The association of umbilical cord blood neurofilament light with non-reassuring fetal status: a prospective observational study

David Zalcberg,[1,2] Kaitlin Kramer,[1,2] Emma Payne,[3] Thomas Payne,[1,2,4] Shreeya Marathe,[2] Neha Mahajan,[2] Ashly Liu,[2] Jessica Barry,[2] Andrew Duckworth,[2] Mitchell Brookes,[2] Bradley de Vries,[5,6] Fernando Gonzalez-Ortiz,[7,8] Kaj Blennow,[7,8,9,10] Henrik Zetterberg,[11,12,13,14,15,16] Adrienne Gordon,[1,5] Benjamin Moran,[17,18,19,20] Helen Manning,[21] Robert D. Sanders[1,2,6,22]*

Author affiliations:

1 Central Clinical School, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

2 Department of Anaesthetics, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney Local Health District, New South Wales, Australia

3 St George Hospital, South Eastern Sydney Local Health District, New South Wales, Australia

4 The Royal Melbourne Hospital, Parkville, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

5 Sydney Institute for Women, Children and their Babies, Sydney Local Health District, New South Wales, Australia

6 NHMRC Clinical Trials Centre, The University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

7 Department of Psychiatry and Neurochemistry, Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, the Sahlgrenska Academy at the University of Gothenburg, Mölndal, Sweden

8 Clinical Neurochemistry Laboratory, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Mölndal, Sweden

9 Paris Brain Institute, ICM, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, Sorbonne University, Paris, France

10 Neurodegenerative Disorder Research Center, Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, and Department of Neurology, Institute on Aging and Brain Disorders, University of Science and Technology of China and First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Hefei, P.R. China

11 Department of Psychiatry and Neurochemistry, Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, the Sahlgrenska Academy at the University of Gothenburg, Mölndal, Sweden

12 Clinical Neurochemistry Laboratory, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Mölndal, Sweden

13 Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen Square, London, UK

14 UK Dementia Research Institute at UCL, London, UK

15 Hong Kong Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases, Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong, China

16 Wisconsin Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

17 Critical Care Program, The George Institute of Global Health, Sydney, Australia.

18 Department of Intensive Care, Gosford Hospital, Gosford, Australia.

19 Department of Anaesthesia and Pain Medicine, Gosford Hospital, Gosford, Australia.

20 School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia.

21 Dept of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Central coast local health district, NSW

22 Institute of Academic Surgery, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney Local Health District, New South Wales, Australia

* Corresponding author: Robert Sanders

Central Clinical School, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

robert.sanders@sydney.edu.au

Words: 2526 (excluding abstract)

Tables & Figures: 5

Running title: Cord blood neurofilament light.

Keywords: Neurofilament light; asphyxia; hypoxic–ischaemic encephalopathy; HIE; umbilical cord blood.

Abstract

Objective: Early detection of hypoxic–ischaemic encephalopathy (HIE) in neonates is critical. We conducted a pilot cohort study to determine the feasibility of collecting umbilical cord blood samples for neurofilament light (NfL) and to assess the association of NfL with non-reassuring fetal status and other cord biomarkers.

Design: Prospective cohort study.

Setting: A single, large tertiary and quaternary referral hospital.

Patients: 108 maternal participants consenting to donate cord blood.

Intervention: Umbilical cord venous blood plasma NfL levels.

Main outcome measures: (1) Feasibility of cord NfL sample collection and analysis; (2) Association of NfL with non-reassuring fetal status (CTG changes and/or documented non-reassuring fetal status), NICU admission and length of stay; (3) Correlation of NfL with other cord biomarkers.

Results: Cord NfL was higher in preterm neonates, and was correlated with cord lactate, pH, and base excess. After controlling for mode of delivery and gestational age, NfL (OR = 2.29, 95%CI: 1.15 to 5.57), but not pH (OR = 0.78, 95%CI: 0.42 to 1.41), base excess (OR = 0.83, 95%CI: 0.37 to 1.86), or lactate (OR = 1.06, 95%CI: 0.51 to 2.12) was associated with non-reassuring fetal status. NfL levels were higher in neonates admitted to NICU (median (IQR): 11.3 (7) versus 8.5 (5.1)).

Conclusions: Cord blood NfL analysis was feasible and provided correlates of adverse outcomes. Higher venous cord blood NfL levels were associated with non-reassuring fetal status. Further research is needed to validate these findings and establish the role of NfL, if any, in clinical practice.

What is already known on this topic

Umbilical cord blood NfL is a promising biomarker of neuronal injury in neonates with overt HIE. Whether cord NfL may improve diagnosis of mild–moderate HIE via identification of in utero hypoxia is unknown.

What this study adds

We found that cord NfL is associated with non-reassuring fetal status, and outperforms other cord biomarkers.

How this study might affect research, practice, or policy

This study lays the groundwork for future research into the use of cord NfL for HIE diagnosis and risk stratification. It supports ongoing development of a point-of-care scalp NfL assay.

Introduction

Hypoxic–ischaemic encephalopathy (HIE) is a common cause of neonatal encephalopathy (NE), occurring in 1–2 per 1000 live births.[1] Therapeutic hypothermia is the only proven treatment for HIE,[2-5] and must be started within 6 hours of birth.[1] Current practice for identifying HIE relies on clinical signs, including need for resuscitation and cord blood acid–base analysis, which has limited sensitivity in part because cord blood acid–base biomarkers are non-specific for detection of neuronal injury.[6, 7] Identification of in utero fetal hypoxia can help to direct expedited delivery of the fetus, in an attempt to decrease the incidence of HIE. A composite outcome 'non-reassuring fetal status' may be used as an indicator of fetal hypoxia, and is defined by abnormalities in fetal heart rate (primarily detected by cardiotocography (CTG)), fetal scalp blood sampling, and ultrasound parameters.[8, 9]

Neurofilament light (NfL) is a neuronal protein released at the time of many types of neuronal injuries.[10] Two case–control studies of cord NfL have suggested associations with HIE and perinatal morbidity.[11, 12] However, research is lacking regarding the correlation between cord NfL and non-reassuring fetal status.[13] Demonstration of such an association would reinforce the use of NfL as a possible adjunct in the diagnosis of HIE, and support continued development of a rapid point-of-care scalp NfL test that may, in future, help identify in utero hypoxia.

We conducted a prospective cohort study to determine the association of umbilical cord NfL with various perinatal factors. Our hypotheses were:

1. Collection and analysis of cord blood NfL is feasible;
2. Cord NfL has a stronger association with non-reassuring fetal status than other cord biomarkers; and
3. Cord NfL is correlated with other cord markers of non-reassuring fetal status.

Methods

Study Design

A prospective cohort study was conducted with women who birthed at Royal Prince Alfred Hospital (RPAH). RPAH is an inner-city tertiary and quaternary public referral hospital in Sydney with mostly urban-dwelling patients. Participants were prospectively recruited at any time from 4 weeks prior to estimated delivery date, to date of delivery (including during delivery). Informed consent was obtained from the birth parent for all participants. Study data were collected and stored in REDCap by the research team. Ethics approval was obtained from Sydney Local Health District Human Research and Ethics Committee (approval number: 2022/ETH01100). Data were reported in accordance with the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines.[14]

Study Population

Women who birthed at RPAH from October 2022 were eligible for study recruitment, including all live births delivered vaginally or via caesarean section (CS). Women were excluded if they were non-English speaking or had a history of psychological illness, or other conditions, that interfered with capacity to provide informed consent.

Biospecimen Collection and Analysis

Immediately at birth, 3mL of umbilical venous cord blood was collected in EDTA tubes from each study participant. Blood samples were centrifuged in the Department of Anaesthetics laboratory, and plasma aliquots stored in barcoded cryovials.

Plasma samples were sent to the University of Gothenburg in Sweden for analysis. Plasma NfL concentration was measured using the NF-Light assay on a Single molecule array (Simoa) HD-X instrument according to instructions from the manufacturer (Quanterix, Billerica, MA). All measurements were done with a four-fold dilution factor in singlicates and performed on one occasion using one batch of reagents with the analyst blinded to clinical data. Intra-assay coefficients of variation were <10% derived from internal control plasma samples measured in duplicate on each analytical run.

Demographic and Outcome Data Collection

Demographic and outcome data were extracted from electronic medical records. Data extraction included antenatal history, maternal and child health factors, intrapartum events and monitoring, adverse perinatal events, and any health events up to four weeks postpartum. Researchers collecting these data were blinded to the NfL results.

Outcomes

Primary trial feasibility outcomes

Our primary feasibility outcomes were the proportion of eligible participants recruited to the study and the proportion of enrolled participants who had cord blood samples successfully sent for analysis.

Primary clinical outcome

Our primary clinical outcome was the association of cord NfL with non-reassuring fetal status. 'Non-reassuring fetal status' was defined as any record of non-reassuring fetal status in the intrapartum or antenatal record of care, as well as any documented cardiotocography (CTG) changes aligning with 'red zone' criteria per the NSW Health electronic fetal monitoring guidelines (Appendix 1). We adjusted our primary outcome for mode of delivery (vaginal or elective CS or emergency CS) and gestational age, given previous work has suggested that vaginal delivery and longer gestation are associated with greater cord NfL, and we hypothesised that these would also be associated with non-reassuring fetal status.[13]

Secondary clinical outcomes

Secondary outcomes included the association of NfL with other cord biomarkers (lactate, base excess, pH), intrapartum factors (mode of delivery, duration of labour), fetal factors (gestational age, head circumference, birthweight), and other neonatal outcomes (resuscitation requirement, NICU admission, NICU length of stay). A full list is provided in Appendix 2. We *a priori* defined preterm as birth at <37 weeks' gestation and very preterm as <32 weeks' gestation. We defined resuscitation requirement as any continuous positive airway pressure requirement postnatally. Analyses of birthweight and head circumference were adjusted for gestational age, as this has been suggested to be a confounder.[13] While no previous work exists, we hypothesised that analyses of resuscitation requirement required adjustment for gestational age, while analyses of NICU length of stay required adjustment for mode of delivery and gestational age.

Power analysis

Previous work has suggested the standard deviation (SD) of umbilical cord NfL is 13 pg/mL.[11] To ensure that the 95% confidence interval estimate for mean NfL in our sample was within 3 pg/mL of the true population mean, 73 neonates were required. Anticipating possible issues with sample storage/shipment, 110 mothers were recruited. Using the previously reported incidence of non-reassuring fetal status of approximately 16%,[8] 110 participants yields 80% power to detect a large effect size (Cohen's d = 0.8), based on a two-sided *t*-test with $\alpha = 0.025$ (halved from 0.05 to account for our dual feasibility/clinical primary outcome).

Statistical methods

NfL concentrations showed a strong positive skew, so were $\log_{10}$ transformed for all analyses. Where the dependent variable was binary, we used logistic regression. Biomarker concentrations were standardised in these models by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation. Area under the receiver operator curve (AUROC) was calculated for biomarkers in predicting non-reassuring fetal status. The 95% confidence interval for the AUROC was calculated using 2000 stratified bootstrap replicates. The calculation of Youden's Index from the receiver–operator curve (ROC)[15] was used to determine a binary cutoff value for all biomarkers that maximised the sum of the specificity and sensitivity. We did not undertake model calibration nor perform cross-validation—our analyses aimed to be descriptive.

Regarding secondary outcomes, we report rank-based nonparametric methods for bivariate biomarker analysis. Linear regression with ordinary least squares estimation was used for

multivariable models where pH or base excess was the dependent variable. Where $\log_{10}$ NfL or lactate was the dependent variable, we used a generalised linear model with an inverse Gaussian family with log link. We aimed to model count data using the simplest possible distribution (the Poisson distribution), unless overdispersion was present, in which case we used a negative binomial family model. Nested models were compared using F-tests (or χ^2 tests for count models). As this study was hypothesis-generating, no adjustments were made for multiple comparisons.

All analyses were conducted in R using RStudio (Version 2023.06.1; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), using the 'lme4', 'plotROC', and 'pROC' packages.

Results

Cohort demographic information is summarised in Supplementary Table 1.

Primary outcomes

Feasibility of testing cord NfL

Of 509 births at RPAH over the period 24th October 2022 to 9th of December 2022, 110 women were recruited, meaning 22% of all eligible participants were enrolled in the study. A total of 108 participants had cord blood sent for analysis (STROBE diagram: Supplementary Figure 1), representing a 98% conversion rate from enrolment to analysis.

Association of neurofilament light with non-reassuring fetal status

Participants classified as experiencing non-reassuring fetal status (n = 16) had higher cord NfL (median (Q1, Q3) NfL: 14.8 (11.2, 18.0) vs. 8.4 (6.7, 11.4)). These participants also experienced higher lactate levels, as well as lower cord pH and base excess (Supplementary Figure 2). The association between $\log_{10}$ NfL (in standardised form) and non-reassuring fetal status persisted after adjusting for mode of delivery and gestational age (adjusted OR per 1 SD increase in $\log_{10}$ NfL = 2.29, 95%CI: 1.15 to 5.57; p = 0.038), whereas pH, base excess, and lactate were not associated with non-reassuring fetal status in the adjusted model (Table 1).

The combination of NfL with delivery mode (vaginal or elective CS or emergency CS) and gestational age provided a slightly better AUC (0.87 95%CI: 0.79 to 0.95) for the association with non-reassuring fetal status than the combination of gestational age and delivery mode with the other biomarkers (Figure 1A). When using biomarkers alone for prediction of non-reassuring fetal status, the most pronounced difference between NfL and other biomarkers was seen when excluding elective CS and preterm births (Figure 1F).

Youden's Index was calculated for all biomarkers. When including all births, diagnostic test characteristics of $\log_{10}$ NfL >1.09 included a negative predictive value of 0.96 (Table 2). In general, the specificity and positive predictive value of various $\log_{10}$ NfL cutoffs was much better than other biomarkers, while sensitivity was lower.

Secondary outcomes

Cord NfL demonstrated an inverse correlation with cord pH and base excess, and a positive correlation with cord blood lactate (Figure 2). Conversely, examining only participants who laboured, no association was found for any biomarker (Supplementary Figure 3).

NfL, pH, base excess, and lactate values differed significantly by mode of delivery (Kruskal–Wallis, all $p < 0.001$) (Figure 3). There was no statistically significant correlation of any biomarker with duration of 1st stage of labour. Whilst duration of the 2nd stage was negatively correlated with pH (Spearman $\rho = -0.49$, $p = 0.009$) and base excess (Spearman $\rho = -0.44$, $p = 0.044$) and positively correlated with lactate (Spearman $\rho = 0.40$, $p = 0.037$), there was no statistically significant correlation with NfL (Spearman $\rho = -0.27$, $p = 0.17$) (Supplementary Figure 4).

We observed a lower cord NfL level in participants who were born term (n = 94) compared to those born preterm (under 37 completed weeks gestation; n = 10), and very preterm (under 32 completed weeks gestation; n = 4) (median (Q1, Q3) $\log_{10}$ NfL = 0.94 (0.84, 1.08) vs. 1.18 (0.97, 1.48) vs. 1.17 (1.14, 1.24); Kruskal–Wallis $p = 0.004$) (Supplementary Figure 5). Conversely, we did not observe a difference in cord pH, base excess, or lactate across these groups of gestational age.

Keeping gestational age constant, every 1 kg increase in birth weight was associated with an 11% decrease in mean $\log_{10}$ NfL ($\exp(\beta) = 0.89$, 95%CI: 0.81 to 0.98; $p = 0.025$) (Supplementary Table 2). There was no significant relationship with biomarkers and head circumference in adjusted analysis (Supplementary Table 3).

We did not observe evidence of an association of NfL, pH, base excess, or lactate with resuscitation requirement after adjusting for preterm birth (Supplementary Table 4). NfL values were significantly higher in participants who required NICU admission (median (Q1,

Q3) $\log_{10}$ NfL: 1.05 (0.91, 1.18) vs. 0.93 (0.84, 1.08); Wilcoxon p = 0.040). Conversely, we did not observe evidence for a difference in cord pH and lactate values in neonates admitted to NICU vs. those not, while base excess values were slightly higher in those admitted to NICU (Supplementary Figure 6).

We did not observe strong evidence to suggest higher NfL values (in standardised form) were associated with an increased NICU length of stay in the unadjusted model (incidence rate ratio (IRR) = 3.04, 95%CI: 0.94 to 9.80; p = 0.063), or after adjusting for gestational age and mode of delivery (IRR = 1.51, 95%CI: 0.71 to 3.19; p = 0.284) (Supplementary Table 5). Cord pH, base excess, and lactate were all associated with NICU length of stay in the unadjusted models, but none were statistically significant in the adjusted model (Supplementary Table 5).

Discussion

We observed an association between higher cord blood NfL with non-reassuring fetal status, which remained robust after adjusting for mode of delivery and gestational age. In addition, we showed that NfL correlates with cord biomarkers of neonatal asphyxia. Together, our findings provide valuable evidence of the associations between NfL and surrogates of in-utero hypoxia, which is supportive of future studies of NfL in the diagnosis and treatment of HIE.

The largest descriptive study of cord blood NfL to date (n = 665), by Kurner and colleagues, supports our findings of higher NfL levels in vaginal delivery.[13] Meanwhile, in that study,

higher gestational age was associated with greater cord NfL, while in our cohort, there was a negative association. In addition, our study found a negative association between NfL and birthweight, whilst Kurner and colleagues found no evidence of this association. A possible reason for these discrepancies is that Kurner and colleagues included only healthy term neonates,[13] whilst we included a higher risk cohort (24% admitted to NICU), and 13% of our cohort were born preterm. NfL appears to be higher in preterm neonates, who also have lower birthweight.

Our study adds to previous research regarding the association between NfL and adverse outcomes in neonates. Studies of cord NfL in HIE are limited to case–control designs given the rarity of overt HIE.[11, 12] The two case–control studies (n = 38 and 150) of cord blood demonstrated a higher NfL in cases of asphyxia with or without HIE,[11, 12] with asphyxia defined as Apgar ≤7 at 5 min and/or umbilical cord blood acidosis (pH <7.0). By linking cord NfL with non-reassuring fetal status, we attempt to bridge the results of these case–control studies to a possible role of NfL in the identification of in utero hypoxia, which may in future lead to studies of NfL in the diagnosis of milder or unrecognised cases of HIE. 'Pathological' fetal heart rate abnormalities, detected by CTG and ultrasound, may indicate early compensatory changes to hypoxia,[16] and correlate with neonatal acidosis.[17-19] Other studies of the plasma and CSF obtained in the days following birth have shown associations of NfL with neonatal asphyxia and HIE,[20, 21] providing mechanistic support for our work.

Limitations of this study included a relatively small sample size (n = 108). In addition, our population included a high proportion of elective CS, which are excluded from intrapartum identification of non-reassuring fetal status by our criteria. In addition, we did not assess

whether hypoxia suggested by non-reassuring fetal status led to downstream neurological effects. There is not yet evidence that increased intrapartum monitoring and identification of non-reassuring fetal status leads to decreased incidence of HIE overall, despite correlating with a reduction in neonatal seizure incidence.[22-25] Moreover, fetal heart rate patterns have differing clinical implications depending on fetal and maternal background, and therefore having variable sensitivity and specificity for hypoxic injury.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study underscores the potential of NfL as a promising biomarker of non-reassuring fetal status, and hence fetal hypoxia.

Details of author contributions

DZ and RDS designed the study in consultation with BdV, KK, BM, and HM. FG, HZ and KB supplied the assays and managed biofluid analysis. EP and TP conducted the statistical analysis. EP and DZ drafted the manuscript. All authors provided critical feedback on the manuscript.

Funding

The work is supported by US National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant R01 AG063849-01 (RDS). KB is supported by the Swedish Research Council (#2017-00915 and #2022-00732), the Swedish Alzheimer Foundation (#AF-930351, #AF-939721, #AF-968270, and #AF-994551), Hjärnfonden, Sweden (#FO2017-0243 and #ALZ2022-0006), the Swedish state under the agreement between the Swedish government and the County Councils, the ALF-agreement (#ALFGBG-715986 and #ALFGBG-965240), the European Union Joint Program for Neurodegenerative Disorders (JPND2019-466-236), the Alzheimer's Association 2021 Zenith Award (ZEN-21-848495), the Alzheimer's Association 2022-2025 Grant (SG-23-1038904 QC), La Fondation Recherche Alzheimer (FRA), Paris, France, and the Kirsten and Freddy Johansen

Foundation, Copenhagen, Denmark. HZ is a Wallenberg Scholar and a Distinguished Professor at the Swedish Research Council supported by grants from the Swedish Research Council (#2023-00356; #2022-01018 and #2019-02397), the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101053962, Swedish State Support for Clinical Research (#ALFGBG-71320), the Alzheimer Drug Discovery Foundation (ADDF), USA (#201809-2016862), the AD Strategic Fund and the Alzheimer's Association (#ADSF-21-831376-C, #ADSF-21-831381-C, #ADSF-21-831377-C, and #ADSF-24-1284328-C), the Bluefield Project, Cure Alzheimer's Fund, the Olav Thon Foundation, the Erling-Persson Family Foundation, Stiftelsen för Gamla Tjänarinnor, Hjärnfonden, Sweden (#FO2022-0270), the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 860197 (MIRIADE), the European Union Joint Programme – Neurodegenerative Disease Research (JPND2021-00694), the National Institute for Health and Care Research University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre, and the UK Dementia Research Institute at UCL (UKDRI-1003).

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available online.

Declarations of interests

KB has served as a consultant and at advisory boards for Acumen, ALZPath, AriBio, BioArctic, Biogen, Eisai, Lilly, Moleac Pte. Ltd, Novartis, Ono Pharma, Prothena, Roche Diagnostics, and Siemens Healthineers; has served at data monitoring committees for Julius Clinical and Novartis; has given lectures, produced educational materials and participated in educational programs for AC Immune, Biogen, Celdara Medical, Eisai and Roche Diagnostics; and is a co-founder of Brain Biomarker Solutions in Gothenburg AB (BBS), which is a part of the GU Ventures Incubator Program, outside the work presented in this paper.

HZ has served at scientific advisory boards and/or as a consultant for Abbvie, Acumen, Alector, Alzinova, ALZPath, Amylyx, Annexon, Apellis, Artery Therapeutics, AZTherapies, Cognito Therapeutics, CogRx, Denali, Eisai, Merry Life, Nervgen, Novo Nordisk, Optoceutics, Passage Bio, Pinteon Therapeutics, Prothena, Red Abbey Labs, reMYND, Roche, Samumed, Siemens Healthineers, Triplet Therapeutics, and Wave, has given lectures in symposia

sponsored by Alzecure, Biogen, Cellectricon, Fujirebio, Lilly, and Roche, and is a co-founder of Brain Biomarker Solutions in Gothenburg AB (BBS), which is a part of the GU Ventures Incubator Program (outside submitted work). The other authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Data availability

The raw data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

1 Stoke R, Schreiber V, Hocking K, Jardine L, Kumar S. Perinatal antecedents of moderate and severe neonatal hypoxic ischaemic encephalopathy: An Australian birth cohort study. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 2023; **63**: 409-17

2 Shah PS, Ohlsson A, Perlman M. Hypothermia to treat neonatal hypoxic ischemic encephalopathy: systematic review. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2007; **161**: 951-8

3 Takenouchi T, Iwata O, Nabetani M, Tamura M. Therapeutic hypothermia for neonatal encephalopathy: JSPNM & MHLW Japan Working Group Practice Guidelines Consensus Statement from the Working Group on Therapeutic Hypothermia for Neonatal Encephalopathy, Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare (MHLW), Japan, and Japan Society for Perinatal and Neonatal Medicine (JSPNM). *Brain Dev* 2012; **34**: 165-70

4 Jacobs SE, Berg M, Hunt R, Tarnow-Mordi WO, Inder TE, Davis PG. Cooling for newborns with hypoxic ischaemic encephalopathy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013: CD003311

5 Tagin MA, Woolcott CG, Vincer MJ, Whyte RK, Stinson DA. Hypothermia for neonatal hypoxic ischemic encephalopathy: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2012; **166**: 558-66

6 Ferriero DM. Neonatal brain injury. *N Engl J Med* 2004; **351**: 1985-95

7 Chalak L, Latremouille S, Mir I, Sanchez PJ, Sant'Anna G. A review of the conundrum of mild hypoxic-ischemic encephalopathy: Current challenges and moving forward. *Early Hum Dev* 2018; **120**: 88-94

8 East CE, Leader LR, Sheehan P, Henshall NE, Colditz PB, Lau R. Intrapartum fetal scalp lactate sampling for fetal assessment in the presence of a non-reassuring fetal heart rate trace. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015: Cd006174

9 Fetal distress and birth asphyxia. ACOG Committee Opinion: Committee on Obstetric Practice. Number 137--April 1994. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 1994; **45**: 302

10 Barro C, Chitnis T, Weiner HL. Blood neurofilament light: a critical review of its application to neurologic disease. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol* 2020; **7**: 2508-23

11 Toorell H, Zetterberg H, Blennow K, Savman K, Hagberg H. Increase of neuronal injury markers Tau and neurofilament light proteins in umbilical blood after intrapartum asphyxia. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2018; **31**: 2468-72

12 Toorell H, Carlsson Y, Hallberg B, et al. Neuro-Specific and Immuno-Inflammatory Biomarkers in Umbilical Cord Blood in Neonatal Hypoxic-Ischemic Encephalopathy. *Neonatology* 2023: 1-9

13 Kürner K, Goeral K, Atkinson A, et al. Vaginal Delivery Is Associated with Neurochemical Evidence of Increased Neuroaxonal Remodelling in Infants from the KUNO-Kids Health Study: Cross-Sectional Analysis. *Neonatology* 2022; **119**: 769-76

14 von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *The Lancet* 2007; **370**: 1453-7

15 Youden WJ. Index for rating diagnostic tests. *Cancer* 1950; **3**: 32-5

16 Penning S, Garite TJ. Management of fetal distress. *Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am* 1999; **26**: 259-74

17 Cahill AG, Tuuli MG, Stout MJ, López JD, Macones GA. A prospective cohort study of fetal heart rate monitoring: deceleration area is predictive of fetal acidemia. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2018; **218**: 523.e1-.e12

18 Martí Gamboa S, Lapresta Moros M, Pascual Mancho J, Lapresta Moros C, Castán Mateo S. Deceleration area and fetal acidemia. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2017; **30**: 2578-84
19 Furukawa A, Neilson D, Hamilton E. Cumulative deceleration area: a simplified predictor of metabolic acidemia. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2021; **34**: 3104-11
20 Blennow M, Sävman K, Ilves P, Thoresen M, Rosengren L. Brain-specific proteins in the cerebrospinal fluid of severely asphyxiated newborn infants. *Acta Paediatr* 2001; **90**: 1171-5
21 Shah DK, Ponnusamy V, Evanson J, et al. Raised Plasma Neurofilament Light Protein Levels Are Associated with Abnormal MRI Outcomes in Newborns Undergoing Therapeutic Hypothermia. *Front Neurol* 2018; **9**: 86
22 Alfirevic Z, Devane D, Gyte GM, Cuthbert A. Continuous cardiotocography (CTG) as a form of electronic fetal monitoring (EFM) for fetal assessment during labour. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017; **2**: Cd006066
23 Spong CY, Berghella V, Wenstrom KD, Mercer BM, Saade GR. Preventing the first cesarean delivery: summary of a joint Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine, and American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists Workshop. *Obstet Gynecol* 2012; **120**: 1181-93
24 Blackwell SC, Grobman WA, Antoniewicz L, Hutchinson M, Gyamfi Bannerman C. Interobserver and intraobserver reliability of the NICHD 3-Tier Fetal Heart Rate Interpretation System. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2011; **205**: 378.e1-5
25 Chauhan SP, Weiner SJ, Saade GR, et al. Intrapartum fetal heart rate tracing among small-for-gestational age compared with appropriate-for-gestational-Age neonates. *Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2018; **132(4)**: 1019-25

Table 1. Results from binomial-family models predicting non-reassuring fetal status. Results for all four biomarkers are shown. Biomarkers were standardised by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation. AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; NfL = neurofilament light.

	Log10 cord NfL[1]			**Cord pH**[2]			**Cord base excess**[3]			**Cord lactate**[4]		
Characteristic	**OR**[5]	**95% CI**[5]	**p-value**[6]	**OR**[5]	**95% CI**[5]	**p-value**[6]	**OR**[5]	**95% CI**[5]	**p-value**[6]	**OR**[5]	**95% CI**[5]	**p-value**[6]
Unadjusted model												
Cord biomarker (standardised)	2.20	1.35, 4.00	0.004**	0.49	0.27, 0.85	0.013*	0.40	0.21, 0.70	0.002**	2.19	1.33, 3.74	0.003**
Model adjusted for mode of delivery and gestational age												
Cord biomarker (standardised)	2.29	1.15, 5.57	0.038*	0.78	0.42, 1.41	0.423	0.83	0.37, 1.86	0.650	1.06	0.51, 2.12	0.862

[1] Unadjusted model: AIC = 79.8; BIC = 85.1; No. Obs. = 105. Adjusted model: AIC = 70.1; BIC = 83.3; No. Obs. = 105; p-value from F-test comparing unadjusted vs. adjusted model fit = 0.001
[2] Unadjusted model: AIC = 79.7; BIC = 85.0; No. Obs. = 104. Adjusted model: AIC = 70.2; BIC = 83.5; No. Obs. = 104; p-value from F-test comparing unadjusted vs. adjusted model fit = 0.001
[3] Unadjusted model: AIC = 65.7; BIC = 70.8; No. Obs. = 94. Adjusted model: AIC = 62.1; BIC = 74.8; No. Obs. = 94; p-value from F-test comparing unadjusted vs. adjusted model fit = 0.023
[4] Unadjusted model: AIC = 76.6; BIC = 81.9; No. Obs. = 103. Adjusted model: AIC = 70.8; BIC = 84.0; No. Obs. = 103; p-value from F-test comparing unadjusted vs. adjusted model fit = 0.008
[5] OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval
[6] *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table 2. Test characteristics of cord biomarkers in predicting non-reassuring fetal status. The cutoff value is determined by the calculation of Youden's Index from the receiver–operator curve, which maximises the sum of the sensitivity + specificity. CS = caesarean section; NfL = neurofilament light.

	Threshold (95%CI)[1]	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	Positive predictive value (95%CI)	Negative predictive value (95%CI)
All births					
Log10 NfL	1.09 (0.90, 1.17)	0.80 (0.60, 1.00)	0.84 (0.43, 0.92)	0.44 (0.23, 0.64)	0.96 (0.92, 1.00)
pH	7.25 (7.13, 7.31)	0.79 (0.43, 1.00)	0.66 (0.26, 0.91)	0.27 (0.17, 0.50)	0.95 (0.91, 1.00)
Base excess	-4.50 (-6.50, -3.50)	1.00 (0.75, 1.00)	0.63 (0.45, 0.83)	0.28 (0.21, 0.42)	1.00 (0.96, 1.00)
Lactate	3.95 (3.35, 5.00)	0.86 (0.64, 1.00)	0.75 (0.51, 0.88)	0.34 (0.23, 0.50)	0.97 (0.93, 1.00)
Excluding preterm births					
Log10 NfL	1.09 (0.90, 1.16)	0.77 (0.54, 1.00)	0.86 (0.44, 0.95)	0.48 (0.22, 0.72)	0.96 (0.93, 1.00)
pH	7.25 (7.17, 7.25)	0.77 (0.46, 1.00)	0.68 (0.45, 0.90)	0.29 (0.20, 0.50)	0.96 (0.91, 1.00)
Base excess	-4.50 (-6.50, -4.50)	1.00 (0.82, 1.00)	0.66 (0.52, 0.82)	0.30 (0.24, 0.44)	1.00 (0.97, 1.00)
Lactate	3.95 (3.35, 5.00)	0.85 (0.69, 1.00)	0.76 (0.52, 0.87)	0.37 (0.24, 0.52)	0.97 (0.93, 1.00)
Excluding elective CS births					
Log10 NfL	1.12 (0.90, 1.17)	0.71 (0.43, 1.00)	0.79 (0.27, 0.97)	0.58 (0.37, 0.87)	0.86 (0.77, 1.00)
pH	7.25 (7.12, 7.32)	0.92 (0.46, 1.00)	0.48 (0.18, 0.88)	0.40 (0.33, 0.63)	0.94 (0.79, 1.00)
Base excess	-4.50 (-11.50, -4.00)	1.00 (0.45, 1.00)	0.43 (0.25, 0.93)	0.41 (0.34, 0.75)	1.00 (0.81, 1.00)
Lactate	4.45 (3.35, 7.25)	0.85 (0.31, 1.00)	0.52 (0.21, 0.94)	0.41 (0.32, 0.71)	0.89 (0.76, 1.00)
Excluding elective CS and preterm births					
Log10 NfL	1.11 (0.90, 1.22)	0.69 (0.38, 1.00)	0.82 (0.32, 1.00)	0.65 (0.39, 1.00)	0.85 (0.76, 1.00)
pH	7.25 (7.08, 7.31)	0.85 (0.31, 1.00)	0.46 (0.11, 0.93)	0.42 (0.34, 0.69)	0.88 (0.73, 1.00)
Base excess	-9.50 (-Inf, Inf)	0.73 (0.00, 1.00)	0.46 (0.00, 1.00)	0.36 (0.31, 0.50)	0.76 (0.69, 1.00)
Lactate	4.45 (2.94, 9.55)	0.85 (0.08, 1.00)	0.50 (0.11, 1.00)	0.43 (0.33, 1.00)	0.83 (0.70, 1.00)

[1] Obtained using the calculation of Youden's Index (maximum sum of sensitivity + specificity).


A: pH (continuous)
ρ = −0.2
p = 0.043
Log10 cord NfL
Cord pH
B: pH (dichotomised)
Wilcoxon, p = 0.24
>7.10
≤7.10
Cord pH
Delivery Method
Elective CS
Emergency CS
Vaginal
C: Base excess
ρ = −0.4
p < 0.001
Cord base excess
D: Lactate
ρ = 0.41
p < 0.001
Cord lactate


A: All births, predicted by model of biomarker + MOD + gestational age
AUC (95%CI) = 0.87 (0.79, 0.95)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.83 (0.70, 0.97)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.83 (0.67, 0.98)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.82 (0.69, 0.95)
B: All births, predicted by model of biomarker + MOD
AUC (95%CI) = 0.87 (0.79, 0.94)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.85 (0.75, 0.94)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.85 (0.75, 0.95)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.84 (0.75, 0.93)
C: All births, predicted by biomarker alone
AUC (95%CI) = 0.80 (0.69, 0.91)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.73 (0.60, 0.86)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.81 (0.72, 0.91)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.79 (0.69, 0.90)
D: Excluding preterm, predicted by biomarker alone
AUC (95%CI) = 0.82 (0.71, 0.94)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.74 (0.59, 0.88)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.83 (0.74, 0.92)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.79 (0.69, 0.90)
E: Excluding elective CS delivery, predicted by biomarker alone
AUC (95%CI) = 0.70 (0.54, 0.87)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.64 (0.48, 0.81)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.63 (0.45, 0.82)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.60 (0.43, 0.78)
F: Excluding elective CS + preterm, predicted by biomarker alone
AUC (95%CI) = 0.73 (0.55, 0.90)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.59 (0.40, 0.77)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.43 (0.22, 0.63)
AUC (95%CI) = 0.54 (0.35, 0.73)
Sensitivity
1 - Specificity
0.00 0.10 0.25 0.50 0.75 0.90 1.00
Biomarker
NfL
Cord pH
Base excess
Lactate


A: NfL
Kruskal-Wallis, p <0.001
0.45
2.6e-05
0.062
Log10 Cord NfL
3
2
1
Elective CS
Emergency CS
Vaginal
Delivery mode
B: pH
Kruskal-Wallis, p <0.001
0.99
0.00013
0.035
Cord pH
7.6
7.4
7.2
7.0
Elective CS
Emergency CS
Vaginal
Delivery mode
C: Base excess
Kruskal-Wallis, p <0.001
0.93
2.7e-09
0.0012
Cord base excess
5
0
-5
-10
-15
Elective CS
Emergency CS
Vaginal
Delivery mode
D: Lactate
Kruskal-Wallis, p <0.001
0.14
1.8e-12
0.00067
Cord lactate
10
5
Elective CS
Emergency CS
Vaginal
Delivery mode