



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية
التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكرو فيلم

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم



MONA MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية
التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم



MONA MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية
التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها
علي هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار



MONA MAGHRABY

**A comparison of the efficacy and safety of
repetitive hourly dose of oral misoprostol and
two hourly dose oral regimens for cervical
ripening and labor induction: A R.C.T**

A Thesis

Submitted for partial fulfillment of master degree
in Obstetrics & Gynecology

By

Essam Salah Mohamed Hagag

M.B.B.Ch., Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University (2012)

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Sabry Sayed Mohamed

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Dr. Hayam Fathy Mohammed

Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Dr. Ahmed Mohammed Essam El Din Mansour

Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

**Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
2020**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

لسببائك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢



Acknowledgments

*First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **Allah**, the **Most Beneficent** and **Merciful**, who gave me the strength to accomplish this work,*

*My deepest gratitude to my supervisor, **Prof. Dr. Sabry Sayed Mohamed**, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his valuable guidance and expert supervision, in addition to his great deal of support and encouragement. I really have the honor to complete this work under his supervision.*

*I would like to express my great and deep appreciation and thanks to **Dr. Hayam Fathy Mohammed**, Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her meticulous supervision, and her patience in reviewing and correcting this work,*

*I must express my deepest thanks to **Dr. Ahmed Mohammed Essam El Din Mansour**, Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for guiding me throughout this work and for granting me much of his time. I greatly appreciate his efforts.*

*Special thanks to my **Parents**, my **Wife** and all my **Family** members for their continuous encouragement, enduring me and standing by me.*

*✍ **Essam Salah Mohamed Hagag***

List of Contents

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
List of Abbreviations.....	i
List of Tables.....	ii
List of Figures	iii
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	5
Review of Literature	
Induction of labor	6
Misoprostol in induction of labor.....	57
Management of first stage of labor	69
Patients and Methods.....	86
Results.....	97
Discussion	116
Summary	125
Conclusions	132
References	133
Arabic Summary	—

List of Abbreviations

<i>Abbr.</i>	<i>Full-term</i>
ACOG	: American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
BMI	: Body mass index
CI	: Confidence interval
FDA	: Food and Drug Administration
FHR	: Fetal heart rate
GBS	: Group B Streptococcus
HELLP	: Hemolysis, elevated liver enzymes, low platelets
HR	: Hazard ratio
IOL	: Induction of labor
IV	: Intravenous
NO	: Nitric oxide
NSAIDs	: Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs
OR	: Odds ratio
PG	: Prostaglandin
RR	: Relative risk
SPSS	: Statistical package for social science
UK	: United Kingdom

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Comparison between group I and group II according to baseline characteristics.....	97
Table (2):	Comparison between group I and group II according to indication of induction.	100
Table (3):	Comparison between group I and group II according to bishop score.....	102
Table (4):	Comparison between group I and group II according to maternal outcome.....	103
Table (5):	Comparison between group I and group II according to mode of delivery, no. of req. doses and duration of delivery.	104
Table (6):	Comparison between group I and group II according to mode of delivery.	108
Table (7):	Comparison between group I and group II according to need for oxytocin.....	109
Table (8):	Comparison between group I and group II according to fetal outcome.	110
Table (9):	Comparison between group I and group II according to all parameters, ≤ 24 hr of duration of delivery and vaginal delivery.	113
Table (10):	Comparison between group I and group II according to all parameters, > 24 hr of duration of delivery and vaginal delivery.	114
Table (11):	Relation between mode of delivery and bishop score in each group.....	115

List of Figures

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to age (years).	98
Figure (2):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to GA.	98
Figure (3):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to BMI.....	99
Figure (4):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to indication of induction.	101
Figure (5):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to bishop score.....	102
Figure (6):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to maternal outcome.	103
Figure (7):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to mode of delivery.....	105
Figure (8):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to duration of delivery.	106
Figure (9):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to total dose of misoprostol (µg).	106
Figure (10):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to mode of delivery within 24hrs and after 24 hrs.	108
Figure (11):	Bar chart between group I and group II according to need for oxytocin.....	109

Figure (12): Bar chart between group I and group II according to Apgar score at 5min.	111
Figure (13): Bar chart between group I and group II according to birth weight.....	111
Figure (14): Bar chart between group I and group II according to mecon staining and NICU admission.....	112
Figure (15): Bar chart relation between mode of delivery and bishop score.....	115

Introduction

Induction of labor (IOL) is defined as artificial stimulation of uterine contractions before the spontaneous onset of labor, with or without ruptured membranes, Labor induction most frequently conducted through interventional procedures, and their use has been increasing in the past several decades. In a survey by the National Center for Health Statistics the rate of labor induction was noted to have increased from 9.5% in 1991 to 22.5% in 2006 (*Chung et al., 2015*).

Methods for induction of labor can be mechanical or pharmacological. Mechanical means of labor induction include the use of various types of catheters and hygroscopic dilators introduced into the cervical canal or into the extra-amniotic space. Pharmacological methods include prostaglandins, mifepristone and oxytocin (*Hofmeyr et al., 2010*).

Two types of prostaglandin preparations, natural prostaglandin E2 (dinoprostone) and synthetic prostaglandin E1 (misoprostol), are currently approved by the US Food and Drug Administration for pre-induction cervical ripening. Dinoprostone although widely used, has two disadvantages: it is expensive and requires continuous refrigeration (*Asunción et al., 2017*).

Misoprostol, therefore, which is less expensive and more stable at room temperature, has been proposed as an alternative agent for labor induction. However, misoprostol may lead to adverse effects such as gastrointestinal disturbance, uterine tachysystole, and the most severe, uterine rupture (*Thaisomboon et al., 2012*). These adverse effects are likely to be dose and route related (*León et al., 2012*).

The more frequent dosing may address the short half-life of misoprostol, which is reported to reach the highest serum peak concentration (300-800 pg./mL) in approximately 14-30 minutes, with a terminal half-life of 20- 40 minutes (*Abdul Rahim et al., 2017*).

Induction regimens using vaginal misoprostol have raised concerns of hyper stimulation and fetal heart rate changes due to the longer half-life and direct effect of misoprostol on the cervix.

The presence of vaginal secretions, bleeding, or leaking amniotic fluid can contribute to inconsistent dose absorption, concentration, and variable peak plasma levels when misoprostol is administered vaginally (*Weeks et al., 2007*).

Additionally, dosing may be difficult to determine secondary to broken pill fragments when breaking 200 mcg pills into 25 mcg doses for vaginal administration. Overall, oral administration of misoprostol has a rapid onset with

consistent doses that are not affected by the presence of vaginal bleeding or discharge; and decreased risk of infection from ascending bacteria by preventing multiple sterile vaginal examinations.

In addition to the route of administration and dosage, it is also apparent that the duration and the time interval between doses play an important role in the efficacy and safety of oral misoprostol for cervical ripening and labor induction (*Morris et al., 2017*).

Induction of labor is commonly performed in hospital settings using a range of interventions. In recent years there has been increased interest in the use of outpatient induction of labor. In this setting, women attend the hospital to receive the induction agent and then return home afterwards. They then return to the hospital when they start to contract regularly, or if they require further interventions.

Induction of labor in an outpatient setting is therefore, restricted to low-risk circumstances when cervical ripening and labor induction is carried out without an ongoing requirement for continuous or frequent maternal or fetal monitoring. The use of outpatient induction of labor attempts to balance potential improvement in maternal satisfaction, convenience, reduced length of hospitalization and lower cost, with safety of both mother and fetus (*Adelson et al., 2013*).

A study by Cheng et al. showed that oral misoprostol for labor induction was associated with a lower incidence of uterine hyper stimulation and a lower cesarean delivery rate in patients with an unfavorable cervix; however, this study compared oral and vaginal routes of misoprostol administration (*Cheng et al., 2008*).