Maternal-Fetal Surgery for Myelomeningocele
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Background

Practices are often adopted into obstetrical management without objective evaluation, especially for high-risk patients.
Background – Fetal Surgery

• Fetal surgery began for lethal conditions
• Risks involve two:
  – Mom
  – Baby
• Long term risks: future pregnancies
Fetal surgery for myelomeningocele moves beyond the typical paradigm - not a lethal condition
Background - Myelomeningocele

- In first 28 days of pregnancy
  - Two sides of the spine join to cover the spinal cord, spinal nerves and meninges
- If it doesn’t happen: birth defect with incomplete closure of spine
- Most significant/common type of spina bifida
  - Extrusion of the spinal cord into a fluid filled sac
Myelomeningocele

- Most common and severe CNS congenital anomaly
- Affecting ~ 1500 fetuses in US annually
- Severity correlated with level of the spinal cord lesion
  - The higher the more severe
  - Thoracic to sacral level (lumbar most common)
Complications of Spina Bifida

• Chiari II malformation – mainly hindbrain herniation (downward displacement of parts of brain into the cervical spinal canal)
  – Hydrocephalus, shunt placement to divert ventricular fluid to the peritoneum
  – Shunts can get blocked/infected
  – Brainstem malfunction, breathing, swallowing difficulty
Complications of Spina Bifida

• Incompletely functioning nerves
• Muscles do not get messages from the damaged nerves
  – Varying degrees of paralysis
  – Bowel and bladder dysfunction
• Clubfoot, skeletal abnormalities
• Social, emotional issues, obesity
Standard of Care

- Delivery by cesarean
- Postnatal closure of defect soon after birth
- Does not ‘cure’ spina bifida
- Most need a shunt
- Multifactorial disability – needs multidisciplinary care
Fetal Surgery for Myelomeningocele

• Fetal lamb model suggested improved neuromotor function

• Prenatal closure of lesion may reduce nerve damage from exposure to amniotic fluid
Human Fetal Myelomeningocele Repair
Prenatal Surgery: Open Hysterotomy
Prenatal Surgery

- Open hysterotomy; repair fetal lesion in utero
- By mid-2000 about 95 cases at 3 centers
- Apparent improvement in hindbrain herniation; shunting
- Conflicting results on neuromotor function
NICHD Workshop, July 2000

“Current Scientific, Ethical and Clinical Considerations of Maternal Fetal Surgery”

- Encouraged name of “maternal-fetal surgery”
- Myelomeningocele surgery discussed
  - Already clinically available
  - Limited follow-up
  - Unknown if outcome better
  - Called for randomized trial
Maternal-fetal surgery for myelomeningocele should be evaluated in a multicenter RCT
Why perform a trial?

- Apparent benefit to prenatal surgery (hindbrain herniation/need for shunting) but...
  - Comparison with historical controls; potential confounding
  - Potential risks to mom (uterine rupture?)
  - All babies born prematurely
  - Increased risk of fetal/neonatal death
  - Short term data only / incomplete follow-up
Goal of the MOMS Trial

To compare the safety and efficacy of in-utero repair of myelomeningocele with that of the standard postnatal repair.
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Development of MOMS Trial

- Three sites (CHOP, Vanderbilt, UCSF) agreed to collaborate
- Other maternal-fetal surgery sites agreed to “no back door” policy
  - Held off developing program for myelomeningocele repair
  - No maternal-fetal surgery available in US outside of the trial
Trial Design Issues

• Strong belief in benefit of prenatal surgery by some (doctors and patients) – lot of publicity

• Innovators – not used to standardization / multi-center trials

• Unmasked trial – subject to bias

• Primary outcome
  – Ventriculoperitoneal shunting practice-dependent
  – Disagreement regarding importance of shunting but neuromotor skills difficult to evaluate
  – Potential competing risk of fetal/neonatal death
Major Eligibility Criteria

- Singleton
- Upper boundary of lesion at T1-S1
- Evidence of hindbrain herniation by imaging
- Gestational age 19-25 weeks
- Normal karyotype (chromosomes)
- US residency
- BMI < 35
- Low risk of preterm birth
Basic Study Design

• Unmasked randomized trial
• Sample size 200
• Patients centrally screened at the Coordinating Center
• Those eligible and still interested assigned to a MOMS center
• Evaluated at MOMS center and if consenting, randomized
• Prenatal, postnatal repair & delivery at MOMS center
• 12 and 30 month follow-up
Central Screening

- Interested patients/doctors contacted DCC
- Screening by qualified personnel (MD, genetics counselor) masked to outcome of other patients
- Counseling for all patients
  - Spina bifida information
  - Potential benefits and risks of prenatal surgery
  - Concept of randomized trial
Referral

- Time to consider options, process information
- If patient eligible (from medical records) and could handle requirements of trial
  - Referred to one of the MOMS clinical centers
  - Assigned to center based on geography/convenience not choice of physician
Protocol

Eligible women assigned to a center
Central internet randomization

Prenatal group
Admitted to MOMS center
In utero repair
Remain near center until delivery
Delivery by Cesarean at 37wks if undelivered
Follow-up at 12, 30 months

Postnatal group
Return home
Return at 37wks to MOMS center for delivery by Cesarean
Postnatal closure within 48h
Primary Outcome (12 months)

• Death or need for ventricular decompressive shunting at 12 months defined by objective criteria
  – All babies had MRI at 12 months
  – Criteria met, but no shunt – still qualifies
  – After baby born, study neurosurgeon contacted home neurosurgeon

• Independent committee of neurosurgeons (blinded to surgery group)
Primary Outcome (30 months)

- Composite score (sum of ranks) of
  - Bayley Scales of Infant Development MDI and
  - Difference between the motor level and anatomic level

- Also potentially subject to bias, so
  - Evaluated by blinded independent examiners
  - Videotapes of physical exams reviewed by independent expert (motor level evaluation)
Difference between motor function and anatomic levels

(Observed motor function) – (anatomic level)

Examples:
(obs S1) – (anatomic L4) = + 2 levels
(obs L2) – (anatomic L4) = - 2 levels
Secondary Outcomes

• Pregnancy and delivery complications; gestational age at delivery
• Hindbrain herniation / other brain parameters (assessed from study MRIs by independent group of radiologists)
• Bayley Scales of Infant Development and other developmental tests
• Results of physical exam – including motor function and ability to walk
• Urology outcome (assessed by independent group of pediatric urologists)
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Protocol

Screening at Clinical Center
Central internet randomization

Prenatal group
Admitted to MOMS center
In utero repair
Remains near center until delivery
Deliver by Cesarean at 37wks if undelivered
Follow-up at 12, 30 months

Postnatal group
Return home
Return at 37wks to MOMS center for delivery by Cesarean
Postnatal closure within 48h
Screening at Clinical Center (2 days)

Travel / lodging arranged for mother and support person; paid by study

Evaluation process

If requirements met, offered randomization

Comprehensive ultrasound
MRI of fetus
Fetal echocardiogram
Psychological testing
Meetings with evaluations team

Fetal surgeon
Neurosurgeon
Nurse
Neonatologist
Social worker
Anesthesiologist
Perinatologist
Fetal Rx: Judging Risks vs. Benefits

- Risks to Mother
- Benefits/Risks to Fetus

- Future Benefits to Fetal Patient
Informed Consent

• Hopes versus reality
• Confidence to say “no”
• Randomization: a blessing and a curse
• Obstacles
  – Language barriers
  – Level of education
Motivation to Participate

• Wanting to do everything possible for their baby
• Termination not an option
• Wanting to help other children similarly affected
• Belief and respect for medicine and medical research
Alternative Motivation

• Pressure from family or partner
• Lured by the candor and kindness of team members
• Focus of attention
• Escape into a caretaking world and away from other psychosocial realities
Maternal Considerations

- Stress of procedure
- Uncertainty of outcome
- Mental health issues and coping style
- Available support person
- Separation from children, spouse, work
Institutional Constraints

- Limited family housing
- Time consuming process for team members
MOMS Coordinator Role

• Representative on the multidisciplinary team
• Clinical understanding of the problem
• Patient advocate
• “Communicator” with all team members
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Recruitment

• Sample size 200
• Projected timeline 18 months for recruitment (before 2\textsuperscript{nd} endpoint evaluated)
• Started enrollment Feb 2003
• Data and Safety Monitoring Committee meeting in 2010 – 183 recruited
Results

• DSMC recommendations:
  • Immediate termination of recruitment for efficacy (both boundaries crossed)
  • MOMS centers allowed to offer prenatal surgery
  • Expedite publication

• Results based on:
  • 158 patients whose children were evaluated at 12 months
  • 134 patients whose children were evaluated at 30 months
A Randomized Trial of Prenatal versus Postnatal Repair of Myelomeningocele
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# 12 Month Primary Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prenatal N=78</th>
<th>Postnatal N=80</th>
<th>RR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary outcome</td>
<td>53 (68)</td>
<td>78 (98)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.58–0.84)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual placement of shunt</td>
<td>31 (40)</td>
<td>66 (82)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.36–0.64)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindbrain herniation</td>
<td>45/70 (64%)</td>
<td>66/69 (96%)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.56–0.81)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 30 Month Primary Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prenatal N=64</th>
<th>Postnatal N=70</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary outcome score</strong></td>
<td>148.6 ± 57.5</td>
<td>122.6 ± 57.2</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Components of primary outcome:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayley mental developmental index (MDI)</td>
<td>89.7 ± 14.0</td>
<td>87.3 ± 18.4</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between motor function and anatomic levels</td>
<td>0.58 ± 1.94</td>
<td>-0.69 ± 1.99</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 2 levels better than expected</td>
<td>20 (32)</td>
<td>8 (12)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Secondary Outcomes (30 months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prenatal</th>
<th>Postnatal</th>
<th>RR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking independently on exam</strong></td>
<td>26 (42%)</td>
<td>14 (21%)</td>
<td>2.01 (1.16–3.48)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bayley psychomotor developmental index</strong></td>
<td>64.0±17.4</td>
<td>58.3±14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peabody Motor Scales:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary score</td>
<td>7.4±1.1</td>
<td>7.0±1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locomotion score</td>
<td>3.0±1.8</td>
<td>2.1±1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object manipulation score</td>
<td>5.1±2.6</td>
<td>3.7±2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Maternal Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prenatal N=78</th>
<th>Postnatal N=80</th>
<th>RR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chorioamniotic membrane separation</td>
<td>20 (25.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary edema</td>
<td>5 (6.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligohydramnios (low amniotic fluid)</td>
<td>16 (20.5)</td>
<td>3 (3.8)</td>
<td>5.47 (1.66-18.04)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placental abruption</td>
<td>5 (6.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood transfusion at delivery</td>
<td>7 (9.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.3)</td>
<td>7.18 (0.90-57.01)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Maternal Outcome – Hysterotomy Scar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scar Type</th>
<th>Prenatal N=76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intact, well-healed</td>
<td>49 (64.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very thin</td>
<td>19 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of dehiscence</td>
<td>7 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete dehiscence</td>
<td>1 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Dehiscence Rate:** 35.5%
## Fetal and Neonatal Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prenatal N=78</th>
<th>Postnatal N=80</th>
<th>RR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradycardia during repair surgery</td>
<td>8 (10.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perinatal death*</td>
<td>2 (2.6)</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>1.03 (0.14-7.10)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA at birth</td>
<td>34.1±3.1</td>
<td>37.3±1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 wks</td>
<td>10 (12.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 weeks</td>
<td>26 (33.3)</td>
<td>4 (5.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-36 weeks</td>
<td>26 (33.3)</td>
<td>8 (10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=37 weeks</td>
<td>16 (20.5)</td>
<td>68 (85.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prenatal: 26 wks, 23 wks
Postnatal: neonatal deaths with severe symptoms of Chiari II
Neonatal Outcomes

• As expected many more babies in the prenatal surgery group were born prematurely
• Significant difference in respiratory distress syndrome (RDS) 21% vs 6%
• Other morbidity rare in prenatal surgery group
Summary

- Prenatal surgery for myelomeningocele reduces the need for a shunt or death and improves motor outcomes at 30 months but is associated with maternal and fetal risks.
Summary

- Prenatal surgery is associated with other favorable secondary outcomes:
  - Reduces hindbrain herniation at 12 months
    No evidence of herniation in 36% vs 4%
  - Doubles ability to walk without orthotics
    42% vs 21%
  - More likely to have a level of function that was two or more levels better than expected according to anatomic levels
    32% vs 12%
Summary

- Prenatal surgery associated with maternal and fetal risks
  - Preterm birth: 80% vs 15%
  - Bradycardia
  - Oligohydramnios
  - Placental abruption
  - Transfusion at delivery
  - Uterine dehiscence at surgical site (35%)
Important considerations

• Repairs were undertaken at three sites with
  – multidisciplinary teams
  – expertise in open maternal-fetal surgical cases
  – facilities to handle complications

• Specific protocol followed
  – Continuous fetal echocardiographic surveillance throughout surgery
  – Residing near center until delivery

• Implementation of this intervention should be carefully planned and monitored
Implementation

- October 2011: NICHD convened MOMS Implementation meeting
  - Professional organizations, experts, insurers, governmental agencies (NIH, CDC, AHRQ, CMS)
- December 2011: MOMS Implementation Follow-up meeting convened
- Plans:
  - Consensus document on implementation underway with planned publication
  - Collaborative efforts across professional groups
Follow-up Study: MOMS2

- MOMS children at 6-9 years of age
- Primary outcome: Vineland Scales of Adaptive Behavior
- Visits: June 2012 - 2016
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