COMPARISON OF MATERNAL AND FOETAL OUTCOME BETWEEN INDUCED LABOUR AND SPONTANEOUS LABOUR IN LOW RISK PREGNANCY IN PRIMIGRAVIDA
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ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND

Induction of labour helps to reduce the number of foetal deaths due to placental insufficiency caused by continuation of pregnancy beyond 40 weeks. Induction in unselected population has been associated with prolonged labour, hyperstimulation, unsuccessful labour and iatrogenic prematurity. We wanted to compare maternal and foetal outcome between induced labour and spontaneous labour in primigravida low risk pregnancy.

METHODS

In this study, we included 146 women with term singleton pregnancy with vertex presentation in each group. Outcome measures were the mean duration of labour, mode of delivery and the foeto-maternal outcomes.

RESULTS

There was no difference in the mean age, height and weight in the two groups. The average GA was 38.81 weeks in spontaneous group and 40.03 weeks in induced labour. More women had spontaneous vaginal delivery among those with spontaneous labour (84.24% versus 67.12%). Among those who were delivered vaginally, only 8% needed instrumental delivery in both groups; rest delivered normally. The mean duration of active stage of labour was significantly more in induced labour (5.32 hours) than in spontaneous labour (4.93 hours) (p=0.05). Average duration of induction to delivery in induced group was 13.29 hours. In the present study, among both groups, it was seen that foetal distress was the common reason for LSCS, followed by failure of induction among induced labour group, followed by maternal request, followed by non-decent of foetal head and non-progress of labour and one more reason that was noticed among spontaneous labour patient was persistent occipitoposterior position.

CONCLUSIONS

No statistically significant difference was seen with regard to mean APGAR scores and maternal complications in the two groups, but rate of caesarean section increased in induced labour.
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The inclusion criteria not presenting medical/obstetric indications for caesarean or induction and willing to give consent include Primigravida, Singleton, Vertex presentation, 37-41 weeks’ gestation.

The exclusion criteria being Foetal distress, Cephalopelvic disproportion, Placenta previa type 2 posterior 3,4, Malpresentation, Multifoetal gestation, Pregnancy with medical disorder, Patients unwilling to give consent, non-cephalic presentation, intrauterine growth restriction, oligohydramnios, polyhydramnios, pre-eclampsia, gestational diabetes mellitus, foetal congenital anomalies, hydrocephalus or cystic hygroma. 2,3 A written informed consent was obtained from each subject participating in the study.

**Data Analysis**

The collected data was compiled in Microsoft Excel 2010. Data describing quantitative measures was expressed as mean, median, mean ± SD, standard deviation. Qualitative type of data was expressed as percentage or proportion. Data was analysed using SPSS (Statistical Programme for Social Sciences) software 21 version, OpenEpi Software Version 2.3. For quantitative type of data test of significance applied was Student t test and for Qualitative data Chi square test was applied.

**DISCUSSION**

Labour induction rate has gradually increased. Elective induction is done so that delivery happens as per physician’s convenience. It is also done due to patients desire to end their pregnancy because of physical discomfort. In present age the doctor as well as the women in labour prefers to accomplish the delivery in shortest possible time, compatible with safety of mother and newborn. Hence, now a days the hopeful expectancy is replaced by an active management of labour. Thus, it is imperative to determine the potential effects and outcomes associated with elective induction of Labour.

Although only limited literature is available on elective induction, its advantages and disadvantages have been described. This prospective study on the effect of elective induction of Labour on the mother and foetus have been conducted with the aim not to validate or promote elective induction but to rather identify whether electively induced Labour actually places the mother and her foetus at increased risk as compared with her spontaneous Labour group in low risk.
risk patients and also to determine the influence of Labour induction on caesarean delivery.

Present study showed that Average gestational age of group I was 40.03±0.26 weeks. Average weight of group II was 38.81±0.96 weeks. Applying t test, p value <0.00001. As p value is <0.05, statistical significance seen.

Study by Yadav P et al(9) showed that mean gestational age among spontaneous labour was 39.32±0.91 and induced was 39.63±1.07 weeks. p=0.08, shows no statistical significance. Similar study by Singh A et al(9) showed that mean gestational age among spontaneous labour was 39.37±1.46 and induced was 39.63±1.07 weeks. p=0.22, shows no statistical significance.

Study by Abisowo OY et al(9) showed that mean gestational age at delivery was 40.25±1.33 for the study group compared to 39.33±1.03 for the control group showing statistically significant difference (t = 8.107, p=< 0.001).

There was difference in the mean gestational age which is probably because the spontaneous group population going into Labour before the expected date of delivery and the induced group, most of them being induced after crossing of their expected date of delivery.

In present study among both group I and II majority delivered vaginally compared to LSCS. Statistical significance was also seen (p=0.0003).

Study by Chaubey S et al(7) showed that majority had vaginal delivery in both groups. Similar results were seen in present study.

Study by Yadav P et al showed that majority had vaginal delivery among both the groups. (p=0.02), shows statistical significance.

Similar study by Singh A et al showed that majority delivered vaginal among both the groups. (p=0.00).

Study by Abisowo OY et al showed that among both groups majority delivered vaginally. P=0.0001, shows significance.

Similar findings were seen in present study.

**Duration of Labour in Active Stage in Hours**
- In present study Average Duration of labour (hours) of group I was 5.32±1.76 hours.
- Average Duration of labour (hours) of group II was 4.93±1.76 hours.
- Applying t test, p value =0.05. As p value is <0.05, statistical significance seen.
- Study by Chaubey S et al showed that mean duration among induced females was 8.83±1.39 hours and among non-induced it was 11.29±1.57 hrs.
- Similar study by Singh A et al showed that mean duration among spontaneous labour was 6.08±2.3 and induced was 6.5±2.23 hours. p=0.15, shows no statistical significance.

**Duration of Induction to Delivery in Hours**
- Average Duration of Induction to delivery (hours) of group I was 13.29±4.11 hours.
- Similar study by Singh A et al showed that average duration was 6.08±2.3 hours.

**Method Used in Vaginal Delivery**

- Among those who were delivered vaginally in both groups, majority had normal vaginal delivery but some needed instrumental delivery (8.16%)
- Study by Yadav P et al showed that only 6.7% needed instrumental delivery.

**Reason for LSCS**
- In present study among both group I and II it was seen that foetal distress was the common reason for LSCS, followed by failure of induction among group I followed by maternal request, followed by non-decent of foetal head and non-progress of labour and one more reason was noticed among the group II females i.e. Persistent occipitoposterior position. Statistical significance was also seen (p=0.0003).
- Similar study by Singh A et al showed that indication for LSCS were cephalopelvic disproportion, foetal distress and failure to progress. (p=0.00) shows significance.
- Study by Abisowo OY et al showed that main reason for LSCS was cephalopelvic disproportion followed by foetal distress among both groups. p=0.03, shows significance. Similar findings were seen in present study.

  Duration in the present was less.

**APGAR Score of Newborn at 1 min.**
- Average APGAR score of group I was 7.38±1.08.
- Average APGAR score of group II was 7.86±0.73.
- Applying t test, p value =0.09. As p value is >0.05, there is no statistical significance seen.
- Study by Chaubey S et al showed that mean APGAR at 1 min among induced was 8.9±0.3 and non-induced was 8.8±0.33.
- Study by Yadav P et al showed that mean APGAR at 1 min among spontaneous labour was 7.1±1.22 and induced was 7.17±1.2. p=0.76, shows no statistical significance.
- Similar study by Singh A et al showed that mean APGAR at 1 min among spontaneous labour was 7.68±2.5 and induced was 8.42±2.15. p=0.00, shows statistical significance.
- Study by Abisowo OY et al showed that mean APGAR at 1 min of control group was 6.3±1.4 and induced group 6.2±1.4.

**APGAR Score of newborn at 5 min.**
- Average APGAR score of group I was 8.63±1.04.
- Average APGAR score of group II was 8.81±0.63.
- Applying t test, p value =0.07. As p value is >0.05, there is no statistical significance seen.
- Study by Chaubey S et al showed that mean APGAR at 5 min among induced was 9.96±0.2 and non-induced was 9.9±0.36. p=0.05, no significance seen. Similar findings were seen in present study.
- Study by Yadav P et al showed that mean APGAR at 5 min among spontaneous labour was 9.38±0.8 and induced was 9.33±0.88. p=0.73, shows no statistical significance.
- Similar study by Singh A et al showed that mean APGAR at 5 min among spontaneous labour was 8.93±1.87 and induced was 9.45±1.1. p=0.008, shows statistical significance.
Study by Abisowo OY et al showed that mean APGAR at 5
min of control group was 8.4±1.3 and induced group
8.33±1.2.

NICU Admission
In present study it was seen that among group I 18 new-borns
needed NICU admission and 12 new-borns among group II
needed NICU admission. No statistical significance was seen
(p=0.12). Study by Chaubey S et al showed that only 2%
newborn were shifted to NICU each among both groups. Study
by Abisowo OY et al showed that 3.6% among spontaneous
group were admitted to NICU and 7.3% of induced group.

Maternal Complication Among the Study Population
In present study among both groups various maternal
complications were seen, like cervical tear, paraurethral tear,
uterine hyperstimulation. No statistical significance was seen
(p=0.39). In study by Yadav P et al it was seen that cervical tear
was in only induced case p=1.

CONCLUSIONS
A number of studies have examined the outcome of elective
induction and most have concluded that there is litter
difference in outcomes between those patients who undergo
elective induction and those who have spontaneous labour.
We conclude from this study that while induced labour may
increase chances of caesarean section, it does not adversely
affect maternal outcome and foetal outcome. However,
increased risk of caesarean section by induction of labour
should be a part of informed consent, discussion with patient
who needs induction is important. The patient may very well
choose to delay, avoid or accept induction.
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