ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Factors Predicting Uterine Rupture Following a Cesarean Section

Shehla Tabassum, Bushra Khan^{*}, Hina Zahra Qureshi, Humaira Imran

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study was conducted to evaluate factors that predict uterine rupture following a previous cesarean section.

Study Design: A cross-sectional study.

Place and Duration of Study: The Study was conducted at the Department of Gynecology, Bakhtawar Amin Hospital Multan, Pakistan from June 2022 to June 2023.

Methods: The study included 100 women who had previously given birth. Women who had a successful vaginal birth after cesarean section (VBAC) were controls and who had rupture/scar dehiscence were considered cases. Socio-demographic data and information related to delivery, labor, and pregnancy were collected.

Results: A total of 100 women (40 cases and 60 controls) were included in the study. All women had spontaneous onset of labor. 12.5% (8) cases and 85% (51) controls had a successful vaginal birth after the cesarean section (VBAC). 34.1% of all rupture cases happened during the second stage of labor and 41.4% during the latent phase of labor. Upon arrival 30% (12) of cases had shock. Maternal complications in cases included anemia (21 patients), death (2 patients), uterine artery involvement (3 patients), and bladder rupture (4 patients). According to multivariate analysis factors including previous vagina delivery, duration of labor, fetal weight, and number of ANC visits were significantly related to rupture of uterus after previous cesarean (P<.05). **Conclusion:** Factors including prolonged labor, lesser antenatal care follows ups, and fetal weight > 3.8 kg increase the likelihood of uterine rupture following a C-section. It is crucial to develop strict criteria, considering intrapartum obstetric care, infrastructure, and referral system, for the selection of favorable candidates for trial of labor.

Keywords: Cesarean Section, Gynecology, Trial of Labor, Uterine Rupture.

How to cite this: Tabassum S, Khan B, Qureshi HZ, Imran H. Factors Predicting Uterine Rupture Following a Cesarean Section. Life and Science. 2024; 5(4): 446-451. doi: http://doi.org/10.37185/LnS.1.1.540

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International license. (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). Non-commercial uses of the work are permitted, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Uterine ruptures occur when whole layers of the uterus separate during labor or pregnancy.¹ It occurs rarely in the unscarred uterus (.034%), while in the scarred uterus its incidence is relatively higher (.14-2.4%).^{2,3} There has been an increased effort to avoid repeat cesarean section (C-section), and suitable candidates were allowed to undergo the trial of labor (TOL) after previous C-section.⁴ Vaginal birth after

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Bakhtawar Amin Trust Hospital Multan, Pakistan Correspondence: Dr. Bushra Khan Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Bakhtawar Amin Trust Hospital Multan, Pakistan E-mail: w_khan87@yahoo.com Received: Nov 30, 2023; 1st Revision: Feb 22, 2024 2nd Revision: Jun 18, 2024; Accepted: Jul 06, 2024 cesarean section (VBAC) has relatively less risk of complications and more than 50% successful births. However, it is not completely risk free and is associated with a higher risk of uterus rupture.⁵ Rupture of the uterus can be life threatening and can cause serious feto-maternal complications, requiring urgent laparotomy followed by hysterectomy or uterine repair. Moreover, with VBAC there is the risk of visceral injuries, major vessel involvement, severe bleeding, and hysterectomy.⁶ Studies show that an increasing number of emergency C-sections are being conducted due to maternal anxiety and fear of uterine rupture. However, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists recommends that VBAC should be preferred in favorable conditions. Different studies have been conducted to assess predictors of uterine rupture after VBAC; however,

there is debate over definite factors that cause uterine rupture.7 Women with one previous Csection and without any contraindication for VBAC are candidates for trial of labor (TOL) However, these recommendations were made by studies conducted in developed countries with better obstetric care. There is limited research on predictors of uterine rupture in developing countries like ours. Developing countries have limited health resources and a major portion of the population resides in rural regions and has to travel to obstetric care centers in urban areas. Thus, there is a high risk of fetomaternal complications after TOL, and strict criterion is required to choose candidates suitable for TOL. Studies suggested that strict criteria and intrapartum follow-up reduce the risk of complications.⁸ In this study we aim to evaluate factors that predict uterine rupture following a previous cesarean section. There is limited data on predictors of uterine rupture so results will provide insight for developing criteria for TOL after VBAC.

Methods

This cross-sectional study was conducted in the Department of Gynecology, Bakhtawar Amin Hospital Multan, Pakistan from June 2022 to June 2023 after obtaining approval from the Ethical Review Board of the hospital vide letter no: 22/120 held on dated: 08th February 2022. The study included 100 adult women with singleton pregnancies who had given birth previously by cesarean section selected through convenience sampling. The sample size was calculated by Fisher's formula keeping a 95% confidence interval, 50% population proportion, and 70% precision. Primipara women, women with multiple gestations, a history of hypertension, and those whose medical records were missing were excluded. All women provided their informed consent to become a part of the study. Women who had successful VBAC were controls and those who had rupture/scar dehiscence during birth were considered cases. Sociodemographic data and information related to delivery, labor, and pregnancy were collected.

SPSS version 23 was used for data analysis. Data was presented as mean, standard deviation, and frequencies. The association between study variables and uterine rupture was by binary logistic regression analysis. Statistically significant variables were subjected to multivariate analysis. *P* value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

A total of 100 women (40 cases and 60 controls) were included in the study. The mean age of the cases was 28.53 \pm 4.34 years and of controls was 28.11 \pm 4.82 years. 50% of cases and 20% of controls were rural residents. About 2/3rd controls had > 4 antenatal care (ANC) visits, while cases had < 4 ANC visits. 17.5% and 1.6% controls had more than 5 previous pregnancies.

All women had spontaneous onset of labor. 12.5% (8) cases and 85% (51) controls had successful VBAC. 8.3% (5) controls and 40% (16) cases reported macrosomia. 34.1% of all rupture cases happened during the second stage of labor and 41.4% during the latent phase of labor. (Table-1).

Upon arrival 12 (30%) cases had shock. Maternal complications cases included anemia (21 cases), uterine artery involvement (3 cases), maternal death (2 cases), and bladder rupture (4 cases). 65% of cases require total abdominal hysterectomy and uterine repair. (Table-2).

According to multivariate analysis factors including previous vagina delivery, duration of labor, fetal weight, and number of ANC visits were significantly associated with uterine rupture after previous C-section (P<.05) (Table-3).

Discussion

The results of our study showed that factors like previous vaginal delivery, number of ANC visits, duration of labor, and fetal weight > 3.8 kg are associated with uterine rupture following a previous C-section.

The trial of labor in our cases was 7.5% which is significantly higher than the previously reported range of 0.3-4.6% making it a significant risk factor for uterine rupture.^{9,10} Trial of labor has also been reported as an independent predictor of uterine rupture in other studies.^{3,11} This calls for standardized examination of women with a history C-section before initiating TOL. Evaluating uterine scars had been reported as a useful method for predicting patients at a higher risk of rupture.^{12,13}

A history of vaginal birth is also a predictor of successful trial of labor in cesarean delivery as

Table-1: Intrapartui Variable		Cacae (==40)	Controls (n=60)	<i>P</i> -value	Chi cauara
	C	Cases (n=40)	Controls (n=60)	P-value	Chi-square
Labor onset	Spontaneous	40 (100%)	60 (100%)	-	
Partograph use Obstructed Labor	Yes	4 (10%)	18 (30%)	0.50	39.34
	No	36 (90%)	42 (70%)		
	Yes	5 (12.5%)	-	0.369	36.45
	No	35 (87.5%)	60 (100%)		
Trial of	Yes	2 (5%)	-	0.200	26.01
Instrumental	No	38 (95%)	60 (100%)	0.390	36.91
Delivery	A 1	27 (22 5%)	50 (00 00)		
Trial of labor after	No	37 (92.5%)	50 (83.3%)	0.80	47.27
cesarean (TOLAC)	Yes	3 (7.5%)	10 (16.6%)	0.02	22.04
Previous Vaginal	Yes	10 (25%)	42 (70%)	0.02	23.84
Delivery	No	30 (75%)	18 (30%)	-	
Diagnosis of Rupture	Latent phase of	17 (42.5%)	-	-	
	labor	9 (21.9%)	-	-	
	The active phase	13 (32.5%)	-	-	
	oflabor	1 (2.5%)		-	
	The second stage	· · · · · ·			
	of labor				
	Postpartum				
Fetal Weight	≤3800 > 2001	17 (42.5%)	42 (70%)	0.002	19.03
	≥3801	23 (57.5%)	18 (30%)		
Median days of	Median (days)	4	3.20±2.5	-	
Hospital					
Admittance					
Admittance to	None	0	22 (36.6%)		
Hospitals before	1	9 (22.5%)	31(51.6%)	0.003	19.74
Arrival at Current	2	31 (77.5%)	7 (11.6%)		
Institution					
Fisher's exact test					
Table-2: Compariso	n of perioperative co	onditions between			
Variables		Cases	Controls	Chi-Square value	P-value
Maternal condition					
	Stable	28 (70%)	60 (100%)		
		28 (70%)	60 (100%)	18.35	0.002
on admission	Stable Shock	28 (70%) 12 (30%)	60 (100%) 0		
on admission Weight of baby		28 (70%)	60 (100%)	18.35	0.002
on admission Weight of baby	Shock	28 (70%) <u>12 (30%)</u> 3530.6 ±549	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9		
on admission Weight of baby (grams)	Shock Good APGAR	28 (70%) 12 (30%)	60 (100%) 0	18.35	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby	Shock Good APGAR score	28 (70%) 12 (30%) 3530.6 ±549 0	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%)	18.35	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR	28 (70%) <u>12 (30%)</u> 3530.6 ±549	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9	18.35 3.06	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score	28 (70%) <u>12 (30%)</u> 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%)	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0	18.35 3.06	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby after birth	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead	28 (70%) <u>12 (30%)</u> 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) <u>36 (90%)</u>	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0 0	18.35 3.06 0.04	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby after birth	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead Alive	28 (70%) <u>12 (30%)</u> 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) <u>36 (90%)</u> <u>38 (95%)</u>	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0	18.35 3.06	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby after birth	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead Alive Dead	28 (70%) 12 (30%) 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) 36 (90%) 38 (95%) 2 (5%)	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0 0	18.35 3.06 0.04	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby after birth	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead Alive Dead LUST	28 (70%) 12 (30%) 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) 36 (90%) 38 (95%) 2 (5%) 34 (85%)	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0 0 60 (100%)	18.35 3.06 0.04	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby after birth Status of mother	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead Alive Dead LUST LUS vertical	28 (70%) 12 (30%) 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) 36 (90%) 38 (95%) 2 (5%) 34 (85%) 4 (10%)	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0 60 (100%) 0 0	18.35 3.06 0.04	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby after birth Status of mother	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead Alive Dead LUST	28 (70%) 12 (30%) 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) 36 (90%) 38 (95%) 2 (5%) 34 (85%)	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0 60 (100%) 0 0	18.35 3.06 0.04	0.002
	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead Alive Dead LUST LUS vertical	28 (70%) 12 (30%) 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) 36 (90%) 38 (95%) 2 (5%) 34 (85%) 4 (10%)	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0 60 (100%) 0 0	18.35 3.06 0.04	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby after birth Status of mother Rupture of uterus	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead Alive Dead LUST LUS vertical Died before	28 (70%) 12 (30%) 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) 36 (90%) 38 (95%) 2 (5%) 34 (85%) 4 (10%)	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0 60 (100%) 0 0	18.35 3.06 0.04	0.002
on admission Weight of baby (grams) Condition of baby after birth Status of mother	Shock Good APGAR score Low APGAR score Dead Alive Dead LUST LUS vertical Died before surgery	28 (70%) 12 (30%) 3530.6 ±549 0 4 (10%) 36 (90%) 38 (95%) 2 (5%) 34 (85%) 4 (10%) 2 (5%)	60 (100%) 0 3249.4± 670.9 60 (100%) 0 60 (100%) 0 0	18.35 3.06 0.04	0.002

*Chi-square test

Table-3: Factors associa	ated with risk of uto	•		
Variables		Crude odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value	t test statistics
Place of residence	Urban Rural	1 12.58 (7.9–16.4)	0.8	1.38
Age	<35 ≥35	1 2.30 (1.50–3.49)	0.40	0.32
Number of ANC	<4 ≥4	1 4.0 (1.40– 7.30)	0.02	15.89
Previous vaginal delivery	Yes No	1 1.8 (1.89–3.39)	0.03	10.58
Gravidity	1–4 ≥5	1 16.30 (1.69–12.50)	0.19	1.47
Trial of labor after cesarean	Yes No	1 4.80 (1.58–13.90)	0.29	0.78
Fetal weight	<3800 ≥3801	1 6.9 (2.30–21.40)	0.0002	1591.55
Uterine scar duration	19–59 months Short and long intervals	1 3.12 (1.20–7.10)	0.10	3.08
Duration of labor	<15 hrs. ≥ 15 hrs.	1 10.50 (2.09–52.6)	0.002	1591.55

*Multi-variate regression analysis

reported by the literature.^{14,15} In our study, vaginal delivery was reported as a risk factor of uterine rupture. Another study also contradicts the previously reported results and concluded that women with more vaginal births were more likely to get a complete uterine rupture, indicating that vaginal birth does not guarantee the elimination of the risk of rupture, and if rupture occurs there is a high chance of complete rupture.¹⁶

In the current study, fetal weight > 3800g increased the risk of uterine rupture. It was observed that fetal weight greater than 3800g doubled the risk of rupture, similar to findings of previous studies; however, the cut point in this study is lower because of socioeconomic disparities.¹² However, considering fetal weight as a risk factor for uterine rupture remains debatable.⁷ Mothers who have < 4 ANC follow-ups are at increased risk of uterine rupture compared to those who have > 4 follow-ups. Different institutions have verified the importance of antenatal care in improving neonatal and maternal outcomes. Reports reveal that more than 4 ANC follow-ups have a major positive impact on fetomaternal outcomes.¹⁷ ANC visits enable health providers to assess pelvic adequacy, fetal weight, and the possibility of malpresentation, and thus screen

favorable candidates. Moreover, it is the ideal time for counseling regarding TOL.

The majority of the cases had visited other health institutions before coming to the managing hospital. This is common practice in this country and about 47.5% of cases visited primary health centers and were referred from there. Pakistan's healthcare comprises primary, secondary, and tertiary healthcare facilities.¹⁸ These facilities serve a major portion of the population, primary healthcare facilities have very limited resources and personnel so which they refer patients to better-equipped facilities. This referral unnecessarily delays management and prolongs labor. Moreover, rural residents have limited access to transportation and route of transport which further complicates the situation. A previous study has shown that prolonged labor is a significant risk factor for uterine rupture, even in an unscarred uterus.¹⁹ A current study revealed that labor > 15 hours increases the risk of uterine rupture. Moreover, the majority of cases had no pantograph follow-up due to there being no prior information on labor abnormities.²⁰ Infrastructurerelated and other socio-cultural causes delay in interventions due to which there is an increased risk of uterine rupture, particularly in the scarred uterus.

Delayed intervention leads to poor neonatal and maternal outcomes.

Unfortunately, Pakistan has a dilapidated health structure, its infrastructure is underdeveloped and there is a severe lack of operation setups and human and medical resources. There is a need for precise criteria for choosing women for TOL, thus a largescale study is required for gather general data. The strength of the current study is, that it will be a good addition to the limited literature on this topic and shed light on new factors such as institution-related variables and duration of labor.

Our study has some limitations. We did not categorize women according to complete and partial uterine rupture. Additionally, the study was conducted at hospitals with excellent obstetrics care, the results could only be relevant to facilities with comparable services.

Conclusion

Factors including prolonged labor, lesser ANC follow ups and fetal weight > 3.8 kg increase the risk of uterine rupture following a C-section. It is crucial to develop strict criteria, considering intrapartum obstetric care, infrastructure, and referral system, for the selection of favorable candidates for TOL.

Acknowledgment: None.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Grant Support and Financial Disclosure: None.

REFERENCES

- Dellino M, Crupano FM, He X, Malvasi A, Vimercati A. Uterine rupture after previous cesarean section with hysterotomy above the lower uterine segment. Acta Bio Medica. 2022; 93: e2022269. doi: 10.23750/abm.v93iS1. 12872
- Kabore C, Chaillet N, Kouanda S, Bujold E, Traore M, Dumont A. Maternal and perinatal outcomes associated with a trial of labour after previous caesarean section in sub-Saharan countries. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2016; 123: 2147-55. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.13615
- Dimitrova D, Kästner AL, Kästner AN, Paping A, Henrich W, Braun T. Risk factors and outcomes associated with type of uterine rupture. Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics. 2022; 306: 1967-77. doi: 10.1007/s00404-022-06452-0

- Hidalgo-Lopezosa P, Hidalgo-Maestre M. Risk of uterine rupture in vaginal birth after cesarean: Systematic review. Enfermería Clínica. 2017; 27: 28-39. doi: 10.1016/j.enfcle. 2016.08.002
- Lipschuetz M, Guedalia J, Rottenstreich A, Persky MN, Cohen SM, Kabiri D, et al. Prediction of vaginal birth after cesarean deliveries using machine learning. American journal of obstetrics and gynecology. 2020; 222: 613.e1e12. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2019.12.267
- Vandenberghe G, Bloemenkamp K, Berlage S, Colmorn L, Deneux-Tharaux C, Gissler M, et al. The International Network of Obstetric Survey Systems study of uterine rupture: a descriptive multi-country population-based study. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2019; 126: 370-81. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528. 15271
- Luchristt D, Brown O, Pidaparti M, Kenton K, Lewicky-Gaupp C, Miller ES. Predicting obstetrical anal sphincter injuries in patients who undergo vaginal birth after cesarean delivery. An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2021; 225: 173.e1-e8. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2021.02.014
- Timor-Tritsch I, Buca D, Di Mascio D, Cali G, D'Amico A, Monteagudo A, et al. Outcome of cesarean scar pregnancy according to gestational age at diagnosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology. 2021; 258: 53-9. doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2020.11.036
- Fishel Bartal M, Sibai BM, Ilan H, Fried M, Rahav R, Alexandroni H, et al. Trial of labor after cesarean (TOLAC) in women with premature rupture of membranes. The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine. 2020; 33: 2976-82. doi: 10.1080/14767058.2019.1566312
- Kabiri D, Masarwy R, Schachter-Safrai N, Masarwa R, Raccah BH, Ezra Y, et al. Trial of labor after cesarean delivery in twin gestations: systematic review and meta-analysis. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology. 2019; 220: 336-47. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2018.11.125
- 11. Mi Y, Qu P, Guo N, Bai R, Gao J, Ma Z, et al. Evaluation of factors that predict the success rate of trial of labor after the cesarean section. BMC pregnancy childbirth. 2021; 21: 527. doi: 10.1186/s12884-021-04004-z
- Wingert A, Hartling L, Sebastianski M, Johnson C, Featherstone R, Vandermeer B, et al. Clinical interventions that influence vaginal birth after cesarean delivery rates: Systematic Review & Meta-Analysis. BMC pregnancy childbirth. 2019; 19: 529. doi: 10.1186/s12884-019-2689-5
- 13. Figueiró-Filho EA, Gomez JM, Farine D. Risk factors

associated with uterine rupture and dehiscence: a crosssectional Canadian study. Revista Brasileira de Ginecologia e Obstetrícia. 2022; 43: 820-5. doi: 10.1055/s-0041-1739461

- Trojano G, Damiani GR, Olivieri C, Villa M, Malvasi A, Alfonso R, et al. VBAC: antenatal predictors of success. Acta BioMedica. 2019; 90: 300-9. doi: 10.23750/abm.v90i3. 7623
- Baqai S, Afroze S. Evaluating Prediction Score For Success of Trial of Labor After Cesarean (TOLAC). Pakistan Armed Forces Medical Journal. 2022; 72: 169-72. doi: 10.51253/pafmj.v72i1.7286
- Nahum-Yerushalmy A, Walfisch A, Lipschuetz M, Rosenbloom JI, Kabiri D, Hochler H. Uterine rupture risk in a trial of labor after cesarean section with and without previous vaginal births. Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics. 2022; 305: 1633-9. doi: 10.1007/s00404-021-06368-1
- 17. Abebe GF, Alie MS, Girma D, Mankelkl G, Berchedi AA, Negesse Y. Determinants of early initiation of first antenatal

care visit in Ethiopia based on the 2019 Ethiopia minidemographic and health survey: A multilevel analysis. Plos one. 2023; 18: e0281038. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone. 0281038

- Khan SA. Situation analysis of health care system of Pakistan: post 18 amendments. Health Care Current Reviews. 2019; 7: 244. doi: 10.35248/2375-4273.19.7.244
- Feleke G, Tantu T, Zewdu D, Gedefawu A, Wondosen M, Gunta M. Case-control study on determinants of uterine rupture among mothers who gave birth at Hawassa University comprehensive specialized hospital. PLoS One. 2023; 18: e0279175. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0279175
- Sospeter PF, Al-Beity FMA, Kidanto HL, Said A, Kikula A, Godfrey S. Labour outcomes among low-risk women using WHO next-generation partograph versus WHO composite partograph: A quasi-experimental study. 2023. doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-2603863/v1

Authors Contribution

ST: Idea conception, data collection

BH: Study designing, data analysis, results and interpretation, manuscript writing and proofreading **HZQ:** Data collection

.....

HI: Idea conception, data analysis, results and interpretation