than the bride? Was he attending to a second spouse? Was he abusive? I propose that any of the previously cited factors are grounds for lack of interest and/or pleasure in sexual activity.

I comprehend that such an extensive research endeavor may have been outside the scope and time constraint of this cross-sectional study and do not argue that female circumcision undoubtedly plays a role in dyspareunia. Nevertheless, I would have liked more conclusive information encompassing factors that may have skewed the data, and a great practitioner should keep these limiting factors in mind when practicing evidence-based medicine. ■

Angelia L. Sakyi-Agyekum, PA-S
Nova Southeastern University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314
as3372@mynsu.nova.edu
angelia4564@gmail.com

The author reports no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Rouzi AA, Berg RC, Sahly N, et al. Effects of female genital mutilation/cutting on the sexual function of Sudanese women: a cross-sectional study. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2017;217:62.e1-6.

2. Lawry L, Canteli C, Rabenzanahary T, et al. A mixed methods assessment of barriers to maternal, newborn and child health in Gogrial West, South Sudan. Reprod Health 2017;14:12.

 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2017.08.115

REPLY

We thank Ms Sakyi-Agyekum for her close review of our article.[1] The points she raises emphasize the difficulty in assessing sexual functioning in women with female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C), and we encourage other researchers to investigate this issue, taking, for example, physiological and cultural covariates into consideration.

We used the Female Sexual Function Index in our study because it is considered the gold standard assessment of sexual functioning in women.[2] Within the context of sexual functioning among women with FGM/C, we agree that it would be interesting to examine why some couples do not attempt intercourse as well as the influence of age difference between the couple, polygamy, and abuse. These issues were, as Ms Sakyi-Agyekum suggests, outside the scope of our study, but we agree that research on these issues would add valuable information to the evidence base for policies regarding FGM/C. ■

Abdulrahim A. Rouzi, MBChB
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
King Abdulaziz University
Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
aarouzi@gmail.com

Rigmor C. Berg, PhD
Knowledge Center
Norwegian Institute of Public Health
PO Box 4404 Nydalen
N-0403 Oslo, Norway
rigmor.berg@fhi.no

The authors report no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Rouzi AA, Berg RC, Sahly N, et al. Effects of female genital mutilation/cutting on the sexual function of Sudanese women: a cross-sectional study. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2017;217:62.e1-6.

2. Rosen R, Brown C, Heiman J, et al. The Female Sexual Function Index (FSFI): a multidimensional self-report instrument for the assessment of female sexual function. J Sex Marital Ther 2000;26:191-208.

 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2017.08.116

Beyond the traditional models of group prenatal care: the case for Moms2B

TO THE EDITORS: We read with interest the review of Mazzoni and Carter[1] of the topic of group prenatal care (GPNC). As noted, GPNC is a complex and difficult model to achieve in health systems designed for individual prenatal care (IPC).

We have developed an alternative, scalable community-based group model (CGM) that addresses the barriers faced by health systems in utilizing GPNC. The model, called Moms2B, has been implemented to date in predominantly African-American neighborhoods in Columbus, OH, to address disparities in infant mortality, preterm births, and low birthweight babies.

We recently described our model and reported a 5-fold reduction in infant mortality at our first site.[2] At Moms2B, a multidisciplinary team of health professionals empowers women living in poverty through weekly, 2 hour sessions focused on pregnancy and parenting education, stress reduction, and healthy nutrition. This CGM serves as an adjunct to traditional IPC and addresses the barriers to the implementation of traditional GPNC models as outlined in the Table.

In summary, we suggest the CGM that we have developed allows health systems to continue to use their current IPC model while also addressing the social determinants of health in high-risk populations, thereby improving maternal and infant health. This alternative to GPC could be replicated in

TABLE
Barriers to implementation of traditional group prenatal care models and Moms2B's approach

GPNC barriers	Moms2B CGM response to barriers
Accepts only women with low-risk pregnancies	All low-income pregnant women are welcome, including those with high-risk pregnancies
Requires adequate space for group sessions in clinics	Community based and can be easily implemented in churches and other public meeting spaces
Children of pregnant women are not allowed at the prenatal group sessions	Provides developmentally stimulating childcare for children of all ages
Appointments must be scheduled in groups based on women's gestational age	Sessions are held at the same time every week in the same setting. Women of all gestational ages attend together. Once delivered, women are encouraged to continue to attend with their children until their newborn's first birthday.
It is difficult to recruit and retain women at the same gestational age to maintain a cohesive group experience	Referrals come from multiple sources: prenatal clinics, WIC clinics, and community outreach. Women are excited to attend and often develop close relationships with other mothers in the community.

CGM, community group model; *GPNC*, group prenatal care; *Moms2B*, CGM model; *WIC*, Women, Infants, and Children.

Gabbe. The case for Moms2B. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2018.

other sites and details regarding the program are available from the authors. ■

Patricia T. Gabbe, MD, MPH
Departments of Pediatrics and Obstetrics and Gynecology
The Ohio State University College of Medicine
700 Ackerman Place, Suite 440
Columbus, OH 43202
Pat.Gabbe@osumc.edu

Steven G. Gabbe, MD
Courtney D. Lynch, PhD, MPH
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
The Ohio State University College of Medicine
Columbus, OH 43202

The authors report no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Mazzoni SE, Carter EB. Group prenatal care. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2017;216:552-6.

2. Gabbe PT, Reno R, Clutter C, et al. Improving maternal and infant child health outcomes with community-based pregnancy support groups: outcomes from Moms2B Ohio. Matern Child Health J 2017;21:1130-8.

 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2017.08.117

REPLY

We are excited to learn of other programs working to improve the quality of prenatal care for women in the United States. We appreciate the authors' comments. ■

Sara Mazzoni, MD, MPH
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
University of Alabama at Birmingham
1700 6th Avenue South
Birmingham AL 35249
smazzoni@uabmc.edu

Ebony Boyce Carter, MD, MPH
Division of Maternal-Fetal Medicine
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Washington University School of Medicine
660 South Euclid Avenue
Campus Box 8064
St Louis, MO 63110
ebcarter@wustl.edu

The authors report no conflict of interest.

 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2017.08.118

3D transvaginal sonography in obstetrics and gynecology

TO THE EDITORS: We certainly agree with the authors, Lee and Yoon,[1] in that 3-dimensional transvaginal ultrasonography (3D TVS) clearly offers additional clinical value as a diagnostic imaging tool, well beyond 2D TVS. The identification of a ureteral calculus within the ureter provides a good example of this value; such use should be encouraged and