

Predstavitev primera: Je carski rez v drugem trimestru nosečnosti nerazpoznavni dejavnik tveganja za nenamerno podaljšanje histerotomije v spodnji del maternice?

Case report: Is mid-trimester cesarean section an unrecognized risk factor for accidental extension to the lower uterine segment?

Avtor / Author

Ustanova / Institute

Leyla Al Mahdawi¹, Lucija Kuder², Faris Mujezinović^{2, 3}

¹Univerzitetni klinični center Maribor, Klinika za ginekologijo in perinatologijo, Oddelek za ginekološko onkologijo in onkologijo dojk, Maribor, Slovenija; ²Univerzitetni klinični center Maribor, Klinika za ginekologijo in perinatologijo, Oddelek za perinatologijo, Maribor, Slovenija; ³Univerza v Mariboru, Medicinska fakulteta, Katedra za ginekologijo in porodništvo, Maribor, Slovenija;

¹University Medical Centre Maribor, University Department of Gynecology and Perinatology, Department of Gynecological Oncology and Breast Oncology, Maribor, Slovenia; ²University Medical Centre Maribor, University Department of Gynecology and Perinatology, Department of Perinatology, Maribor, Slovenia; ³University of Maribor, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Maribor, Slovenia

Ključne besede:

carski rez v drugem trimesečju, nenamerno zatrganje kotov maternice, tehnika carskega reza

Key words:

second trimester cesarean section, unintentional hysterotomy tear, cesarean section technique

Članek prispel / Received

25. 11. 2019

Članek sprejet / Accepted

1. 3. 2021

Izvleček

Namen: Ob carskem rezu se pogosto dogaja nenamerno zatrganje kotov maternice, ki je povezano z resnejšo izgubo krvi, večjim tveganjem za potrebo po transfuziji in nenačrtovano histerektomijo. Najpomembnejši dejavnik tveganja je carski rez v drugi porodni dobi.

Poročilo o primeru: Opisujemo primer 35-letne nosečnice v drugem trimesečju, pri kateri smo opravili drugi carski rez. Prišlo je do nenamernega zatrganja kotov maternice, kar je vodilo v resno izgubo krvi. Odpuščena je bila četrty pooperativni dan v klinično stabilnem stanju.

Abstract

Purpose: Hysterotomy extension at the time of cesarean section is frequent and associated with severe blood loss, risk of transfusion, and unplanned hysterectomy. Cesarean section during the second stage of labor is the most important risk factor.

Case report: We describe a case of a 35-year-old gravida 4 para 1 at 26+1 weeks gestation who underwent a repeat cesarean section. An unintentional hysterotomy extension led to severe blood loss. The patient was discharged on day 4 after the operation in stable condition.

**Naslov za dopisovanje /
Correspondence**

Leyla Al Mahdawi, dr. med.,
Univerzitetni klinični center Maribor,
Oddelek za ginekološko onkologijo in
onkologijo dojk, Ljubljanska 5, 2000
Maribor, Slovenija
Telefon +386 23212408
Fax +386 23212085
E-pošta: almahdawi@gmail.com

Zaključek: Nenamerno zatrganje kotov maternice je povezano z višjo maternalno obolevnostjo in umrljivostjo. Topa kirurška tehnika vstopa in obratna medenična ekstrakcija sta povezani z manjšim tveganjem za zatrganje kotov maternice.

Conclusion: Hysterotomy extension is associated with higher maternal morbidity and mortality. Blunt expansion of the hysterotomy and a reverse breech extraction are associated with a lower uterine tear rate.

INTRODUCTION

Caesarean section (CS) is one of the most frequent operative procedures in obstetrics and gynecology, and is considered to be a safe procedure (1).

In some cases, however, incidental injury to the uterus can significantly increase the operative time and be life-threatening. In our case, this type of complication is described as an unintended hysterotomy extension (UHE).

CASE REPORT

A 35-year-old gravida 4 para 1 was admitted to the delivery room with a diagnosis of preterm premature rupture of membranes (PPROM) at 26+1 weeks gestation. A CS was required in the previous pregnancy at approximately the same gestational age. Both pregnancies were characterized by cervical insufficiency with a cervical cerclage. In the current pregnancy, gestational hypertension and gestational diabetes were managed with anti-hypertensives and diet. At 24+3 weeks gestation the patient had one episode of vaginal bleeding. Antenatal corticosteroids were recommended for fetal lung maturation, but the patient declined further in-patient care. The bleeding subsided shortly thereafter.

At the time of PPRM, antibiotics were initiated, a vaginal smear was obtained, and laboratory testing was performed. The laboratory testing results were normal

(leukocytosis [as expected in pregnancy]; hemoglobin, 107 g/L; and hematocrit, 0.33), except C-reactive protein, which was minimally elevated at 9 mg/mL. *Escherichia coli* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* were isolated from the vaginal swab. The vital signs were normal (blood pressure, 139/79 mmHg; and pulse, 90 beats/min).

Shortly after PPRM, contractions ensued and the cervix began to dilate. Accordingly, atosiban for tocolysis and magnesium sulphate for neonatal neuroprotection were administered. The cerclage was removed.

Cervical dilation continued and a CS was recommended. Immediately after extraction of the fetal head, the surgeon noticed a major laceration of the uterus extending from the right hysterotomy angle towards the lower uterine segment. The laceration was quickly repaired; however, the hemorrhage was profound. The patient was administered methergine (0.2 mg IM), carboprost (250 mcg IM [2 doses]), 2 units of O+ blood along with 2 liters of crystalloids. The estimated blood loss was 2800 mL. At the end of the 2-h procedure, the blood pressure was 98/56 mmHg and the heart rate was approximately 120 beats/min. The hemoglobin concentration was 94 g/L and the hematocrit 0.30. Further laboratory testing did not reveal a coagulopathy or platelet disorder. During the hospital stay, the hemoglobin level decreased to 62 g/L and the hematocrit decreased to 0.22.

DISCUSSION

A UHE occurred as a complication associated with an emergency CS resulting in an increased operative time, blood loss, and injured uterus. Considering the frequency of CSs, it is interesting that UHE was not reported in detail in the literature until 2006 (2). Even more surprising was that this complication has an incidence of 8% (3). Therefore, it is important to be aware of UHE as a potential complication when making the decision for an emergency cesarean section, especially during the last stage of labor.

The probability of a UHE increases 10-fold during the second stage of labor. In this stage, the lower uterine segment is very thin, and thus highly susceptible to a tear during the transabdominal disengagement of the fetal head, which is fixed deep in the pelvis. Of note, a UHE can occur in other stages of delivery (2). Our case confirms that a UHE can occur, even during the first stage of labor.

Our procedure lasted for 2 h, which is significantly more time than reported in the literature. The reason for the increased operative time was the brisk bleeding that required immediate attention and doubled the length of the operation. Thus, the additional time was not devoted to managing the laceration, but rather on achieving adequate hemostasis.

In an uneventful CS, the hemoglobin values are < 10% in 34.4% of the patients; however, the decreased hemoglobin level is more pronounced after hemorrhage, often requiring a blood transfusion (3, 4). Bilgard et al. (3) reported that the UHE risk is as high as 5-fold, with a 17-fold increased risk of hematoma formation, injury to the bladder, and need for hysterectomy. A delayed decrease in the hemoglobin concentration after hemorrhage with a normal postoperative recovery confirms the weak correlation between blood loss and hemoglobin markers, and should therefore always be interpreted with caution (5). A blunt surgical technique and reverse breech extraction are options that will lower the risk of UHE (6-10).

CONCLUSIONS

A UHE is a potential complication of CS, not only in the second stage of labor, but also in the first stage of labor and the second trimester, and is associated with increased patient morbidity.




Figure 1. A sketch of unintentional uterine repair

REFERENCES

1. Dahlke JD, Mendez-Figueroa H, Rouse DJ, Berghella V, Baxter JK, Chauhan SP. Evidence-based surgery for cesarean delivery: an updated systematic review. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2013; 209 (4): 294-306.
2. De la Torre L, González-Quintero VH, Mayor-Lynn K, et al. Significance of accidental extensions in the lower uterine segment during cesarean delivery. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2006; 194 (05): e4–e6.
3. Bligard KH, Durst JK, Stout MJ, Martin S, Cahill AG, Macones GA et al. Risk Factors and Maternal Morbidity Associated with Unintentional Hysterotomy Extension at the Time of Cesarean Delivery. *Am J Perinatol.* 2019; 36 (10): 1054–59.
4. Giugale LE, Sakamoto S, Yabes J, Dunn SL, Krans EE. Unintended hysterotomy extension during cesarean delivery: risk factors and maternal morbidity. *J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2018; 38 (8): 1048–53.
5. Anger H, Durocher J, Dabash R, Winikoff B. How well do postpartum blood loss and common definitions of postpartum hemorrhage correlate with postpartum anemia and fall in hemoglobin? *PLoS One.* 2019; 14 (8): e0221216
6. Rodriguez AI, Porter KB, O'Brien WF. Blunt versus sharp expansion of the uterine incision in low-segment transverse cesarean section. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 1994; 171 (4): 1022-5.
7. Ascioglu O, Gungorduk K, Ascioglu BB, Yildirim G, Gungorduk OC, Ark C. Unintended extension of the lower segment uterine incision at cesarean delivery: a randomized comparison of sharp versus blunt techniques. *Am J Perinatol.* 2014; 31 (10): 837-44.
8. Saad AF, Rahman M, Costantine MM, Saade GR. Blunt versus sharp uterine incision expansion during low transverse cesarean delivery: a meta-analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2014; 211 (6): 684.e1-11.
9. Waterfall H, Grivell RM, Dodd JM. Techniques for assisting difficult delivery at caesarean section. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016; (1): CD004944.
10. Lenz F, Kimmich N, Zimmermann R, Kreft M. Maternal and neonatal outcome of reverse breech extraction of an impacted fetal head during caesarean section in advanced stage of labour: a retrospective cohort study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2019; 19 (1): 98.