

# International Journal of Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology

ISSN (P): 2522-6614  
ISSN (E): 2522-6622  
© Gynaecology Journal  
www.gynaecologyjournal.com  
2019; 3(5): 380-384  
Received: 19-07-2019  
Accepted: 23-08-2019

## Dr. S Dhivya

Assistant Professor of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Govt. Thiruvannamalai Medical College Hospital, Thiruvannamalai, Tamil Nadu, India

## Dr. K Jayanthi

Senior Assistant Professor of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Govt. Thiruvannamalai Medical College Hospital, Thiruvannamalai, Tamil Nadu, India

## Study on influence of vaginal pH on efficacy of dinoprostone gel for labour induction

Dr. S Dhivya and Dr. K Jayanthi

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/gynae.2019.v3.i5f.379>

### Abstract

**Background:** Induction of labour is one of the common interventions practiced in modern obstetrics. Overall, throughout the world, up to 20 percent of women have labour induced by one method or the other. Induction is indicated before the spontaneous onset of labour when the benefit to the mother or fetus is perceived to outweigh continuation of pregnancy.

Vaginal pH may be one such factor that may influence the efficacy of prostaglandins for cervical ripening /labour induction. Vaginal pH may alter PGE2 release from the delivery vehicle, alter PGE2 absorption or metabolism and modulate prostaglandin activity in the cervico vaginal environment, thus altering its clinical efficacy.

**Aims & Objectives:** To compare the efficacy of Dinoprostone gel for labour induction in patients with vaginal pH < 4.5 and pH >4.5.

2. To improve the patient selection for PGE2 gel induction which would reduce the incidence of failed induction and unwanted outcomes.

**Materials Methods:** After obtaining clearance from the hospital ethical committee, this cohort study was undertaken in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at Government Kilpauk Medical College and Hospital, Chennai from October 2017 to March 2018. Written informed consent was obtained from the women explaining it to them in their language they best understand. This hospital based study included 54 antenatal women attending labour ward of Kilpauk Medical College and Hospital, Chennai.

**Inclusion Criteria:** Singleton pregnancy with vertex presentation, unfavourable cervix and no contraindication to vaginal delivery with reactive NST.

### Exclusion Criteria

- Hypersensitivity to prostaglandins
- Premature rupture of membranes
- Placenta previa
- Previous cesarean delivery or a history of uterine surgery
- Major cephalo pelvic disproportion.

The sample size should be minimum of 27 for each group and so total sample size is 54.

**Results:** A total of 54 cases with unfavourable cervix were enrolled in this study. They were divided into 2 groups based on the vaginal pH. Out of 54 there were 27 cases in group 1 (vaginal pH <4.5) and 27 cases in group 2 (vaginal pH >4.5).

**Conclusion:** This shows that vaginal pH has significant effect on cervical ripening and Bishop score change and may lead to improved clinical efficacy of Dinoprostone gel. So, we can see that assessing vaginal pH before induction can be an useful parameter in predicting the outcome of labour in pregnant women who are undergoing labour induction with PGE2 gel.

**Keywords:** influence, vaginal pH, dinoprostone, labour induction

### Introduction

Induction of labour is one of the common interventions practiced in modern obstetrics. Overall, throughout the world, up to 20 percent of women have labour induced by one method or the other. Induction is indicated before the spontaneous onset of labour when the benefit to the mother or fetus is perceived to outweigh continuation of pregnancy. Induction rates vary with practices and cultural backgrounds.

The reasons for the rising rate of induction of labour can be complex and multifactorial. Some of them are

1. Improved ability of physicians to determine the gestational age accurately with dating scans, thus avoiding the possibility of iatrogenic prematurity.
2. Widespread availability of cervical ripening agents.

### Corresponding Author:

#### Dr. K Jayanthi

Senior Assistant Professor of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Govt. Thiruvannamalai Medical College Hospital, Thiruvannamalai, Tamil Nadu, India

Induction of labour is one of the common interventions practiced in modern obstetrics. Overall, throughout the world, up to 20 percent of women have labour induced by one method or the other. Induction is indicated before the spontaneous onset of labour when the benefit to the mother or fetus is perceived to outweigh continuation of pregnancy. Induction rates vary with practices and cultural backgrounds.

The reasons for the rising rate of induction of labour can be complex and multifactorial. Some of them are

1. Improved ability of physicians to determine the gestational age accurately with dating scans, thus avoiding the possibility of iatrogenic prematurity.
2. Widespread availability of cervical ripening agents.
3. Improved knowledge of methods and indications for induction.
4. Litigation constraints.

As induction of labour is a common intervention in obstetrics, and failed induction contributes significantly to cesarean sections. The success of induction depends largely on the state of the cervix which can be assessed with Bishop's Score. When the cervix is unfavorable, preinduction cervical ripening reduces the time required for induction and reduces cesarean delivery. Prostaglandins are the first choice for cervical ripening in comparison to oxytocin, since oxytocin mainly affects the uterine contractions and not the cervix directly.

Since the discovery of prostaglandins in the early 1970s, they have contributed significantly to the practice of obstetrics. Prostaglandins are almost produced by every tissue in the body and serve as important messengers or effectors in a wide variety of functions. Prostaglandins are important mediators of uterine activity and play a pivotal role in the contraction of smooth muscle of the uterus and the biophysical changes associated with cervical ripening.

The prostaglandins E and F are most important for labour, delivery and the postpartum period. Among this Prostaglandin E series are relatively more uteroslective and more effective in cervical ripening.

Prostaglandin E2 soften the cervix, induce gap junctions and further sensitizes the myometrium to Oxytocin, leading to progressive cervical dilatation.

While a large body of evidence of evidence exists documenting the clinical efficacy of these agents for cervical ripening and labour induction, only few studies have characterized the factors that influence the relative clinical efficacy of these prostaglandin preparations.

Vaginal pH may be one such factor that may influence the efficacy of prostaglandins for cervical ripening /labour induction. Vaginal pH may alter PGE2 release from the delivery vehicle, alter PGE2 absorption or metabolism and modulate prostaglandin activity in the cervico vaginal environment, thus altering its clinical efficacy.

**Aims & Objectives:** To compare the efficacy of Dinoprostone gel for labour induction in patients with vaginal pH < 4.5 and pH >4.5.

2. To improve the patient selection for PGE2 gel induction which would reduce the incidence of failed induction and unwanted outcomes.

### Materials Methods

After obtaining clearance from the hospital ethical committee, this cohort study was undertaken in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at Government Kilpauk Medical College and

Hospital, Chennai from October 2017 to March 2018. Written informed consent was obtained from the women explaining it to them in their language they best understand. This hospital based study included 54 antenatal women attending labour ward of Kilpauk Medical College and Hospital, Chennai.

### Inclusion criteria

Singleton pregnancy with vertex presentation, unfavourable cervix and no contraindication to vaginal delivery with reactive NST.

### Exclusion criteria

- Hypersensitivity to prostaglandins
- Premature rupture of membranes
- Placenta previa
- Previous cesarean delivery or a history of uterine surgery
- Major cephalo pelvic disproportion.

The sample size should be minimum of 27 for each group and so total sample size is 54.

### Results

**Table 1:** Comparison of labour outcomes

| Change in bishop score over 12 hours | Group I | Group II |
|--------------------------------------|---------|----------|
| Mean                                 | 2.41    | 6.37     |
| SD                                   | 1.01    | 0.97     |
| p Value by 't' Test                  | <0.001  |          |

The difference between the mean of change in Bishop score over 12 hours between the group I (2.41) and group II (6.37) was statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 2:** Comparison of time for active labour:

| Time for Active Labour | Group I | Group II |
|------------------------|---------|----------|
| Mean                   | 21.13   | 11.04    |
| Sd                     | 1.42    | 0.93     |
| P Value By 'T' Test    | <0.001  |          |

The difference between the mean of time to entry into active labour between group I (21.13) and II (11.04) was statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 3:** Comparison of Augmentation required between two groups.

| Augmentation Required (%) | Group I          | Group II |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------|
| Yes                       | 23               | 5        |
| No                        | 4                | 22       |
| P Value By 'T' Test       | <0.001           |          |
| Odds Ratio                | 0.04 (0.01-0.17) |          |

The difference between need for augmentation between group I (23) and II (5) was statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 3.1:** Induction Delivery Interval.

| Induction Delivery Interval | Group I | Group II |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------|
| Mean                        | 27.24   | 15.2     |
| Sd                          | 0.58    | 1.03     |
| P Value By 'T' Test         | <0.001  |          |

The difference between the mean of induction to delivery interval between group I (27.24) and group II (15.2) was statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 4:** Comparison of mode of delivery

| Mode Of Delivery    | Group I           | Group II |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Vaginal             | 9                 | 23       |
| Lscs                | 18                | 4        |
| Total               | 27                | 27       |
| P Value By X2 Test  | 0.0001            |          |
| ODDS Ratio (95% CI) | 11.5 (3.04-43.46) |          |

The above table shows comparison of mode of delivery between the two groups. Group II had higher rate of vaginal delivery when compared to group.

**Table 5:** Comparison of Fetal Complications

| Neonatal Hyperbilirubinemia | Group I         | Group II |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| Yes                         | 1               | 3        |
| No                          | 26              | 24       |
| P Value By 'T' Test         | 0.2987          |          |
| Odds Ratio (95 % Ci)        | 0.31(0.03-3.16) |          |

The difference between the two groups was statistically insignificant (p=0.2987).

**Table 6:** Comparison of Apgar @ 5 Minutes

| Apgar <7 @ 5 Minutes | Group I | Group II |
|----------------------|---------|----------|
| Yes                  | 1       | 1        |
| No                   | 26      | 26       |
| Fisher Exact P Value | 0.509   |          |

Baseline characteristics were shown in table.1. There was no statistically significant association between the two groups with respect to maternal age, gestational age, gravidity.

**Table 9:** Baseline Characteristics

| Characteristics        | Baseline Characteristics |                |          |                | P Value By 'T' Test |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------|----------------|---------------------|
|                        | Group I                  |                | Group II |                |                     |
|                        | Mean                     | Std. Deviation | Mean     | Std. Deviation |                     |
| Age (years)            | 25.11                    | 3.38           | 25.07    | 3.86           | 0.97                |
| Gestational age (weks) | 39.13                    | 1.28           | 39.25    | 1.27           | 0.727               |
| Gravida(no)            | 1.48                     | 0.64           | 1.67     | 0.83           | 0.364               |
| Initial Bishop score   | 1.41                     | 0.5            | 2.3      | 0.95           | <0.001              |

The difference between the two groups was statistically insignificant (p=0.509)

**Table 7:** Comparison of maternal complications

| Puerperal Pyrexia    | Group I | Group II |
|----------------------|---------|----------|
| Yes                  | 1       | 0        |
| No                   | 26      | 27       |
| Fisher Exact P Value | 0.5     |          |

The difference between the two groups was statistically insignificant (p=0.5)

**Table 8:** Postpartum Hemorrhage.

| Postpartum Hemorrhage | Group I | Group II |
|-----------------------|---------|----------|
| Yes                   | 0       | 2        |
| No                    | 27      | 25       |
| Fisher Exact P Value  | 0.245   |          |

The difference between the two groups was statistically insignificant (p=0.245).

## Discussion

A total of 54 cases with unfavourable cervix were enrolled in this study. They were divided into 2 groups based on the vaginal pH. Out of 54 there were 27 cases in group 1 (vaginal pH <4.5) and 27 cases in group 2 (vaginal pH >4.5).

**Table 10:** Labour Outcomes

| Outcomes                           | Labour Outcomes |                |          |                | P Value By 'T' Test |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|---------------------|
|                                    | Group I         |                | Group II |                |                     |
|                                    | Mean            | Std. Deviation | Mean     | Std. Deviation |                     |
| Bishop score change over 12 hours  | 2.41            | 1.01           | 6.37     | 0.97           | <0.001              |
| Time to active labour(hours)       | 21.13           | 1.42           | 11.04    | 0.93           | <0.001              |
| Augmentation required (%)          | 85.18%          |                | 18.51%   |                | 0.364               |
| Induction delivery interval(hours) | 27.24           | 0.58           | 15.2     | 1.03           | <0.001              |

Comparison of labour outcomes between the two groups is shown in Table. 2. The Bishop score change over 12 hours, time to active labour, need for augmentation, induction delivery interval was significantly different between the two groups. Out of 54 cases, 23 (85.18%) required augmentation with

oxytocin belonged to group I and 5 (18.51%) belonged to group II. Out of the 26 cases who did not require augmentation 4 (14.81%) belonged to group I and rest 22 (81.48%) belonged to group II.

**Table 11:** Mode of Delivery

| Mode Of Delivery    | Group I           | Group II   | Total      |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| Vaginal             | 9 (33.33%)        | 23(85.18%) | 32(59.25%) |
| Lscs                | 18(66.66%)        | 4(14.81%)  | 22(40.74%) |
| Total               | 27(100%)          | 27(100%)   | 54(100%)   |
| P Value By X2 Test  | 0.0001            |            |            |
| Odds Ratio (95% Ci) | 11.5 (3.04-43.46) |            |            |

Table 3 shows comparison of mode of delivery between the two groups. Out of 54 cases, 32 (59.25%) had vaginal delivery of

which 9 (33.33%) belonged to group I and 23 (85.18%) belonged to group II. 22 (40.74%) had cesarean section of which 18 (66.66%) belonged to group I and 4 (14.81%) belonged to

group II. Group II had higher rate of vaginal delivery when compared to group I.

**Table 12:** Maternal Complications

| Maternal complications |         |          |          |                        |
|------------------------|---------|----------|----------|------------------------|
|                        | Group I | Group II | Total    | P Value (Fisher Exact) |
| Puerperal Pyrexia      | 1(3.7%) | 0(0%)    | 1(1.85%) | 0.5                    |
| Postpartum Hemorrhage  | 0(0%)   | 2(7.4%)  | 2(3.7%)  | 0.245                  |

Table (4) shows the distribution of maternal complications between the two groups. There were totally 3 cases of postpartum maternal complications. Out of 54 cases, there was 1

(3.7%) case of puerperal pyrexia which was due to breast engorgement belonged to group I. There was 2 (7.4%) cases of postpartum hemorrhage, both of which belonged to group II.

**Table 13:** Neonatal complications

| Neonatal complications      |         |           |         |                        |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|------------------------|
| Neonatal complications      | Group I | Group II  | Total   | P Value (Fisher Exact) |
| Neonatal Hyperbilirubinemia | 1(3.7%) | 3(11.11%) | 4(7.4%) | 0.2987                 |
| Apgar Score <7 At 5 Mins    | 1(3.7%) | 1(3.7%)   | 2(3.7%) | 0.509                  |

Table 5 shows distribution of neonatal complications between the two groups. There were totally 6 neonatal complications.

Out of 54 cases, there was 1 (3.7%) case of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia belonged to group I and 3 (11.11%) cases belonged to group II. Out of the 50 cases who did not develop neonatal hyperbilirubinemia, 26(96.29%) cases belonged to group I and 24 (88.88%) cases belonged to group II.

Out of 54 cases, there was 1 (3.7%) case of 5 min APGAR score <7 belonged to group I and the other 1 (3.7%) belonged to group II. Out of the 52 cases, who had an APGAR score >7, 26 (96.29%) cases belonged to group I and, 26 (96.29%) cases belonged to group II.

The difference between the two groups was statistically insignificant ( $p > 0.05$ ).

### Conclusion

The findings of the present study showed that vaginal pH can be an important predictor for success of PGE2 gel induction.

Patients with higher vaginal pH has better change of Bishop's score (mean - 6.37,  $p$  value <0.001).

The duration of time to active labour was found to be shorter (mean -11.04,  $p$  value <0.001) in patients with higher vaginal pH.

The induction delivery interval (mean-15.2,  $p$  value<0.001) was also found to be shortened with higher vaginal pH.

Patients with higher vaginal pH is associated with more number of vaginal deliveries (85.18%) than LSCS (14.81%).

This shows that vaginal pH has significant effect on cervical ripening and Bishop score change and may lead to improved clinical efficacy of Dinoprostone gel. So, we can see that assessing vaginal pH before induction can be a useful parameter in predicting the outcome of labour in pregnant women who are undergoing labour induction with PGE2 gel.

Further research is required to find various agents that would increase the vaginal pH thereby creating a favorable environment for PGE2 gel induction.

A well designed pharmacological study with bigger study population is necessary to study the role of vaginal pH in absorption and overall efficacy of Dinoprostone gel which in future could increase the efficacy and reduce unwanted outcomes.

### References

- Cunningham FG, Leveno KJ, Bloom SL, Hoth JC, Rouse DJ, Sponge CY. Williams Obstetrics. 23rd Edi. New York; McGrawHill, 2010.
- Choudhury A, Das S, Kar M. A Review on Novelty and Potentiality of Vaginal Drug Delivery. International Journal of Pharm-Tech Research. 2011; 3(2):1033-44.
- Stehle RG. Physical chemistry, stability and handling of prostaglandin E2, F2, D2, I2: A critical summary. Methods Enzymol. 1982; 86:436-58.
- Johnson TA *et al.* The effect of pH on release of PGE24. Johnson TA, *et al.* The effect of pH on release of PGE2 from vaginal and endocervical preparations for induction of labour. Br J Obstet Gynaecol. 1992; 99(11):877-80.
- Taylor AVG, MacKenzi IZ. The effect of pH on release of PGE2 from vaginal and endocervical preparations for induction of labour. BJOG. 1993; 100(5): 50001.
- MacDonald IA *et al.* The effect of pH on release of PGE2 from vaginal and endocervical preparations for induction of labour. Br J Obstet Gynaecol. 1993; 100(11):1066-7.
- Lyrenas S, Clason I, Ulmsten controlled release of PGE2 from a vaginal insert (0.8 mm, 10 mg) during induction of labor. Br J Obstet Gynaecol. 2001; 108:169-78.
- Ramsey PS *et al.* Effect of vaginal pH on efficacy of the dinoprostone gel for cervical ripening/labor induction. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2002; 187(4):843-6.
- Basirat Z *et al.* Does vaginal Ph affect the efficacy of dinoprostone in cervical ripening /labor? Clin Exp Obstet Gynecol. 2012; 39(4):522-5.
- Önen F *et al.* The Role of Vaginal pH on Efficacy of Controlled-Release Dinoprostone Vaginal Insert for Cervical Ripening/Labor Induction: A Prospective Double-Blind Study. J Turkish-German Gynecol Assoc. 2008; 9(4):206-10.
- Ramsey PS, Ogburn PL Jr, Harris DY *et al.* Effect of vaginal pH on efficacy of the controlled-release dinoprostone vaginal insert for cervical ripening/labor induction. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2003; 13:250-3.
- Singh U, Mehrotra S, Gupta HP, Dhakad A, Jain V. A prospective double blind trial investigating impact of vaginal pH on efficacy of prostaglandin gel for cervical

- ripening and course of labour. *J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2011; 31(3):217-9.
13. Denison FC, Calder AA, Kelly RW. The action of prostaglandin E2 on the human cervix: stimulation of interleukin 8 and inhibition of secretory leukocyte protease inhibitor. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 1999; 180(3 Pt. 1):614-20.
  14. Norman M, Ekman G, Ulmsten U, Barchan K Malmstrom A. Proteoglycan metabolism in the connective tissue of pregnant and non-pregnant human cervix. An *in vitro* study. *Biochem. J.* 1991; 275:515-20.
  15. Kurian MJ, Rao B, Rao A, Shameem VPA. Effect of vaginal pH on efficacy of dinoprostone gel for labour induction. *Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol* 2016; 5:1196-1201.
  16. Marx SG. Effects of Progesterone on iNOS, COX-2, and Collagen Expression in the Cervix. *Journal of Histochemistry & Cytochemistry.* 2006; 54(6):623-39.