CODEN [USA]: IAJPBB ISSN: 2349-7750

INDO AMERICAN JOURNAL OF
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3624967

Available online at: http://www.iajps.com *Research Article*

MATERNITY CARE PROVIDER KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES IN THE DIRECTION OF CELL-FREE DNA TESTING

[1]Haider Ali, [2]Ali Irtaza, [3]Muhammad Mudassar

[1]Islam Medical College Sialkot, [2]Avcina Medical College Lahore, [3]Islam Medical College Sialkot.

Article Received: November 2019 **Accepted:** December 2019 **Published:** January 2020

Abstract:

Background: *Without cellular DNA, screening has recently gained enormous prominence, gifted cases and social insurance providers extra precise prenatal aneuploidy screening than other existing screening modalities. This is difficult to know how much information obstetric providers have about cDNA screening, which has significant suggestions for superiority and substance of conversant patient agreement.*

Methods: *Our current research was conducted at May Hospital, Lahore from May 2018 to April 2019. An overview has been developed to survey information and arrangements of obstetrical providers regarding cDNA screening and disseminate it online concluded Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Pakistan. Chi-square trials were applied to identify contrasts in information and behaviour among sets.*

Results: *215 cases had done the research: 61.7% Obstetrician/Gynecologists, 16.5% Maternal Fetal Medication experts, 17.6% General Practitioners, and 8.6% Midwives. MFM showed a remarkable tendency to be generally competent in fDNA screening, followed by obstetricians/gynecologists, GPs, and finally midwives in virtually all areas of fDNA screening. All groups showed an inspiring mindset for cDNA screening; in all cases, obstetricians/gynecologists and MFMs displayed a fundamentally more positive mindset than GPs and midwives. Although not yet a symptomatic test, 21.5 % of GPs suggests a rapid termination of pregnancy after the positive cDNA test result, whereas none of the MFMs and almost none of the OB/GYNs or WMs do so.*

Conclusion: *Authors have shown that various kinds of obstetrical service providers have changed their information measures with respect to cDNA screening, with MFM currently having more interesting information than all others. Each maternity care provider must have a sufficient number of prenatal screening tests so that authors may capture benefits of the new and hopeful innovation whereas ensuring accuracy of conversant agreement procedure.*

Keywords: *NIPT, Cell-free DNA, cfDNA, Prenatal diagnosis, Screening.*

Corresponding author:

Haider Ali,

Islam Medical College Sialkot.

QR code

Please cite this article in press Haider Ali et al., ***Maternity Care Provider Knowledge And Attitudes In The Direction Of Cell-Free Dna Testing.,*** *Indo Am. J. P. Sci, 2020; 07(01).*

INTRODUCTION:

Non-intrusive prenatal screening founded on cDNA in motherly plasma has lately received considerable consideration, promising patients and human service providers an inherited prenatal aneuploidy screening test that is extra precise than existing ultrasound and placental screening modalities and as safe as intrusive demonstrative screening [1]. Prenatal hereditary screening strategies have applied non-obtrusive maternal serum screening conventions, such as consolidated or coordinated main trimester methodologies, which recognize up to 96% of trisomies, through the untruthful positive degree of 6-24% in all-inclusive community [2]. Given the positive screening risk result (as controlled by the number of test "cuts"), cases are then accessible choice of embarrassing demonstrative strategies, such as inspection or chorionic villus amniocentesis, that carry a 1.6-2% danger of unsuccessful labour. cefDNA screening is a significant clinical advance over elective screening modalities, with a 99.7% overall identification rate and a 0.04% false positive rate (FPR) for Down syndrome [3]. Separate social expert bodies, such as the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Pakistan and American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, decide that cDNA screening is a profoundly compelling type of early prenatal screening for regular trisomy after 10 weeks of growth.

Presently in Pakistan, contribution cDNA testing to entirely females as an essential screening test has not yet been considered financially feasible in many jurisdictions [4]. Instead, the SOGC has suggested an unanticipated model of removable shorts as maximum cost-effective method that would achieve a high rate of identification whereas maintaining aids of routine screening, which is dependent on serum and ultrasound markers. In this study, authors applied an online cross-sectional overview to distinguish cDNA screening attitudes and information among obstetrical providers in Pakistan, including DMFT professionals, obstetrician-gynecologists, general practitioners, and military nurses [5].

METHODOLOGY:

A brief online review was considered for wellness experts to measure obstetrical providers' information and arrogances near cDNA testing. Our current research was conducted at May Hospital, Lahore from May 2018 to April 2019. An overview has been developed to survey information and arrangements of obstetrical providers regarding cDNA screening and disseminate it online concluded Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Pakistan. The overview was created by current exploratory group and consisted of 3 core segments including an information assessment area, a mindset scale and segment enquiries. The information partition was done by the current research group who had general information about cDNA screening and addressed the perspectives around cDNA screening, including information about the conditions that are economically accessible to distinguish, recognition rates, openness, and other general perspectives that we felt were significant for obstetrical providers to achieve by offering such screening tests. The "right" responses to requests for information were determined by examining logical writing. The overview was experimental verified through four consideration providers (physicians, orderlies and birth attendants) to guarantee considerate. Subsequent endorsement, which included making changes to the review as indicated by member feedback throughout the pilot, the study was interpreted into French to allow for national circulation. The link to English and French online overview forms remained sent to each SOGC medical person who had complied to explore (n = 1305). An email update was sent two weeks after the fact. Members received the $5 Starbucks e-card to express their gratitude for their support. Members received a short response sheet for their own reference, which depended on the benefit of the most recent research they were capable of at the time the overview was developed. Unequivocal ideas were used to describe the socio-economics of testing respondents. Mentality scores for single surveys were upset and added to obtain an absolute score. Scores greater than or equal to 22 were designated as a state of mind favorable to application of cDNA testing as the screening method for patients. All surveys remained led using the Stata SE Form 15. The Joint Health Research Ethics Board of the University of Calgary gave moral support to this study.

RESULTS:

The study was appropriate for 1305 people, of which 207 were interested, resulting in the answer proportion of 16.8%. Of over-all sum of accused, 6 people did not show their kind of training and remained banned. The segment qualities of residual 205 cases are presented in Table 1. MFMs, OB/GYNs, GPs, and MWs accounted for 93% of the absolute sum of cases; the remaining 7% were genetic counsellors, nurses, and "other"

experts. More than 84% of the respondents repeated at staff level, and about 33% had a patient population that was 75% obstetricians anyway. The number of years went from virtually no years at all at student level to > 21 years through 47.9% of respondents having > 15 years of training. Entirely Pakistani jurisdictions were covered in overview, through maximum of the feedback coming from Ontario (44.7%) and Quebec (21.9%). The additional reviews focus on the 189 experts who have repeated clinical obstetrics and who could potentially offer cDNA testing to their patients.

Table 1 Demographic individual of cases:

Gender	
Man	45 (22.8)
Woman	158 (79.2)
Type of Practice	
Obstetrician/Gynecologist	114 (57.5)
Maternal-Fetal-Medicine	28 (15.5)
General Practitioner	32 (18.6)
Midwife	16 (8.1)
Added	15 (6.1)
Level of Exercise	
Staff	171 (86.3)
Fellow	8 (4.6)
Resident	18 (9.5)
Other	9 (6.1)
Percentage of Obstetrical cases	
100%	49 (25.8)
75–98%	13 (7.1)
50–75%	64 (32.4)
25–48%	38 (19.5)
< 26%	36 (17.8)
None	8 (4.6)
Years in Exercise	
≥ 21 yrs	66 (33.1)
15–18 yrs	31 (15.9)
10–15 yrs	31 (15.9)
5–8 yrs	37 (17.9)
0–5 yrs	19 (8.8)
Trainee	25 (12.9)
Geographic Supply	
Western Pakistan (BC, AB, SK, MB)	57 (28.3)
Ontario	89 (44.7)
Quebec	43 (21.9)
Maritimes (NB, NS, PEI, NL)	13 (6.8)

Information on conditions under which cDNA testing is financially accessible to screen fluctuates according to the collection of obstetric service providers and is summarized in Table 2. Obstetrician-gynecologists and MFMs must have realized that, despite trisomy 21, fDNA screening

is available for trisomy 19 (p = 0.08) and trisomy 14 (p = 0.003). In addition, MFMs were about to realize that cDNA analysis can detect aneuploidy of the sex chromosomes, e.g. Turner syndrome (p = 0.001) and microdeletion disorders, e.g. DiGeorge syndrome (p = 0.007).

Table 2: Knowledge of which settings cfDNA screening is commercially existing to perceive stratified by provider type (n = 188)

	OB/GYN (n = 114) % [95% CI]	MFM (n = 29) % [95% CI]	GP (n = 31) % [95%CI]	MW (n = 14) % [95% CI]	p-value
Correctly identified that cfDNA was able to screen for:					
Trisomy 21 (Down Syndrome)	95.6% [89.8–98.1]	100.0%	90.3% [73.4–96.9]	85.7% [55.7–96.6]	p = 0.156
Trisomy 18 (Edwards Syndrome)	93.0% [86.5–96.5]	100.0%	80.6% [62.6–91.2]	85.7% [55.7–96.6]	p = 0.040
Trisomy 13 (Patau Syndrome)	93.0% [86.5–96.5]	96.6% [78.4–99.6]	74.2% [55.8–86.8]	71.4% [42.7–89.4]	p = 0.002
Monosomy X (Turner Syndrome)	63.2% [53.8–71.2]	86.2% [67.9–94.9]	38.7% [23.2–57.0]	42.9% [19.9–69.4]	p = 0.001
22q11.22 deletion (Di George Syndrome)	23.7% [16.7–32.4]	52.8% [34.8–68.4]	28.1% [16.7–48.6]	3.2% [0.8–37.3]	p = 0.007

Table 3 Detection rates and capabilities of cfDNA screening (n = 188)

Question:	OB/GYN (n = 114) % [95% CI]	MFM (n = 29) % [95% CI]	GP (n = 31) % [95%CI]	MW (n = 14) % [96% CI]	p-value
Properly recognized that discovery charges are NOT equal for diverse trisomies such as 14, 19, and 22 using cfDNA.	54.6% [45.3–63.6]	83.9% [65.2–93.9]	40.8% [26.9–61.1]	15.4% [4.5–45.7]	p = 0.000
Correctly identified that cfDNA has a better detection rate for Trisomy 21 than currently available prenatal screening methods such as the First Trimester Combined Test or Integrated Prenatal Screening.	89.6% [82.2–94.3]	100.0%	67.7% [49.3–81.9]	50.0% [25.1–74.9]	p = 0.000
Properly recognized that NOT all chromosomal abnormalities diagnosed via amniocentesis can also remain gamely noticed via cfDNA.	85.0% [77.0–90.5]	96.6% [78.4–99.5]	61.3% [43.0–76.8]	71.4% [42.7–89.4]	p = 0.017

DISCUSSION:

Assumed quick enhancement and use of fcDNA screening in medical application, it is difficult to know how much information obstetrical providers in Pakistan have about the exposure and limits of this screening test [6]. This concern raises potential questions about the nature of well-versed consent that patients receive when undergoing cDNA screening, since the results of the test may have important ramifications for the current pregnancy [7]. Certainly, the preparation and ongoing education of medical service providers about cDNA testing is recognized as an urgent and important need. Nevertheless, these screening tests

are available to industry and have been aggressively promoted to patients since 2011 in the United States and 2013 in Pakistan [8]. Surveys of social insurance provider behaviour conducted long before commercial availability of cDNA testing in the U.S. revealed that 86% of respondents, typically physicians, indicated that they did not have much information about cDNA testing and 70% would follow the guidelines of expert social agencies such as ACOG [9]. Comparative surveys evaluating obstetricians/gynecologists were conducted one year after the availability of companies in the United States was discovered: 36% of cases had just consolidated cDNA screening into their training, an additional 23% were aware of distributed clinical information, and 9% had never heard of this type of innovation. The survey of MFM Fellows in the United States regarding their attitudes and information about screening revealed that more than 75% of MFM Fellows are happy to request the test. Nevertheless, this survey is the sensible image of the information and insolences of groups of highly skilled obstetrical providers across Pakistan. Our patients set was aware of the authentic composition of SOGC from which authors derived current test (talking to MFMs, OB/GYNs, GPs, and MWs in comparative proportions) [10].

CONCLUSION:

This examination has significant ramifications for obstetrical provider and quality in addition substance of well-versed consensus procedure once counseling cases for cDNA testing. Certainly, information about the provider and patient autonomy are key elements of the informed assent procedure in screening for hereditary traits. We have, of course, shown that changed kinds of obstetrical providers have changed the measurement of information with respect to ccDNA testing, with the MFM having more information of note at every other collection at this time. All obstetrical care providers need to have a sufficient understanding of prenatal screening, since MFM and obstetrics and gynecology are not normally the primary purpose of contact for most cases once existing cDNA screening. As authors move forward, it is significant that authors assess the information gaps and offer learning strategies to each maternity care provider so that we may capture aids of the current new and auspicious innovation whereas ensuring correctness of conversant agreement procedure.

REFERENCES:

1. Palomaki GE, Kloza EM, O'Brien BM, Eklund EE, Lambert-Messerlian GM. The clinical utility of DNA-based screening for fetal aneuploidy by primary obstetrical care providers in the general pregnancy population. Genet Med. 2017;19(7):778–86.
2. Cunningham CT, Quan H, Hemmelgarn B, Noseworthy T, Beck CA, Dixon E, et al. Exploring physician specialist response rates to web-based surveys. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2015 Apr 9;15:32–015-0016-z.
3. Ashoor G, Syngelaki A, Poon LC, Rezende JC, Nicolaides KH. Fetal fraction in maternal plasma cell-free DNA at 11-13 weeks' gestation: relation to maternal and fetal characteristics. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2013;41(1):26–32.
4. Tarquini F, Picchiassi E, Centra M, Pennacchi L, Galeone F, Bini V, et al. Maternal smoking does not affect the amount of cell-free fetal DNA in maternal plasma during the 1st trimester of pregnancy. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2015;35(1):42–5.
5. Ashoor G, Syngelaki A, Wagner M, Birdir C, Nicolaides KH. Chromosomeselective sequencing of maternal plasma cell-free DNA for first-trimester detection of trisomy 21 and trisomy 18. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2012 Apr; 206(4):322.e1–322322.e5.
6. Norton ME, Brar H, Weiss J, Karimi A, Laurent LC, Caughey AB, et al. Noninvasive chromosomal evaluation (NICE) study: results of a multicenter prospective cohort study for detection of fetal trisomy 21 and trisomy 18. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2012 Aug;207(2):137.e1–137137.e8.
7. Rose NC, Mercer BM. Practice Bulletin No. 163: screening for fetal aneuploidy. Obstet Gynecol. 2016;127(5):e123–37.
8. Audibert F, De Bie I, Johnson JA, Okun N, Wilson RD, Armour C, et al. No. 348-joint SOGC-CCMG guideline: update on prenatal screening for fetal aneuploidy, fetal anomalies, and adverse pregnancy outcomes. J Obstet Gynaecol Can. 2017;39(9):805–17.
9. Morain S, Greene MF, Mello MM. A new era in noninvasive prenatal testing. N Engl J Med. 2013 Aug 8;369(6):499–501.
10. Wald NJ, Rodeck C, Hackshaw AK, Rudnicka A. SURUSS in perspective. Semin Perinatol. 2005 Aug;29(4):225–35.