# "PREDICTION OF PRETERM LABOUR BY ESTIMATING THE CERVICAL LENGTH AT MID-GESTATION BY TRANSVAGINAL SONOGRAPHY IN TWIN PREGNANCIES"

Dissertation submitted to

# The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University

in partial fulfilment for the award of the Degree of

# M.D. (OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY) BRANCH-II



THE TAMIL NADU Dr.M.G.R.MEDICAL UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL OBSTETRICS, GOVT KASTURBA GANDHI HOSPITAL, MADRAS MEDICAL COLLEGE & HOSPITAL. MARCH 2012

## **BONAFIDE CERTIFICATE**

This is to certify that this dissertation entitled "**PREDICTION OF PRETERM LABOUR BY ESTIMATING THE CERVICAL LENGTH AT MID-GESTATION BY TRANSVAGINAL SONOGRAPHY IN TWIN PREGNANCIES**" is the bonafide work done by Dr. DEEPA LAKSHMI.M., post graduate in obstetrics and gynaecology under my over all supervision and guidance in the Institute of Social Obstetrics, Kasturba Gandhi Hospital, Madras medical college Chennai, in partial fulfillment of the requirements of The Tamil Nadu Dr.M.G.R.University for the award of M.D DEGREE in Obstetrics and Gynaecology BRANCH - II.

**Prof. Dr. P.M. GOPINATH, M.D., D.G.O** Director and Superintendent Institute of Social Obstetrics, Kasturba Gandhi Hospital, Madras Medical College, Chennai - 600005, **Dr.KANAGASABAI M.D,** Dean Madras Medical College, Chennai- 600003,

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I gratefully acknowledge and sincerely thank **Dr.KANAGASABAI, M.D.**, Dean, Madras Medical College and Research Institute, Chennai and **Dr.P.M.GOPINATH, M.D., D.G.O.,** Director and Superintendent, Institute of Social Obstetrics, Kasturba Gandhi hospital, Triplicane for granting me permission to utilize the facilities of the Institute for my study.

I am extremely grateful to our Director and Superintendent Professor and Head of the Department, **Dr. P.M. GOPINATH, M.D., D.G.O.,** of the Institute of Social Obstetrics Government Kasturba Gandhi hospital, Triplicane, Chennai for his guidance and encouragement given in fulfilling my work.

I thank all former Directors of Institute of Social Obstetrics, Kasturba Gandhi hospital, **Dr.M.MOHANAMBAL**, **M.D.**, **D.G.O and Dr. ISAAC ABRAHAM, M.D.**, **D.G.O.**, **Prof.**(**Retd**) for their valuable guidance.

I thank **Prof.DR.RAMANI RAJENDRAN M.D., D.G.O.,** Institute of Social Obstetrics Kasturba Gandhi hospital, Chennai for her valuable support. I am extremely grateful for her valuable guidance to undertake this study. I am greatly indebted for her extreme co-operation and her motivation in this study.

My sincere thanks to Dr. R. THANARAJ D.M.R.D., for his excellent guidance and valuable suggestions which tremendously helped me in this assignment.

I am immensely happy to thank all my Assistant Professor for their invaluable support and expert guidance during this study.

I am very grateful to all the Patients who took part in this study without whom this study could not have been completed.

# CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled "PREDICTION OF PRETERM LABOUR BY ESTIMATING THE CERVICAL LENGTH AT MID-GESTATION BY TRANSVAGINAL SONOGRAPHY IN TWIN PREGNANCIES" is a bonafide work done by **Dr. DEEPA LAKSHMI.M.** at **Madras Medical College, Chennai.** This dissertation is submitted to Tamilnadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University in partial fulfillment of University rules and regulations for the award of M.D. degree in Obstetrics and Gynaecology.

#### INSTITUTIONAL ETHICAL COMMITTEE MADRAS MEDICAL COLLEGE, CHENNAI -3

Telephone No: 04425305301 Fax : 044 25363970

#### CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

To Dr. Deepa Lashmi .M PG in MD Obstetric & Gynaecology KGH / Madras Medical College Chennai -3.

Dear Dr. Deepa Lakshmi .M

The Institutional Ethical Committee of Madras Medical College reviewed and discussed your application for approval of the project / proposal / clinical trail entitled "Prediction of Spontaneous Preterm Delivery in Twin pregnancies By Cervical Length at Mid – Gestation by transvaginal sonogram" "No 62082010.

The following members of Ethical committee were present in the meeting held on 24.08.2010 conducted at Madras Medical College, Chennai -3.

| 1. | Prof. S.K. Rajan, MD                                |      | Chairperson      |
|----|---|------|------------------|
| 2. | Prof. J. Mohanasundaram, MD, Ph.D, DNB              | 2720 | Deputy Chairman  |
|    | Dean, Madras Medical College, Chennai -3            |      |                  |
| 3. | Prof. A. Sundaram, MD                               |      | Member Secretary |
|    | Vice Principal , MMC, Chennai -3                    |      |                  |
| 4. | Prof R. Nandhini, MD                                |      | Member           |
|    | Director, institute of Pharmacology, MMC, Ch-3      |      |                  |
| 5. | Prof. C. Rajendiran , MD                            |      | Member           |
|    | Director, Institute of Internal Medicine, MMC, Ch-3 |      | Member           |
| 6. | Prof. Md. Ali, MD, DM                               |      | Member           |
|    | Professor & Head ,,Dept. of MGE, MMC, Ch-3          |      | Member           |
| 7  | Prof. Shantha Ravishankar, MD                       |      |                  |
|    | Professor of Neuro Pathology, MMC, Ch-3             |      | Member           |
| 8. | Tmt. Arnold Soulina                                 |      | Social Scientist |

We approve the trail to be conducted in its presented form.

Sd /. Chairman & Other Members

The Institutional Ethics Committee expects to be informed about the progress of the study, any SAE occurring in the course of the study, any changes in the protocol and patient information / informed consent and asks to be provided a copy of the final report

Member Secretary, Ethics Committee

# CONTENTS

| S. NO. | Title                 | Page No. |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|
| 1.     | INTRODUCTION          | 1        |
| 2.     | AIM OF THE STUDY      | 3        |
| 3.     | OVERVIEW              | 4        |
| 4.     | REVIEW OF LITERATURE  | 27       |
| 5.     | MATERIALS AND METHODS | 36       |
| 6.     | ANALYSIS OF RESULTS   | 40       |
| 7.     | SUMMARY               | 67       |
| 8.     | CONCLUSION            | 72       |
| 9.     | BIBLIOGRAPHY          | 75       |
| 10.    | PROFORMA              | 82       |
| 11.    | MASTER CHART          | 85       |

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Preterm birth is a major public health problem in terms of perinatal mortality, long term morbidity and health economics. It is the leading cause of perinatal morbidity in India. It is responsible for more than half of all neonatal deaths. The economic burden of prematurity relates not only to initial neonatal intensive care but also to the longer term, increased use of medical, social and specialist educational services, as well as the lost economic productivity.

Despite advancing knowledge of the risk factors and mechanism associated with preterm labour and delivery, the preterm birth rate has risen. This increase has been explained in part by a rise in the number of preterm delivery of multiple pregnancies that occurred as a result of assisted reproductive technologies.

Overall, twin pregnancies comprise 15% of all preterm births accounting for a disproportionate share of preterm births. Therefore, there is an urgent need to develop cost-effective tests for the prediction of preterm birth in twin pregnancies. The ability to identify women at high risk for spontaneous preterm birth could allow for patients to undergo targeted interventions such as transfer to a tertiary care centre, antenatal corticosteroid administration and tocolysis, which might improve perinatal outcomes among twins. Previous reviews have suggested that transvaginal sonographic assessment of cervical length is an effective tool for predicting preterm birth, particularly in asymptomatic women or those at a higher risk of spontaneous preterm birth.

Preterm birth is defined as the onset of labour in patients before 37 weeks in pregnancy beyond 20 weeks of gestation. Preterm birth is associated with 80% of perinatal morbidity and 70% mortality, for infants born without congenital anomalies. About 66% of preterm birth occurs due to preterm labour and 10% results from preterm prelabour rupture of membranes. The remaining 24% are due to medical or obstetric complications. The incidence of preterm labour in twin gestation is 54.9%.

# 2. AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of our study is to evaluate the co-relation of the cervical length measured by transvaginal sonography at 20-24 weeks of gestation in twin pregnancies and to follow them up until delivery to assess role of cervical length as a predictor of preterm labour.

### **3. OVERVIEW**

### **ANATOMY OF CERVIX**

The word 'cervix' is derived from the Latin word 'cervix uteri', meaning 'neck of the womb'. It is the lower narrow and cylindrical portion of the uterus, which enters the vagina and at the right angles to it. The ectocervix is the portion projecting into the vagina also knows as 'portiovaginalis', is convex and elliptical. It measures 3 cm long and 2.5 cm wide. Its opening is called the external os. The size and shape of external os and ectocervix varies with age, hormonal state, and whether the woman has had a vaginal birth.

The endocervical canal is the passage way between the internal os and the uterine cavity. It varies in length and width. Approximately measures 7 to 8 mm at its widest in reproductive aged women.

The internal os is the termination of the endocervical canal inside the uterine cavity.

### **HISTOLOGY OF THE CERVIX**

The ectocervix is composed of keratinized squamous epithelium. The endocervix is composed of simple columnar epithelium<sup>1</sup>. The area adjacent to the border of the endocervix and ectocervix is known as the transformation zone. The transformation zone undergoes metaplasia when the endocervix is exposed to vagina, pregnancy and also when the ectocervix enters the uterine cavity. Nabothian cysts<sup>2</sup> are often found in the cervix.

### PHYSIOLOGICAL CHANGES OF CERVIX IN PREGNANCY

During the first trimester, the isthmus hypertrophies and elongates to about 3 times its original length. With advancing pregnancy beyond 12 weeks, it progressively unfolds from above, downwards until it is incorporated into the uterine cavity.

### **DEFINITION**

Preterm labour is defined as the onset of regular, painful, frequent, uterine contractions causing progressive effacement and dilatation of cervix occurring before 37 completed weeks of gestation from the first day of last menstrual period<sup>3</sup>.

### **INCIDENCE**

The incidence of preterm labour in developed countries is between 5% to 10%.

# **AETIOLOGY AND RISK FACTORS<sup>4</sup>**

In 20 to 40% of cases, there is no identifiable cause i.e., idiopathic.

It is called spontaneous preterm labour (Subclinical infection may be the cause in some of these cases).

In nearly half of these patients there are 2 or more causes suggestive of multi factorial origin of the disorder.

Various risk factors associated with preterm labour are as follows:

| Age                     | : | <18 yrs and >40 yrs. Lumley et al., 1993    |  |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|
|                         |   | reported high incidence of preterm delivery |  |
|                         |   | in women under 20 years and over 35 years.  |  |
| Race <sup>5</sup>       | : | Nonwhite in USA.                            |  |
| Socio Economic status : |   | Low socioeconomic status.                   |  |
| Education               | : | Low education.                              |  |
| Small stature           | : | Height< 145 cm.                             |  |
| Weight                  | : | Underweight. Hickey and colleagues, 1995    |  |
|                         |   | have shown low maternal prenatal weight     |  |
|                         |   | gain specifically associated with preterm   |  |
|                         |   | birth.                                      |  |

## A. Demographic risk factors:

### **B.** Behavioral factors:

Smoking<sup>6</sup>, tobacco chewing,

Mental stress<sup>7</sup>

Substance abuse- alcohol, cocaine- Bakketing and Hoffman (1981)

reported higher incidence of preterm labour.

Poor nutrition,

Excessive physical activity,

Coitus in last trimester<sup>8</sup>.

### C. Obstetric risk factors:

Past history- h/o preterm labour (16-41%), second trimester abortion, h/o recurrent abortion, difficult delivery (cervical trauma).

Over distension of uterus- multiple pregnancy<sup>9</sup>, Hydramnios,

Fetal causes - IUFD, fetal anomalies, malpresentation, Rh

isoimmunization.

Congenital uterine anomalies (1-3%) - septate uterus, unicornuate,

bicornuate, cervical incompetence,

Premature rupture of membranes,

Grand multipara,

APH, vaginal bleeding in early pregnancy.

### **D. Medical causes:**

Anemia, liver disease, asthma, PIH, renal disease, tuberculosis, cardiac disease, diabetes, hyperthyroidism, hyperpyrexia, malaria.

# **E.** Infections<sup>10</sup>:

Chorioamnionitis<sup>11</sup> (20-30%) Bobitt and Ledger first suggested that unrecognized Chorioamnionitis may be related to preterm labour. Colonization with Chlamydia trachomatis (Martin et al., Harrison et al.,) <sup>12</sup> Mycoplasma hominis (Klein et al., Harrison et al.,) <sup>13</sup> Ureaplasma urealyticum, Gonorrhea (Edward et al.,) <sup>14</sup> are associated with preterm labour.

Asymptomatic bacteriuria,

Acute appendicitis,

Bacterial vaginosis,<sup>15</sup>

Gastroenteritis,

Intrauterine infection by viruses, bacteria, Chlamydia, protozoa.

### F. Iatrogenic:

Elective premature induction due to fetal or maternal indication, Induction with wrong estimation of gestational age.

### G. Miscellaneous:

Abdominal surgery during pregnancy, severe trauma,

Drugs e.g. quinine.

### PATHOGENESIS

All the above factors initiate a cascade of mechanism, by increasing the cortisol levels. Cox and colleagues<sup>16</sup> (1992) found that cytokines<sup>17</sup> (IL-1, IL-6 and IL-8, TNF $\alpha$ ) are released when there is inflammatory response to infection. Twin pregnancies mainly contribute by increasing mechanical stretch, IL-8, gap junction and Prostaglandin synthetase<sup>18</sup>. These act on chorion, amnion and deciduas to release inflammatory mediators like PGE, PGF2 $\alpha$ , TXA2, proteases, collagenases, leucocyte elastase and decreases the PG deydrogenase ultimately resulting in myometrial contractions, cervical ripening and preterm labour. The role of oxytocin and prostaglandin is still unclear<sup>19</sup>.

#### **PREDICTORS OF PRETERM BIRTH:**

# A. WARNING SIGNALS<sup>20</sup>:

Menstrual like cramps,

Low dull backache,

Abdominal cramps,

Feeling of pelvic pressure or heaviness in the vagina,

Increase/change in vaginal discharge: glairy mucoid.

# **B.TRANSVAGINAL SONOGRAPHY<sup>21</sup>**

The patients in whom cervical length < 2.5 cm funneling or widening of cervical canal, (Y, V, U shape), bulging of membranes in cervical canal and thinning of lower uterine segment are noted; they are high risk for preterm labour. Leveno<sup>22</sup> and associates found that one fourth of women whose cervices were dilated 2-3 cms between 26 and 30 weeks delivered before 34 weeks.

This study analyses the value of transvaginal sonographic cervical length for the prediction of spontaneous preterm birth in women with twin pregnancies through the use of formal methods for systematic reviews and Meta analytical technique.

The application of transvaginal sonography for cervical length has emerged as a recommendation by the American college of Radiology, that the cervix and lower uterine segment be imaged as part of every obstetric examination in the second trimester.

#### **C.BIOCHEMICAL MARKERS:**

### **1. Fetal fibronectin**<sup>23</sup>:

It is a glycoprotein produced in 20 different molecular forms by hepatocytes, fibroblast, endothelial cells, and fetal amnion. It is concentrated in amniotic fluid and the extra villous tropho decidual interface. The substance is expressed in cervicovaginal secretions during the first 20 weeks of pregnancy, disappears from the secretions after this period and does not normally reappear until spontaneous rupture of membranes at term. Fetal fibronectin value of >50 ng/ml estimated by ELISA is considered as a positive predictor of preterm labour. Lockwood (1991) and co-workers reported that the presence of fetal fibronectin as a predictor of preterm delivery before 37 weeks had a sensitivity of 92.6%, and a specificity of 51.7%, a positive predictive value of 46.3% and a negative predictive value of 93.9%.

#### 2. Salivary estriol:

A value of more than 2.3 ng/ml predicts preterm labour.

- 3. Phosphorylated insulin like growth factor binding protein-1.
- 4. Serum Collagenases.
- 5. Tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinase (TIMP).
- 6. Relaxin.
- 7. Corticotrophin releasing hormone (CRH).
- 8. Mediators of inflammation and infection.
- a) C-Reactive Protein<sup>24</sup>.
- b) Leucocyte esterase.
- c) Cytokine.
- d) Amniotic fluid glucose concentration.
- e) Zinc.
- f) Lipocortin 1.
- g) Positive cultures.

# **D.HOME UTERINE ACTIVITY MONITORING<sup>25</sup>:**

Contractions are recorded by telemetry twice a day. It is costly and not easily available equipment. However it is not useful reducing the incidence of preterm labour.

### **E.FOETAL BREATHING MOVEMENT:**

Absence of fetal breathing movements detected on real time ultra sonogram suggests that patients are likely to go in preterm labour within 48 hours.

# F.RISK SCORING SYSTEM<sup>26</sup>:

Papiernick (1974) evolved an elaborate scoring system for detection of patient's high risk for spontaneous preterm labour. It was modified by Creasy et al. It is based on socioeconomic factors, previous medical history, daily habits and some aspects of current pregnancy. Score of 10 or more are considered to be at high risk for preterm labour.

### **ACOG CRITERIA:**

ACOG (1997) criteria to diagnose preterm labour:

Contractions of 4 in 20 minutes or 8 in 60 minutes with progressive change in the cervix,

Cervical dilatation more than or equal to 1 cm,

Cervical effacement more than or equal to 80%

### **PREVENTION OF PRETERM BIRTH:**

- 1. Improvement of socioeconomic condition.
- 2. Patient education- prepregnancy counseling particularly in high risk patients (regarding warning signals).
- Identification and correction of risk factor whenever possible-1.
  Proper nutrition, 2. Avoidance of smoking, alcohol, 3. Adequate rest-avoidance of physical and mental stress, 4. Control of medical diseases, 5.cervical encirclage in proved case of cervical incompetence.
- 4. Any operation in pregnant woman is planned during second trimester if possible.
- 5. Proper assessment before induction of labour to avoid iatrogenic prematurity.
- 6. Treatment of vaginal and cervical infections and asymptomatic bacteriuria during pregnancy should be adequately done. Bacterial vaginosis increases the risk of preterm labour.
- Coitus late in pregnancy should be avoided. Seminal prostaglandin and female orgasm increases uterine contractions. Also there is increased risk of amniotic fluid infection.

- 8. Prophylactic tocolysis, even though commonly practiced, is not indicated.
- **9.** Cervical Encerclage<sup>27</sup>- A short cervix diagnosed by ultrasound in asymptomatic women may be an indication for cerclage. The role of cervical cerclage for the prevention of preterm delivery is now disputed as cerclage has an inherent risk which actually increases preterm labour by increasing the pericervical inflammation or infection.
- **10.**Progesterone<sup>28</sup> Weekly intramuscular administration to women at high risk for preterm labour resulted in lower rates of preterm birth and perinatal mortality when compared to placebo. The dose used was 250 mg of 17-hydroxy progesterone caproate intramuscularly every week from 20 to 36 weeks.

### **DIAGNOSIS OF PRETERM LABOUR**

- 1. Symptoms of preterm labour.
- 2. Pelvic examination.
- 3. Ultra sonogram<sup>29</sup>.
- 4. Toco cardiographs.

### MANAGEMENT OF PRETERM LABOUR

### **1. Bed rest and hydration**<sup>30</sup>.

### **2.** Steroid<sup>31</sup>.

In 1994, a National Institute of Health Consensus Development Panel recommended corticosteroids for fetal lung maturation in preterm labour. Since then, there has been nearly universal acceptance and implementation of these recommendations.

Recommended regimens includes a single course of two doses of 12 mg of betamethasone given intramuscularly 24 hours apart, or four doses of 6mg of dexamethasone given intramuscularly 12 hours apart.

All pregnant women between 24 and 34 weeks of gestation who are at risk of preterm delivery within 7 days should be considered candidates for antenatal corticosteroids.

Although benefit on neonatal outcome is maximum between 24 hours and 7 days after initiation of therapy, steroids confer significant survival advantages even when delivery occurs within 24 hours. Therefore treatment should not be withheld when delivery is probable within 24 hours.

## 3. Tocolysis<sup>32</sup>.

Tocolytics are the drugs which inhibit uterine activity.

### a. BETA SYMPATHOMIMETICS

Rucker in 1925 noted that small doses of epinephrine inhibited uterine hyperactivity

*I generation:* Isoxsuprine, orciprenaline, Isoprenaline

*II generation:* Ritodrine<sup>33</sup>, Terbutaline<sup>34</sup>, Fenoterol

Unfortunately in terms of clinical effectiveness the inhibition of contractions by  $\beta$  adrenergic agonists is often short lived.

# b. MAGNESIUM SULPHATE<sup>35</sup>

MgSO<sub>4</sub> uncouples the depolarization contraction Coupling (Elliott, 1983)

Therapeutic level for both indications is 4-8 mmol per litre.

### c. PROSTAGLANDIN SYNTHETASE INHIBITORS

Drugs like aspirin, indomethacin<sup>36</sup> are used as an alternative to  $\beta$  agonist to prevent preterm labour in patients with cardiac disease and hyperthyroidism. Not routinely used because of fear of PDA closure and pulmonary hypertension in fetus.

### d. CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS<sup>37</sup>

They are heterogeneous group of organic compounds that inhibit the influx of extracellular calcium across the cell membrane during inward calcium current of action potential. They also inhibit the release of intracellular calcium from the sarcoplasmic reticulum. Thus they reduce the tone of smooth muscles. The commonly used drug Nifedipine is a potent inhibitor of myometrial contractions in non pregnant, pregnant and post partum uterus.

# e. OXYTOCIN ANTAGONIST (ATOSIBAN)<sup>38</sup>

There will be increase in myometrial oxytocin receptors in labour. This analogue competitively blocks the oxytocin receptors and inhibits preterm labour. RCOG guidelines suggest that if tocolytics are administered, the first choice should be oxytocin antagonists or Nifedipine. But compared with other tocolytics atosiban therapy is expensive.

### **EVOLUTION OF SONOGRAPHY**

One of the pioneers of medical use of ultrasound was introduced by the Scottish physician, Ian Donald. His article "Investigation of abdominal masses by Pulsed Ultrasound" was published in "The Lancet" in 1958.

He was an obstetrician with interest in machines and electronics. Along with Tom Brown he invented and constructed the prototype of the first Compound B Mode Contact Scanner. Professor Donald introduced several diagnostic techniques in obstetrics and gynaecology which are till today in use such as the measurement of fetal biparietal diameter.

Today, ultrasound is a sophisticated computer integrated tool. Its use has extended from obstetrics, as in the early days, to image almost every organ system of the body resolving structures down to couple of millimeters in size. Additionally, it has the advantages of involving no ionizing radiation, has no known side effects, is readily available, relatively cheap, non invasive and portable.

### **CERVICAL EXAMINATIONS**

### MANUAL CERVICAL EXAMINATION:

The manual assessment of cervical length is subjective and has poor intraobserver variability (Ann J Obstet gynaecol 1995; 173:942945). The cervix starts to shorten and dilate at the internal cervical os. The main drawback of the examining finger is the inability to evaluate this part of the internal cervical os. Rozenburg et al., have stopped utilizing digital examination on patients with symptoms of preterm labour. Hence the limitations of these subjective evaluations led to the use of sonography as potentially more objective for examination of cervix.

### SONOGRAPHIC CERVICAL EXAMINATION:

The principle of imaging involves a sound wave when strikes an object, it echoes back. By measuring these echo waves, it is possible to determine how for the object is and its size, shape and consistency.

#### Advantages of ultrasound:

- It is noninvasive and painless.
- It is widely available, simple and less expensive than other imaging modalities.
- It does not use any ionizing radiation.
- It is preferred imaging modality for diagnosis and monitoring of pregnant woman and their unborn baby.
- Gives a clear picture of soft tissue that do not inhibit on x- ray.

• Makes a good tool for minimal invasive technique.

#### **Disadvantages of ultrasound:**

- It is not an ideal imaging technique especially when organs are obscured by the bowel.
- Obesity causes poor quality imaging.

### TRANSABDOMINAL ULTRASOUND

The women were asked not to void for 1 to 2 hours prior to examination, but an over distended bladder was not required. The patient is positioned lying on the examination table. A clear water-base gel is applied to the area of the skin to secure contact with the transducer. It also minimizes or removes the air pocket .The scans were performed using 3.5 MHz curvilinear probe.

The uterine cervix is best visualized when the bladder is full because this provides an acoustic window. Visual beam is achieved in 86% patients with a full bladder and is reduced to 46% with partial bladder fullness. An over distended bladder fairly increases the cervical length by compressing the lower segment, in addition it may create false funneling.

### Limitations:

- Over distension of maternal bladder
- The fetal structures which obscures the visualization of the cervix
- The position of the cervix, if retroverted is more difficult
- Maternal habitués like obesity, polyhydramnios and scarred abdomen.





# TRANSLABIAL SONOGRAPHY<sup>39, 40</sup>

Tran labial approach is well tolerated by the patient. Partial bladder fullness assists visualization of the cervix. Kirtzman *et al* showed a good correlation between cervical length measurements obtained using transvaginal& transperineal methods.

### Limitations:

- Technical factors
- Full bladder and fluid in the vaginal vault mistaken for the cervix
- Poor penetration or too small field of view
- Scan angle
- Bowel gas, cervical cysts, pericervical veins.



## **TRANSVAGINAL SONOGRAPHY**<sup>41</sup>

The transvaginal sonogram is performed similar to gynaecologic examination. However it is more comfortable than a manual gynaecologic examination. It is a simple, cost-effective, reproducible and reliable method to assess and predict the risk of preterm delivery.

## Limitations:

- Incomplete or failure to empty the maternal bladder is associated with false measurement.
- Increased pressure on the vaginal probe.
- Any polyp, fibroid, cervical growth, that obscure proper imaging.
- A poorly developed lower uterine segment.







To reduce the intra-observer variability and improve reproducibility of cervical length measurements, the following conditions are suggested

The internal os is often visualized as a flat dimple or an isosceles triangle.

The whole length of the cervix is visualized.

The external os appears symmetric.

The distance from the surface of posterior lip to the cervical canal is equal to the distance from the surface of the anterior lip to the cervical canal.

These conditions when met, ensures visualization of the entire cervix and placement of only minimal pressure on the cervix by the transducer (which may falsely include cervical length and create false funneling. Rust et al., have found that, a funnel is a significant risk for preterm labour, But the study had a small sample size and was retrospective in nature. Additional prospective studies will be required to substantiate it.) Using these guidelines, the intra-observer variability decrease from 3.04 to 1.24mm.

Newer modalities such as 3D ultrasound to calculate the cervical volume and blood flow which also includes, Power Doppler angiography (PD) and The Virtual Organ Computer-aided Analysis (VOCAL)

Bega et al., suggested that 3d ultrasound has a more complete assessment of cervix than 2d ultrasound.

Farrel et al., have shown that application of 3D ultrasound volume estimation of the non pregnant cervix is unreliable and inaccurate. But the results of their study cannot be applied to pregnant cervix.

Horreli et al., studies showed a good correlation between cervical length and cervical volume without difference between normal cervix and short cervix group but could not substantiate the benefit of the volume assessment of cervix as compared to length measurement. However presently, the volume and vascularity assessment of the cervix should be considered experimental.



# **4. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Leitich et al, pointed that mean cervical lengths are shown to differ in different population, consequently, it may be more appropriate to define reference value of cervical length for the appropriate population.

Hetzberge et al using transvaginal ultra sonogram showed that there was increase in cervical length as gestational age increases. The increase in cervical length with increasing gestational age compare favorably with the results of other researchers too.

Beyond the gestational age of 35- 39 weeks, there is decline in the rate of increase in cervical length- Brieger and co authors which showed that cervical length follows a normal distribution.

Lawson explained that in multiparous and also many primiparous of black descent, the fetal head descent is delayed and hence the cervical measurement by transvaginal ultrasonography may be varied.

Klein k and colleagues estimated cervical length in 262 women in twin pregnancies. Their results showed that there was a significant correlation between cervical length 0f <25 mm and spontaneous delivery before 34 weeks (50%vs13%, p=0.007). They concluded that the risk of severe preterm delivery in twins is high. Cervical length at mid-gestation was the only predictor of delivery before 34 weeks; our study also proves the same.

Imseis HM Albert TA, lams JD and colleagues conducted a study in identifying twin gestation at low risk for preterm birth with a transvaginal sonographic cervical measurement at 24 to 26 weeks gestation in 85 women .The mean cervical length those delivered at  $\geq$  34 weeks gestation without intervention (36.4+-5.8 mm) was significantly greater p< 0.0001. Thus women with cervical length >35 mm were identified as low risk for delivery before 34 weeks gestation.

Fuchs and colleagues study by measuring cervical length by transvaginal sonography in 81 women with twin pregnancies presenting with regular and painful uterine contractions at 24 - 36 weeks of gestation .The delivery within 7 days of presentation occurred in pregnancies that was inversely related to cervical length. They concluded that the sonographic measurement of cervical length helped to distinguish those women who deliver within 7 days or not.

Bergelin L.Valentin conducted a study on 20 women with twin pregnancies .The cervical length and width were measured, the internal cervical os was assessed being open or closed, and any dynamic cervical changes were noted with transvaginal sonogram every week from 24 weeks of gestation until delivery. They concluded that pattern of cervical changes from 24 weeks gestation to delivery differ between twin pregnancies delivery pattern (at 32 - 35 weeks) and at term ( $\geq 36$  weeks). In twin pregnancies delivered preterm cervical shortening is more rapid, the cervix does not broaden to the same extent as in twin delivered at term, an open internal cervical os and dynamic cervical changes are seen earlier in gestation.

In a study conducted by J.L Gibson and co-authors which evaluated prospectively the cervical measurement and fetal fibronectin detection as predictor of spontaneous preterm delivery in an unselected population of twin pregnancies. This study confirms the value of transvaginal sonogram accuracy of cervical length as a predictor of preterm delivery in twin pregnancies. However, the poor sensitivity of this test makes it unreliable as a single predictor of preterm delivery.
Fetal fibronectin does not identify twin pregnancies destined to deliver prematurely.

L.Sperling and colleagues published their work on identification of twins at low risk of spontaneous preterm delivery by measuring the cervical length at 23 weeks gestation in 383 twin pregnancies. They recommended that a cut off 25 mm to be taken, as a predictor for spontaneous preterm in twin pregnancies.

The cervical length to predict preterm birth was noted by Anderson et al., The cervical changes in length and width as pregnancy progresses seem to be similar in nulliparous and multiparous women. In twin pregnancies, the cervical length decreases with advancing gestation-Berglin and Valentin et al.,

Conosenti et al., and Cas valho et al., studied unselected pregnant population (that included both singleton and multiple pregnancies), whose results showed cervical length at 11-15 weeks cannot predict preterm delivery and cervical length tends to shorten sometime after 15 weeks of gestation in women who delivered preterm, (because the lower uterine segment may not have developed, a short cervix is difficult to identify at less than 14 weeks. The bladder reflection has generally been considered the boundary between the lower uterine segment and cervix).

Only one systematic review which included 14 studies involving 159 women has evaluated the accuracy of transvaginal sonographic cervical length in predicting spontaneous preterm birth in twin pregnancies- Honest et al.

Gordon et al., study included 125 women with twin pregnancies were randomly assigned to undergo a transvaginal sonographic cervical length measurement and a cervical digital examination every 4 weeks starting at 16-20 weeks until 28 weeks gestation. Women who underwent transvaginal sonographic cervical examination were treated with predetermined with the use of bed rest and cerclage there was no significant difference between the control and test group.

<u>Newman RB</u>, <u>Gill PJ</u>, <u>Katz M</u>s- This study was on prelabour uterine activity was monitored daily in a group of ambulatory outpatients who were delivered at term. The study included 22 patients with one fetus and 18 with twin gestations. The mean weekly frequency of uterine activity during twin gestations was found to be significantly higher throughout pregnancy than that identified during pregnancies with a single fetus. In twin gestations a gradual significant rise in frequency of contractions could be observed with advancing gestational age.

<u>Nathan</u> S. Fox, <u>Andrei Rebarber</u>, <u>Chad</u> K. Klauser, <u>Danielle Peress</u>, <u>Christine V. Gutierrez</u>, <u>Daniel H. Saltzman</u>- This study evaluated the change in cervical length as a predictor of preterm birth in asymptomatic twin pregnancies. It was a historical cohort. The patients in the shortened cervical length group had a significantly higher rate of spontaneous preterm birth <28 weeks, <30 weeks, <32 weeks, and <34 weeks. This study concluded that in twin pregnancies, a cervical length that decreases by 20% over 2 measurements is a significant predictor of very preterm birth, even in the setting of a normal cervical length. Serial cervical length measurements should be considered in twin pregnancies, starting <24 weeks.

Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2000;183:1103–7 . Soriano D, Weisz B, Seidman DS, Chetrit A, Schiff E, Lipitz S, Achiron R- This study included identification of the risk factors for preterm birth in primigravida with twin gestation and the role of transvaginal ultrasonography assessment of the cervix. 54 twin pregnancies were prospectively enrolled. Multiple logistic regression analysis was used to evaluate the association between the length of the cervix at 18-24 weeks of gestation and outcome variables, controlling for possible confounding factors. This study concluded that there was no statistically significant difference between women who delivered before or after 34 weeks of gestation in regard to maternal age, body mass index (BMI), weight gain in pregnancy, smoking and work during pregnancy. The mean cervical length of patients who delivered before 34 weeks of gestation (30.1 +/-6.1 mm) was significantly shorter than that of women who delivered after 34 weeks of gestation (42.2 +/- 6.2 mm; P < 0.001). Cervical length longer than 35 mm predicted delivery.

Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2002; 187:1596–604- This study determined the accuracy of cervical length and funnelling of the internal os in the prediction of the spontaneous very preterm birth of twin pregnancies. For spontaneous delivery before 32 and 35 weeks of gestation, the sensitivity of cervical length < or =30 mm was 46% and 27%, respectively; the specificity was 89% and 90%, respectively. The sensitivity of funnelling was 54% and 33%, and its specificity 89% and 91%, respectively. The study concluded that for spontaneous delivery before 32 and 35 weeks of gestation, the sensitivity of cervical length < or =25 mm was 100% and 54%, respectively, and the specificity was 84% and 87%, respectively. The sensitivity of funnelling was 86% and 54%, and the specificity 78% and 82%, respectively. After multivariate analysis, both indicators remained significant for delivery before 35 weeks of gestation. Funnelling after transfundal pressure at 22 or 27 weeks did not predict very preterm delivery.

<u>Arabin B, Roos C, Kollen B, van Eyck J</u>- This study evaluated whether serial transvaginal sonographic examination of the cervix with the woman in a standing position improves the prediction of spontaneous preterm birth compared with the conventional posture. In 363 pregnancies at risk for spontaneous preterm birth, we determined prospectively CL and funnel width (FW) including differences between the positions and between longitudinal measurements from 15 weeks onwards. The incidence of funnelling was greater in an upright compared with a recumbent maternal position by 12.3% in singleton and 13.1% in twin pregnancies before 25 weeks, and by 13.0% and 21.6% between 25 and 30 weeks, respectively. The study concluded that evaluation of the cervix with the woman in the upright position permits earlier detection of funnelling. This may enable earlier and more appropriate intervention to avoid spontaneous preterm birth.

Several published studies have demonstrated inverse relationship between cervical length and incidence of preterm delivery. In primigravida population, the smaller the cervix, they were more prone to preterm labour. However, in the multiparous women, the internal os dilatation was a more useful predictor. Hence the authors have concluded that the length of the cervix was possibly an indirect indicator of preterm labour.

The process of the changes of the internal os often is better determined well before the recognition of external os changes. The cervical effacement may occur slowly and often precedes clinically evident preterm labour.

## **5. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

It is an observational prospective study conducted in Institute of Social Obstetrics and Government Kasturba Gandhi Hospital, Madras Medical College, Chennai from October 2010 to September 2011.

- This systematic review was conducted following a prospective protocol to determine the correlation between cervical lengths estimated at 20-24 weeks along with period of gestation at delivery in twin pregnancies over a period of 1 year.
- This study group included 115 women who attended our hospital.

### **INCLUSION CRITERIA**

Primigravida with twin pregnancy Multigravida with twin pregnancy Low risk patients Good dates Booked in our hospital Under regular antenatal follow up in our hospital To deliver in our hospital Consent taken for their participation.

## **EXCLUSION CRITERIA**

### Maternal factors

Singleton pregnancies

Pregnancy induced hypertension

Gestational diabetes mellitus

Ante partum hemorrhage

Other maternal illness

Patient in other therapeutic trials

Fetal factors

Fetal congenital anomalies

Intrauterine death

# PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

This included demographic data, obstetric and medical histories, at their first visit to the hospital. Ultrasound findings were recorded in the data base at the time of scan, and the patient were under follow up until delivery.

#### SUBJECT AND METHODS

This was a prospective study in women with twin pregnancy who presented to us at 20-24 weeks scan; women were also offered the option of having transvaginal sonographic assessment of their cervices along with the anomaly scan.

Women were asked to empty their bladder and were placed in dorsal lithotomy position. Transvaginal sonography with 5MHz transducer (2D ultra sonogram unit) was done by sonographer. A protective cover is placed over the transducer, lubricated with a small amount of gel. The probe was placed in the anterior fornix of the vagina and a sagittal view of the cervix, with the ecogenic endocervical mucosa along with the length of the canal was obtained, care was taken to avoid exerting undue pressure on the cervix. The cervix should occupy at least 50% to 75% of the screen. Calipers were used to measure the distance between the triangular area of ecodensity at the external os and the v – shaped notch at the internal os. At least 3 measurements were obtained; the shortest best measurement is recorded. Burger et al., observed an average intra observer difference of 1.24 mm. Rust et al., have found that as a categorical variable (present or absent), a funnel is a significant risk factor for preterm labour.



# 6. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Total number of patients enrolled in the study-115

Number of patients who completed the study -112

Number of patients who were excluded-10

Final list of patients-102

Total number of patients who delivered preterm-21

Incidence of preterm in the study-20.5%

Number of preterm babies who required NICU admission-(25)60%

Number of babies who were born at term required NICU admission-(5)3%

# TABLE-1

|                 |                   |                   | G      | GA Group |        |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|----------|--------|
|                 |                   |                   | 0      | 1        | Total  |
| AgeGroup        | 1                 | Count             | 8      | 3        | 11     |
| $\leq 20$ years |                   | % within GA Group | 9.9%   | 14.3%    | 10.8%  |
|                 |                   | % of Total        | 7.8%   | 2.9%     | 10.8%  |
| 21-25           | 2                 | Count             | 58     | 8        | 66     |
| years           | % within GA Group | 71.6%             | 38.1%  | 64.7%    |        |
|                 |                   | % of Total        | 56.9%  | 7.8%     | 64.7%  |
| 26.20           | 3                 | Count             | 15     | 10       | 25     |
| years           |                   | % within GAGroup  | 18.5%  | 47.6%    | 24.5%  |
|                 | % of Total        | 14.7%             | 9.8%   | 24.5%    |        |
|                 | Total             | Count             | 81     | 21       | 102    |
|                 |                   | % within GAGroup  | 100.0% | 100.0%   | 100.0% |
|                 |                   | % of Total        | 79.4%  | 20.6%    | 100.0% |

Maternal age group relation in preterm labour

| Chi-Square Tests   |                    |    |                       |  |  |
|--------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|--|--|
|                    | Value              | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |  |  |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 8.957 <sup>a</sup> | 2  | <mark>.011</mark>     |  |  |
| Likelihood Ratio   | 8.430              | 2  | .015                  |  |  |
| N of Valid Cases   | 102                |    |                       |  |  |

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.26.



p < 0.011 SIGNIFICANT.

The above table gives the details of maternal age distribution in relation to preterm labour. According to which, out of 21 cases of preterm delivery 10 cases were in the age group of 26-30 years i.e., 47.6% whereas more than 80% of term delivery were in the age group of 21-25 years and only 18.5% of preterm delivery belonged to this group. **Inference:** there is higher incidence of preterm labour in women with advanced maternal age.

## TABLE- 2

# Working group

|         |       |   | Gestational a<br>Group | ige at delivery |        |
|---------|-------|---|------------------------|-----------------|--------|
|         |       |   | 0                      | 1               | Total  |
| Working | 0     | Count   | 18                     | 4               | 22     |
|         |       | % within Gestational age<br>at delivery Group | 22.2%                  | 19.0%           | 21.6%  |
|         |       | % of Total                                    | 17.6%                  | 3.9%            | 21.6%  |
|         | 1     | Count   | 63                     | 17              | 80     |
|         |       | % within Gestational age at delivery Group    | 77.8%                  | 81.0%           | 78.4%  |
|         |       | % of Total                                    | 61.8%                  | 16.7%           | 78.4%  |
|         | Total | Count   | 81                     | 21              | 102    |
|         |       | % within Gestational age at delivery Group    | 100.0%                 | 100.0%          | 100.0% |
|         |       | % of Total                                    | 79.4%                  | 20.6%           | 100.0% |

# **Chi-Square Tests**

|                              | Value             | df | Asymp. Sig.<br>(2-sided) | Exact Sig.<br>(2-sided) | Exact<br>Sig. (1-<br>sided) |
|------------------------------|-------------------|----|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square           | .099 <sup>a</sup> | 1  | .753                     |                         |                             |
| Continuity Correction        | .000              | 1  | .986                     |                         |                             |
| Likelihood Ratio             | .102              | 1  | .750                     |                         |                             |
| Fisher's Exact Test          |                   |    |                          | 1.000                   | .507                        |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .098              | 1  | .754                     |                         |                             |
| N of Valid Cases             | 102               |    |                          |                         |                             |

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.53.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table



Chi-square = 0.099 p < 0.753 NOT SIGNIFICANT

The above table gives the details of working patients and their relation with preterm labour. From the above data, there was no increase in preterm labour in patients belonging to working group.

# TABLE -3

|           |       |                  | GAGroup | GAGroup |        |
|-----------|-------|------------------|---------|---------|--------|
|           |       |                  | 0       | 1       | Total  |
| Obstetric | 1     | Count            | 66      | 9       | 75     |
| Score     |       | % within GAGroup | 81.5%   | 42.9%   | 73.5%  |
|           |       | % of Total       | 64.7%   | 8.8%    | 73.5%  |
|           | 2     | Count            | 15      | 5       | 20     |
|           |       | % within GAGroup | 18.5%   | 23.8%   | 19.6%  |
|           |       | % of Total       | 14.7%   | 4.9%    | 19.6%  |
|           | 3     | Count            | 0       | 3       | 3      |
|           |       | % within GAGroup | .0%     | 14.3%   | 2.9%   |
|           |       | % of Total       | .0%     | 2.9%    | 2.9%   |
|           | 4     | Count            | 0       | 4       | 4      |
|           |       | % within GAGroup | .0%     | 19.0%   | 3.9%   |
|           |       | % of Total       | .0%     | 3.9%    | 3.9%   |
|           | Total | Count            | 81      | 21      | 102    |
|           |       | % within GAGroup | 100.0%  | 100.0%  | 100.0% |
|           |       | % of Total       | 79.4%   | 20.6%   | 100.0% |

# Obstetric score

# **Chi-Square Tests**

|                              | Value               | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 30.622 <sup>a</sup> | 3  | .000                  |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 26.192              | 3  | .000                  |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 25.908              | 1  | .000                  |
| N of Valid Cases             | 102                 |    |                       |



## p < 0.001 SIGNIFICANT

The above table gives the relation of parity with preterm labour. According to this study, patients who were primigravida had lesser incidence of preterm labour when compared to patients with multigravida with 42.9% and 57.1% respectively.

**Inference:** Women with increasing parity were more prone for preterm labour. The preterm labour is directly proportional to the increasing parity.

# **TABLE-4**

# Previous abortions

|          |       |                  | GAGroup |        |        |
|----------|-------|------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|          |       |                  | 0       | 1      | Total  |
| Abortion | 0     | Count            | 73      | 11     | 84     |
|          |       | % within GAGroup | 90.1%   | 52.4%  | 82.4%  |
|          |       | % of Total       | 71.6%   | 10.8%  | 82.4%  |
|          | 1     | Count            | 8       | 6      | 14     |
|          |       | % within GAGroup | 9.9%    | 28.6%  | 13.7%  |
|          |       | % of Total       | 7.8%    | 5.9%   | 13.7%  |
|          | 2     | Count            | 0       | 4      | 4      |
|          |       | % within GAGroup | .0%     | 19.0%  | 3.9%   |
|          |       | % of Total       | .0%     | 3.9%   | 3.9%   |
|          | Total | Count            | 81      | 21     | 102    |
|          |       | % within GAGroup | 100.0%  | 100.0% | 100.0% |
|          |       | % of Total       | 79.4%   | 20.6%  | 100.0% |

# **Chi-Square Tests**

|                    | Value               | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|--------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 22.560 <sup>a</sup> | 2  | .000                  |
| Likelihood Ratio   | 19.386              | 2  | .000                  |
| N of Valid Cases   | 102                 |    |                       |

|          |       |                  | GAGroup |        |        |
|----------|-------|------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|          |       |                  | 0       | 1      | Total  |
| Abortion | 0     | Count            | 73      | 11     | 84     |
|          |       | % within GAGroup | 90.1%   | 52.4%  | 82.4%  |
|          |       | % of Total       | 71.6%   | 10.8%  | 82.4%  |
|          | 1     | Count            | 8       | 6      | 14     |
|          |       | % within GAGroup | 9.9%    | 28.6%  | 13.7%  |
|          |       | % of Total       | 7.8%    | 5.9%   | 13.7%  |
|          | 2     | Count            | 0       | 4      | 4      |
|          |       | % within GAGroup | .0%     | 19.0%  | 3.9%   |
|          |       | % of Total       | .0%     | 3.9%   | 3.9%   |
|          | Total | Count            | 81      | 21     | 102    |
|          |       | % within GAGroup | 100.0%  | 100.0% | 100.0% |

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .82.



### p<0.001 SIGNIFICANT

The above table shows the co-relation of abortion and preterm labour. In this study, patients who went in for preterm labour had a previous history of abortion 47.6%, whereas 11% of patients with preterm labour had no history of previous abortion.

Inference: Patients with previous pregnancy loss had a predilection towards preterm labour.

## **TABLE-5**

|                         |       |                      | GAGroup |        |        |
|-------------------------|-------|----------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                         |       |                      | 0       | 1      | Total  |
| Features of             | 0     | Count                | 70      | 16     | 86     |
| Urinary tract infection |       | % within GA<br>Group | 86.4%   | 76.2%  | 84.3%  |
|                         |       | % of Total           | 68.6%   | 15.7%  | 84.3%  |
|                         | 1     | Count                | 11      | 5      | 16     |
|                         |       | % within GA<br>Group | 13.6%   | 23.8%  | 15.7%  |
|                         |       | % of Total           | 10.8%   | 4.9%   | 15.7%  |
|                         | Total | Count                | 81      | 21     | 102    |
|                         |       | % within GA<br>Group | 100.0%  | 100.0% | 100.0% |
|                         |       | % of Total           | 79.4%   | 20.6%  | 100.0% |

# Features of Urinary tract Infection

# **Chi-Square Tests**

|                                    | Value              | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-<br>sided) | Exact Sig. (1-<br>sided) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square                 | 1.319 <sup>a</sup> | 1  | .251                  |                          |                          |
| Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup> | .659               | 1  | .417                  |                          |                          |
| Likelihood Ratio                   | 1.213              | 1  | .271                  |                          |                          |
| Fisher's Exact Test                |                    |    |                       | .312                     | .204                     |
| Linear-by-Linear<br>Association    | 1.306              | 1  | .253                  |                          |                          |
| N of Valid Cases                   | 102                |    |                       |                          |                          |

a. 1 ce lls (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.29.b. Computed only for a 2x2 table



Chi-square = 1.319 p< 0.251 NOT SIGNIFICANT

The above table shows the relation between patients with urinary tract infections and preterm labour. According to which, women who showed features of urinary tract infection did not have preponderance to preterm labour.

# TABLE 6

| Previous Dilatation and Curettage | Previous | Dilatation | and | Curettage |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|-----|-----------|
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|-----|-----------|

|              |       |                  | GAGroup | GAGroup |        |  |
|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|---------|--------|--|
|              |       |                  | 0       | 1       | Total  |  |
| Previous     | 0     | Count            | 73      | 12      | 85     |  |
| Dilatation & |       | % within GAGroup | 90.1%   | 57.1%   | 83.3%  |  |
| curettage    |       | % of Total       | 71.6%   | 11.8%   | 83.3%  |  |
|              | 1     | Count            | 8       | 5       | 13     |  |
|              |       | % within GAGroup | 9.9%    | 23.8%   | 12.7%  |  |
|              |       | % of Total       | 7.8%    | 4.9%    | 12.7%  |  |
|              | 2     | Count            | 0       | 4       | 4      |  |
|              |       | % within GAGroup | .0%     | 19.0%   | 3.9%   |  |
|              |       | % of Total       | .0%     | 3.9%    | 3.9%   |  |
|              | Total | Count            | 81      | 21      | 102    |  |
|              |       | % within GAGroup | 100.0%  | 100.0%  | 100.0% |  |
|              |       | % of Total       | 79.4%   | 20.6%   | 100.0% |  |

# **Chi-Square Tests**

|  | Value                | df                 | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square                     | 20.145 <sup>ª</sup>  | 2                  | .000                  |
| Likelihood Ratio                       | 17.195               | 2                  | .000                  |
| N of Valid Cases                       | 102                  |                    |                       |
| a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count | less than 5. The min | imum expected cour | it is .82.            |



## p<0.000<0.005 SIGNIFICANT.

The above table shows the relation of previous dilatation and curettage with preterm labour. According to this study, patients who had previous history of cervical intervention had higher incidence of preterm labour when compared to patients with no history of previous cervical interventions, with 57.1% and 42.9% respectively.

INFERENCE- Patients with previous history of cervical interventions were prone for preterm labour.

# Table-7

# NICU Admission

| Gestational age at delivery<br>(weeks) * NICU |       |                            |                   |        |        |
|---|-------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------|--------|
|   |       |                            | NICU<br>Admission |        |        |
|   |       |                            | 0                 | 1      | Total  |
| Gestational age at delivery                   | 32    | Count                      | 0                 | 1      | 1      |
| (weeks)                                       |       | % within NICU<br>Admission | .0%               | 6.3%   | 1.0%   |
|   |       | % of Total                 | .0%               | 1.0%   | 1.0%   |
|   | 33    | Count                      | 0                 | 2      | 2      |
|   |       | % within NICU<br>Admission | .0%               | 12.5%  | 2.0%   |
|   |       | % of Total                 | .0%               | 2.0%   | 2.0%   |
|   | 34    | Count                      | 0                 | 10     | 10     |
|   |       | % within NICU<br>Admission | .0%               | 62.5%  | 9.8%   |
|   |       | % of Total                 | .0%               | 9.8%   | 9.8%   |
|   | 36    | Count                      | 8                 | 0      | 8      |
|   |       | % within NICU<br>Admission | 9.3%              | .0%    | 7.8%   |
|   |       | % of Total                 | 7.8%              | .0%    | 7.8%   |
|   | 37    | Count                      | 39                | 3      | 42     |
|   |       | % within NICU<br>Admission | 45.3%             | 18.8%  | 41.2%  |
|   |       | % of Total                 | 38.2%             | 2.9%   | 41.2%  |
|   | 38    | Count                      | 34                | 0      | 34     |
|   |       | % within NICU<br>Admission | 39.5%             | .0%    | 33.3%  |
|   |       | % of Total                 | 33.3%             | .0%    | 33.3%  |
|   | 39    | Count                      | 5                 | 0      | 5      |
|   |       | % within NICU<br>Admission | 5.8%              | .0%    | 4.9%   |
|   |       | % of Total                 | 4.9%              | .0%    | 4.9%   |
|   | Total | Count                      | 86                | 16     | 102    |
|   |       | % within NICU<br>Admission | 100.0%            | 100.0% | 100.0% |
|   |       | % of Total                 | 84.3%             | 15.7%  | 100.0% |

### **Chi-Square Tests**

|                              | Value               | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 80.937 <sup>a</sup> | 6  | .000                  |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 67.009              | 6  | .000                  |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 63.041              | 1  | .000                  |
| N of Valid Cases             | 102                 |    |                       |

a. 8 cells (57.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.



CHI-SQUARE= 80.937

p<0.000<0.005

SIGNIFICANT

| GA Group              |   | Ν  | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----------------------|---|----|--------|----------------|-----------------|
| Twin A, Baby's Weight | 1 | 21 | 2.0933 | .18494         | .04036          |
| (kg)                  | 0 | 81 | 2.3107 | .09172         | .01019          |
| Twin B, Baby's Weight | 1 | 21 | 2.1100 | .19877         | .04338          |
| (kg)                  | 0 | 81 | 2.3142 | .08633         | .00959          |

# **Independent Samples Test**

|                |    |        |                                | Levene's Test for Equality of<br>Variances |      | t-test for<br>Equality of<br>Means |
|----------------|----|--------|--------------------------------|--|------|------------------------------------|
|                |    |        |                                | F  | Sig. | Т                                  |
| Twin<br>Weight | А, | Baby's | Equal variances assumed        | 28.307                                     | .000 | -7.621                             |
| (kg)           |    |        | Equal variances not<br>assumed |  |      | -5.223                             |
| Twin<br>Weight | В, | Baby's | Equal variances assumed        | 49.131                                     | .000 | -7.082                             |
| (kg)           |    |        | Equal variances not<br>assumed |  |      | -4.597                             |

### **Independent Samples Test**

|                                  | t-test for Equality of Means |        |                   |                    |  |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------------------|--|
|                                  |                              | df     | Sig. (2-tailed)   | Mean Difference    |  |
| Twin A,<br>Baby's Weight<br>(kg) | Equal variances assumed      | 100    | <mark>.000</mark> | <mark>21741</mark> |  |
|                                  | Equal variances not assumed  | 22.609 | .000              | 21741              |  |
| Twin B,<br>Baby's Weight<br>(kg) | Equal variances assumed      | 100    | .000              | 20420              |  |
|                                  | Equal variances not assumed  | 21.991 | .000              | 20420              |  |

Twin A Baby's weight- p<0.000 Twin B Baby's weight- p<0.000

SIGNIFICNT SIGNIFICNT

#### **Group Statistics A**

| GA Group              |   | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----------------------|---|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| APGAR SCORE 1 MINUTE  | 1 | 21 | 5.86 | 1.558          | .340            |
|                       | 0 | 81 | 7.33 | .880           | .098            |
| APGAR SCORE 5 MINUTES | 1 | 21 | 6.57 | 1.434          | .313            |
|                       | 0 | 81 | 8.11 | .837           | .093            |

#### Independent Samples Test

|                       |                             | Levene's<br>Variances | Test | for  | Equality | of | t-test for Eq<br>of Means | uality |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------|------|----------|----|---------------------------|--------|
|                       |                             | F                     |      | Sig. |          |    | Т                         |        |
| APGAR SCORE 1 MINUTE  | Equal variances assumed     | 16.432                |      | .000 | .000     |    | -5.733                    |        |
|                       | Equal variances not assumed |                       |      | 1    |          |    | -4.172                    |        |
| APGAR SCORE 5 MINUTES | Equal variances assumed     | 17.557                |      | .000 | )        |    | -6.379                    |        |
|                       | Equal variances not assumed |                       |      |      |          |    | -4.716                    |        |

#### **Independent Samples Test**

|                       |                             | t-test for E | t-test for Equality of Means |                 |  |  |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
|                       |                             | Df           | Sig. (2-tailed)              | Mean Difference |  |  |
| APGAR SCORE 1 MINUTE  | Equal variances assumed     | 100          | .000                         | -1.476          |  |  |
|                       | Equal variances not assumed | 23.406       | .000                         | -1.476          |  |  |
| APGAR SCORE 5 MINUTES | Equal variances assumed     | 100          | .000                         | -1.540          |  |  |
|                       | Equal variances not assumed | 23.638       | .000                         | -1.540          |  |  |

#### **Group Statistics B**

| GA Group              |   | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----------------------|---|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| APGAR SCORE 1 MINUTE  | 1 | 21 | 5.71 | 1.707          | .373            |
|                       | 0 | 81 | 7.35 | .924           | .103            |
| APGAR SCORE 5 MINUTES | 1 | 21 | 6.33 | 1.528          | .333            |
|                       | 0 | 81 | 8.16 | .782           | .087            |

#### **Independent Samples Test**

|                  |         |                             | Levene's Test<br>Variances | for Equality of | t-test for<br>Equality of<br>Means |
|------------------|---------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
|                  |         |                             |                            |                 |                                    |
|                  |         |                             | F                          | Sig.            | Т                                  |
| APGAR            | SCORE 1 | Equal variances assumed     | 25.274                     | .000            | -5.921                             |
| MINUTE           |         | Equal variances not assumed |                            |                 | -4.222                             |
| APGAR<br>MINUTES | SCORE 5 | Equal variances assumed     | 30.854                     | .000            | -7.632                             |
|                  |         | Equal variances not assumed |                            |                 | -5.304                             |

# **Independent Samples Test**

|                         |                                | t-test for Equality of Means |                   |                     |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                         |                                | Df                           | Sig. (2-tailed)   | Mean<br>Difference  |
| APGAR SCORE 1<br>MINUTE | Equal variances assumed        | 100                          | <mark>.000</mark> | <mark>-1.631</mark> |
|                         | Equal variances not<br>assumed | 23.121                       | .000              | -1.631              |
| APGARSCORE 5<br>MINUTES | Equal variances assumed        | 100                          | .000              | -1.827              |
|                         | Equal variances not assumed    | 22.783                       | .000              | -1.827              |

# Twin A APGAR Score

| 1 Minute- p<0.000 | SIGNIFICANT |
|-------------------|-------------|
| 5 Minute- p<0.000 | SIGNIFICANT |

# Twin B APGAR Score

| 1 Minute- p<0.000 | SIGNIFICANT |
|-------------------|-------------|
| 5 Minute- p<0.000 | SIGNIFICANT |

The above tables show the co-relation between the incidence of NICU admission and low birth weight with the preterm labour. According to this study neonates belonging to preterm birth had higher incidence of neonatal intensive care admissions along with low APGAR score when compared to the neonates of term delivery which is 81.3%% and 18.7% respectively.

Furthermore, twins belonging to preterm birth had low birth weight, more so with the second twin when compared to the term neonates.

## Table -8

## Pre-pregnancy weight

|                      | GA Group | Ν  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------------------|----------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Pre pregnancy Weight | 1        | 21 | 57.95 | 8.925          | 1.947           |
| (Kg)                 | 0        | 81 | 55.68 | 4.488          | .499            |

#### **Independent Samples Test**

|                   |                                | Levene's<br>Equality of V | Test for<br>/ariances | t-test for Equality of<br>Means |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
|                   |                                | F                         | Sig.                  | Т                               |
| Pre<br>preganancy | Equal variances assumed        | 26.426                    | .000                  | 1.640                           |
| Weight<br>(Kg)    | Equal variances not<br>assumed |                           |                       | 1.131                           |

## **Independent Samples Test**

|                      |                                | t-test for Equality of Means |                   |                    |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
|                      |                                | df                           | Sig. (2-tailed)   | Mean<br>Difference |
| Pre pregnancy Weight | Equal variances assumed        | 100                          | <mark>.104</mark> | 2.273              |
| (Kg)                 | Equal variances not<br>assumed | 22.685                       | .270              | 2.273              |

## p > 0.104 NOT SIGNIFICANT

The above table includes the data of pre-pregnancy weight and preterm labour. In this study when only pre pregnancy weight alone was taken into consideration, it did not have any correlation with the preterm labour.

## Table-9

# Height

**Group Statistics** 

|        | GA<br>Group | N  | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------|-------------|----|--------|----------------|-----------------|
| Height | 1           | 21 | 536.24 | 1744.999       | 380.790         |
| Cm)    | 0           | 81 | 156.16 | 16.668         | 1.852           |

Independent Samples Test

|               |                             | Levene's Test<br>Variances | for Equality of | t-test for l<br>Means | Equality of |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------|
|               |                             | F                          | Sig.            | t                     | Df          |
| Height<br>Cm) | Equal variances assumed     | 17.304                     | .000            | 1.989                 | 100         |
|               | Equal variances not assumed |                            |                 | .998                  | 20.001      |

Independent Samples Test

|               |                               | t-test for Equality of Means |                    |                          |  |
|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|
|               |                               | Sig. (2-tailed)              | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>Difference |  |
| Height<br>Cm) | Equal variances assumed       | <mark>.049</mark>            | 380.078            | 191.134                  |  |
|               | Equal variances no<br>assumed | t.330                        | 380.078            | 380.795                  |  |

p<0.049 SIGNIFICANT.

The above table shows the relation of maternal height with preterm labour. Patients with height <155 cms had a preponderance to preterm labour.

## Table -10

## Body mass index

| GA Group        |   | N  | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----------------|---|----|--------|----------------|-----------------|
| Body Mass Index | 1 | 21 | 24.014 | 3.4647         | .7561           |
| (Kg/m2)         | 0 | 81 | 22.004 | 2.7180         | .3020           |

#### **Independent Samples Test**

|                    |                                | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |        |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|
|                    |                                | F                                       | Sig. | Т                            | df     |
| Body Mass<br>Index | Equal variances assumed        | 7.525                                   | .007 | 2.848                        | 100    |
| (Kg/m2)            | Equal variances not<br>assumed |   |      | 2.469                        | 26.721 |

#### **Independent Samples Test**

|                 |                             | t-test for Equali | ty of Means        |                          |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
|                 |                             | Sig. (2-tailed)   | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>Difference |
| Body Mass Index | Equal variances assumed     | <mark>.005</mark> | 2.0105             | .7059                    |
| (Kg/m2)         | Equal variances not assumed | .020              | 2.0105             | .8141                    |

## p < 0.005 SIGNIFICANT

The above table shows the relation of body mass index with preterm labour. Patients with increased body mass index had preponderance to preterm labour when compared to patients with normal body mass index. Similarly, patients with low body mass index did not show any preponderance towards preterm labour in our study.

# Table-11

## Haemoglobin

| GA Group    |   | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------|---|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Haemoglobin | 1 | 21 | 9.105 | .5005          | .1092           |
| (gldl)      | 0 | 81 | 9.374 | .3549          | .0394           |

## **Independent Samples Test**

|                       |                                | Levene's Test<br>of Variances | t for Equality | t-test for E<br>of Means | Equality |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------|
|                       |                                | F                             | Sig.           | Т                        | df       |
| Haemoglobin<br>(gldl) | Equal variances assumed        | 5.698                         | .019           | -2.832                   | 100      |
|                       | Equal variances not<br>assumed |                               |                | -2.319                   | 25.446   |

Independent Samples Test

|                       |                                | t-test for Equality of Means |                    |                          |  |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|
|                       |                                | Sig. (2-<br>tailed)          | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>Difference |  |
| Haemoglobin<br>(gldl) | Equal variances<br>assumed     | <mark>.006</mark>            | <mark>2693</mark>  | .0951                    |  |
|                       | Equal variances not<br>assumed | .029                         | 2693               | .1161                    |  |

p<0.006

### SIGNIFICANT

The above table includes the details of hemoglobin and preterm labour Preterm labour was more prevalent in patients with low hemoglobin, more so with hemoglobin  $\leq 8.8$  gm/dl.

## Table-12

# **ROC curve**

| Variable                          | Transvaginal_cervical_length _cm_ |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Classification variable           | Gestational_age_at_delivery_Group |  |  |
| Positive group                    |                                   |  |  |
| Gestational_age_at_delivery_Group | = 1                               |  |  |
| Sample size                       | 21                                |  |  |
| Negative group                    |                                   |  |  |
| Gestational_age_at_delivery_Group | = 0                               |  |  |
| Sample size                       | 81                                |  |  |
| Disease prevalence (%)            | 20.6                              |  |  |
| Area under the ROC curve (AUC)    | 0.886                             |  |  |
| Standard error                    | 0.0332                            |  |  |
| 95% Confidence interval           | 0.808 to 0.941                    |  |  |
| z statistic                       | 11.643                            |  |  |
| Significance level P (Area=0.5)   | 0.0001                            |  |  |

## Criterion values and coordinates of the ROC curve

| Criterion          | Sensitivity | 95% CI                   | Specificity | 95% CI                   | +LR   | -LR  | +PV   | -PV   |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| < 2                | 0.00        | 0.0 - 16.3               | 100.00      | 95.5 - 100.0             |       | 1.00 |       | 79.4  |
| <=2                | 4.76        | 0.8 - 23.9               | 100.00      | 95.5 - 100.0             |       | 0.95 | 100.0 | 80.2  |
| <=2.3              | 19.05       | 5.6 - 41.9               | 100.00      | 95.5 - 100.0             |       | 0.81 | 100.0 | 82.7  |
| <=2.4              | 42.86       | 21.9 - 66.0              | 100.00      | 95.5 - 100.0             |       | 0.57 | 100.0 | 87.1  |
| <=2.5              | 52.38       | 29.8 - 74.3              | 98.77       | 93.3 - 99.8              | 42.43 | 0.48 | 91.7  | 88.9  |
| <=2.6              | 57.14       | 34.0 - 78.1              | 98.77       | 93.3 - 99.8              | 46.29 | 0.43 | 92.3  | 89.9  |
| <=3 <mark>*</mark> | 85.71       | 63.6 <mark>-</mark> 96.8 | 70.37       | 59.2 <mark>-</mark> 80.0 | 2.89  | 0.20 | 42.9  | 95.0  |
| <=3.2              | 95.24       | 76.1 - 99.2              | 46.91       | 35.7 - 58.3              | 1.79  | 0.10 | 31.7  | 97.4  |
| <=3.3              | 95.24       | 76.1 - 99.2              | 45.68       | 34.6 - 57.1              | 1.75  | 0.10 | 31.3  | 97.4  |
| <=3.4              | 100.00      | 83.7 - 100.0             | 32.10       | 22.2 - 43.4              | 1.47  | 0.00 | 27.6  | 100.0 |
| <=3.5              | 100.00      | 83.7 - 100.0             | 30.86       | 21.1 - 42.1              | 1.45  | 0.00 | 27.3  | 100.0 |
| <=3.6              | 100.00      | 83.7 - 100.0             | 14.81       | 7.9 - 24.5               | 1.17  | 0.00 | 23.3  | 100.0 |
| <=3.8              | 100.00      | 83.7 - 100.0             | 2.47        | 0.4 - 8.7                | 1.03  | 0.00 | 21.0  | 100.0 |
| <=4                | 100.00      | 83.7 - 100.0             | 1.23        | 0.2 - 6.7                | 1.01  | 0.00 | 20.8  | 100.0 |
| <=8                | 100.00      | 83.7 - 100.0             | 0.00        | 0.0 - 4.5                | 1.00  |      | 20.6  |       |

- +LR : Positive likelihood ratio
- -LR : Negative likelihood ratio
- +PV : Positive predictive value
- -PV : Negative predictive value



The above table describes the Receiver-Operating Characteristic curve for all the values obtained by measuring the cervical length by transvaginal sonography at 20 to 24 weeks of gestation in twin pregnancies.

Considering the cervical length cut-off of 2.5cm the sensitivity, specificity, positive likelihood ratio, negative likelihood ratio, positive predictive value and negative predictive value were 52.38%, 98.77%, 42.43, 0.48, 91.7 and 88.9 respectively.
Similarly considering the cervical length cut-off of 3.0cm, the sensitivity, specificity, positive likelihood ratio, negative likelihood ratio, positive predictive value and negative predictive value were 85.71%, 70.37%, 2.89, 0.20, 42.9, and 95.0 respectively.

Inference: from the above data we infer that the cervical length measurement of 3.0 cm would be a better predictor of preterm labour.

## 7. SUMMARY

This prospective study was conducted at Institute of Social Obstetrics and Government Kasturba Gandhi hospital from September 2010 to October 2011. The study included 115 patients with twin pregnancies (primigravida and multigravida) who were booked here, had their regular antenatal follow up and accomplished their deliveries in our hospital. These women underwent a transvaginal sonographic estimation of their cervical length at 20 to 24 weeks gestation which was coupled with the routine anomaly scan.

Besides detailed history taking, clinical examination and initial investigation which included the first trimester ultrasound for fetal viability, patients were followed until 20 to 24 weeks of gestation wherein a transvaginal sonographic measurement of cervical length was taken that was coupled with routine anomaly scan.

The total number of patients enrolled in our study-115 Total number of patients who completed the study -112 Total number of patients who were excluded due to complications-10 The final list of patients -102. The study analyzed the values of transvaginal sonographic measurement of cervical length and its predictor as a preterm labour. Along with the other variables – maternal age, height, pre-pregnancy weight, body mass index, parity, previous pregnancy loss, previous cervical dilatation and curettage, hemoglobin, and features of urinary tract infection. The incidence of NICU admissions and low birth weight were also analyzed.

- In patients with maternal age group of 26 to 30 years 47.6% had preterm labour, whereas 80% of term deliveries were in age group of 20 to 25 years and only 18.5% went in for preterm labour, p<0.0011 which is significant. Hence advancing gestational age had higher predilection for preterm labour.
- The relation of women in working group for risk of preterm labour describes the Chi-square = 0.09 and P < 0.753 which is not significant. Thus women who belonged to the working group did not have a predilection of preterm labour.
- According to this study, patients who were primigravida had lesser incidence of preterm labour when compared to patients with multigravida with 42.9% and 57.1% respectively. p < 0.001

Significant. That concludes that women with increasing parity were more prone for preterm labour.

- In this study, patients who went in for preterm labour had a previous history of abortion 47.6%, whereas 11% of patients with preterm labour had no history of previous abortion. P<0.001 which is significant. Patients with previous pregnancy loss had a predilection towards preterm labour.
- The relation between patients with urinary tract infections and preterm labour determined the Chi-square = 1.31 p < 0.251, which is not significant. Women who showed features of urinary tract infection did not have preponderance to preterm labour.
- The relation of previous cervical interventions on preterm labour determined the Chi-square = 20.145 p<0.000<0.005 which is significant. Thus women who had previous cervical interventions had a higher incidence of preterm labour.
- The co-relation between the incidence of NICU admission and low birth weight with the preterm labour describes the Chisquare=49.077 p<0.000<0.005 which is significant. According to this study neonates belonging to preterm birth had higher incidence

of neonatal intensive care admissions along with low APGAR score when compared to the neonates of term delivery which is 61.9% and 38.1% respectively. Furthermore, twins belonging to preterm birth had low birth weight, more so with the second twin when compared to the term neonates.

- The study data of pre-pregnancy weight and preterm labour, gave p
  > 0.005 which is not significant. In this study when only prepregnancy weight alone was taken into consideration, it did not have any correlation with the preterm labour.
- The association of height with preterm labour, p<0.049 which is significant. Preterm labour was more common among patients with height ≤155 cm's.
- The relation of body mass index with preterm labour determined p<0.005 which is significant. Patients with increased body mass index had preponderance to preterm labour when compared to patients with normal body mass index. Similarly, patients with low body mass index did not show any preponderance towards preterm labour in our study.

- The relation of hemoglobin and preterm labour determined p<0.006 which is significant. Preterm labour was more prevalent in patients with low hemoglobin, more so with hemoglobin ≤ 8.8 gm/dl.
- When the cervical length cut-off of 3.0cm is considered the sensitivity, specificity, positive likelihood ratio, negative likelihood ratio, positive predictive value and negative predictive value were 85.71%, 70.37%, 2.89, 0.20, 42.9 and 95.0 respectively when compared to the cervical length cut-off of 2.5cm the sensitivity, specificity, positive likelihood ratio, negative likelihood ratio, positive predictive value and negative predictive value were 52.38%, 98.77%, 42.43, 0.48, 91.7 and 88.9 respectively. Hence from our study we conclude that a cervical length cut-off of 3.0 cm would predict a better obstetric outcome.

## 9. CONCLUSION

This prospective study was conducted from September 2010 to October 2011 in Institute of Social Obstetrics and Government Kasturba Gandhi Hospital for Women and Children. Madras Medical College, that included all women who were both primigravida and multigravida belonging to low risk group, among 115 twin pregnancies 3 defaulted the study, 10 were excluded, hence the study included total number of 102 patients.

#### Our study concluded that:

- Patients with advancing maternal age had a more predilection towards preterm labour.
- Patients who were working did not go in for preterm labour
- The pre-pregnancy weight was not useful in predicting the preterm labour.
- Patients whose height was ≤155 cm's had a predilection towards preterm labour.

- Patients with higher body mass index had more predilections to preterm labour. But patients with lower body mass index did not have any such preponderance.
- Patients with primigravida twin pregnancies had a lower risk of preterm labour when compared to multigravida twin pregnancies.
- Patients who had previous pregnancy loss were more prone for preterm labour. The magnitude increases as the number of pregnancy loss increases.
- Patients who had previous dilatation and curettage were at high risk of preterm labour.
- Patients who had low hemoglobin went in for preterm labour.
- Patients who had features of urinary tract infection did not go in for preterm labour.
- Neonates belonging to the preterm had low birth weight along with increased morbidity.
- Finally our study concluded that measuring transvaginal sonographic cervical length at 20 to 24 weeks in twin pregnancies is a valuable predictor of preterm labour when the cut-off of

cervical length is more than 30mm. Moreover, it is a simple costeffective, reproducible, and non-invasive method.

## **Recommendations suggested from our study:**

- Every patient with twin pregnancies irrespective of their parity to be considered as a high risk for preterm labour.
- These patients besides the routine fetal anomaly scan, it is mandatory to have their cervical length measured by transvaginal sonography at 20 to 24 weeks gestation with a cut-off> 30mm along with the other initial investigations.
- Ante partum in utero transfer to be provided for the patients with their cervical length ≤2.9 cm's to tertiary institute for better neonatal salvage ability and obstetric outcome.

#### **10.BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- 1. Histology at BU 19404loa.
- 2. Weschler, pp. 227–228.
- 3. Ian Donald's practical obstetric problems 6th edition-preterm labour, Chapter 20, pp.412, 413.
- 4. Goldenberg RL, Culhane JF, Iams JD, Romero R. Epidemiology and causes of preterm birth. Lancet. 2008; 371:75–84.
- Papiernik E, Alexander GR and Paneth N. Racial differences in pregnancy and its implications for perinatal care. *Med Hypotheses*, 1990; November, 33(3):181-6.
- The Complex relationship between smoking in pregnancy & very preterm delivery. Result of the Epipage study, *BJOG*, 2004; March, 111(3):258-65.
- Copper RL, Goldenberg RL and DAS A, *et al.* The Preterm Prediction study: Maternal stress is associated with spontaneous preterm birth at less than 35 wks gestation. *AJOG*, 1996; 175:1286.
- 8. Yost NP, Owen J and Berghella V. Effect of coitus on recurrent preterm birth obstet gynecol, April, 2006; 107(4):793-7.

- Gonzalez N, Bige V, Kandoussi S, Graesslin O, Quereux C, Gabriel R. Sonographic measurement of cervical length in twin pregnancies with preterm labour: comparison with singleton pregnancies [Article in French] Gynecol Obstet Fertil. 2004;32:122–7.
- Klein LL and Gibbs RS. Infection and Preterm birth. Obstetrics gynecol clin North America, 2005; September, 32(3):397-410.
- 11. Alexander JM, Gilstrap LC and Cox SM, et al. Clinical chorioamnionitis and prognosis for very low birthweight infants, Obstetric Gynecology, 1998; 91:725.
- 12.Martin DH, *et al.*, double blinded placebo controlled treatment trial of Chlamydia trachomatis endo cervical infection in pregnant woman. *Infect dis obst gynec*, 1997; 5:10.
- 13. Klein Jo, Braun P and Lee YH *et al.*, Birth weight and genital mycoplasma in pregnancy. *N Eng J Med.*, 1971; 284:167-171.
- 14. Benito CW and Blusewicz TA. The relationship of ureaplasma urealyticum cervical colonization and preterm delivery in high risk pregnancies obstet gynecol.

- 15.Wennerholm UB, Holm B, Mattsby-Baltzer I, Nielsen T, Platz-Christensen J, Sundell G, Hosseini N, Hagberg H. Fetal fibronectin, endotoxin, bacterial vaginosis and cervical length as predictors of preterm birth and neonatal morbidity in twin pregnancies. Br J Obstet Gynaecol. 1997; 104:1398–404.
- 16.Cox SM, King MR, Casey ML and Mac Donald PC: Interleukin 1 and 6 and Prostaglandins in vaginal and cervical fluids of pregnant women before and during labour. *J Clin Endocrinol metab*, 1993; 77:805-815. 65.
- 17. Oliver R and Lament RF. Role of cytokines in spontaneous preterm labourand preterm birth. Progress in obstetrics & Gynecology. In *Studd J. Ed.*, Vol. 16, Churchill Livingstone, London, 2005.
- Arias F. Pharmacology of oxytocin & Prostaglandins, *Clinical obstet gynecol*, 2000; 43:455-68.
- 19. Fuch AR-oxytocin receptors in the human uterus during pregnancy and parturition, *AJOG*, 1984; 150:734.

- Iams JD, Johnson FF and Parker M. A Prospective Evaluation of signs and symptoms of preterm labourobstet gynecol, 1994; 84:227.
- 21. Crane JM, Hutchens D. Transvaginal sonographic measurement of cervical length to predict preterm birth in asymptomatic women at increased risk: a systematic review. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2008;31:579–87.
- 22. Leveno KJ and Coxk Roark ML: Cervical dilation and prematurity revisited obstet gynecol, 1986a; 68:434.
- 23. Fox NS, Saltzman DH, Klauser CK, Peress D, Gutierrez CV, Rebarber A. Prediction of spontaneous preterm birth in asymptomatic twin pregnancies with the use of combined fetal fibronectin and cervical length. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2009; 201:313.e1–5.
- 24. Dodds WG and Iams J.D. Maternal CRP and preterm Labour. *J Reprod Med*, 1987; 32:527-30.
- 25. Katz M, Gill PJ and Newman RB: Detection of preterm labour by ambulatory monitoring of uterine activity: A Preliminary report. Obstet gynecol, 1986; 68:773-778.

- 26. Gardosi J and Francis A. Early pregnancy predictors of Preterm birth. The role of a prolonged menstruation conception interval, *BJOG* 2000; 107:228-237.
- 27. Jorgensen AL, Alfirevic Z, Tudur Smith C, Williamson PR. cerclage IPD Meta-analysis Group. Cervical stitch (cerclage) for preventing pregnancy loss: individual patient data meta-analysis. BJOG. 2007; 114:1460–76.
- 28. Norman JE, Mackenzie F, Owen P, Mactier H, Hanretty K, Cooper S, Calder A, Mires G, Danielian P, Sturgiss S, MacLennan G, Tydeman G, Thornton S, Martin B, Thornton JG, Neilson JP, Norrie J. Progesterone for the prevention of preterm birth in twin pregnancy (STOPPIT): a randomised, double-blind, placebocontrolled study and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2009; 373:2034–40.
- 29. Grisaru-Granovsky S, Farine D, Barrett J, Van Eyk N, Ryan G, Seaward PGR, Windrim R. Is a single ultrasound measurement of cervical length a predictor of the risk of preterm delivery in multifetal pregnancy? Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1998; 178(1S):191S.
- 30. Crowther CA. Hospitalisation and bed rest for multiple pregnancies. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2001;1 CD000110

- 31. NIH consensus statement: Effect of corticosteroids for fetal maturation and perinatal outcomes, Vol.12, No.2, Bethesda National Institute of Health, 1994.
- 32. Yamasmit W, Chaithongwongwatthana S, Tolosa JE, Limpongsanurak S, Pereira L, Lumbiganon P. Prophylactic oral betamimetics for reducing preterm birth in women with a twin pregnancy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2005; 3 CD004733.
- 33.Canadian Preterm Labour Investigations group treatment of preterm labour with beta adrenergic agonist ritodrine, *N Engl J Med*, 1992; 327:308.
- 34. Weristorm K, Weiner CP and Merrill D *et al.* A placebo controlled randomized trial of the terbutaline pump for prevention of preterm delivery, *Am J Perinatol*, 1997; 14:87.
- 35. Elliott JP. Magnesium sulfate as a tocolytic agent, *AJOG*, 1983; 147:277.
- 36. Muench MV, Baschat AA and Kopelman J, *et al.* Indomethacin therapy initiated before 24 weeks of gestation for the prevention of preterm birth [abstract] obstet Gynecol, 2003; 101:655. 68

- 37.Carr DB, Clark AL and Kernek K, *et al.* Maintenance oral Nifedpine for preterm Labour: A randomized clinical trial. *AJOG*, 1999; 181:822.
- 38. Goodwin TM, Millar L and North L, *et al.* The pharmacokinetics of the oxytocin antagonist atosiban in pregnant women with preterm uterine contractions, *AJOG*, 1995; 173:913.
- 39.Zilianti M, Azuaga A, Calderson F *et al*: Monitoring the new effacement of the uterine cervix by transperineal ultrasound: a perspective J of USG Med 1995:14 :719-724.
- 40.Kushnir O, Vigil D A, Ixqueirdo *et al*: vaginal ultrasound assessment of the cervix and changes during normal pregnancy (Am J Obs and Gyn 1990: 162: 991-993).
- 41.Yang JH, Kuhlman K, Daly S, Berghella V. Prediction of preterm birth by second trimester cervical sonography in twin pregnancies. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2000; 15:288–91.

# **10. PROFORMA**

| NAME    | : | AGE :   |
|---------|---|---------|
| ADDRESS | : | IP NO : |

| OCCUPATION                | : |  |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| HEIGHT                    | : |  |
| WEIGHT                    | : |  |
| B0DY MASS INDEX           | : |  |
| OBSTETRIC CODE            | : |  |
| LAST MENSTRUAL PERIOD     | : |  |
| EXPECTED DATE OF DELIVERY | : |  |
| GESTATIONAL AGE           | : |  |
| BOOKED/UNBOOKED           | : |  |
| SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS     | : |  |
|                           |   |  |

### HISTORY OF PRESENT ILLNESS:

| MENSTRUAL HISTORY | : |
|-------------------|---|
| MARITAL HISTORY   | : |
| OBSTETRIC HISTORY | : |
| PAST HISTORY      | : |

H/o preterm labour / Abortion – induced or spontaneous/ still birth DM/ heart disease/hypertension/TB/Epilepsy/renal disease

:

## **PERSONAL HISTORY** :

#### **GENERAL EXAMINATION :**

- Pallor :
- Edema :
- Febrile :

#### VITALS

- Temperature :
- Pulse Rate :
- Blood Pressure :
- Respiratory Rate :

#### SYSTEMIC EXAMINATION:

| Cardio Vascular System | : |
|------------------------|---|
| Respiratory System     | : |
| Central Nervous System | : |

Abdominal examination

#### INVESTIGATIONS

Urine – sugar/ albumin/microscopy/culture sensitivity Complete haemogram Blood sugar Blood urea Vaginal swab culture sensitivity Dating Ultra sonogram Anomaly ultra sonogram Transabdominal Ultra sonogram Twin A Twin B **Biparietal diameter** Femur Length Placenta Amniotic Fluid Fetal Congenital Anomalies Gestational Age Transvaginal Ultra sonogram Cervical Length

:

:

#### **DELIVERED** AT

Gestational age in weeks

#### NICU ADMISSIONS

Neonatal Morbidity Neonatal Mortality

## **11.MASTERCHART**

| S<br>NO | Patient Number | Name         | Age (years) | Height<br>(Cm) | Prepreganancy Weight (kgs) | Body Mass Index (kg/m2) | Working | Obstetric Score | Abortion | Previous dilatation &<br>curettage | Hemoglobin (g/dl) | Features of Urinary tract infection | Transvaginal cervical length<br>(cm) | Transvaginal cervical length<br>Group | Transvaginal cervical length<br>(Abnormal/Normal) | Gestational age at delivery<br>(weeks) | Gestational age at delivery<br>Group | Twin A Baby's Weight (kgs) | Twin B Baby's Weight (kgs) | Twin A APGAR score 1<br>minute | Twin A APGAR score 5<br>minute | Twin B APGAR Score 1<br>minute | Twin B APGAR Score 5<br>minute | NICU Admission |
|---------|----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-----------------|----------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
|         | 7071           | Diliamma     | 24          | 152            | 60                         | 25.9                    | 1       | 3               | 1        | 1                                  | 9.2               | 0                                   | 2                                    | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 1.92                       | 1.94                       | 4                              | 5                              | 5                              | 5                              | 2              |
| 47      | 22525          | Anjammal     | 28          | 158            | 68                         | 27.2                    | 1       | 4               | 2        | 2                                  | 8.8               | 1                                   | 2.3                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 32                                     | 1                                    | 1.88                       | 1.85                       | 4                              | 5                              | 4                              | 5                              | 2              |
| 67      | 1757           | Chellamma    | 28          | 154            | 68                         | 28.6                    | 0       | 4               | 2        | 2                                  | 8.6               | 0                                   | 2.3                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 1.86                       | 1.87                       | 4                              | 5                              | 4                              | 4                              | 2              |
| 93      | 10020          | Rani         | 22          | 154            | 68                         | 28.6                    | 1       | 1               | 0        | 0                                  | 9.4               | 0                                   | 2.3                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 1.89                       | 1.9                        | 4                              | 6                              | 5                              | 6                              | 2              |
| 15      | 12082          | Menaka       | 28          | 168            | 68                         | 24.9                    | 1       | 4               | 2        | 2                                  | 8.2               | 0                                   | 2.4                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 33                                     | 1                                    | 1.96                       | 1.99                       | 5                              | 5                              | 4                              | 6                              | 2              |
| 35      | 17928          | Noorjahan    | 28          | 156            | 72                         | 29.5                    | 1       | 3               | 1        | 1                                  | 8.6               | 0                                   | 2.4                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 33                                     | 1                                    | 1.98                       | 1.99                       | 5                              | 5                              | 4                              | 5                              | 2              |
| 56      | 24618          | Mallar       | 26          | 158            | 72                         | 28.8                    | 1       | 4               | 2        | 2                                  | 8.8               | 0                                   | 2.4                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 2.01                       | 1.98                       | 5                              | 6                              | 4                              | 5                              | 2              |
| 83      | 7519           | Mumtaz       | 19          | 144            | 42                         | 20.2                    | 1       | 1               | 0        | 0                                  | 9.8               | 0                                   | 2.4                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 2.1                        | 2.12                       | 6                              | 6                              | 5                              | 6                              | 2              |
| 84      | 7708           | Moogambigai  | 28          | 150            | 64                         | 28.4                    | 1       | 3               | 1        | 1                                  | 9.6               | 0                                   | 2.4                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 2.12                       | 2.19                       | 6                              | 6                              | 5                              | 5                              | 2              |
| 1       | 5869           | Lalitha      | 20          | 164            | 52                         | 19.3                    | 1       | 1               | 0        | 0                                  | 8.8               | 0                                   | 2.5                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 1.85                       | 1.82                       | 4                              | 5                              | 4                              | 5                              | 2              |
| 7       | 8945           | Varalakhsmi  | 24          | 150            | 52                         | 23.1                    | 0       | 1               | 0        | 0                                  | 9.2               | 0                                   | 2.6                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 36                                     | 1                                    | 2.01                       | 2.03                       | 8                              | 8                              | 7                              | 7                              | 0              |
| 14      | 11220          | Sumithra     | 26          | 145            | 52                         | 24.7                    | 0       | 2               | 1        | 0                                  | 9.8               | 1                                   | 3                                    | 1                                     | 1   | 36                                     | 1                                    | 2.3                        | 2.33                       | 7                              | 8                              | 9                              | 9                              | 0              |
| 21      | 13594          | Kamala       | 25          | 160            | 60                         | 23.4                    | 1       | 1               | 0        | 0                                  | 9.4               | 1                                   | 3                                    | 1                                     | 1   | 36                                     | 1                                    | 2.28                       | 2.24                       | 8                              | 8                              | 7                              | 8                              | 0              |
| 29      | 15920          | Thilagam     | 26          | 158            | 48                         | 19.2                    | 1       | 2               | 1        | 1                                  | 8.8               | 0                                   | 2.5                                  | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 2.01                       | 2.02                       | 6                              | 7                              | 5                              | 5                              | 2              |
| 63      | 1389           | Divya        | 26          | 158            | 56                         | 22.4                    | 1       | 1               | 0        | 0                                  | 9.8               | 1                                   | 2.5                                  | 1                                     | 0   | 37                                     | 0                                    | 2.25                       | 2.25                       | 5                              | 5                              | 5                              | 6                              | 2              |
| 81      | 6874           | Dhanalakshmi | 24          | 152            | 45                         | 19.4                    | 1       | 1               | 0        | 0                                  | 8.8               | 0                                   | 3                                    | 1                                     | 1   | 34                                     | 1                                    | 2.01                       | 1.98                       | 5                              | 6                              | 4                              | 5                              | 2              |

| 99  | 12821 | Kumudha    | 26 | 156 | 50 | 20.5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3   | 1 | 1 | 34 | 1 | 2.11 | 2.28 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 1 |
|-----|-------|------------|----|-----|----|------|---|---|---|---|-----|---|-----|---|---|----|---|------|------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10  | 10021 | Malliga    | 26 | 158 | 62 | 24.8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8.2 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.18 | 2.19 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 70  | 2068  | Poornima   | 22 | 158 | 56 | 22.4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 1 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.31 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 94  | 10531 | Poorna     | 21 | 158 | 56 | 22.4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 1 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.31 | 2.33 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 95  | 10895 | Sandhya    | 22 | 156 | 54 | 22.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.31 | 2.32 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 18  | 12892 | Mala       | 22 | 15  | 58 | 23.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.1 | 1 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.33 | 2.42 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 27  | 15621 | Pramila    | 21 | 158 | 62 | 24.8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.54 | 2.52 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 31  | 16875 | Beevi      | 25 | 160 | 60 | 23.4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.21 | 2.24 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 44  | 20890 | Valli      | 20 | 168 | 62 | 21.9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.21 | 2.21 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 45  | 21156 | Nithya     | 22 | 154 | 60 | 25.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 1 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.12 | 2.1  | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 51  | 23771 | Alisha     | 24 | 168 | 64 | 22.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.51 | 2.53 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 0 |
| 54  | 20021 | Kalyani    | 26 | 158 | 52 | 20.8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9.6 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 64  | 1490  | Chitra     | 24 | 156 | 58 | 21.3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9.6 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.26 | 2.28 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 88  | 8201  | Seetha     | 19 | 150 | 44 | 19.5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 | 1 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.34 | 2.34 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 92  | 9987  | Ananthi    | 26 | 152 | 54 | 23.3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9.6 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.36 | 2.36 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 97  | 11821 | Rosika     | 22 | 166 | 58 | 21   | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.32 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 5   | 7764  | Gowri      | 22 | 154 | 52 | 21.8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.51 | 2.51 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 6   | 7872  | Jamuna     | 26 | 148 | 50 | 22.8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8.6 | 1 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.21 | 2.21 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 12  | 11929 | Esther     | 22 | 162 | 58 | 22.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.27 | 2.3  | 7 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 1 |
| 20  | 13232 | Banu       | 20 | 156 | 52 | 21.3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 2.35 | 2.38 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 24  | 14212 | Lakshmi    | 26 | 154 | 54 | 22.7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9.8 | 1 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 2.41 | 2.42 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 42  | 20032 | Nalini     | 22 | 168 | 62 | 21.9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 1 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.34 | 2.36 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
| 52  | 23889 | Runiri     | 21 | 166 | 62 | 22.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 2.42 | 2.43 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 62  | 1281  | Suraari    | 20 | 156 | 48 | 19.7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.21 | 2.21 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 65  | 1510  | Ambika     | 19 | 156 | 52 | 21.3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.31 | 2.28 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 100 | 13921 | Pushpa     | 22 | 152 | 52 | 22.5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 0 | 3   | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.26 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
| 8   | 9421  | Loganayaki | 22 | 150 | 48 | 21.3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.36 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 0 |

| 16  | 12259 | lvothi    | 24 | 160  | 58 | 22.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 92               | 1 | 32  | 3 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 2 21 | 2 22 | 7 | 7 | 7      | 8 | 0 |
|-----|-------|-----------|----|------|----|------|---|---|---|---|------------------|---|-----|---|---|----|---|------|------|---|---|--------|---|---|
| 17  | 12602 | Sudha     | 26 | 164  | 52 | 10.3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0. <u>2</u><br>Q | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.21 | 2.22 | 6 | 7 | 7      | 7 | 0 |
| 10  | 12002 | Nirmele   | 20 | 0150 | 52 | 24.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.0              | 0 | 2.2 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 2.01 | 2.12 | 0 | , | ,<br>0 |   | 0 |
| 19  | 10001 | Nimaia    | 24 | 0152 | 00 | 24.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.2              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 2.4  | 2.42 | 0 | 9 | 0      | 0 | 0 |
| 25  | 14514 | Kokila    | 22 | 164  | 64 | 23.7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.4  | 2.34 | 1 | 8 | 8      | 9 | 0 |
| 26  | 14524 | Sulochana | 22 | 156  | 60 | 24.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 1 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.52 | 2.5  | 5 | 7 | 5      | 7 | 0 |
| 28  | 15975 | Malliga   | 22 | 145  | 52 | 24.7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.31 | 2.33 | 7 | 8 | 7      | 8 | 0 |
| 32  | 16955 | Saroja    | 24 | 158  | 52 | 20.8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.24 | 2.26 | 8 | 8 | 8      | 9 | 0 |
| 36  | 18356 | Vennilla  | 20 | 156  | 48 | 19.7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.41 | 2.38 | 8 | 9 | 7      | 8 | 0 |
| 40  | 19654 | Amala     | 24 | 158  | 60 | 24   | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.29 | 2.31 | 7 | 8 | 8      | 8 | 0 |
| 43  | 20713 | Anitha    | 24 | 162  | 64 | 24.3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.4  | 2.38 | 8 | 9 | 7      | 9 | 0 |
| 46  | 21546 | Prema     | 24 | 152  | 60 | 25.9 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9.8              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.21 | 2.22 | 5 | 6 | 5      | 6 | 2 |
| 53  | 24064 | Saroja    | 22 | 164  | 60 | 22.3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.5  | 2.48 | 8 | 8 | 7      | 8 | 0 |
| 61  | 1101  | Rathra    | 22 | 145  | 52 | 24.7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.4  | 2.38 | 8 | 8 | 7      | 8 | 0 |
| 73  | 3011  | Sastri    | 26 | 154  | 52 | 21.9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.33 | 2.32 | 7 | 9 | 9      | 9 | 0 |
| 76  | 4221  | Selvi     | 22 | 156  | 52 | 21.3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.31 | 2.33 | 7 | 7 | 8      | 8 | 0 |
| 78  | 5760  | Amul      | 28 | 160  | 60 | 23.4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9.8              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 7 | 7 | 8      | 8 | 0 |
| 80  | 6357  | Rohini    | 22 | 158  | 52 | 20.8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 8 | 8 | 8      | 8 | 0 |
| 90  | 9081  | Sujama    | 22 | 154  | 56 | 23.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.4  | 2.38 | 8 | 9 | 8      | 8 | 0 |
| 98  | 12042 | Sabiya    | 24 | 158  | 52 | 20.8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.3  | 2.1  | 8 | 8 | 8      | 9 | 0 |
| 101 | 14021 | Yasodha   | 22 | 160  | 58 | 22.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6              | 0 | 3.2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.31 | 2.33 | 7 | 7 | 8      | 8 | 0 |
| 48  | 22801 | Meena     | 22 | 160  | 58 | 22.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6              | 0 | 3.3 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.28 | 8 | 9 | 8      | 9 | 0 |
| 2   | 5924  | Indira    | 22 | 160  | 56 | 21.8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 2.3  | 2.34 | 6 | 7 | 7      | 7 | 0 |
| 22  | 14042 | Crystal   | 28 | 160  | 58 | 22.6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8.8              | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 8 | 8 | 8      | 9 | 0 |
| 30  | 16211 | Ranju     | 24 | 158  | 58 | 23.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.33 | 2.33 | 7 | 8 | 8      | 8 | 0 |
| 33  | 17409 | Deivam    | 22 | 164  | 52 | 19.3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4              | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.26 | 2.28 | 7 | 9 | 8      | 9 | 0 |
| 37  | 18581 | Kartika   | 21 | 162  | 58 | 2.21 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.31 | 2.33 | 9 | 9 | 7      | 8 | 0 |
| 50  | 23691 | Princy    | 22 | 156  | 60 | 24.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2              | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 8 | 9 | 7      | 8 | 0 |

| 55  | 24542 | Jameela   | 19 | 162 | 48 | 18.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8.6 | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.02 | 2.04 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
|-----|-------|-----------|----|-----|----|------|---|---|---|---|-----|---|-----|---|---|----|---|------|------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 75  | 3421  | Banumathi | 24 | 150 | 52 | 23.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.28 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
| 77  | 4621  | Saradha   | 24 | 154 | 52 | 23.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.24 | 2.25 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 0 |
| 82  | 7161  | Victoria  | 26 | 156 | 58 | 23.8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.21 | 2.22 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 91  | 9421  | Swathi    | 24 | 156 | 52 | 21.3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.38 | 2.38 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 102 | 14331 | Uma       | 24 | 150 | 52 | 21.3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.4 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.3  | 2.28 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 57  | 4     | Sathya    | 22 | 162 | 58 | 22.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.5 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 3   | 6821  | Faridha   | 21 | 158 | 54 | 21.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.46 | 2.43 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 0 |
| 9   | 9965  | Satya     | 24 | 156 | 60 | 24.6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.21 | 2.24 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
| 23  | 14052 | Sunitha   | 24 | 158 | 52 | 20.8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.42 | 2.4  | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 34  | 17411 | Sumathy   | 21 | 160 | 58 | 22.6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.31 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 39  | 19200 | Gayathri  | 20 | 152 | 52 | 22.5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.32 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
| 41  | 19891 | Amudha    | 26 | 164 | 58 | 21.5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 58  | 92    | Pattu     | 26 | 168 | 62 | 21.9 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9.6 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 2.41 | 2.41 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 60  | 982   | Babitra   | 22 | 158 | 58 | 23.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
| 68  | 1982  | Devi      | 24 | 152 | 52 | 22.5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.33 | 2.34 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
| 71  | 2462  | Nazeema   | 24 | 156 | 52 | 21.3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.28 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 79  | 6091  | Sangeetha | 26 | 162 | 58 | 22.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.26 | 2.28 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 86  | 7788  | Bhagya    | 20 | 162 | 56 | 21.3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.26 | 2.28 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 89  | 8546  | Elizabeth | 24 | 152 | 58 | 25.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 0 | 3.6 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.35 | 2.36 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 13  | 11009 | Karpargam | 24 | 160 | 56 | 21.8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.28 | 2.32 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 38  | 18921 | Bhavani   | 22 | 160 | 56 | 21.8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.6 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.26 | 2.28 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 59  | 221   | Mary      | 24 | 158 | 52 | 20.8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.36 | 2.32 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 66  | 1672  | Kala      | 21 | 154 | 50 | 21   | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 2.34 | 2.32 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 69  | 2042  | Vinodhini | 26 | 160 | 58 | 22.6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9.4 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.35 | 2.3  | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 72  | 2958  | Anjali    | 22 | 158 | 54 | 21.6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.3  | 2.31 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 74  | 3359  | Vimala    | 22 | 152 | 50 | 21.6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 1 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 2.31 | 2.31 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 |

| 85 | 7698  | Karpargam | 21 | 158 | 52 | 20.8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.38 | 2.36 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
|----|-------|-----------|----|-----|----|------|---|---|---|---|-----|---|-----|---|---|----|---|------|------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 87 | 7989  | Shakila   | 22 | 164 | 50 | 18.5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8.6 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 96 | 10900 | Madhiya   | 26 | 162 | 58 | 22.1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 3.8 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.33 | 2.34 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 11 | 10981 | Annamal   | 21 | 164 | 64 | 23.7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 | 1 | 4   | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.3  | 2.27 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 49 | 23085 | Sharmila  | 24 | 162 | 58 | 22.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9.4 | 0 | 8   | 4 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 2.3  | 2.31 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 0 |