# MATERNAL FACTORS INFLUENCING PERINATAL MORBIDITY AND MORTALITY

## ARUNA RANGNEKAR • BANDANA BISWAS

#### SUMMARY

The perinatal outcome can easily be predicted by a simple scoring system of maternal factors. This scoring can be determined not only by doctors and sisters but also by ANM and paramedical staff and patients with higher score referred to larger hospitals where specialists and facilities are available, thus lowering perinatal morbidity and mortality.

### ntroduction

Successful motherhood is the unique chievement in an woman's life. Though it is a natural phenomenon, yet the way to chieve it may endanger not only the life of he mother but that of foetus as well.

Apart from "Too young, too old, too nany and too close" the high risk patients re those which by virtue of their compliation need individualised special care.

In India, most of the population has oor knowledge of antenatal and intranal care available to them. Moreover there a lack of well organised maternity serve to majority of women. To add, there is communication gap and deficiency in ansport system. All those factors have rtainly added to the increased incidence maternal and perinatal morbidity and ortality.

Dept. of Obs. & Gyn., G.M. College. Bhopal. Accepted for publication 16/2/90 The present studyaims at developing a very simple scoring system to identify the high risk patients and lower the maternal and perinatal morbidity and mortality by referring the high risk cases to specialised institution where they can be taken care of properly.

## Material & Methods

This study was carried out at Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Gandhi Medical College, Bhopal. A total of 500 cases in labour were studied.

Among these, 100 cases were taken as control group and remaining 400 cases were high risk patients. Scoring of the cases was done on the following ground:

- (i) Age.
- (ii) Education
- (iii) Occupation
- (iv) Income-On the basis of Income they were further put in five groups
- (v) Parity

- (vi) Height
- (vii) Weight
- (viii) Haemoglobin-level
- (ix) No. of antenatal visits
- (x) Complications in present pregnancy and past obstetric history.

## **Observations**

Pregnancy outcome in booked & unbooked cases.

tal death in booked group were because of malformation incompatible with life. The only maternal mortality was because of Heart disease. Perinatal mortality and morbidity was less in booked cases.

## Discussion

The higher incidence of perinatal loss in the present series might be attributed to the low health care, poor nutrition, low

#### TABLE-I

No.of Patients	No. Babies		Maternal death			
	THE STATE OF THE S	Live Birth	Still Birth	Neonatal Death	Perinatal Death	
183	195	190 (97.43%)	3 (1.54)	2 (1.036%)	5 (2.56%)	Booked 1
217	221	151 (68.32%)	54 (24.43%)	16 (7.24%)	70 (31.67%)	Unbooked 9 (4.15%)

Table-I & II show that among 400 high risk cases 183 were Booked and 217 were unbooked patients. Perinatal loss in unbooked series was 31.67% in comparison to 2.56% in Booked cases. The perina-

standard of education, poor socio-economic conditions and overall unsatisfactory antenatal care prevailing in the developing countries.

The incidence of still birth as re-

TABLE-II
MATERNAL & FOETAL OUTCOME IN RELATION OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS

Social Class.	No.of Patient	No.of Babies	Liver Birth	772	Foetal Still Birth	Outcome Neo Death	Perinatal Death	Maternal Death
I	15	15	14	11	1		1 (6.67%)	
II	18	19	17		1	1	2 (10.53%)	W Little Stille
III	55	57	54		2	1	3 (5.26%)	W Look or
IV	94	102	90		11	1	12 (11.76%)	1 (1.06%)
V	218	223	166		42	15	57 (25.56%)	9 (4.12%)
Total	400	416	341	10-1	57	18	75	10

Higher perinatal & maternal morbidity and mortality in lower socio-economic group.

TABLE-III
FOETAL OUTCOME IN RELATION TO SCORE

Scoring	No.of		Foetal Outcome				
	Patient	Live Birth	Still Birth	Neo Death	Perinatal Death	death	
		HE THE	113	6,107.00	4-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14		
i) Below 10	23	28	_	-		annite() =	
ii) 10-29	256	235	20	6	26	1	
		(90.04%)	(7.66%)	(2.29%)	(9.96%)		
iii) Above 30	121	78	37	12	49	9	
		(61.42%)	(9.45%)	(7.32%)	(29.12)	(38.58%)	

The above observation indicates that perinatal loss is directly proportional to the higher scoring.

TABLE - IV
EDUCATIONAL STATUS & PREGNANCY OUTCOME

Education	No.of patients		Maternal			
		Live Birth	Still Birth	Neo Death	Perinatal Death	Death
. Higher	89	85	3 (3.32%)	2 (2.22%)	5 (5.56%)	-
. Middle/ Lower	140	131	13 (7.69%)	5 (2.96%)	18 (10.65%)	1 (1.22%)
3. Uneducated	171	125	41 (3.16%)	11 (6.21%)	52 (29.37%)	9 (5.26%)

Highest perinatal loss was in uneducated group.

ported by Nair & Nayer (1965) was 65/1000 while in the present study it was 187/1000. The difference is mainly because of the fact that the majority of the cases admitted in emergencies belonged to high risk group and never had any antenatal check-up.

Different scoring system has been developed to identify the high risk preganancies by Nesbitt and Aubrey (1969) Effar and Good Win (1969), Hobbs et al (1973) Coopland et al (1977) and Morrison et al (1979-80). In India a simplified scoring system for identification of high risk births was suggested by Bhargava et al (1982). Taylor (1967) stated that "More and better

prenatal care is not the complete solution. The answer lies in raising the standards of living of the under-privileged, the underfed, the under housed and the under educated so that this group assimilated in to larger middle class."

From this study it is concluded that high risk patients do have a higher maternal & perinatal morbidity and mortality rate. But the incidence can certainly be lowered by a proper screening programme at grass root level and a good referal System. It is not the literacy but the proper education specialy to the women would have an impact on the maternal and child health.

expensed leavening to be a compact of the first operation from the compact in the contract of the contract of

## Bibliography

- Aubry R. H. and Nesbilt, R.E.L. "Am J. Obstet & Gynec 105: 241, 1969
- 2. Bhargava, Sk.K.: Indian Ped. 19: 209 1982.
- Coopland, A. D. Peddle, L. J. Basket, T et al : C.M.A. Journal 116: 999,1977.
- 4. Effer, S.B.: Can. Med. Assn. Jour, 101:55, 1969
- Hobbs. M.S.T. and Acheson, E. D. Am, J. Pub-Health 47: 570, 1957.
- 6. Morrison, Ian and Oslen, J; Obstet Gynec 53: 362, 1979.
- Nair, N. S. and Nayar, T.C.V.: J-Obstet-Gynec. India 15:384, 1965.
- Nesbitt, R.I.L.: 'Perinatal Loss in Modern Obstetrics' E.A. Davis Com. Philadelphia 1957.
- 9. Taylor, E.S.: Editorial Obstet and Gynec India 22: 264, 1967.