinical data from matern				
2 3 4	327	TRAK.				
5 6	328					
7 8 9	329	Copyright				
10 11	330	The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all				
12 13	331	authors, <u>a worldwide licence</u> to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and				
14 15 16	332	media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store				
17 18	333	the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include				
19 20	334	within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any				
21 22 23	335	other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution,				
23 24 25	336	v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be				
25 26 27 28	337 338	located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.				
29 30	339	Disclosure of Interests The authors have no interests to disclose. Contribution to authorship				
31 32 33	340	The authors have no interests to disclose.				
34 35	341					
36 37 38	342	Contribution to authorship				
39 40	343	FD and RR conceived the study and drafted the paper. FD, HM, LS, KS, JN and RR designed the study.				
41 42	344	FD, HM, LS, KS and RR acquired and analysed the data. All authors interpreted the data, revised the				
43 44 45	345	paper critically for important intellectual content and approved the final version.				
46 47	346					
48 49	347	Details of Ethics Approval				
50 51 52	348	This study was an approved by our local audit committee.				
53 54	349	Funding				
55 56	350	Funding We asknowledge funding from Tommy's the Paby Charity				
57 58 59 60	351	We acknowledge funding from Tommy's the Baby Charity				
		For peer review only - http://bmiopen.hmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml				

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

1 2	352	Refere	ences			
3	353	1.	Report, C.f.M.a.C.E., Maternal obesity in the UK: findings from a national project, in Centre for			
4		1.				
5	354	2	Maternal and Child Enquiries2010: Chiltern Court, 188 Baker Street, London, NW1 5SD.			
6	355	2.	Denison, F.C., et al., Association between maternal body mass index during pregnancy, short-			
7	356		term morbidity, and increased health service costs: a population-based study. BJOG, 2014.			
8	357		121 (1): p. 72-81; discussion 82.			
9	358	3.	Denison, F.C. and C. Chiswick, Improving pregnancy outcome in obese women. Proc Nutr Soc,			
10	359		2011. 70 (4): p. 457-64.			
11	360	4.	Denison, F.C., et al., Increased Maternal BMI is associated with an Increased Risk of Minor			
12	361		Complications during Pregnancy With Consequent Cost Implications. BJOG, 2009. 116(11): p.			
13	362		1467-72.			
14	363	5.	Reynolds, R.M., et al., Maternal and Offspring Outcomes of Pregnancies associated with Severe			
15	364	5.	Obesity: Study design and preliminary data from the Hormones and Inflammation in Obese			
16	365					
17		(<i>Pregnancy Study</i> . J of Developmental Origins of Health and Disease 2009: p. P7A-318.			
18	366	6.	Morgan, K.L., et al., Obesity in pregnancy: a retrospective prevalence-based study on health			
19	367	_	service utilisation and costs on the NHS. BMJ Open, 2014. 4(2): p. e003983.			
20	368	7.	Ghaffari, N., S.K. Srinivas, and C.P. Durnwald, <i>The multidisciplinary approach to the care of the</i>			
21	369		obese parturient. Am J Obstet Gynecol, 2015. 213(3): p. 318-25.			
22	370	8.	Jarvie, E. and J.E. Ramsay, <i>Obstetric management of obesity in pregnancy</i> . Semin Fetal Neonatal			
23	371		Med, 2010. 15 (2): p. 83-8.			
24	372	9.	ACOG Committee Opinion No. 650: Physical Activity and Exercise During Pregnancy and the			
25 26	373		Postpartum Period. Obstet Gynecol, 2015. 126(6): p. e135-42.			
20 27	374	10.	ACOG Practice Bulletin No 156: Obesity in Pregnancy. Obstet Gynecol, 2015. 126(6): p. e112-			
28	375	10.	26.			
20 29	376	11.	Alavi, N., et al., Comparison of national gestational weight gain guidelines and energy intake			
29 30	377	11.	recommendations. Obes Rev, 2013. 14(1): p. 68-85.			
31	378	10				
32		12.	Fitzsimons, K.J. and J. Modder, <i>Setting maternity care standards for women with obesity in</i>			
33	379	10	pregnancy. Semin Fetal Neonatal Med, 2010. 15(2): p. 100-7.			
34	380	13.	RCOG, Management of Women with Obesity in Pregnancy in RCOG CMACE/RCOG, Editor			
35	381		2010, CMACE/RCOG: London.			
36	382	14.	Lutsiv, O., et al., The effects of morbid obesity on maternal and neonatal health outcomes: a			
37	383		systematic review and meta-analyses. Obes Rev, 2015. 16(7): p. 531-46.			
38	384	15.	Network, S.I.G., Management of Diabetes: A national clinical guideline, 2014, Scottish			
39	385		Intercollegiate Guidelines Network: Edinburgh.			
40	386	16.	NICE, Hypertension in pregnancy: diagnosis and management: CG107, 2011.			
41	387	17.	Government, T.S., Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2012. A National Statistics Publication			
42	388	- / •	for Scotland, in National Statistics2012, The Scottish Government.			
43	389	18.	(SIGN), S.I.G.N., <i>Management of Diabetes. SIGN publication no.55</i> , 2001, SIGN: Edinburgh.			
44	390	18. 19.	International Association of D., et al., International association of diabetes and pregnancy study			
45		19.				
46	391		groups recommendations on the diagnosis and classification of hyperglycemia in pregnancy. $D_{1}^{2} = 0$			
47	392	•	Diabetes Care, 2010. 33 (3): p. 676-82.			
48	393	20.	Bonellie, S., et al., Centile charts for birthweight for gestational age for Scottish singleton births.			
49	394		BMC Pregnancy Childbirth, 2008. 8: p. 5.			
50	395	21.	Aune, D., et al., Maternal body mass index and the risk of fetal death, stillbirth, and infant death:			
51	396		a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA, 2014. 311 (15): p. 1536-46.			
52	397	22.	Flenady, V., et al., Stillbirths: the way forward in high-income countries. Lancet, 2011.			
53	398		377 (9778): p. 1703-17.			
54	399	23.	Shah, P.S. and L.B.W.P.T.b. Knowledge Synthesis Group on Determinants of, <i>Parity and low</i>			
55	400		birth weight and preterm birth: a systematic review and meta-analyses. Acta Obstet Gynecol			
56	401		Scand, 2010. 89 (7): p. 862-75.			
57	402	24.	ISD. <i>Stillbirth and Infant Deaths</i> . 2016 [cited 2016 14th November, 2016]; Available from:			
58 59	402	∠⊣.	http://www.isdscotland.org/health-Topics/Maternity-and-Births/Stillbirth-and-Infant-Deaths/.			
59 60	403					
00						

Page 17 of 27

BMJ Open

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

- 404 25. Raatikainen, K., N. Heiskanen, and S. Heinonen, *Under-attending free antenatal care is associated with adverse pregnancy outcomes*. BMC Public Health, 2007. 7: p. 268.
- 406 26. Health, D.o., *Changing childbirth. Part 1: report of the Expert Maternity Group.*, D.o. Health,
 407 Editor 1993, Department of Health: London.
- 407 Editor 1995, Department of Health. London.
 408 27. Health, D.o., National Service Framework for children, young people and maternity services: 7 409 maternity services, 2004, Department of Health: London.
- 8 410 28. Health, D.o., *Matnerity matters: choice, access and continuity of care in a safe service*, 2007,
 9 411 Department of Health: London.
- 1041229.Government, S. A Refreshed Framework for Maternity Care in Scotland. 2011 [cited 2016 24th11413October, 2016]; Available from: http://www.gov.scot/resource/doc/337644/0110854.pdf.
- ¹² 414 30. *Better Births Improving outcomes of maternity services in England*, N.M. Review, Editor 2016.
- ¹³ 415
 ¹⁴ 416
 ¹⁵ 417
 ¹⁴ Dodd, J.M. and C.A. Crowther, *Specialised antenatal clinics for women with a multiple pregnancy for improving maternal and infant outcomes*. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2012(8): p. CD005300.
- 418
 419
 420
 32. Dodd, J.M., T. Dowswell, and C.A. Crowther, Specialised antenatal clinics for women with a multiple pregnancy for improving maternal and infant outcomes. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2015(11): p. CD005300.
- 421 33. Whitworth, M., et al., Specialised antenatal clinics for women with a pregnancy at high risk of
 422 423 preterm birth (excluding multiple pregnancy) to improve maternal and infant outcomes. Cochrane
 Database Syst Rev, 2011(9): p. CD006760.
 - 424 34. Sandall, J., et al., *Midwife-led continuity models versus other models of care for childbearing women.* Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016. 4: p. CD004667.

Support of the state of	linia inamazza	autoom og in	mantaman 1	alagitar
Specialist ci	linic improves	outcomes in	maternal	obesity
1	1			2

429	Table 1:	Demographics of population
120		

		Attenders	Non-attenders	P value
		(n=511)	(n=502)	
	Age (years; mean (SD))	29.8 (5.4)	29.3 (5.5)	0.11
	BMI (kg/m ² ; mean (SD))	44.5 (4.3)	43.2 (3.1)	< 0.001
	Ethnicity (n (%))*			0.35
	White	441 (94.6%)	432 (92.9%)	
	Other	25 (5.4%)	33 (7.1%)	
	Parity (n (%))	· · · ·		< 0.001
	0	235 (46.0%)	125 (24.9%)	
	1	161 (31.5%)	212 (42.2%)	
	2 or more	115 (22.5%)	165 (32.9%)	
	Smoking status (n (%))*	115 (22.570)	105 (52.970)	0.51
	Current	45 (17.2%)	42 (13.7%)	0.01
		63 (24.0%)	79 (25.7%)	
	Former			
	Never	154 (58.8%)	186 (60.6%)	0.07
	Deprivation quintile (n (%)) ¹ *	1 40 (27 - 20)	100 (00 00 ()	0.07
	1	140 (27.7%)	108 (22.2%)	
	2	141 (27.9%)	150 (30.9%)	
	3	95 (18.8%)	107 (22.0%)	
	4	66 (13.1%)	74 (15.2%)	
	5	63 (12.5%)	47 (9.7%)	
	Systolic blood pressure (mmHg; mean (SD))	122 (11.9)	122 (11.1)	0.79
	Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg) ¹	75 (9.0)	75 (8.0)	0.98
434 435				

Page 19 of 27

BMJ Open

Attenders

2 (0.4%)

16 (1.6%)

18 (1.8%)

31 (3.1%)

496 (100%)

129 (26.0%)

N=511

Non-attenders

N=502

12 (2.4%)

11 (1.1%)

16 (1.6%)

25 (2.5%)

356 (73.6%)

61 (12.5%)

P value

0.008

< 0.001

< 0.001

0.27

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Table 2:

Maternal outcomes

Pre-existing co-morbidities

Hypertensive complications

Gestational diabetes*

Type 2 diabetes (n; %)

Pre-eclampsia (n; %)

Prevalence (n; %)

Chronic hypertension (n; %)

Gestational hypertension (n; %)

Screening/diagnostic test performed (n; %)

	Labour and delivery			
	Onset labour (n; %)			0.009
	No labour	111 (21.7%)	109 (21.7%)	
	Spontaneous onset	204 (39.9%)	243 (48.4%)	
	Induction	196 (38.4%)	150 (29.9%)	
	Delivery method (n; %)			
	Elective caesarean	103 (20.2%)	89 (17.7%)	< 0.001
	Emergency caesarean	122 (23.9%)	102 (20.3%)	
	Instrumental	56 (11.0%)	23 (4.6%)	
	Spontaneous vertex	229 (44.9%)	288 (57.4%)	
	Blood loss at delivery (mls; mean (SD))	575 (464)	465 (387)	< 0.001
	Obstetric triage attendances (n; %)			< 0.001
	0	108 (21.1%)	229 (45.6%)	
	1	132 (25.8%)	104 (20.7%)	
	2	93 (18.2%)	70 (13.9%)	
	3 or more	172 (33.7%)	93 (18.5%)	
438	*Denominator excludes women with pre-existing			
439	tertiary referral centre. In attenders and non-atten	ders, the prevale	nce is based on b	lood glucose levels and not the
440	clinical diagnosis recorded in the notes.			
441				
442				
443				
444				
445				

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

446	Table 3:	Offspring outcomes

	Attenders	Non-attenders	Significance
	N=511	N=502	(P value)
Gender (n; %)			0.34
Female	238 (46.6%)	249 (49.6%)	
Male	273 (53.4%)	253 (50.4%)	
Birthweight (g; mean (SD))	3576 (635)	3559 (664)	0.69
Macrosomia ¹ (n; %)	31 (6.1%)	26 (5.2%)	0.54
Low birthweight ² (n; %)	21 (4.1%)	35 (7.0%)	0.04
Gestation (days; mean (SD))	277 (14.1)	277 (14.7)	0.82
Preterm birth ^{3} (n; %)	40 (7.8%)	39 (8.4%)	0.97
Outcome (n; %)			
Livebirth	510 (99.8%)	494 (98.4%)	0.02
Stillbirth	1 (0.2%)	8 (1.6%)	

¹macrosomia defined as birthweight of 4000g or more; ²low birthweight defined as birthweight of 2500g or lower;
 ³preterm birth defined as birth before 259 days gestation.

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

1	452
2	453

3	454	Table 4: Details of stillbirths
1		

Case		Demograph		Risk factors	Outcome	Birthweight	Cause
	Age (years)	Parity	BMI (kg/m ²)			centile ¹	
NA1	31	P2	42	Smoker, type 2 diabetes, RFM	33+5 weeks, male, 2050g	$25^{\text{th}} - 50^{\text{th}}$	Uncontrolled hypertension abruption
NA2	32	P1	42	No risk factors	30+5 weeks, female, 700g,	<3 rd	IUGR, placental insufficiency
NA3	38	P4	42	RFM	37 weeks, male, 2720g,	$10^{th}-25^{th}$	Severe pre-eclampsia, abruption
NA4	32	P2	45	Smoker, RFM	36 weeks, male, 2160g,	$5^{th}-10^{th}$	Acute intra-uterine hypox
NA5	26	P2	47	Smoker, RFM, isolated congenital anomaly	35+5 weeks, female, 2155g,	$10^{th}-25^{th}$	Congenital anomaly
NA6	32	P2	52	Smoker	30+5 weeks, female, 1620g,	$75^{th}-90^{th}$	Abruption
NA7	27	P2	40	Type 2 diabetes, RFM	38+2 weeks, male, 3370g,	$50^{th}-75^{th}$	Poorly controlled diabetes
NA8	21	P0	40	Smoker	26+3 weeks, female, 750g,	$25^{th}-50^{th}$	IUGR, placental insufficiency
A1	20	P1	41	No risk factors	39+5 weeks, male, 3725g,	$50^{th}-75^{th}$	Unexplained
457 RFI	7: NA non-atte M reduced feta natal patholog	ıl movemen		ntrauterine growth res	triction, placental in		
457 RFI 458 peri	M reduced feta	ıl movemen		ntrauterine growth res			

	Item No.	STROBE items	Location in manuscript where items are reported	RECORD items	Location in manuscript where items are reported
Title and abstra	act				
	1	 (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced 	(a) Page 1 (b) Page 4-5	RECORD 1.1: The type of data used should be specified in the title or abstract. When possible, the name of the databases used should be included.	1.1: Lines 52-53
		summary of what was done and what was found		RECORD 1.2: If applicable, the geographic region and timeframe within which the study took place should be reported in the title or abstract.	1.2: Lines 57-58
			evi.	RECORD 1.3: If linkage between databases was conducted for the study, this should be clearly stated in the title or abstract.	1.3: Not applicable
Introduction					
Background rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 6 &7, lines 83 - 111	0	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 6 & 7, lines 106 - 111		
Methods					
Study Design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 7 & 8, lines 117 - 155		
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Page 7, lines 117 - 124		
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study - Give the eligibility criteria, and the	(a) Page 7 & 8, lines 127 – 155	RECORD 6.1: The methods of study population selection (such as codes or	6.1: Lines 152 – 155

The RECORD statement – checklist of items, extended from the STROBE statement, that should be reported in observational studies using routinely collected health data.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

		sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (b) Cohort study - For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> - For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	(b) Page 8, lines 152 - 155	 algorithms used to identify subjects) should be listed in detail. If this is not possible, an explanation should be provided. RECORD 6.2: Any validation studies of the codes or algorithms used to select the population should be referenced. If validation was conducted for this study and not published elsewhere, detailed methods and results should be provided. RECORD 6.3: If the study involved linkage of databases, consider use of a flow diagram or other graphical display to demonstrate the data linkage process, including the number of individuals with linked data at each stage. 	6.2: Not applicable6.3: Not applicable
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.	Page 8 & 9: lines 158 - 189	RECORD 7.1: A complete list of codes and algorithms used to classify exposures, outcomes, confounders, and effect modifiers should be provided. If these cannot be reported, an explanation should be provided.	Page 8 & 9: line 158 - 189
Data sources/ measurement	8	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Page 8 & 9: lines 158 - 189		
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 9: lines 184 - 189		
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was	Page 7: lines 117 -		

Page	24	of	27
------	----	----	----

		arrived at	121		
Quantitative	11	Explain how quantitative	Page 8 & 9: lines		
variables		variables were handled in the	158 - 189		
		analyses. If applicable, describe			
		which groupings were chosen,			
		and why			
Statistical	12	(a) Describe all statistical	(a) – (e) Page 10:		
methods		methods, including those used to	lines 191 - 196		
		control for confounding			
		(b) Describe any methods used to			
		examine subgroups and			
		interactions			
		(c) Explain how missing data			
		were addressed			
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> - If applicable,			
		explain how loss to follow-up			
		was addressed			
		<i>Case-control study</i> - If			
		applicable, explain how matching			
		of cases and controls was			
		addressed	er:		
		Cross-sectional study - If			
		applicable, describe analytical			
		methods taking account of			
		sampling strategy			
		(e) Describe any sensitivity			
		analyses			
Data access and				RECORD 12.1: Authors should	12.1: Page 9, lines
cleaning methods				describe the extent to which the	184 – 189
				investigators had access to the database	
				population used to create the study	
				population.	
				RECORD 12.2: Authors should provide	12.2: Page 9, lines
				information on the data cleaning	184 - 189
				methods used in the study.	
Linkage				RECORD 12.3: State whether the study	12.3: Not
č				included person-level, institutional-	applicable

				level, or other data linkage across two or more databases. The methods of linkage and methods of linkage quality evaluation should be provided.	
Results					
Participants	13	 (a) Report the numbers of individuals at each stage of the study (<i>e.g.</i>, numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed) (b) Give reasons for non- participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram 	(a - b) Page 6: lines 121 – 124 and page 10: lines 200 (c) Not applicable	RECORD 13.1: Describe in detail the selection of the persons included in the study (<i>i.e.</i> , study population selection) including filtering based on data quality, data availability and linkage. The selection of included persons can be described in the text and/or by means of the study flow diagram.	13.1: Page 6: lines 121 – 124 and page 10: lines 200
Descriptive data	14	 (a) Give characteristics of study participants (<i>e.g.</i>, demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> - summarise follow-up time (<i>e.g.</i>, average and total amount) 	 (a) Page 9: lines 199 – 203 (b) Table 1 (c) Not applicable 		
Outcome data	15	Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Page 9 & 10, lines 205 – 235 and Tables 1 - 4		
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates	(a – c): Main results		

		and, if applicable, confounder- adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	section		
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Not applicable		
Discussion					
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 11: lines 238 - 242		
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Page 12: Lines 269 - 281	RECORD 19.1: Discuss the implications of using data that were not created or collected to answer the specific research question(s). Include discussion of misclassification bias, unmeasured confounding, missing data, and changing eligibility over time, as they pertain to the study being reported.	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Page 12: Lines 283 - 298		
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Page 14: lines 300 - 313		

Page	27 of 27	BMJ Open		
4	Other Information	n		
2 3 4 5 6	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 15: lines 338
7 8 9 10 11 12	Accessibility of protocol, raw data, and programming code			

*Reference: Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttmann A, Harron K, Moher D, Petersen I, Sørensen HT, von Elm E, Langan SM, the RECORD Working Committee. The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) Statement. PLoS Medicine 2015; in press.

*Checklist is protected under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

RECORD 22.1: Authors should provide

information on how to access any supplemental information such as the

study protocol, raw data, or

programming code.

22.1

BMJ Open

Does attendance at a specialist antenatal clinic improve clinical outcomes in women with Class III obesity compared to standard care? : a retrospective case-note analysis.

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-015218.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Jan-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Denison, Fiona; The University of Edinburgh , MRC Centre for Reproductive Healht MacGregor, Heather; University of Edinburgh Queen's Medical Research Institute Stirrat, Laura; University of Edinburgh Queen's Medical Research Institute Stevenson, Kerrie; University of Edinburgh Queen's Medical Research Institute Norman, Jane; University of Edinburgh Reynolds, Rebecca; University of Edinburgh,
Primary Subject Heading :	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	Obesity, Stillbirth, low birthweight

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page	1	of	28
1 490		•••	~~

1 2	1	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Does attendance at a specialist antenatal clinic improve clinical outcomes in women with Class III obesity
2 3 4	2	compared to standard care? a retrospective case-note analysis.
5 6	3	
7 8	4	Denison FC [*] , MacGregor H, Stirrat LI, Stevenson, KJ, Norman JE, Reynolds RM
9 10 11	5	
12 13	6	Denison FC: Reader and Honorary Consultant in Maternal and Fetal Health, Tommy's Centre for
14 15	7	Maternal and Fetal Health, University of Edinburgh MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, Queen's
16 17	8	Medical Research Institute, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TY
18 19	9	
20 21 22	10	MacGregor H: Medical Student, University of Edinburgh
23 24	11	
25 26	12	Stirrat LI: Clinical Research Fellow, Tommy's Centre for Maternal and Fetal Health, University of
27 28	13	Edinburgh MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, Queen's Medical Research Institute, 47 Little France
29 30 31	14	Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TY
32 33	15	
34 35	16	Stevenson, KJ: Medical Student, University of Edinburgh
36 37	17	
38 39 40	18	Norman JE: Professor of Maternal and Fetal Health, Tommy's Centre for Maternal and Fetal Health,
40 41 42	19	University of Edinburgh MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, Queen's Medical Research Institute, 47
43 44	20	Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TY
45 46	21	
47 48 40	22	Reynolds RM: Professor of Metabolic Medicine, British Heart Foundation Centre for Cardiovascular
49 50 51	23	Science, Queen's Medical Research Institute, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TY
52 53	24	
54 55	25	Corresponding author:
56 57	26	Dr Fiona Denison
58 59 60	27	Tommy's Centre for Maternal and Fetal Health
00		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1	28	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity MRC Centre for Reproductive Health
2 3 4	29	Queen's Medical Research Institute
5 6	30	Edinburgh
7 8	31	0131 242 6449
9 10	32	Fiona.Denison@ed.ac.uk
$\begin{array}{c} 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 02\\ 12\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 9\\ 03\\ 12\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 89\\ 04\\ 14\\ 23\\ 44\\ 56\\ 47\\ 89\\ 05\\ 15\\ 23\\ 45\\ 56\\ 57\\ 58\\ 58\\ 58\\ 58\\ 58\\ 58\\ 58\\ 58\\ 58\\ 58$	33	

Page 3 of 28

1 2	34	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Abstract
2 3 4 5 6	35	
5 6	36	Objectives: To determine whether attendance at a specialised multidisciplinary antenatal clinic for women
7 8	37	with Class III obesity (BMI>40kg/m ²) is associated with improved clinical outcomes compared to
9 10 11	38	standard antenatal care
12 13	39	
14 15	40	Design: Retrospective cohort study using routinely collected data from electronic patient record
16 17	41	
18 19	42	Setting: Community and hospital based antenatal care
20 21 22	43	
23 24	44	Participants: Women with a singleton pregnancy with Class III obesity booked for antenatal care and
25 26	45	delivered in one of two hospitals in NHS Lothian, Scotland, UK between 2008 – 2014. Maternal and
27 28	46	offspring outcomes were compared in women who attended a specialised obesity clinic (n=511)
29 30	47	compared to standard antenatal care (n=502).
31 32 33	48	
34 35	49	Main Outcome Measures: Included stillbirth, low birthweight, gestational diabetes, induction of labour
36 37	50	and caesarean section.
38 39	51	
40 41 42	52	Results: Compared to standard care, women receiving specialist care were less likely to have a stillbirth
43 44	53	(Odds Ratio (OR), 95% Confidence Interval (CI) 0.12, 0.06-0.97) and a low birthweight baby (OR, 95%
45 46	54	CI 0.57, 0.33-0.99) and more likely to be screened for (100% vs 73.6%; <0.001) and diagnosed with
47 48	55	(26.0% vs 12.5%; p<0.001) gestational diabetes, to require induction of labour (38.4% vs 29.9%,
49 50 51	56	p=0.009), an elective (20.3% vs 17.7%; p<0.001) and emergency (23.9% vs 20.3%; p<0.001) caesarean
52 53	57	section and attend antenatal triage one or more times during pregnancy (77.7% vs 53.1%; p<0.001).
54 55	58	Women attending the specialist clinic had a higher BMI (44.5kg/m ² (4.3) vs 43.2 kg/m ² (3.1); p<0.001)
56 57	59	and were more likely to be nulliparous (46.0% vs 24.9%; p<0.001). There were no other differences in
58 59 60	60	maternal demographic or maternal and offspring outcomes between groups.

1	61	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity
2 3 4	62	Conclusions: Attendance at a specialised antenatal clinic for obesity is associated with reduced rates of
1 2 3 4 5 6	63	stillbirth and low birthweight and improved detection of gestational diabetes. The improvement in clinical
7 8	64	outcomes is associated with an increase in healthcare attendance to obstetric triage and clinical
9 10 11	65	interventions including induction of labour and caesarean section.
12 13	66	
14 15	67	Keywords
16 17	68	Obesity, stillbirth, low birthweight
18 19	69	Obesity, stillbirth, low birthweight
20 21		
22 23		
24 25		
26 27		
28 29		
30		
31 32		
33 34		
35 36		
37		
38 39		
40 41		
42 43		
44		
45 46		
47 48		
49		
50 51		
52		
53 54		
55		
56 57		
58		

Page 5 of 28

BMJ Open

1 2 3 4	70 71 72	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Article Summary - Strengths and limitations of this study
5 6	73	• This study compares maternal and offspring outcomes in women with Class III obesity who attend
7 8 9	74	a specialist obesity antenatal clinic compared to those who received standard care
9 10 11	75	• A strength of our study is that we were able to compare important clinical outcomes in women
12 13	76	and offspring such as stillbirth and low birthweight.
14 15	77	• The use of routinely collected clinical data means that our results are relevant to clinical practice
16 17 18	78	in which multiple different care pathways exist.
19 20	79	• The stillbirth findings and causality need to be interpreted with caution due to the small sample
21 22	80	size and attenuation of findings in adjusted analyses.
23 24	81	• As a retrospective cohort study using routinely collected data from electronic patient record,
25 26 27	82	results must be interpreted with caution because of potential bias from confounding factors.
28 29	83	
30 31	84	
32 33 34	85	
35 36		
37 38		
39 40		
41 42		
43 44		

 $\begin{array}{r} 45\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ 54\\ 55\\ 56\\ 57\\ 58\\ 59\end{array}$

1 2	86	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity Introduction
3 4 5 6	87	Maternal obesity is the most common co-morbidity of pregnancy. In the UK, approximately 20% of
	88	pregnant women are obese and 2% have very severe obesity (Class III obesity, body mass index BMI \geq
7 8 0	89	40 kg/m ²) [1]. Maternal obesity is associated with increased risks for adverse maternal and offspring
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	90	health including gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), thromboembolic and hypertensive complications,
	91	caesarean section, macrosomia and stillbirth [2-5]. Managing these complications has significant cost
	92	implications for delivery of antenatal care [2, 4] [6].
16 17 18	93	
18 19 20	94	There is recognition that obstetric management of the obese should be consultant led and involve a multi-
21 22	95	disciplinary team to improve outcome [7, 8]. These recommendations are embedded in clinical guidelines
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	96	and standards of care produced by a number of countries [8-13]. However, there is a paucity of evidence
	97	demonstrating that multidisciplinary care and adherence to guidelines results in improved maternal and
	98	offspring outcomes in maternal obesity. There is also less consensus about how multidisciplinary care
	99	should be delivered, and a concern that in areas of high obesity prevalence specialist obesity clinics are
	100	unlikely to be feasible due to cost and the numbers of women who would potentially need to be seen [13].
34 35	101	
36 37 38	102	Women with Class III obesity are at particularly high risk of adverse maternal and offspring outcome
39 40	103	[14]. In 2008 we therefore set up a specialist antenatal clinic for women with Class III obesity living in
41 42	104	Edinburgh and the surrounding Lothian area with the aim of improving maternal and offspring outcomes.
43 44	105	At their first antenatal appointment, which is generally prior to 12 weeks gestation, women with a BMI
45 46 47	106	>40kg/m ² are offered referral to the specialist clinic or can choose to continue to receive standard
47 48 49	107	antenatal care. We have a pan-Lothian guideline for clinical management of pregnancies in women with
50 51	108	obesity (Class I, II and III) so that the same care pathway is offered, regardless of who or where it is
52 53	109	delivered. All women with Class III obesity should therefore receive the same standard of care. We
54 55	110	hypothesised that maternal and offspring outcomes would be better in women who had their antenatal
56 57 58	111	care provided by a multidisciplinary specialist clinic as opposed to receiving standard antenatal care. To
59 60	112	test this hypothesis, we undertook a retrospective case-note review of all women with a BMI>40kg/m ²

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 7 of 28

BMJ Open

1 2	113	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity who delivered in Lothian between 2008 and 2014 and compared clinical outcomes in women who
	114	attended for specialist antenatal care compared to those who received standard antenatal care.
3 4 5 6	115	
7 8 9	116	Methods
9 10 11	117	
12 13	118	Study population
14 15	119	
16 17	120	We performed a retrospective case-note review of all women with Class III obesity with a singleton
18 19 20	121	pregnancy who booked for antenatal care and delivered in either of two hospitals in NHS Lothian trust
20 21 22	122	between 2008 and 2014. The Simpson Centre for Reproductive Health at the Royal Infirmary of
23 24	123	Edinburgh is a tertiary referral centre with more than 6,500 deliveries per annum. St John's Hospital,
25 26	124	Livingston, is a district general hospital with approximately 2,600 deliveries per annum. Women were
27 28 29	125	excluded if they had not delivered by the end of December 2014, had a multiple pregnancy (n=28), or
29 30 31	126	booked later than 20 weeks gestation (n=18) because this meant they would have missed the gestational
32 33	127	window for early screening for GDM [15]. This study was an approved by our local audit committee.
34 35	128	
36 37	129	Clinical care pathway

Women attending the specialist clinic at the Simpson Centre for Reproductive Health, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh receive multidisciplinary consultant-led care throughout pregnancy from obstetricians, specialist midwives, diabetologists, anaesthetists, dieticians and other specialists as clinically indicated. At their first appointment (~10-16 weeks gestation), women are reviewed individually by a dietician with specialist expertise in weight management during pregnancy and given tailored advice about healthy eating and weight management during pregnancy. They are advised to have early screening for GDM with a fasting blood glucose between 12-16 weeks and late screening using a 75g oral glucose tolerance test between 24-28 weeks, as per the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines [15]. If a woman has pre-existing Type 2 diabetes or is diagnosed with GDM during pregnancy, her care remains within the specialist clinic. At each visit, women are weighed, counselled about the maternal and offspring risks associated

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

with maternal obesity, and their blood pressure is measured with appropriate sized cuffs. Women are commenced on 75mg aspirin if they have additional risk factors for pre-eclampsia such as a blood pressure of >140/90 mmHg at antenatal booking or primiparity as per national guidelines [16]. All women have postnatal thromboprophylaxis with low molecular weight heparin, with antenatal thromboprophylaxis being commenced if additional risk factors develop [16]. Fetal growth is monitored by serial growth scans at 28, 32 and 36 weeks. All women receive a personalised delivery plan and an anaesthetic review in the third trimester to discuss intrapartum pain management with specific consideration given to obesity related co-morbidities with implications for analgesia and anaesthesia.

Women who do not attend the specialist clinic receive guideline based consultant led care in hospital (tertiary or district general) or community based antenatal clinics. The main difference between specialist and standard care, is that if a woman receiving standard care develops a complication she needs to attend an additional separate specialist clinic, for example a diabetes clinic in the event she develops gestational diabetes. For women who attend the obesity clinic, this care is centralised in a single multi-professional clinic.

6

 To compare maternal and offspring outcomes by antenatal care setting, women were categorised as 'Specialist care' if they attended for two or more appointments at the specialist clinic with the first appointment being before 20 weeks. The rationale for this was that such women would have received early dietary advice and counselling about the importance of attending for early screening for GDM. Women who did not attend the specialist clinic were categorised as receiving 'standard care'.

Data Collection

Maternal and offspring data were acquired from the maternity electronic patient records database TRAK (supplied by Intersystems), clinical biochemistry database APEX (ApexHealthware) and the neonatal unit electronic patient records database BadgerNet (supplied by Clevermed) systems.

Page 9 of 28

BMJ Open

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity The following data were collected from the maternal record at booking: maternal age, BMI (kg/m²). ethnicity (white, other), parity (P0, P1, P2 or more), smoking status (current, former, never), deprivation 6 quintile (a postcode based Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation from 2012 with five groups ranging from most deprived index (1) to least deprived index (5) [17] and systolic and diastolic blood pressure (mmHg). Maternal outcomes collected were hypertension (pre-existing, gestational, pre-eclampsia), diabetes (pre-existing, GDM), onset of labour (no labour, spontaneous onset, induced), delivery method (elective caesarean, emergency caesarean, instrumental, spontaneous vaginal), blood loss at delivery and antenatal obstetric triage attendances. The prevalence of GDM was determined according to (i) the rates of GDM from diagnoses entered into the electronic patient record and (ii) evaluating whether blood glucose values found on the electronic databases conferred a diagnosis of GDM. Diagnostic accuracy of GDM was determined according to Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines which utilised the World Health Organisation (WHO) recommended thresholds [18] until March 2010 when updated thresholds were published based on the International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups [19]. Offspring outcomes collected were gender, birthweight, birthweight centile [20], macrosomia (defined as a birthweight \geq 4000g), low birthweight (defined as a birthweight \leq 2500g), gestation of delivery, preterm birth (defined as birth <259 days gestation) and outcome (livebirth, stillbirth). All data were anonymised with personal identifiers removed before analysis. To maximize accuracy and to minimise missing data all records were reviewed by HM and LS, glucose data was reviewed by KS and LS with any discrepancies reviewed by FD, RR, For stillbirths, a perinatal pathologist examined placental pathology as is routine clinical practice. HM and LS independently identified risk factors and categorised the likely causality of the stillbirths. Stillbirth causation was checked and verified by a third investigator (FD). All investigators were blinded to whether a woman received 'specialist' or 'standard' care until risk factors and likely causality was agreed for all stillbirths.

1 2	194	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity
3 4	195	Statistical Analysis
5 6	196	Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 21. Differences
7 8	197	in the characteristics and clinical outcomes between the women who attended the specialist obesity clinic
9 10 11	198	and those who received standard care were tested using the student's t-test if the variable was continuous
12 13	199	or the chi-squared test for categorical variables. Logistic regression was used to adjust for BMI and
14 15	200	parity. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.
16 17	201	
18 19 20	202	Results
20 21 22	203	Demographics
23 24	204	Maternal demographics are demonstrated in Table 1. Compared to standard care women who attended the
25 26	205	specialist clinic had a higher BMI, and were more likely to be primiparous. There were no differences in
27 28 29	206	age, ethnicity, smoking status, systolic or diastolic blood pressure at booking between attenders and non-
30 31	207	attenders. There was a trend towards deprivation levels being different in those attending for specialist
32 33	208	compared to standard care with more women from both the least and most deprived attending specialist
34 35	209	care.
36 37 38	210	
39 40	211	Maternal outcomes
41 42	212	Maternal outcomes are demonstrated in Table 2. After excluding women with pre-existing Type 1 and
43 44	213	Type 2 diabetes, all women who attended the specialist clinic had a screening test with sufficient
45 46 47	214	information being collected to confirm or exclude a diagnosis of GDM. In contrast, 26.4% (128/484) of
47 48 49	215	those receiving standard care either had no screening test for GDM or insufficient information was
50 51	216	collected for a diagnosis of GDM to be made. The clinical diagnosis of GDM from the patient record
52 53	217	matched the diagnosis from blood glucose levels in all women who attended the specialist clinic. In
54 55	218	contrast, in those receiving standard care, when the notes and actual blood glucose values were compared,
56 57 58	219	the 'wrong' diagnosis was made in 17 women. One woman was incorrectly diagnosed with GDM when
59 60	220	her screening test for GDM was normal. A further 16 woman had a positive diagnostic test for GDM

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 2	221	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity according to glucose values obtained during a glucose tolerance test but the diagnosis was missed and
2 3 4	222	these women were incorrectly labelled as not having GDM (and did not therefore receive treatment).
5 6	223	
7 8 9	224	Compared to those receiving standard care, women who attended the specialist clinic were more likely to
9 10 11	225	have their labour induced, to have a caesarean or instrumental vaginal delivery. Specialist clinic attenders
12 13	226	had a higher blood loss at delivery than those receiving standard care even after adjusting for mode of
14 15	227	delivery, BMI, age and parity (p=0.02). They were also more likely to attend obstetric triage one or more
16 17 18	228	times during pregnancy. Rates of pre-existing chronic hypertension and hypertensive complications
19 20	229	(gestational hypertension and pre-eclampsia) were low in both attenders and non-attenders. Rates of Type
21 22	230	2 diabetes were higher in non-attenders compared to attenders.
23 24	231	
25 26	232	Offspring outcomes
27 28 29	233	The clinical details for the offspring outcomes are demonstrated in Table 3. Compared to standard care,
23 30 31	234	women attending for specialist care were less likely to have a stillbirth (Odds Ratio (OR), 95%
32 33	235	Confidence Interval (CI) 0.12, 0.06-0.97) and a low birthweight baby (OR, 95% CI 0.57, 0.33-0.99). The
34 35	236	lower stillbirth outcomes in women who attended for specialist care were attenuated in analyses adjusting
36 37 28	237	for BMI and parity (adjusted OR (AOR), 95% CI 0.14, 0.02-1.17) but the lower risk of having a low
38 39 40	238	birthweight baby was strengthened in adjusted analyses (AOR, 95% CI 0.52, 0.29-0.93). The clinical
41 42	239	details of the women who had a stillbirth are demonstrated in Table 4. In women attending for standard
43 44	240	care, an additional risk factor for stillbirth was identified in 7 women and a probable cause for stillbirth
45 46	241	was identified in all 8 women. No additional risk factors or cause was identified in the one woman who
47 48 49	242	had a stillbirth who attended the specialist clinic.
49 50 51	243	
52 53	244	Discussion
54 55	245	In this retrospective case-note review, we demonstrated that women with Class III obesity who attended a
56 57	246	specialist multidisciplinary antenatal clinic were less likely to have a stillbirth and low birthweight infant
58 59 60	247	and more likely to be tested, correctly diagnosed with and treated for GDM, and to have an induction of

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

- labour, caesarean section and higher blood loss at delivery compared to those receiving standard antenatal
- care. These differences in outcomes were accompanied by increased attendance at obstetric triage.

 251 Main Findings

A key study finding was that rates of stillbirth and low birthweight were lower in women who attended the clinic compared to those who did. Compared to standard care, women who attended the specialist clinic had a higher BMI, and were more likely to be primiparous. Given that primiparity and higher BMI are independently associated with increased risk of stillbirth and low birthweight [21-23], we expected that rates of stillbirth and low birthweight would be higher in women receiving specialist as compared to standard care. However, we found the converse to be the case, with fewer stillborn and low birthweight babies being born to women attending the specialist clinic, even after adjusting for parity and BMI. We are uncertain why rates of low birthweight are lower in women attending the specialist clinic are lower since there are no differences in the length of gestation or frequency of preterm birth.

The stillbirth rate in women who attended the specialist clinic was 2 per 1000 compared to a rate of 7 per 1000 for women with a BMI>40kg/m² who delivered in Scotland in 2011 - 2012 [24]. To validate this finding, three investigators who were blinded to whether women received specialist or standard care independently checked the stillbirth data. It was striking that additional risk factors were identified in 7 and a cause for stillbirth identified in all 8 women who received standard care and who had a stillbirth but no additional risk factors or cause was identified in the one woman who had a stillbirth who attended the specialist clinic. We accept that rates of unexplained stillbirth are generally reported as being 20 - 25%which is much higher than what we found in our study. We therefore acknowledge the stillbirth findings and causality need to be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size and attenuation of findings in adjusted analyses. However it is tempting to speculate that the continuity of care together with the education of women by the multidisciplinary clinic team raised increased awareness of the importance of risk factors such as reduced fetal movements and this may have led to them presenting earlier to obstetric triage and being induced prior to stillbirth occurring. Future studies such as the AFFIRM clinical trial

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

(NCTT01777022, due to complete in 2017) are designed to address this in the general antenatal

population. 6 Strengths and Limitations A strength of our study is that we were able to compare important clinical outcomes in women and offspring such as stillbirth. We also used routinely collected clinical data meaning that our results are relevant to clinical practice in which multiple different care pathways exist. We accept that a limitation of our study is that this was a retrospective case-note review and our sample size was therefore limited by the study population. For the majority of data fields, other than smoking status (43.8% missing), there was a relatively low proportion of missing data. For the smoking variable, this was due to smoking status not being a mandatory field for recording on the electronic clinical record prior to 2012. The study was also not randomised, so women could choose whether to attend the specialist clinic. However, apart from differences in maternal BMI (albeit a small difference of uncertain clinical significance) and primiparity and a trend towards differences in deprivation status between women who attended for specialist compared to standard care, all other demographic factors were comparable between groups. Given that the clinical outcomes were better in women attending the specialist clinic who were arguably at higher risk than those attending standard care due to their higher BMI and more likely to be primiparous, we believe that our finding that multidisciplinary care improves clinical outcomes in pregnant women with Class III obesity compared to standard care is clinically important. Interpretation In other general and high-risk populations, pregnancy outcomes tend to be worse in women who either under- or do not attend for any antenatal care [25]. However, although we categorised women into women who attended for specialist and standard care this was only in relation to how their antenatal care was organised and not whether they did or did not attend for any antenatal care. In 1993, the landmark Changing Childbirth Report [26], which was built on the 1992 Winterton Report, reversed the official policy that hospital is always the safest place for birth and emphasised the importance of maternal choice.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

control and continuity of carer for women. These recommendations, which were made over 20 years ago are still as relevant today, and frame the rhetoric and delivery of antenatal care across the UK [27-30]. In 6 Lothian, all women receiving community-led care have a named midwife who coordinates their care. This midwife is part of a community team which has a defined case-load. This model ensures that there is continuity of care for a woman at both the individual midwife and midwifery team-level. If a woman is deemed high risk (such as would be the case in women with Class III obesity), she is also designated a named Consultant to oversee her care. Despite this model of continuity of care, our study demonstrates that maternal and offspring outcomes are better in women who attend a hospital based specialist clinic compared to those who receive standard antenatal care. Although specialist clinics have been advocated as a way of improving maternal and offspring outcomes, there is currently a paucity of evidence from randomised controlled trials about the benefits and harms of specialist antenatal clinics compared with standard antenatal care for women [31]. For example, systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials have concluded that there is currently limited information to assess the role of specialist antenatal clinics for women with a multiple pregnancy [32] and no clear evidence that specialist clinics reduce the number of preterm births [33]. Given that the antenatal care pathway followed was the same in women who attended the specialist clinic and those who received standard care, it is not clear why maternal and offspring outcomes were better in women who attended the specialist clinic. A recent systematic review by Sandall et al. highlighted the importance of continuity of care, demonstrating that pregnant women receiving midwife-led continuity models of care had at least comparable clinical outcomes and were likely to experience less intervention [34]. It is therefore plausible that the continuity of care that the specialist multidisciplinary team provided enabled compromised pregnancies to be identified more accurately and interventions such as induction of labour to be targeted more appropriately compared to those women receiving standard care. It is also possible that staff providing standard antenatal care have less experience of Class III obesity and poorer access to appropriate facilities and equipment which may have adversely impacted their ability to provide optimal antenatal care to these high risk women.

1	329	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity							
2 3 4	330	Conclusion							
5 6	331	In summary, our study demonstrates that attendance at a multidisciplinary specialist antenatal clinic							
7 8	332	improves maternal and offspring outcomes in women with Class III obesity. This challenges current							
9 10	333	recommendations that women with very Class III obesity can be effectively managed outside a specialist							
11 12 13	334	service. Further research is needed to identify the most appropriate and economic model of care for							
14 15	335	women with Class III obesity to optimise maternal and offspring outcomes.							
16 17	336								
18 19	337	Acknowledgements							
20 21 22	338	We would like to acknowledge Mr Allyn Dick for assistance in extracting the clinical data from maternity							
23 24	339	TRAK.							
25 26	340								
27 28	341	Copyright							
29 30 31	342	The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all							
32 33	343	authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and							
34 35	344	media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store							
36 37	345	the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include							
38 39 40	346	within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any							
40 41 42	347	other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution,							
43 44	348	v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be							
45 46	349	located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.							
47 48 49	350								
49 50 51	351	Disclosure of Interests							
52 53	352	The authors have no interests to disclose.							
54 55	353								
56 57	354	Contribution to authorship							
58 59 60									
00		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml							

		•
1 2	355	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity FD and RR conceived the study and drafted the paper. FD, HM, LS, KS, JN and RR designed the study.
2 3 4	356	FD, HM, LS, KS and RR acquired and analysed the data. All authors interpreted the data, revised the
5 6	357	paper critically for important intellectual content and approved the final version.
7 8	358	
9 10 11	359	Details of Ethics Approval
12 13	360	This study was an approved by our local audit committee.
14 15	361	
16 17	362	Data Sharing
18 19	363	No additional data available
20 21 22	364	
22 23 24	365	Funding
25 26	366	We acknowledge funding from Tommy's the Baby Charity. This work was carried out in the MRC
27 28	367	Centre for Reproductive Health: Centre Grant MRC MR/N022556/1
29 30		
31 32		
33 34		
35 36		
37 38		
39 40		
41 42		
43 44		
45 46		
47 48		
49 50		
51 52		
53		
54 55		
56 57		
58		
59 60		

Page 17 of 28

1	368	Speci Refer	alist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity ences
2 3			
4	369	1.	Report, C.f.M.a.C.E., Maternal obesity in the UK: findings from a national project, in Centre for
5	370		Maternal and Child Enquiries2010: Chiltern Court, 188 Baker Street, London, NW1 5SD.
6	371	2.	Denison, F.C., et al., Association between maternal body mass index during pregnancy, short-
7	372		term morbidity, and increased health service costs: a population-based study. BJOG, 2014.
8	373	_	121 (1): p. 72-81; discussion 82.
9	374	3.	Denison, F.C. and C. Chiswick, Improving pregnancy outcome in obese women. Proc Nutr Soc,
10	375		2011. 70 (4): p. 457-64.
11	376	4.	Denison, F.C., et al., Increased Maternal BMI is associated with an Increased Risk of Minor
12 13	377		Complications during Pregnancy With Consequent Cost Implications. BJOG, 2009. 116(11): p.
14	378		1467-72.
15	379	5.	Reynolds, R.M., et al., Maternal and Offspring Outcomes of Pregnancies associated with Severe
16	380		Obesity: Study design and preliminary data from the Hormones and Inflammation in Obese
17	381		Pregnancy Study. J of Developmental Origins of Health and Disease 2009: p. P7A-318.
18	382	6.	Morgan, K.L., et al., Obesity in pregnancy: a retrospective prevalence-based study on health
19	383		service utilisation and costs on the NHS. BMJ Open, 2014. 4(2): p. e003983.
20	384	7.	Ghaffari, N., S.K. Srinivas, and C.P. Durnwald, The multidisciplinary approach to the care of the
21	385		obese parturient. Am J Obstet Gynecol, 2015. 213(3): p. 318-25.
22	386	8.	Jarvie, E. and J.E. Ramsay, <i>Obstetric management of obesity in pregnancy</i> . Semin Fetal Neonatal
23 24	387		Med, 2010. 15 (2): p. 83-8.
24 25	388	9.	ACOG Committee Opinion No. 650: Physical Activity and Exercise During Pregnancy and the
26	389		Postpartum Period. Obstet Gynecol, 2015. 126(6): p. e135-42.
27	390	10.	ACOG Practice Bulletin No 156: Obesity in Pregnancy. Obstet Gynecol, 2015. 126(6): p. e112-
28	391		26.
29	392	11.	Alavi, N., et al., Comparison of national gestational weight gain guidelines and energy intake
30	393		recommendations. Obes Rev, 2013. 14(1): p. 68-85.
31	394	12.	Fitzsimons, K.J. and J. Modder, Setting maternity care standards for women with obesity in
32	395		pregnancy. Semin Fetal Neonatal Med, 2010. 15(2): p. 100-7.
33 34	396	13.	RCOG, Management of Women with Obesity in Pregnancy in RCOG CMACE/RCOG, Editor
34 35	397		2010, CMACE/RCOG: London.
36	398	14.	Lutsiv, O., et al., The effects of morbid obesity on maternal and neonatal health outcomes: a
37	399		systematic review and meta-analyses. Obes Rev, 2015. 16(7): p. 531-46.
38	400	15.	Network, S.I.G., Management of Diabetes: A national clinical guideline, 2014, Scottish
39	401		Intercollegiate Guidelines Network: Edinburgh.
40	402	16.	NICE, Hypertension in pregnancy: diagnosis and management: CG107, 2011.
41	403	17.	Government, T.S., Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2012. A National Statistics Publication
42	404		for Scotland, in National Statistics2012, The Scottish Government.
43 44	405	18.	(SIGN), S.I.G.N., Management of Diabetes. SIGN publication no.55, 2001, SIGN: Edinburgh.
44	406	19.	International Association of, D., et al., International association of diabetes and pregnancy study
46	407		groups recommendations on the diagnosis and classification of hyperglycemia in pregnancy.
47	408		Diabetes Care, 2010. 33 (3): p. 676-82.
48	409	20.	Bonellie, S., et al., Centile charts for birthweight for gestational age for Scottish singleton births.
49	410		BMC Pregnancy Childbirth, 2008. 8: p. 5.
50	411	21.	Aune, D., et al., Maternal body mass index and the risk of fetal death, stillbirth, and infant death:
51	412		a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA, 2014. 311 (15): p. 1536-46.
52	413	22.	Flenady, V., et al., Stillbirths: the way forward in high-income countries. Lancet, 2011.
53 54	414		377 (9778): p. 1703-17.
54 55	415	23.	Shah, P.S. and L.B.W.P.T.b. Knowledge Synthesis Group on Determinants of, Parity and low
55 56	416		birth weight and preterm birth: a systematic review and meta-analyses. Acta Obstet Gynecol
57	417		Scand, 2010. 89 (7): p. 862-75.
58	418	24.	ISD. Stillbirth and Infant Deaths. 2016 [cited 2016 14th November, 2016]; Available from:
59	419		http://www.isdscotland.org/health-Topics/Maternity-and-Births/Stillbirth-and-Infant-Deaths/.
60			

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

- Raatikainen, K., N. Heiskanen, and S. Heinonen, Under-attending free antenatal care is 25. associated with adverse pregnancy outcomes. BMC Public Health, 2007. 7: p. 268.
- 26. Health, D.o., Changing childbirth. Part 1: report of the Expert Maternity Group., D.o. Health, Editor 1993, Department of Health: London.
- 27. Health, D.o., National Service Framework for children, young people and maternity services: maternity services, 2004, Department of Health: London.
- Health, D.o., Matnerity matters: choice, access and continuity of care in a safe service, 2007, 28. Department of Health: London.
- 29. Government, S. A Refreshed Framework for Maternity Care in Scotland. 2011 [cited 2016 24th October, 2016]; Available from: http://www.gov.scot/resource/doc/337644/0110854.pdf.
- Better Births - Improving outcomes of maternity services in England, N.M. Review, Editor 2016. 30.
- Dodd, J.M. and C.A. Crowther, Specialised antenatal clinics for women with a multiple 31. pregnancy for improving maternal and infant outcomes. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2012(8): p. CD005300.
- Dodd, J.M., T. Dowswell, and C.A. Crowther, Specialised antenatal clinics for women with a 32. multiple pregnancy for improving maternal and infant outcomes. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2015(11): p. CD005300.
 - Whitworth, M., et al., Specialised antenatal clinics for women with a pregnancy at high risk of 33. preterm birth (excluding multiple pregnancy) to improve maternal and infant outcomes. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2011(9): p. CD006760.
 - Sandall, J., et al., Midwife-led continuity models versus other models of care for childbearing 34. women. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016. 4: p. CD004667.

ago 10 of 29

445 446	Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maTable 1:Demographics of population			
3 -		Specialist (n=511)	Standard (n=502)	P value
5	Age (years; mean (SD))	29.8 (5.4)	29.3 (5.5)	0.11
	BMI (kg/m ² ; mean (SD))	44.5 (4.3)	43.2 (3.1)	< 0.001
	Ethnicity (n (%))*			0.35
	White	441 (94.6%)	432 (92.9%)	
`	Other	25 (5.4%)	33 (7.1%)	
)	Parity (n (%))			< 0.001
	0	235 (46.0%)	125 (24.9%)	
2	1	161 (31.5%)	212 (42.2%)	
3	2 or more	115 (22.5%)	165 (32.9%)	
4	Smoking status (n (%))*			0.51
5 6	Current	45 (17.2%)	42 (13.7%)	
7	Former	63 (24.0%)	79 (25.7%)	
3	Never	154 (58.8%)	186 (60.6%)	
)	Deprivation quintile $(n (\%))^{1*}$			0.07
)	1	140 (27.7%)	108 (22.2%)	
	2	141 (27.9%)	150 (30.9%)	
2	3	95 (18.8%)	107 (22.0%)	
3	4	66 (13.1%)	74 (15.2%)	
4	5	63 (12.5%)	47 (9.7%)	
5	Systolic blood pressure (mmHg; mean (SD))	122 (11.9)	122 (11.1)	0.79
6	Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg) ¹	75 (9.0)	75 (8.0)	0.98

m deprivation quintile. Missing data is high from smoking as this was not a mandatory field on the electronic record until 2012; ¹deprivation quintile where 1 is the most and 5 the least deprived.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1
2
2
3
4
5
6
7
0
0
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15
16
17
12
10
19
20
-345678910123415167890212234256789011233456789013233456789011234567890112345678901323345678901323345678
22
23
20
24
25
26
27
28
20
29
30
31
32
33
24
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
50 51
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
50

2	Table 2:Maternal outcomes			
8		Specialist N=511	Standard N=502	P value
	Pre-existing co-morbidities	N=311	11-302	
	Type 2 diabetes (n; %)	2 (0.4%)	12 (2.4%)	0.008
	Hypertensive complications	2 (0.170)	12 (2.170)	0.27
	Chronic hypertension (n; %)	16 (1.6%)	11 (1.1%)	0.27
	Gestational hypertension (n; %)	18 (1.8%)	16 (1.6%)	
	Pre-eclampsia (n; %)	31 (3.1%)	25 (2.5%)	
	Gestational diabetes*	01 (0.170)	20 (2.070)	
	Screening/diagnostic test performed (n; %)	496 (100%)	356 (73.6%)	< 0.001
	Prevalence (n; %)	129 (26.0%)	61 (12.5%)	< 0.001
	Labour and delivery			
	Onset labour (n; %)			0.009
	No labour	111 (21.7%)	109 (21.7%)	
	Spontaneous onset	204 (39.9%)	243 (48.4%)	
	Induction	196 (38.4%)	150 (29.9%)	
	Delivery method (n; %)	~ /	· · · ·	
	Elective caesarean	103 (20.2%)	89 (17.7%)	< 0.001
	Emergency caesarean	122 (23.9%)	102 (20.3%)	
	Instrumental	56 (11.0%)	23 (4.6%)	
	Spontaneous vertex	229 (44.9%)	288 (57.4%)	
	Blood loss at delivery (mls; mean (SD))	575 (464)	465 (387)	< 0.001
	Obstetric triage attendances (n; %)			< 0.001
	0	108 (21.1%)	229 (45.6%)	
	1	132 (25.8%)	104 (20.7%)	
	2	93 (18.2%)	70 (13.9%)	
	3 or more	172 (33.7%)	93 (18.5%)	
ŀ	*Denominator excludes women with pre-existing			
	tertiary referral centre. In women who attended			evalence is based of
)	glucose levels and not the clinical diagnosis rec	corded in the notes.		
7				
3				
)				
)				
-				

Page 21 of 28

BMJ Open

a	• 1• /	1	•		, 1	1 .
- N	necialist	clinic	improves	outcomes in	maternal	obesity
0	pecialist	onno	mproves	outcomes m	maternar	obesity

Offspring outcomes

1 462 2 463

Table 3:

	Specialist	Standard	Significance
	N=511	N=502	(P value)
Gender (n; %)			0.34
Female	238 (46.6%)	249 (49.6%)	
Male	273 (53.4%)	253 (50.4%)	
Birthweight (g; mean (SD))	3576 (635)	3559 (664)	0.69
Macrosomia ¹ (n; %)	31 (6.1%)	26 (5.2%)	0.54
Low birthweight ² $(n; \%)$	21 (4.1%)	35 (7.0%)	0.04
Gestation (days; mean (SD))	277 (14.1)	277 (14.7)	0.82
Preterm birth ³ (n; %)	40 (7.8%)	39 (8.4%)	0.97
Outcome (n; %)			
Livebirth	510 (99.8%)	494 (98.4%)	0.02
Stillbirth	1 (0.2%)	8 (1.6%)	

¹macrosomia defined as birthweight of 4000g or more; ²low birthweight defined as birthweight of 2500g or lower;
 ³preterm birth defined as birth before 259 days gestation.

Specialist clinic improves outcomes in maternal obesity

Demogra Age (years) 31	aphics Parity P2	BMI (kg/m ²) 42	Risk factors	Outcome	Birthweight centile ¹	Cause
(years) 31	-	(kg/m^2)			centile ¹	
31	P2		<u>G 1 4 2</u>			
			Smoker, type 2 diabetes, RFM	33+5 weeks, male, 2050g	$25^{\text{th}} - 50^{\text{th}}$	Uncontrolled hypertension abruption
32	P1	42	No risk factors	30+5 weeks, female, 700g,	<3 rd	IUGR, placental insufficiency
38	P4	42	RFM	37 weeks, male, 2720g,		Severe pre-eclampsia, abruption
32	P2	45	Smoker, RFM	36 weeks, male, 2160g,		Acute intra-uterine hypoxi
26	P2	47	Smoker, RFM, isolated congenital anomaly	35+5 weeks, female, 2155g,	$10^{th} - 25^{th}$	Congenital anomaly
32	P2	52	Smoker	30+5 weeks, female, 1620g.	$75^{th}-90^{th}$	Abruption
27	P2	40	Type 2 diabetes, RFM	38+2 weeks,	$50^{th}-75^{th}$	Poorly controlled diabetes
21	PO	40	Smoker	26+3 weeks,	$25^{th}-50^{th}$	IUGR, placental insufficiency
20	P1	41	No risk factors	39+5 weeks,	$50^{th}-75^{th}$	Unexplained
	32 26 32 27 21 20 Key: ST s reduced for	32 P2 26 P2 32 P2 27 P2 21 P0 20 P1 Key: ST specialist, S	32 P2 45 26 P2 47 32 P2 52 27 P2 40 21 P0 40 20 P1 41 Key: ST specialist, S standard, reduced fetal movements, IUGH	32P245Smoker, RFM26P247Smoker, RFM, isolated congenital anomaly32P252Smoker27P240Type 2 diabetes, RFM21P040Smoker20P141No risk factorsKey: ST specialist, S standard, ¹ birthweight centile de reduced fetal movements, IUGR intrauterine growth reduced	38P442RFM37 weeks, male, 2720g,32P245Smoker, RFM36 weeks, male, 2160g,26P247Smoker, RFM, isolated congenital anomaly35+5 weeks, female, 2155g, anomaly32P252Smoker30+5 weeks, female, 1620g,27P240Type 2 diabetes, RFM38+2 weeks, female, 3370g,21P040Smoker26+3 weeks, female, 750g,20P141No risk factors39+5 weeks, male, 3725g,Key: ST specialist, S standard, ¹ birthweight centile defined by (Bonellie reduced fetal movements, IUGR intrauterine growth restriction, placental	38P442RFM37 weeks, male, $2720g$, $10^{th} - 25^{th}$ $2720g$,32P245Smoker, RFM36 weeks, male, $2160g$, $5^{th} - 10^{th}$ $2160g$,26P247Smoker, RFM, isolated congenital anomaly $35+5$ weeks, female, 2155g, $30+5$ weeks, $75^{th} - 90^{th}$ female, 1620g,32P252Smoker $30+5$ weeks, female, 1620g,27P240Type 2 diabetes, RFM $38+2$ weeks, male, $3370g$,21P040Smoker $26+3$ weeks, female, $750g$, 20 20P141No risk factors male, $3725g$,Key: ST specialist, S standard, ¹ birthweight centile defined by (Bonellie et al., 2008); B reduced fetal movements, IUGR intrauterine growth restriction, placental insufficiency

Page 23 of 28

BMJ Open

	Item No.	STROBE items	Location in manuscript where items are reported	RECORD items	Location in manuscript where items are reported
Title and abstra	ict				
	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced	(a) Page 1 (b) Page 4-5	RECORD 1.1: The type of data used should be specified in the title or abstract. When possible, the name of the databases used should be included.	1.1: Lines 52-53
		summary of what was done and what was found		RECORD 1.2: If applicable, the geographic region and timeframe within which the study took place should be reported in the title or abstract.	1.2: Lines 57-58
			evi.	RECORD 1.3: If linkage between databases was conducted for the study, this should be clearly stated in the title or abstract.	1.3: Not applicable
Introduction					
Background rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 6 &7, lines 83 - 111	0	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 6 & 7, lines 106 - 111		
Methods				·	
Study Design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 7 & 8, lines 117 - 155		
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Page 7, lines 117 - 124		
Participants	6	<i>(a) Cohort study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the	(a) Page 7 & 8, lines 127 – 155	RECORD 6.1: The methods of study population selection (such as codes or	6.1: Lines 152 – 155

The RECORD statement – checklist of items, extended from the STROBE statement, that should be reported in observational studies using routinely collected health data.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

		 sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants <i>(b) Cohort study</i> - For matched studies, give matching criteria and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> - For matched 	(b) Page 8, lines 152 - 155	algorithms used to identify subjects) should be listed in detail. If this is not possible, an explanation should be provided. RECORD 6.2: Any validation studies of the codes or algorithms used to select the population should be referenced. If validation was conducted for this study and not published elsewhere, detailed methods and results should be provided. RECORD 6.3: If the study involved linkage of databases, consider use of a flow diagram or other graphical display to demonstrate the data linkage process, including the number of individuals with linked data at each stage.	6.2: Not applicable6.3: Not applicable
Variables	7	 studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential 	Page 8 & 9: lines 158 - 189	RECORD 7.1: A complete list of codes and algorithms used to classify	Page 8 & 9: lines 158 - 189
		confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.		exposures, outcomes, confounders, and effect modifiers should be provided. If these cannot be reported, an explanation should be provided.	
Data sources/ measurement	8	 For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group 	Page 8 & 9: lines 158 - 189		
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 9: lines 184 - 189		
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was	Page 7: lines 117 -		

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

46

		arrived at	121		
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen,	Page 8 & 9: lines 158 - 189		
Statistical methods	12	and why (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) Cohort study - If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed Case-control study - If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed Cross-sectional study - If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	(a) – (e) Page 10: lines 191 - 196		
Data access and cleaning methods				RECORD 12.1: Authors should describe the extent to which the investigators had access to the database population used to create the study population. RECORD 12.2: Authors should provide information on the data cleaning	12.1: Page 9, lines 184 – 189 12.2: Page 9, lines 184 - 189
Linkage				methods used in the study. RECORD 12.3: State whether the study included person-level, institutional-	12.3: Not applicable

				level, or other data linkage across two or more databases. The methods of linkage and methods of linkage quality	
				evaluation should be provided.	
Results					
Participants	13	 (a) Report the numbers of individuals at each stage of the study (<i>e.g.</i>, numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed) (b) Give reasons for non- participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram 	(a - b) Page 6: lines 121 – 124 and page 10: lines 200 (c) Not applicable	RECORD 13.1: Describe in detail the selection of the persons included in the study (<i>i.e.</i> , study population selection) including filtering based on data quality, data availability and linkage. The selection of included persons can be described in the text and/or by means of the study flow diagram.	13.1: Page 6: lines 121 – 124 and page 10: lines 200
Descriptive data	14	 (a) Give characteristics of study participants (<i>e.g.</i>, demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> - summarise follow-up time (<i>e.g.</i>, average and total amount) 	 (a) Page 9: lines 199 203 (b) Table 1 (c) Not applicable 		
Outcome data	15	Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Page 9 & 10, lines 205 – 235 and Tables 1 - 4		
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates	(a – c): Main results		

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

		and, if applicable, confounder- adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	section		
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Not applicable		
Discussion			•		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 11: lines 238 - 242		
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Page 12: Lines 269 - 281	RECORD 19.1: Discuss the implications of using data that were not created or collected to answer the specific research question(s). Include discussion of misclassification bias, unmeasured confounding, missing data, and changing eligibility over time, as they pertain to the study being reported.	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Page 12: Lines 283 - 298		
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Page 14: lines 300 - 313		

Other Information						
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 15: lines 338			
Accessibility of protocol, raw data, and programming code				RECORD 22.1: Authors should provide information on how to access any supplemental information such as the study protocol, raw data, or programming code.	22.1	

*Reference: Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttmann A, Harron K, Moher D, Petersen I, Sørensen HT, von Elm E, Langan SM, the RECORD Working Committee. The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) Statement. *PLoS Medicine* 2015; in press.

*Checklist is protected under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.