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Dear Editor,

The correspondent has highlighted the very low rate of undelivered FGR after 40 weeks in their institution, and suggested that the routine use of obstetric ultrasound at every antenatal visit has contributed to this low rate. They have suggested that while a single fetal weight estimation may lead to incorrect data; it is less likely that repeated measurements would have the same chance of error.

While it may be a desirable objective to provide bedside ultrasound at every antenatal visit, it is not feasible in an Australian setting due to time constraints, limitations in
ultrasound expertise, availability of ultrasound machines and cost. This makes a screening process, based on identification of risk factors for fetal growth restriction and clinical evidence of such, of great importance in order to triage those who most require ultrasonography.

Universal ultrasound may lead to a higher detection of fetal growth restriction, but it comes at the expense of a high false positive rate.\(^1\) Prior to implementation of universal ultrasound screening, further evidence of benefit may be necessary, given the potential implications of increased obstetric intervention and maternal anxiety associated with an incorrect diagnosis of fetal growth restriction. We would encourage the correspondent to contribute further to the literature in this area.
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