Original Research Paper

VOLUME-6 | ISSUE-1 | JANUARY-2017 • ISSN No 2277 - 8179 | IF : 3.508 | IC Value : 78.46

Study of the Role of Paperless Partograph in Monitoring Primiparous and Multiparous Labour at RIMS RAIPUR

Gynaecology

KEYWORDS: Prospective studies, caesarean section, labour, pregnancy

Dr.Asha Jain — Assistant Professor, Department of Obs and Gyn, Raipur Institute of Medical Sciences,Raipur, C.G.

Dr.Manjusha Agarwal — Assistent Professor, Department of Obs and Gyn, Raipur Institute of Medical Sciences,Raipur, C.G.

Dr.Brajendra kumar — Professor, Department of Medicine, Teerthanker Mahaveer Medical College & Research Centre Moradabad, UP-244001

ABSTRACT

Our study was conducted to determine the role of paperless partograph in monitoring primiparous and multiparous labour by comparing with the WHO Modified partograph. The course of labour in 400(200 primiparous and 200 multiparous) women with term, singleton pregnancies with vertex presentation in labour without any complications was studied by using either partographs in groups of 200 (100 primiparous and 100 multiparous) and the labour outcome of primiparous and multiparous compared. The rate of caesarean section was 9% primiparous and 13% multiparous monitored by Paperless partograph as against 9% primiparous and 12% multiparous of the WHO one. Augmentation was required in 8% primiparous and 5% multiparous cases subjected to the Paperless partograph which was comparable to the WHO Modified partograph. The labour Paperless partograph was similar to the WHO Modified partograph in monitoring primiparous and multiparous labour as an effective means to prevent prolonged labour and its sequel.

INTRODUCTION

The cervical dilation chart during labor is called partogram. Around 42000 or 8% of all maternal deaths in the year 2000 were attributed to prolonged labour. In India 5% of the total maternal deaths are caused by prolonged labour and obstructed labour. Moreover prolonged labour is associated with significant maternal morbidity due to sepsis, post partum hemorrhage, ruptured uterus and urinary fistula. Again prolonged and obstructed labour is also a major precedent of perinatal deaths, birth asphyxia and neonatal sepsis. Early detection of abnormal labour and timely intervention to prevent prolonged labour can reduce the sequel of obstructed labour, postpartum hemorrhage and sepsis and thus result in better labour outcomes. The partograph which is a graphical representation of the various events of labour and salient features of mother and foetus plotted against time serves to be an effective tool to monitor labour. Use of WHO partograph facilitates early recognition of any deviation from normal labour and thereby aids appropriate intervention like amniotomy, oxytocin induction and also caesarean section. It serves to be an early warning system for all health professionals including doctors, midwives and traditional birth attendants and assists in early decision on transfer, augmentation and termination of labour. In our study we have tried to evaluate the impact of use of Paperless partograph in labour outcomes of primiparous and multiparous women.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Our study was an observational study held at RIMS RAIPUR. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Ethics committee and the participants were included after an informed and written consent. In our study 400 (200 nulliparas and 200 multiparous) women attending the labour room was included on the basis of the following inclusion and exclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria: Woman with term singleton pregnancies with vertex presentation in spontaneous labour without any complications. Exclusion criteria: 1) Woman with obstetric complications like preterm labour, previous caesarean section post dated pregnancy, cephalopelvic disproportion, ante partum haemorrhage, severe pre eclampsia/ eclampsia, malpresentations, multiple pregnancy, foetal distress, intrauterine foetal death, intrauterine growth retardation (IUGR), premature rupture of membranes (PROM) etc.2) Woman with medical complications like anaemia, hypertension, diabetes and immuno compromised states. Patients fulfilling the inclusion criteria and those willing to participate were randomly divided (100 primiparous and 100 multiparous) into two groups – Group A and Group B. WHO Modified partograph was used in Group A and Paperless partograph was used in Group B respectively to monitor labour. . The following protocol was followed- The plotting was started when cervical dilatation was 4 cms. Four hourly per vaginal examination was done but could be performed earlier if indicated. If delivery is not achieved by Alert line/ Alert ETD the case is re-evaluated and appropriate decision taken for augmentation, transfer or termination of pregnancies. If delivery does not occur by Action line/ Action ETD, the patient is at risk of prolonged labour and termination is planned by appropriate medical or surgical intervention.

RESULTS

The mean age was 23 ±3.6 years for primiparous and the 26 ±3.2 years for multiparous patients. The average gestational age was 37.6 ± 1.04 weeks in primiparous and 37.7±0.78 weeks in multiparous . The early age of marriage and pregnancy explains the reason for low mean age of primiparous and multiparous. The pulse and blood pressure of both primiparous and multiparous were within the normal range. The average uterine contractions were 2.7±1.06/ 10 mins for primiparous and 2.74±1.16/ 10 mins for multiparous which implied that they were in active labour.In our study it was found that most of the cases delivered before reaching the alert line/alert ETD. 79% primiparous and 85% multiparous in group A delivered within alert line as against 84% primiparous and 85% multiparous of group B who delivered within alert ETD. Again 14% primiparous and 13% multiparous monitored by the WHO Modified partograph delivered between the alert and action line in group A while 13% of primiparous and 14% multiparous delivered between alert and action ETD in group B. Only a small proportion of 7% primiparous and 2% multiparous of group A crossed the action line while 3% primiparous and 1% multiparous monitored in group B delivered beyond the action ETD. Another aspect seen in our study was that augmentation was required in 13% of primiparous and 8% of multiparous monitored by the WHO Modified partograph while 8% of primiparous and 5% of multiparous monitored by Paperless partograph required augmentation. There was no statistical significant difference between the two. Thus course of labour with Paperless partograph in both primiparous and multiparous was comparable with that of WHO modified partograph. In our study it was seen that 84% of primiparous and 86% of multiparous monitored by the WHO Modified partograph delivered spontaneously which was similar to those monitored by the Paperless partograph. Again 7% primiparous and 2% multiparous were delivered by assisted vaginal delivery as against 9% primiparous and 3% multiparous of group B. 9% of primiparous and 12% multiparous cases monitored by the WHO Modified partograph needed caesarean section while 9%

primiparous and 13% multiparous subjected to Paperless partograph required caesarean section. There was however no significant statistical difference between the two groups in regards to mode of delivery.

DISCUSSION

In INDIA,Prolonged and obstructed labour is one of the easily preventable causes of maternal mortality. Early detection of abnormal labour through partograph serves to be an efficient measure to reduce the incidences of prolonged labour and its sequel. Our study was conducted to determine the labour outcome of the Paperless partograph in primiparous and multiparous women by comparing it with the WHO Modified one. In the present study we found that most of the cases followed a normal course of labour and delivered before the alert line/ alert ETD without any undue intervention. 79 % of primiparous and 85 % of multiparous monitored by the WHO Modified partograph delivered within the alert line. Again 84 % primiparous and 85% multiparous subjected to Paperless partograph delivered within the alert ETD. This was in concordance with the study conducted by Dr. Prakash et al in 2014 in Odisha where 75.5% of primigravida and 90.7% of multigravida monitored with the Paperless partograph delivered before the alert ETD. Only 14% of primiparous and 13% of multiparous monitored by the WHO Modified partograph crossed the alert line while 13% of primiparous and 14% of multiparous cases monitored by Paperless partograph crossed the alert ETD. A minor proportion i.e. 7% primiparous and 2% multiparous monitored by the WHO Modified partograph crossed the action line. They were reassessed and terminated accordingly. Similarly only 3% primiparous and 1% multiparous cases subjected to the Paperless partograph crossed the action ETD. However they were delivered within appropriate time so that none of them progressed to obstructed labour. Almost similar results were seen in a study conducted by Dr. Deblina et all in 2013 where it was observed that 14.5% cases monitored by the Paperless partograph delivered between alert and action ETD and only 1.8% beyond the action ETD. The rate of spontaneous deliveries in our study was 84% primiparous and 86% multiparous women in group A and 82% primiparous and 84% multiparous in group B respectively. Augmentation of labour was required with only 13% primiparous and 8% multiparous in group A as against 8% primiparous and 5% multiparous of group B in our study. Another important aspect was that 9% of primiparous and 12% of multiparous women monitored by the WHO Modified partograph required a caesarean section while 9% of primiparous and 13% of multiparous labour observed by the Paperless partograph required caesarean section. From our results we found that primiparous and multiparous women monitored by the Paperless partograph had similar labour outcomes as those monitored by the WHO Modified partograph. It is seen that the Paperless partograph is as effective as the WHO Modified partograph in management of labour. Thus the use of Paperless partograph holds great promises as a simple tool for monitoring labour and preventing prolonged labour and its sequel. Using the Alert and Action ETD was found convenient to derive appropriate measures for the outcome of labor. So, the paperless partogram is a simplified method to manage the active stage of labor that needs advocacy among caregivers, mostly in low-skilled and/or staffed settings.

CONCLUSION

In India, Prolonged labour accounts for nearly 5% of the causes of maternal mortality. These maternal deaths are easily preventable if we can identify any deviation of normal labour at the earliest and initiate prompt measures. The WHO Modified partograph have been a time tested and effective measure for appropriate monitoring and management of labour. Our study concluded that the Paperless partograph has great prospects to prevent prolonged labour as it is simpler, less time consuming without any graph and has similar labour outcomes as the WHO Modified partograph. declared.

REFERENCES

1. Mishra P, Nayak L. ETD-Expected Time of Delivery- A New Simple Clinical Tool for Management of Labour. AICOG Chennai. 2014.
2. Roy D, Dey R. ETD- Expected Time Of Delivery- A New Simple Clinical Tool For Management Of Labour. AICOG Patna. 2014:2.
3. Lingegowda K, Bhuvaneswari, Shailaja N, Kulkarni N, Bhatt SB, Vimala. Comparison of WHO partograph with Paperless partograph in the management of labour and to determine which is more use friendly; AICOG Patna 2014:106-7.
4. Agarwal K, Agarwal L, Agarwal VK, Agarwal A, Sharma M. Evaluation of Paperless Partogram as a Bedside Tool in the Management of Labor. J Family Med Prim Care 2013;2(1):47-9.
5. Fatouh E, Ramadan S. Effect of using Paperless Partogram on the Management and Outcome of Labour and the Nurses' Opinion. Journal of Education and Practice 2015;6(8):17-23.
6. Friedman, E.A. (1955) Primigravid Labour. A Graphicostatistical Analysis. Obstetrics and Gynecology, 6, 567-589.
7. Philpott, R.H. and Castle, W.M. (1972) Cervicographs in the Management of Labour in Primigravidae. International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 79, 592-598.