Clinical Practice Guideline for the Care of Women with Decreased Fetal Movements

Developed in partnership with:

Endorsed by:

10 August 2017

Produced by:

This clinical guideline was produced by a multidisciplinary working group led by the Mater Research Institute, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, under the auspices of the Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Alliance (SANDA) of the Perinatal Society of Australia and New Zealand (PSANZ) in partnership with the Centre of Research Excellence in Stillbirth and the Stillbirth Foundation Australia. Support for guideline development was received from the Mater Foundation, Brisbane.

Endorsed by:

The clinical guideline has been endorsed by: Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RANZCOG); Australian College of Midwives (ACM); Stillbirth Foundation Australia; Australian National Council for Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Support (SANDS); Red Nose; Women's Healthcare Australasia; and Still Aware.

Suggested citation:

Gardener G, Daly L, Bowring V, Burton G, Chadha Y, Ellwood D, Frøen F, Gordon A, Heazell A, MacDonald S, Mahomed K, Norman JE, Oats J, Flenady V. *Clinical practice guideline for the care of women with decreased fetal movements*. Centre of Research Excellence in Stillbirth. Brisbane, Australia, August 2017.

Disclaimer:

The main objective of this guideline is to provide advice to health care providers on the care of women with concerns of decreased fetal movements (DFM), and to enhance consistency in information and care provided to women. This guideline has been developed to help reduce the risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes, including perinatal death or disability and maternal anxiety.

This guideline is not intended to be prescriptive. It is designed to provide the best available information, enabling integration of the best evidence, clinicians' judgement and individual choice in arriving at decisions about care. Clinical practice guidelines are considered as generally-recommended practice. Due to the lack of high-quality evidence, recommendations in this guideline are mainly consensus-based, following consideration of the available evidence.

E-learning program

An eLearning program has been developed to familiarise clinicians with the guidelines. Please contact the Centre of Research Excellence in Stillbirth to request access.

Further review and information:

This guideline will remain current until the next review on or before **August 2018**. Requests for further information, comments or suggestions are encouraged and can be forwarded to:

Centre of Research Excellence in Stillbirth
Mater Research Institute
Level 3, Aubigny Place
South Brisbane, QLD 4101 Australia
Phone +61 7 3163 1592
Email: stillbirthcre@mater.uq.edu.au

Table of Contents

Glossary of terms

Acidaemia	Increased acidity of the blood caused by an increased concentration of hydrogen ions and measured by pH.
Amniotic fluid	The fluid that surrounds the fetus within the amniotic sac.
Antenatal	The period of the pregnancy before birth
Antepartum	Before the onset of labour.
Apgar score	A system to assess the status of the baby after birth. The Apgar score is recorded at 1 minute and 5 minutes after birth and is based on the following five variables: heart rate, respiratory effort, muscle tone, reflex irritability and colour, with a maximum score of 10.
Body mass index (BMI)	A person's weight in kilograms divided by the square of height in meters.
Cardiotocography (CTG)	The electronic monitoring of the fetal heart rate (cardio) and of uterine contractions (toco). The fetal heart rate is recorded by means of either an external ultrasonic abdominal transducer or a fetal scalp electrode. Uterine contractions are recorded by means of an abdominal pressure transducer. The recordings are graphically represented over time.
Congenital anomaly	A structural malformation, chromosomal abnormality, genetic syndrome or metabolic disorder which is present from birth.
Customised birthweight	Using a weight reference for the baby that is individualised (customised), and not based on population averages. Factors shown to be predictive of birthweight are maternal height and weight, ethnicity, fetal gender and gestational age. The customised birthweight standard is an adjusted standard for the individual baby.
Doppler ultrasound	A diagnostic tool that uses high frequency ultrasound to detect the presence or absence of blood flow and to measure blood flow velocity.
Fetal death	See “Stillbirth”
Fetal to maternal haemorrhage (FMH)	The passage of blood across the placental interface from the fetus to mother. FMH may be diagnosed using flow cytometry or the Kleihauer test which detects fetal red blood cells separately to the mother’s red blood cells. FMH may be acute or chronic and may be asymptomatic. Although the volume of significant FMH is not defined and is gestational age dependent, it is associated with fetal mortality and morbidity.
Fetal growth restriction (FGR)	Also known as ‘intrauterine growth restriction’ (IUGR). This term is often used interchangeably with the term ‘small for gestational age’ (SGA). SGA is defined as a baby with an antenatal ultrasound biometry assessment less than the 10th percentile for gestational age. FGR refers to babies that have failed to reach their growth potential during pregnancy, which can be assessed by serial ultrasound scans. They are frequently *but not always* SGA.

Flow cytometry	A test used to detect FMH by differentiating fetal and maternal blood cells.
Gestation	The time from conception to birth. The duration of gestation is measured from the first day of the last normal menstrual period.
Human placental lactogen (hPL)	hPL is a hormone produced by the placenta that modifies the metabolic state of the mother during pregnancy to facilitate the energy supply of the fetus.
Hypertension	Elevated blood pressure exceeding 140/90 mmHg.
Hypoglycaemia	Low level of blood glucose (<4.0 mmol/L).
Hyperglycaemia	High level of blood glucose (>7.0 mmol/L when fasting or >11.0 mmol/L at any time).
Kick-chart	A method of counting fetal movements and recording them within a defined time frame.
Live birth	The complete expulsion or extraction from its mother of a product of conception, irrespective of the duration of the pregnancy, which after such separation breathes or shows any other evidence of life, such as beating of the heart, pulsation of the umbilical cord or definite movement of the voluntary muscles, whether or not the umbilical cord has been cut or the placenta is attached. The definition of a live birth is independent of gestational age.
Neonatal	Pertaining to the newborn period, which is the first 28 days after birth.
Neonatal mortality rate (NMR)	The number of neonatal deaths (those occurring within the first 28 days following birth) per 1000 births.
Oligohydramnios	Reduced amniotic fluid volume
Perinatal mortality rate (PMR)	The number of stillbirths and neonatal deaths per 1000 births.
Preterm birth	The birth of a baby at less than 37 weeks gestational age.
Randomised controlled trial	A comparative study in which participants are randomly allocated to intervention and control groups and are followed up to examine differences in outcomes between the two groups.
Small for gestational age (SGA)	A fetus or baby with an estimated birthweight or actual birthweight less than the 10^{th} percentile for gestational age, according to National birthweight percentiles.
Singleton	A single baby.
Stillbirth (Fetal Death)	Death prior to the complete expulsion or extraction from its mother of a product of conception of 20 or more completed weeks of gestation; or if the gestational age is not known, a birthweight of 400g or more. The death is indicated by the fact that after such separation, the fetus does not breathe or show any other evidence of life, such as beating of the heart, pulsation of the umbilical cord, or definite movement of voluntary muscles.
Stillbirth rate	The number of stillbirths per 1000 births.

1. Purpose of this guideline

Stillbirth affects over 2,500 families in Australia and New Zealand[1, 2], and over 2.64 million families worldwide annually[3]. Stillbirths are often preceded by maternal perception of decreased fetal movement (DFM)[4, 5]. DFM is also strongly linked to adverse perinatal outcomes such as neurodevelopmental disability, infection, fetal to maternal haemorrhage (FMH), emergency delivery, umbilical cord complications, small for gestational age (SGA) and fetal growth restriction (FGR)[6, 7]. Decreased fetal movements for some women may be associated with placental dysfunction, which could lead to fetal growth restriction and/or stillbirth[8]. While evidence is still emerging in this area, some studies indicate that a reduction in stillbirth rates may be achieved by increasing maternal, clinician and community awareness about the importance of DFM.

This guideline has been developed on behalf of the Perinatal Society of Australia and New Zealand (PSANZ) in recognition of the variation in clinical practice and information provided to women regarding decreased fetal movements (DFM)[9, 10].

1.1 Aims and objectives

The aim of this guideline is to improve the quality of care for women with DFM, and has been developed with the following objectives:

- Provide an evidence-based approach to the management of women with DFM;
- Improve consistency in the management of women with DFM;
- Assist health care providers to counsel women with DFM;
- Reduce maternal anxiety about fetal activity and self-monitoring;
- Aid in the identification of women with higher-risk pregnancy; and
- Improve outcomes for women and their babies.

The management of women with specific pregnancy conditions identified during the course of care, in accordance with this guideline (e.g. fetal growth restriction, hypertension, diabetes), is beyond the scope of this guideline, as is the management of DFM in multiple pregnancy.

1.2 Target audience

This guideline targets health care professionals providing antenatal care in Australia and New Zealand and encourages them to provide consistent, best-practice management for women with singleton pregnancies who report or who are concerned about DFM in the third trimester of pregnancy. Pregnant women and their partners may also find this guideline helpful.

An information brochure has also been prepared in multiple languages to inform and assist women and their health care providers to facilitate shared management decisions. This brochure is based on the key recommendations set out in this guideline. More information is available at https://sanda.psanz.com.au/resources/pregnancy.

1.3 Methods

These clinical guidelines have utilized the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) guidelines for the development of clinical practice guidelines[11, 12]. Refer to Appendix B for methods of guideline development, Appendix C for an overview of the literature review, and Appendix D for evaluation criteria of evidence levels and grading of recommendations.

2. Summary of clinical practice recommendations and care pathway

2.1 Recommendations for fetal movement monitoring

Recommendations	Evidence level and references*	Recommendation grade*
Recommendation 1		
a. All pregnant women should be routinely provided with verbal and written information regarding normal fetal movements during the antenatal period. This information should include a description of the changing patterns of movement as the fetus develops and normal wake/sleep cycles. b. Clinicians should emphasise the importance of maternal awareness of fetal movements at each clinical visit.	III-3 9, 13	**C** **√**
Recommendation 2		
Women with a concern about decreased fetal movements should be advised to contact their health care provider immediately.	III-3 4, 6, 13	**C**
Recommendation 3		
a. Maternal concern of DFM overrides any definition of DFM based on numbers of fetal movements. b. The use of kick-charts is not currently recommended as part of routine antenatal care.	III-3 3, 6, 13, 14 I 15	**√** **B**

2.2 Recommendations for the investigation of decreased fetal movements

Recommendations	Evidence level and references*	Recommendation grade*
Recommendation 4		
a. When a woman reports DFM, assessment of the woman and her fetus should be undertaken as soon as possible. b. This assessment should preferably be undertaken within 2 hours.	III-3 9, 13, 16, 17 13	**B** **√**
Recommendation 5		
a. Women who report DFM should be assessed for the presence of other risk factors associated with an increased risk of stillbirth. b. Women with DFM in combination with other risk factors should be managed as a high-risk pregnancy.	III-3 4	**C** **√**

Recommendations	Evidence level and references*	Recommendation grade*
Recommendation 6		
Clinical assessment of a woman with DFM should include review of symphysis-fundal height measurements.		**√**
Recommendation 7		
a. A CTG should be performed to exclude immediate fetal compromise. b. Further evaluation is recommended for women with any abnormal CTG pattern.	III-3 13, 16, 18	**C** **√**
Recommendation 8		
Ultrasound scan assessment for fetal biometry and amniotic fluid volume should be considered as part of the preliminary investigation of a woman reporting DFM.	III-3 4, 6, 13, 16, 18, 19	**B**
Recommendation 9		
Ultrasound scan assessment should include evaluation of fetal morphology if this has not already been performed.	III-2 13	**C**
Recommendation 10		
Where an ultrasound scan assessment for DFM is indicated, the timeframe to perform this investigation will be guided by the clinical circumstances and availability of appropriate expertise.		**√**
Recommendation 11		
Testing for fetal to maternal haemorrhage should be considered in the preliminary investigation of women with DFM.	20	**√**
Recommendation 12		
In the presence of a normal clinical assessment (including a CTG and ultrasound), if maternal concern of DFM persists, specialist medical opinion should be sought and further management should be individualised.	21	**√**

* Appendix D offers a description of evidence classification levels and grading of recommendations used in this guideline.

2.3 Care pathway for women presenting with decreased fetal movements from 28 weeks' gestation

Disclaimer: This algorithm is for general guidance only and is subject to a clinician's expert judgement. The algorithm should not be relied on as a substitute for clinical advice.



2.4 Clinical practice points for women presenting with decreased fetal movements from 28 weeks' gestation

Advice to pregnant women

- Be aware of baby's movements daily
- Provide PSANZ patient information brochure (https://sanda.psanz.com.au/parent-centre/pregnancy/)
- Women with concerns about decreased or absent fetal movements should be advised to contact their health care provider immediately.
- Women with concerns about decreased or absent fetal movements should be assessed by a health care provider immediately.

Risk factors for stillbirth

- Previous stillbirth
- Fetal growth restriction and Small for gestational age
- Antepartum haemorrhage
- Diabetes
- Hypertension
- Parity of 0 or >3
- Advanced maternal age (>35 years)
- IVF
- Indigenous ethnicity
- Maternal obesity (BMI >25)
- Smoking or illicit drug use
- Low socioeconomic status

Examination

- Abdominal palpation to assess uterine tone & tenderness, fetal lie/presentation
- Symphyseal fundal height (SFH) to be measured in centimetres & plotted on growth chart
- Handheld ultrasound Doppler is recommended, not auscultation with a stethoscope or Pinards.
- Record maternal pulse rate & confirm as different to fetal heart rate.
- Blood pressure and temperature.

CTG

- Perform within 2 hours of presentation
- Perform for at least 20 mins or until satisfactory.
- Use maternal fetal movement recorder during CTG

Ultrasound

- Consider ultrasound within 24 hours.
- Include fetal biometry, amniotic fluid volume, and morphology (if not already performed).
- Placental and fetal Doppler assessment, as indicated.
- The timeframe to perform this investigation will depend on the clinical circumstances and availability of appropriate expertise.

Fetal to maternal haemorrhage

- Perform Kleihauer test or flow cytometry test, where feasible.
- MCA Doppler assessment may be performed where expertise in ultrasonography is available.

3. Background

3.1 Maternal perception of fetal movement and adverse events

Maternal perception of fetal movement has long been used as an indicator of fetal wellbeing and vitality[22]. The quality and timing of fetal movements reflects neurobehavioural development and maturation of the fetus, and follows a general pattern with advancing gestation[23, 24]. Maternal perception of fetal movement tends to commence from 16 to 20 weeks gestation[25], with these first movements described as a "flutter", "butterflies" or "bubbles"[24]. As pregnancy progresses, description of movements changes to reflect increasing strength, more complex limb and trunk movements and greater frequency[24]. In a qualitative study of 40 women within 2 weeks of delivery of uncomplicated pregnancies, 39 of the women described the fetal movements at this stage as "strong and powerful", and half described the fetal movements as "large"[26, 27].

Studies conducted on the correlation between maternal perception of fetal movements and fetal movements seen on ultrasound scans demonstrated large variations, with correlation rates between maternal perception and actual fetal movement ranging from 16-90%[28-31]. This variation may be related to a number of factors, including fetal size, specific movement patterns of the baby[25], gestational age, amniotic fluid volume, medications, fetal sleep state, anterior placentation, smoking and parity[32-35]. Whilst the type of fetal movements may change as pregnancy advances in the third trimester, evidence does not support that the number of fetal movements decreases as pregnancy advances or prior to the onset of labour[13].

Other considerations that complicate the interpretation of fetal health based on the number of fetal movements are the limited understanding of patterns of fetal activity during "sleep" and active cycles, and the changes in the type of movements as pregnancy advances. Fetal movements are usually absent during fetal "sleep" cycles. Fetal "sleep" cycles occur regularly throughout the day and night and usually last 20 to 40 minutes[33, 34], rarely exceeding 90 minutes in a healthy fetus[17, 33, 34]. It is important to note that that this information should be shared with partners, family and friends so that they too can understand the importance of fetal movements.

Maternal perception of a gradual diminishment of fetal activity can indicate pregnancies at increased risk of adverse outcomes. Studies have reported associations between DFM and low birth weight[16, 36-43], oligohydramnios, preterm birth[36, 44], threatened preterm labour[36], congenital malformations and chromosomal abnormalities[45], fetal to maternal haemorrhage[46], perinatal brain injuries and disturbed neurodevelopment[47, 48], intrauterine infections[49], low Apgar scores and acidaemia[37, 39], hypoglycaemia[36], umbilical cord complications and placental insufficiency[8, 16, 42], emergency delivery, induction of labour and Caesarean section, stillbirths and neonatal deaths[50-54].

Fetal growth restriction appears to be a major factor contributing to the increased risk of adverse outcomes in these pregnancies[16, 51, 55-59]. A case-control study from the UK reported that FGR was present in 11% of women with DFM compared with 0% in the control group[19], suggesting that persistent DFM may alert clinicians to the presence of FGR. A case-control study of 18,000 births across 6 maternity hospitals in Queensland, Australia found that of pregnant women in the third trimester who reported decreased fetal movement, 16% of these had a baby with FGR[28].

DFM is a common cause for maternal concern, with 40 percent of pregnant women overall expressing concern about DFM one or more times during pregnancy[60], and 4-16% of women contacting their health care provider because of concern during the third trimester[13, 61, 62]. Even in pregnancies that are initially deemed as low risk, DFM is associated with the risk of adverse perinatal outcome, including fetal growth restriction (FGR), preterm birth and stillbirth[16, 35, 36, 53, 57, 61, 63]. A

prospective, population-based study in Norway reported a fetal death rate in women who had a live fetus at time of presentation with DFM was 8.2 per 1000, compared to 2.9 per 1000 in the general population[50].

3.2 Perinatal mortality in Australia and New Zealand

Stillbirth affects over 2,500 families per year across Australia and New Zealand[1, 2]. One baby is stillborn for every 142 births across Australia[64]. Fetal death rates have failed to show any significant reduction for more than a decade[65], while the decline in perinatal and neonatal mortality rates in high income countries is largely attributed to advances in neonatal care[66].

Both Australia and New Zealand report fetal deaths from 20 weeks (or weight of ≥ 400 grams if gestation unknown), and neonatal deaths up to 28 days after birth. In Australia, this is reported as a *perinatal mortality rate* and in New Zealand it is reported as a *perinatal related mortality rate*.

Based on 2014 data from the National Perinatal Statistics Unit in Australia, there were 312,548 births and 2,986 perinatal deaths in Australia, giving a perinatal mortality rate (PMR) of 9.6 per 1000 births[64]. Perinatal mortality comprised 2,200 stillbirths and 786 neonatal deaths, giving a stillbirth rate of 7 per 1000 births and a neonatal death rate of 3 per 1000 births[64]. The PMR of babies born to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander mothers was higher than that of babies born to non-Indigenous mothers (14 versus 9 per 1000 births)[2].

In New Zealand in 2014, there were 58,647 births and 656 perinatal deaths, giving a perinatal – related mortality rate of 11.2 per 1000 births. Fetal death rates in New Zealand in 2014 were 8.1 per 1000 births, and neonatal death rates were 3.1 per 1000 births[1]. The overall perinatal-related mortality rate per 1000 births for Māori (12.83), Pacific peoples (14.12) and Indian (16.20) mothers is significantly higher than among Other Asian (7.70), Other (9.57) and New Zealand European (10.35) mothers[1].

Across various studies, the wide variation in the reported contribution of *unexplained* stillbirths from 15%[67] to 71%[68] has been attributed to varying classification systems used, thoroughness of the investigation of deaths and the various definitions of stillbirth[69]. The large proportion of unexplained antepartum stillbirths[70] is a major barrier to further reduction of stillbirth and perinatal mortality rates. The majority of these unexplained deaths occur in late gestation in apparently healthy pregnancies. Many of these babies are, however, found to be growth-restricted after birth[71, 72], indicating potential for the prevention of some of these deaths if antenatal detection and appropriate intervention had been achieved.

Other factors which are associated with an increased risk of stillbirth in a high-income country setting include: maternal age older than 35 years; maternal overweight and obesity; maternal smoking; primiparity; previous stillbirth; and pre-existing maternal diabetes or hypertension[73] (see Appendix A).

3.3 Clinical assessment of fetal movement concerns

Despite the apparent increased risk associated with maternal perception of DFM, a Norwegian study reported that one in four women could not recall having received any information about fetal movements during routine antenatal care[9]. Furthermore, existing guidelines on antenatal care[74, 75], whilst acknowledging the importance of DFM, provide little guidance on what constitutes a clinically significant decrease in fetal movements, nor what is the best practice for management of DFM.

Wide variation in clinical practice regarding the management of DFM was shown in a recent survey of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RANZCOG)[10], as well as in a similar survey for midwives in Australia and New Zealand[76]. These surveys revealed that, although monitoring fetal activity through asking women about fetal movements was

considered an important part of routine antenatal care, the definition of alarm limits, the level of clinical assessment and the follow-up of women presenting with DFM varied widely.

These findings are consistent with other similar surveys from the UK[77] and Norway[50]. Variation in clinical practice was also confirmed in another Australian study[28]. In this clinical audit of practice across six public hospitals in Queensland, 6-8% of pregnant women reported concern about DFM. Whilst the majority of these women were investigated by CTG, the use of ultrasound scan in the initial assessment of these women varied widely amongst clinicians.

Contributing factors relating to suboptimal care account for 30-50% of stillbirths and neonatal deaths[68, 78, 79]. A number of studies in Norway identified that an inappropriate response to maternal perception of DFM was a common factor contributing to stillbirths[78-80]. Prolonged DFM (>24 hours) as well as sudden loss of fetal movements was shown in 47%-64% of all stillbirths[80, 81]. Stillbirths which are preceded by a decrease in fetal activity form an important group on which to focus future research and prevention strategies towards reducing stillbirth rates.

3.4 Investigations of DFM prior to 28 weeks' gestation

There is currently insufficient evidence to inform the management of women who report DFM prior to 28 weeks gestation. Between 20 and 28 weeks gestation, conditions predisposing to DFM, e.g. fetal neuromuscular abnormalities, fetal anaemia, fetal hydrops and fetal growth restriction, may be unrecognised clinically. Fetal ultrasound to assess fetal biometry and amniotic fluid should be considered. CTG prior to 28 weeks can be difficult to interpret due to fetal immaturity and is not routinely recommended. Testing for FMH can also be undertaken by a Kleihauer test or flow cytometry. Where facilities and expertise are available, assessment for fetal anaemia can be undertaken by Doppler ultrasound of the fetal middle cerebral artery blood flow velocity.

4. Defining DFM and maternal perception of fetal activity

Recommendations	Evidence level and references	Recommendation grade
Recommendation 1		
a. All pregnant women should be routinely provided with verbal and written information regarding normal fetal movements during the antenatal period. This information should include a description of the changing patterns of movement as the fetus develops and normal wake/sleep cycles. b. Clinicians should emphasise the importance of maternal awareness of fetal movements at each clinical visit.	III-3 9, 13	**C** **√**
Recommendation 2		
Women with a concern about decreased fetal movements should be advised to contact their health care provider immediately.	III-3 4, 6, 13	**C**

Attempts have been made to define normal patterns of fetal movements, but there is no universally-agreed definition of DFM. One definition of DFM comes from Moore et al who propose "less than 10 movements within 2 hours when the fetus is active"[14]. This is also the currently recommended alarm

limit adopted by the American Academy of Paediatrics and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists[75].

In a study of women with normal, uncomplicated pregnancies, 99% of women were able to feel 10 movements within 60 minutes[50]. Another study of 705 women with low-risk pregnancy aimed to establish a reference value for perceived fetal movements in the second half of pregnancy. Using a modified "count to 10" method to perceive fetal movement, it found that 98% of women gave satisfactory recordings, with 90% of women perceiving 10 movements within 25 minutes at 22-36 weeks gestation, and within 35 minutes at 37-40 weeks[82].

Antenatal education about fetal movement has been shown to reduce the time from maternal perception of DFM to health care-seeking behaviour[13]. A reduction in stillbirth rates has been associated with increased awareness of DFM in a recent quality improvement study in Norway[9, 13]. The study used a prospective "before-and-after" study design to evaluate the combined impact of providing women with information on DFM, and clinicians with clinical practice guidelines on DFM. This combined intervention was associated with a reduction in stillbirth rates, giving an adjusted odds ratio (OR) of 0.67 (95% CI: 0.49-0.94) in the overall study population and an adjusted OR of 0.51 (95% CI: 0.32-0.81) in women with DFM.

However, despite this link between maternal awareness of fetal movement, clinical education and stillbirth prevention, many women do not receive adequate information from their care providers[83, 84]. A recent prospective, descriptive study of 526 pregnant women at a large, metropolitan maternity facility found that more than one-third of women at 34 weeks gestation or later did not recall receiving information from their health care provider about fetal movement[85]. Pregnant women preferred to be given as much information as possible, and cited health professionals as a trustworthy source.

Women with DFM who ask for advice are often told that their baby may respond with movements within 20 minutes after having something sweet to eat, or after having an icy, cold drink. However, there is no evidence available to support this advice. Fetal movements have been shown not to be altered by intravenous glucose administration, or by a recent meal[86-89].

5. The role of formal fetal movement counting

Recommendation 3	Evidence level and references	Recommendation grade
a. Maternal concern of DFM overrides any definition of DFM based on numbers of fetal movements.	III-3 3, 6, 13, 14	√
b. The use of kick-charts is not currently recommended as part of routine antenatal care.	I 15	B

A recent Cochrane review assessed the effect of formal fetal movement counting on perinatal death, major morbidity, maternal anxiety and satisfaction, pregnancy intervention and other adverse pregnancy outcomes, using five randomised trials, involving a total of 71,458 women[15]. Two of the included studies assessed a once-a-day fetal movement counting method with standard care as a control[90, 91]. Two studies compared two different fetal movement counting methods[92, 93].

The largest study included in this review was the cluster-randomised trial by Grant *et al*[90] comparing formal fetal movement counting (using the Cardiff method) versus no instruction to monitor fetal movements. The control group in this study included selective use of counting based on clinician

preference. The review authors concluded that there was not enough evidence to recommend or not recommend formal fetal movement counting for all women or for women at increased risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes, and recommended further research in this area.

The large trial by Grant et al[90] contributing largely to the Cochrane Review findings, however, deserves closer review. This multicentre cluster randomised controlled trial was conducted to investigate the role of fetal movement counting in 68,654 women of at least 28 weeks gestation. When compared to women receiving standard antenatal care (including an informal query about fetal movements during antenatal clinic visits), this study found no significant reduction in the stillbirth rates in women undertaking daily fetal movement counting using a "kick-chart". There was, however, a trend towards more antenatal admissions in the fetal movement counting group than in the control group. Further, there was an increased use of other fetal testing methods, with more women having cardiotocography in the fetal movement counting group than in the group where movement counting was selective.

Although the trial was subject to some methodological bias due to the use of "within hospital" clusters, the overall stillbirth rate of the intervention and the control group combined fell during the study period from 4 per 1000 to 2.8 per 1000 births. It is postulated that this may be attributed to increased maternal awareness and vigilance toward DFM[61, 90]. There was some evidence of an indirect benefit of fetal movement counting as some of the deaths in the fetal movement counting group occurred as a result of suboptimal clinical management following presentation with a live fetus[90].

A meta-analysis of three trials, including 1893 women with at-risk pregnancies provided with "kick-charts", illustrated a strong association between fetal growth restriction and DFM (OR 6.34, 95% CI 4.19-9.58)[61]. A recent literature review[94] of interventions to reduce stillbirth recommended routine fetal movement counting for high risk pregnancies only, especially where there is evidence of FGR. However, this recommendation is limited due to the studies upon which it is based. Limitations of two studies[95, 96] include the methodology used (non-randomised studies), the small numbers enrolled and changes in the population and in practice which may have occurred since these studies were undertaken; both of which were conducted in the late 1980s.

However, a more recent study in Norway demonstrated that a modified count-to-10 method of fetal movement counting may have contributed to a significant increase in antenatal detection of fetal growth restriction[91]. A multi-centre, randomized controlled trial of 1,076 pregnant women, assigned to either perform fetal movement counting from gestational week 28, or to receive standard antenatal care (controls), found that 87% of growth-restricted fetuses were identified antenatally in the intervention group, compared to 60% identified antenatally in the control group, with no increase in consultations or obstetric interventions. This trial also corroborates previous findings that fetal movement counting has not proven to increase maternal concern, anxiety, or risk of being examined in hospital[9].

This finding dispels the concern about the introduction of formal fetal movement counting as a part of routine antenatal care, related to its potential to result in an increased number of antenatal hospital visits, interventions and costs without additional benefit. In line with the trend of increased interventions shown in the Grant trial[90], another review of three case-controlled studies reported that the proportion of women requesting an antenatal visit based on complaints about DFM increased minimally, from 6.7 to 8.8%[61]. Monitoring of fetal movements in that population increased the number of antenatal visits in pregnancy by 2-3 visits per 100 pregnancies.

6. Which investigations should be undertaken for DFM?

6.1 Fetal heart rate monitoring

Recommendations	Evidence level and references	Recommendation grade
Recommendation 4		
a. When a woman reports DFM, assessment of the woman and her fetus should be undertaken as soon as possible. b. This assessment should preferably be undertaken within 2 hours.	III-3 9, 13, 16, 17 13	**B** **√**
Recommendation 5		
a. Women who report DFM should be assessed for the presence of other risk factors associated with an increased risk of stillbirth. b. Women with DFM in combination with other risk factors should be managed as a high-risk pregnancy.	III-3 4	**C** **√**
Recommendation 6		
Clinical assessment of a woman with DFM should include review of symphysis-fundal height measurements.		**√**
Recommendation 7		
a. A CTG should be performed to exclude immediate fetal compromise. b. If suspected fetal compromise on CTG, seek urgent medical review	III-3 13, 16, 18	**C** **√**

The first step in the management of DFM is to ensure the fetus is alive and not in imminent danger of death. Once death is excluded, any coincidental associated pathology should also be excluded as a possible cause for DFM.

A handheld Doppler can immediately confirm the presence of a fetal heartbeat. In doubtful cases, cardiotocography (CTG) may be required to detect a fetal heart beat and to establish the fetal heart rate (FHR) pattern. In both situations, a fetal heartbeat needs to be differentiated from the maternal heartbeat. This is done, in most cases, by noting the difference between the FHR and the maternal pulse rate. If the presence of a fetal heart beat is not confirmed, or if still in doubt, then an immediate ultrasound scan assessment of fetal cardiac activity should be undertaken. Once fetal death is excluded, a CTG can assess for any signs of immediate fetal compromise.

The presence of a normal FHR pattern (i.e. showing accelerations in fetal heart rate coinciding with fetal movements and the absence of decelerations) is a positive indicator of fetal wellbeing and suggests a normally functioning autonomic nervous system[97]. The fetal heart rate (FHR) accelerates with 92-97% of all gross body movements felt by the mother[98, 99]. Other FHR patterns may or may

not be associated with fetal compromise. For example, a "flat" FHR pattern showing reduced variability (<5bpm) may be present during the sleep cycle of a healthy fetus but is more likely to be associated with fetal compromise if it lasts for >90 minutes[100-102]. If fetal compromise is suspected on CTG, an urgent medical review should be sought.

Although CTG has become part of clinical practice, a Cochrane review[103] comprising 4 trials and 1588 women did not confirm or refute any benefits for routine antepartum CTG monitoring of "at-risk" pregnancies. However, the authors acknowledge several limitations of this review, including the small numbers of women studied, methodological concerns, and also the fact that these trials were conducted in the early 1980s when these tests were first introduced into clinical practice. However, a 2011 retrospective, population-based cohort study of women presenting with maternal perception of DFM during the third trimester found that the CTG was a reliable screening indicator of fetal wellbeing, and that abnormal pregnancy outcomes were more common when the initial CTG was abnormal or persistently non-reassuring[104].

Recent non-randomised studies have reported benefits of screening low- and at-risk pregnancies using CTG monitoring for the indication of DFM. For example, in a Norwegian study of 3014 women reporting DFM, a CTG was performed in 97.5% of cases and an abnormal result was detected in 3.2%[105]. In an observational study of women presenting with DFM who underwent CTG and an ultrasound scan, 21% had an abnormal result that required action and 4.4% required immediate delivery[16]. Another study showed that stillbirth rates (corrected for lethal congenital anomalies), after a normal and abnormal CTG, were 1.9 and 26 per 1000 births, respectively[106]. Although the evidence on the effectiveness of CTG monitoring in the identification of "at-risk" babies remains inconclusive, the use of CTG as a screening tool can be justified, as an abnormal FHR pattern may be associated with poor outcomes[107].

6.2 Ultrasound scans for DFM

Recommendations	Evidence level and references	Recommendation grade
Recommendation 8		
Ultrasound scan assessment for fetal biometry and amniotic fluid volume should be considered as part of the preliminary investigation of a woman reporting DFM.	III-3 4, 6, 13, 16, 18, 19	**B**
Recommendation 9		
Ultrasound scan assessment should include evaluation of fetal morphology if this has not already been performed.	III-2 13	**C**
Recommendation 10		
Where an ultrasound scan assessment for DFM is indicated, the timeframe to perform this investigation will be guided by the clinical circumstances and availability of appropriate expertise.		**√**

Although evidence is currently lacking to recommend ultrasound assessment for all cases of women presenting with DFM, ultrasonography may be used for the detection of conditions that contribute

to DFM. A prospective cohort study of 305 women reporting DFM found that of the 67 pregnancies with poor perinatal outcomes, 4 were identified by CTG, 20 by ultrasound assessment of fetal growth, amniotic fluid volume and umbilical artery Doppler, and a further 24 were identified by low hPL level in the absence of any other abnormality[43].

In a prospective cohort study of 3014 women with DFM[105], detection of an abnormality using ultrasound (FGR, reduced amniotic fluid volume or fetal abnormality) was reported in 11.6%. The CTG in this study was abnormal in only 3.2% of cases and an abnormal umbilical artery Doppler was noted in 1.9%.

A recent Cochrane Review comprising 18 studies and over 10,000 women concluded that the use of Doppler ultrasound of the fetal umbilical artery in high-risk pregnancies reduced the risk of perinatal deaths and resulted in fewer obstetric interventions[108]. However, the review cautioned that current evidence was not of high quality and further studies were required.

In a Norwegian study[13], an investigation protocol of CTG and ultrasound scan was used in the management of women reporting DFM. The study recommended that both investigations should be performed within 2 hours if women reported *no fetal movements* and within 12 hours if they reported *decreased fetal movements*. In this study, the ultrasound scan was conducted to assess fetal biometry, amniotic fluid volume, and fetal anatomy. The addition of umbilical artery Doppler studies in the investigation protocol did not show any further benefit.

Although the number of ultrasound scans more than doubled (OR 2.64, 95% CI 2.02-3.45), this appeared to be offset by a reduction in additional follow-up consultations and admissions for induction of labour[13]. The study reported no increase in the number of preterm births, infants requiring transfer to neonatal care, or infants with severe neonatal depression or fetal growth restriction. Importantly, a significant reduction in perinatal mortality was shown (OR 0.51, 95%CI 0.32-0.81).

Another study of 489 women reporting DFM[18] demonstrated that women reporting DFM, but no other pregnancy risk factor, did not require further follow-up once the CTG and the amniotic fluid volume were confirmed as normal. An ultrasound scan was performed to assess amniotic fluid. Women reporting DFM were 3.7 times more likely to have reduced amniotic fluid volume compared to women without DFM.

6.3 Fetal to maternal haemorrhage and DFM

Recommendation 11	Evidence level and references	Recommendation grade
Testing for fetal to maternal haemorrhage should be considered in the preliminary investigation of women with DFM.	[20]	√

Insignificant haemorrhage of fetal blood into the maternal circulation is common and usually unrecognised[20]; but when significant (i.e. acute large volume FMH, recurrent small/moderate FMH or chronic small volume loss over time) it can lead to fetal compromise and/or perinatal death. Massive fetal to maternal haemorrhage (FMH) (varying from >50mls to >150mls) has been demonstrated in approximately 4% of stillbirths and in 0.04% of neonatal deaths[109, 110]. Moderate to severe FMH occurs in around 0.3% of all live births[20]. However, there is ambiguity over the definition of a

clinically relevant volume of haemorrhage, as the rate of blood loss, chronicity of the bleed and gestational age of the fetus may also influence the risk of adverse perinatal outcome[111].

Clinical risk factors do not reliably predict the likelihood of massive fetal to maternal haemorrhage [110] and DFM may be the only history suggesting this possibility[20, 109, 112-114]. A retrospective analysis of clinical data from a multihospital health care system in the U.S. found that decreased or absent fetal movement was reported by pregnant women in 54% of FMH cases and was the most common presenting sign[115]. An earlier review had found decreased or absent fetal movement reported as the presenting symptom of 27% of all FMH cases published in the medical literature to 1997[46].

A sinusoidal FHR pattern is the classically described CTG sign indicating severe fetal anaemia[109], however, this is not present in all cases. A recent study demonstrated that among a population associated with severe fetal anaemia, only 12.5% of cases demonstrated a sinusoidal pattern[115]. A normal CTG therefore cannot exclude significant fetal anaemia and the only "suspicious" CTG signs may be reduced or absent variability[116].

It is suspected that a higher number of FMH cases are unreported, as in miscarriages or undiagnosed intrauterine fetal death. A recent study also found that FMH diagnosis is highly dependent on physician awareness of the condition. The incidence of diagnosed FMH in a large urban hospital, prior to an educational intervention for neonatologists, was 22 per 1000 anaemic neonates, compared to 182 per 1000 afterwards[117].

Testing for FMH from a sample of the mother's blood is widely available by flow cytometry or the Kleihauer test. Where ultrasound facilities and appropriate expertise are available, assessment for fetal anaemia can be undertaken by Doppler measurement of the fetal middle cerebral artery (MCA) velocity. If FMH is suspected or proven on flow cytometry or Kleihauer test, CTG or ultrasound, specialist medical review is recommended.

7. Ongoing maternal concern about DFM

Recommendation 12	Evidence level and references	Recommendation grade
In the presence of a normal clinical assessment (including a CTG and ultrasound), if maternal concern of DFM persists, seek medical review and further management should be individualised.	[21]	✓

Following exclusion of fetal compromise at an initial episode of DFM, maternal concern of DFM may persist or may result in subsequent consultations for DFM. To date, few studies guide the management of women who have ongoing concern about DFM. A small retrospective study, involving 203 women, showed that women with more than one presentation of DFM were at increased risk of poor pregnancy outcomes[21]. A larger retrospective cohort study in the UK, involving 1234 women reporting DFM beyond 36 weeks' gestation, found that 16.6% of these had more than one presentation for DFM. Of women with repeated DFM episodes, 44% birthed a SGA baby, and they were also more likely to have had high second-trimester uterine artery Doppler resistance indices[118]. This study concluded that women presenting with repeated DFM episodes should be considered at high risk for placental dysfunction irrespective of antenatal ultrasound or Doppler assessment results.

While research is limited, with the potential for increased risk, closer surveillance should be considered for women with ongoing concerns of DFM. Any management strategy for DFM needs to take into account the presence of other risk factors and the gestational age. A decision to deliver needs to be weighed against the risks to the mother and baby at that particular gestation[65].

8. Discussion: Implementation and future research

Leading international authorities have recommended that women experiencing DFM should notify their health care providers as soon as reasonably possible. However, beyond this recommendation, there is limited guidance for clinicians on how to manage this presentation, resulting in much variation amongst clinicians with regards to appropriate clinical management. Cochrane reviews related to fetal movement counting and management of reported decreased fetal movements recommend further research in this area[15, 119]. This guideline was developed to promote clinical practice which is based on the best available international evidence, thereby improving information and counselling offered to women during the antenatal period and reducing variation in clinical practice in Australia and New Zealand.

The recommendations of this guideline cover two key areas: 1) information for pregnant women about what constitutes normal fetal movements and advice about reporting concerns of a reduction in fetal movements to a health care provider; and 2) information for clinicians with regards to the management and investigation of women reporting DFM. In the absence of robust research in this area, the thirteen key recommendations are largely based on consensus after careful consideration of the available evidence.

Improving the consistency and standard of information provided to pregnant women on fetal movements and on the significance of reporting decreased fetal movements is likely to reduce anxiety associated with DFM and, more importantly, may lead to timely intervention and a reduction in stillbirths. The findings of a Norwegian study[13] are encouraging in their demonstration of a reduction in the stillbirth rate by one-third following the implementation of a guideline and the provision of information about fetal movements to pregnant women.

The working party emphasises the importance of well-designed studies in order to develop and test appropriate screening tools which identify “at-risk” pregnancies on the basis of fetal movement. Further high-quality randomised controlled trials are needed to determine appropriate intervention strategies for women with DFM. Other outcomes which should be examined in future trials include maternal anxiety and morbidity, health care utilisation and costs. Trials should be adequately powered to examine the effect on perinatal mortality and major neonatal morbidity. Support for such research has been indicated by a recent survey of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists in Australia and New Zealand[10].

Two large stepped-wedge, cluster-randomized trials currently underway will likely impact guidelines to support women experiencing a decrease in fetal movement. These trials in Scotland (AFFIRM study)[120] and Australia/New Zealand (My Baby’s Movements)[121] hypothesise to reduce stillbirth rates through a package of interventions to a) increase pregnant women’s awareness of fetal movement and prompt timely reporting of a decrease in fetal movement; and b) strengthen clinical management plans for women presenting to hospital with decreased fetal movements.

9. References

1. Perinatal and Maternal Mortality Review Committee (PMMRC). Tenth Annual Report of the Perinatal and Maternal Mortality Review Committee: Reporting Mortality 2014. Wellington: Health Quality and Safety Commission, 2016 Contract No.: ISBN 978-0-908345-29-8 (Print)
2. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Australia's mothers and babies 2014—in brief. Canberra: AIHW, 2016.
3. Cousens S, Blencowe H, Stanton C, Chou D, Ahmed S, Steinhardt L, et al. National, regional, and worldwide estimates of stillbirth rates in 2009 with trends since 1995: a systematic analysis. Lancet. 2011;377(9774):1319-30.
4. Froen JF. A kick from within--fetal movement counting and the cancelled progress in antenatal care. J Perinat Med. 2004;32(1):13-24.
5. Erlandsson K, Lindgren H, Davidsson-Bremborg A, Radestad I. Women's premonitions prior to the death of their baby in utero and how they deal with the feeling that their baby may be unwell. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2012;91(1):28-33.
6. Froen JF, Tveit JV, Saastad E, Bordahl PE, Stray-Pedersen B, Heazell AE, et al. Management of decreased fetal movements. Semin Perinatol. 2008;32(4):307-11.
7. Heazell AE, Froen JF. Methods of fetal movement counting and the detection of fetal compromise. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2008;28(2):147-54.
8. Warrander LK, Batra G, Bernatavicius G, Greenwood SL, Dutton P, Jones RL, et al. Maternal perception of reduced fetal movements is associated with altered placental structure and function. PloS one. 2012;7(4):e34851.
9. Saastad E, Tveit JV, Flenady V, Stray-Pedersen B, Fretts R, Bordahl PE, et al. Implementation of uniform information on fetal movement in a Norwegian population reduces delayed reporting of decreased fetal movement and stillbirths in primiparous women - a clinical quality improvement. BMC Res Notes. 2010;3(1):2.
10. Flenady V, MacPhail J, Gardener G, Chadha Y, Mahomed K, Heazell A, et al. Detection and management of decreased fetal movements in Australia and New Zealand: A survey of obstetric practice. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. 2009;49:358-63.
11. National Health and Medical Research Council. A guide to the development, implementation and evaluation of clinical practice guidelines. Canberra: National Health and Medical Research Council, 1999.
12. National Health and Medical Research Council. How to use the evidence: assessment and application of scientific evidence. Canberra2000.
13. Tveit JV, Saastad E, Stray-Pedersen B, Bordahl PE, Flenady V, Fretts R, et al. Reduction of late stillbirth with the introduction of fetal movement information and guidelines - a clinical quality improvement. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2009;9(1):32.
14. Moore TR, Piacquadio K. A prospective evaluation of fetal movement screening to reduce the incidence of antepartum fetal death. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1989;160(5 Pt 1):1075-80.
15. Mangesi L, Hofmeyr GJ, Smith V, Smyth RM. Fetal movement counting for assessment of fetal wellbeing. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015;10:Cd004909.
16. Whitty JE, Garfinkel DA, Divon MY. Maternal perception of decreased fetal movement as an indication for antepartum testing in a low-risk population. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1991;165(4 Pt 1):1084-8.
17. Velazquez MD, Rayburn WF. Antenatal evaluation of the fetus using fetal movement monitoring. Clin Obstet Gynecol 2002;45(4):993-1004.
18. Ahn MO, Phelan JP, Smith CV, Jacobs N, Rutherford SE. Antepartum fetal surveillance in the patient with decreased fetal movement. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1987;157(4 Pt 1):860-4.
19. Sinha D, Sharma A, Nallaswamy V, Jayagopal N, Bhatti N. Obstetric outcome in women complaining of reduced fetal movements. J Obstet Gynaecol 2007;27(1):41-3.
20. Wylie BJ, D'Alton ME. Fetomaternal hemorrhage. Obstet Gynecol. 2010;115(5):1039-51.
21. O'Sullivan O, Stephen G, Martindale E, Heazell AE. Predicting poor perinatal outcome in women who present with decreased fetal movements. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2009;29(8):705-10.
22. Frøen JF, Heazell AE, Tveit JV, Saastad E, Fretts RC, Flenady V. Fetal movement assessment. Semin Perinatol. 2008;32(4):243-6.
23. Hantoushzadeh S, Sheikh M, Shariat M, Farahani Z. Maternal perception of fetal movement type: the effect of gestational age and maternal factors. Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine. 2015;28(6):713-7.
24. Raynes-Greenow CH, Gordon A, Li Q, Hyett JA. A cross-sectional study of maternal perception of fetal movements and antenatal advice in a general pregnant population, using a qualitative framework. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2013;13:32.
25. De Vries JI, Fong BF. Normal fetal motility: an overview. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2006;27(6):701-11.

26. Radestad I. Fetal movements in the third trimester--Important information about wellbeing of the fetus. Sexual & reproductive healthcare : official journal of the Swedish Association of Midwives. 2010;1(4):119-21.
27. Radestad I, Lindgren H. Women's perceptions of fetal movements in full-term pregnancy. Sex Reprod Healthc. 2012;3(3):113-6.
28. Flenady V, Frøen F, MacPhail J, Gilshenan K, Mahomed K, Gardener G, et al., editors. Maternal perception of decreased fetal movements for the detection of the fetus at risk: the Australian experience of the international FEMINA collaboration. International Stillbirth Alliance (ISA) conference; 2008; Oslo, Norway.
29. Johnson TR, Jordan ET, Paine LL. Doppler recordings of fetal movement: II. Comparison with maternal perception. Obstetrics and gynecology. 1990;76(1):42-3.
30. Frøen JF, Saastad E, Tveit JV, Bordahl PE, Stray-Pedersen B. [Clinical practice variation in reduced fetal movements]. Tidsskr Nor Laegeforen. 2005;125(19):2631-4.
31. Hijazi ZR, Callan SE, East CE. Maternal perception of foetal movement compared with movement detected by real-time ultrasound: an exploratory study. Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol. 2010;50(2):144-7.
32. Graca LM, Cardoso CG, Clode N, Calhaz-Jorge C. Acute effects of maternal cigarette smoking on fetal heart rate and fetal body movements felt by the mother. J Perinat Med. 1991;19(5):385-90.
33. Tuffnell DJ, Cartmill RS, Lilford RJ. Fetal movements; factors affecting their perception. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 1991;39(3):165-7.
34. Patrick J, Fetherston W, Vick H, Voegelin R. Human fetal breathing movements and gross fetal body movements at weeks 34 to 35 of gestation. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1978;130(6):693-9.
35. Skornick-Rapaport A, Maslovitz S, Kupferminc M, Lessing JB, Many A. Proposed management for reduced fetal movements: five years' experience in one medical center. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2011;24(4):610-3.
36. Valentin L, Marsal K. Pregnancy outcome in women perceiving decreased fetal movement. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 1987;24(1):23-32.
37. Bekedam DJ, Visser GH. Effects of hypoxemic events on breathing, body movements, and heart rate variation: a study in growth-retarded human fetuses. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1985;153(1):52-6.
38. Gagnon R, Hunse C, Fellows F, Carmichael L, Patrick J. Fetal heart rate and activity patterns in growth-retarded fetuses: changes after vibratory acoustic stimulation. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1988;158(2):265-71.
39. Ribbert LS, Nicolaides KH, Visser GH. Prediction of fetal acidaemia in intrauterine growth retardation: comparison of quantified fetal activity with biophysical profile score. Br J Obstet Gynaecol. 1993;100(7):653-6.
40. Sival DA, Visser GH, Prechtl HF. The effect of intrauterine growth retardation on the quality of general movements in the human fetus. Early Hum Dev. 1992;28(2):119-32.
41. Vindla S, James DK, Sahota DS, Coppens M. Computerised analysis of behaviour in normal and growth-retarded fetuses. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 1997;75(2):169-75.
42. Vindla S, James D, Sahota D. Computerised analysis of unstimulated and stimulated behaviour in fetuses with intrauterine growth restriction. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 1999;83(1):37-45.
43. Dutton PJ, Warrander LK, Roberts SA, Bernatavicius G, Byrd LM, Gaze D, et al. Predictors of poor perinatal outcome following maternal perception of reduced fetal movements--a prospective cohort study. PLoS One. 2012;7(7):e39784.
44. Sherer DM, Spong CY, Minior VK, Salafia CM. Decreased amniotic fluid volume at < 32 weeks of gestation is associated with decreased fetal movements. American journal of perinatology. 1996;13(8):479-82.
45. Lin CC, Adamczyk CJ, Sheikh Z, Mittendorf R. Fetal congenital malformations. Biophysical profile evaluation. J Reprod Med. 1998;43(6):521-7.
46. Giacoia GP. Severe fetomaternal hemorrhage: a review. Obstet Gynecol Surv. 1997;52(6):372-80.
47. Naeye RL, Lin HM. Determination of the timing of fetal brain damage from hypoxemia-ischemia. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2001;184(2):217-24.
48. James DK, Telfer FM, Keating NA, Blair ME, Wilcox MA, Chilvers C. Reduced fetal movements and maternal medication - new pregnancy risk factors for neurodevelopmental disability in childhood. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2000;20(3):226-34.
49. Goldstein I, Romero R, Merrill S, Wan M, O'Connor TZ, Mazor M, et al. Fetal body and breathing movements as predictors of intraamniotic infection in preterm premature rupture of membranes. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1988;159(2):363-8.
50. Tveit JV, Saastad E, Bordahl PE, Stray-Pedersen B, Frøen JF, editors. The epidemiology of decreased fetal movements. Annual conference of the Norwegian Perinatal Society; 2006; Oslo, Norway.
51. Sadovsky E, Yaffe H. Daily fetal movement recording and fetal prognosis. Obstet Gynecol. 1973;41(6):845-50.
52. Stacey T, Thompson JM, Mitchell EA, Ekeroma A, Zuccollo J, McCowan LM. Maternal perception of fetal activity and late stillbirth risk: findings from the Auckland Stillbirth Study. Birth. 2011;38(4):311-6.
53. Tveit JV, Saastad E, Stray-Pedersen B, Bordahl PE, Froen JF. Concerns for decreased foetal movements in uncomplicated pregnancies - Increased risk of foetal growth restriction and stillbirth among women being overweight, advanced age or smoking. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2010.

54. Elizabeth S Draper JJK, Sara Kenyon on behalf of the MBRRACE-UK collaboration. MBRRACE-UK 2015 Perinatal Confidential Enquiry: Term, singleton, normally-formed, antepartum stillbirth. Leicester U.K.: University of Leicester, Department of Health Sciences, Infant Mortality and Morbidity Studies, November 2015.
55. Dubiel M, Gudmundsson S, Thuring-Jonsson A, Maesel A, Marsal K. Doppler velocimetry and nonstress test for predicting outcome of pregnancies with decreased fetal movements. American journal of perinatology. 1997;14(3):139-44.
56. Ehrstrom C. Fetal movement monitoring in normal and high-risk pregnancy. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand Suppl. 1979;80:1-32.
57. Fischer S, Fullerton JT, Trezise L. Fetal movement and fetal outcome in a low-risk population. J Nurse Midwifery. 1981;26(1):24-30.
58. Heazell AE, Sumathi GM, Bhatti NR. What investigation is appropriate following maternal perception of reduced fetal movements? J Obstet Gynaecol. 2005;25(7):648-50.
59. Rayburn W, Zuspan F, Motley ME, Donaldson M. An alternative to antepartum fetal heart rate testing. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1980;138(2):223-6.
60. Saastad E, Winje BA, Israel P, Froen JF. Fetal movement counting--maternal concern and experiences: a multicenter, randomized, controlled trial. Birth. 2012;39(1):10-20.
61. Frøen JF. A kick from within--fetal movement counting and the cancelled progress in antenatal care. J Perinat Med 2004;32(1):13-24.
62. Sergent F, Lefevre A, Verspyck E, Marpeau L. [Decreased fetal movements in the third trimester: what to do?]. Gynecol Obstet Fertil. 2005;33(11):861-9.
63. Rayburn WF, McKean HE. Maternal perception of fetal movement and perinatal outcome. Obstet Gynecol. 1980;56(2):161-4.
64. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). National Perinatal Data Collection, 2014. Canberra2016.
65. Smith GC, Fretts RC. Stillbirth. Lancet. 2007;370(9600):1715-25.
66. Lawn JE, Blencowe H, Waiswa P, Amouzou A, Mathers C, Hogan D, et al. Stillbirths: rates, risk factors, and acceleration towards 2030. Lancet. 2016;387(10018):587-603.
67. Gardosi J, Kady SM, McGeown P, Francis A, Tonks A. Classification of stillbirth by relevant condition at death (ReCoDe): population based cohort study. BMJ. 2005;331(7525):1113-7.
68. CESDI. Confidential enquiry into stillbirths and deaths in infancy. 8th Annual Report. Focussing on stillbirths, European comparisons of perinatal care, paediatric postmortem issues, survival rates of premature babies. London: Maternal and Child Health Research Consortium 2001.
69. Flenady V, Froen JF, Pinar H, Torabi R, Saastad E, Guyon G, et al. An evaluation of classification systems for stillbirth. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2009;9:24.
70. Laws P, Sullivan EA. Australia's mothers and babies 2007. Sydney: AIHW National Perinatal Statistics Unit, 2009 Contract No.: Cat.no. PER 48.
71. Frøen JF, Gardosi JO, Thurmann A, Francis A, Stray-Pedersen B. Restricted fetal growth in sudden intrauterine unexplained death. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2004;83(9):801-7.
72. Flenady V, Hockey R, Chang A, Walters K, editors. Unexplained fetal death at a large maternity hospital: identification of antenatal risk factors. Perinatal Society of Australia and New Zealand, 8th annual congress Integrating science and perinatal practice: Controversies and Dilemma's; 2004 15th-18th March, 2004; Sydney (NSW), Australia.
73. Flenady V, Koopmans L, Middleton P, Froen JF, Smith GC, Gibbons K, et al. Major risk factors for stillbirth in high-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2011;377(9774):1331-40.
74. Antenatal care: routine care for the healthy pregnant women. London: National Institute for Clinical Excellence, 2003.
75. ACOG. Guidelines for perinatal care. Washington DC: The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) and the American Academy of Paediatrics., 2002.
76. Peacock A, Flenady V, Stacey T, Cooke H, MacPhail J, Gardener G, et al. Fetal movement monitoring: midwifery practice in Australia and New Zealand. Perinatal Society of Australia and New Zealand (PSANZ) 13th annual congress; Darwin, Australia2009.
77. Heazell AE, Green M, Wright C, Flenady V, Froen JF. Midwives' and obstetricians' knowledge and management of women presenting with decreased fetal movements. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2008;87(3):331-9.
78. Fossen D, Silberg IE. Perinatal deaths in the county of Ostfold 1989-97. Tidsskr Nor Laegeforen 1999;119(9):1272-5.
79. Saastad E, Vangen S, Frøen JF. Suboptimal care in stillbirths - a retrospective audit study. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand 2007;86(4):444-50.
80. Froen JF, Arnestad M, Frey K, Vege A, Saugstad OD, Stray-Pedersen B. Risk factors for sudden intrauterine unexplained death: epidemiologic characteristics of singleton cases in Oslo, Norway, 1986-1995. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2001;184(4):694-702.

81. Maleckiene L, Nadisauskiene R, Bergstrom S. Socio-economic, demographic and obstetric risk factors for late fetal death of unknown etiology in Lithuania: a case--referent study. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2001;80(4):321-5.
82. Kuwata T, Matsubara S, Ohkusa T, Ohkuchi A, Izumi A, Watanabe T, et al. Establishing a reference value for the frequency of fetal movements using modified 'count to 10' method. J Obstet Gynaecol Res. 2008;34(3):318-23.
83. Saastad E, Ahlborg T, Froen JF. Low maternal awareness of fetal movement is associated with small for gestational age infants. J Midwifery Womens Health. 2008;53(4):345-52.
84. Peat AM, Stacey T, Cronin R, McCowan LM. Maternal knowledge of fetal movements in late pregnancy. Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol. 2012;52(5):445-9.
85. McArdle A, Flenady V, Toohill J, Gamble J, Creedy D. How pregnant women learn about foetal movements: sources and preferences for information. Women and birth : journal of the Australian College of Midwives. 2015;28(1):54-9.
86. Birkenfeld A, Laufer N, Sadovsky E. Diurnal variation of fetal activity. Obstet Gynecol. 1980;55(4):417-9.
87. Druzin M, Foodim J, Fox A, Weiss C. The effect of maternal glucose ingestion (MGI) compared to maternal water ingestion (MWI) on the non stress test (NST). In: Scientific Abstracts of the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the Society for Gynecologic Investigation, March 17-20, 1983. [Abstract 59], Washington, DC: Society for Gynecologic Investigation;. 1983.
88. Esin S, Baser E, Cakir C, Ustun Tuncal GN, Kucukozkan T. Chocolate or orange juice for non-reactive non-stress test (NST) patterns: a randomized prospective controlled study. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2013;26(9):915-9.
89. Michaan N, Baruch Y, Topilsky M, Amzalag S, Iaskov I, Many A, et al. The effect of glucose administration on perceived fetal movements in women with decreased fetal movement, a double-blinded placebo-controlled trial. J Perinatol. 2016.
90. Grant A, Elbourne D, Valentin L, Alexander S. Routine formal fetal movement counting and risk of antepartum late death in normally formed singletons. Lancet. 1989;2(8659):345-9.
91. Saastad E, Winje BA, Stray Pedersen B, Froen JF. Fetal movement counting improved identification of fetal growth restriction and perinatal outcomes--a multi-centre, randomized, controlled trial. PloS one. 2011;6(12):e28482.
92. Freda MC, Mikhail M, Mazloom E, Polizzotto R, Damus K, Merkatz I. Fetal movement counting: which method? MCN Am J Matern Child Nurs. 1993;18(6):314-21.
93. Gomez LM, De la Vega G, Padilla L, Bautista F, Villar A. Compliance with a fetal movement chart by high-risk obstetric patients in a Peruvian hospital. Am J Perinatol. 2007;24(2):89-93.
94. Haws RA, Yakoob MY, Soomro T, Menezes EV, Darmstadt GL, Bhutta ZA. Reducing stillbirths: screening and monitoring during pregnancy and labour. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2009;9 Suppl 1:S5.
95. De Muylder X. The kick chart in high-risk pregnancies: a two-year experience in Zimbabwe. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 1988;27(3):353-7.
96. Lema VM, Rogo KO, Mwalali PN. Foetal movements: value in monitoring high-risk pregnancies. East Afr Med J. 1988;65(11):785-92.
97. Keegan KA, Jr., Paul RH. Antepartum fetal heart rate testing. IV. The nonstress test as a primary approach. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1980;136(1):75-80.
98. Patrick J, Carmichael L, Chess L, Staples C. Accelerations of the human fetal heart rate at 38 to 40 weeks' gestational age. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1984;148(1):35-41.
99. Rabinowitz R, Persitz E, Sadovsky E. The relation between fetal heart rate accelerations and fetal movements. Obstetrics and gynecology. 1983;61(1):16-8.
100. Brown R, Patrick J. The non-stress test: How long is enough? Amer J Obstet Gynecol 1981;141:646-51.
101. Lee CY, Drukker B. The nonstress test for the antepartum assessment of fetal reserve. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1979;134(4):460-70.
102. Leveno KJ, Williams ML, DePalma RT, Whalley PJ. Perinatal outcome in the absence of antepartum fetal heart rate acceleration. Obstet Gynecol 1983;61(3):347-55.
103. Pattison N, McCowan L. Cardiotocography for antepartum fetal assessment. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 1999(Issue 1).
104. Daly N, Brennan D, Foley M, O'Herlihy C. Cardiotocography as a predictor of fetal outcome in women presenting with reduced fetal movement. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 2011;159(1):57-61.
105. Frøen JF, Tveit JV, Saastad E, Bordahl PE, Stray-Pedersen B, Heazell AE, et al. Management of decreased fetal movements. Semin Perinatol 2008;32(4):307-11.
106. Freeman RK, Anderson G, Dorchester W. A prospective multi-institutional study of antepartum fetal heart rate monitoring. I. Risk of perinatal mortality and morbidity according to antepartum fetal heart rate test results. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1982;143(7):771-7.
107. Malcus P. Antenatal fetal surveillance. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol. 2004;16(2):123-8.

108. Alfirevic Z, Stampalija T, Gyte GM. Fetal and umbilical Doppler ultrasound in high-risk pregnancies. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013;11:Cd007529.
109. Eichbaum M, Gast AS, Sohn C. Doppler sonography of the fetal middle cerebral artery in the management of massive fetomaternal hemorrhage. Fetal Diagn Ther 2006;21(4):334-8.
110. Samadi R, Greenspoon JS, Gviazda I, Settlage RH, Goodwin TM. Massive fetomaternal hemorrhage and fetal death: are they predictable? J Perinatol 1999;19(3):227-9.
111. Solomonia N, Playforth K, Reynolds EW. Fetal-maternal hemorrhage: a case and literature review. AJP reports. 2012;2(1):7-14.
112. Markham LA, Charsha DS, Perelmuter B. Case report of massive fetomaternal hemorrhage and a guideline for acute neonatal management. Adv Neonatal Care 2006;6(4):197-205; quiz 6-7.
113. Rubod C, Houfflin V, Belot F, Ardiet E, Dufour P, Subtil D, et al. Successful in utero treatment of chronic and massive fetomaternal hemorrhage with fetal hydrops. Fetal Diagn Ther 2006;21(5):410-3.
114. Maier JT, Schalinski E, Schneider W, Gottschalk U, Hellmeyer L. Fetomaternal hemorrhage (FMH), an update: review of literature and an illustrative case. Archives of gynecology and obstetrics. 2015.
115. Christensen RD, Lambert DK, Baer VL, Richards DS, Bennett ST, Ilstrup SJ, et al. Severe neonatal anemia from fetomaternal hemorrhage: report from a multihospital health-care system. J Perinatol. 2013;33(6):429-34.
116. Kosasa TS, Ebesugawa I, Nakayama RT, Hale RW. Massive fetomaternal hemorrhage preceded by decreased fetal movement and a nonreactive fetal heart rate pattern. Obstetrics and gynecology. 1993;82(4 Pt 2 Suppl):711-4.
117. Stroustrup A, Plafkin C, Savitz DA. Impact of physician awareness on diagnosis of fetomaternal hemorrhage. Neonatology. 2014;105(4):250-5.
118. Scala C, Bhide A, Familiari A, Pagani G, Khalil A, Papageorghiou A, et al. Number of episodes of reduced fetal movement at term: association with adverse perinatal outcome. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2015;213(5):678.e1-6.
119. Hofmeyr GJ, Novikova N. Management of reported decreased fetal movements for improving pregnancy outcomes. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;4:Cd009148.
120. Norman JE. Study Protocol: Can Promoting Awareness of Fetal movements and Focussing Interventions Reduce Fetal Mortality - a stepped wedge cluster randomised trial? (AFFIRM). In: University of Edinburgh MRC Centre for Reproductive Health QsMRC, editor. Version 4, 31st March 2014 ed. Edinburgh, Scotland2014.
121. The Australian and New Zealand Stillbirth Alliance Research Consortium. My Baby's Movements: a stepped wedge cluster randomised controlled trial to raise maternal awareness of fetal movements during pregnancy (Study Protocol). Version 3 ed. Brisbane, Australia2014.
122. Coleman K, Norris S, Weston A, Grimmer-Somers K, Hillier S, Merlin T, et al. NHMRC additional levels of evidence and grades for recommendations for developers of guidelines - consultation draft. Canberra: National Health and Medical Research Council, 2008.
123. National Health and Medical Research Council. Procedures and requirements for meeting the 2011 NHMRC standard for clinical practice guidelines. Melbourne: National Health and Medical Research Council; 2011.

Appendix A. Risk factors for stillbirth in high-income country settings

Factor	aOR (95% CI)	PAR* (%)
Demographic and fertility		
Maternal age[¥]		
35-39 years	1.5 (1.2-1.7)	-
40-44 years	1.8 (1.4-2.3)	-
≥45 years	2.9 (1.9-4.4)	-
>35 years	1.7 (1.6-1.7)	12
Low education	1.7 (1.4-2.0)	4.9
Low socioeconomic status	1.2 (1.0-1.4)	9.0
No antenatal care	3.3 (3.1-3.6)	0.7
Assisted reproductive technology (ART), singleton pregnancy	2.7 (1.6-4.7)	3.1
Primiparity	1.4 (1.3-1.5)	15
Previous stillbirth	3.4 (2.6-4.4)[π]	1[π]
Non-communicable disease and obesity		
BMI (kg/m^2)[€]		
25-30	1.2 (1.1-1.4)	-
>30	1.6 (1.4-2.0)	
>25		8-18
Pre-existing diabetes	2.9 (2.1-4.1)	2-3
Pre-existing hypertension	2.6 (2.1-3.1)	5-10
Pre-eclampsia	1.6 (1.1-2.2)	3.1
Eclampsia	2.2 (1.5-3.2)	0.1
Fetal factors		
Small for gestational age (<10 centile)	3.9 (3.0-5.1)	23.3
Post-term pregnancy (≥42 weeks)	1.3 (1.1-1.7)	0.3
Rhesus disease	2.6 (2.0-3.2)[±]	0.6[±]
Lifestyle factors		
Smoking	1.4 (1.3-1.5)	4-7
Illicit drug use	1.9 (1.2-3.0)	2.1

Notes: High-income countries for aOR and PAR calculations include Australia, Canada, USA, UK and the Netherlands. [Σ] aOR=adjusted odds ratio (95% confidence interval). *PAR=population attributable risk (the proportion of cases that would not occur *in a population* if the factor were eliminated). Calculated using a prevalence of 0.05%. [¥] Reference < 35 years of age. [€] Reference BMI < 25. Source: Unless otherwise stated: Flenady V, Koopmans L, Middleton P, et al. Major risk factors for stillbirth in high-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2011; 377(9774): 1331-40. [±]Lawn JE, Blencowe H, Waiswa P et al. Stillbirths: Stillbirths: rates, risk factors and potential for progress towards 2030. Lancet 2016; 387: 587–603. [π] Lamont K, Scott NW, Jones GT, Bhattacharya S. Risk of recurrent stillbirth: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2015; 350: h3080.

Appendix B. Methods for guideline development

In 2010, the Australian and New Zealand arm of the international Fetal Movement Intervention and Assessment (FEMINA) collaboration developed this clinical practice guideline with a working party of clinicians and health service researchers. The process was coordinated by the Mater Mothers' Research Centre (MMRC), Mater Health Services, South Brisbane.

A literature review was undertaken based on questions identified by members of the working party (see Appendix C). Relevant papers were identified and classified according to level of evidence (see Appendix D). Recommendations were prepared with strength of recommendation grading and were presented to the working party for consensus. Following comment and necessary amendments, a final consultation draft of the guideline was shared with stakeholders and a consumer advisory panel for endorsement and circulation (see Appendix G).

The working party adopted the procedures recommended by the NHMRC for developing this guideline. These procedures comprised:

- Review the scope of the guideline for clinical relevance, to identify questions, target groups and health outcomes relevant to the guideline;
- Assess existing guidelines;
- Conduct a systematic graded review of the literature, to identify and evaluate the evidence relating to the effectiveness and appropriateness of the recommended interventions;
- Subject the draft guideline to wider stakeholder consultation, including a consumer advisory panel;
- Refine the guideline and related materials to make them accessible to the target users.

The following steps have also been undertaken in collaboration with PSANZ:

- Disseminate and implement the guideline;
- Monitor, evaluate and maintain the guideline
- Identify gaps in current information for the ongoing refinement of the guideline.

In 2015-16, an update was undertaken to review the literature, evidence and recommendations. Additional clinical resources were highlighted, including 1) patient information brochures, 2) clinician eLearning opportunities, and 3) an updated care pathway to reflect updated evidence for investigation of decreased fetal movement and to add clinical practice points.

Appendix C. Literature search

Guiding research questions

The following questions were raised by the working party and formed the basis of the search strategy:

- What is the definition of DFM?
- Within what time frame should a women report concerns of DFM?
- What is the role of formal fetal movement monitoring in reducing adverse pregnancy outcome?
- Which investigations should be conducted when a woman presents with DFM?
- What follow-up care should be provided to women who report DFM?

Search strategy

A literature search was undertaken of major guideline websites (see below) and electronic databases: Medline OVID, CINAHL, Cochrane Library databases and Maternity and Infant Care.

The search of electronic databases was limited to the English language, and searches were undertaken using the following terms:

Medline OVID

((“fetal Movement” OR “foetal movement”).sh,ab,ti. OR ("fetal motility" or "foetal motility").sh,ab,ti. OR ("fetal activity" or "foetal activity").sh,ab,ti. OR ("fetal hypomotility" or "foetal hypomotility").sh,ab,ti. OR ("fetal hypoactivity" or "foetal hypoactivity").ab,ti. OR (fetal adj2 movement).ab,ti. OR (foetal adj2 movement).ab,ti.))

Cochrane Library

(fetal OR foetal) near/3 (movement* OR activity OR motility OR hypomotility OR hypoactivity).ti,ab.

MeSH descriptor Fetal Movement explode all trees

CINAHL

"Fetal Movement” (CINAHL heading) OR ("fetal movement*" OR "foetal movement*" OR "fetal activity" OR "foetal activity" OR "fetal hypoactivity" OR "foetal hypoactivity" OR "fetal hypomotility" OR "foetal hypomotility" OR "fetal motility" OR "foetal motility").ab,ti

Maternity and infant care

“fetal movement”.de OR ("fetal movement$" OR "foetal movement$" OR "fetal activity" OR "foetal activity" OR "fetal hypoactivity" OR "foetal hypoactivity" OR "fetal hypomotility" OR "foetal hypomotility" OR "fetal motility" OR "foetal motility").ab,ti

Relevant references provided in bibliographies from various articles were searched manually, as were any references recommended in personal communications with experts in the field.

The relevant existing guidelines were searched at the National Guideline Clearinghouse (http://www.guideline.gov/).

The literature review was updated in 2016 to include evidence published between May 2010 and July 2016. As such, 42 articles have been added as key citations in this update.

Appendix D. Level of evidence & grading of recommendations

The relevant papers were identified and classified according to level of evidence. Evidence based recommendations were prepared and graded on the strength of the evidence. This classification of the evidence and grading of the recommendations was based, as stated below, on criteria advocated by the National Health and Medical Research Committee[11].

Levels of Evidence

Level	Description
Level I	Evidence obtained from a systematic review of all relevant randomised controlled trials.
Level II	Evidence obtained from at least one properly designed randomised controlled trial.
Level III-1	Evidence obtained from well-designed pseudo-randomised controlled trials (alternate allocation or some other method).
Level III-2	Evidence obtained from comparative studies with concurrent controls and allocation not randomised (cohort studies), case control studies, or interrupted time series with a control group.
Level III-3	Evidence obtained from comparative studies with historical control, two or more single-arm studies, or interrupted time series without a parallel control group.
Level IV	Evidence obtained from case series, either post-test or pre-test and post-test.

Grading of recommendations[122]

Grade of recommendation	Description
A	Body of evidence can be trusted to guide practice
B	Body of evidence can be trusted to guide practice in most situations
C	Body of evidence provides some support for recommendation(s) but care should be taken in its application
D	The body of evidence is weak and the recommendation(s) must be applied with caution.
√	Body of evidence is inadequate and recommendation is based on consensus for good clinical practice

Body of Evidence Matrix[122]

Component	A	B	C	D
	Excellent	**Good**	**Satisfactory**	**Poor**
Evidence base[1]	several level I or II studies with low risk of bias	one or two level II studies with low risk of bias or a SR/ multiple level III studies with low risk of bias	level III studies with low risk of bias, or level I or II studies with moderate risk of bias	level IV studies, or level I to III studies with high risk of bias
Consistency[2]	all studies consistent	most studies consistent and inconsistency may be explained	some inconsistency reflecting genuine uncertainty around clinical question	Evidence is inconsistent
Clinical impact	very large	substantial	moderate	slight or restricted
Generalisability	population/s studied in body of evidence are the same as the target population for the guideline	population/s studied in the body of evidence are similar to the target population for the guideline	population/s studied in body of evidence differ to target population for guideline but it is clinically sensible to apply this evidence to target population[3]	population/s studied in body of evidence differ to target population and hard to judge whether it is sensible to generalise to target population
Applicability	directly applicable to Australian healthcare context	applicable to Australian healthcare context with few caveats	probably applicable to Australian healthcare context with some caveats	not applicable to Australian healthcare context

[1] Level of evidence determined from the NHMRC evidence hierarchy;

[2] If there is only one study, rank this component as 'not applicable';

[3] For example, results in adults that are clinically sensible to apply to children OR psychosocial outcomes for one cancer that may be applicable to patients with another cancer.

Appendix E. Guideline working party

These updated clinical guidelines have been compiled by the following clinicians, health researchers and representatives from collaborating organizations:

Name	Role and/or affiliation
Ms Victoria Bowring*	General Manager, Stillbirth Foundation Australia
Dr Wendy Burton	Chair, Mater Mothers' Hospital Alignment; Maternity Lead, Brisbane South Primary Health Network; General Practitioner, Brisbane, Australia
Dr Yogesh Chadha	Senior Staff Specialist, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital; Brisbane, Australia
Ms Lisa Daly*	PhD Candidate, NHMRC Centre of Research Excellence in Stillbirth, Mater Research Institute – The University of Queensland; Brisbane, Australia
Prof David Ellwood*	Professor of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Griffith University School of Medicine, and Director of Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Gold Coast University Hospital
Prof Vicki Flenady*	Director, NHMRC Centre of Research Excellence in Stillbirth, Mater Research Institute – The University of Queensland; Secretary PSANZ/SANDA; Brisbane, Australia
Dr J Frederik Frøen*	Head of Research and Perinatal Epidemiologist, Norwegian Institute of Public Health; Oslo, Norway
Dr Glenn Gardener*	Director, Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Mater Health Services; Research Fellow, NHMRC Centre of Research Excellence in Stillbirth, Mater Research Institute – The University of Queensland; Brisbane, Australia
Dr Adrienne Gordon*	Senior Staff Specialist - Neonatology at Royal Prince Alfred Hospital and NHMRC Early Career Fellow, University of Sydney, Australia
Dr Alexander Heazell*	Senior Clinical Lecturer in Obstetrics, Maternal and Fetal Health Research group, University of Manchester; Board Chair, International Stillbirth Alliance. Manchester, United Kingdom
A/Prof Kassam Mahomed*	Senior Staff Specialist, Ipswich Hospital, and The University of Queensland, Australia
Prof Susan McDonald*	Professor of Midwifery, La Trobe University and Mercy Hospital for Women; Melbourne, Australia
Dr Jane E Norman*	Professor of Maternal-Fetal Health, University of Edinburgh, Scotland
Prof Jeremy Oats*	Chair, Victorian Consultative Council on Obstetric and Paediatric Mortality and Morbidity; Professorial Fellow, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne; Chair PSANZ/ SANDA

** Affiliated with the NHMRC Centre of Research Excellence in Stillbirth*

The original guideline development also included the following working party members:

Name	Role and/or affiliation
Dr Scott Preston	General practitioner, medical educator; Brisbane, Australia
Dr Ruth Fretts	Senior staff specialist, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard University Medical School; Boston, USA
Ms Julie MacPhail	Mater Medical Research Institute, Mater Health Services; Brisbane, Australia
Ms Liz Conway	Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Support (SANDS) Queensland; Brisbane, Australia.
Ms Laura Koopmans	Fetal movement study group coordinator, Mater Medical Research Institute, Mater Health Services; Brisbane Australia
Ms Tomasina Stacey	Senior lecturer, School of Midwifery, Auckland University of Technology; Auckland, New Zealand

Appendix F. Conflict of Interest statement

The working party feels strongly that the identification and management of conflicts of interest are of central importance, to ensure that there is no influence by competing interests that could erode the integrity of recommendations. Under the *Procedures and requirements for meeting the 2011 NHMRC standard for clinical practice guidelines* (the 2011 NHMRC Standard[123]), this working group has been required to identify, document and manage potential competing interests through adherence to the following NHMRC principles:

- transparency in the disclosure of any interests
- managing interests in a manner consistent with the NHMRC policy
- balance and diversity of expertise and perspectives
- balancing the benefit of having persons with expertise against the risks of their interests biasing a process
- the focus on technical knowledge should not override or dominate all other considerations
- the committee or working group is chaired by someone who has no conflicts of interest that could, or could be perceived to, erode the integrity of the recommendations
- ensuring the integrity of the guidelines.

Each member of the group has agreed to comply with the principles about disclosure of interests and also follows their own internal institutional procedures in relation to declaration, identification and management of interests.

Appendix G. Stakeholder consultation

Once the working party had achieved consensus around recommendations, consultation was undertaken including the following organisations and individuals:

1. Perinatal Society of Australia and New Zealand (PSANZ), Policy Committee
2. PSANZ Consumer Advisory Panel
3. PSANZ SANDA membership
4. Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RANZCOG)
5. Australian College of Midwives (ACM)
6. Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (RACGP)
7. New Zealand College of Midwives
8. National SIDS Council of Australia Ltd (Red Nose)
9. Stillbirth Foundation Australia
10. SANDS Australia
11. Still Aware
12. Women's Healthcare Australasia