

REPLY



I thank Dr van Baaren and colleagues for their letter concerning the meta-analysis and editorial of fetal fibronectin testing in women with symptoms of preterm labor.^{1,2} I believe the purpose of their letter is to point out that observational studies can also be used to assess the performance of diagnostic tests. To support this argument, the authors cite their own work, which was an observational study of how fetal fibronectin and cervical length could be used to risk-stratify women with symptoms of preterm labor.³ They suggest, based on careful analyses of their own data, that the combination of cervical length and fibronectin results could reduce the number of referrals and admissions to perinatal centers in 10% of all women.... Such a reduction would also result in fewer medications side effects, less maternal stress, and lower health care costs.

All of this of course sounds terrific, but I would point out the words “could” and “would” in the above sentence. Yes, this algorithm could, in theory, result in many things. What we need to know is not what *could* happen, but rather what *actually does* happen. How do physicians actually use these tests in real life? What do they do with the results? How does the test influence use of medications and admission? This is where the clinical trial data become important, and the results

of the meta-analysis by Berghella and Saccone¹ are clear and unambiguous.

I do agree with the authors that observational studies are very useful for determining the potential utility of a diagnostic test. But in the case of fetal fibronectin, we have to move away from theoretical musings of what *may* happen, and focus on what *does* happen. ■

George A. Macones, MD
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Washington University in St Louis
School of Medicine
St Louis, MO
maconesg@wudosis.wustl.edu

The authors report no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Berghella V, Saccone G. Fetal fibronectin testing for prevention of preterm birth in singleton pregnancies with threatened preterm labor: a systematic review and metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2016;215:431-8.
2. Macones GA. Fetal fibronectin testing in threatened preterm labor: time to stop. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2016;215:405.
3. van Baaren GJ, Vis JY, Wilms FF, et al. Predictive value of cervical length measurement and fibronectin testing in threatened preterm labor. *Obstet Gynecol* 2014;123:1185-92.

© 2017 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2017.10.039>

Letter to the editor

In response to the article entitled “Management of premature rupture of membranes at term: the need to correct a recurring mistake in articles, chapters, and recommendations of professional organizations,”¹ the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) shares the belief that published reviews, recommendations, and guidelines should be evidence based and published errata should be incorporated promptly.

ACOG acknowledges the inclusion of the original uncorrected information from Table 1 of the 1999 publication by Hannah et al² in the references Practice Bulletin entitled “Premature Rupture of Membranes”³ and recognizes that this may have resulted in patients being given incorrect statistics when they are counseled in general about term Premature Rupture of the Membranes (PROM) on admission. As a result, ACOG has taken steps to address this error by correcting the specified Practice Bulletin on PROM through an interim update that will be distributed to its membership.

However, it is important to note that it is unlikely that any inappropriate management advice resulted from the inclusion of this error. The uncorrected information has always been presented as background material and not as part of the Clinical Considerations and Recommendations section

regarding patient management. The clinical recommendation for prompt induction after presentation with term PROM is based on additional data, including a systematic review and meta-analysis, which has recently been updated and will be included in the interim update of the Practice Bulletin.^{4,5} ACOG continues to stand by its clinical recommendation.

ACOG has long had mechanisms in place to rectify these matters, and we have added steps to strengthen those checks to ensure that all ACOG publications provide accurate information for the obstetrician-gynecologist. We continue to strive for development and dissemination of accurate, current, and evidence-supported clinical guidance for the care of women. ■

Marc Jackson, MD, MBA
Mark A. Turrentine, MD
Christopher M. Zahn, MD
Col (Ret), USAF, MC
Committees on Obstetric Practice and Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics
American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
409 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20024
czahn@acog.org

The authors report no conflict of interest.