

Vaginal delivery after previous one lower segment caesarean section at a tertiary care hospital

Anita Sharma *, Himanshi Gangwal, Madhu Bhat, Nilesh Yadav and Ekta Meena

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mahila Hospital, S.M.S Medical college Jaipur-302004, Rajasthan, India.

Abstract

Aims & Objectives: To find out the predictors of spontaneous term vaginal birth after a previous one lower segment caesarean delivery.

Materials & Methods: A prospective study was conducted in the Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, SMS Medical College, and Jaipur from March 2015 to October 2016. 120 pregnant women with a history of one previous Lower segment caesarean section (LSCS) were enrolled in the study.

Results: In our study, 60% cases had a successful Vaginal birth after caesarean section (VBAC) and 40% underwent a repeat emergency LSCS for failed trial of labour after caesarean section. Anterior position of cervix, cervical dilatation ≥ 3 cm, effacement ≥ 60 -70%, vertex position at or below the ischial spine at the time of admission in labour room were significant factor in favoring a successful VBAC. The incidence of scar dehiscence was 5.83%. There was no maternal or neonatal mortality.

Conclusion: Trial of labour after caesarean section (TOLAC) can be given in selected cases with good monitoring of Fetal heart sound (FHS) and progress of labour under supervision of trained staff at a tertiary care hospital.

Keywords: Vaginal birth after caesarean section; Lower segment caesarean section; TOLAC; Fetal heart sound

1 Introduction

The dictum “once a caesarean section always a caesarean section” no longer holds true. Several studies suggest that in women with prior lower segment caesarean section for non-recurrent cause, a trial of labour is as safe as elective repeat Caesarean section.

For successful delivery after a previous caesarian section the Obstetrician requires to have the expertise to carefully select the patients for trial of labour because rupture of scar can endanger the life of both mother and her child. Successful trial of labour shortens the duration of hospital stay and gives more patients satisfaction [1] plus the complications associated with the surgical procedure are also eliminated. Hence, the present study was done to find out the predictors of spontaneous term vaginal birth after a previous one lower segment caesarean delivery.

* Corresponding author: Anita Sharma

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mahila Hospital, S.M.S Medical college Jaipur-302004, Rajasthan, India.

2 Material and methods

This prospective study was done in the Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, SMS Medical College, Jaipur from March 2015 to October 2016.

During study period we included women with a previous one lower segment caesarean section with cephalic presentation admitted in labour room with spontaneous labour. women with estimated fetal weight >3.5 kg, malpresentation, history of postoperative wound infection following previous LSCS and previous history of any unknown uterine surgery, contraindications to vaginal delivery like cephalopelvic disproportion, major degree placenta previa, abruptio placentae and transverse lie and previous preterm caesarean section <34 weeks were excluded from the study. A total of 120 cases that fulfilled the selection criteria were enrolled in the study.

All women were thoroughly evaluated regarding complete history, parity, indication for previous LSCS, thorough clinical examination, per-abdominal examination, pelvic examination and all risk factors were evaluated.

After taking informed consent labour was closely monitored. Strict Fetal heart monitoring was done (by cardiotocography). Progress of labour was monitored on regular basis by using standard WHO partograph and 4 hourly internal examination performed to assess progress of labour and when necessary labour was augmented with oxytocin. Patients were vigilantly monitored for scar tenderness or delay in progression of labour and if need arises immediate LSCS was done.

2.1 Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed with the SPSS, Trial version 23 for Windows statistical software package (SPSS inc., Chicago, il, USA) and Primer. The Categorical data were presented as numbers (percent) and were compared among groups using Chi-square test. Groups were compared for quantitative data were presented as mean and standard deviation and were compared using by students t-test Probability p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3 Results

Table 1 Distribution of Cases According to Mode of Delivery

Mode of Delivery	No.	%
LSCS	48	40.00
Successful VBAC	72	60.00
Total	120	100.00

In our study TOLAC was applied on 120 cases, out of them 72 (60%) successful VBAC and 48 (40%) had emergency LSCS {Table-1}.

Majority of cases were in the age group of 26-30 yrs.

Table 2 Distribution of Cases According to Interval between Previous LSCS and Present Pregnancy

Interval (in yrs)	Emergency LSCS		Successful VBAC		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
>2	37	38.54	59	61.45	96	80.00
≤ 2	11	45.83	13	54.16	24	20.00
Total	48	40.00	72	60.00	120	100.00

$\chi^2 = 0.176$; d.f. = 1, $p = 0.675$ NS[not significant] It was observed that interval between previous LSCS and present pregnancy was more than 2 yrs in 80% cases ($p > 0.05$).

Table 3 Distribution of Cases According to Indication of Previous LSCS

Indication of Previous LSCS	Emergency LSCS		Successful VBAC		Total		p-value, LS
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Fetal distress	16	44.44	20	55.56	36	30.00	0.65, NS
Malpresentation	14	56.00	11	44.00	25	28.83	0.108, NS
Oblique Lie	0	0.00	1	100.00	1	0.83	
Breech	9	56.25	7	43.75	16	13.33	
Transverse Lie	5	62.50	3	37.50	8	6.67	
Severe Preeclampsia	5	33.33	10	66.67	15	12.50	0.77, NS
Prolonged Premature rupture of membrane (PROM)	3	25.00	9	75.00	12	10.00	0.42, NS
Nonprogress of labour (NPOL)	7	63.64	4	36.36	11	9.17	0.17 NS
Failed Induction	0	0.00	10	100.00	10	8.33	0.018, Sig
Multiple Gestation	2	33.33	4	66.67	6	5.00	0.92, NS
Cord Prolapse	0	0.00	2	100.00	2	1.67	0.66, NS
Placental Previa	0	0.00	2	100.00	2	1.67	0.66, NS
Unfavourable Cervix	1	100.00	0	0.00	1	0.83	0.83, NS
Total	48	40.00	72	60.00	120	100.00	

Of the 120 cases, indication of previous caesarean section was the fetal distress 30% cases, out of them 44.44% cases had successful VBAC. Malpresentation was the had successful VBAC. Breech presentation was the indication for 13.33% cases and out of them 43.75% cases had successful VBAC and 56.25% cases had emergency LSCS. Severe pre-eclampsia was the indication for 12.5% cases of previous LSCS and out of them 33.33% cases had emergency LSCS and 66.67% cases had successful VBAC. So incidence of successful VBAC was 43.75% and 55.56% when the previous LSCS was for breech presentation and fetal distress {Table-3}.

Table 4 Distribution of Cases According to Position of Cervix

Position of Cervix	Emergency LSCS		Successful VBAC		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Anterior	26	30.23	60	69.77	86	71.67
Mid	22	64.71	12	35.29	34	28.33
Posterior	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	48	40.00	72	60.00	120	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 10.672, \text{ d.f.} = 1 \text{ p} = 0.001 \text{ Sig}$$

Table 5 Distribution of Cases According to Cervical Dilatation

Cervical Dilatation (in cm)	Emergency LSCS		Successful VBAC		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2	4	57.14	3	42.86	7	5.83
3	28	60.87	18	39.13	46	38.33
4	15	34.09	29	65.91	44	36.67
5	1	5.88	16	94.12	17	14.17
6	0	0.00	6	100.00	6	5.00
Total	48	40.00	72	60.00	120	100.00
Mean±SD	3.27 ± 0.644		4.06 ± 0.99		3.74 ± 0.948	

$$\chi^2 = 22.090 \quad \text{d.f.} = 4 \quad p < 0.001 \quad \text{Sig}$$

Table 6 Distribution of Cases According to Effacement of Cervix

Effacement of Cervix (in %)	Emergency LSCS		Successful VBAC		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
40 - 50	13	72.22	5	27.78	18	15.00
50 - 60	19	55.88	15	44.12	34	28.33
60 - 70	11	36.67	19	63.33	30	25.00
70 - 80	3	21.43	11	78.57	14	11.67
100	2	8.33	22	91.67	24	20.00
Total	48	40.00	72	60.00	120	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 25.539 \quad \text{d.f.} = 4 \quad p < 0.001 \quad \text{Sig}$$

Table 7 Distribution of Cases According to Station of Head

State of Head	Emergency LSCS		Successful VBAC		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
-3	32	54.24	27	45.76	59	49.17
-2	12	41.38	17	58.62	29	24.17
-1	3	37.50	5	62.50	8	6.67
0	1	10.00	9	90.00	10	8.32
1	0	0.00	12	100.00	12	10.00
2	0	0.00	2	100.00	2	1.67
Total	48	40.00	72	60.00	120	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 18.110 \quad \text{d.f.} = 5 \quad p = 0.003 \quad \text{Sig}$$

It was seen that women who presenting in labour room with anterior / posterior of cervix, cervical dilatation ≥ 3 cm, effacement ≥ 60 -70%, vertex position at or below the ischial spine had a better chance 69.77%, 76.12%, 76.47%, 95.83% of successful VBAC {Table-4, 5, 6, 7}.

Table 8 Distribution of Cases According to Indication of Emergency LSCS in Present Pregnancy

Indication of LSCS in Present Pregnancy	No.	%
Fetal Distress	25	52.08
1. Irregular FHS	14	29.17
2. MSL	11	22.91
Scar Tenderness	11	22.91
NPOL	8	16.67
Cord Prolapse	2	4.17
Prolonged PROM	2	4.17
Total	48	100.00

The indications of emergency LSCS in present pregnancy were fetal distress (52.08%), scar tenderness (22.91%), NPOL (16.67%), cord prolapse (4.17%) and prolonged PROM (4.17%) {Table-8}.

4 Discussion

With the significant rise in the incidence of primary CS for various indications, an increasing proportion of the pregnant women coming for antenatal care report with a history of a previous CS. In our study, we included only those women that came in the labour room with good Apgar score and fulfilled the selection criteria. The mean age of this study was 26.88 ± 2.42 yrs. The interval between previous LSCS and present pregnancy was more than two years in 80% cases, whereas it was less than two years in 20% of the cases. Bangal VB et al (2013) [2] shows the similar results that interval between previous LSCS and present pregnancy was more than two years in 77% cases and 23% cases had interval of less than 2 years. In our study, the commonest indication for a previous caesarean section was the fetal distress. In our study incidence of successful VBAC was 43.75% and 55.56% when the previous LSCS was for breech presentation and fetal distress. Wing DA et al (1999) [3] stated that successful VBAC varies with the indication of previous LSCS and reported 91% and 84% when the previous LSCS was for breech presentation and fetal distress. Shakti V et al (2006)⁴ stated that success of VBAC was 91% for breech and 8.8% for fetal distress as indication of previous caesarean section. So in our study success rate of VBAC for indication like fetal distress, malpresentation, pre-eclampsia, premature rupture of membrane, cord prolapse, failed induction, and multiple gestation was in the range of 50 to 90% while indication like non-progress of labour was 37%. Bangal VB et al (2013) [2] study shows that the success rate of vaginal birth after a previous caesarean section done for indication like fetal distress, malpresentation, pre-eclampsia, premature rupture of membranes was in the range of 80 to 90% and indication like non-progress of labour was 66%.

The success rate of VBAC was significantly higher (76.12 as against 39.62%) in cases with cervical dilatation of ≥ 3 cm at the time of admission than with a dilatation of < 3 cm. Bangal VB et al (2013)² study shows higher results (of successful VBAC) than our study 90% and 60%, if cervical dilatation more than 3 cm and less than 3 cm respectively. The rate of successful VBAC was higher for women that had effacement ≥ 60 -70%, vertex position at or below the ischial spine at the time of admission.

In our study commonest indication for repeat caesarean section was fetal distress in (52.08%) cases and percentage of repeat caesarean section was 40% which was higher than other studies eg Shakti V et al (2006) [4] 27%, Bengal VB et al (2013) [2] 15% and similar rate was observed in Gupta P et al (2014)⁵ study 40%. High rate of repeat caesarean section in our study was due to referred subjects coming from rural areas usually came in late labour without prior antenatal check-ups. Maximum number of subjects had no documentation of their previous caesarean section which make decision for trial of labour difficult and usually trial eliminated in caesarean section after a short period because most of them had taken trial at home. Our study shows 60% successful VBAC cases and 40% emergency LSCS cases. Shakti V et al (2006) [4] shows 72% successful VBAC cases and 28% emergency LSCS cases and Bangal VB et al (2013) [2] shows rate of emergency LSCS 15% and 85% successful VBAC. Gupta P et al (2014) [5] shows 59% successful VBAC cases and 41% emergency LSCS cases.

5 Conclusion

Women who presenting in labour room with previous one LSCS with full term pregnancy with cephalic presentation and have Anterior position of cervix, cervical dilatation ≥ 3 cm, effacement ≥ 60 -70%, vertex position at or below the

ischial spine with no complain of scar tenderness TOLAC can be given in selected cases with good monitoring of FHS and progress of labour under supervision of trained staff at a tertiary care hospital.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the help of Dr. Madhu Bhat, Senior professor and Unit head, Obstetrics and Gynecology Department, SMS Medical college and Attached Hospital for valuable help during the study.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Statement of informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

References

- [1] Jongen VHWM, Halfwerk MGC, Brouwer W.K. Vaginal delivery after previous Caesarean section for failure of second stage of labour. British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. October 1998; 105: 1079-1081.
- [2] Bangal VB, Giri PA, Shinde KK, Gavhane SP. Vaginal Birth after Caesarean Section. N Am J Med Sci. Feb 2013; 5(2): 140-144.
- [3] Wing DA, Paul RH. Vaginal birth after caesarean section: selection and management. Clin Obstet Gynecol. 1999; 42: 836-48.
- [4] Shakti V, Behera RC, Sandhu GS, Singh A., Bandhu HC. Vaginal Birth after Caesarean Delivery. 2006; 56(4): 320-323.
- [5] Gupta P, Jahan I and Jograjiya GR. Is vaginal delivery safe after previous lower segment caesarean section in developing country? Niger Med J. May-Jun 2014; 55(3): 260-265.