



# **Evaluation of Trials of Labour after Previous Caesarean Section in Ain Shams University Maternity Hospital: A Retrospective Study**

***A Thesis***

*Submitted for Partial Fulfilment Of  
Master of Science Degree in Obstetrics and Gynaecology*

*Presented By*

***Hamdy Bakry Mohye El Kinawy***

*MBBCh (2010)*

*Teaching Assistant at Obstetrics and Gynaecology Department  
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Under Supervision Of

**Prof. Ahmed Ramy Mohammed Ramy**

*Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology  
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

**Dr Rehab Mohammed Abd El Rahman**

*Lecturer in Obstetrics and Gynaecology  
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

*Faculty of Medicine  
Ain Shams University*

**2016**



# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

## First and foremost, thanks to Allah

I'd like to express my gratitude to **Prof. Ahmed Ramy M. Ramy**, *Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*, for his wise guidance and generous support.

Thanks are due to **Dr Rehab M. Abd El Rahman**, *Lecturer in Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*, for her precious advice and invaluable co-operation.

Thanks to all friends and colleagues who helped and encouraged to get this work come to existence.

I feel deeply thankful to my wonderful family for their support, love and belief.

*Hamdy Bakry*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>Study Protocol.....</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Aim of the Work.....	5
<b>Review of Literature.....</b>	<b>7</b>
History of VBAC: A Century of Controversy .....	7
Assessment of Scar Integrity .....	17
TOLAC: The Practice and Management.....	31
<b>Methods.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Results .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Summary and Conclusion.....</b>	<b>99</b>
Recommendations .....	101
<b>References.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Arabic Summary.....</b>	<b>119</b>

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACOG	The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
aOR	adjusted odds ratio
BMI	body-mass index
CS	caesarean section
CTG	cardiotocography
DM	diabetes mellitus
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i> , for example
ECV	external cephalic version
<i>et al.</i>	<i>et alii</i> , and other people
FHR	fetal heart rate
g	gram
GA	gestational age
HELLP	haemolysis, elevated liver enzymes, low platelet count
HIE	hypoxic-ischaemic encephalopathy
HTN	hypertension
i.e.	<i>id est</i> , in other words
IUFD	intrauterine fetal demise
IUGR	intrauterine growth restriction
kg	kilogram
LBW	low birth weight
LUS	lower uterine segment
mg	milligram
mm	millimetre

NHS	English <b>N</b> ational <b>H</b> ealth <b>S</b> ervice
NICU	<b>n</b> eonatal <b>i</b> ntensive <b>c</b> are <b>u</b> nit
NIH	US <b>N</b> ational <b>I</b> nstitutes of <b>H</b> ealth
OR	<b>o</b> dds <b>r</b> atio
<i>p</i>	<b>p</b> robability value
PGDM	<b>p</b> re-gestational <b>d</b> iabetes <b>m</b> ellitus
PPH	<b>p</b> ostpartum <b>h</b> aemorrhage
PROM	<b>p</b> relabour <b>r</b> upture of <b>m</b> embranes
PT	<b>p</b> reterm
RCOG	The <b>R</b> oyal <b>C</b> ollege of <b>O</b> bstetricians and <b>G</b> ynaecologists
RDS	<b>r</b> espiratory <b>d</b> istress <b>s</b> yndrome
RR	<b>r</b> elative <b>r</b> isk
SLE	<b>s</b> ystemic <b>l</b> upus <b>e</b> rythematosus
SOGC	The <b>S</b> ociety of <b>O</b> bstetricians and <b>G</b> ynaecologists of <b>C</b> anada
SROM	<b>s</b> pontaneous <b>r</b> upture of <b>m</b> embranes
TAS	<b>t</b> ransabdominal <b>s</b> can
TOL	<b>t</b> rial of <b>l</b> abour
TOLAC	<b>t</b> rial of <b>l</b> abour <b>a</b> fter <b>c</b> aesarean <b>s</b> ection
TTN	<b>t</b> ransient <b>t</b> achypnoea of the <b>n</b> ewborn
TVS	<b>t</b> ransvaginal <b>s</b> can
UK	The <b>U</b> nited <b>K</b> ingdom
US	The <b>U</b> nited <b>S</b> tates of <b>A</b> merica
USS	<b>u</b> ltrasound <b>s</b> can
VBAC	<b>v</b> aginal <b>b</b> irth <b>a</b> fter <b>c</b> aesarean <b>s</b> ection
VD	<b>v</b> aginal <b>d</b> elivery
WHO	<b>W</b> orld <b>H</b> ealth <b>O</b> rganisation
95% CI	<b>95%</b> <b>c</b> onfidence <b>i</b> nterval

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1.</b>	<i>Summary of benefits and risks of VBAC vs ERCS.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<b>Table 2.</b>	<i>Types of prior uterine incisions and estimated risks for uterine rupture.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<b>Table 3.</b>	<i>Statistics of reviewed data for the study period.....</i>	<i>61</i>
<b>Table 4.</b>	<i>Cases with 1 prior CS who presented in labour but had a repeat CS.....</i>	<i>62</i>
<b>Table 5.</b>	<i>Characteristics of the study population.....</i>	<i>63</i>
<b>Table 6.</b>	<i>Associated medical disorders in the study population. ..</i>	<i>65</i>
<b>Table 7.</b>	<i>Registered indications for the previous CS in women undergoing TOLAC after 1 prior CS.....</i>	<i>67</i>
<b>Table 8.</b>	<i>Comparison of the study population characteristics at time of TOLAC according to outcome.....</i>	<i>69</i>
<b>Table 9.</b>	<i>Relation of prior vaginal deliveries and prior successful VBAC to outcome of TOLAC. ....</i>	<i>72</i>
<b>Table 10.</b>	<i>Relation of inter-delivery interval and outcome of TOLAC. ....</i>	<i>73</i>
<b>Table 11.</b>	<i>Relation between phase of labour on admission and outcome of TOLAC.....</i>	<i>74</i>
<b>Table 12.</b>	<i>Relation between fetal membrane status on admission and outcome of TOLAC. ....</i>	<i>75</i>
<b>Table 13.</b>	<i>Maternal medical disorders at the time of TOLAC according to outcome. ....</i>	<i>76</i>
<b>Table 14.</b>	<i>Maternal hospital-stay after TOLAC according to outcome.....</i>	<i>77</i>
<b>Table 15.</b>	<i>Maternal outcomes after TOLAC. ....</i>	<i>78</i>
<b>Table 16.</b>	<i>Perinatal outcomes after TOLAC.....</i>	<i>81</i>
<b>Table 17.</b>	<i>Perinatal outcomes after uterine rupture.....</i>	<i>83</i>

# LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 1.</b>	<i>Trends in the US rates of CS and VBAC, 1970 to 1993.</i>	11
<b>Figure 2.</b>	<i>Trends in the US rates of CS and VBAC, 1989 to 2007.</i>	13
<b>Figure 3.</b>	<i>LUS thickness measured by TAS and TVS.</i>	22
<b>Figure 4.</b>	<i>Measurement of the LUS thickness.</i>	23
<b>Figure 5.</b>	<i>Longitudinal sonogram showing a uterine defect. The myometrial layer is seen adjacent to the defect. A defect was found in the LUS during CS.</i>	24
<b>Figure 6.</b>	<i>Longitudinal sonogram showing an area of increased echogenicity in the outer layer with myometrial thinning measuring 2.3 mm.</i>	24
<b>Figure 7.</b>	<i>Ultrasound images from the same woman before and at SCSH. The arrow points to the scar defect whose border was seen more clearly at SCSH than without saline enhancement.</i>	28
<b>Figure 8.</b>	<i>Diagram of a scar defect on TVS. The grey shaded triangular area represents the scar defect. The dotted (imaginary) line represents the level of the internal cervical os. Size is estimated by measuring the length (L) and height (h) of the defect, the thickness of the remaining myometrium over the defect (r) and the thickness of the myometrium close to and fundal to the defect (m).</i>	28



<b>Figure 9.</b> Distribution of maternal age in the study population.	64
<b>Figure 10.</b> Distribution of maternal BMI at delivery in the study population.....	64
<b>Figure 11.</b> Health status of the study population at time of delivery.....	65
<b>Figure 12.</b> Distribution of GA at delivery in the study population.	66
<b>Figure 13.</b> Distribution of neonatal birth weight in the study population.....	66
<b>Figure 14.</b> Outcome of TOLAC.....	68
<b>Figure 15.</b> Relative outcomes of TOLAC in maternal age categories. ....	70
<b>Figure 16.</b> Relative outcomes of TOLAC in BMI categories.....	70
<b>Figure 17.</b> Relative outcomes of TOLAC in GA categories. ....	71
<b>Figure 18.</b> Relative outcomes of TOLAC in birth weight categories. ....	71
<b>Figure 19.</b> Proportions of women with and without a previous VD in cases who achieved a successful VBAC. ....	72
<b>Figure 20.</b> Relative outcomes of TOLAC in inter-delivery interval categories. ....	73
<b>Figure 21.</b> Relative outcomes of TOLAC according to phase of labour on admission. ....	74
<b>Figure 22.</b> Relative outcomes of TOLAC according to fetal membrane status on admission. ....	75
<b>Figure 23.</b> Hospital-stay after delivery in both outcomes. ....	77
<b>Figure 24.</b> Approximate frequencies of maternal outcomes. ...	79
<b>Figure 25.</b> Frequency of maternal complications relative to outcomes. ....	79
<b>Figure 26.</b> Approximate frequencies of perinatal outcomes after TOLAC in the study population. ....	81



# ABSTRACT

## Objective

Evaluation of the practice and short term maternal and perinatal outcomes of TOLAC offered to women at ASUMH during the 3-year period from Jan 2013 to Dec 2015.

## Study design

Retrospective record-based study.

## Results

VBAC rate was 86%. A prior VD, particularly a prior VBAC, and presenting in active labour were significantly associated with a higher rate of success. Lower neonatal birth weight, longer inter-delivery interval and younger maternal age positively influenced the outcome. Hospital-stay was significantly shorter with successful VBAC. Maternal adverse events were more frequent among women who had an unsuccessful TOL, including uterine rupture, blood transfusion and endometritis.

## Conclusion

Assessment of individual risks and the likelihood of VBAC is important in determining who are appropriate candidates for TOLAC. If the prerequisites for TOLAC are not available, ERCS is a safer option for delivery.

**Keywords:** trial of labour, TOLAC, VBAC



# STUDY PROTOCOL

## *Introduction*

Since 1985, the international healthcare community has considered the ideal rate for Caesarean Section (CS) to be 10–15%. Since then, CS became increasingly common in both developed and developing countries. When medically justified, a CS can effectively prevent maternal and perinatal mortality and morbidity. However, there is no evidence showing the benefits of CS for women or infants who do not require the procedure (*WHO, 2015*).

In recent years, there has been widespread public and professional concern about the increasing proportion of CS births and the potential negative consequences for maternal and infant health (*RCOG, 2007; WHO, 2015*).

Between 1970 and 2007, the CS rate (defined as the number of CS per 100 live births) in the United States increased dramatically from 5% to more than 31%. This increase was a result of several changes in the practice environment, including the introduction of electronic foetal monitoring and the decrease in use of vaginal breech deliveries and forceps deliveries, which influenced the increase in primary CS rate, and the dictum ‘once a caesarean, always a caesarean’ has largely permeated the obstetric practice (*ACOG, 2010*).

The rising rate of primary CS have led to an increased proportion of the obstetric population who have a history of prior caesarean delivery (*RCOG, 2007*). Pregnant women with a CS may be offered either **E**lective **R**epeat **C**aesarean **S**ection (ERCS) or **T**rial **O**f **L**abour **A**fter previous **C**aesarean section (TOLAC), which when successful provides women who desire a vaginal delivery with the possibility of achieving that goal—a **V**aginal **B**irth **A**fter **C**aesarean delivery (VBAC) (*ACOG, 2010*). The proportion of women who decline VBAC is, in turn, a significant determinant of overall rates of caesarean birth (*RCOG, 2007; Guise et al., 2010b*).

As the annual incidence of CS in the United States increased from less than 5% during the 1970s to 23.5% in 1988, the **N**ational **I**nstitutes of **H**ealth (NIH) and the **W**orld **H**ealth **O**rganization (WHO) held consensus conferences in the 1980s and concluded that CS rates were too high and VBAC was an acceptable approach for reducing these rates (*Cheng et al., 2011*).

This change in approach and recommendations favouring TOLAC was reflected in increased VBAC rates (VBAC per 100 women with a prior CS) from just more than 5% in 1985 to 28.3% by 1996, and the overall CS rate decreased to approximately 20% (*ACOG, 2010*).

At an individual level, in addition to fulfilling a patient's preference for vaginal delivery, VBAC is associated with decreased maternal morbidity and a decreased risk of complications in future pregnancies. At a population level, VBAC also is associated with a decrease in the overall CS rate (*ACOG, 2010*).

A woman's perception of self-efficacy and inability to fulfil family obligations have been cited as reasons for women choosing VBAC rather than ERCS. Patient involvement in decision-making as well as VBAC counselling have also been associated with increased choice for VBAC, in addition to increased patient satisfaction. Conversely, lack of education or discussion with the clinician was associated with ERCS. Studies examining external influences on a woman's choice for VBAC have found that women highly value the opinion of their healthcare provider (*Guise et al., 2010b*).

Yet, neither ERCS nor TOLAC is without risks. As the number of women pursuing TOLAC increased, so did the number of reports of uterine scar dehiscence or rupture and associated maternal and/or neonatal morbidity and mortality. In part, these reports, and the professional liability pressures they engendered, have resulted in a reversal of VBAC and CS trends (*ACOG, 2010; Cheng et al., 2011*). By 2006, the VBAC rate had decreased to 8.5 % and the total CS rate had increased by more than 50% (from 20.7% in 1996) to 31.1% (*ACOG, 2010; Guise et al., 2010b*).

The coupling of this trend with a concomitant increase in the primary CS rate portends a continued escalation in the overall CS rate. Both vaginal delivery and CS hold inherent risks. Thus, mothers and clinicians are confronted with complex decisions and must weigh possible risks and benefits associated with VBAC versus ERCS (*Guise et al., 2010b*).