ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Effects of forceps delivery and vacuum extraction on maternal and fetal outcomes

S.Mallika Bhramaramba

Assistant Professor, Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Santhiram Medical College & General Hospital, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT:

Background: Every year, millions of women worldwide need assisted vaginal births. Obstetricians can use either an obstetric forceps or a vacuum extractor as their aided vaginal delivery tool. The present study compared effects of forceps delivery and vacuum extraction on maternal and fetal outcome. **Materials & Methods:** 70 women in the second stage of laborrequiring assisted vaginal deliverywere divided into 2 groups of 35 each. In group I, ventouse was used and in group II, forceps were used. Parameter such as mode of delivery, indication for delivery and neonatal outcomes were recorded. **Results:** The mode of delivery was specified instrument in 30 in group I and 35 in group II. Other (forceps) were in 5 in group I. Indication for delivery was fetal distress in 25 and 8, delay plus distress in 1 and 7, delayed second stage in 7 and 18 and to shorten second stage in 2 patients each in group I and 1 in group I and 1 in group I, facial palsy in 1 in group I and 3 in group II, and mortality was seen in 1 in group I patients. The difference was significant (P< 0.05). **Conclusion:** Ventousetechniques were discovered to be more effective than using forceps. **Key words:** Forceps, delivery, vacuum extractor

Corresponding author: S.Mallika Bhramaramba, Assistant Professor, Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Santhiram Medical College & General Hospital, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, India

This article may be cited as: Bhramaramba SM. Effects of forceps delivery and vacuum extraction on maternal and fetal outcomes. J Adv Med Dent Scie Res 2016;4(3):232-234.

INTRODUCTION

Every year, millions of women worldwide need assisted vaginal births. Obstetricians can use either an obstetric forceps or a vacuum extractor as their aided vaginal delivery tool. The fundamental differences between the vacuum extractor and forceps methods of head extraction are outlined by Myerscough.¹ The metal-cup vacuum extractor is a metal cup with a diameter that ranges from 40 to 60 mm, fashioned like a mushroom. The cup is connected to a detachable handle that provides traction via a centrally attached chain. A vacuum port positioned on the edge of the metal cup is used to connect an electrical or mechanical suction device to it.^{2,3}

Higher success rates and simpler cup positioning in the occipito-posterior (OP) position are two benefits of metal-cup vacuum extraction over soft-cup extraction, particularly when an OP cup is utilized.⁴ Sadly, the stiffness of metal cups can make application painful and challenging, and using them raises the possibility of embryonic scalp injury. In the US, metal-cup vacuum extractors are not commonly utilized.⁵The majority of these studies examining the effects of forceps delivery versus vacuum extractor on mothers and fetuses concur that vacuum extractors are superior to forceps for mothers because they cause less soft tissue damage, require less regional or general anesthesia, and result in less blood loss.⁶The present study compared effects of forceps delivery and vacuum extraction on maternal and fetal outcome.

MATERIALS & METHODS

The present study consisted of 70women in the second stage of laborrequiring assisted vaginal delivery. All patients gave their written consent for the participation in the study.

Data such as name, age, etc. was recorded. Patients were divided into 2 groups of 35 each. In group I, ventouse was used and in group II, forceps were used.Parameters including the timing of the instrument's application, the delivery time, the kind of tool used, the number of pulls or detachments in the event of a ventouse, the amount of analgesia or anesthesia administered, the extent of the episiotomy, the perineal tears, the vaginal lacerations, the cervical tears, Apgar score, maternal blood loss, and other data were noted.Data thus obtained were subjected to statistical analysis. P value < 0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS

Table I	Assessment	of	parameters
---------	------------	----	------------

Parameters	Variables	Group I	Group II	P value
Mode of delivery	Specified instrument	30	35	0.72
	Other (forceps)	5	0	

Indication for	Fetal distress	25	8	0.05
delivery	Delay plus distress	1	7	
	Delayed second stage	7	18	
	To shorten second stage	2	2	

Table I shows thatmode of delivery was specified instrument in 30in group I and 35 in group II. Other (forceps)were in 5 in group I. Indication for delivery was fetal distress in 25 and 8, delay plus distress in 1 and 7, delayed second stage in 7 and 18 and to shorten second stage in 2patients each in group I and II respectively. The difference was significant (P < 0.05).

Table II	Analysis	of neonatal	outcome
----------	----------	-------------	---------

Neonatal outcome	Group I	Group II	P value
Cephalhematoma	3	2	0.05
Jaundice	4	1	
Facial palsy	1	3	
Mortality	1	0	

Table II shows that neonatal outcome was cephalhematoma in 3 in group I and 2 in group II, jaundice in 4 in group I and 1 in group I, facial palsy in 1 in group I and 3 in group II, and mortalitywas seen in 1 in group I patients. The difference was significant (P < 0.05).

DISCUSSION

Forceps delivery and vacuum extraction are obstetric procedures used to assist in childbirth when there are concerns about the progress of labor or the well-being of the mother or baby.7 While both techniques can aid in safely delivering the baby, they also carry certain risks and potential complications.Forceps delivery may be indicated when there is prolonged secondstage labor (pushing stage).8,9 Maternal exhaustion or inability to push effectively.Fetal distress where expedited delivery is necessary.Maternal health conditions where minimizing pushing effort is crucial (e.g., heart disease). Vacuum extraction may be used when there is prolonged second-stage labor.Maternal fatigue or inability to push effectively. Fetal distress where a quicker delivery is needed.^{10,11}The present study compared effects of forceps delivery and vacuum extraction on maternal and fetal outcome.

We found that mode of delivery was specified instrument in 30 in group I and 35 in group II. Other (forceps) were in 5 in group I. Indication for delivery was fetal distress in 25 and 8, delay plus distress in 1 and 7, delayed second stage in 7 and 18 and to shorten second stage in 2 patients each in group I and II respectively. Research by Berkus et al12 has demonstrated that overdiagnosing cephalhematomas based solely on clinical characteristics without ultrasound confirmation is possible. Previous research shows a varied occurrence of cephalhematomas and concludes that when more ventouse extraction techniques are mastered, the incidence of these lesions decreases. 82% of forceps and 77.3% of vacuum cases showed the occipitoanteriorposition as reported by Shihadeh et al.¹³ It was observed that 17.38% of vacuum and 17.33% of forceps had occipitoanterior locations.

We observed that neonatal outcome was cephalhematoma in 3 in group I and 2 in group II, jaundice in 4 in group I and 1 in group I, facial palsy in 1 in group I and 3 in group II, and mortality was seen in 1 in group I patients. One hundred suitable women in the second stage of labor who needed assisted vaginal delivery were randomly assigned to have vacuum extraction or forceps delivery in a study by Shekhar et al.¹⁴ A total of 100% of the women assigned to forceps delivery actually used the instrument (a delivery rate of 100% in forceps vs. 90% in VE); however, the group assigned to vacuum extraction experienced significantly less maternal trauma (40% in forceps vs. 10% in VE, p<0.001), analgesic medication use (p<0.001), and blood loss (234 ml in VE vs. 337 ml in forceps group, p<0.05). On the other hand, vacuum extraction seems to raise the risk of cephalhematoma and neonatal jaundice. In both groups, more severe newborn morbidity was infrequent.

CONCLUSION

Authors found that ventouse techniques were discovered to be more effective than using forceps.

REFERENCES

- Greis JB, Bieniarz J, Seommegna A. Comparison of maternal and fetal effects of vacuum extraction with forceps or caesarean deliveries. ObstetGynecol 1981;57(5):571–77.
- Johanson RB, Rice C, Doyle M, et al. A randomized prospective study comparing the new vacuum extractor policy with forceps delivery. Br J ObstetGynaecol1993;100:524–30.
- Vacca A, Grant A, Geoffrey W, et al. Porstmouth operative delivery trial, a comparison of vacuum extraction and forceps delivery. Br J ObstetGynecol1983;90:1107–12.
- 4. Myerscough PR. Munro Kerr's operative obstetrics. 10th ed. London: Balliere Tindall; 1992.
- 5. Lucas MJ. The role of vacuum extraction in modern obstetrics. Clin obstetGynecol 1994;37(4):794–805.
- 6. Ali UA, Norwitz Er. Vacuum assisted vaginal delivery. Rev Obstet Gynecol. 2009;2(1):5–17.
- 7. Carter J, Gudgeon WC. Vacuum extraction and forceps delivery in a district hospital. Aust NZ J ObstetGynecol1987;27:117–9.

- Johanson R, Pusey J, Livera N, et al. North Staffordshire/wigan assisted delivery trial. Br J ObstetGynecol1989;96:537–44.
- 9. Achanna S, Monga D. Outcome of forceps delivery versus vacuum extracton, a review of 200 cases. Singapore Med J 1994; 35:605–8.
- Kovavisarach E, Varanuntakul T. Neonatal and maternal complications among pregnant women delivered by vacuum extraction or forceps extraction. J Med Assoc Thai 1999;82(4):319–23.
- Arya LA, Jackson ND, Myers DL, et al. Risk of new onset urinary incontinence after forceps and vacuum delivery in primiparous women. Am J ObstetGynecol2001;18596:1318–24.
- Berkus MD, Ramamurthy RS, O'Connor PS, et al. Cohort study of silastic obstetric vacuum cup deliveries, unsuccessful vacuum extraction. ObstetGynecol 1986;68(5):662–66.
- 13. Shihadeh, Al-Najdawi W. Forceps and vacuum extraction; a comparison of maternal and neonatal morbidity. East mediterr health J., 2001; 7: 106-14.
- 14. Shekhar S, Rana N, Jaswal RS. A prospective randomized study comparing maternal and fetal effects of forceps delivery and vacuum extraction. The Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology of India. 2013 Apr;63(2):116-9.