Performance of Different Scan Protocols of Fetal Echocardiography in the Diagnosis of Fetal Congenital Heart Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Yifei Li1,2,3, Yimin Hua1,2,4, Jie Fang5, Chuan Wang1,2,3, Lina Qiao1,2,4, Chaomin Wan1,2,4, Dezhi Mu1,2,4, Kaiyu Zhou1,2,4*  

1 Department of Pediatric Cardiovascular Disease, West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China, 2 Ministry of Education Key Laboratory of Women and Children’s Diseases and Birth Defects, West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China, 3 West China Medical School of Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China, 4 Program for Changjiang Scholars and Innovative Research Team in University, West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China, 5 State Key Laboratory of Oral Disease, West China Hospital of Stomatology, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

Abstract

Objective: The rapid progress in fetal echocardiography has lead to early detection of congenital heart diseases. Increasing evidences have shown that prenatal diagnosis could be life saving in certain cases. However, there is no agreement on which protocol is most adaptive diagnostic one. Thus, we use meta-analysis to conduct a pooled performance test on 5 diagnostic protocols.

Methods: We searched PUBMED, EMBASE, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials and WHO clinical trials registry center to identify relevant studies up to August, 2012. We performed meta-analysis in a fixed/random-effect model using Meta-disc 1.4. We used STATA 11.0 to estimate the publication bias and SPSS 17.0 to evaluate variance.

Results: We use results from 81 studies in 63 articles to analyze the pooled accuracy. The overall performance of pooled sensitivities of spatiotemporal image correlation (STIC), extend cardiac echography examination (ECEE) and 4 chambers view + outflow tract view + 3 vessels and trachea view (4 CV+OTV+3 VTV) were around 0.90, which was significant higher than that of 4 chambers view + outflow tract view or 3 vessels and trachea view (4 CV+OTV/3 VTV) and 4 chambers view (4 CV). Unfortunately the pooled specificity of STIC was 0.92, which was significant lower than that of other 4 protocols which reached at 1.00. The area under the summary receiver operating characteristic curves value of STIC, ECEE, 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV, 4 CV+OTV/3 VTV and 4 CV were 0.9700, 0.9971, 0.9983, 0.9929 and 0.9928 respectively.

Conclusion: These results suggest a great diagnostic potential for fetal echocardiography detection as a reliable method of fetal congenital heart disease. But at least 3 sections view (4 CV, OTV and 3 VTV) should be included in scan protocol, while the STIC can be used to provide more information for local details of defects, and can not be used to make a definite diagnosis alone with its low specificity.

Introduction

Congenital heart disease (CHD) is the most common birth abnormality, with an incidence of 6–8% in all live births [1]. 20% of those who survive have major CHD. Many of them need surgical procedure in early life stage to retain their life [2]. In certain cases of fetal cardiac and other structural anomalies, prenatal diagnosis may be helpful or even life saving [3–5], with prenatal diagnosis providing optimal perinatal and perioperative management [6]. Fortunately, constant advance in ultrasound imaging has improved the imaging quality and the accuracy of earlier detection [7,8]. At first, 4 chambers view (4 CV) was used to scan fetal heart defects, then outflow tract view (OTV) and 3 vessels trachea view (3 VTV) were added to increase accuracy of fetal echocardiography. Nowadays, extend cardiac echography examination (ECEE) was carried out as a specific protocol to identify some minimal defects in utero and provide more detail information on suspicious fetal heart. Since spatiotemporal image correlation (STIC), was first introduced for fetal echocardiography in 2003 [9]. Many studies have described its application to scanning normal and anomalous fetal hearts [10,11]. Also cardiovascular diseases can be diagnosed by assessing abnormal flow behavior in the heart using noninvasive assessment based on magnetic resonance. And with the computer-aided flow analysis,
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high quality image can be caught to make a reliable diagnosis during fetal life [12–15]. Compared to ultrasound diagnostic protocols, the magnetic resonance examination must be performed in hospital and spend a longer time as well as its higher cost. So the echocardiography is still the most popular scan method and performed in many kinds of examination during pregnancy.

So far, a lot of studies have demonstrated the short-term and long-term prognostic benefit resulting from the prenatal diagnosis of CHD. Nowadays, 4 CV, 4 CV+OTV/3 VTV, 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV, ECEE and STIC were the most popular scan protocols for fetal CHD diagnosis during last several decades [8,16,17]. However, Moreover, no general agreement has been recognized on how to choose from the 5 protocols for fetal CHD diagnosis, even though some comparison studies have been done on the accuracy among different scan protocols. Thus, in the meta-analysis, we estimated the accuracy of fetal diagnosis and compared sensitivities and specificities among 5 diagnostic protocols.

Materials and Methods

Study Protocol

This analysis was conducted in accordance with a predetermined protocol following the recommendations of Deeks et al. [18]. And there is no existed protocol. The data collection and reporting were in accordance with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement (Table S1).

Search Strategy

Pubmed, Embase, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials and World Health Organization clinical trials registry center were searched using a high sensitive and high specific search strategy, which was “diagnosis AND (heart defects, congenital [MeSH Terms] OR congenital heart disease) AND (ultrasoundography OR sonography OR echocardiography OR ultrasound) AND (prenatal OR antenatal OR intrauterine OR in utero)”. Search was updated to August 2012. The language restriction was used only for English published papers.

Study Selection

Citations initially selected by systematic search were first retrieved as title and/or abstract and preliminarily screened. Potentially relevant reports were then retrieved as complete manuscripts and assessed for compliance to inclusion and exclusion criteria.

The inclusion criteria were as followings: 1) the patients were taken fetal echocardiography or ultrasound examination in utero; 2) diagnostic test; 3) the prenatal diagnosis confirmed by neonatal echocardiography or autopsy or surgery or cardiac catheterization; 4) contained the date of true positive, false positive, false negative and true negative; or the sensitivity, specificity and essential sample size.

The exclusion criteria were as followings: 1) the total sample size was quite small (total sample size ≤15); 2) the same cohort had been studied in other study; 3) unable to construct 2×2 table; 4) special echocardiography use for diagnosis; 5) not focused on CHD; 6) conferences articles.

Data Collection and Assessment of Study Quality

Two investigators (Yifei Li, Jie Fang) independently assessed eligibility of reports at the title and/or at abstract level, with a third reviewer (Kaiyu Zhou) determining the divergences together; studies that met the inclusion criteria were selected for further analysis.

The quality of each study’s methodology was assessed using the 14-item Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS) list [19]. Each question was assigned with a response of yes, no, or unclear when evaluating each of the included studies. Since the assessment of quality related strongly to the reporting of results, a well conducted study could score poorly if the methods and results were not reported in sufficient detail. Therefore, we did not report the assessment in scores but in descriptive forms only.

Publication Bias

Publication bias was tested using funnel plots and the Deek’s test by Stata statistical software (STATA) version 11.0. An asymmetric distribution of data points in the funnel plot and a quantified result of P, 0.10 in the Deek’s test indicated the presence of potential publication bias [20].

Heterogeneity

The $X^2$ test was used to examine heterogeneity in pooling sensitivity and specificity. The Cochran Q test was used to examine heterogeneity in pooling diagnostic odds ratio. Heterogeneity was considered to be statistically significant when $P<0.05$ in these qualitative tests. The $I^2$ test was also conducted in every pooling analysis to quantitatively estimate the proportion of total variation across studies that was attributable to heterogeneity rather than chance. The $I^2$ value would range from 0 to 100%, with a value over 50% indicating significant heterogeneity. The existence of a threshold effect would manifest as a curvilinear shape in the summary receiver operating characteristic curves.

Sensitivity Analysis

To determine whether any single study was incurring undue weight in the analysis, one set of study data were systematically removed, and the pooled results for the remaining studies were rechecked whether the results had a significant change. The sensitivity analysis was conducted for every study.

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed using Meta-Disc Version 1.4 [21] and STATA version 11.0. The test performance of different types of echocardiography detection for the fetal CHDs was measured by the following indicators: sensitivity, specificity and diagnostic odds ratio. Sensitivity was represented by the proportion of fetus with heart malformation that was correctly identified by the positive results of different types of echocardiography. Specificity was represented by the non-heart malformation cases that were correctly identified by the negative results of different types of echocardiography. Moreover, it was more reliable to define the summary of test performance using diagnostic odds ratio than simply pooling sensitivity and specificity together across the studies. Diagnostic odds ratio was an independent indicator ranging from 0 to infinity, which represented how much greater the odds of having fetal congenital heart disease were for patient with a positive detecting result than for patient with a negative ultrasound result. The higher the diagnostic odds ratio, the better the discriminatory ability of the test was [22]. The summary receiver operating characteristic curve was plotted based on the combination of sensitivity and specificity, and the area under the curve value was then calculated as a global measurement of test performance. The closer the the area under the curve value was to 1, the better the test performance [23]. And the $X^2$ test of evaluating the sensitivities and specificities among different types of
results of such accuracy evaluation [68]. The basic characteristics of included studies were showed in Table 1.

Study Quality
The QUADAS list of questions was used to review the test quality of the included studies. Most of the studies satisfied a majority of the items on the QUADAS list. The most common missing items in the studies included in this analysis were reports of uninterruptible test results and withdrawn cases. In addition, almost all of the studies failed to mention the blinded interpretations between the fetal ultrasound results and the neonatal or autopsy evaluation (Table S2).

Publication Bias
Funnel plots were used to evaluate the publication bias of included studies. Each dot represents a study and the distance between each dot and the vertical line suggests bias in each study. The absence of any asymmetric distribution suggested there was no publication bias. While the asymmetric distribution existed, that indicated that publication bias was existed. The Deek’s test revealed the possibility of significant publication bias among the included reports of ECEE (p = 0.01, 95% CI, −54.69 to −76.4) and 4 CV (p = 0.00, 95% CI, −52.92 to −17.20) evaluation pooled results. The funnel plot in Figure S2 and S3 also presented a certain degree of asymmetry, indicating the potential for publication bias among the studies included in this analysis. Otherwise, there were no significant publication bias among the included reports of STIC (p = 0.28, 95% CI, −13.03 to 37.69), 4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV (p = 0.21, 95% CI, −93.30 to 24.30) and 4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV (p = 0.13, 95% CI, −70.08 to 11.95) evaluation pooled results. The funnel plot in Figure S1, Figure S3 and Figure S4 also presented a certain degree of symmetry, indicating there was no potential for publication bias among the studies included in this analysis.

Overall Diagnostic Performance of Fetal Echocardiography

**STIC.** Overall diagnostic performance of STIC (Figure 2 and 3) shows the capability of STIC in detecting fetal CHD. The summary sensitivity was 0.90 (95% CI, 0.87 to 0.93), with individual sensitivities ranging from 0.70 to 1.00. The summary specificity was 0.92 (95% CI, 0.90 to 0.94), with individual specificities ranging from 0.46 to 0.99. Both pooled estimations showed significant heterogeneity (Sensitivity; P = 0.0100, \( \chi^2 = 18.47, I^2 = 62.1\); specificity; P = 0.0000, \( \chi^2 = 61.75, I^2 = 88.7\)%). The pooled diagnostic odds ratio was 131.65 (95% CI, 44.62 to 388.50), with individual diagnostic odds ratio ranging from 5.14 to 1267.00. The results of diagnostic odds ratio showed no consistency across the included reports, with noticeable heterogeneity (P = 0.0005, Cochran-Q = 26.14, \( I^2 = 73.2\)). The point size in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve represented the distribution existed, that indicated that publication bias was existed. The Deek’s test revealed the possibility of significant publication bias among the included reports of ECEE (p = 0.01, 95% CI, −54.69 to −76.4); specificity; P = 0.0000, \( \chi^2 = 144.48, I^2 = 84.1\)%). The pooled diagnostic odds ratio was 2538.16 (95% CI, 1144.30 to 5628.88), with individual diagnostic odds ratios ranging from 42.50 to 374862.84. The results of diagnostic odds ratio showed no consistency across the included reports, with noticeable heterogeneity (P = 0.0000, Cochran-Q = 77.38, \( I^2 = 70.3\)). The point size in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve suggested no potential presence of a threshold effect.

**ECEE.** Overall Diagnostic Performance of ECEE shows the capability of ECEE in detecting fetal CHD. The summary sensitivity was 0.89 (95% CI, 0.87 to 0.90), with individual sensitivities ranging from 0.43 to 1.00. The summary specificity was 1.00 (95% CI, 1.00 to 1.00), with individual specificities ranging from 0.96 to 1.00. Both pooled estimations showed significant heterogeneity (Sensitivity; P = 0.0000, \( \chi^2 = 168.03, I^2 = 86.3\); specificity; P = 0.0000, \( \chi^2 = 144.48, I^2 = 84.1\)%). The pooled diagnostic odds ratio was 5242.27 (95% CI, 2071.12 to 13177.88), with individual diagnostic odds ratios ranging from 42.50 to 374862.84. The results of diagnostic odds ratio showed no consistency across the included reports, with noticeable heterogeneity (P = 0.0000, Cochran-Q = 77.38, \( I^2 = 70.3\)). The point size in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve represented the proportional study weight. Most data gathered near the top left corner where sensitivity and specificity were both the highest. The area under the curve value was 0.9971 ± 0.0009. The absence of curvilinear shape in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve suggested no potential presence of a threshold effect.

**4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV.** Overall Diagnostic Performance of 4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV (Figure 4) shows the capability of 4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV in detecting fetal CHD. The summary sensitivity was 0.90 (95% CI, 0.86 to 0.93), with individual sensitivities ranging from 0.68 to 1.00. The summary specificity was 1.00 (95% CI, 1.00 to 1.00), with individual specificities ranging from 0.99 to 1.00. Both pooled estimations showed significant heterogeneity (Sensitivity; P = 0.0000, \( \chi^2 = 51.46, I^2 = 84.5\); specificity; P = 0.0082, \( \chi^2 = 20.63, I^2 = 61.2\)%). The pooled diagnostic odds ratio was 5224.27 (95% CI, 2071.12 to 13177.88), with individual diagnostic odds ratios ranging from 809.72 to 202125.00. The results of diagnostic odds ratio showed no consistency across the included reports, with noticeable heterogeneity (P = 0.01188, Cochran-Q = 12.80, \( I^2 = 37.5\)). The point size in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve suggested no potential presence of a threshold effect.

**4 CV + OTV / 3 VTV.** Overall Diagnostic Performance of 4 CV + OTV or 4 CV + 3 VTV shows the capability of...
Figure 1. Flow diagram of study selection process.
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| No. | Author    | Year | Journal                        | Design                        | Countries               | Sections | Types of CHDs | High/Low risk | Gestation weeks | Adequate reference standard | Fetus |
|-----|-----------|------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|
| 1a  | Volpe     | 2012 | J Ultrasound Med              | Retrospective & consecutive   | Italy                   | 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV          | Unselected  | Unselected    | Early (11–14)       | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 870   |
| 1b  | Volpe     | 2012 | J Ultrasound Med              | Retrospective & consecutive   | Italy                   | 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV          | Unselected  | Unselected    | Middle (18–22)      | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 870   |
| 2   | Yagel     | 2011 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol     | Retrospective & consecutive   | Israel                  | ECEE      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Early and Middle (14–16) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 13101 |
| 3   | Okturtlu  | 2010 | Anadolu Kardiyol Derg         | Retrospective & consecutive   | Turkey                  | 4 CV      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Early and Middle   | Partial postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 1370  |
| 4   | Espinoza  | 2010 | J Ultrasound Med              | Retrospective & nonconsecutive | USA+Italy+Israel+Chile | STIC     | Unselected    | Unselected    | Middle (18–26)     | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 90    |
| 5a  | Bennasar  | 2010 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol     | Prospective & consecutive     | Spain                   | ECEE      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Early and Middle (11–16) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 342   |
| 5b  | Bennasar  | 2010 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol     | Prospective & consecutive     | Spain                   | STIC      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Early and Middle (11–17) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 335   |
| 6   | Abu-Rustum| 2010 | J Ultrasound Med              | Retrospective & consecutive   | Lebanon                 | 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV          | Major CHDs | Unselected    | Early and Middle   | Postnatal ECHO | 1370  |
| 7a  | Wu        | 2009 | J Ultrasound Med              | Prospective & consecutive     | China                   | 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV          | Unselected  | Unselected    | Middle (20–24)     | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 8025  |
| 7b  | Wu        | 2009 | J Ultrasound Med              | Prospective & consecutive     | China                   | 4 CV      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Middle (20–24)     | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 8025  |
| 8a  | Bernard   | 2009 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol     | Retrospective & nonconsecutive | USA                    | 4 CV      | Unselected    | High Risk      | Middle (Mean 19)   | Postnatal ECHO | 117   |
| 8b  | Bernard   | 2009 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol     | Retrospective & nonconsecutive | USA                    | 4 CV      | Unselected    | High Risk      | Middle (Mean 23)   | Postnatal ECHO | 117   |
| 9a  | Bennasar  | 2009 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol     | Prospective & consecutive     | Spain                   | STIC      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Early (11–14)      | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 64    |
| 9b  | Bennasar  | 2009 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol     | Prospective & consecutive     | Spain                   | ECEE      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Early (11–15)      | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 64    |
| 10  | Paladini  | 2008 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol     | Prospective & consecutive     | Italy                   | STIC      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Middle (20)       | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 364   |
| 11a | Rizzo      | 2008 | Fetal Diagn Ther              | Retrospective & consecutive   | Italy                   | STIC      | Unselected    | Low Risk       | Middle (20.4)      | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 111   |
| 11b | Rizzo      | 2008 | Fetal Diagn Ther              | Retrospective & consecutive   | Italy                   | STIC      | Unselected    | Low Risk       | Middle (20.4)      | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 111   |
| 12  | Khoo       | 2008 | Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol    | Retrospective & consecutive   | Australia               | ECEE      | Unselected    | Unselected    | Middle (>20)       | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 310   |
| 13  | Plesinac   | 2007 | Int J Fertil Womens Med       | Prospective & consecutive     | Serbia                  | ECEE      | Unselected    | High Risk      | Not provided       | Postnatal ECHO or Surgery or PM Autopsy | 517   |
| 14a | Pascal     | 2007 | Cardiol Young                 | Retrospective & consecutive   | UK                      | ECEE      | Ventricular septal defects | Unselected | Middle and Late (18–34) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 57    |
| No. | Author | Year | Journal | Design            | Countries | Sections | Types of CHDs       | High/Low risk | Gestation weeks       | Adequate reference                  | Fetus |
|-----|--------|------|---------|-------------------|-----------|----------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|
| 14b | Pascal | 2007 | Cardiol Young | Retrospective & consecutive | UK        | ECEE     | Coarctation of the aorta | Unselected | Middle and Late (18–34) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 54    |
| 15  | Li     | 2007 | Chin Med J (Engl) | Retrospective & consecutive | China     | ECEE     | Twins in CHDs        | Unselected | Middle and Late (20–37) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 1103  |
| 16  | Bakiler | 2007 | Fetal Diagn Ther | Retrospective & consecutive | Turkey    | ECEE     | Unselected | High Risk | Middle (26–4) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 197   |
| 17  | Tegnander | 2006 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Prospective & consecutive | Norway    | 4 CV+3 VTV | Major CHDs | Unselected | Middle (16–22) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 29460 |
| 18  | Ogge   | 2006 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Prospective & consecutive | Italy     | 4 CV+OTV  | Unselected | Low Risk | Middle (16–22) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 9074  |
| 19  | Goncalves | 2006 | J Perinat Med | Retrospective & consecutive | USA       | STIC     | Unselected | Unselected | Early to Late (14–41) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 168   |
| 20a | Del Bianco | 2006 | J Perinat Med | Retrospective & consecutive | Italy     | 4 CV     | Unselected | Low Risk | Middle (20–24) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 2847  |
| 20b | Del Bianco | 2006 | J Perinat Med | Retrospective & consecutive | Italy     | 4 CV+3 VTV | Unselected | Low Risk | Middle (20–24) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 2847  |
| 21a | Becker | 2006 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Prospective & consecutive | Germany   | ECEE     | Unselected | Low Risk | Early (11–13) | Postnatal ECHO | 3094  |
| 21b | Becker | 2006 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Prospective & consecutive | Germany   | ECEE     | Unselected | High Risk | Early (11–13) | Postnatal ECHO | 306   |
| 22a | Zhou   | 2005 | Chin Med J (Engl) | Prospective & consecutive | China     | 4 CV     | Unselected | High Risk | Early and Middle (11–16) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 383   |
| 22b | Zhou   | 2005 | Chin Med J (Engl) | Prospective & consecutive | China     | ECEE     | Unselected | High Risk | Early and Middle (11–16) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 383   |
| 23  | Sklansky | 2005 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Retrospective & nonconsecutive | USA       | STIC     | Unselected | Unselected | Middle (26–28) | Fetal ECHO by 4 Reviewers | 18    |
| 24  | Paladini | 2005 | Prenat Diagn | Retrospective & consecutive | Italy     | 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV | Multiple pregnancies in CHDs | Unselected | Middle and Late (16–35) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 678   |
| 25  | Okturklu | 2005 | Turk J Pediatr | Prospective & consecutive | Turkey    | ECEE     | Unselected | High Risk | Middle and Late (18–39) | Postnatal ECHO or Cardiac catheterization or PM Autopsy | 642   |
| 26  | McAuliffe | 2005 | Am J Obstet Gynecol | Retrospective & Prospective & consecutive | Canada    | 4 CV+3 VTV | Unselected | High Risk | Early and Middle (11–15) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 153   |
| 27  | Machlitt | 2004 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Retrospective & Prospective & consecutive | Germany   | 4 CV     | AVSD     | Unselected | Middle (18–23) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 152   |
| 28  | Carvalho | 2004 | Heart | Retrospective & consecutive | UK        | 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV | Major CHDs | High Risk | Early (<16) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 230   |
| 29  | Galindo | 2003 | J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med | Retrospective & consecutive | Spain     | 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV | Unselected | High Risk | Middle (18–22) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 138   |
| No. | Author          | Year | Journal                          | Design                  | Countries | Sections | Types of CHDs | High/Low risk | Gestation weeks | Adequate reference standard | Fetus |
|-----|-----------------|------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|
| 30  | Bronshtein      | 2003 | Am J Cardiol                    | Retrospective & nonconsecutive | Israel    | ECEE     | AVSD          | High Risk     | Early (11–14)   | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 803   |
| 31a | Weiner          | 2002 | J Ultrasound Med                | Retrospective & consecutive | Israel    | 4 CV + 3 OTV | Unselected   | High Risk     | Early (11–14)   | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 392   |
| 31b | Weiner          | 2002 | J Ultrasound Med                | Retrospective & consecutive | Israel    | ECEE     | Unselected    | High Risk     | Early (15–16)   | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 438   |
| 31c | Weiner          | 2002 | J Ultrasound Med                | Retrospective & consecutive | Israel    | ECEE     | Unselected    | High Risk     | Middle (22–24) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 777   |
| 32  | Skeels          | 2002 | Pediatr Cardiol                 | Retrospective & consecutive | USA       | ECEE     | Unselected    | Unselected    | Middle (mean 21) | Late perinatal ECHO or postnatal ECHO | 614   |
| 33  | Haak            | 2002 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol       | Prospective & consecutive | Netherlands | ECEE     | Unselected    | High Risk     | Early (11–14)   | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 38    |
| 34  | Comas Gabriel   | 2002 | Prenat Diagn                    | Retrospective & consecutive | Spain     | 4 CV + 3 VTV | Unselected   | High Risk     | Early and Middle (12–17) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 334   |
| 35  | Meyer-Wittkopf  | 2001 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol       | Retrospective & consecutive | UK        | ECEE     | Major CHDs    | High Risk     | Middle and Late (17–38) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 1037  |
| 36a | Berghella       | 2001 | Fetal Diagn Ther                | Retrospective & consecutive | USA       | 4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV | Unselected | Unselected   | Middle and Late (Mean 30.4) | Postnatal ECHO or Surgery or PM Autopsy | 619   |
| 36b | Berghella       | 2001 | Fetal Diagn Ther                | Retrospective & consecutive | USA       | 4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV | Unselected | Unselected   | Middle and Late (Mean 29.4) | Postnatal ECHO or Surgery or PM Autopsy | 2147  |
| 37  | Simpson         | 2000 | BJOG                            | Retrospective & consecutive | UK        | 4 CV     | Major CHDs    | High Risk     | Early (11–15)   | Late perinatal ECHO or postnatal ECHO | 226   |
| 38  | Rustico         | 2000 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol       | Prospective & consecutive | Italy     | 4 CV     | Major CHDs    | Unselected    | Early (11–14)   | Late perinatal ECHO or postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 4716  |
| 39  | Zosmer          | 1999 | Br J Obstet Gynaecol            | Prospective & consecutive | UK        | 4 CV + OTV | Major CHDs    | High Risk     | Early (11–14)   | Late perinatal ECHO or postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 398   |
| 40  | Stefos          | 1999 | J Matern Fetal Med              | Prospective & consecutive | Greece    | 4 CV     | Unselected    | Unselected    | Middle (18–22)  | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 7236  |
| 41a | Odutlu          | 1999 | Turk J Pediatr                  | Prospective & consecutive | Turkey    | 4 CV + OTV | Major CHDs    | Unselected    | Middle and Late (15–37) | Postnatal ECHO or Cardiac catheterization | 128   |
| 41b | Odutlu          | 1999 | Turk J Pediatr                  | Prospective & consecutive | Turkey    | 4 CV + OTV | Minor CHDs    | Unselected    | Middle and Late (15–37) | Postnatal ECHO or Cardiac catheterization | 128   |
| 42a | Buskens         | 1996 | Circulation                     | Prospective & consecutive | Netherlands | 4 CV     | Unselected    | Unselected    | Middle (16–24)  | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 5319  |
| 42b | Buskens         | 1996 | Circulation                     | Prospective & consecutive | Netherlands | 4 CV     | Major CHDs    | Unselected    | Middle (16–24)  | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 5319  |
| 43  | Hafler          | 1998 | Prenat Diagn                    | Retrospective & consecutive | Austria   | 4 CV + OTV | Unselected    | Low Risk      | Early and Middle (10–24) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 6541  |
| 44  | Todros          | 1997 | Prenat Diagn                    | Prospective & consecutive | Italy      | 4 CV     | Unselected    | Low Risk      | Middle (19–22)  | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy          | 8299  |
| No. | Author       | Year | Journal              | Design                   | Countries | Sections       | Types of CHDs | High/Low risk | Gestation weeks | Adequate reference standard | Fetus |
|-----|--------------|------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| 45  | Kirk         | 1997 | Obstet Gynecol       | Retrospective & consecutive | USA       | 4 CV + OTV      | Unselected     | Unselected    | Middle and Late (>14) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 1612  |
| 46  | Crane        | 1997 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Retrospective & consecutive | Canada    | 4 CV           | Unselected     | Unselected    | Middle and Late (16–40) | Postnatal ECHO or Surgery or PM Autopsy | 409   |
| 47  | Stumpfelen   | 1996 | Lancet               | Retrospective & consecutive | Austria   | 4 CV + OTV      | Unselected     | Unselected    | Middle (18–28)     | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 3085  |
| 48  | Buskens      | 1996 | Obstet Gynecol       | Retrospective & consecutive | Netherlands | ECEE       | Unselected     | High Risk     | Middle (16–25)      | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 3223  |
| 49  | Saxena       | 1995 | Indian J Pediatr     | Retrospective & consecutive | Indian     | 4 CV           | Unselected     | High Risk     | Middle and Late (>20) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 993   |
| 50  | Rustico      | 1995 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Retrospective & consecutive | Italy     | 4 CV           | Unselected     | Low Risk      | Middle (20–22)      | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 7024  |
| 51a | Ott          | 1995 | Am J Obstet Gynecol  | Prospective & consecutive | USA       | 4 CV + OTV      | Unselected     | High Risk     | Middle and Late (>15) | Postnatal ECHO | 886   |
| 51b | Ott          | 1995 | Am J Obstet Gynecol  | Prospective & consecutive | USA       | 4 CV + OTV      | Unselected     | Low Risk      | Middle and Late (>15) | Postnatal ECHO | 1136  |
| 52  | Giancotti    | 1995 | Clin Exp Obstet Gynecol | Retrospective & consecutive | Italy     | ECEE           | Unselected     | High Risk     | Middle and Late (16–40) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 736   |
| 53  | Edwards      | 1995 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Retrospective & consecutive | USA       | ECEE           | Twins in CHDs | Unselected    | Middle (16–20)      | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 490   |
| 54  | Wilson       | 1994 | N Z Med J            | Retrospective & consecutive | New Zealand | 4 CV           | Unselected     | High Risk     | Middle (Mean 24)   | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 130   |
| 55  | Achiron      | 1994 | J Ultrasound Med     | Retrospective & consecutive | Israel    | ECEE           | Unselected     | Low Risk      | Early (13–15)     | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 660   |
| 56  | Vergani      | 1992 | Am J Obstet Gynecol  | Prospective & consecutive | Italy     | 4 CV           | Unselected     | Unselected    | Middle (18–20)     | Postnatal ECHO | 9016  |
| 57a | Achiron      | 1992 | BMJ                  | Retrospective & consecutive | Israel    | 4 CV           | Unselected     | Low Risk      | Middle (18–24)     | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 5347  |
| 57b | Achiron      | 1992 | BMJ                  | Retrospective & consecutive | Israel    | ECEE           | Unselected     | Low Risk      | Middle (18–24)     | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 5347  |
| 58  | Levi         | 1991 | Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol | Prospective & consecutive | Belgium   | 4 CV           | Unselected     | Low Risk      | Middle (16–20)     | Postnatal ECHO | 16361 |
| 59  | Martin       | 1990 | J Am Soc Echocardiogr| Retrospective & consecutive | USA       | 4 CV           | Unselected     | High Risk     | Middle (Mean 24)   | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 382   |
| 60  | Allan        | 1989 | Int J Cardiol        | Retrospective & consecutive | UK       | ECEE           | Unselected     | High Risk     | Middle and Late (20–34) | Postnatal ECHO or PM Autopsy | 978   |
| 61  | Copel        | 1987 | Am J Obstet Gynecol  | Retrospective & consecutive | USA       | 4 CV           | Unselected     | Not provided  | Postnatal ECHO | 1012 |
| 62  | Shollerd     | 1986 | Med J Aust           | Retrospective & consecutive | Australia | 4 CV           | Unselected     | High Risk     | Middle and Late (18–38) | Postnatal ECHO | 36    |
4 CV + OTV or 4 CV + 3 VTV in detecting fetal CHD. The summary sensitivity was 0.65 (95% CI, 0.61 to 0.69), with individual sensitivities ranging from 0.14 to 0.93. The summary specificity was 1.00 (95% CI, 1.00 to 1.00), with individual specificities ranging from 0.90 to 1.00. Both pooled estimations showed significant heterogeneity (Sensitivity: $P = 0.0000, \chi^2 = 68.44, I^2 = 82.5\%$; specificity: $P = 0.0000, \chi^2 = 144.48, I^2 = 91.7\%$). The pooled diagnostic odds ratio was 817.72 (95% CI, 310.54 to 2153.26), with individual diagnostic odds ratios ranging from 15.42 to 43402.38. The results of diagnostic odds ratio showed no consistency across the included reports, with noticeable heterogeneity ($P = 0.0000, \text{Cochran-Q} = 76.17, I^2 = 84.2\%$). The point size in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve represented the proportional study weight. Most data gathered near the left border where sensitivity diffused with a large range and specificity was the highest. The area under the curve value was 0.9929 ± 0.0029. The absence of curvilinear shape in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve suggested no potential presence of a threshold effect.

Overall Diagnostic Performance of 4 CV shows the capability of 4 CV in detecting fetal CHD. The summary sensitivity was 0.52 (95% CI, 0.50 to 0.55), with individual sensitivities ranging from 0.15 to 1.00. The summary specificity was 1.00 (95% CI, 1.00 to 1.00), with individual specificities ranging from 0.94 to 1.00. Both pooled estimations showed significant heterogeneity (Sensitivity: $P = 0.0000, \chi^2 = 589.26, I^2 = 96.1\%$; specificity: $P = 0.0000, \chi^2 = 252.76, I^2 = 90.9\%$). The pooled diagnostic odds ratio was 804.37 (95% CI, 385.59 to 1677.95), with individual diagnostic odds ratios ranging from 50.19 to 43435.59. The results of diagnostic odds ratio showed no consistency across the included reports, with noticeable heterogeneity ($P = 0.0000, \text{Cochran-Q} = 105.52, I^2 = 78.2\%$). The point size in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve represented the proportional study weight. Most data gathered near the left border where sensitivity diffused with a large range and specificity was the highest. The area under the curve value was 0.9928 ± 0.0022. The absence of curvilinear shape in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve suggested no potential presence of a threshold effect.

Sensitivity Analysis

We systematically removed one data set at a time and recalculated the diagnostic odds ratio and area under the curve values for the remaining studies. These results indicated that no single data set carried enough weight to significantly influence the pooled test performance reported for the ability of each type of fetal echocardiography to identify cases of fetal CHD. Finally, sensitivity analysis had been done by a larger sample size subgroup analysis in the comparison which enrolled more than 5 studies, and every analysis confirmed in both direction and magnitude of statistical significance the findings of the overall analysis.

Analysis of Variance

The comparison of sensitivity and specificity among different types of echocardiography had been done by $\chi^2$ test. Among 5 groups, the sensitivities and specificities were not all same for pooled results. Moreover, the sensitivities of STIC, ECEE and 4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV showed no significant difference by comparison. However, the results of 4 CV + OTV + 3 VTV and 4 CV pooled estimations showed significant differences between each group, with a significant lower sensitivity, especially for the 4 CV. The specificity of STIC pooled estimations showed significant differences between each group by comparison, with a significant lower specificity. However, the results of ECEE,
Discussion

This meta-analysis was restricted to the characteristics and accuracy of different protocols of fetal echocardiography scanning. Since the introduction of fetal echocardiography from 1980s, many studies have focused on its effectiveness of detecting fetal CHDs, and provided convincing evidence about its reliability and high scan quality [44,50,57,124]. Antenatal detection of CHDs remains one of the most challenging issues of prenatal diagnosis. Fetal cardiac abnormalities can be scanned and diagnosed as early as 11 weeks’ gestation by experienced groups [125], although the widely recommended age for performing routine fetal echocardiography is 22–24 weeks. It is also reasonable to put the scanning time forward to 12–20 gestation weeks for high-risk pregnancies [126,127]. Considering the superiority of prenatal diagnosis in helping neonatal administration and even life saving, fetal echocardiography has been listed in routine obstetrics ultrasound to provide more fetal information for parents [128,129]. The doctors can be informed clearly about the fetal heart function and the hemodynamics of fetal circulation. When the fetus meets restricted and harmful hemodynamics which could lead to abortion, her or his mother could receive immediately cesarean to terminate the continuous depravation of fetal condition [6,130–132]. Regarding this point, it is important to make a definite and scientific diagnosis.

Currently, most of cardiac malformations can be found out with the help of fetal echocardiography. Although amount of studies demonstrated the sensitivities and specificities of STIC, ECEE, 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV, 4 CV+OTV/3 VTV and 4 CV pooled estimations showed significant differences between each group, with almost the same specificities (Table 2).

Figure 2. Sensitivity and specificity of STIC detection for the diagnosis of fetal CHDs. (A) Pooled sensitivity. (B) Pooled specificity. Effect sizes were pooled by random-effects models. The point estimates from each study are shown as solid squares. The pooled estimates are shown as a solid diamond. Error bars represent 95% CIs; STIC, spatiotemporal image correlation; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0065484.g002
In this meta-analysis, we included 63 relevant studies with a total of 81 studies. Among the pooled diagnostic odds ratios, the STIC had the lowest diagnostic odds ratio of 131.65 (95% CI, 44.62 to 388.50). The areas under the curve of the summary receiver operating characteristic curves for all data sets were higher than 0.99 which demonstrated a quite high diagnostic accuracy. And the area under the curve of summary receiver operating characteristic of STIC was 0.9700 ± 0.0126. These results represented a good diagnostic efficacy for every method in identifying fetal CHD, regardless of the sample origin and methodology variation. STIC technology has been incorporated by some groups into the management of fetuses at high risk of CHDs [9]. The use of STIC in the first trimester has been reported only in some very recent series. STIC technology offers other advantages such as access to virtual planes not available for direct visualization in 2D ultrasound and multiplanar reconstruc-

Figure 3. Overall diagnostic odds ratio and summary receiver operating characteristic curves for all data sets describing the diagnostic performance of STIC detection in identifying fetal CHDs. (A) Overall diagnostic odds ratio. (B) The summary receiver operating characteristic curves for all data sets. Effect sizes were pooled by random-effects models. The pooled diagnostic odds ratio is shown as a solid diamond. Each square in the summary receiver operating characteristic curve represents one study. Sample size is indicated by the size of the square. STIC, spatiotemporal image correlation; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; DOR, diagnostic odds ratio; AUC, area under curve. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0065484.g003
tion to view three orthogonal planes simultaneously [10,31,86,135]. The navigation dot in multiplanar reconstruction provides positioning and orientation assistance to the operator. There are functional cardiology analyses that can only be performed with STIC technology. Vinals et al. demonstrated that volume datasets from a first-trimester fetal heart can be acquired in a high proportion of cases by properly trained non-expert operators and sent to an expert in ECEE for offline evaluation via telemedicine [136]. Although non-experts in echocardiography could acquire correct volumes in all patients in Bennasar et al. series [78]. Though STIC technology has above advantages, it can not take all the place of the 2D ultrasound scan for its poorer specificity. As previously reported, there are some areas of difficulty in diagnosis of CHD, especially at 11 to 14 weeks. This difficulty applies particularly to minor defects, such as ventricular septal defects [83,121], and to several forms of structural heart disease, which evolve in uterine and become apparent with the advancing of gestation.

To investigate potential variables of sensitivities and specificities among 5 scan protocols, a $\chi^2$ analysis was conducted to provide clues for methodological indications. It found that the sensitivities had been stabled at a level about 0.90, which suggested that completed 3 sections view could provide a satisfied sensitivity. Even though more sections scan could provide more information about fetal heart, but to routine fetal heart examination for low risk fetuses, the sections viewed after finishing 4 CV, OTV and 3 VTV with high quality images can get a stable accurate diagnosis level, and may not shrink the accuracy. However, once the fetus had been identified CHD, the ECEE and STIC maybe helpful in supplying more information, especially for complex CHDs. But the new technology of STIC could not get a top performance of specificity which traditional 2D ultrasound showed almost no false positive. At the same time, these results suggested the STIC technique can not be a final diagnostic method for fetal CHD alone. 2D ultrasound should be performed firstly and consider the STIC as an additional examination to provide local detail information of defects.

For such fetus in the early term of gestation, there are some difficulties to obtain 3 cardiac sections or complete a whole ECEE examination [125,137]. In this circumstances, it’s not responsible to make diagnosis of whether this fetus suffering from CHD. Longer term follow-up is still needed until echocardiography can be finished with more than 3 cardiac sections, especially for the pregnant woman with high risk factors. After that, the observers can make a scientific diagnosis and get more stereoscopic images.

![Figure 4. Sensitivity and specificity of 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV detection for the diagnosis of fetal CHDs.](image-url)

(A) Pooled sensitivity. (B) Pooled specificity. Effect sizes were pooled by random-effects models. The point estimates from each study are shown as solid squares. The pooled estimates are shown as a solid diamond. Error bars represent 95% CIs. 4 CV, 4 chamber view; OTV, outflow tract view; VTV, three-vessel trachea view; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0065484.g004
for fetal evaluation or even fetal treatment, such as fetal cardiac intervention and neonatal surgery at the very beginning of life.

The limitations of this meta-analysis are: 1) only English publications were included; 2) univariate analysis about the examination weeks, with or without high risk and the publication years had not been done for the large heterogeneity. The potential influence factors analysis might get unconvincing results for few studies respectively.

In conclusion, despite inter-study variability, the test performance of fetal CHD detected by echocardiography technology was impressive and non-consistent under circumstances of methodological changes. But each method demonstrated both acceptable sensitivity and specificity in detecting fetal heart defects. These results suggest a great diagnostic potential for fetal echocardiography detection as a reliable method of fetal CHD. At least 3 sections view (4 CV, OTV and 3 VTV) should be included in routine scan protocols, but in the specific examination of fetal heart structure, the ECEE should be done for more range of information and it encourages that ECEE should be performed for every high-risk pregnant women and in tertiary medical center. So that without 3 section view completed in primary scan, diagnosis of CHD can not be reached. While the STIC technology can be used to provide more detail information for local situation of defects, especially for such fetus who would undergo fetal cardiac intervention, STIC may be quite helpful and provide exact instructions. However, STIC can not be used to make a definite diagnosis alone with its relatively low specificity.

Supporting Information

Table 2. Analysis of Variance.

|            | STIC | ECEE | 4 CV+OTV+3 VTV | 4 CV+OTV/3 VTV |
|------------|------|------|----------------|----------------|
| Sensitivitya | 0.651<sup>+</sup> | 0.651<sup>+</sup> | 0.651<sup>+</sup> | 0.651<sup>+</sup> |
| Specificityb | <0.001<sup>d</sup> | <0.001<sup>d</sup> | <0.001<sup>d</sup> | <0.001<sup>d</sup> |

aThe sensitivities of 5 groups were not all the same by X<sup>2</sup> test with a p value <0.05.
bThe specificities of 5 groups were not all the same by X<sup>2</sup> test with a p value <0.05.
cWithout significant difference as p value ≥ 0.05.
dWith significant difference as p value < 0.05.

STIC, spatiotemporal image correlation; ECEE, extended cardiac echography examination; 4 CV, 4 chamber view; OTV, outflow tract view; VTV, three-vessel trachea view.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0065484.t002
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