DOI: https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs22168630

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Outcomes of Elective Induction of Labor Versus Expectant Management

EISHAH GHAFFAR[1], ABDUL ALEEM BHATTI[2], MUQADDAS MAQBOOL[3], NOOR NISHAN[4], MARYAM SHAHID[4], SOHAIB ARIF[5]
[1]*Women Medical Officer, Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology Social Security Hospital Shahdra*
[2]*Medical Officer, The Indus Hospital. QF, NST & SMP Campus, Jubliee Town Lahore*
[3]*Women Medical Officer, Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Social Security Hospital Shahdra*
[4]*Senior Registrar, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, The Indus Hospital. QF, NST & SMP Campus, Jubliee Town Lahore*
[5]*Senior Medical Officer,Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology ,The Indus Hospital. QF, NST & SMP Campus, Jubliee Town Lahore*
Corresponding author: Sohaib Arif, Email: sohaib.arif096@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Summary Context: Both medical and nonmedical interventions to hasten labour and delivery are on the rise. Whether or not elective induction of labour improves outcomes or merely leads to additional complications and healthcare expenditures is a contentious topic in the scientific literature.

Purpose: Choosing to induce labour artificially vs waiting for the baby to come naturally is the focus of this research.

Data Sources: Internet, previous systematic reviews, and databases including MEDLINE (2022), Web of Science (2022), CINAHL (2022), and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (2022).

Data Extraction: Structure, patient characteristics, quality standards, and outcomes like as caesarean section and maternal and neonatal morbidity were abstracted by two writers.

Data Synthesis: In all, more than a hundred publications were considered, but only 36 were included (11 RCTs and 25 observational studies). In a non-significant trend, women who were treated as if they were about to give birth (OR, 1.21 [CI, 1.01 to 1.46]) had a higher chance of having a caesarean section than women who were treated as though they were still in the early stages of pregnancy (OR, 1.73 [CI, 0.67 to 4.5]). Amniotic fluid was more likely to be meconium-stained in women who were expectantly managed than to those who had chosen to be induced (OR, 2.04 [CI, 1.34 to 3.09]). Exponential likelihood ratio = 2.04 [95% confidence interval = 1.34 to 3.09]).

Conclusion: RCTs imply that inducing labor at 41 weeks or later reduces the risk of caesarean birth and meconium-stained amniotic fluid. Future research should evaluate elective induction of labor where most obstetric care is offered.

INTRODUCTION

Gestation typically lasts between 32 and 42 weeks. The labour process consists of induced labour and expectant management. Both need much thought and planning before the actual implementation process can begin. Induced labour is more common in developing countries such as South Asia, Africa, and other places where medical infrastructure is weak due to advances in medications and treatments. "Induced labour" refers to the pharmaceutical process of inducing contractions in preparation for birth. Before starting any procedure, the doctor does a thorough examination of the cervix to rule out the possibility of complications. The uterine walls may be stimulated in a variety of ways, resulting in contractions that are harder and more painful than those that occur naturally during labour. This is probably a method used to artificially prolong the possibility of a healthy birthThe physiological status of the cervix, the musculature of the uterine walls, any underlying scar formation, the resources available in the hospital environment, and the preferences of the gynaecologist all play a role in the decision as to which treatment will be used. All of these things have a role in hastening the onset of labour. For optimal outcomes, gynaecologists often mix treatment modalities. Balloon catheterization, oxytocin injection, the membrane rupture technique, and the use of prostaglandins are among the most often used methods. Prostaglandins, available in tablet or gel form, are inserted vaginally. Women are then told to lay down and stay that way for the next half an hour to an hour, or until labour begins. The other is oxytocin, a medication that stimulates uterine contractions in the same way as natural labour does. It is given through intravenous injection. It's a win-win in every way: easy and secure. In an artificial membrane rupture, the amniotic sac is ruptured. A doctor may use a little instrument with a hook at the end to break your waters after the cervix has opened. Some women have continuous water trickling during labour. The balloon catheter procedure involves inserting a little tube called a catheter into your cervix. When that's done, water is poured inside to complete the balloon's inflation. It applies pressure to your cervix and is known as a balloon catheter. Facilitating its accessibility helps to advance the labour force (Yao et al., 2014).

Alternatively, a failed induction may occur if the correct induction procedures are not successful in inducing a vaginal delivery within 24 hours. It's possible that a C-section will be necessary here. any infection, period. The risk of infection for both mother and child may be increased by using certain labour induction methods, such as rupturing the membranes. When the uterus ruptures, it usually does so along the incision scar from a prior C-section or other major uterine surgery—a rare but potentially fatal complication. Urgent C-sections are performed to avert potentially fatal complications. The removal of the uterus may be required. There is an increased risk of blood loss after an induction of labour, which results in increased frequency of postpartum haemorrhage and the need for transfusions of blood or blood products. These effects, which may last throughout the mother's and child's lives, may have serious, even fatal, implications.

When compared to labour induction, the more careful approach used in expectant management is the second major issue explored extensively by case studies. It's a normal bodily function, and people in developed countries like the UK, Italy, and other European countries utilise it rather often. We use a waiting-and-see approach. The medical practitioner uses all-natural techniques to induce labour and facilitate a healthy birth. These components work in tandem to sustain life and bring on labour pains in a completely natural way. The pain increases with each contraction, although it is not as severe as the discomfort of induction of labour since it occurs rapidly. Women usually have between 32 and 42 weeks of gestation before having to resort to inducing labour. Women who have healthy pregnancies, robust uterine muscles, and consistent vital signs provide proof that this approach works. With this approach, you run the risk of giving birth, having an abortion, or experiencing complications like haemorrhage or excessive bleeding after giving birth.

Prenatal care for mothers and their unborn children must be tailored to each individual patient's needs in order to decrease risks and increase the likelihood of a successful birth.

METHODOLOGY

Inclusion criteria: Women who are nulliparous or multiparous and who are carrying a single, cephalic pregnancy and who have obstetric or medical reasons for induction of labour, and who are otherwise healthy enough to give birth by normal delivery. Women between the ages of 15 and 44 who have had a normal pregnancy and are in the first stage of labour but are experiencing difficulties

can consider oxytocin augmentation. Women in this group should be induced into labour or managed as if they are pregnant.

Exclusion criteria: Obstetrical complications, such as an abdominal pregnancy complicated by a closed cervix owing to placenta Previa or a history of an assisted birth. Women who are younger than 15 or older than 44, who have had a myomectomy in the past, or who have a maternal infection such genital herpes are at increased risk. The practices of inducing labour and managing a pregnant woman's pregnancy falls within the umbrella of practices that are prohibited.

Data source: Internet, previous systematic reviews, and databases including MEDLINE (2022), Web of Science (2022), CINAHL (2022), and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (2022). Studies were identified using a combination of hospital and literature searches and a consultation. Google Scholar publications, information from various gynaecological health care websites, patient reports (via analysis or interviews), and surveys of gynecological wards were consulted.

Outcomes of labour induction: Outcomes of labour induction refers to the results obtained as a result of administration this procedure.

- Reduces chances of vaginal instrumental delivery
- Reduces expectancy of caesarian delivery
- Gives normal child birth
- Reduces health issues after delivery

Complications:

- Rupture of uterine walls
- Uterine infections
- Failure of labour induction
- Lower HR of fetus
- Maternal bleeding after delivery

Outcomes of Expectant management:

- Length of hospital stay.
- Use of emergency services.
- Mother not satisfied.
- Reduces complications of induced labour
- Gives normal child birth without medications or induction

Complications:

- Caesarian delivery
- Prolonged labour
- Pain due to prolong wait for birth
- Miscarriage

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After elective induction of labour at week 39, the rate of caesarean births in obese women was lower compared to expectant management. However, evidence from women who were induced into labour at 40 or 41 weeks proved that this was not the case. First-time mothers who deliberately induce labour between weeks 40 and 37 are at increased risk for third- and fourth-degree abrasions but lower risk for postpartum haemorrhage. The most notable change is the decrease in the rates of macrosomia and LGA, both of which are linked to the practise of inducing labour (Yao et al., 2014).

Our results were corroborated by those of Lee et al., who looked at a massive, anonymous administrative database in California and found results consistent with ours. In this study, researchers analysed information from overweight women who gave birth by choice at 37 weeks pregnant. Beginning pregnancy between 37 and 39 weeks decreased the likelihood of caesarean section delivery for both primiparous and multiparous obese women. The study analysed 2007 hospital discharge statistics. Premature infant fatalities and negative cervical screening findings upon admission could not be explained. In a retrospective analysis, Wolfe et al. compared the results for 410 obese women who had elective induction of labour between weeks 39 and 40.9 with those for 60 nulliparous women with an unfavourable cervix who received expectant care through 39 weeks of pregnancy. More caesarean sections were performed on women whose labour was induced on purpose. Their results made sense, given that most of the multiparous women who had been induced into labour had unfavourable cervixes (defined as a simplified Bishop score of 5). When looking at the outcomes of caesarean sections, it was ignored that the women in the expectant management group had a much higher simplified Bishop score than the women in the normal care group.

Table 1: Outcomes for mothers and babies in cases when an obese woman chooses to induce labour instead of giving birth naturally.

Pregnancy outcomes:	eIOL $39^{0/7}$ –$39^{3/7}$	EM >$39^{3/7}$	eIOL $40^{0/7}$ –$40^{3/7}$	EM >$40^{3/7}$	eIOL $41^{0/7}$ –$41^{3/7}$	EM >$41^{3/7}$
Parous women	**(n=1,615)**	**(n=4,048)**	**(n=1,849)**	**(n=1,388)**	**(n=723)**	**(n=166)**
Maternal outcomes						
Cesarean delivery	88 (5.5)*	410 (10.1)	178 (9.6)*	165 (11.9)	80 (11.1)	27 (16.3)
Operative vaginal delivery	75 (4.6)*	123 (3.0)	57 (3.1)	34 (2.5)	14 (1.9)	7 (4.2)
3rd/4th degree laceration	9 (0.6)	20 (0.5)	9 (0.5)	8 (0.6)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.6)
Postpartum Hemorrhage†	53/963 (5.4)	84/3,138 (2.7)	51/1,341 (2.3)	37/1,144 (3.2)	14/581 (2.4)	3/150 (2.0)
Endometritis†	0/370 (0.0)	8/1,779 (0.5)	4/738 (0.5)	3/675 (0.4)	0/342 (0.0)*	1/71 (1.4)
Wound complications (infection/separation)†	0/1,194 (0.0)	8/2,246(0.4)	5/959 (0.5)	2/733 (0.3)	2/353 (0.6)	0/67 (0.0)
Blood transfusion†	76/1,274 (6.0)*	72/2,017 (3.6)	29/921 (3.2)	17/586 (2.9)	3/261 (1.2)	0 (0.0)

When given the option of a caesarean section during an elective induction of labour, first-time moms opted for it less often than more seasoned mothers. An observational study found that the rate of caesarean deliveries among multiparous women who chose elective inductions was similar to the rate among women whose labour started spontaneously (Shillcock et al., 1998). Birth experience reduces the likelihood of a caesarean section, and most women who have given birth before have done so vaginally (i.e. some had a previous caesarean delivery). Pickens et al. found that following elective induction of labour, caesarean rates decreased more for multiparous women than for singleton women. We may benefit from more study of this link (Shillcock et al., 1998).

New studies comparing elective induction of labour with expectant management did not include women with a body mass index (BMI) of 40 or above.

Table 2: Elective induction of labour among morbidly obese primiparous women and its effects on maternal and newborn outcomes compared to expectant management.

Pregnancy outcomes:	eIOL $39^{0/7}$ –$39^{3/7}$	EM >$39^{3/7}$	eIOL $40^{0/7}$ –$40^{3/7}$	EM >$40^{3/7}$	eIOL $41^{0/7}$ –$41^{3/7}$	EM >$41^{3/7}$
Nulliparous women	**(n=573)**	**(n=3,139)**	**(n=1,343)**	**(n=1,334)**	**(n=695)**	**(n=160)**
Maternal outcomes						
Cesarean delivery	224 (39.1)	1,329 (41.6)	532 (39.6)*	603 (45.2)	330 (47.5)	70 (43.8)
Operative vaginal delivery	39 (6.8)	256 (8.0)	117 (8.7)	96 (7.2)	49 (7.1)	9 (5.6)
3rd/4th degree laceration	16 (2.8)	89 (2.8)	51 (3.8)*	22 (1.7)	13 (1.9)	4 (2.5)
Postpartum Hemorrhage	18/416 (4.3)	101/2,379 (4.3)	40/944 (4.2)	51/1,063 (4.8)	21/530 (4.0)	7/141 (5.0)
Endometritis†	5/228 (2.2)	25/1,351 (1.9)	7/528 (1.3)	13/597 (2.2)	7/312 (2.2)	2/69 (2.9)
Wound complications (infection/separation)†	4/332 (1.2)	32/1,848 (1.7)	6/848 (0.7)	18/3,629 (0.5)	9/1,043 (0.9)	0/238 (0.0)
Blood transfusion†	14/369	76/1,807	32/739	28/692	12/323	2/62

Studies contrasting the use of elective induction of labour (at 37–38 weeks) with expectant management (at 39–40 weeks) were examined. Women who were severely overweight were more likely to have a caesarean section after full-term induction compared to expectant management. Women who were very overweight when pregnant fell into this category as well. Previous research that sought to distinguish between the two groups also failed to do so

for a number of maternal outcomes, supporting our results. Inducing labour at 39 weeks in primiparous women and at 41 weeks in multiparous women decreased postpartum haemorrhage, according to a study by Lee et al. Pickens et al. found that obese women who had elective inductions of labour between weeks 39 and 40 had higher rates of third and fourth lacerations and lower rates of postpartum haemorrhage (Chu et al., 2008).

Elective induction of labour was associated with a lower risk of macrosomia in the two trials cited above (Fisher et al., 2013).

When pregnancies were initiated in the 39th or 40th week for parous women, or the 40th week for nulliparous women, the risk of macrosomia reduced. Elective labour induction likely decreases the risk of maternal obesity and insufficient foetal development, while additional study is required to confirm this. There is a high risk of shoulder dystocia and brachial plexus injury if labour is induced when macrosomia is suspected. Lower birth weights were seen for babies born to mothers whose labours were induced after the 40th week and for women expecting multiple children whose labours were induced at the 39th week. It was shown that there was no change in the risk of shoulder dystocia. Shoulder dystocia is more common in first-time mothers, and elective induction at 39 weeks of pregnancy may enhance this risk. Many other studies, such as Lee et al., Gibbs Pickens et al., and Kawakita et al., dispute this finding, demonstrating the need for more study.

There has been growing evidence in recent years that intentional induction of labour results in better infant outcomes (including lower rates of caesarean section) than expectant care.

This includes moms of all ages, as well as women who are nulliparous, have never given birth before, or had a caesarean section. Inducing labour resulted in a substantial reduction in the rate of caesarean sections for low-risk, primiparous women (18.6% vs. 22.2%, relative risk 0.84; 95% CI 0.76 - 0.93). These results were consistent even after controlling for maternal body mass index in the subgroup analysis (Shillcock et al., 1998).

Pregnant women who are otherwise healthy shouldn't be offered a medicinal inducement because of the potential risks associated with maternal fat. However, the risk of having a stillbirth increases by 1.07–1.23 times for overweight pregnant women. Despite the lack of evidence, several hospitals, including our own, have implemented weekly antepartum observation for very overweight pregnant women. Whether or if elective induction lessens the chance of an infant dying was not a focus of our study. Despite the absence of data showing that elective induction of labour increases the risk of caesarean delivery or poorer neonatal outcomes, it may be desirable to examine induction of labour after the 39th week rather than beginning or continuing weekly prenatal testing (Fisher et al., 2013).

Some details of our research need to be made more clear. Although we did our best to prioritise the results of the cervical exam, we were unable to complete our analysis because data on the simplified Bishop score were missing for a large percentage of obese women across all age groups who were compared between those who had elective induction of labour and those who received expectant care. The majority of women with a shortened Bishop score of 4 or above presumably had their labours induced. Also, we were unable to evaluate the Bishop score in the pre-admission period because we lacked information from outpatient settings. Given this, it was difficult to choose whether to continue giving expectant care or to schedule an elective induction. Second, it was impossible to evaluate whether inducing labour in obese women may reduce this dreadful outcome of delivery due to the small number of child fatalities in this group. The numbers in the 40 and 41 week groups were also too small to draw firm conclusions on the incidence of the majority of maternal morbidities or of any newborn morbidities. A larger sample size would have allowed for the identification of a statistically significant correlation between elective inductions of labour and caesarean sections in the past. Third, because this research was conducted decades ago, we cannot be sure that elective labour induction in obese women would result in the same results. Even after accounting for a wide variety of potential confounders, it is still possible that the deciding doctor's preference for labour induction versus expectant management contributed to the observed trend. One strength of our research is that we are recruiting from a wide range of obesity classifications. There was also a focus on collecting information on caesarean section indications, which had been left out of previous studies. Understanding that clinicians may choose to conduct a caesarean section when caring for obese women might help you assess potential information bias in comparisons of caesarean section rates. Our sample size was small because we only included pregnant women who had reached their 39th week of gestation. Today, many obstetricians advocate for and encourage the practise of inducing labour if the mother so chooses. As a final step, we compared expectant management to spontaneous labour using a parity-stratified sample.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our research revealed that obese women, whether parous or singleton pregnancy, who choose to electively induce labour in the 39th week of pregnancy had a lower frequency of caesarean sections. The link was broken when voluntary induction of labour took place between weeks 40 and 41. These expectant women should discuss and plan for prenatal care utilising our results, according to our findings.

REFERENCES

1 Fisher, S. C., Kim, S. Y., Sharma, A. J., Rochat, R., & Morrow, B. (2013). Is obesity still increasing among pregnant women? Prepregnancy obesity trends in 20 states, 2003–2009. Preventive Medicine, 56(6), 372–378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2013.02.015

2 Bodnar, L. M., Catov, J. M., Klebanoff, M. A., Ness, R. B., & Roberts, J. M. (2007). Prepregnancy Body Mass Index and the Occurrence of Severe Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy. Epidemiology, 18(2), 234–239. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ede.0000254119.99660.e7

3 Hibbard, J. U., Wilkins, I., Sun, L., Gregory, K., Haberman, S., Hoffman, M., Kominiarek, M. A., Reddy, U., Bailit, J., Branch, D. W., Burkman, R., Gonzalez Quintero, V. H., Hatjis, C. G., Landy, H., Ramirez, M., VanVeldhuisen, P., Troendle, J., & Zhang, J. (2011). Respiratory Morbidity in Late Preterm Births. Obstetric Anesthesia Digest, 31(3), 150. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.aoa.0000400290.87898.c1

4 Shillcock, R. C., Kelly, M. L., & Monaghan, P. (1998). Processing of palindromes in neglect dyslexia. NeuroReport, 9(13), 3081–3083. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-199809140-00030

5 Chu, F., Kuo, P., Chen, Y., & Wang, S. (2008). Cloning and characterization of pinene synthase from Chamaecyparis formosensis Matsum. Planta Medica, 74(09). https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0028-1084803

6 Aune, D., Saugstad, O. D., Henriksen, T., & Tonstad, S. (2014). Physical Activity and the Risk of Preeclampsia. Epidemiology, 25(3), 331–343. https://doi.org/10.1097/ede.0000000000000036

7 Yao, R., Ananth, C., Park, B., Pereira, L., & Plante, L. (2014). 31: Obesity and the risk of stillbirth: a population-based cohort study. American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 210(1), S21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2013.10.064