

Jun 07, 2023

Incidence of postpartum hemorrhage based on the improved combined method in evaluating blood loss

DOI

<https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.j8nlkobewv5r/v1>

Fangyuan Zheng¹, Haiyan Wen¹

¹Hangzhou women's hospital



Fangyuan Zheng

Create & collaborate more with a free account

Edit and publish protocols, collaborate in communities, share insights through comments, and track progress with run records.

Create free account

OPEN  ACCESS



DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.j8nlkobewv5r/v1>

Protocol Citation: Fangyuan Zheng, Haiyan Wen 2023. Incidence of postpartum hemorrhage based on the improved combined method in evaluating blood loss. protocols.io <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.j8nlkobewv5r/v1>

Manuscript citation:

None

License: This is an open access protocol distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

Protocol status: Working

We use this protocol and it's working

Created: June 07, 2023

Last Modified: June 07, 2023

Protocol Integer ID: 82997

Keywords: Caesarean section, Estimation of blood loss, Forceps, Incidence, Postpartum hemorrhage, Vaginal delivery, underestimations of postpartum hemorrhage amount, postpartum hemorrhage amount, clinical characteristics of postpartum hemorrhage, incidence of postpartum hemorrhage, postpartum hemorrhage, evaluating blood loss, blood loss, volumetric method, combination of volumetric method, blood loss in view, different modes of delivery, gravimetric method, area method

Disclaimer

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Abstract

In view of the current clinical inaccuracies and underestimations of postpartum hemorrhage amount, this study aims to investigate the incidence, etiology, clinical characteristics of postpartum hemorrhage in different modes of delivery based on the combination of volumetric method, gravimetric method and area method in evaluating blood loss.

Image Attribution

None

Design

- 1 This retrospective cohort study was conducted in Hangzhou Women's Hospital from January 2020 to June 2021. Based on different modes of delivery, the participants were divided into three groups: vaginal delivery, forceps delivery, and cesarean section, for comparison. Blood loss, incidence, and causes of postpartum hemorrhage in different delivery groups (vaginal delivery, forceps delivery, and cesarean section groups) were compared using an improved combined assessment method of blood loss, which is a standardized method for estimating blood loss during delivery that includes both visual and quantitative assessments.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

- 2 The inclusion criteria required participants to have a gestational week of delivery of ≥ 28 weeks and to have given birth in the hospital. Participants with severe liver and kidney dysfunction, severe hematological diseases (excluding anemia and simple thrombocytopenia), or incomplete information were excluded.

Definition of postpartum hemorrhage

- 3 PPH is defined as blood loss ≥ 500 mLs following vaginal birth or ≥ 1000 mLs following caesarean section within 24 hours. Severe PPH refers to blood loss ≥ 1000 mLs or hypovolemic shock within 24 hours after delivery.

Quantitative assessment methods of postpartum blood loss

- 4 The combined method can be divided into the following three steps. Firstly, the volume of the blood collection basin used in vaginal delivery and the suction bottle used in cesarean section can be directly read (the volume of amniotic fluid and irrigating fluid need to be deducted). During vaginal delivery, when the amniotic fluid had basically flowed completely after fetal birth, then the blood collection basin was placed under the maternal buttocks to collect blood loss. The medical covering drape used in cesarean section is waterproof, which can collect amniotic fluid and blood loss effectively. During cesarean section, the assistant used a negative pressure aspirator to collect as much amniotic fluid as possible after the rupture of amniotic membrane and record the amount of amniotic fluid in the suction bottle. Then removed the amount of amniotic fluid when calculating the blood loss in the suction bottle. Secondly, the remaining bleeding on the operating table was calculated by the area method (10cm $\times$ 10cm is referred as 10 mL). At last, the perineal pad was placed under maternal buttocks until 24 hours after delivery. The perineal pad would be replaced several times, and the final weight was calculated totally (blood volume (mL) = (the weight of the pad used - the weight before use)/1.05).

The sum of the blood loss in the above three steps is the total blood loss within 24 hours after delivery.

Protocol references

1. Practice Bulletin No. 183: Postpartum Hemorrhage. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2017;130(4):e168-e186.
2. Callaghan WM, Kuklina EV, Berg CJ. Trends in postpartum hemorrhage: United States, 1994-2006. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2010;202(4):353.e1-6.
3. Muir HA. Pharmacologic intervention for managing uterine atony and related maternal hemorrhage: what is the most effective drug dose? *Can J Anaesth.* 2013;60(11):1047-53.
4. Calvert C, Thomas SL, Ronsmans C, Wagner KS, Adler AJ, Filippi V. Identifying regional variation in the prevalence of postpartum haemorrhage: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2012;7(7):e41114.
5. Lin JH, Lin QD, Liu JH, Pan ZR, Hu LW, Wang L. Reassessment of postpartum hemorrhage. *Chinese Journal of Practical Gynecology and Obstetrics.* 2002(02):27-29. [In Chinese, English abstract]
6. Lertbunnaphong T, Lapthanapat N, Leetheeragul J, Hakularb P, Ownon A. Postpartum blood loss: visual estimation versus objective quantification with a novel birthing drape. *Singapore Med J.* 2016;57(6):325-8.
7. Al Kadri HM, Al Anazi BK, Tamim HM. Visual estimation versus gravimetric measurement of postpartum blood loss: a prospective cohort study. *Arch Gynecol Obstet.* 2011;283(6):1207-13.
8. Rath WH. Postpartum hemorrhage--update on problems of definitions and diagnosis. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 2011;90(5):421-8.
9. Bingham D, Lyndon A, Lagrew D, Main EK. A state-wide obstetric hemorrhage quality improvement initiative. *MCN Am J Matern Child Nurs.* 2011;36(5):297-304.
10. Della Torre M, Kilpatrick SJ, Hibbard JU, Simonson L, Scott S, Koch A, et al. Assessing preventability for obstetric hemorrhage. *Am J Perinatol.* 2011;28(10):753-60.
11. Seacrist MJ, VanOtterloo LR, Morton CH, Main EK. Quality Improvement Opportunities Identified Through Case Review of Pregnancy-Related Deaths From Obstetric Hemorrhage. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs.* 2019;48(3):288-299.
12. Hancock A, Weeks AD, Lavender DT. Is accurate and reliable blood loss estimation the 'crucial step' in early detection of postpartum haemorrhage: an integrative review of the literature. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2015;15:230.
13. Larsson C, Saltvedt S, Wiklund I, Pahlen S, Andolf E. Estimation of blood loss after cesarean section and vaginal delivery has low validity with a tendency to exaggeration. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 2006;85(12):1448-52.
14. Wilcox CF 3rd, Hunt AB, Owens CA Jr. The measurement of blood lost during cesarean section. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 1959;77(4):772-9.
15. Chua S, Ho LM, Vanaja K, Nordstrom L, Roy AC, Arulkumaran S. Validation of a laboratory method of measuring postpartum blood loss. *Gynecol Obstet Invest.* 1998;46(1):31-3.
16. Patel A, Goudar SS, Geller SE, Kodkany BS, Edlavitch SA, Wagh K, et al. Drape estimation vs. visual assessment for estimating postpartum hemorrhage. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet.* 2006;93(3):220-4.