Early versus traditional postoperative feeding after Cesarean Section

Thesis submitted for fulfillment of the M.Sc degree in Obstetrics and Gynecology

By

Naglaa Fattouh Abdallah

(MBBCH)-Cairo University

Supervised by

Professor / Mohammed Mohammed Ismaeil Albokl

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology Cairo University

Dr/ Sherif Mohammed Maher Negm

Assistant professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology Cairo University

Dr/ Fouad Abd El Kader Abou Hemeila

Assistant professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology Cairo university

> Faculty of medicine Cairo University 2009

Abstract

Key words: Feeding_ after caesarean_ early_traditional

This short study showed that early feedind after caesarean section is much more better than traditional feeding after bowl sound s or passage of flatus , it resulted in less nausea , less vomiting ,more rapid return in bowel function , less distension and less hospital stay, in addition to more rapid return to home,less crowdedness in hospitals

CONTENTS

- INTRODUCTION AND AIM OF THE WORK
- REVIEW OF LITERATURE
- *Chapter 1 Cesarean Section
 - Definition
 - History
 - Rate and recent trends
 - Indications
 - Techniques
 - Complications
 - Vaginal birth after cesarean
- * Chapter 2 Pain and spinal anesthesia
- * Chapter 3 Intestinal motility and paralytic ileus
- *Chapter 4 Feeding after cesarean section
- MATERIALS AND METHODS
- RESULTS
- **DISCUSSION**
- SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
- REFERENCES
- ARABIC SUMMARY

List of Tables:

No	Title	Page
1	Cesarean section rates and selective indications in the USA in	11
	1980-1988	
2	Cesarean rates per 100 deliveries	16
3	Direct death rates per million maternities by mode in delivery 3	
	in UK, 1997-1999.	
4	Contraindication to neuro-axial blockade	43
5	Low dose combined spinal anesthesia compared with	45
	epidural and spinal.	
6	Demographic data in both groups	65
7	The indications of cesarean sections by number and their 6	
	percentage in the study group	
8	The mean bowel sounds for group A and group B	71
9	The mean passage of flatus of group A and group B	72
10	The mean bowel movements of group A and group B	73
11	Mean duration of surgery(minutes) for group A and group B	74
12	Mean hospital stay(hours) for group A and group B	75

List of Figures:

No	Title	Page
1	History of cesarean section	
2	Cesarean section in modern hospital	
3	A cesarean section in progress	
4	Spread of opioids in the cerebrospinal fluids	
5	Pharmacokinetics of spinal fluids	45a
6	UK cesarean sections in 1997: GA,CSE	45b
7	Pencil -point and bevel-tip spinal	45b
8	Mean age for both groups	66
9	Mean parity for both groups	66
10	Mean gestational age for both groups	67
11	The distribution of indications of the cesarean sections in	68
	group A	
12	The distribution of indications of the cesarean sections in	69
	group B	
13	The comparison of the percentage of the same indications	69
	between the two groups	
14	Percentage of patients having nausea or vomiting	70
15	Percentage of patients having distension	70
16	The mean bowel sounds of group A and group B	71
17	The mean passage of flatus of group A and group B	72
18	The mean bowel movements for group A and group B	73
19	The mean duration of surgery (minutes) for group A and	74
	group B	
20	The mean hospital stay(hours) for group A and group B	75

List of Abbreviations

ACOG AD After date BC Before Christ CS Cesarean section CSE Combined spinal epidural CTG Cardiotogography DVT Deep venous thrombosis EDD Expected date of delivery EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom USA United States of America		
AD After date BC Before Christ CS Cesarean section CSE Combined spinal epidural CTG Cardiotogography DVT Deep venous thrombosis EDD Expected date of delivery EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age Gestational age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	ACOG	American college of Obstetricians, and Gynecologists
BC Cesarean section CSE Combined spinal epidural CTG Cardiotogography DVT Deep venous thrombosis EDD Expected date of delivery EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
CS Cesarean section CSE Combined spinal epidural CTG Cardiotogography DVT Deep venous thrombosis EDD Expected date of delivery EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
CSE Combined spinal epidural CTG Cardiotogography DVT Deep venous thrombosis EDD Expected date of delivery EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
CTG Cardiotogography DVT Deep venous thrombosis EDD Expected date of delivery EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
DVT Deep venous thrombosis EDD Expected date of delivery EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
EDD Expected date of delivery EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
EFM Electroning fetal monitoring E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
E.g. For example FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
FBS Fetal blood sampling FHR Fetal heart rate GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
FHR GA General anesthesia Gest. age Gestational age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	_	1
GA General anesthesia Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		1 0
Gest. age HIV Human immune virus IL Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom		
HIV Interleukin L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	GA	General anesthesia
IL Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	Gest. age	Gestational age
L Lumbar LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	HIV	Human immune virus
LSCS Lower segment cesarean section MMC Migrating motor complex NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	IL	Interleukin
MMC NS Non significant P Probability level POI POSTOPERATIVE ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	L	Lumbar
MMC NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	LSCS	Lower segment cesarean section
NS Non significant P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	MMC	Migrating motor complex
P Probability level POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	NS	
POI Postoperative ileus RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	P	
RCOG Royal college of Gynecologists and obstetricians RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	POI	1
RCT Randomized controlled trial SD Standard deviation UK United Kingdom	RCOG	· •
UK United Kingdom	RCT	
UK United Kingdom	SD	Standard deviation
\mathcal{E}		
VBAC Vaginal birth after cesarean		

Acknowledgment

First and above all my deepest gratitude and thanks to

Allah

For achieving any work in my life

I would like to express many thanks for all

my family and my husband

For their kind efforts and support that made achievement of this work possible

I would like to express my special cordial thanks, endless Gratitude and appreciation to

Prof. Mohammed Mohammed Ismaeil AlBokl

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, For giving my opportunity to work under his meticulous supervision. His honest assistance and patience make me truly indebted to him with great pleasure

I am also grateful to

Dr Sherief Mohammed Maher Negm

Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, , Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, who undertook the task of reading the entire typescript. His comprehensive knowledge and timely advice saved me from many errors.

I am also deeply grateful to

Dr Fouaad Abdelkadir Abou Hemeila

Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, , Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, who offered me a lot of help and encouragement. Thanks for his invaluable care.

Introduction And Aim of the Work

Introduction

There has been an increase in Cesarean section rate over the past 20 years, which is not uniform but associated with wide variations between and within countries .(Sachs et al; 1999)

This is not a recent phenomenon, a senior Obstetrician in 1922 wrote to the British Medical Journal: "The art and science of midwifery have either been lost by the younger generation in this country or will certainly be lost if this mad rage for Cesarean section is continued (Chamberlain and Steer; 2001)

Women delivered by Cesarean section need more care after the operation than those who give birth vaginally. (Kovavisarach and Atthakorn).

One long-standing caveat of post surgical care related to feeding of the abdominal surgery requires the patient to have normal bowel sounds and pass flatus before starting oral feeding. This practice is based on the assumptions that early feeding increases the incidence of nausea, vomiting, and abdominal distention if bowel sounds have not returned before the initiation of oral feeding.(*Adupa et al*; 2003).

The current protocol for postoperative management requires that oral feeding should be restricted during the first 24 hours .After this restricted period a liquid diet is provided for the next meal, and a soft diet is prescribed on the next day after the Cesarean section .The full regular diet is prescribed on the third day if the patients do not feel abdominal

discomfort .The length of hospital stay is at least 4 days. (Chantarasorn and Tannirandorn; 2006)

Because most Cesarean deliveries are performed under regional anaesthesia, require little intestinal manipulation and involve younger patients, some investigators have suggested that women who have undergone a Cesarean can safely receive solid food as early as 4-8 hours after surgery.(Gocmen et al; 2002)

Studies has shown that early oral feeding is associated with reduced protein store depletion, improved wound healing and faster recovery, with earlier hospital discharge and reduced costs. (Adupa et al; 2003).

The nature of Cesarean section surgery which includes minimal bowel manipulation, a low rate of preoperative peritonitis and a relatively short duration of surgery allow a more rapid postoperative return of bowel function and quite more rapid patient recovery compared with other major abdominal surgeries or the ill/moribund patients. (Adupa et al; 2003)

Aim of the study

The aim of this work was to evaluate feasibility, safety and tolerance of early oral feeding after cesarean and its effect on the length of hospital stay.

Review of Literature

Chapter 1:

Cesarean Section

Cesarean section

Definition

Delivery of a baby by an abdominal and uterine incision known as Cesarean section (C.S) is increasingly used for safe delivery for fetal or maternal reasons either electively or as an emergency. A small proportion is contributed by maternal request for non medical reasons (*Penna &Arulkumaran*; 2003) or by monetary incentives (*Finger*; 2003). Advent of blood transfusion with minimal incidence of cross reactions, improved anesthesia, aseptic and antiseptic techniques and the invention of antibiotics have made it a safe procedure. Depending on the population and the facilities available the incidence varies between 10 and 25 % in most developed countries. (*Arulkmaran*; 2007)

History Of Cesarean Section

Young in his monograph of "the history of cesarean section" published in 1944 reached a conclusion that" it is quite impossible to ascertain exactly when the operation of cesarean section was first performed, whether on a living woman or post-mortem. There is no doubt however, that history of cesarean section is of great antiquity" (Young; 1944).

Though the earliest medical writers are silent on the subject of cesarean section, yet unmistakable references are made to it in ancient Rabbinical writings such as the Mischnagoth (140 B.C.) and the Talmud

complied between the second and sixth centuries AD covered all aspects of obstetrics, didn't refer to cesarean section (*Cunningham et al*, 2005).

As for the origin of the term "cesarean section" several explanations have been suggested. It has been widely believed that the name of the operation is derived from a Roman Law, supposedly created by-Numa Pompilius (2nd king of Rome, 761-715 B.C.) Known as the Lex Regia, by which it was forbidden to burry a pregnant woman before the child had been cut out. Later in the time of the Caesars, the law became the Lex Caesarea, and this is the most probable derivation of its present name (*Cunningham et al*, 2005).

Another explanation is that according to legend, Julius Caesar was born in this manner, with the result that the procedure became known as the "Cesarean operation". Several circumstances however weaken this explanation. Firstly the mother of Julius Cesar lived for many years after his birth in 100 B.C., and as late as the 17th century, the operation is almost invariably fatal. Secondly the operation whether performed on the living or dead, is not mentioned by any medical writer before the middle ages. (Cunningham et al, 2005).

A linguistic explanation states that the word cesarean was derived sometime in the middle ages from the Latin verb Caedera, "to cut". An obvious cognate is the word caesura, a cutting, or pause, in a line of verse. This explanation of the term cesarean seems most logical, but exactly when it was first applied to the operation is uncertain. Because "section" is