|| ISSN(online): 2589-8698 || ISSN(print): 2589-868X ||
International Journal of Medical and Biomedical Studies
Available Online at www.ijmbs.info
NLM (National Library of Medicine ID: 101738825)
Index Copernicus Value 2018: 75.71
Original Research Article
Volume 4, Issue 9; September: 2020; Page No. 120-128

A CASE-CONTROL STUDY ON: RISK FACTORS FOR SEVERE POSTPARTUM HEMORRHAGE

Dr. Neeru Sharma[1*],
[1] Professor, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Institute for Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Jaipur National University, Jaipur

Article Info: Received 02 September 2020; Accepted 27 September 2020
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32553/ijmbs.v4i9.1712
Corresponding author: Dr. Neeru Sharma
Conflict of interest: No conflict of interest.

Abstract

Background: In high-income countries, the frequency of extreme baby blues drain (PPH) has expanded. This has significant general wellbeing importance in light of the fact that extreme PPH is a main source of major maternal dismalness. In any case, scarcely any examinations have recognized danger factors for extreme PPH inside a contemporary obstetric partner.

Methods: We performed a case-control study to recognize hazard factors for extreme PPH among an associate of ladies who conveyed at one of three emergency clinics in Norway somewhere in the range of 2008 and 2011. A case (extreme PPH) was characterized by an expected blood misfortune ≥1500 mL or the requirement for blood bonding for inordinate baby blues dying. Utilizing calculated relapse, we applied a sober minded procedure to distinguish autonomous danger factors for extreme PPH.

Results: Among an aggregate of 43,105 conveyances happening somewhere in the range of 2008 and 2011, we distinguished 1064 cases and 2059 irregular controls. The recurrence of serious PPH was 2.5% (95% certainty stretch (CI): 2.32–2.62). The most widely recognized etiologies for extreme PPH were uterine atony (60%) and placental complexities (36%). The most grounded hazard factors were a past filled with serious PPH (changed OR (aOR) = 8.97, 95% CI: 5.25–15.33), anticoagulant medicine (aOR = 4.79, 95% CI: 2.72–8.41), paleness at booking (aOR = 4.27, 95% CI: 2.79–6.54), extreme toxemia or HELLP condition (aOR = 3.03, 95% CI: 1.74–5.27), uterine fibromas (aOR = 2.71, 95% CI: 1.69–4.35), numerous pregnancy (aOR = 2.11, 95% CI: 1.39–3.22) and helped regenerative advances (aOR = 1.88, 95% CI: 1.33–2.65).

Conclusions: Based on our discoveries, ladies with a background marked by extreme PPH are at most elevated danger of serious PPH. Just as other set up clinical danger factors for PPH, a background marked by serious PPH ought to be incorporated as a danger factor in the turn of events and approval of expectation models for PPH.

Keywords: Postpartum discharge, Case-control study, Predictors, Risk factors, Obstetric mediations, High-hazard, Prediction, Prevention

Introduction

Serious baby blues discharge (PPH) is the biggest con-tributor to maternal grimness around the world, representing 50–75% of all such cases (1–4). Thus, PPH has gotten expanding consideration as a quality marker for obstetric consideration. Moreover, proof exists that the occurrence of PPH is expanding in top level salary nations (5–12). An expansion in the predominance of realized maternal and obstetric danger factors for PPH could assume a job, yet the supporting proof from the distributed investigations islimited. For instance, in a Canadian report (7), enlistment of work, expansion of work, and cesarean segment incompletely clarified the expanding pace of PPH. These discoveries may show that ladies going through these mediations need nearer checking for serious PPH in the early baby blues period.

A few danger factors for PPH are referred to, for example, various pregnancy, usable conveyance and chorionam-nionitis, anyway PPH may happen among patients with no realized danger factors (13, 14). Our capacity to lessen the danger of PPH relies upon continuous examinations of previ-ously unaccounted for causes and danger factors. The essential point of the examination was to assess hazard factors for serious PPH, contemplating pre-pregnancy, antenatal and intrapartum factors.

Methods

The source populace was characterized as pregnant ladies living in the metropolitan region of the Oslo and Buskerud region who were admitted to two college emergency clinics in Oslo (Ullevaal or Rikshospitalet) or Dram-men Hospital for conveyance between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2011. From this source populace, we played out a review case-control study. We identi-fied 1064 instances of serious PPH through birth suite records and medical clinic information bases. Serious PPH was characterized as blood misfortune ≥1500 mL or the requirement for blood transfu-sion for inordinate seeping at the hour of conveyance. Blood bonding for extreme draining was characterized as a blood bonding given for an imaginable PPH ≥1500 mL because of clinical side effects and indications of sickliness or hemodynamic decompensation after conveyance. We barred ladies who

got a blood bonding due to baby blues frailty, without proof of extreme drain. The going to doctor or maternity specialist assessed the blood misfortune outwardly in every one of the three clinics. Controls were an irregular example of all conveyances without extreme PPH from a similar source populace and timeframe as the cases, containing a sum of 2059 conveyances. We chose irregular controls subsequent to eliminating the instances of serious PPH from the all out number of conveyances at the three clinics. Weighting was finished by the complete number of conveyances in every medical clinic during the examination time frame, bringing about control parts from Rikshospitalet, Ullevaal, and Drammen of 21%, 62%, and 17%, regard ively. Considering two controls for every case, we assessed the quantity of controls required from every medical clinic as indicated by the quantity of conveying ladies in every emergency clinic contrasted with the absolute number. This delivered testing portions at Rikshospitalet, Ullevaal, and Drammen of 4.8%, 5.2%, and 4.7%, separately. The ran-dom test was produced in STATA rendition 11.0 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX, USA). Enlistment of patient information depended on data from 1) the emergency clinics' clinical records; 2) maternity information bases (Obstetrix® from Siemens AG, Oslo, Norway and Partus® from Clinsoft, Oslo, Norway), and 3) birth suite records containing work and conveyance results on all conveyances, including the volume of blood misfortune during conveyance. In the event that a lady had more than one conveyance, the second and ensuing pregnancies were barred to restrict rehashed related estimations.

In this investigation, we recognized reasons for and hazard factors for PPH; no immediate causes were remembered for the danger factor examinations. Reasons for serious PPH were named Tone (uterine atony, uterine reversal and unexpectedness of the placenta), Tissue (held placenta and held pieces of placenta, and unusual placentation), Trauma (uterine crack, birth trench injury, and careful injury), and Thrombin (coagulation problems).

We enrolled up to two foundations for each case if both were viewed as primary driver, besides in cases marked as atony because of held placenta which were re-ported as a held placenta. A held placenta neces-sitating a manual or usable conveyance of the placenta was named a held placenta. Cases with held placental tissues analyzed in the working theater or by ultrasound and requiring careful or manual evacuation, were named held placental tissue. Strange placentation was characterized as placenta accreta, increta or percreta. We distinguished cases brought about by strange placentation post-conveyance by investigating clinical records and pathology reports.

In view of writing survey, we chose potential danger factors for thought in our investigations. Pre-pregnancy factors included conjugal status, identity, uterine anom-alies (septated uterus, uni-or bicornuate uterus, uterus didelphys), past uterine medical procedure (myomectomy and septal evacuations), past cesarean area, past extreme PPH (≥1500 mL), and uterine fibromas. Current pregnancy conditions included maternal age, nationality (nation of cause), pre-pregnancy weight record (BMI), frailty in beginning of pregnancy (hemoglobin ≤9 g/dL), helped regenerative innovation (in vitro preparation [IVF] or intra-cytoplasmic sperm infusion [ICSI]), numerous pregnancy, gestational diabetes (insulin treated or diet managed), utilization of anticoagulant medica-tions, for example, low sub-atomic weight heparin (LMWH) in pregnancy, polyhydramnios, extreme toxemia or HELLP-condition, and untimely crack of films (PROM). Intrapartum factors included maternal fever (>38°C) during conveyance, method of conveyance, acceptance of work, work enlargement with oxytocin, and newborn child birth weight. Maternal age, BMI, and baby birth weight were considered as persistent factors for incorporation in the last model and clear cut factors for distinct purposes. Age was partitioned into 5-year gatherings, utilizing 20–24 years as the reference gathering. BMI was sorted utilizing the World Health Organization (WHO's) classifica-tion, with a BMI of 18.5-24.9 kg/m2 as the reference. Newborn child birth weight was dichotomized into ≥4500 g or <4500 g, as per the meaning of fetal macrosomia (15). Moreover, we utilized WHO's reality districts to characterize ethnic inception (16).

The information were gone into an information base underlying EpiData Version 3.1. (EpiData Association, Odense, Denmark). The clinical records were reconsidered in the event that we noticed information exceptions or arrangement mistakes for free and ward factors. All clinical records were explored by two agents (LTN and SP).

For our example size assessment, we considered mater-nal age and enlistment of work as potential danger factors for serious PPH. For both example size gauges, we considered a sort 1 blunder of 5%, a force of 80%, and a case:control proportion of 1:2. With respect to age, in Oslo, roughly 18% of parturients are 35 years or more established (17). We theorized that ladies in this age bunch had a 1.4-overlay expanded danger of serious PPH com-pared to more youthful ladies (1, 18). With a base distinguishable chances proportion (OR) = 1.4, we would require at any rate 656 cases and 1312 controls for a sum of 1968 patients. As to of work, in Norway, the recurrence of works prompted with oxytocin is 3.4% as per figures from The Medical Birth Registry of Norway (17). In a populace based investigation from Norway inspecting hazard factors for serious PPH, the absolute pace of acceptance of work was 10.8% (18). We assessed that the recurrence of acceptance of work would be around the mean of these rates. Expecting a 1.6-overlap expanded danger of extreme PPH in initiated work (1, 18), we would require at any rate 698

cases and 1396 controls, absolutely 2094 patients, while considering a base perceivable OR = 1.6. Along these lines, for this case–control study, we chose to incorporate at any rate 2400 conveyances (800 cases and 1600 controls).

We investigated the information as indicated by a commonsense methodology (19), which implies need was not given to a particular etio-sensible theory. Univariable investigation was done to survey applicant factors as danger factors for extreme PPH, and the relationship between potential danger factors and serious PPH was evaluated by the OR and 95% certainty stretch (CI). The multivariable investigation was gone before by assessment of collinearity between hazard factors. At the point when collinearity existed between two factors, we precluded the one with least clinical pertinence. At last, multivariable calculated relapse with manual in reverse disposal was utilized to recognize in-subordinate danger factors for serious PPH (20). Our standards for successive disposal of competitor hazard factors were the factors' solidarity and essentialness on the relationship with extreme PPH, and ideal adjustment and segregation of the model. The nonstop factors of maternal age, BMI, and birth weight were brought into the model in itslogged structure as they were straightly connected with the out-come. Nonetheless, birth weight is introduced dichotomized in Table 3 as this was judged clinically additionally fascinating. Since we were applying a realistic technique, the pre-dictive exactness of the model was assessed by adjustment and segregation (21). Adjustment, which gauges the capacity of the model to dole out the suitable danger, was assessed by the Hosmer and Lemeshow (H-L) decency of-fit test. A measurably non-huge H-L outcome (P > 0.05) proposes that the model predicts precisely by and large. Separation, which quantifies the model's abil-ity to separate between people with and without serious PPH, was assessed by examination of the region under the beneficiary working trademark (ROC) bend. On the off chance that the region under the bend is more prominent than 0.7, it very well may be con-cluded that the model has a satisfactory oppressive ability. All measurable examination was performed utilizing STATA rendition 11.0 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX, USA). We utilized Strengthening the Reporting of Observa-tional Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) rules in announcing our case–control study (22).

Results

From the source populace of 43,105 conveyances, we recognized 1064 ladies with a recorded PPH of ≥1500 mL or blood bonding, giving a recurrence of 2.5% (95% CI: 2.32–2.62). The recognized reasons for extreme PPH are recorded in Table 1. The most widely recognized reason was uterine atony (60.4%), while we distinguished held pla-centa in 19.8% of the cases. Anomalous placentation was analyzed post-conveyance in 4.4% of the cases.

The investigation populace involved a sum of 1064 instances of serious PPH and 2059 arbitrary controls without extreme PPH. The appropriation of potential danger factors is introduced in Table 2. Europe, the United States, and Oceania were nations of birthplace for most of cases and controls (78.8% versus 81.7%, individually). The middle (interquartile ranges) values for maternal age, BMI, and birthweight were comparative among cases and controls; maternal age: 32 (29–36) a long time versus 32 (29–35) a long time individually; pre-pregnancy BMI: 23.1 (21.0–26.1) kg/m2 versus 22.8 (20.8–25.7) kg/m2 individually; and birth-weight: 3546 (3075–3930) g versus 3465 (3120–3834) g individually. In the univariable examination, extreme PPH was more probable among ladies with the accompanying clinical and obstetric attributes: primiparity, ladies who were hitched or living together, past serious PPH, previ-ous uterine medical procedure, known uterine inconsistency, different incubation, IVF/ICSI pregnancies, pallor, gestational diabetes mellitus, uterine fibroma, polyhydramnios,

Table 1: Causes of severe postpartum hemorrhage (N = 1064)

Cause[a]	
Tone	671 (63.0%)
Uterine atony[b]	643 (60.4%)
Uterine inversion	5 (0.5%)
Abruption of placenta	23 (2.2%)
Tissue	380 (35.7%)
Retained placenta	211 (19.8%)
Retained placental tissue	122 (11.4%)
Abnormal placentation (accreta, increta, percreta)	47 (4.4%)
Trauma	189 (17.8%)
Birth canal trauma	114 (10.7%)
Surgical trauma during caesarean delivery	63(5.9%)
Uterine rupture	12(1.1%)
Thrombin	16 (1.5%)
Disseminated intravascular coagulation	8 (0.8%)
Pre-existing coagulation disorders	8 (0.8%)

Table 2: Clinical profile of women with severe postpartum hemorrhage versus controls

	Severe PPH (N = 1064)	Controls (N = 2059)	OR	95% CI	P -value
Age (years)					
14 – 19	12 (1.1%)	13 (0.6%)	2.23	0.96 – 5.17	0.061
20 – 24	60 (5.6%)	145 (7.0%)	Ref.		
25 –29	240 (22.6%)	507 (24.6%)	1.14	0.82 – 1.60	0.435
30 –34	395 (37.1%)	770 (37.4%)	1.24	0.90 –1.71	0.194
35–39	283 (26.6%)	501 (24.3%)	1.36	0.98–1.91	0.068
≥40	74 (7.0%)	123 (6.0%)	1.45	0.96–2.21	0.078
Parity					
0	622 (58.5%)	1007 (48.9%)	1.54	1.30 – 1.82	<0.001
1	296 (27.8%)	738 (35.8%)	Ref.		
2	96 (9.0%)	229 (11.1%)	1.04	0.79 – 1.37	0.752
≥3	50 (4.6%)	85 (4.1%)	1.47	1.01 – 2.13	0.045
Ethnicity					
Europe/USA/Oceania	838 (78.8%)	1682 (81.7%)	Ref.		
Middle-East/North-Africa	50 (4.6%)	122 (5.9%)	0.82	0.58 – 1.15	0.259
Latin-America	14 (1.3%)	22 (1.1%)	1.28	0.65 – 2.51	0.477
Asia	99 (9.3%)	151 (7.3%)	1.31	1.01 – 1.72	0.044
Sub-Saharan Africa	63 (5.9%)	82 (4.0%)	1.54	1.10 – 2.16	0.012
BMI (kg/m2)					
<18.5	42 (4.0%)	80 (3.9%)	1.08	0.74 – 1.59	0.688
18.5 – 24.9	639 (60.1%)	1317 (64.0%)	Ref.		
25.0 – 29.9	205 (19.3%)	378 (18.4%)	1.12	0.92 – 1.36	0.262
30.0 – 34.9	82 (7.7%)	145 (7.0%)	1.16	0.87 – 1.55	0.295
35.0 – 39.9	25 (2.4%)	36 (1.8%)	1.43	0.85 – 2.40	0.176
≥40	7 (0.7%)	14 (0.7%)	1.03	0.41 – 2.56	0.949
Married/cohabitant	973 (91.4%)	1932 (94.1%)	0.7	0.53 – 0.93	0.014
Pre-pregnancy conditions					
Uterine anomaly	16 (1.5%)	13 (0.6%)	2.4	1.15 – 5.01	0.02
Uterine surgery	19 (1.8%)	11 (0.5%)	3.38	1.60 – 7.14	0.001
Previous cesarean	126 (11.8%)	221 (10.7%)	1.12	0.88 – 1.41	0.35
Previous severe PPH	66 (6.2%)	21 (1.0%)	6.42	3.90 – 10.6	<0.001
Obstetric factors					
Multiple pregnancy	94 (8.8%)	52 (2.5%)	3.74	2.64 – 5.29	<0.001
IVF/ICSI	115 (10.8%)	82 (4.0%)	2.92	2.18 – 3.92	<0.001
Anemia (Hb ≤ 9.0 g/dL)	74 (7.0%)	38 (1.9%)	4.11	2.76 – 6.13	<0.001
Gestational diabetes mellitus	46 (9.4%)	58 (2.8%)	1.56	1.05 – 2.31	0.027
Uterine fibroma	52 (4.9%)	38 (1.9%)	2.73	1.79 – 4.18	<0.001
Polyhydramnios	16 (1.5%)	12 (0.6%)	2.6	1.23 – 5.52	0.013
Anticoagulant medication	51 (4.8%)	22 (2.1%)	4.66	2.81 – 7.73	<0.001
Severe pre-eclampsia or HELLP syndrome	50 (4.7%)	28 (2.6%)	3.58	2.24 – 5.71	<0.001
Intrapartum factors					

Table 2: Clinical profile of women with severe postpartum hemorrhage versus controls (Continued)

Instrumental vaginal	212 (20.0%)	25 (12.2%)	2.26	1.83 – 2.79	<0.001
In-labor cesarean	248 (23.3%)	245 (11.9%)	2.71	2.21 – 3.32	<0.001
Elective cesarean	97 (8.6%)	205 (10.0%)	1.27	0.97 – 1.65	0.077
PROM	127 (12.0%)	169 (8.2%)	1.51	1.19 – 1.93	0.001
Fever (temp > 38 °C) in labor	75 (7.1%)	60 (2.9%)	2.53	1.78 – 3.58	<0.001
Labor augmentation	587 (55.2%)	797 (38.7%)	1.95	1.68 – 2.26	<0.001
Labor induction	349 (32.8%)	402 (19.5%)	2.01	1.70 – 2.38	<0.001
Birth weight > 4500 g	51 (4.8%)	57 (2.8%)	1.77	1.20 – 2.60	0.004

Data presented as n (%), odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) BMI body mass index, Hb hemoglobin, IVF/ICSI in vitro fertilization/intra-cytoplasmic sperm injection, HELLP hemolysis, elevated liver enzymes, low platelet count, PROM premature rupture of membranes, PPH postpartum haemorrhage receipt of anticoagulant prescription, and serious toxemia or HELLP condition. Extreme PPH was more probable among ladies with these intrapartum and deliv-ery qualities: instrumental vaginal conveyance, in-labor cesarean conveyance, incited work, work augmenta-tion with oxytocin, fever during work, PROM, and baby birth weight ≥4500 g.

Danger factors freely connected with serious PPH are introduced in Table 3. The most grounded autonomous danger factors were a background marked by extreme PPH (changed chances proportion (aOR) = 8.97; 95% CI: 5.25–15.33), anticoagulant drugs in pregnancy (aOR = 4.78; 95% CI: 2.72–8.41), frailty

Table 3: Multivariable logistic model for severe postpartum haemorrhage

Independent risk factors	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P – value
Previous severe PPH	8.97	5.25 – 15.33	<0.001
Anticoagulant medication	4.79	2.72 – 8.41	<0.001
Anemia (Hb ≤ 9.0 g/dL)	4.27	2.79 – 6.54	<0.001
Severe preeclampsia or HELLP syndrome	3.03	1.74 – 5.27	<0.001
Uterine fibromas	2.71	1.69 – 4.35	<0.001
Multiple pregnancy	2.11	1.39 – 3.22	<0.001
Mode of delivery			
Spontaneous vaginal	Ref.		
Instrumental vaginal	1.5	1.17 – 1.93	0.001
In-labor cesarean	1.95	1.53 – 2.47	<0.001
Elective cesarean	1.66	1.22 – 2.24	0.006
IVF/ICSI	1.88	1.33 – 2.65	<0.001
Fever (>38 °C)	1.88	1.28-2.75	0.001
Labor induction	1.69	1.39 – 2.05	<0.001
Labor augmentation	1.59	1.32 – 1.91	<0.001
Birth weight > 4500 g	1.46	1.01 – 2.12	0.046
Primiparity	1.2	0.99 – 1.44	0.055
Area under ROC curve = 0.7173, Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi2$ = 12.99, p = 0.1122			
PPH postpartum hemorrhage, Hb hemoglobin, HELLP hemolysis, elevated liver enzymes, low platelet count, IVF/ICSI in vitro fertilization/intra-cytoplasmic			

Analyzed in the beginning of pregnancy (aOR = 4.27; 95% CI: 2.79–6.54), serious toxemia or HELLP disorder (aOR = 3.03; 95% CI: 1.74–5.27), uterine fibromas (Or then again = 2.71; 95% CI: 1.69–4.35), and different preg-nancy (aOR = 2.11; 95% CI: 1.39–3.22). The H-L great ness-of-fit test was non-critical (chi-square = 12.99, P = 0.1122), showing good model fit. The region under the ROC bend was 0.7173, demonstrating an adequate dis-criminatory ability.

At long last, we played out an extra affectability investigation where the result was restricted to an expected postpar-tum blood misfortune ≥1500 mL. While considering a similar danger factors, the consequences of the sub-investigation didn't change our decisions (Appendix: Table 4). Integrity of-attack of the model was demonstrated by a non-huge H-L test ($\chi2$ = 8.77, p = 0.3618), and a fringe discrim-inatory capacity (territory under the ROC bend = 0.6927).

Discussion

For this situation control study, we assessed hazard factors for extreme PPH. A past filled with serious PPH was the most grounded autonomous danger factor in our investigation. Our discoveries sug-gest that ladies with expanded danger of extreme PPH can be recognized when antepartum and intrapartum factors are thought of. Besides, held placental tissue was a significantly more continuous reason for serious PPH than recently revealed.

Strengths and limitations

The fundamental strength of this case-control study was the nature of the information source. By exploring clinical records, we had the option to assess potential danger factors for serious PPH utilizing a wide choice of clinical factors which may not be effectively recovered from libraries. Also, perusing the clinical records empowered us to introduce accur-ate data on the reasons for extreme

PPH and espe-cially on the pace of held placental tissue (counting unusual placentation) in the cases. We needed information on ladies with suspected anomalous placentation before conveyance as there was little mindfulness around pre- conveyance determination of anomalous placentation in Norway during the examination time frame. Unusual placentation could in this way not be incorporated as a danger factor for serious PPH in our model.

Evaluating hazard factors by and large is an impediment in this examination. To limit choice inclination, we chose all instances of serious PPH and an arbitrary example of controls from a similar source populace. There is a likelihood that a few cases were misclassified. Blood misfortune was assessed outwardly in the three emergency clinics remembered for our investigation, and the blood misfortune may have been underesti-mated (23, 24). Nonetheless, we had further information in clinical records to survey the seriousness of the drain by need for blood bonding. There is a chance of informa-tion predisposition because of misclassification of the openings. How-ever, neither the inhabitant obstetrician nor birthing specialist knew about our examination questions, hence the potential for misclassification of danger elements would be non-differential making an inclination toward the invalid (20). The example size gave satisfactory ability to feature hazard factors gently connected with extreme PPH, for example, baby birth weight. Notwithstanding, we didn't represent various testing in the force examination and the littlest noticeable chances proportions may have been disparaged.

We put together our outcomes with respect to conveyances in three emergency clinics in or near Oslo, Norway, and our outcomes may not really be generalizable to other conveyance populaces in well-resourced nations. Most of the ladies in this examination had European, USA, or Oceanian identity, and was non-hefty and hitched. These qualities mirror a general public with a low extent of ladies with low socioeco-nomic status and less migrants contrasted with other well-resourced nations. Besides, the medical clinics chiefly mirror a metropolitan setting, yet metropolitan rustic contrasts in Norway are little and home births are a special case.

18% of the variety in PPH obligation might be clarified by maternal hereditary elements. Modifications in maternal hemostasis and oxytocin motioning at the myometrial level were proposed as potential pathways for a maternal hereditary inclination to PPH.

A near five-overlay expanded danger of extreme PPH was found in ladies utilizing anticoagulant drugs in pregnancy. The obstetric rules in Norway suggest halting anticoagulants at the beginning of work or 12 h before an arranged cesarean conveyance. Our finding is in line those from a Swedish report (30). In this investigation, the danger of PPH was expanded three-overlap for ladies utilizing anticoagulants in pregnancy. Different investigations, nonetheless, have not discovered any fundamentally expanded danger of serious PPH related with the utilization of anticoagulant drugs (31, 32). Contrasts in anticoagulant drug regimens may clarify why this affiliation has not been reliably appeared across these investigations. Of note, in our examinations, we didn't represent drug dosing or the time stretch between last anticoagu-lant portion and PPH beginning. Obstetric mediations, for example, growth and enlistment of work, instrumental vaginal conveyance, and cesarean conveyance, were all fundamentally connected with extreme PPH. A potential for hazard decrease is likely if the utilization of these mediations are restricted to circumstances where existing proof backings their protected use. In accordance with past examinations, contrasted and unconstrained vaginal conveyance, the chances of extreme PPH were higher among ladies going through either in the process of giving birth or arranged cesarean conveyance (1, 33). Past investigations have indicated clashing outcomes (1, 34–36) on whether work growth is a danger factor autonomous of enlistment. Oxytocin receptor desensitization may clarify why work expansion with oxytocin is related with uterine atony prompting PPH (37–39). The relationship between oxytocin administrator istration and PPH has been accounted for to be portion related and proof based rules are expected to decide ideal oxytocin regimens for work increase to decrease the danger of atonic PPH (34).

We found that an IVF or ICSI pregnancy was an inde-swinging danger factor for extreme PPH. This affiliation has been inadequately portrayed, and past investigations noticing a relationship between helped regenerative innovation and serious PPH are from review barrenness partners (40–42). Occasions around the implantation of the placenta, for example, low arrangement of the undeveloped organism into the uterus and endometrial capacity unsettling influences, could assume a part here. As the utilization of helped regenerative innovation is increas-ing, more examination to research the expected relationship among IVF and ICSI pregnancies and PPH is justified.

Frequency and causes of severe PPH

In our examination, the recurrence of serious PPH was 2.5%. A populace based examination from Norway utilizing the NorwegianBirth Registry (18), announced an extreme PPH pace of 1.1%. The distinction can be disclosed by an inclination to underreport instances of extreme PPH to the birth vaults. An approval concentrate from Australia (43) indicated an underreporting of obstetric discharge with an affectability of just 74% in populace based vault contemplates.

In an examination analyzing hazard variables and results of enormous blood bondings during conveyance (44), strange placentation was accounted for to be the most well-known reason (26.6%). A similar report detailed that a lopsided number of ladies who got a gigantic blood transfu-sion experienced serious maternal grimness, representing why unusual placentation is turning into a significant worry in obstetrics. In our investigation, we recognized placental issues (held placenta, held placental tissue and strange placentation) as the reason for extreme PPH in almost 36% of cases. Anomalous placentation was analyzed post-conveyance in 4.4% of cases. Furthermore, strange placentation may have been available for certain cases analyzed as held placenta as pathology reports are not accessible for most of these cases. Held placental tissue, including strange placentation, has been assessed to cause around 10% of all PPHs (8, 24). Our discoveries recommend that held placental tissue might be a more unmistakable reason for serious PPH than recently detailed. Bogus report-ing of cases brought about by held placental tissue as atonic seeping in libraries could clarify this disparity. In an approval study analyzing the commitment of uterine atony to PPH (28), the frequency of uterine atony was over-assessed by 10% when vault information were contrasted and clinical information. Admittance to itemized clinical data en-abled us to precisely gauge the extent of cases with placental issues in our populace. We accept the high pace of placental issues uncovered in the current examination could mirror an expanding pace of placental issues.

Conclusion

In this examination, the most grounded hazard factors for extreme PPH was a past filled with serious PPH, anticoagulant medicine, weakness, extreme toxemia or HELLP disorder, uterine fibromas, and numerous pregnancy. Counting these danger factors in clinical rules could assist with distinguishing ladies with high danger of extreme PPH before conveyance. By recognizing these ladies, sufficient assets and staff could be assembled in anticipation of extreme seeping at the hour of conveyance. A few of the distinguished danger factors in our investigation were identified with clinical and obstetric interven-tions, for example, anticoagulant drug, helped reproduct-ive advancements, work enlistment, and work enlargement with oxytocin. Further examinations are expected to better under-stand the danger advantage profile of every mediation on maternal results. Danger factors distinguished in our investigation could be considered in future examinations analyzing hazard forecast models for extreme PPH.

References

1. Waterstone M, Bewley S, Wolfe C. Incidence and predictors of severe obstetric morbidity: case-control study. BMJ. 2001;322:1089–93.
2. Zhang WH, Alexander S, Bouvier-Colle MH, Macfarlane A, Group M-B. Incidence of severe pre-eclampsia, postpartum haemorrhage and sepsis as a surrogate marker for severe maternal morbidity in a European population- based study: the MOMS-B survey. BJOG. 2005;112:89–96.
3. Mantel GD, Buchmann E, Rees H, Pattinson RC. Severe acute maternal morbidity: a pilot study of a definition for a near-miss. BJOG. 1998;105:985–90.
4. Brace V, Penney G, Hall M. Quantifying severe maternal morbidity: a Scottish population study. BJOG. 2004;111:481–4.
5. Knight M, Callaghan WM, Berg C, Alexander S, Bouvier-Colle MH, Ford JB, et al. Trends in postpartum hemorrhage in high resource countries:
6. a review and recommendations from the international postpartum hemorrhage collaborative group. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2009;9:55.
7. Bateman BT, Berman MF, Riley LE, Leffert LR. The epidemiology of postpartum hemorrhage in a large, nationwide sample of deliveries. Anesth Analg. 2010;110:1368–73.
8. Kramer MS, Dahhou M, Vallerand D, Liston R, Joseph KS. Risk factors for postpartum hemorrhage: can we explain the recent temporal increase? J Obstet Gynaec Can. 2011;33:810–9.
9. Kramer MS, Berg C, Abenhaim H, Dahhou M, Rouleau J, Mehrabadi A, et al. Incidence, risk factors, and temporal trends in severe postpartum hemorrhage. Am J Obst Gynecol. 2013;209:449.e1–7.
10. Ford JB, Roberts CL, Simpson JM, Vaughan J, Cameron CA. Increased postpartum hemorrhage rates in Australia. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2007;98:237–43.
11. Callaghan WM, Kuklina EV, Berg CJ. Trends in postpartum hemorrhage: United States, 1994–2006. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2010;202:353. e1-6.
12. Joseph KS, Rouleau J, Kramer MS, Young DC, Liston RM, Baskett TF, et al. Investigation of an increase in postpartum haemorrhage in Canada. BJOG. 2007;114:751–9.
13. Blomberg M. Maternal obesity and risk of postpartum hemorrhage. Obstet Gynecol. 2011;118:561–8.
14. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. ACOG practice bulletin: clinical management guidelines for obstetrician-gynecologists number 76, October 2006: postpartum hemorrhage. Obstet Gynecol. 2006;108:1039–47.
15. Akins S. Postpartum hemorrhage. A 90s approach to an age-old problem. J Nurse Midwifery. 1994;39 Suppl 2:123S–34S.
16. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Practice bulletin No. 173: fetal macrosomia. Obstet Gynecol. 2016;128:e195–209.

17. World Health Organization. Definition of WHO regions. Available from: http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/definition_regions/ en/. Accessed 10 Apr 2016.
18. Norwegian Institute of Public Health. The Medical Birth Registry of Norway. Available from: https://www.fhi.no. Accessed 10 Apr 2016.
19. Al-Zirqi I, Vangen S, Forsen L, Stray-Pedersen B. Prevalence and risk factors of severe obstetric haemorrhage. BJOG. 2008;115:1265–72.
20. Abdelnoor M, Sandven I. Explanatory versus prognostic strategy in clinical research. Nor Epidemiol. 2006;16:77–80.
21. Kleinbaum DG, Kupper LL, Morgenstern H. Principles and quantitative methods. Epidemiologic research. New York: Wiley; 1982.
22. Kleinbaum DG, Klein M. Logistic regression. A self-learning text. 3 ed. New York: Springer; 2010.
23. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. PLoS Med. 2007;4:e296.
24. Glover P. Blood loss at delivery: how accurate is your estimation? Austr J Midwifery. 2003;16:21–4.
25. Coker A, Oliver R. Definitions and classifications. In: B-Lynch C, Keith L, Lalonde A, Karoshi M, editors. A textbook of postpartum hemorrhage. 1 ed. Duncow: Sapiens Publishing; 2006.
26. Magann EF, Evans S, Hutchinson M, Collins R, Howard BC, Morrison JC. Postpartum hemorrhage after vaginal birth: an analysis of risk factors. South Medical J. 2005;98:419–22.
27. Ford JB, Roberts CL, Bell JC, Algert CS, Morris JM. Postpartum haemorrhage occurrence and recurrence: a population-based study. Med J Austr. 2007;187:391–3.
28. Oberg AS, Hernandez-Diaz S, Palmsten K, Almqvist C, Bateman BT. Patterns of recurrence of postpartum hemorrhage in a large population-based cohort. Am J Obst Gynecol. 2014;210:229. e1-8.
29. Ford JB, Algert CS, Kok C, Choy MA, Roberts CL. Hospital data reporting on postpartum hemorrhage: under-estimates recurrence and over-estimates the contribution of uterine atony. Matern Child Health J. 2012;16:1542–8.
30. Oberg AS, Hernandez-Diaz S, Frisell T, Greene MF, Almqvist C, Bateman BT. Genetic contribution to postpartum haemorrhage in Swedish population: cohort study of 466,686 births. BMJ Open. 2014;349:g4984.
31. Lindqvist PG, Bremme K, Hellgren M, Hem-ARG. Efficacy of obstetric thromboprophylaxis and long-term risk of recurrence of venous thromboembolism. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2011;90:648–53.
32. Roshani S, Cohn DM, Stehouwer AC, Wolf H, van der Post JA, Buller HR, et al. Incidence of postpartum haemorrhage in women receiving therapeutic doses of low-molecular-weight heparin: results of a retrospective cohort study. BMJ Open. 2011;1:e000257.
33. Knol HM, Schultinge L, Veeger NJ, Kluin-Nelemans HC, Erwich JJ, Meijer K. The risk of postpartum hemorrhage in women using high dose of low-molecular-weight heparins during pregnancy. Thromb Res. 2012;130:334–8.
34. Al-Zirqi I, Vangen S, Forsen L, Stray-Pedersen B. Effects of onset of labor and mode of delivery on severe postpartum hemorrhage. Am J Obst Gynecol. 2009;201:273. e1-9.
35. Belghiti J, Kayem G, Dupont C, Rudigoz RC, Bouvier-Colle MH, Deneux-
36. Tharaux C. Oxytocin during labour and risk of severe postpartum
37. haemorrhage: a population-based, cohort-nested case–control study. BMJ Open. 2011;1:e000514.
38. Sheiner E, Sarid L, Levy A, Seidman DS, Hallak M. Obstetric risk factors and outcome of pregnancies complicated with early postpartum hemorrhage: a population-based study. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2005;18:149–54.
39. Khireddine I, Le Ray C, Dupont C, Rudigoz RC, Bouvier-Colle MH, Deneux- Tharaux C. Induction of labor and risk of postpartum hemorrhage in low risk parturients. PLoS One. 2013;8:e54858.
40. Phaneuf S, Asboth G, Carrasco MP, Europe-Finner GN, Saji F, Kimura T, et al. The desensitization of oxytocin receptors in human myometrial cells is accompanied by down-regulation of oxytocin receptor messenger RNA.J Endocrinol. 1997;154:7–18.
41. Phaneuf S, Rodriguez Linares B, TambyRaja RL, MacKenzie IZ, Lopez BA. Loss of myometrial oxytocin receptors during oxytocin-induced and oxytocin-augmented labour. J Reprod Fertil. 2000;120:91–7.
42. Magalhaes JK, Carvalho JC, Parkes RK, Kingdom J, Li Y, Balki M. Oxytocin pretreatment decreases oxytocin-induced myometrial contractions in pregnant rats in a concentration-dependent but not time-dependent manner. Reprod Sci. 2009;16:501–8.
43. Healy DL, Breheny S, Halliday J, Jaques A, Rushford D, Garrett C, et al. Prevalence and risk factors for obstetric haemorrhage in 6730 singleton births after assisted reproductive technology in Victoria Australia. Hum Reprod. 2010;25:265–74.
44. Kallen B, Finnstrom O, Nygren KG, Otterblad Olausson P, Wennerholm UB. In vitro fertilisation in Sweden:

obstetric characteristics, maternal morbidity and mortality. BJOG. 2005;112:1529–35.

45. Hayashi M, Nakai A, Satoh S, Matsuda Y. Adverse obstetric and perinatal outcomes of singleton pregnancies may be related to maternal factors associated with infertility rather than the type of assisted reproductive technology procedure used. Fertil Steril. 2012;98:922–8.
46. Lain SJ, Roberts CL, Hadfield RM, Bell JC, Morris JM. How accurate is the reporting of obstetric haemorrhage in hospital discharge data? A validation study. Aust NZ J Obstet Gynaecol. 2008;48(5):481–4.
47. Mhyre JM, Shilkrut A, Kuklina EV, Callaghan WM, Creanga AA, Kaminsky S, et al. Massive blood transfusion during hospitalization for delivery in New York state, 1998–2007. Obstet Gynecol. 2013;122:1288–94.