



HAL
open science

Should prenatal chromosomal microarray analysis be offered for isolated fetal growth restriction? A French multicenter study

Isabelle Monier, Aline Receveur, Véronique Houfflin-Debargue, Valérie Goua, Vanina Castaigne, Jean-Marie Jouannic, Eve Mousty, Anne-Hélène Saliou, Hanane Bouchghoul, Thierry Rousseau, et al.

► To cite this version:

Isabelle Monier, Aline Receveur, Véronique Houfflin-Debargue, Valérie Goua, Vanina Castaigne, et al.. Should prenatal chromosomal microarray analysis be offered for isolated fetal growth restriction? A French multicenter study. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 2021, 225 (6), pp.676.e1-676.e15. 10.1016/j.ajog.2021.05.035 . inserm-03617447

HAL Id: inserm-03617447

<https://inserm.hal.science/inserm-03617447v1>

Submitted on 5 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Should prenatal chromosomal microarray analysis be offered for isolated fetal**
2 **growth restriction? A French multicenter study**

3
4 Isabelle MONIER^{1,2}, RM, PhD, Aline RECEVEUR³, MD, Véronique HOUFFLIN-
5 DEBARGE⁴, MD, PhD, Valérie GOUA⁵, MD, Vanina CASTAIGNE⁶, MD, Jean-Marie
6 JOUANNIC⁷, MD, PhD, Eve MOUSTY⁸, MD, Anne-Hélène SALIOU⁹, MD, Hanane
7 BOUCHGHOUL¹⁰, MD, Thierry ROUSSEAU¹¹, MD, Anne-Sylvie VALAT¹², MD, Marion
8 GROUSSOLLES¹³, MD, Florent FUCHS¹⁴, MD, PhD, Guillaume BENOIST¹⁵, MD,
9 PhD, Sophie DEGRE¹⁶, MD, Jérôme MASSARDIER¹⁷, MD, Vassilis TSATSARIS¹⁸,
10 MD, PhD, Pascale KLEINFINGER¹⁹, MD, Jennifer ZEITLIN¹, MA, DSc, Alexandra
11 BENACHI², MD, PhD, for the French Federation of Fetal Medicine Centers

12
13 **Affiliations**

14 1 Obstetrical, Perinatal and Pediatric Epidemiology Research Team (EPOPé),
15 Université de Paris, Epidemiology and Statistics Research Center (CRESS), Institut
16 national de la santé et de la recherche médicale (INSERM), Institut national de la
17 recherche agronomique (INRA), Paris, France

18 2 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Antoine Bécère Hospital, AP-HP, Paris
19 Saclay University, Clamart, France

20 3 Department of Cytogenetics and Reproductive Biology, Antoine Bécère Hospital,
21 AP-HP, Paris Saclay University, Clamart, France

22 4 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Jeanne de Flandres University Hospital,
23 Lille, France

24 5 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Poitiers University Hospital, Poitiers,
25 France

26 6 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Centre Hospitalier Intercommunal de
27 Créteil, Créteil, France

28 7 Fetal Medicine Department, Armand-Trousseau Hospital, AP-HP, Sorbonne
29 University, Paris, France

30 8 Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Nîmes University Hospital, Nîmes,
31 France

32 9 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Brest University Hospital, Brest, France

33 10 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Bicêtre Hospital, AP-HP, Paris Saclay
34 University, Le Kremlin Bicêtre, France

- 35 11 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Dijon University Hospital, Dijon, France
36 12 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Lens Hospital, Lens, France
37 13 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Paule de Viguier Hospital, Toulouse
38 University Hospital, Toulouse, France
39 14 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Montpellier University Hospital Center,
40 Montpellier, France
41 15 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Caen University Hospital Center, Caen,
42 France
43 16 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Le Havre University Hospital Center, Le
44 Havre, France
45 17 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Bron, France
46 18 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Cochin Hospital, AP-HP, Paris-
47 Descartes University, Paris, France
48 19 Laboratoire CERBA, 7/11 Rue de l'Équerre, Saint-Ouen-l'Aumône, France

49

50 **Disclosure statement:** The authors report no conflict of interest

51

52 **Source of funding:** The study was funded by the French Biomedicine Agency

53

54 **Corresponding Author**

55 Isabelle MONIER

56 Inserm UMR 1153, Obstetrical, Perinatal and Pediatric Epidemiology Research Team
57 Port Royal Maternity Unit, 53 Avenue de l'Observatoire, 75014 Paris, France

58 Tel: +33 (0)1 42 34 55 86

59 Fax: +33 (0)1 43 26 89 79

60 E-mail: isabelle.monier@inserm.fr

61

62 **Word Count:** Abstract: 347 Main text: 3292

63

64

65 **Condensation**

66 Chromosomal microarray analysis should be offered in addition to karyotype in fetuses
67 diagnosed with isolated fetal growth restriction

68

69 **Short Title**

70 Chromosomal microarray analysis for isolated fetal growth restriction

71

72 **AJOG at a Glance**

73 **A. Why was the study conducted?**

74 This study aimed to investigate the diagnostic yield of chromosomal microarray
75 analysis over karyotype in the detection of genetic anomalies in fetuses diagnosed with
76 isolated fetal growth restriction.

77

78 **B. What are the key findings?**

79 Among fetuses diagnosed with isolated fetal growth restriction and a normal karyotype,
80 chromosomal microarray analysis identified clinically significant findings in 3.6% of
81 fetuses and variants of unknown significance in 2.1%.

82

83 **C. What does this study add to what is already known?**

84 Chromosomal microarray analysis improves the detection of genetic anomalies
85 compared to karyotype alone in fetuses diagnosed with isolated fetal growth restriction.

86 Findings from this study support offering chromosomal microarray analysis in addition
87 to karyotype in cases of isolated fetal growth restriction.

88

89 **Keywords:** fetal growth restriction, prenatal diagnosis, chromosomal microarray, copy
90 number variants, karyotype

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109 **Abstract**

110 **Background:** Chromosomal microarray analysis (CMA) improves the detection of
111 genetic anomalies over standard karyotype and is thus recommended in many prenatal
112 indications. However, evidence is still lacking on the clinical utility of CMA in cases of
113 isolated fetal growth restriction (FGR).

114 **Objective:** To estimate the proportion of copy number variants (CNVs) detected by
115 CMA and the incremental yield of CMA over karyotype in the detection of genetic
116 abnormalities in fetuses with isolated FGR.

117 **Study design:** This retrospective study included all singleton fetuses diagnosed with
118 FGR and no structural ultrasound anomalies and referred to 13 French fetal medicine
119 centers over a one-year period in 2016. FGR was defined as an estimated fetal weight
120 <10th percentile for gestational age identified in ultrasound reports. For this analysis,
121 we selected fetuses who underwent invasive genetic testing with karyotype and CMA
122 results. Data were obtained from medical records and ultrasound databases as well as
123 post-mortem and placental examination reports in case of spontaneous stillbirths and
124 terminations of pregnancy. Following the American College of Medical Genetics and
125 Genomics guidelines, CNVs were classified into 5 groups as following: pathogenic,
126 likely pathogenic, variant of unknown significance (VOUS), likely benign and benign.

127 **Results:** Of 682 referred fetuses diagnosed with isolated FGR, both karyotype and
128 CMA were performed in 146 fetuses. Overall, the detection rate of genetic anomalies
129 found by CMA was estimated to be 7.5% (11/146, CI95%: 3.3,11.8) including 10 CNVs
130 classified as pathogenic and one as likely pathogenic. Among the 139 fetuses with
131 normal karyotype, 5 fetuses were detected with pathogenic and likely pathogenic
132 CNVs resulting in an incremental yield of 3.6% (CI95%: 0.5-6.6) of CMA over

133 karyotype. All fetuses detected with pathogenic or likely pathogenic CNVs resulted in
134 terminations of pregnancy. In addition, 3 fetuses with normal karyotype were detected
135 with VOUS (2.1%). Of the 7 fetuses with abnormal karyotype, CMA did not detect one
136 fetus with trisomy 18 mosaicism.

137 **Conclusion:** Our study found that CMA improves the detection of genetic anomalies
138 over karyotype in fetuses diagnosed with isolated FGR. These results support the use
139 of CMA in addition to karyotype for isolated FGR.

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155 **Introduction**

156 Fetal growth restriction (FGR) is associated with high risks of perinatal mortality,
157 neurodevelopmental impairments and other neonatal morbidities that can be related
158 to risks of vascular disease in adulthood.¹⁻⁵ The diagnosis of FGR is most often based
159 on an estimated fetal weight <10th percentile for gestational age.⁶⁻⁸ There are several
160 pathological mechanisms leading to FGR and identifying these is required for optimal
161 management of the pregnancy. One cause can be the presence of chromosomal
162 abnormalities associated with structural anomalies which account for between 7% and
163 30% of FGR cases.⁹⁻¹¹ However, chromosomal anomalies can also be present when
164 no structural anomalies associated with FGR are detected on the ultrasound,^{9,12} and
165 therefore prenatal invasive genetic testing may be offered in cases of isolated FGR in
166 order to exclude genetic disorders.

167 Chromosomal microarray analysis (CMA) is known to improve the detection of
168 genomic abnormalities compared to prenatal karyotype¹³⁻¹⁷ but the clinical utility of
169 CMA in fetuses with isolated FGR is still debated. While the Society for Maternal-Fetal
170 Medicine recently recommended that CMA should be offered in cases of isolated FGR
171 diagnosed before 32 weeks of gestation,¹⁸ other societies do not have guidelines for
172 best practice on the use of CMA for this indication.¹⁹⁻²³ This uncertainty highlights, in
173 part, the absence of high-quality empirical data on the impact of CMA in cases of
174 isolated FGR, as reflected by the assessment of the Society for Maternal-Fetal
175 Medicine that the evidence for their recommendation was of low-quality (grade C).¹⁸
176 There is one meta-analysis of 9 observational studies that showed an increase of 4%
177 in detection of genomic abnormalities by CMA in fetuses diagnosed with isolated FGR
178 with a normal karyotype.²⁴ However, most studies included in this meta-analysis were
179 single-center studies using small samples with inconsistencies between studies in the

180 definition of FGR. More generally, there is heterogeneity across studies in the method
181 used to estimate the incremental yield of CMA over karyotype leading to uncertainties
182 in the relevance of performing CMA for this indication and to confusion when
183 interpreting and comparing results from different studies.

184 This study aimed to estimate the proportion and the type of copy number variants
185 (CNVs) detected by CMA and the diagnosis yield of CMA over karyotype in the
186 detection of genomic abnormalities in fetuses with isolated FGR.

187

188 **Materials and Methods**

189 Data come from a retrospective observational study including all singleton fetuses
190 diagnosed with FGR without apparent structural ultrasound anomalies regardless of
191 gestational age at diagnosis and referred to 13 French fetal medicine centers between
192 January 1st and December 31st, 2016. Exclusion criteria were multiple pregnancy,
193 imprecise pregnancy dating as assessed by no first trimester ultrasound between 11+0
194 and 13+6 weeks of gestational age,⁶ maternal age <18 years old, short femoral length
195 as the only criteria for suspicion of FGR and congenital malformation detected at
196 ultrasound at the time of referral. FGR associated with congenital infections such as
197 Toxoplasmosis or Cytomegalovirus were not excluded if there was no structural
198 ultrasound anomaly associated with. This study received ethics approval from the
199 National Data Protection Authority (National Commission on Informatics and Liberty
200 no. 917163) and Ethical Committee (approval granted April 02, 2017, reference
201 CEROG OBS 2016-11-05). The study was funded by the French Biomedicine Agency.
202 The study population included fetuses diagnosed with isolated FGR who underwent
203 invasive genetic testing with both karyotype and CMA results. According to the

204 American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommendations,⁸
205 FGR was defined as fetuses with an estimated fetal weight (EFW) <10th percentile for
206 gestational age noted in ultrasound reports by expert sonographers and identified in
207 the electronic ultrasound databases (ViewPoint) used in all participating centers. In
208 France, gestational age is determined using the measurement of crown-rump length
209 at the first trimester ultrasound and French growth references are recommended for
210 calculating EFW percentiles.^{6,25} Structural anomalies associated with FGR included
211 and excluded from the study were independently selected by three experts in fetal
212 medicine based on the list of minor anomalies developed by the European surveillance
213 of congenital anomalies (EUROCAT) network (Table S1).²⁶ Discordant entries were
214 adjudicated between the experts (AB, VT, JM). Soft markers such as intestinal
215 hyperechogenicity and amniotic fluid abnormalities, are not structural anomalies and
216 were thus included.

217 Data were obtained from ultrasound electronic database and medical charts using a
218 standardized form by two midwives (IM and CV) trained for the study. Maternal
219 characteristics included maternal age, parity, height and weight before pregnancy and
220 smoking status; clinical characteristics included prenatal care, management of the
221 pregnancy in fetal medicine centers, pregnancy complications and mode of delivery.
222 We also collected ultrasound characteristics of the ultrasound when FGR was
223 diagnosed; this included gestational age at ultrasound, EFW expressed in grams and
224 in percentiles according to French growth references²⁵ and results of uterine and
225 umbilical Dopplers. Information on gestational age at birth, birthweight, neonatal
226 resuscitation and admission in a neonatal unit was collected to describe the infant's
227 health. We used intrauterine growth curves adapted to the French population for
228 calculating birthweight percentile.²⁷ Fetus autopsy (or postmortem) and placental

229 examination reports were also reviewed in case of spontaneous stillbirth or
230 terminations of pregnancy if these tests were accepted by parents.

231 The genomic study was performed using DNA extracted from native amniotic fluid or
232 cultured amniotic cells. According to cytogenetics laboratories, comparative genomic
233 hybridization (CGH) or single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) microarrays were used.
234 Hybridization strategies included hybridization against fetal sex reference and trio-
235 hybridization patients against parent's DNA. For array-CGH, chip design were most
236 often PrecytoNEM which is a specific enriched design for prenatal diagnosis
237 assessment (resolution: 105K genome-wide randomized probes with specific
238 enrichment, Agilent) and SurePrint G3 Human which is a basic design (resolution:
239 60K/180 K genome-wide randomized probes, Agilent); for SNP, Omniexpress 24
240 design was used (resolution: 130/400 million respectively of genome-wide randomized
241 clusters, Illumina). DNA extracted from parental blood samples were also often
242 analyzed in case of CMA findings for heritability assessment or during trios analyses.

243 In case of CMA findings, parental DNA were studied using both CMA and quantitative
244 fluorescence polymerase chain reaction to confirm CNVs. For CNV >200 kb, rapid
245 aneuploidy detection by quantitative fluorescence polymerase chain reaction was
246 performed on circulating lymphocytes isolated from parental blood samples.

247 All CMA were retrospectively reviewed and CNVs were classified using the data
248 available at the time of the study period by two cytogeneticists (AR, PK) based on
249 their size, their genomic position and the involved genes based on the published
250 literature (PubMed) and the following genetic databases: Database of Genomic
251 Variants (DGV), Clinical Genome Resource consortium (ClinGen), Database of
252 genomic variation and Phenotype in Human using Ensembl Resources (DECIPHER,
253 v10.2), Achropuce French consortium database and ClinVar. According to joint

254 consensus recommendations of the American College of Medical Genetics and
255 Genomics (ACMG) and the Clinical Genome Resource (ClinGen), CNVs were
256 classified into 5 groups:^{28,29} pathogenic, likely pathogenic, variant of unknown
257 significance (VOUS), likely benign and benign. CNVs documented as likely benign or
258 a benign variant, which corresponds to a normal result, were not reported as
259 recommended in French cytogenetic guidelines.³⁰ CMA and karyotype results were
260 reported using ISCN nomenclature (ISCN 2016).

261 We first described the maternal, clinical and neonatal characteristics of the study
262 population. Characteristics of the study population were compared to fetuses who did
263 not undergo genetic invasive testing and to with only karyotype. The detection rate of
264 clinically significant findings found by CMA was estimated among all fetuses
265 irrespectively of karyotype results. The diagnostic yield of CMA over karyotype was
266 calculated as the proportion of fetuses detected with pathogenic and likely pathogenic
267 CNVs among fetuses with normal karyotype. Details of cases detected with clinically
268 significant findings found by CMA were reported according to karyotype results.

269 To compare our results with the existing evidence, we tabulated the results of the 9
270 studies included in the meta-analysis conducted from January 2009 to November
271 2016²⁴ and added studies conducted from January 2017 through January 2021.
272 Studies in English language were included if CMA and karyotype were performed in
273 fetuses diagnosed with isolated FGR. These were identified using the PudMed
274 database and the following search terms: 'fetal growth restriction', 'intrauterine growth
275 restriction', 'small-for-gestational age', 'chromosomal microarray analysis', 'copy
276 number variants' and 'karyotype'. We also looked for additional studies in the reference
277 lists of selected articles. This comparison took into consideration the different
278 estimation methods for the incremental yield of CMA over karyotype and the studies'

279 inclusion of VOUS. Descriptive analyses were performed using STATA software
280 (version 15.0; StataCorp LP, College Station, TX).

281

282 **Results**

283 The study included 682 singleton fetuses diagnosed with isolated FGR without
284 structural anomalies and referred to one of the 13 fetal medicine centers participating
285 to the study between January 1st and December 31st, 2016. (Figure 1) Invasive testing
286 was performed in 245 fetuses (35.9%). Of these, the study population included 146
287 fetuses with both karyotype and CMA results. There was only one case of CMV
288 infection and no case of Toxoplasmosis infection.

289 Maternal and neonatal characteristics of the study population are described in Table
290 1. Mean maternal age was 30.7 (standard deviation (SD): 6.1) and almost all women
291 performed first or second trimester serum tests for Down's syndrome screening
292 (96.5%). Among all cases, 83.0% were live births, 4.2% were spontaneous stillbirths
293 and 12.8% were terminations of pregnancy. Mean gestational age at FGR diagnosis
294 was 24.7 (SD: 4.1) with an EFW <3rd percentile for 79% of fetuses. Because
295 information on intrauterine growth charts used by ultrasonographers was not available,
296 EFW percentiles were calculating using French College of Fetal Ultrasonography
297 references and 6 fetuses had an EFW >10th percentile. Mean gestational age at birth
298 was 34.7 (SD: 4.8) and 68.6% of infants had birthweights <3rd percentile. As expected,
299 fetuses who did not undergo invasive genetic testing were diagnosed later with FGR
300 and had a higher EFW compared to those where karyotype and CMA were performed.
301 (Table S2) Compared to the study population, fetuses with karyotype only were more
302 often stillbirths or terminations of pregnancy with delivery before 26 weeks of gestation.

303 (Table S3) All genetic samples were obtained from amniocentesis. Pathogenic and
304 likely pathogenic CNVs were found in 11 of the 146 fetuses resulting in an overall
305 detection rate of genetic anomalies by CMA estimated to be 7.5% (CI95%: 3.3,11.8).
306 Among the 139 fetuses with normal karyotype, 4 fetuses were detected with
307 pathogenic CNVs and one fetus with likely pathogenic CNV resulting in an incremental
308 yield of CMA over normal karyotype estimated to be 3.6% (CI95%: 0.5-6.6). (Table 2)
309 Among pathogenic findings by CMA, there was one uniparental disomy related to
310 Prader-Willi syndrome and non-recurrent microdeletions at 19q12q13.12, 12q13.13
311 and 19p13.2p13.11loci. All these cases resulted in terminations of pregnancy with
312 fetuses having birthweights <3rd percentile, except one fetus who had a birthweight
313 between the 3rd and the 10th percentile. One fetus was found with polyhydramnios
314 (case 4) and one fetus was diagnosed with FGR after 32 weeks of gestation (case 5).
315 In this last case, a nulliparous 27 year-old woman with a low-risk pregnancy had normal
316 first and second trimester ultrasounds, but fetal weight was estimated to be 1508g (<3rd
317 percentile) with normal amniotic fluid and Doppler at the third trimester ultrasound at
318 32 weeks and 5 days gestation. The karyotype was normal but a pathogenic CNV was
319 found by CMA; the pregnancy resulted in a late termination of pregnancy. Finally, 3
320 fetuses (2.1%) were detected with CNVs classified as VOUS at the time of the study
321 period.

322 Seven fetuses were found with abnormal karyotype (4.8%, CI95%: 1.3-8.3). Clinical
323 characteristics and genetic results of fetuses with abnormal karyotype are presented
324 in Table 3. Abnormal karyotype was related to syndromes in four cases: 4p (Wolf
325 Hirschhorn syndrome, case 9), 47XXY (Klinefelter syndrome, case 11), 45, X (Turner
326 syndrome, case 14) and Trisomy 18 (Edwards syndrome, case 13). The Klinefelter
327 syndrome (case 11) may be considered as an incidental finding since the phenotype

328 is not associated with FGR. For the Edwards syndrome (case 13), CMA did not detect
329 anomalies although the karyotype was abnormal; this case had rapid prenatal FISH
330 testing performed from uncultured amniotic fluid at 34 weeks and 4 days. It revealed a
331 mosaic trisomy 18 in 13% of interphasic cells, confirmed on cultured cells. The case
332 15 found with abnormal karyotype and CNV classified as pathogenic was associated
333 with echogenic bowel. Other 11 cases associated with echogenic bowel had normal
334 karyotype and no CMA finding.

335 Overall, 5 studies were identified in addition to the 9 existing studies included in the
336 meta-analysis of Borrell et al. (Table 4) The incremental yield of CMA over normal
337 karyotype ranged between 0% to 16.7% for all studies and from 2.6% to 6.1% among
338 the studies with samples over 100. Four of the five new studies reported results falling
339 within the 95% confidence intervals of Borrell's pooled estimate. VOUS were found in
340 0.8% to 7.2% of fetuses with normal karyotype, but this information was not reported
341 in all studies. Some studies included VOUS in their reported estimates of the
342 incremental yield of CMA which had a large impact on the results.

343

344 **Comment**

345 *Principal findings*

346 Our study found that CMA had an added value in the detection of genetic anomalies
347 compared to karyotype in cases of isolated FGR with no structural anomalies. In
348 fetuses with normal karyotype, CMA detected additional clinically significant findings
349 in 3.6% of cases and VOUS in 2.1%.

350

351 *Results in context*

352 The diagnostic yield of CMA over karyotype in singleton fetuses diagnosed with
353 isolated FGR has varied in past studies. In the meta-analysis of Borrell et al., the overall
354 increase of CMA over karyotype in the detection of genetic anomalies defined as
355 pathogenic CNVs was estimated to be 4% (CI95%: 1-6) with a wide range of rates
356 between 0% and 17% across studies.²⁴ The more recent literature has provided
357 detection rates in line with this pooled estimate of this meta-analysis ranging between
358 0% and 5.9%. In our study, we found a similar detection rate of 3.6% (CI95%: 0.5-6.6).
359 When interpreting results from studies, it is important to compare the definitions of FGR
360 and isolated FGR as well as array-based techniques. Further, some studies classify
361 VOUS as genomic abnormalities³¹ although VOUS may be benign CNVs and therefore
362 cannot be considered as abnormalities. Our study found that 2.1% of isolated FGR
363 fetuses were detected with VOUS. Previous studies using large samples found a
364 similar prevalence of VOUS ranging between 2% and 4% in fetuses with ultrasound
365 anomalies including FGR^{15,17,32} and also in those from mothers with low-risk
366 pregnancies.³³ In contrast, 7.2% of VOUS were detected in a recent retrospective
367 study including 428 FGR fetuses with early-onset FGR or FGR associated with
368 ultrasound anomalies,³⁴

369 Further, few studies have considered fetuses found with abnormal karyotype when
370 investigating the benefits and limitations of CMA. However, when comparing with
371 karyotype and rapid aneuploidy detection, one main limitation of CMA using CGH array
372 analysis is the non-detection of low-level mosaicism <10/15% or triploidies, both
373 associated with FGR.³⁵ The non-detection of lower level of mosaicism by CMA when
374 comparing with karyotype is debated because it depends on the DNA extraction's
375 quality and the possibility to avoid a culture selection of the normal cell line. Moreover,
376 triploidies could be detected if SNP array testing is used. In a systematic review of 14

377 observational studies (N=874), the detection rate of abnormal karyotype in isolated
378 FGR fetuses was estimated to 6.4% with rates ranged between 0% and 26%.¹² In our
379 sample, 4.8% (CI95%: 1.3-8.3) of fetuses had abnormal karyotype. Among the 7
380 fetuses with abnormal karyotype, one fetus had a mosaic trisomy 18 with 13% of
381 interphasic cells which was not detected using CGH microarray analysis. As opposed
382 to CGH based arrays, the SNP microarray analysis enables the detection of
383 uniparental disomy, consanguinity, triploidy and parental origin. However, the choice
384 between SNP and CGH techniques may depend of their availability in the center and
385 there is currently no recommendation in favor on one of these array-techniques.

386

387 *Clinical and research implications*

388 Recommendations on the use of CMA for cases of isolated FGR differ between
389 professional societies. Several societies have no rules for performing CMA in case of
390 suboptimal fetal growth.²² In Canada, CMA is recommended for all pregnancies
391 suspected with FGR²⁰ while the Italian Society of Human Genetics called for more
392 investigation of the utility of CMA in cases of FGR.¹⁹ In 2020, the Society Maternal-
393 Fetal Medicine recommended offering CMA in pregnancies diagnosed with isolated
394 FGR before 32 weeks of gestation, although they graded evidence as low-quality.¹⁸
395 The French National College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists also recommends
396 genetic tests in case of early-onset FGR diagnosed before the third trimester of
397 pregnancy, increase of amniotic fluid, suspicion of congenital malformation or no cause
398 of FGR (i.e. normal doppler, no maternal vascular disorders).³⁶ However, there is no
399 restriction of gestational age for offering genetic invasive testing in France. In addition,
400 French cytogenetic guidelines recommend performing CMA and karyotype in fetuses
401 with an EFW <3rd percentile.³⁰ In line with these recommendations, we found that

402 almost all fetuses included in our analysis had birthweights <3rd percentile. Further,
403 most fetuses were suspected with FGR before 32 weeks of gestation. Our study
404 provides evidence to support current guidelines in offering CMA in addition to
405 karyotype in fetuses with isolated FGR. However, more studies are needed to
406 investigate the utility of offering CMA after 32 weeks of gestation. Further, VOUS are
407 inconstantly reported in studies, however, CNVs are classified as VOUS at the time of
408 reporting and their interpretation evolves over time as more information becomes
409 available on outcomes. Therefore, information on infants detected with VOUS should
410 be reported systematically and followed-up to strengthen the knowledge base about
411 potentially pathogenic variants.

412

413 *Strengths and limitations*

414 Strengths of this study are collection of data from 13 French referral fetal medicine
415 centers using a common protocol and pre-definition of fetuses diagnosed with isolated
416 FGR. Two midwives trained for this study collected data in all participating centers using
417 a standardized form and all CMA were reviewed by two cytogeneticists. Further, our
418 sample was large compared to studies in our review, where only 5 out of 14 had more
419 than 100 inclusions and only one had a sample size exceeding ours. Our study also
420 has several limitations. We used a retrospective study design leading to lower quality
421 of data compared to prospective studies; however, most previous studies have used
422 retrospective designs because these ensure the availability of all genetic results at the
423 time of data collection. Despite the French recommendations,³⁶ CMA was not
424 performed in all fetuses with an EFW <3rd percentile because of the availability of CMA
425 in some centers at the time of the study and varying criteria established by each center
426 for performing CMA. Another limit results from differences between centers regarding

427 CMA resolution and array techniques used, however, this reflects real-life variation in
428 clinical practice. There was also variability in the use of various platforms and VOUS
429 reporting; for this reason, all CMA were re-assessed by 2 cytogenetics based on
430 American professional standards.²⁹ In addition, the external validity of our results
431 should be confirmed in other contexts including in populations with different uptake of
432 invasive genetic testing, especially since the introduction of cell-free DNA screening or
433 where other EFW charts or abdominal circumference <10th percentile are used to
434 diagnose FGR. Finally, our study population was based on pregnancies suspected
435 with FGR and referred to fetal medicine centers; we were not able to estimate the
436 proportion of pregnancies suspected with FGR who were not referred to fetal medicine
437 centers when they should have been.

438

439 **Conclusions**

440 In summary, CMA provides substantial additional genetic information compared to
441 karyotype and should be performed in case of isolated FGR. More studies using large
442 sample of isolated FGR fetuses should be conducted to confirm the clinical utility of
443 CMA in this population in balance with risks of detecting variants of unknown
444 significance that can impact on prenatal counselling and increase parental anxiety.

445

446

447

448

449

450 **Acknowledgments**

451 We acknowledge the collaborators of the DANRCIU Group including the following:

452 Sonia Bouquillon (Department of Cytogenetics, Jeanne de Flandres University
453 Hospital, Lille, France), Frédéric Bilan (Department of Cytogenetics and Reproductive
454 Biology, Poitiers University Hospital, Poitiers, France), Genevieve Quenum
455 (Department of Cytogenetics and Reproductive Biology, Hospital Armand-Trousseau,
456 AP-HP, Sorbonne University, Paris, France), Jean Chiesa (Department of Genetics,
457 University Hospital, Nîmes, France), Kevin Uguen (Department of Molecular Genetics,
458 Brest University Hospital, Brest, France), Patrick CALLIER (Department of
459 Cytogenetics and Molecular Genetics, Dijon University Hospital, Dijon, France), Cedric
460 Le Caignec (Medical genetics department, Paule de Viguier Hospital, Toulouse
461 University Hospital, Toulouse, France), Jean-Baptiste Gaillard (Department of
462 Cytogenetics, University Hospital Center, Montpellier, France), Nicolas Gruchy
463 (Department of Cytogenetics, Caen University Hospital Center, Caen, France)

464 We would like to thank Chloé PUISNEY-DAKHLI who made suggestions for revisions
465 and Marine MUSCAT for the data management. We would also like to thank Charène
466 VAILLAND and all members of Fetal Medecine Centers for their support to the data
467 collection.

468

469

470

471

472

473 **References**

- 474 1. Flenady V, Koopmans L, Middleton P, et al. Major risk factors for stillbirth in
475 high-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*.
476 2011;377(9774):1331-1340.
- 477 2. McIntire DD, Bloom SL, Casey BM, Leveno KJ. Birth weight in relation to
478 morbidity and mortality among newborn infants. *N Engl J Med*.
479 1999;340(16):1234-1238.
- 480 3. Baschat AA, Viscardi RM, Hussey-Gardner B, Hashmi N, Harman C. Infant
481 neurodevelopment following fetal growth restriction: relationship with
482 antepartum surveillance parameters. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*.
483 2009;33(1):44-50.
- 484 4. Zanardo V, Visentin S, Trevisanuto D, Bertin M, Cavallin F, Cosmi E. Fetal aortic
485 wall thickness: a marker of hypertension in IUGR children? *Hypertens Res*.
486 2013;36(5):440-443.
- 487 5. Longo S, Bollani L, Decembrino L, Di Comite A, Angelini M, Stronati M. Short-
488 term and long-term sequelae in intrauterine growth retardation (IUGR). *J Matern*
489 *Fetal Neonatal Med*. 2013;26(3):222-225.
- 490 6. Vayssiere C, Sentilhes L, Ego A, et al. Fetal growth restriction and intra-uterine
491 growth restriction: guidelines for clinical practice from the French College of
492 Gynaecologists and Obstetricians. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*.
493 2015;193:10-18.
- 494 7. Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. The investigation and
495 management of the small-for-gestational fetus. Green-top Guideline No.31, 2nd
496 Edition, London, UK: Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists;2013.
- 497 8. Fetal Growth Restriction: ACOG Practice Bulletin, Number 227. *Obstet*
498 *Gynecol*. 2021;137(2):e16-e28.

- 499 9. Snijders RJ, Sherrod C, Gosden CM, Nicolaidis KH. Fetal growth retardation:
500 associated malformations and chromosomal abnormalities. *Am J Obstet*
501 *Gynecol.* 1993;168(2):547-555.
- 502 10. Wilkins-Haug L, Roberts DJ, Morton CC. Confined placental mosaicism and
503 intrauterine growth retardation: a case-control analysis of placentas at delivery.
504 *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 1995;172(1 Pt 1):44-50.
- 505 11. Dall'Asta A, Girardelli S, Usman S, et al. Etiology and perinatal outcome of
506 periviable fetal growth restriction associated with structural or genetic anomaly.
507 *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2020;55(3):368-374.
- 508 12. Sagi-Dain L, Peleg A, Sagi S. Risk for chromosomal aberrations in apparently
509 isolated intrauterine growth restriction: A systematic review. *Prenat Diagn.*
510 2017;37(11):1061-1066.
- 511 13. Lee CN, Lin SY, Lin CH, Shih JC, Lin TH, Su YN. Clinical utility of array
512 comparative genomic hybridisation for prenatal diagnosis: a cohort study of
513 3171 pregnancies. *BJOG.* 2012;119(5):614-625.
- 514 14. Fiorentino F, Caiazzo F, Napolitano S, et al. Introducing array comparative
515 genomic hybridization into routine prenatal diagnosis practice: a prospective
516 study on over 1000 consecutive clinical cases. *Prenat Diagn.* 2011;31(13):1270-
517 1282.
- 518 15. Hillman SC, McMullan DJ, Hall G, et al. Use of prenatal chromosomal
519 microarray: prospective cohort study and systematic review and meta-analysis.
520 *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2013;41(6):610-620.
- 521 16. Saldarriaga W, Garcia-Perdomo HA, Arango-Pineda J, Fonseca J. Karyotype
522 versus genomic hybridization for the prenatal diagnosis of chromosomal

- 523 abnormalities: a metaanalysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2015;212(3):330 e331-
524 310.
- 525 17. Wapner RJ, Martin CL, Levy B, et al. Chromosomal microarray versus
526 karyotyping for prenatal diagnosis. *N Engl J Med.* 2012;367(23):2175-2184.
- 527 18. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine . Electronic address pso, Martins JG, Biggio
528 JR, Abuhamad A. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine Consult Series #52:
529 Diagnosis and management of fetal growth restriction: (Replaces Clinical
530 Guideline Number 3, April 2012). *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2020;223(4):B2-B17.
- 531 19. Novelli A, Grati FR, Ballarati L, et al. Microarray application in prenatal
532 diagnosis: a position statement from the cytogenetics working group of the
533 Italian Society of Human Genetics (SIGU), November 2011. *Ultrasound Obstet*
534 *Gynecol.* 2012;39(4):384-388.
- 535 20. Armour CM, Dougan SD, Brock JA, et al. Practice guideline: joint CCMG-SOGC
536 recommendations for the use of chromosomal microarray analysis for prenatal
537 diagnosis and assessment of fetal loss in Canada. *J Med Genet.*
538 2018;55(4):215-221.
- 539 21. Muys J, Blaumeiser B, Jacquemyn Y, et al. The Belgian MicroArray Prenatal
540 (BEMAPRE) database: A systematic nationwide repository of fetal genomic
541 aberrations. *Prenat Diagn.* 2018;38(13):1120-1128.
- 542 22. Silva M, de Leeuw N, Mann K, et al. European guidelines for constitutional
543 cytogenomic analysis. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2019;27(1):1-16.
- 544 23. Duncan A, Langlois S, Committee SG, Committee CPD. Use of array genomic
545 hybridization technology in prenatal diagnosis in Canada. *J Obstet Gynaecol*
546 *Can.* 2011;33(12):1256-1259.

- 547 24. Borrell A, Grande M, Pauta M, Rodriguez-Revenga L, Figueras F.
548 Chromosomal Microarray Analysis in Fetuses with Growth Restriction and
549 Normal Karyotype: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Fetal Diagn Ther.*
550 2018;44(1):1-9.
- 551 25. Massoud M, Duyme M, Fontanges M, French College of Fetal S, Combourieu
552 D. [Chart for estimation of fetal weight 2014 by the French College of Fetal
553 Sonography (CFEF)]. *J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod (Paris)*. 2016;45(1):80-85.
- 554 26. Minor anomalies for exclusion. EUROCAT Guide 1.4. Section 3.2. 2014.
555 Available at: [https://eu-rd-](https://eu-rd-platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/Section%203.2-%2027_Oct2016.pdf)
556 [platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/Section%203.2-](https://eu-rd-platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/Section%203.2-%2027_Oct2016.pdf)
557 [%2027_Oct2016.pdf](https://eu-rd-platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/Section%203.2-%2027_Oct2016.pdf). [Last Accessed February 2020].
- 558 27. Ego A, Prunet C, Lebreton E, et al. [Customized and non-customized French
559 intrauterine growth curves. I - Methodology]. *J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod*
560 *(Paris)*. 2016;45(2):155-164.
- 561 28. Kearney HM, Thorland EC, Brown KK, Quintero-Rivera F, South ST, Working
562 Group of the American College of Medical Genetics Laboratory Quality
563 Assurance C. American College of Medical Genetics standards and guidelines
564 for interpretation and reporting of postnatal constitutional copy number variants.
565 *Genet Med*. 2011;13(7):680-685.
- 566 29. Riggs ER, Andersen EF, Cherry AM, et al. Technical standards for the
567 interpretation and reporting of constitutional copy-number variants: a joint
568 consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and
569 Genomics (ACMG) and the Clinical Genome Resource (ClinGen). *Genet Med*.
570 2020;22(2):245-257.

- 571 30. Réseau Achropuce. Guide des bonnes pratiques de l'analyse chromosomique
572 sur puce à ADN (ACPA) en prénatal. Version 2.1 Juin 2019. Available at:
573 <http://acpa-achropuce.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/GUIDE-DES->
574 [BONNES-PRATIQUES-ACPA-DPN-2019-V2.1-22_7_20.pdf](http://acpa-achropuce.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/GUIDE-DES-BONNES-PRATIQUES-ACPA-DPN-2019-V2.1-22_7_20.pdf) [last accessed
575 September 2020].
- 576 31. Zhu H, Lin S, Huang L, et al. Application of chromosomal microarray analysis in
577 prenatal diagnosis of fetal growth restriction. *Prenat Diagn.* 2016;36(7):686-692.
- 578 32. Shaffer LG, Dabell MP, Fisher AJ, et al. Experience with microarray-based
579 comparative genomic hybridization for prenatal diagnosis in over 5000
580 pregnancies. *Prenat Diagn.* 2012;32(10):976-985.
- 581 33. Stern S, Hachohen N, Meiner V, et al. Universal chromosomal microarray
582 analysis reveals high proportion of copy number variants in low risk
583 pregnancies. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2020.
- 584 34. Sagi-Dain L, Maya I, Reches A, et al. Chromosomal Microarray Analysis Results
585 From Pregnancies With Various Ultrasonographic Anomalies. *Obstet Gynecol.*
586 2018;132(6):1368-1375.
- 587 35. Levy B, Wapner R. Prenatal diagnosis by chromosomal microarray analysis.
588 *Fertil Steril.* 2018;109(2):201-212.
- 589 36. Analyse Chromosomique sur Puce à ADN (ACPA) : Guide des bonnes
590 pratiques pour l'activité postnatale. Groupe ACPA et le groupe qualité du réseau
591 Achropuce. Décembre 2018. Available at
592 http://www.eacrf.org/docs/ACPA/GBP-ACPA_d%C3%A9cembre2018.pdf [Last
593 Accessed January 29, 2020].
- 594 37. Borrell A, Grande M, Meler E, et al. Genomic Microarray in Fetuses with Early
595 Growth Restriction: A Multicenter Study. *Fetal Diagn Ther.* 2017;42(3):174-180.

- 596 38. de Wit MC, Srebniak MI, Joosten M, et al. Prenatal and postnatal findings in
597 small-for-gestational-age fetuses without structural ultrasound anomalies at 18-
598 24 weeks. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2017;49(3):342-348.
- 599 39. Gruchy N, Decamp M, Richard N, et al. Array CGH analysis in high-risk
600 pregnancies: comparing DNA from cultured cells and cell-free fetal DNA. *Prenat*
601 *Diagn.* 2012;32(4):383-388.
- 602 40. Van den Veyver IB, Patel A, Shaw CA, et al. Clinical use of array comparative
603 genomic hybridization (aCGH) for prenatal diagnosis in 300 cases. *Prenat*
604 *Diagn.* 2009;29(1):29-39.
- 605 41. Kleeman L, Bianchi DW, Shaffer LG, et al. Use of array comparative genomic
606 hybridization for prenatal diagnosis of fetuses with sonographic anomalies and
607 normal metaphase karyotype. *Prenat Diagn.* 2009;29(13):1213-1217.
- 608 42. Lovrecic L, Remec ZI, Volk M, Rudolf G, Writzl K, Peterlin B. Clinical utility of
609 array comparative genomic hybridisation in prenatal setting. *BMC Med Genet.*
610 2016;17(1):81.
- 611 43. Oneda B, Baldinger R, Reissmann R, et al. High-resolution chromosomal
612 microarrays in prenatal diagnosis significantly increase diagnostic power.
613 *Prenat Diagn.* 2014;34(6):525-533.
- 614 44. An G, Lin Y, Xu LP, et al. Application of chromosomal microarray to investigate
615 genetic causes of isolated fetal growth restriction. *Mol Cytogenet.* 2018;11:33.
- 616 45. Peng R, Yang J, Xie HN, Lin MF, Zheng J. Chromosomal and subchromosomal
617 anomalies associated to small for gestational age fetuses with no additional
618 structural anomalies. *Prenat Diagn.* 2017;37(12):1219-1224.

619 46. Brun S, Pennamen P, Mattuizzi A, et al. Interest of chromosomal microarray
620 analysis in the prenatal diagnosis of fetal intrauterine growth restriction. *Prenat*
621 *Diagn.* 2018;38(13):1111-1119.

622 47. Hui AS, Chau MHK, Chan YM, et al. The role of chromosomal microarray
623 analysis among fetuses with normal karyotype and single system anomaly or
624 nonspecific sonographic findings. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.*
625 2021;100(2):235-243.

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

Table 1. Maternal and neonatal characteristics of the study population

Total N=146	n/N (%) or mean \pm sd
Maternal characteristics	
Maternal age (years) (n=146)	30.7 \pm 6.1
Nulliparous	82/146 (56.2)
Smoking during pregnancy	31/141 (22.0)
Clinical characteristics	
Maternal serum screening for Down's syndrome	139/144 (96.5)
Pre-eclampsia	20/139 (14.4)
Caesarean birth	62/139 (44.6)
Ultrasound characteristics	
GA at suspicion of FGR (weeks) (n=145)	24.7 \pm 4.1
Estimated fetal weight (grams) (n=138)	630.7 \pm 404
Estimated fetal weight percentile ^a (n=138)	3.5 \pm 7.5
<3 rd percentile	109 (79.0)
3 rd -10 th percentile	23 (16.7)
10 th percentile+	6 (4.3)
Abnormal uterine Doppler	51/110 (46.4)
Abnormal umbilical Doppler	12/113 (10.6)
Neonatal characteristics	
Vital status at birth	
Live birth	117/141 (83.0)
Spontaneous stillbirths	6/141 (4.2)
Termination of pregnancy	18/141 (12.8)
Male sex	65/141 (46.1)
GA at birth (weeks of gestation)	34.7 \pm 4.8
<26	12/141 (8.5)
27-31	22/141 (15.6)
32-36	34/141 (24.1)
37+	73/141 (51.8)
Birthweight (grams) (n=140)	1835.5 \pm 845
Birthweight percentile ^b	5.8 \pm 12.1

<3 rd percentile	96/140 (68.6)
3 rd -10 th percentile	27/140 (19.3)
10 th percentile+	17/140 (12.1)

Sd: standard deviation; GA: gestational age

a Based on an intrauterine growth charts adapted to French population²⁷ ; b According to French growth references²⁵

648

649

650 Table 2. Type of abnormalities detected and clinical relevant characteristics in fetuses with normal karyotype and CMA findings

Case	WG at suspicion of FGR	Sampling method	CNV position	Type of CNV	Interpretation	Parental study	Outcome	Sex Birthweight (percentile*)
1	21+6	AC	arr[hg19] 16p12.2(21951379_22645765)x3 dn	Likely pathogenic	Duplication at 16p12.2	<i>de novo</i>	TOP 28+6 WG	Male 840g (<3 rd)
2	21+5	AC	upd(15)mat.arr[hg19](15q11.2q26.3)x2 htz	Pathogenic	Prader-Willi syndrome	Maternal inherited	TOP 32+5 WG	Female 1610g (<3 rd)
3	18+3	AC	arr[hg19] 19q12q13.12(30091373_35646245)x1 dn	Pathogenic	Deletion at 19q12q13.12	<i>de novo</i>	TOP 26+0 WG	Male 670g (<10 th)
4	24+1	AC	arr[hg19] 2q21.1(131513263_132098109)x3 dn	VOUS	Duplication at 2q21.1	<i>de novo</i>	Live birth 31+4 WG	Female 1070g (<3 rd)
5	32+5	AC	arr[hg19] 12q13.13(53617806_54463057)x1 dn	Pathogenic	Deletion at 12q13.13	<i>de novo</i>	TOP 37+5 WG	Female 2070g (<3 rd)
6	25+5	AC	arr[hg19] 19p13.2p13.11(13802749_16346160)x1dn	Pathogenic	Deletion at 19p13.2p13.11	<i>de novo</i>	TOP 27+1 WG	Male 730g (<3 rd)
7	21+1	AC	arr[hg19] 7q11.22(69773947_70115001)x1 pat	VOUS	Deletion at 7q11.22	Paternal inherited	TOP 35+4 WG	Female 1835g (<3 rd)
8	18+0	AC	arr[hg19] Xp22.33(907346_1608329)x3	VOUS	Duplication at Xp22.33	Missing	TOP (HELLP syndrome) 26+5 WG	Male 435g (<3 rd)

AC: amniocentesis; WG: weeks of gestational age; TOP: termination of pregnancy
 * according to a French intrauterine growth charts adjusted on infant sex (EPOPé M1)²⁷

651

652 Table 3. Type of abnormalities detected and clinical relevant characteristics in fetuses with abnormal karyotype

Case	WG at suspicion of FGR	Sampling method	Cytogenetic result (karyotype or FISH)	CNV position	Type of CNV	Interpretation	Outcome	Sex Birthweight (percentile ^a)
9	24+5	AC	46,XX,rec(4)dup(4q)inv(4)(p14q35)pat. nuc ish(WHSCRx1,4qterx3)	arr[hg19] 4p16.3p15.31(71552_19694060)x1,4q35.1q35.2(186154276_191154276)x3	Pathogenic	Wolf Hirschhorn syndrome	TOP 27+4 WG	Female 610g (<3 rd)
10	23+0	AC	46,XY,del(8)(p11.23p22)	arr[hg19] 8p22p11.23(14921564_36502963)x1	Pathogenic	Deletion at 8p22p11.23	TOP 33+1 WG	Male 1740g (<10 th)
11	27+3	AC	47, XXY nuc ish(DXZ1x2,DYZ3x1,D18Z1x2),(RB1x2,DSCR4x2)[50]	arr[hg19](X)x2,(Y)x1	Pathogenic	Klinefelter syndrome	Live birth 37+2 WG	Male 1810g (<3 rd)
12	22+5	AC	46,XY,r(15)(p10qter)	arr[hg19] 15q26.3(98664117_102465355)x1	Pathogenic	Deletion at 15q26.[3]	TOP 26+5 WG	Male 640g (<3 rd)
13	31+0	AC	nuc ish(DXZ1x1,DYZ3x1,D18Z1x3)[40/300]	arr[hg19](1-22)x2,(X,Y)x1	No finding ^b	Trisomy 18 in mosaicism	TOP 36+6 WG	Male 2150g (<3 rd)
14	25+0	AC	45,X[46]/46,XX[4]	arr(X)x1[0,9]	Pathogenic	Turner syndrome	Live birth 39+1 WG	Female 1920g (<3 rd)
15	18+5	AC	46,XX,del(8)(p11.2).ish del(8)(wcp8+,D8S504-,VIJ2yRM2053+).nuc ish(D8S504x1,VIJ2yRM2053x2)	arr[hg19] 8p23.3p11.21(221611_41559138)x1	Pathogenic	Deletion at 8p11.21p23.3	TOP 24+2 WG	Female 505g (<10 th)

AC: amniocentesis; WG: weeks of gestational age; TOP: termination of pregnancy
a according to a French intrauterine growth charts adjusted on infant sex (EPOPé M1)²⁷
b low mosaicism, not detectable using CMA

653

654

655

656

657

658

659 Table 4. Summary of studies assessing the incremental yield of CMA over karyotype in fetuses with isolated fetal growth restriction

First author	Study design	Year Country	Total	Among normal karyotype			Among abnormal karyotype			
				Number of normal karyotype	Pathogenic and likely pathogenic CNVs	VOUS	Pathogenic + likely pathogenic + VOUS	Number of abnormal karyotype	Pathogenic and likely pathogenic CNVs	VOUS
Zhu* ³¹	Retrospective Single-center	2013-2015 China	53	45	3 (6.7%)	2 (4.4%)	5 (11.1%)	8	5	0
Borrell* ³⁷	Prospective Multicenter	2015 Spain	114	114	7 (6.1%)	0	7 (6.1%)	Not included	-	-
De Witt* ³⁸	Retrospective Multicenter	2011-2015 Netherlands	68	65	1 (1.5%)	Not included	-	3	No CMA performed	No CMA performed
Schaffer* ³²	Retrospective Single-center	2004-2011 US	115	115	3 (2.6%)	Not included	-	Not included	-	-
Gruchy* ³⁹	Retrospective Single-center	2009-2010 France	9	9	1 (11.1%)	0	1 (11.1%)	Not included	-	-
Van den Veyver* ⁴⁰	Retrospective <i>Not specified</i>	2005-2008 US	3	3	0 (0%)	0	0%	0	0	0
Kleeman* ⁴¹	Prospective Multicenter	2007-2008 US	3	3	0 (0%)	0	0%	Not included	-	-
Lovrecic* ⁴²	Retrospective Single-center	2012-2015 Slovenia	16	16	0 (0%)	1 (6.2%)	1 (6.2%)	Not reported	-	-
Oneda* ⁴³	Retrospective <i>Not specified</i>	2010-2013 Switzerland	6	6	1 (16.7%)	0	1 (16.7%)	Not included	-	-
An ⁴⁴	Prospective Multicenter	2015-2018 China	127	123	7 (5.7%)	1 (0.8%)	8 (6.5%)	4	3	1
Sagi ¹²	Retrospective Multicenter	2013-2017 Israel	428	427	12 (2.8%)	31 (7.2%)	43 (10.1%)	1	1	0
Peng ⁴⁵	Retrospective Single-center	2013-2017 China	126	120	4 (3.3%)	6 (5.0%)	10 (8.3%)	6	Not reported	Not reported
Brun ⁴⁶	Retrospective Single-center	2012-2017 France	83	78	0 (0%)	3 (3.8%)	3 (3.8%)	5	Not reported	Not reported
Hui ⁴⁷	Retrospective Single-center	2007-2017 China	34	34	2 (5.9%)	Not included	-	Not included	-	-
Present study	Retrospective Multicenter	2016 France	146	139	5 (3.6%)	3 (2.1%)	8 (5.8%)	7	6	0

* Studies included in the meta-analysis of Borrell et al.; Data are n or n (%)

661 **Figure Legend**

662

663 Figure 1. Flow-chart

664 The study population included 146 singleton fetuses diagnosed with isolated FGR who
665 underwent invasive genetic testing with both karyotype and CMA results

Figure 1. Flow diagram of the study population

