

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery and Preference for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on Mode of Birth.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031766
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-May-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Ryan, Gillian; NUI Galway, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology; Galway University Hospitals, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology O Doherty, Kate; National Maternity Hospital, Obstetrics and Gynaecology Devane, Declan; National University Of Ireland, Galway, School of Nursing & Midwifery McAuliffe, Fionnuala; University College Dublin, UCD Perinatal Research Centre; National Maternity Hospital, Obstetrics and Gynaecology Morrison, John; National University of Ireland Galway, Obstetrics and Gynaecology
Keywords:	Maternal medicine < OBSTETRICS, Caesarean section, Vaginal Birth after Caesarean, Birth Preference after Caesarean, Randomised Trial on Mode of Birth

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery and Preference**
4 **for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on Mode of Birth.**
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Running Title: Survey of Women's Views after a first Caesarean**
11
12
13

14 Authors: Gillian A Ryan,^{1,2} Kate C O Doherty⁴, Declan Devane³, Fionnuala M McAuliffe⁴, John
15 J Morrison^{1,2}.
16
17
18
19
20

- 21
22 1. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, National University of Ireland Galway,
23 Galway, Ireland.
24
25 2. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Galway University Hospital, Galway,
26 Ireland.
27
28 3. HRB-Trials Methodology Research Network & School of Nursing and Midwifery,
29 National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland
30
31 4. UCD Perinatal Research Centre, School of Medicine, University College Dublin,
32 National Maternity Hospital, Dublin, Ireland.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Gillian A Ryan, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology,
43 Clinical Science Institute, National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland; **Work**
44 **telephone number:** +353 91493537; **Email:** gillian.ryan@nuigalway.ie
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objective:

To assess the views of women after a first caesarean section on their birth experience, preference for future mode of delivery and willingness to participate in a randomised controlled trial on mode of birth in a future pregnancy.

Design:

Questionnaire survey.

Setting:

Two tertiary maternity centres in Ireland, Galway University Hospital, Galway and the National Maternity Hospital, Dublin.

Participants:

Women with one previous caesarean section.

Methods:

Eligible women were consented to participate, and postal surveys forwarded. Results were collected and analysed. Results were compared between women who had elective and emergency operations.

Primary Outcome Measures:

The satisfaction levels of women after a first caesarean, their preference for mode of birth in a future pregnancy and their willingness to participate in a randomised trial on mode of birth.

Results:

There were 347 completed surveys of 633 women consented (54.8%), of whom 285 and 62 had emergency and elective caesarean deliveries respectively. In general, satisfaction ratings with the delivery were greater than 90%, with similar levels of satisfaction with the care received from doctors and midwives. Women who an emergency procedure expressed lower satisfaction levels with the information about the caesarean and the debriefing received afterwards than women who had a planned operation ($P < 0.05$). For future mode of delivery 39.5% expressed a preference for vaginal birth after caesarean in a subsequent pregnancy and 80% said they would consider involvement in a randomised trial in a future pregnancy.

Conclusion:

Debriefing and counselling women after a caesarean section is an important part of pregnancy care and can significantly impact on a woman's overall birth experience. A significant proportion of this cohort considered vaginal birth after caesarean as a future birth option. These data indicate that a randomised trial on mode of birth after caesarean would be viewed positively by women in our population.

Strengths and Limitations of this Study

- This study assesses the satisfactions levels of women having a first caesarean sections on various aspects of care and investigates whether the type of

1
2
3 caesarean delivery influences preference for future mode of
4 delivery and willingness to participate in a randomised
5 trial on mode of birth in a future pregnancy.
6
7
8

- 9
- 10 • The strengths of this study include the large number of women recruited across two
11 different geographical sites.
12
 - 13 • The evaluation of future birth preferences and willingness to participate in a randomised
14 controlled trial on mode of delivery is a topic on which there are minimal data in a
15 European obstetric population.
16
 - 17 • This analysis gives an overview of preference for future mode of birth and willingness to
18 be involved in a trial on mode of birth, but we are unable to assess how this preference
19 may change over time.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 29 **Disclosure of interests**

30
31 None declared.
32
33

34 35 **Funding Statement**

36 This research received no specific funding from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
37 not-for-profit sectors.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery and Preference for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on Mode of Birth.

Introduction

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Women who have had one previous caesarean section (CS) represent a significant proportion of all women presenting for antenatal care in pregnancy [1,2]. For the majority of such women, the option of having either a vaginal birth after caesarean (VBAC) or a repeat elective caesarean section (ELSCS) is a focus of major discussion in a subsequent pregnancy. Many factors influence this decision including the reason for the original CS, other obstetric variables, views of the attending obstetrician, and finally, and most importantly, the views of the mother and her partner [1,3]. This discussion includes attention to the risks and benefits of VBAC versus repeat ELSCS [3-8]. Apart from these clinical issues, there are many geographical [1,9-11], institutional

1
2
3 [12], epidemiological and legal factors [13] that influence VBAC rates worldwide. What is clear
4
5 however is that VBAC attempt rates [1], and VBAC rates [1], have been declining significantly
6
7 in recent years in developed countries [1,7]. Apart from the clinical importance of this topic, and
8
9 the associated morbidity, increasing CS rates also place a significant burden on healthcare
10
11 resources [14,15].
12
13
14
15
16

17 Notwithstanding the issues outlined above, the evidence available for counselling the woman
18
19 who has had one CS regarding her birth options in a future pregnancy is limited. Currently, the
20
21 only data from randomised controlled trials (RCT) of VBAC versus repeat ELSCS emanates
22
23 from two trials [16,17], totalling 320 women. Only one of these provided results on maternal and
24
25 fetal outcomes [17], and the numbers were too small to generate strong recommendations that
26
27 might inform women's decision on mode of birth. A Cochrane review concluded that both
28
29 options of VBAC and repeat ELSCS are associated with benefits and harms, however evidence
30
31 for the magnitude of these outcomes was drawn from non-randomised studies, associated with
32
33 potential bias, and hence must be interpreted with caution [4]. The need for further RCTs was
34
35 emphasized. However, there remains a doubt concerning the feasibility of such a trial, and
36
37 whether or not women would agree to randomisation [4,14]. There are minimal data regarding
38
39 women's views on this topic, and none to our knowledge pertaining to a European population of
40
41 expectant mothers. The aims of this study were to evaluate the views of women who had one
42
43 previous CS regarding their experience of delivery, their preference for birth options in a future
44
45 pregnancy, and finally their willingness, or otherwise, to participate in a potential future RCT of
46
47 VBAC versus repeat ELSCS.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methods

This study used a written questionnaire survey of women who had their first CS between January and August 2017 in two tertiary teaching hospitals in the Republic of Ireland, Galway University Hospital on the west coast, and the National Maternity Hospital, Dublin on the east coast.

Institutional review board approval was obtained at both sites (Galway University Hospital Reference No. 1804 and National Maternity Hospital Reference No. EC 37.2017). Eligible participants were identified using hospital maintained computerised databases. Women were contacted by telephone or post for consent, and postal surveys forwarded subsequently. Surveys were distributed over a 9-month period (September 2017-March 2018) in an effort to capture the woman's views on a subsequent mode of delivery within the first year after the index pregnancy. Exclusion criteria included women under 18 years of age and women identified as having had a perinatal loss (information received from the hospital databases).

The following factors were included in the survey instrument: 1. The reason for CS; 2. Whether it was planned or unplanned/emergency; 3. Women's satisfaction regarding; (a) the statement that a caesarean section was the best option for them at the time; (b) the care received from the obstetric team; (c) the care received from the midwifery team; (d) the information received prior to delivery regarding the CS; (e) the information / debriefing received after delivery regarding the CS; 4. Women's preference for mode of delivery in a future pregnancy; and 5. Women's willingness or otherwise, to participate in a future RCT of VBAC versus repeat ELSCS.

Satisfaction scores obtained (1-5) were grouped into those from women who described themselves as satisfied (satisfaction rating 1-2) with their experience or those that were not

1
2
3 satisfied (satisfaction rating 3-5). A copy of the survey form is in Supplementary File 1 and has
4
5 been forwarded to the editorial board.
6
7
8
9

10 Demographic details including maternal age, BMI, gestation at delivery, parity and ethnicity
11 were ascertained from the hospital databases. Statistical analyses were performed using Chi-
12 Square test and T-Test as appropriate (IBM SPSS Version 24). A P value of <0.05 was accepted
13 as being statistically significant. A subgroup analysis was also performed between women who
14 had a planned / ELSCS and women who had an unplanned/ emergency CS (EMCS).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Results**

25
26 A total number of 734 women were identified from the hospital databases as being eligible to
27 participate in the survey and 633/734 (86.2%) consented to participate and were sent postal
28 questionnaire surveys. There were 347/633 (54.8%%) completed survey forms returned for
29 analysis; 154/242 (63%) at Galway University Hospital and 193/391 (49.4%) at the National
30 Maternity Hospital, Dublin. Of these, 285/347(82.1%%) had an EMCS, and 62/347 (17.9%) had
31 an ELSCS. The main reasons for CS were failure to progress in labour or failed induction of
32 labour 121/347 (34.9%); abnormal fetal heart rate pattern 108/347 (31.1%); malposition
33 (including breech presentation) 50/347 (14.4%); other (including previous third-degree tear,
34 maternal anxiety, previous shoulder dystocia, urinary incontinence) 35/347 (10.1%), maternal
35 medical reason 24/347 (6.9%), failed instrumental delivery 8/347 (2.3%) and one where the
36 woman was unsure of the indication for CS 1/347 (0.3%). There were 261 women who had the
37 CS in their first pregnancy (Para 1) and 86 women had the CS in a second or subsequent
38 pregnancy (parity >1). The demographics of the group are presented in Table 1. The average
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 maternal age was 34.9 years and the average BMI was 25.9 kg/m². The mean gestation at time of
4 birth was higher in the EMCS group than in the ELSCS group (39⁺⁶ weeks vs 38⁺⁵ weeks
5
6 respectively, P=0.01). There were no other significant differences in the demographics of both
7
8
9 groups of women.
10

11
12
13
14
15 A comparison of the results of the survey questions by women in EMCS and ELSCS groups are
16 presented in Table 2. The vast majority of women in both groups (95-96%) were satisfied in
17
18 general that CS was the most appropriate delivery option for them given their clinical
19
20 circumstances. Replies to the question pertaining to the medical care provided revealed
21
22 satisfaction levels of 92-98%. Regarding midwifery care, satisfaction levels were 90-93%.
23
24 However, women in the EMCS group were less satisfied with the information received regarding
25
26 the CS, both prior to delivery (P<0.05) and postnatally (P<0.01) (Table 2). The lowest rates of
27
28 satisfaction overall (54%) were experienced by women in the EMCS group regarding their views
29
30 on the debriefing information they received postnatally. No difference was observed between
31
32 hospital sites in relation to these levels of satisfaction.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In the overall cohort, 39.5% of women expressed a preference for VBAC in a subsequent
41 pregnancy, and this was similar for women in the EMCS and ELSCS groups (Table 3). The
42 preference rate for repeat ELSCS overall was 31.7%. The proportion of women who were
43
44 undecided was 28.8%. Approximately 80% of women in both groups said they would consider
45
46 randomisation in a future pregnancy (Table 3). These findings were similar among women across
47
48
49 both hospital sites.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusion

Management of delivery for the woman who has had one previous CS is a controversial area of obstetric practice, with many factors influencing the decision to pursue either VBAC or ERCS [1, 3,13,18], as outlined above. However, it is well established that the view of the woman is paramount in arriving at a decision regarding mode of delivery in these circumstances [19], and hence the focus of this study was that of the satisfaction levels of women who had one CS regarding their past delivery, and their plans or deliberations for a future birth. There are minimal data to our knowledge on this topic in a European obstetric population. The strengths of this study include the large number of women recruited across two different geographical sites, specific evaluation of future birth preferences and willingness to participate in a randomised controlled trial on mode of delivery, and finally, the level of concordance of the results across both sites. The limitations of this study are discussed below.

In this study, satisfaction with the delivery, i.e. having had a CS, was in the region of 95% and was similar for both EMCS and ELSCS groups. This is in contrast to other studies which have reported lower satisfaction rates for women who had unplanned caesarean sections compared with women who had planned caesarean

1
2
3 sections [20,21]. We similarly observed high satisfaction rates,
4
5 i.e. greater than 90% with care providers. This study also assessed the
6
7 level of satisfaction women experienced related to information received at the time of CS and the
8
9 postnatal debriefing provided. Unsurprisingly, women who had an EMCS reported a
10
11 significantly lower satisfaction level with information received at the time of delivery than their
12
13 counterparts who had an ELSCS. This factor may well be related to the fact that the majority of
14
15 these operations were performed intrapartum, and in many cases done as an emergency
16
17 procedure. It is disappointing that only 54% of women in the EMCS group were satisfied with
18
19 postnatal counselling and debriefing. Specific comments from women included 'I found the
20
21 aftercare disappointing', 'there was no counselling or information given about what happened or
22
23 what to expect', 'my experience was very frightening, and the reason discussed only briefly' and
24
25 'I still have unanswered questions about my delivery'. The NICE guideline on CS states that
26
27 women after a CS should be given the opportunity to discuss the reasons for the CS and be
28
29 provided with both verbal and printed information about future birth options [22]. Despite this
30
31 recommendation there remains a paucity of guidelines surrounding the best practice for postnatal
32
33 debriefing, and similarly there is a lack of guidance regarding postnatal follow up for women
34
35 who may have had more difficult or traumatic childbirth experiences.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Regarding future mode of birth, 39.5% of the overall group expressed a preference for VBAC,
46
47 while 31.7% had a preference for repeat ELSCS and 28.8% were undecided. The statistic of
48
49 approximately 40% of women expressing a preference for VBAC is remarkably consistent from
50
51 the studies that are available. A recent US study on this topic reported that at 12 months
52
53 postpartum, 45% of women who delivered by caesarean in their first birth wanted to have their
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 next delivery vaginally [23]. An Australian survey by Dodd et al explored the views of women in
4 the first 6 months after delivery and found a similar preference with regards to VBAC at 41%,
5 while only 23% expressed an interest in a repeat ELSCS and 35% described themselves as being
6 unsure [14]. However, when it comes to willingness to be recruited to a future RCT of VBAC
7 versus repeat ELSCS, the data from our study are markedly in contrast to the findings from the
8 one other study that examined this [14]. In our study, 80% of the women expressed a
9 willingness to being involved in a future RCT in which their mode of delivery would be
10 determined by a process of randomisation. In the Australian study, only 29 women (10%)
11 indicated a willingness to take part in such a trial [14]. While we acknowledge it is unlikely that
12 women with a clear preference for ELSCS will opt in to such a study, we are of the opinion that
13 women who are undecided (28.8%) and those with an interest in having a VBAC (39.5%) may
14 remain open to being involved in such a trial, but it is difficult to estimate, with any accuracy,
15 those that would eventually agree to randomisation in a future pregnancy. This is an important
16 finding from our study as it supports the concept of feasibility of such an RCT in an Irish
17 population.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 We recognise that there are certain limitations to our study. This analysis gives an overview of
41 women's satisfaction with their CS and their preference for future mode of birth but was not able
42 to assess the strength of this preference. Similarly, the birth preference may change over time
43 and the data presented may not truly reflect the proportion who ultimately pursue their stated
44 preference in a subsequent pregnancy. It is encouraging for a future RCT that 80% of our
45 population expressed an interest in being recruited but that statistic, as alluded to above, may
46 change during the course of a subsequent pregnancy. It was not possible to assess the strength of

1
2
3 the views expressed, particularly as randomly assigning mode of birth would remove the element
4
5 of clinician preference and patient choice, though one could argue that agreeing to randomisation
6
7 is in fact a birth preference in itself.
8
9

10
11
12 In conclusion, a significant proportion of women in this cohort considered VBAC as an option
13
14 for a future birth, and a majority of women stated they would consider randomisation in a
15
16 potential RCT on the topic. These data indicate that randomised trial of VBAC versus repeat
17
18 ELSCS would be viewed positively by women with one previous CS.
19
20

21 22 **Contribution to authorship**

23
24
25 Study concept and design GR, JM, FM. Data acquisition and analysis GR, KOD. Drafting and
26
27 critical revision of the manuscript GR, JM, DD, FM.
28
29

30 31 **Details of ethics approval**

32
33
34 Ethical approval was received from both Galway University Hospital and the National Maternity
35
36 Hospital for this study (Galway University Hospital Reference No. 1804, 13th October 2017 and
37
38 National Maternity Hospital Reference No. EC 37.2017, 8th January 2018).
39
40

41 42 **Acknowledgements**

43
44
45 We are grateful to all the women who participated in this study and all involved in collecting and
46
47 analysing the data at both hospital sites.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References:

1. Ryan GA, Nicholson SM, Morrison JJ. Vaginal birth after caesarean section: Current status and where to from here? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2018 May; 224:52-57.
2. RCOG The Sentinel National Caesarean Section Audit Report- RCOG Clinical Effectiveness Support Unit. RCOG Press 2001.
https://www.rcog.org.uk/globalassets/documents/guidelines/research--audit/nscs_audit.pdf
3. Bonzon M, Gross MM, Karch A, et al. Deciding on the mode of birth after a previous caesarean section - An online survey investigating women's preferences in Western Switzerland. *Midwifery.* 2017; 50:219-227.
4. Dodd JM, Crowther CA, Huertas E, et al. Planned elective repeat caesarean section versus planned vaginal birth for women with a previous caesarean birth. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Review* 2013, Issue 12.
5. Cheng YW, Eden KB, Marshall N, et al. Delivery after prior caesarean: maternal morbidity and mortality. *Clin Perinatol.* 2011; 38(2):297-309.
6. RCOG Green-top Guideline No.45 Birth after Previous Caesarean Birth (2015).
<https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelines-research-services/guidelines/gtg45/>

- 1
2
3 7. ACOG. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 205: Vaginal Birth After Cesarean Delivery. *Obstet*
4
5 *Gynecol.* 2019; 133(2), e110-e127.
6
- 7
8 8. Royal College of Physicians of Ireland, Institute of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.
9
10 RCPI Delivery After Previous Caesarean Section Clinical Practice Guideline 2013.
11
12 [https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/clinical-strategy-and-programmes/delivery-
14 after-previous-caesarean-section.pdf](https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/clinical-strategy-and-programmes/delivery-
13 after-previous-caesarean-section.pdf)
15
- 16
17
18 9. Mercer BM, Gilbert S, Landon MB, et al; National Institute of Child Health and Human
19
20 Development Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units Network. Labor outcomes with increasing
21
22 number of prior vaginal births after caesarean delivery. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2008 Feb;111(2
23
24 Pt 1):285-91.
25
- 26
27 10. Uddin SF, Simon AE. Rates and success rates of trial of labor after cesarean delivery in
28
29 the United States, 1990-2009. *Matern Child Health J.* 2013 Sep;17(7):1309-14.
30
- 31
32 11. Knight HE, Gurol-Urganci I, van der Meulen JH, et al. Vaginal birth after
33
34 caesarean section: a cohort study investigating factors associated with its uptake and
35
36 success. *BJOG.* 2014 Jan;121(2):183-92
37
- 38
39 12. Colais P, Bontempi K, Pinnarelli L, et al. Vaginal Birth After Caesarean Birth in Italy:
40
41 Variations Among Areas of Residence and Hospitals. *BMC Pregnancy*
42
43 *Childbirth.* 2018;18(1):383.
44
- 45
46 13. Cox KJ. Providers' perspectives on the vaginal birth after caesarean guidelines in Florida,
47
48 United States: a qualitative study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2011; 12;11:72.
49
- 50
51 14. Dodd J, Pearce E, Crowther C. Women's experiences and preferences
52
53 following Caesarean birth. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2004 Dec;44(6):521-4.
54
55
56
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 15. Fobelets M, Beeckman K, Faron G, et al. Vaginal birth
4
5 after caesarean versus elective repeat caesarean delivery after one
6
7 previous caesarean section: a cost-effectiveness analysis in four European countries.
8
9 BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2018 Apr 11;18(1):92.
10
11
- 12 16. Law LW, Pang MW, Chung TK, et al. Randomised trial of assigned mode of delivery
13
14 after a previous caesarean section-impact on maternal psychological dynamics. J Matern
15
16 Fetal Neonatal Med. 2010; 23(10):1106-13.
17
18
- 19 17. Crowther CA, Dodd JM, Hiller JE, et al; Birth After Caesarean Study Group. Planned
20
21 Vaginal Birth or Elective Repeat Caesarean: Patient Preference Restricted Cohort with
22
23 Nested Randomised Trial. PLoS Med. 2012; 9(3):e1001192.
24
25
- 26 18. Chinkam S, Ewan J, Koeniger-Donohue R, et al. The Effect of Evidence-Based Scripted
27
28 Midwifery Counselling on Women's Choices about Mode of Birth after a
29
30 Previous Caesarean. J Midwifery Womens Health. 2016; 61: 613–620.
31
32
- 33 19. Nilsson C, Lalor J, Begley C, et al. Vaginal birth after caesarean: Views of women from
34
35 countries with low VBAC rates. Women Birth. 2017;30(6):481-490.
36
37
- 38 20. Blomquist JL, Quiroz LH, Macmillan D, et al. Mothers' satisfaction with planned vaginal
39
40 and planned cesarean birth. Am J Perinatol. 2011;28(5):383-8.
41
42
- 43 21. Shorten A, Shorten B. The importance of mode of birth after previous cesarean:
44
45 success, satisfaction, and postnatal health. J Midwifery Womens Health. 2012;57(2):126-
46
47 32.
48
- 49 22. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence's (NICE) guidance on elective
50
51 caesarean section 2011(Update 2019). <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg132>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

23. Attanasio LB, Kozhimannil KB, Kjerulff KH. Women's preference for vaginal

	Overall group (n=347)	EMCS (n=285)	ELSCS (n=62)	P Value	birth after a
Para>1	86	56	30		
Para=1	261	229	32		
Average age (Years)	34.9	34.99	34.89	ns	
Average BMI (kg/m²)	25.9	25.95	25.43	ns	
Gestation at Delivery (weeks + days) Mean	39 ⁺⁵	39 ⁺⁶	38 ⁺⁵	P<0.01	
Nationality: Irish	276 (79.5%)	227 (79.6%)	49 (79.04%)		
Other	71 (20.5%)	58 (20.35%)	13 (20.96%)		

first delivery by caesarean. Birth. 2019;46(1):51-60.

Table 1: Demographic Features of the Groups.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Legend. Patient demographic features comparing the emergency caesarean delivery group with elective caesarean delivery group.

Statistical significance was taken as $P < 0.05$. ns=Not significant.

EMCS = emergency caesarean section. ELSCS= elective caesarean section.

Para1=Women after their first pregnancy. Para>1 =Women in a second or subsequent pregnancy.

Table 2. Patients Level of Satisfaction by Emergency Caesarean Delivery versus Elective Caesarean Delivery

	EMCS (n=285)	ELSCS(n=62)	P Value
Satisfied with Mode of Delivery	272 (95.5%)	60 (96.8%)	ns
Satisfied with Medical Care Provided	263 (92.3%)	61 (98.4%)	ns
Satisfied with Midwifery Care Provided	259 (90.9%)	58 (93.5%)	ns
Satisfied with information at time of delivery	250 (87.8%)	61 (98.4%)	P<0.05
Satisfied with Postnatal Counselling & Information about Caesarean	154 (54%)	51 (82.3%)	P<0.001

Table 2 Legend. Patient satisfaction levels comparing emergency caesarean delivery group with elective caesarean delivery group.

Statistical significance was taken as P<0.05. ns=Not significant.

EMCS = emergency caesarean delivery. ELSCS= elective caesarean delivery

	Overall Group (n=347)	EMCS (n=285)	ELSCS (n=62)	P Value
Preference for Future Mode of Delivery:				
VBAC	137 (39.5%)	114 (40%)	23 (37.1%)	ns
Repeat ELSCS	110 (31.7%)	83 (29.1%)	27 (43.5%)	ns
Undecided	100 (28.8%)	88 (30.9%)	12 (19.4%)	ns
Would consider involvement in an RCT of VBAC vs Repeat ELSCS?				
Yes	281 (81%)	230 (80.7%)	51 (82.3%)	ns
No	66 (19%)	55 (19.3%)	11(17.7%)	ns

Table 3. Preferences for Future Delivery.

Table 3 Legend. Patient preferences for future mode of delivery and willingness to be involved in a future randomised trial of vaginal birth after caesarean or elective repeat caesarean delivery. Statistical significance was taken a $P < 0.05$. ns=Not significant. VBAC= vaginal birth after caesarean. RCT= randomised controlled trial. EMCS = emergency caesarean section. ELSCS= elective caesarean section.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Supplementary File 1. The questionnaire survey completed by patients.

Questionnaire

1. What reason below best fits with the reason you had the caesarean section? (Please tick beside most appropriate answer)

1. Fetal Distress i.e. there was concern about the baby in labour
2. Failure to Progress/Failed induction of labour/Very slow or poor progress in labour
3. Maternal medical reason (e.g. diabetes, low lying placenta)
4. Baby in the wrong position (e.g. breech, transverse)
5. No success with delivery of the baby with forceps or vacuum
6. Other
7. Don't know

2. Was it a planned procedure in advance (called elective) or what was it an emergency? _____

3. Are you satisfied that the caesarean section was the best option, for you in those circumstances, for the delivery of the baby?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Not sure
4. Not satisfied
5. Very unsatisfied

4. Do you feel the care you received was professional and supportive from the doctors?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Not sure
4. Not satisfied
5. Very unsatisfied

PTO

1
2
3 **5. Do you feel the care you received was professional and supportive from the**
4 **midwifery team?**
5

- 6
7 1. Very satisfied
8 2. Satisfied
9 3. Not sure
10 4. Not satisfied
11 5. Very unsatisfied
12

13
14 **6. Are you satisfied that you received adequate information about the reason for**
15 **caesarean section at the time of your delivery?**
16

- 17
18 1. Very satisfied
19 2. Satisfied
20 3. Not sure
21 4. Not satisfied
22 5. Very unsatisfied
23

24
25 **7. Are you satisfied that you received adequate information and counselling in the**
26 **postnatal period (i.e. after delivery)?**
27

- 28
29 1. Very satisfied
30 2. Satisfied
31 3. Not sure
32 4. Not satisfied
33 5. Very unsatisfied
34

35
36
37 **8. What would be your preferred option for a future delivery?**
38

- 39 1. Normal labour and delivery
40 2. Repeat planned caesarean section
41 3. Undecided
42

43
44
45 **9. If you have a future pregnancy, discussion will take place between you and your**
46 **doctor about the best method of delivery again, i.e. a normal labour and delivery or**
47 **a repeat caesarean section. Sometimes the answer is not always clear. If there is a**
48 **research study on this topic, which assigns you to one or the other option, would you**
49 **agree to participate?**
50

- 51 1. Yes
52 2. No
53

54
55 *(If you did opt into a research study you would have the power to opt out at any time if you*
56
57

1
2
3 *changed your mind. This question is for research purposes only and will not affect your*
4 *future care in any way.)*
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

<http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/>

Page/line no(s).

Title and abstract

<p>Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended</p>	Yes
<p>Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results, and conclusions</p>	Yes

Introduction

<p>Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement</p>	Yes
<p>Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions</p>	Yes

Methods

<p>Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g., postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**</p>	Yes
<p>Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience, relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability</p>	Yes
<p>Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**</p>	Yes
<p>Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g., sampling saturation); rationale**</p>	Yes
<p>Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues</p>	YES
<p>Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**</p>	Yes

Data collection instruments and technologies - Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	Yes
Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	Yes
Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	Yes
Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	Yes
Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation); rationale**	Yes

Results/findings

Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with prior research or theory	Yes
Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	

Discussion

Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; identification of unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	Yes
Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	Yes

Other

Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	Yes
Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection, interpretation, and reporting	Yes

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. **Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations.** *Academic Medicine*, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014
DOI: [10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388](https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388)

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery in Two Tertiary Centres in Ireland and their Preference for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on Mode of Birth.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031766.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Ryan, Gillian; NUI Galway, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology; Galway University Hospitals, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology O Doherty, Kate; National Maternity Hospital, Obstetrics and Gynaecology Devane, Declan; National University Of Ireland, Galway, School of Nursing & Midwifery McAuliffe, Fionnuala; University College Dublin, UCD Perinatal Research Centre; National Maternity Hospital, Obstetrics and Gynaecology Morrison, John; National University of Ireland Galway, Obstetrics and Gynaecology
Primary Subject Heading:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Keywords:	Maternal medicine < OBSTETRICS, Caesarean section, Vaginal Birth after Caesarean, Birth Preference after Caesarean, Randomised Trial on Mode of Birth

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery in Two Tertiary**
4 **Centres in Ireland and their Preference for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on**
5 **Mode of Birth.**
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 **Running Title: Survey of Women's Views after a first Caesarean**
13

14
15
16
17 Authors: Gillian A Ryan,^{1,2} Kate C O Doherty⁴, Declan Devane³, Fionnuala M McAuliffe⁴, John
18 J Morrison^{1,2}.
19
20
21
22
23

- 24 1. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, National University of Ireland Galway,
25 Galway, Ireland.
- 26 2. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Galway University Hospital, Galway,
27 Ireland.
- 28 3. HRB-Trials Methodology Research Network & School of Nursing and Midwifery,
29 National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland
30
- 31 4. UCD Perinatal Research Centre, School of Medicine, University College Dublin,
32 National Maternity Hospital, Dublin, Ireland.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Gillian A Ryan, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology,
45 Clinical Science Institute, National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland; **Work**
46
47 **telephone number:** +353 91493537; **Email:** gillian.ryan@nuigalway.ie
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objective:

To assess the views of women after a first caesarean section on their birth experience, preference for future mode of birth and willingness to participate in a randomised controlled trial on mode of birth in a future pregnancy.

Design:

Questionnaire survey.

Setting:

Two tertiary maternity centres in Ireland, Galway University Hospital, Galway and the National Maternity Hospital, Dublin.

Participants:

Women with one previous caesarean section.

Methods:

Eligible women were consented to participate, and postal surveys forwarded. Results were collected and analysed. Results were compared between women who had elective and emergency operations.

Primary Outcome Measures:

The satisfaction levels of women after a first caesarean, their preference for mode of birth in a future pregnancy and their willingness to participate in a randomised trial on mode of birth.

Results:

1
2
3 There were 347 completed surveys of 633 women consented (54.8%),
4
5 of whom 285 and 62 had emergency and elective caesarean
6
7 deliveries respectively. In general, satisfaction ratings with
8
9 the delivery were greater than 90%, with similar levels of
10
11 satisfaction with the care received from doctors and midwives.
12
13 Women who an emergency procedure expressed lower satisfaction
14
15 levels with the information about the caesarean and the
16
17 debriefing received afterwards than women who had a planned
18
19 operation ($P < 0.05$). For future mode of birth 39.5% expressed a
20
21 preference for vaginal birth after caesarean in a subsequent
22
23 pregnancy and 80% said they would consider involvement in a
24
25 randomised trial in a future pregnancy.
26
27
28
29

30 **Conclusion:**

31
32 Debriefing and counselling women after a caesarean section is an
33
34 important part of pregnancy care and can significantly impact on
35
36 a woman's overall birth experience. A significant proportion of this cohort
37
38 considered vaginal birth after caesarean as a future birth option. These data indicate that a
39
40 randomised trial on mode of birth after caesarean would be viewed positively by women in our
41
42 population.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Strengths and Limitations of this Study**

- 50
51 • This study assesses the satisfactions levels of women having a first caesarean section on
52
53 various aspects of care and investigates whether the type of
54
55 caesarean delivery influences their preference for future
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mode of birth and their willingness to participate in a
4 randomised trial on mode of birth in a future pregnancy.
5
6

- 7
- 8 • The strengths of this study include the large number of women recruited across two
9 different geographical sites.
10
 - 11 • The evaluation of future birth preferences and willingness to participate in a randomised
12 controlled trial on mode of birth is a topic on which there are minimal data in a European
13 obstetric population.
14
 - 15 • This analysis gives an overview of preference for future mode of birth and willingness to
16 be involved in a trial on mode of birth, but we are unable to assess how this preference
17 may change over time.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 27 **Disclosure of interests**

28
29 None declared.
30
31

32 33 **Funding Statement**

34 This research received no specific funding from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
35 not-for-profit sectors.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 **Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery in Two Tertiary**
16 **Centres in Ireland and their Preference for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on**
17 **Mode of Birth.**
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Introduction**

25
26 Women who have had one previous caesarean section (CS) represent a significant proportion of
27 all women presenting for antenatal care in pregnancy [1,2]. For the majority of such women, the
28 option of having either a vaginal birth after caesarean (VBAC) or a repeat elective caesarean
29 section (ELSCS) is a focus of major discussion in a subsequent pregnancy. Many factors
30 influence this decision including the reason for the original CS, other obstetric variables, views
31 of the attending obstetrician, and finally, and most importantly, the views of the mother and her
32 partner [1,3]. This discussion includes attention to the risks and benefits of VBAC versus repeat
33 ELSCS [3-8]. Apart from these clinical issues, there are many geographical [1,9-11], institutional
34 [12], epidemiological and legal factors [13] that influence VBAC rates worldwide. What is clear
35 however is that VBAC attempt rates [1], and VBAC rates [1], have been declining significantly
36 in recent years in developed countries [1,7]. Apart from the clinical importance of this topic, and
37 the associated morbidity, increasing CS rates also place a significant burden on healthcare
38 resources [14,15].
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Notwithstanding the issues outlined above, the evidence available for counselling the woman
7
8 who has had one CS regarding her birth options in a future pregnancy is limited. Currently, the
9
10 only data from randomised controlled trials (RCT) of VBAC versus repeat ELSCS emanates
11
12 from two trials [16,17], totalling 320 women. Only one of these provided results on maternal and
13
14 fetal outcomes [17], and the numbers were too small to generate any strong recommendations
15
16 that might inform women's decision on mode of birth. A Cochrane review concluded that both
17
18 options of VBAC and repeat ELSCS are associated with benefits and harms, however the
19
20 evidence for the magnitude of these outcomes was drawn from non-randomised studies, and
21
22 associated with potential bias, and therefore must be interpreted with caution [4]. The need for
23
24 further RCTs was emphasized. However, there remains a doubt concerning the feasibility of such
25
26 a trial, and whether or not women would agree to randomisation [4,14]. There are minimal data
27
28 regarding women's views on this topic, and none to our knowledge pertaining to a European
29
30 population of expectant mothers. The aims of this study were to evaluate the views of women
31
32 who had one previous CS regarding their experience of delivery, their preference for birth
33
34 options in a future pregnancy, and finally their willingness, or otherwise, to participate in a
35
36 potential future RCT of VBAC versus repeat ELSCS.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Methods**

46
47 This study used a written questionnaire survey of women who had their first CS between January
48
49 and August 2017 in two tertiary teaching hospitals in the Republic of Ireland, Galway University
50
51 Hospital, Galway on the west coast, and the National Maternity Hospital, Dublin on the east
52
53 coast. Institutional review board approval was obtained at both sites (Galway University Hospital
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Reference No. 1804 and National Maternity Hospital Reference No. EC 37.2017). Eligible
4 participants were identified using hospital maintained computerised databases. Women were
5 contacted by telephone or post for consent, and postal surveys subsequently forwarded. Surveys
6 were distributed over a 9-month period from September 2017 to March 2018 in an effort to
7 capture the woman's views on a subsequent mode of delivery within the first year after the index
8 pregnancy. Exclusion criteria included women under 18 years of age and any women who had a
9 perinatal loss (information received from the hospital databases). A patient interaction focus
10 group was organised prior to the study with a number (n=10) of women who recently had their
11 first caesarean section. Validation of the survey questions was a component of this meeting. In
12 addition, telephone contact was made with a small number of participants (n=20) after receipt of
13 the survey, to assess their understanding of the information included.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The following factors were included in the survey instrument: 1. The reason for the CS; 2.
32 Whether it was a planned or unplanned/emergency procedure; 3. Women's satisfaction
33 regarding; (a) the statement that a CS was the best option for them at the time; (b) the care
34 received from the obstetric team; (c) the care received from the midwifery team; (d) the
35 information received prior to delivery regarding the CS; (e) the information / debriefing received
36 after delivery regarding the CS; 4. Women's preference for mode of birth in a future pregnancy;
37 and 5. Women's willingness or otherwise, to participate in a future RCT of VBAC versus repeat
38 ELSCS. Satisfaction scores obtained (1-5) were grouped into those from women who described
39 themselves as satisfied (satisfaction rating 1-2) with their experience or those that were not
40 satisfied (satisfaction rating 3-5). A copy of the survey form is in Supplementary File 1 and has
41 been forwarded to the editorial board.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Demographic details including maternal age, BMI, gestation at delivery, parity and ethnicity
6 were ascertained from the hospital databases. Statistical analyses were performed using Chi-
7
8 Square test and T-Test as appropriate (IBM SPSS Version 24). A P value of <0.05 was accepted
9
10 as being statistically significant. A subgroup analysis was also performed between women who
11
12 had a planned / ELSCS and women who had an unplanned/ emergency CS (EMCS).
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Patient and Public Involvement**

20
21 During the development of this questionnaire survey women after a first CS were invited to take
22
23 part in a focus group to share their experience surrounding their care at the time of CS and their
24
25 preferences for future mode of birth. They were also invited to give their opinion on what
26
27 information they felt was important to be collected for the survey. During the initial phase of the
28
29 survey responses were selected at random and patients were contacted to discuss their responses
30
31 to the survey to ensure they had no comments on how to improve it. Once published, the data
32
33 will be made available on both hospital sites, for antenatal clinic visits, and for formal prenatal
34
35 education classes.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Results**

46
47 A total of n=734 women were identified from the hospital databases as being eligible to
48
49 participate in the survey and 633/734 (86.2%) consented to participate and were sent postal
50
51 questionnaire surveys. There were 347/633 (54.8%%) completed survey forms returned for
52
53 analysis; 154/242 (63%) at Galway University Hospital and 193/391 (49.4%) at the National
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Maternity Hospital, Dublin. Of these, 285/347(82.1%%) had an EMCS, and 62/347 (17.9%) had
4
5 an ELSCS. The main reasons for CS were failure to progress in labour or failed induction of
6
7 labour 121/347 (34.9%); abnormal fetal heart rate pattern 108/347 (31.1%); malposition
8
9 (including breech presentation) 50/347 (14.4%); other (including previous third-degree tear,
10
11 maternal anxiety, previous shoulder dystocia, urinary incontinence) 35/347 (10.1%), maternal
12
13 medical reason 24/347 (6.9%), failed instrumental delivery 8/347 (2.3%) and one where the
14
15 woman was unsure of the indication for CS 1/347 (0.3%). There were 261 women who had the
16
17 CS in their first pregnancy (Para 1) and 86 women had their first CS in a second or subsequent
18
19 pregnancy (Para >1). The demographic features of the groups are presented in Table 1. The
20
21 average maternal age was 34.9 years and the average BMI was 25.9 kg/m². The mean gestation
22
23 at the time of birth was higher in the EMCS group than in the ELSCS group (39⁺⁶ weeks vs 38⁺⁵
24
25 weeks respectively, p=0.01). There were no other significant differences between the
26
27 demographics of the groups.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 A comparison of the results of the survey questions divided by women in the EMCS and ELSCS
36
37 groups are presented in Table 2. The vast majority of women in both groups (95-96%) were
38
39 satisfied in general that CS was the most appropriate delivery option for them given their clinical
40
41 circumstances. Replies to the question pertaining to the medical care provided revealed
42
43 satisfaction levels of 92-98%. Regarding midwifery care, satisfaction levels were 90-93%.
44
45 However, women in the EMCS group were less satisfied with the information received regarding
46
47 the CS, both prior to delivery (p<0.05) and postnatally (p<0.01) (Table 2). The lowest rates of
48
49 satisfaction overall (54%) were experienced by women in the EMCS group regarding their views
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on the debriefing information they received postnatally. No difference was observed between
4
5 hospital sites in relation to these levels of satisfaction.
6
7

8
9
10 In the overall cohort, 39.5% of women expressed a preference for VBAC in a subsequent
11 pregnancy, and this was similar for women in the EMCS and ELSCS groups (Table 3). The
12 preference rate for repeat ELSCS overall was 31.7%. The proportion of women who were
13 preference rate for repeat ELSCS overall was 31.7%. The proportion of women who were
14 undecided was 28.8%. Approximately 80% of women in both groups said they would consider
15 randomisation in a future pregnancy (Table 3). These findings were similar among women across
16 both hospital sites.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24
25
26 Women in the Para 1 group had an EMCS rate of 87.7% compared to 65.1% in the Para >1
27 group ($p<0.01$). The women in the Para 1 group were also less satisfied with the postnatal
28 counselling received than those in the Para >1 group (55.6% vs 72.1%, $p<0.01$). There was also a
29 difference observed in the preference for future mode of delivery, with 35.6% in the Para 1 group
30 expressing a preference for VBAC compared to 52.3% of women in the Para >1 ($p<0.01$).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Despite this there was no difference observed in the proportions who would consider involvement in a future randomised trial on mode of birth, Para 1=82.4% and Para >1= 76.7% ($p=0.25$).

Discussion

Management of delivery for the woman who has had one previous CS is a controversial area of obstetric practice, with many factors influencing the decision to pursue either VBAC or ERCS

1
2
3 [1, 3,13,18], as outlined above. However, it is well established that the view of the woman is
4 paramount in arriving at a decision regarding mode of birth in these circumstances [19], and
5 hence the focus of this study was on the satisfaction levels of women who had one CS regarding
6 their past birth, and their plans or deliberations for a future birth. There are minimal data to our
7 knowledge on this topic in a European obstetric population. The strengths of this study include
8 the large number of women recruited across two different geographical sites, specific evaluation
9 of future birth preferences and willingness to participate in a randomised controlled trial on mode
10 of birth, and finally, the level of concordance of the results across both sites. The limitations of
11 this study are discussed below.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In this study, satisfaction with the delivery, i.e. having had a CS, was in the region of 95% and
27 was similar for both EMCS and ELSCS groups. This is in contrast to other studies which have
28 reported lower satisfaction rates for women who had unplanned caesarean sections compared
29 with women who had planned caesarean sections [20,21]. We similarly observed high
30 satisfaction rates, i.e. greater than 90% with care providers. This study also assessed the level of
31 satisfaction the women experienced in relation to information received at the time of CS and the
32 postnatal debriefing provided. Unsurprisingly, women who had an EMCS reported a
33 significantly lower satisfaction level with the information received at the time of delivery than
34 women who had an ELSCS. This factor may well be related to the fact that the majority of these
35 operations were performed intrapartum, as an emergency procedure. It is disappointing that only
36 54% of women in the EMCS group were satisfied with postnatal counselling and debriefing.
37 Specific comments from women included 'I found the aftercare disappointing', 'there was no
38 counselling or information given about what happened or what to expect', 'my experience was
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 very frightening, and the reason discussed only briefly' and 'I still have unanswered questions
4 about my delivery'. The usual practice at both hospital sites for counselling women after their
5 first CS includes a number of approaches. The women and their partners are debriefed in the first
6 24 hours by the medical obstetric team involved. Depending on circumstances, and if it reflects
7 patient preference, a hospital postnatal visit is arranged for 6 weeks after the delivery. The NICE
8 guideline on CS states that women after a CS should be given the opportunity to discuss the
9 reasons for the CS and be provided with both verbal and printed information about future birth
10 options [22]. Despite this recommendation there remains a paucity of guidelines surrounding the
11 best practice for postnatal debriefing, and similarly there is a lack of guidance regarding
12 postnatal follow up for women who may have had more difficult or traumatic childbirth
13 experiences.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Regarding future mode of birth, 39.5% of the overall group expressed a preference for VBAC,
32 while 31.7% had a preference for repeat ELSCS and 28.8% were undecided. The statistic of
33 approximately 40% of women expressing a preference for VBAC is remarkably consistent from
34 the studies that are available. A recent US study on this topic reported that at 12 months
35 postpartum, 45% of women who delivered by caesarean in their first birth wanted to have their
36 next delivery vaginally [23]. An Australian survey by Dodd et al explored the views of women in
37 the first 6 months after delivery and found a similar preference with regards to VBAC at 41%,
38 while only 23% expressed an interest in a repeat ELSCS and 35% described themselves as being
39 unsure [14]. However, when it comes to willingness to be recruited to a future RCT of VBAC
40 versus repeat ELSCS, the data from our study are markedly in contrast to the findings from the
41 one other study that examined this [14]. In our study, 80% of the women expressed a
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 willingness to being involved in a future RCT in which their mode of delivery would be
4 determined by a process of randomisation. In the Australian study, only 29 women (10%)
5 indicated a willingness to take part in such a trial [14]. While we acknowledge it is unlikely that
6 women with a clear preference for ELSCS will opt in to such a study, we are of the opinion that
7 women who are undecided (28.8%) and those with an interest in having a VBAC (39.5%) may
8 remain open to being involved in such a trial, but it is difficult to estimate, with any accuracy,
9 those that would eventually agree to randomisation in a future pregnancy. This is an important
10 finding from our study as it supports the concept of feasibility of such an RCT in an Irish
11 population. It is our view that prior to any future RCT on this topic it would still be wise to
12 perform a pilot study.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 We recognise that there are certain limitations to our study. This analysis gives an overview of
29 women's satisfaction with their CS and their preference for future mode of birth but was not able
30 to assess the strength of this preference. Similarly, the birth preference may change over time
31 and the data presented may not truly reflect the proportion who ultimately pursue their stated
32 preference in a subsequent pregnancy. It is encouraging for a future RCT that 80% of our
33 population expressed an interest in being recruited but that statistic, as alluded to above, may
34 change during the course of a subsequent pregnancy. It was not possible to assess the strength of
35 the views expressed, particularly as randomly assigning mode of birth would remove the element
36 of clinician preference and patient choice, though one could argue that agreeing to randomisation
37 is in fact a birth preference in itself. A further limitation is that these results reflect the opinions
38 of those who responded to the study. We are aware that the that the 45.2% of women who did
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 not respond may have a different preference on mode of birth and may not be willing to
4 participate in a trial of this nature.
5
6
7
8
9

10 In conclusion, a significant proportion of women in this cohort considered VBAC as an option
11 for a future birth, and a majority of women stated they would consider randomisation in a
12 potential RCT on the topic. These data indicate that randomised trial of VBAC versus repeat
13 ELSCS would be viewed positively by women with one previous CS.
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Contribution to authorship**

20
21
22
23 Study concept and design GR, JM, FM. Data acquisition and analysis GR, KOD. Drafting and
24 critical revision of the manuscript GR, JM, DD, FM.
25
26
27

28 **Details of ethics approval**

29
30
31 Ethical approval was received from both Galway University Hospital and the National Maternity
32 Hospital for this study (Galway University Hospital Reference No. 1804, 13th October 2017 and
33 National Maternity Hospital Reference No. EC 37.2017, 8th January 2018).
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Acknowledgements**

40
41
42 We are grateful to all the women who participated in this study and all involved in collecting and
43 analysing the data at both hospital sites.
44
45
46
47

48 **Data Sharing Statement**

49
50
51 All data have been included in the manuscript. A copy of the survey form is in Supplementary
52 File 1 and has been forwarded to the editorial board.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References:

1. Ryan GA, Nicholson SM, Morrison JJ. Vaginal birth after caesarean section: Current status and where to from here? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2018 May; 224:52-57.
2. RCOG The Sentinel National Caesarean Section Audit Report- RCOG Clinical Effectiveness Support Unit. RCOG Press 2001.
https://www.rcog.org.uk/globalassets/documents/guidelines/research--audit/nscs_audit.pdf
3. Bonzon M, Gross MM, Karch A, et al. Deciding on the mode of birth after a previous caesarean section - An online survey investigating women's preferences in Western Switzerland. *Midwifery.* 2017; 50:219-227.
4. Dodd JM, Crowther CA, Huertas E, et al. Planned elective repeat caesarean section versus planned vaginal birth for women with a previous caesarean birth. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Review* 2013, Issue 12.
5. Cheng YW, Eden KB, Marshall N, et al. Delivery after prior caesarean: maternal morbidity and mortality. *Clin Perinatol.* 2011; 38(2):297-309.
6. RCOG Green-top Guideline No.45 Birth after Previous Caesarean Birth (2015).
<https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelines-research-services/guidelines/gtg45/>

- 1
2
3 7. ACOG. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 205: Vaginal Birth After Cesarean Delivery. *Obstet*
4
5 *Gynecol.* 2019; 133(2), e110-e127.
6
7
- 8 8. Royal College of Physicians of Ireland, Institute of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.
9
10 RCPI Delivery After Previous Caesarean Section Clinical Practice Guideline 2013.
11
12 <https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/clinical-strategy-and-programmes/delivery->
13
14 [after-previous-caesarean-section.pdf](https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/clinical-strategy-and-programmes/delivery-after-previous-caesarean-section.pdf)
15
16
- 17
18 9. Mercer BM, Gilbert S, Landon MB, et al; National Institute of Child Health and Human
19
20 Development Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units Network. Labor outcomes with increasing
21
22 number of prior vaginal births after caesarean delivery. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2008 Feb;111(2
23
24 Pt 1):285-91.
25
26
- 27 10. Uddin SF, Simon AE. Rates and success rates of trial of labor after cesarean delivery in
28
29 the United States, 1990-2009. *Matern Child Health J.* 2013 Sep;17(7):1309-14.
30
31
- 32 11. Knight HE, Gurol-Urganci I, van der Meulen JH, et al. Vaginal birth after
33
34 caesarean section: a cohort study investigating factors associated with its uptake and
35
36 success. *BJOG.* 2014 Jan;121(2):183-92
37
38
- 39 12. Colais P, Bontempi K, Pinnarelli L, et al. Vaginal Birth After Caesarean Birth in Italy:
40
41 Variations Among Areas of Residence and Hospitals. *BMC Pregnancy*
42
43 *Childbirth.* 2018;18(1):383.
44
45
- 46 13. Cox KJ. Providers' perspectives on the vaginal birth after caesarean guidelines in Florida,
47
48 United States: a qualitative study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2011; 12;11:72.
49
50
- 51 14. Dodd J, Pearce E, Crowther C. Women's experiences and preferences
52
53 following Caesarean birth. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2004 Dec;44(6):521-4.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 15. Fobelets M, Beeckman K, Faron G, et al. Vaginal birth
4
5 after caesarean versus elective repeat caesarean delivery after one
6
7 previous caesarean section: a cost-effectiveness analysis in four European countries.
8
9 BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2018 Apr 11;18(1):92.
10
11
- 12 16. Law LW, Pang MW, Chung TK, et al. Randomised trial of assigned mode of delivery
13
14 after a previous caesarean section-impact on maternal psychological dynamics. J Matern
15
16 Fetal Neonatal Med. 2010; 23(10):1106-13.
17
18
- 19 17. Crowther CA, Dodd JM, Hiller JE, et al; Birth After Caesarean Study Group. Planned
20
21 Vaginal Birth or Elective Repeat Caesarean: Patient Preference Restricted Cohort with
22
23 Nested Randomised Trial. PLoS Med. 2012; 9(3):e1001192.
24
25
- 26 18. Chinkam S, Ewan J, Koeniger-Donohue R, et al. The Effect of Evidence-Based Scripted
27
28 Midwifery Counselling on Women's Choices about Mode of Birth after a
29
30 Previous Caesarean. J Midwifery Womens Health. 2016; 61: 613–620.
31
32
- 33 19. Nilsson C, Lalor J, Begley C, et al. Vaginal birth after caesarean: Views of women from
34
35 countries with low VBAC rates. Women Birth. 2017;30(6):481-490.
36
37
- 38 20. Blomquist JL, Quiroz LH, Macmillan D, et al. Mothers' satisfaction with planned vaginal
39
40 and planned cesarean birth. Am J Perinatol. 2011;28(5):383-8.
41
42
- 43 21. Shorten A, Shorten B. The importance of mode of birth after previous cesarean:
44
45 success, satisfaction, and postnatal health. J Midwifery Womens Health. 2012;57(2):126-
46
47 32.
48
- 49 22. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence's (NICE) guidance on elective
50
51 caesarean section 2011(Update 2019). <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg132>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

23. Attanasio LB, Kozhimannil KB, Kjerulff KH. Women's preference for vaginal

	Overall group (n=347)	EMCS (n=285)	ELSCS (n=62)	P Value	
Para>1	86	56	30		birth afte
Para=1	261	229	32		r a
Average age (Years)	34.9	34.99	34.89	ns	first deli
Average BMI (kg/m²)	25.9	25.95	25.43	ns	very by
Gestation at Delivery (weeks + days)					caesarea
Mean	39 ⁺⁵	39 ⁺⁶	38 ⁺⁵	P<0.01	n.
Nationality: Irish	276 (79.5%)	227 (79.6%)	49 (79.04%)		Birth. 20
Other	71 (20.5%)	58 (20.35%)	13 (20.96%)		19;46(1)

Table 1:**Demographic Features of the Groups.**

	EMCS (n=285)	ELSCS(n=62)	P Value
Satisfied with Mode of Delivery	272 (95.5%)	60 (96.8%)	ns
Satisfied with Medical Care Provided	263 (92.3%)	61 (98.4%)	ns
Satisfied with Midwifery Care Provided	259 (90.9%)	58 (93.5%)	ns

Table 1 Legend. Patient demographic features comparing the emergency caesarean delivery group with elective caesarean delivery group.

Statistical significance was taken as $p < 0.05$. ns=Not significant.

EMCS = emergency caesarean section. ELSCS= elective caesarean section.

Para 1=Women after their first pregnancy. Para >1 =Women in a second or subsequent pregnancy.

Table 2. Patients Level of Satisfaction by Emergency Caesarean Delivery versus Elective Caesarean Delivery

	Overall Group (n=345)	EMCS (n=285)	ELSCS (n=62)	P Value
Satisfied with information at time of delivery	250 (81.8%)	61 (98.4%)		P<0.05
Satisfied with Postnatal Counselling & Information about Caesarean				P<0.001
Preference for Future Mode of Delivery:	(54%)	(82.3%)		
VBAC	137 (39.5%)	114 (40%)	23 (37.1%)	ns
Repeat ELSCS	110 (31.7%)	83 (29.1%)	27 (43.5%)	ns
Undecided	100 (28.8%)	88 (30.9%)	12 (19.4%)	ns

Table 2 Legend. Patient satisfaction levels comparing emergency caesarean delivery group with elective caesarean delivery group.

Statistical significance was taken as $p < 0.05$. ns=Not significant.

EMCS = emergency caesarean delivery. ELSCS= elective caesarean delivery

Table 3. Preferences for Future Delivery

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **Would consider involvement in an RCT**
9
10 **of VBAC vs Repeat ELSCS?**

12 Yes	281 (81%)	230 (80.7%)	51 (82.3%)	ns
14 No	66 (19%)	55 (19.3%)	11(17.7%)	ns

19
20 *Table 3 Legend. Patient preferences for future mode of delivery and willingness to be involved in*
21 *a future randomised trial of vaginal birth after caesarean or elective repeat caesarean delivery.*
22 *Statistical significance was taken as $p < 0.05$. ns=Not significant.*
23 *VBAC= vaginal birth after caesarean. RCT= randomised controlled trial.*
24 *EMCS = emergency caesarean section. ELSCS= elective caesarean section.*
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplementary File 1. The questionnaire survey completed by patients.

Questionnaire

1. What reason below best fits with the reason you had the caesarean section? (Please tick beside most appropriate answer)

1. Fetal Distress i.e. there was concern about the baby in labour
2. Failure to Progress/Failed induction of labour/Very slow or poor progress in labour
3. Maternal medical reason (e.g. diabetes, low lying placenta)
4. Baby in the wrong position (e.g. breech, transverse)
5. No success with delivery of the baby with forceps or vacuum
6. Other
7. Don't know

2. Was it a planned procedure in advance (called elective) or what was it an emergency? _____

3. Are you satisfied that the caesarean section was the best option, for you in those circumstances, for the delivery of the baby?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Not sure
4. Not satisfied
5. Very unsatisfied

4. Do you feel the care you received was professional and supportive from the doctors?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Not sure
4. Not satisfied
5. Very unsatisfied

PTO

1
2
3 **5. Do you feel the care you received was professional and supportive from the**
4 **midwifery team?**
5

- 6
7 1. Very satisfied
8 2. Satisfied
9 3. Not sure
10 4. Not satisfied
11 5. Very unsatisfied
12

13
14 **6. Are you satisfied that you received adequate information about the reason for**
15 **caesarean section at the time of your delivery?**
16

- 17
18 1. Very satisfied
19 2. Satisfied
20 3. Not sure
21 4. Not satisfied
22 5. Very unsatisfied
23

24
25 **7. Are you satisfied that you received adequate information and counselling in the**
26 **postnatal period (i.e. after delivery)?**
27

- 28
29 1. Very satisfied
30 2. Satisfied
31 3. Not sure
32 4. Not satisfied
33 5. Very unsatisfied
34

35
36
37 **8. What would be your preferred option for a future delivery?**
38

- 39 1. Normal labour and delivery
40 2. Repeat planned caesarean section
41 3. Undecided
42

43
44
45 **9. If you have a future pregnancy, discussion will take place between you and your**
46 **doctor about the best method of delivery again, i.e. a normal labour and delivery or**
47 **a repeat caesarean section. Sometimes the answer is not always clear. If there is a**
48 **research study on this topic, which assigns you to one or the other option, would you**
49 **agree to participate?**
50

- 51 1. Yes
52 2. No
53

54
55 *(If you did opt into a research study you would have the power to opt out at any time if you*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *changed your mind. This question is for research purposes only and will not affect your*
4 *future care in any way.)*
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract Done - P1 (Title) and P2 (Abstract) (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found Included P2
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported P5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses P6
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper Included P6 and 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection Included P6 and 7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up Included in P6 and 7 <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable Included P7 and P8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Included P7 and P8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias NA
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at P6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why P7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding

P7 and 8

(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions

P7 and P8

(c) Explain how missing data were addressed

P13

(d) *Cohort study*—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed

NA

Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed

Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

Continued on next page

Results

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed P8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders P9
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest NA
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) P9
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time P9 and P10
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included Main results presented P9 and 10 and Tables 1,2 and 3 (P18-20)
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized Main results presented P9 and 10 and Tables 1,2 and 3 (P18-20)
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses P10

Discussion

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives P10 and P11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias P11 and P12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence P11 and 12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results P11 and P12

Other information

Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based NA
---------	----	--

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery in Two Tertiary Centres in Ireland and their Preference for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on Mode of Birth.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031766.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Sep-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Ryan, Gillian; NUI Galway, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology; Galway University Hospitals, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology O Doherty, Kate; National Maternity Hospital, Obstetrics and Gynaecology Devane, Declan; National University Of Ireland, Galway, School of Nursing & Midwifery McAuliffe, Fionnuala; University College Dublin, UCD Perinatal Research Centre; National Maternity Hospital, Obstetrics and Gynaecology Morrison, John; National University of Ireland Galway, Obstetrics and Gynaecology
Primary Subject Heading:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Keywords:	Maternal medicine < OBSTETRICS, Caesarean section, Vaginal Birth after Caesarean, Birth Preference after Caesarean, Randomised Trial on Mode of Birth

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery in Two Tertiary**
4 **Centres in Ireland and their Preference for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on**
5 **Mode of Birth.**
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 **Running Title: Survey of Women's Views after a first Caesarean**
13

14
15
16
17 Authors: Gillian A Ryan,^{1,2} Kate C O Doherty⁴, Declan Devane³, Fionnuala M McAuliffe⁴, John
18 J Morrison^{1,2}.
19

- 20
21
22
23
24 1. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, National University of Ireland Galway,
25 Galway, Ireland.
26
27 2. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Galway University Hospital, Galway,
28 Ireland.
29
30 3. HRB-Trials Methodology Research Network & School of Nursing and Midwifery,
31 National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland
32
33 4. UCD Perinatal Research Centre, School of Medicine, University College Dublin,
34 National Maternity Hospital, Dublin, Ireland.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Gillian A Ryan, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology,
46 Clinical Science Institute, National University of Ireland Galway, Galway, Ireland; **Work**
47 **telephone number:** +353 91493537; **Email:** gillian.ryan@nuigalway.ie
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objective:

To assess the views of women after a first caesarean section on their birth experience, preference for future mode of birth and willingness to participate in a randomised controlled trial on mode of birth in a future pregnancy.

Design:

Questionnaire survey.

Setting:

Two tertiary maternity centres in Ireland, Galway University Hospital, Galway and the National Maternity Hospital, Dublin.

Participants:

Women with one previous caesarean section.

Methods:

Eligible women were consented to participate, and postal surveys forwarded. Results were collected and analysed. Results were compared between women who had elective and emergency operations.

Primary Outcome Measures:

The satisfaction levels of women after a first caesarean, their preference for mode of birth in a future pregnancy and their willingness to participate in a randomised trial on mode of birth.

Results:

1
2
3 There were 347 completed surveys of 633 women consented (54.8%),
4
5 of whom 285 and 62 had emergency and elective caesarean
6
7 deliveries respectively. In general, satisfaction ratings with
8
9 the delivery were greater than 90%, with similar levels of
10
11 satisfaction with the care received from doctors and midwives.
12
13 Women who an emergency procedure expressed lower satisfaction
14
15 levels with the information about the caesarean and the
16
17 debriefing received afterwards than women who had a planned
18
19 operation ($P < 0.05$). For future mode of birth 39.5% expressed a
20
21 preference for vaginal birth after caesarean in a subsequent
22
23 pregnancy and 80% said they would consider involvement in a
24
25 randomised trial in a future pregnancy.
26
27
28
29

30 **Conclusion:**

31
32 Debriefing and counselling women after a caesarean section is an
33
34 important part of pregnancy care and can significantly impact on
35
36 a woman's overall birth experience. A significant proportion of this cohort
37
38 considered vaginal birth after caesarean as a future birth option. These data indicate that a
39
40 randomised trial on mode of birth after caesarean would be viewed positively by women in our
41
42 population.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Strengths and Limitations of this Study**

- 50
51 • This study assesses the satisfactions levels of women having a first caesarean section on
52
53 various aspects of care and investigates whether the type of
54
55 caesarean delivery influences their preference for future
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mode of birth and their willingness to participate in a
4 randomised trial on mode of birth in a future pregnancy.
5
6

- 7
- 8 • The strengths of this study include the large number of women recruited across two
9 different geographical sites.
 - 10 • The evaluation of future birth preferences and willingness to participate in a randomised
11 controlled trial on mode of birth is a topic on which there are minimal data in a European
12 obstetric population.
 - 13 • This analysis gives an overview of preference for future mode of birth and willingness to
14 be involved in a trial on mode of birth, but we are unable to assess how this preference
15 may change over time.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 27 **Disclosure of interests**

28
29 None declared.
30
31

32 **Funding Statement**

33 This research received no specific funding from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
34 not-for-profit sectors.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 **Questionnaire Survey on Women's Views after a first Caesarean Delivery in Two Tertiary**
16 **Centres in Ireland and their Preference for Involvement in a Future Randomised Trial on**
17 **Mode of Birth.**
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Introduction**

25
26 Women who have had one previous caesarean section (CS) represent a significant proportion of
27 all women presenting for antenatal care in pregnancy [1,2]. For the majority of such women, the
28 option of having either a vaginal birth after caesarean (VBAC) or a repeat elective caesarean
29 section (ELSCS) is a focus of major discussion in a subsequent pregnancy. Many factors
30 influence this decision including the reason for the original CS, other obstetric variables, views
31 of the attending obstetrician, and finally, and most importantly, the views of the mother and her
32 partner [1,3]. This discussion includes attention to the risks and benefits of VBAC versus repeat
33 ELSCS [3-8]. Apart from these clinical issues, there are many geographical [1,9-11], institutional
34 [12], epidemiological and legal factors [13] that influence VBAC rates worldwide. What is clear
35 however is that VBAC attempt rates [1], and VBAC rates [1], have been declining significantly
36 in recent years in developed countries [1,7]. Apart from the clinical importance of this topic, and
37 the associated morbidity, increasing CS rates also place a significant burden on healthcare
38 resources [14,15].
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Notwithstanding the issues outlined above, the evidence available for counselling the woman
7
8 who has had one CS regarding her birth options in a future pregnancy is limited. Currently, the
9
10 only data from randomised controlled trials (RCT) of VBAC versus repeat ELSCS emanates
11
12 from two trials [16,17], totalling 320 women. Only one of these provided results on maternal and
13
14 fetal outcomes [17], and the numbers were too small to generate any strong recommendations
15
16 that might inform women's decision on mode of birth. A Cochrane review concluded that both
17
18 options of VBAC and repeat ELSCS are associated with benefits and harms, however the
19
20 evidence for the magnitude of these outcomes was drawn from non-randomised studies, and
21
22 associated with potential bias, and therefore must be interpreted with caution [4]. The need for
23
24 further RCTs was emphasized. However, there remains a doubt concerning the feasibility of such
25
26 a trial, and whether or not women would agree to randomisation [4,14]. There are minimal data
27
28 regarding women's views on this topic, and none to our knowledge pertaining to a European
29
30 population of expectant mothers. The aims of this study were to evaluate the views of women
31
32 who had one previous CS regarding their experience of delivery, their preference for birth
33
34 options in a future pregnancy, and finally their willingness, or otherwise, to participate in a
35
36 potential future RCT of VBAC versus repeat ELSCS.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Methods**

46
47 This study used a written questionnaire survey of women who had their first CS between January
48
49 and August 2017 in two tertiary teaching hospitals in the Republic of Ireland, Galway University
50
51 Hospital, Galway on the west coast, and the National Maternity Hospital, Dublin on the east
52
53 coast. Institutional review board approval was obtained at both sites (Galway University Hospital
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Reference No. 1804 and National Maternity Hospital Reference No. EC 37.2017). Eligible
4 participants were identified using hospital maintained computerised databases. Women were
5 contacted by telephone or post for consent, and postal surveys subsequently forwarded. Surveys
6 were distributed over a 9-month period from September 2017 to March 2018 in an effort to
7 capture the woman's views on a subsequent mode of birth within the first year after the index
8 pregnancy. Exclusion criteria included women under 18 years of age and any women who had a
9 perinatal loss (information received from the hospital databases). A patient interaction focus
10 group was organised prior to the study with a number (n=10) of women who recently had their
11 first caesarean section. Validation of the survey questions was a component of this meeting. In
12 addition, telephone contact was made with a small number of participants (n=20) after receipt of
13 the survey, to assess their understanding of the information included.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The following factors were included in the survey instrument: 1. The reason for the CS; 2.
32 Whether it was a planned or unplanned/emergency procedure; 3. Women's satisfaction
33 regarding; (a) the statement that a CS was the best option for them at the time; (b) the care
34 received from the obstetric team; (c) the care received from the midwifery team; (d) the
35 information received prior to delivery regarding the CS; (e) the information / debriefing received
36 after delivery regarding the CS; 4. Women's preference for mode of birth in a future pregnancy;
37 and 5. Women's willingness or otherwise, to participate in a future RCT of VBAC versus repeat
38 ELSCS. Satisfaction scores obtained (1-5) were grouped into those from women who described
39 themselves as satisfied (satisfaction rating 1-2) with their experience or those that were not
40 satisfied (satisfaction rating 3-5). A copy of the survey form is in Supplementary File 1 and has
41 been forwarded to the editorial board.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Demographic details including maternal age, BMI, gestation at delivery, parity and ethnicity
6 were ascertained from the hospital databases. Statistical analyses were performed using Chi-
7
8 Square test and T-Test as appropriate (IBM SPSS Version 24). A P value of <0.05 was accepted
9
10 as being statistically significant. A subgroup analysis was also performed between women who
11
12 had a planned / ELSCS and women who had an unplanned/ emergency CS (EMCS).
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Patient and Public Involvement**

20
21 During the development of this questionnaire survey women after a first CS were invited to take
22
23 part in a focus group to share their experience surrounding their care at the time of CS and their
24
25 preferences for future mode of birth. They were also invited to give their opinion on what
26
27 information they felt was important to be collected for the survey. During the initial phase of the
28
29 survey responses were selected at random and patients were contacted to discuss their responses
30
31 to the survey to ensure they had no comments on how to improve it. Once published, the data
32
33 will be made available on both hospital sites, for antenatal clinic visits, and for formal prenatal
34
35 education classes.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Results**

46
47 A total of n=734 women were identified from the hospital databases as being eligible to
48
49 participate in the survey and 633/734 (86.2%) consented to participate and were sent postal
50
51 questionnaire surveys. There were 347/633 (54.8%%) completed survey forms returned for
52
53 analysis; 154/242 (63%) at Galway University Hospital and 193/391 (49.4%) at the National
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Maternity Hospital, Dublin. Of these, 285/347(82.1%%) had an EMCS, and 62/347 (17.9%) had
4
5 an ELSCS. The main reasons for CS were failure to progress in labour or failed induction of
6
7 labour 121/347 (34.9%); abnormal fetal heart rate pattern 108/347 (31.1%); malposition
8
9 (including breech presentation) 50/347 (14.4%); other (including previous third-degree tear,
10
11 maternal anxiety, previous shoulder dystocia, urinary incontinence) 35/347 (10.1%), maternal
12
13 medical reason 24/347 (6.9%), failed instrumental delivery 8/347 (2.3%) and one where the
14
15 woman was unsure of the indication for CS 1/347 (0.3%). There were 261 women who had the
16
17 CS in their first pregnancy (Para 1) and 86 women had their first CS in a second or subsequent
18
19 pregnancy (Para >1). The demographic features of the groups are presented in Table 1. The
20
21 average maternal age was 34.9 years and the average BMI was 25.9 kg/m². The mean gestation
22
23 at the time of birth was higher in the EMCS group than in the ELSCS group (39⁺⁶ weeks vs 38⁺⁵
24
25 weeks respectively, p=0.01). There were no other significant differences between the
26
27 demographics of the groups.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 A comparison of the results of the survey questions divided by women in the EMCS and ELSCS
36
37 groups are presented in Table 2. The vast majority of women in both groups (95-96%) were
38
39 satisfied in general that CS was the most appropriate delivery option for them given their clinical
40
41 circumstances. Replies to the question pertaining to the medical care provided revealed
42
43 satisfaction levels of 92-98%. Regarding midwifery care, satisfaction levels were 90-93%.
44
45 However, women in the EMCS group were less satisfied with the information received regarding
46
47 the CS, both prior to delivery (p<0.05) and postnatally (p<0.01) (Table 2). The lowest rates of
48
49 satisfaction overall (54%) were experienced by women in the EMCS group regarding their views
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on the debriefing information they received postnatally. No difference was observed between
4
5 hospital sites in relation to these levels of satisfaction.
6
7

8
9
10 In the overall cohort, 39.5% of women expressed a preference for VBAC in a subsequent
11 pregnancy, and this was similar for women in the EMCS and ELSCS groups (Table 3). The
12 preference rate for repeat ELSCS overall was 31.7%. The proportion of women who were
13 preference rate for repeat ELSCS overall was 31.7%. The proportion of women who were
14 undecided was 28.8%. Approximately 80% of women in both groups said they would consider
15 randomisation in a future pregnancy (Table 3). These findings were similar among women across
16 both hospital sites.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24
25
26 Women in the Para 1 group had an EMCS rate of 87.7% compared to 65.1% in the Para >1
27 group ($p<0.01$). The women in the Para 1 group were also less satisfied with the postnatal
28 counselling received than those in the Para >1 group (55.6% vs 72.1%, $p<0.01$). There was also a
29 difference observed in the preference for future mode of birth, with 35.6% in the Para 1 group
30 expressing a preference for VBAC compared to 52.3% of women in the Para >1 ($p<0.01$).
31
32
33 Despite this there was no difference observed in the proportions who would consider
34 involvement in a future randomised trial on mode of birth, Para 1=82.4% and Para >1= 76.7%
35 (p=0.25).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Discussion

50
51 Management of delivery for the woman who has had one previous CS is a controversial area of
52 obstetric practice, with many factors influencing the decision to pursue either VBAC or ERCS
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [1, 3,13,18], as outlined above. However, it is well established that the view of the woman is
4 paramount in arriving at a decision regarding mode of birth in these circumstances [19], and
5 hence the focus of this study was on the satisfaction levels of women who had one CS regarding
6 their past birth, and their plans or deliberations for a future birth. There are minimal data to our
7 knowledge on this topic in a European obstetric population. The strengths of this study include
8 the large number of women recruited across two different geographical sites, specific evaluation
9 of future birth preferences and willingness to participate in a randomised controlled trial on mode
10 of birth, and finally, the level of concordance of the results across both sites. The limitations of
11 this study are discussed below.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In this study, satisfaction with the delivery, i.e. having had a CS, was in the region of 95% and
27 was similar for both EMCS and ELSCS groups. This is in contrast to other studies which have
28 reported lower satisfaction rates for women who had unplanned caesarean sections compared
29 with women who had planned caesarean sections [20,21]. We similarly observed high
30 satisfaction rates, i.e. greater than 90% with care providers. This study also assessed the level of
31 satisfaction the women experienced in relation to information received at the time of CS and the
32 postnatal debriefing provided. Unsurprisingly, women who had an EMCS reported a
33 significantly lower satisfaction level with the information received at the time of delivery than
34 women who had an ELSCS. This factor may well be related to the fact that the majority of these
35 operations were performed intrapartum, as an emergency procedure. It is disappointing that only
36 54% of women in the EMCS group were satisfied with postnatal counselling and debriefing.
37 Specific comments from women included 'I found the aftercare disappointing', 'there was no
38 counselling or information given about what happened or what to expect', 'my experience was
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 very frightening, and the reason discussed only briefly’ and ‘I still have unanswered questions
4 about my delivery’. The usual practice at both hospital sites for counselling women after their
5 first CS includes a number of approaches. The women and their partners are debriefed in the first
6 24 hours by the medical obstetric team involved. Depending on circumstances, and if it reflects
7 patient preference, a hospital postnatal visit is arranged for 6 weeks after the delivery. The NICE
8 guideline on CS states that women after a CS should be given the opportunity to discuss the
9 reasons for the CS and be provided with both verbal and printed information about future birth
10 options [22]. Despite this recommendation there remains a paucity of guidelines surrounding the
11 best practice for postnatal debriefing, and similarly there is a lack of guidance regarding
12 postnatal follow up for women who may have had more difficult or traumatic childbirth
13 experiences.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Regarding future mode of birth, 39.5% of the overall group expressed a preference for VBAC,
32 while 31.7% had a preference for repeat ELSCS and 28.8% were undecided. The statistic of
33 approximately 40% of women expressing a preference for VBAC is remarkably consistent from
34 the studies that are available. A recent US study on this topic reported that at 12 months
35 postpartum, 45% of women who delivered by caesarean in their first birth wanted to have their
36 next delivery vaginally [23]. An Australian survey by Dodd et al explored the views of women in
37 the first 6 months after delivery and found a similar preference with regards to VBAC at 41%,
38 while only 23% expressed an interest in a repeat ELSCS and 35% described themselves as being
39 unsure [14]. However, when it comes to willingness to be recruited to a future RCT of VBAC
40 versus repeat ELSCS, the data from our study are markedly in contrast to the findings from the
41 one other study that examined this [14]. In our study, 80% of the women expressed a
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 willingness to being involved in a future RCT in which their mode of birth would be determined
4
5 by a process of randomisation. In the Australian study, only 29 women (10%) indicated a
6
7 willingness to take part in such a trial [14]. While we acknowledge it is unlikely that women with
8
9 a clear preference for ELSCS will opt in to such a study, we are of the opinion that women who
10
11 are undecided (28.8%) and those with an interest in having a VBAC (39.5%) may remain open to
12
13 being involved in such a trial, but it is difficult to estimate, with any accuracy, those that would
14
15 eventually agree to randomisation in a future pregnancy. This is an important finding from our
16
17 study as it supports the concept of feasibility of such an RCT in an Irish population. It is our
18
19 view that prior to any future RCT on this topic it would still be wise to perform a pilot study.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 We recognise that there are certain limitations to our study. This analysis gives an overview of
27
28 women's satisfaction with their CS and their preference for future mode of birth but was not able
29
30 to assess the strength of this preference. Similarly, the birth preference may change over time
31
32 and the data presented may not truly reflect the proportion who ultimately pursue their stated
33
34 preference in a subsequent pregnancy. It is encouraging for a future RCT that 80% of our
35
36 population expressed an interest in being recruited but that statistic, as alluded to above, may
37
38 change during the course of a subsequent pregnancy. It was not possible to assess the strength of
39
40 the views expressed, particularly as randomly assigning mode of birth would remove the element
41
42 of clinician preference and patient choice, though one could argue that agreeing to randomisation
43
44 is in fact a birth preference in itself. A further limitation is that these results reflect the opinions
45
46 of those who responded to the study. We are aware that the that the 45.2% of women who did
47
48 not respond may have a different preference on mode of birth and may not be willing to
49
50 participate in a trial of this nature. The aim of this study was to capture the views of women
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 within one year after their first CS. A further limitation of the study is that we do not have data
4
5 on the average time frame and the range of their responses and are therefore unable to comment
6
7 if this would have influenced their views in any way.
8
9

10
11
12 In conclusion, a significant proportion of women in this cohort considered VBAC as an option
13
14 for a future birth, and a majority of women stated they would consider randomisation in a
15
16 potential RCT on the topic. These data indicate that randomised trial of VBAC versus repeat
17
18 ELSCS would be viewed positively by women with one previous CS.
19
20
21
22

23 24 **Contribution to authorship**

25
26
27 Study concept and design GR, JM, FM. Data acquisition and analysis GR, KOD. Drafting and
28
29 critical revision of the manuscript GR, JM, DD, FM.
30
31
32

33 34 **Details of ethics approval**

35
36 Ethical approval was received from both Galway University Hospital and the National Maternity
37
38 Hospital for this study (Galway University Hospital Reference No. 1804, 13th October 2017 and
39
40 National Maternity Hospital Reference No. EC 37.2017, 8th January 2018).
41
42
43

44 45 **Acknowledgements**

46
47 We are grateful to all the women who participated in this study and all involved in collecting and
48
49 analysing the data at both hospital sites.
50
51

52 53 **Data Sharing Statement**

1
2
3 All data have been included in the manuscript. A copy of the survey form is in Supplementary
4
5 File 1 and has been forwarded to the editorial board.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **References:**

- 18
19
20 1. Ryan GA, Nicholson SM, Morrison JJ. Vaginal birth after caesarean section: Current
21
22 status and where to from here? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2018 May; 224:52-57.
23
24
- 25 2. RCOG The Sentinel National Caesarean Section Audit Report- RCOG Clinical
26
27 Effectiveness Support Unit. RCOG Press 2001.
28
29 [audit/nscs_audit.pdf](https://www.rcog.org.uk/globalassets/documents/guidelines/research--
30 <u>audit/nscs_audit.pdf</u>
31
32)
33
- 34 3. Bonzon M, Gross MM, Karch A, et al. Deciding on the mode
35
36 of birth after a previous caesarean section - An online survey investigating women's
37
38 preferences in Western Switzerland. *Midwifery.* 2017; 50:219-227.
39
40
- 41 4. Dodd JM, Crowther CA, Huertas E, et al. Planned elective repeat caesarean section versus
42
43 planned vaginal birth for women with a previous caesarean birth. *Cochrane Database of*
44
45 *Systematic Review* 2013, Issue 12.
46
47
- 48 5. Cheng YW, Eden KB, Marshall N, et al.
49
50 *Delivery after prior caesarean: maternal morbidity and mortality. Clin Perinatol.* 2011;
51
52 38(2):297-309.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 6. RCOG Green-top Guideline No.45 Birth after Previous Caesarean Birth (2015).
4
5 <https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelines-research-services/guidelines/gtg45/>
6
7
- 8 7. ACOG. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 205: Vaginal Birth After Cesarean Delivery. *Obstet*
9
10 *Gynecol.* 2019; 133(2), e110-e127.
11
- 12 8. Royal College of Physicians of Ireland, Institute of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.
13
14 RCPI Delivery After Previous Caesarean Section Clinical Practice Guideline 2013.
15
16 [https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/clinical-strategy-and-programmes/delivery-](https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/clinical-strategy-and-programmes/delivery-after-previous-caesarean-section.pdf)
17
18 [after-previous-caesarean-section.pdf](https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/clinical-strategy-and-programmes/delivery-after-previous-caesarean-section.pdf)
19
20
- 21 9. Mercer BM, Gilbert S, Landon MB, et al; National Institute of Child Health and Human
22
23 Development Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units Network. Labor outcomes with increasing
24
25 number of prior vaginal births after caesarean delivery. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2008 Feb;111(2
26
27 Pt 1):285-91.
28
29
- 30 10. Uddin SF, Simon AE. Rates and success rates of trial of labor after cesarean delivery in
31
32 the United States, 1990-2009. *Matern Child Health J.* 2013 Sep;17(7):1309-14.
33
34
- 35 11. Knight HE, Gurol-Urganci I, van der Meulen JH, et al. Vaginal birth after
36
37 caesarean section: a cohort study investigating factors associated with its uptake and
38
39 success. *BJOG.* 2014 Jan;121(2):183-92
40
41
- 42 12. Colais P, Bontempi K, Pinnarelli L, et al. Vaginal Birth After Cesarean Birth in Italy:
43
44 Variations Among Areas of Residence and Hospitals. *BMC Pregnancy*
45
46 *Childbirth.* 2018;18(1):383.
47
48
- 49 13. Cox KJ. Providers' perspectives on the vaginal birth after caesarean guidelines in Florida,
50
51 United States: a qualitative study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2011; 12;11:72.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 14. Dodd J, Pearce E, Crowther C. Women's experiences and preferences
4 following Caesarean birth. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2004 Dec;44(6):521-4.
5
6
7
8 15. Fobelets M, Beeckman K, Faron G, et al. Vaginal birth
9 after caesarean versus elective repeat caesarean delivery after one
10 previous caesarean section: a cost-effectiveness analysis in four European countries.
11 *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2018 Apr 11;18(1):92.
12
13
14
15
16
17 16. Law LW, Pang MW, Chung TK, et al. Randomised trial of assigned mode of delivery
18 after a previous caesarean section-impact on maternal psychological dynamics. *J Matern*
19 *Fetal Neonatal Med*. 2010; 23(10):1106-13.
20
21
22
23
24 17. Crowther CA, Dodd JM, Hiller JE, [et al](#); [Birth After Caesarean Study Group](#). Planned
25 Vaginal Birth or Elective Repeat Caesarean: Patient Preference Restricted Cohort with
26 Nested Randomised Trial. *PLoS Med*. 2012; 9(3):e1001192.
27
28
29
30
31 18. Chinkam S, Ewan J, Koeniger-Donohue R, et al. The Effect of Evidence-Based Scripted
32 Midwifery Counselling on Women's Choices about Mode of Birth after a
33 Previous Caesarean. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2016; 61: 613–620.
34
35
36
37
38 19. Nilsson C, Lalor J, Begley C, et al. Vaginal birth after caesarean: Views of women from
39 countries with low VBAC rates. *Women Birth*. 2017;30(6):481-490.
40
41
42
43 20. Blomquist JL, Quiroz LH, Macmillan D, et al. Mothers' satisfaction with planned vaginal
44 and planned cesarean birth. *Am J Perinatol*. 2011;28(5):383-8.
45
46
47 21. Shorten A, Shorten B. The importance of mode of birth after previous cesarean:
48 success, satisfaction, and postnatal health. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2012;57(2):126-
49
50
51 32.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

22. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence's (NICE) guidance on elective

	Overall group (n=347)	EMCS (n=285)	ELSCS (n=62)	P Value	<u>caesarean section</u>
Para>1	86	56	30		2011(Update
Para=1	261	229	32		2019).
Average age (Years)	34.9	34.99	34.89	ns	
Average BMI (kg/m²)	25.9	25.95	25.43	ns	
Gestation at Delivery (weeks + days)					
Mean	39 ⁺⁵	39 ⁺⁶	38 ⁺⁵	P<0.01	
Nationality:					
Irish	276 (79.5%)	227 (79.6%)	49 (79.04%)		
Other	71 (20.5%)	58 (20.35%)	13 (20.96%)		

<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg132>

23. Attanasio LB, Kozhimannil KB, Kjerulff KH. Women's preference for vaginal birth after a first delivery by caesarean. Birth. 2019;46(1):51-60.

Table 1: Demographic Features of the Groups.

	EMCS (n=285)	ELSCS(n=62)	P Value
Satisfied with Mode of Delivery	272	60	ns

Table 1 Legend. Patient demographic features comparing the emergency caesarean delivery group with elective caesarean delivery group.

Statistical significance was taken as $p < 0.05$. ns=Not significant.

EMCS = emergency caesarean section. ELSCS= elective caesarean section.

Para 1=Women after their first pregnancy. Para >1 =Women in a second or subsequent pregnancy.

Table 2. Patients Level of Satisfaction by Emergency Caesarean Delivery versus Elective Caesarean Delivery

	(95.5%)	(96.8%)		
Satisfied with Medical Care Provided	Overall Group (n=347) (97.3%)	EMCS (n=285) (98.4%)	ELSCS (n=62)	ns
Satisfied with Midwifery Care Provided	259 (90.9%)	58 (93.5%)		ns
Satisfied with information at time of delivery	250 (87.8%)	61 (98.4%)		P<0.05
Satisfied with Postnatal Counselling & Information about Caesarean	154 (54%)	51 (82.3%)		P<0.001

Table 2 Legend. Patient satisfaction levels comparing emergency caesarean delivery group with elective caesarean delivery group.

Statistical significance was taken as $p < 0.05$. ns=Not significant.

EMCS = emergency caesarean delivery. ELSCS= elective caesarean delivery

Table 3. Preferences for Future Delivery

Preference for Future Mode of Delivery:

VBAC	137 (39.5%)	114 (40%)	23 (37.1%)	ns
Repeat ELSCS	110 (31.7%)	83 (29.1%)	27 (43.5%)	ns
Undecided	100 (28.8%)	88 (30.9%)	12 (19.4%)	ns

Would consider involvement in an RCT of VBAC vs Repeat ELSCS?

Yes	281 (81%)	230 (80.7%)	51 (82.3%)	ns
No	66 (19%)	55 (19.3%)	11(17.7%)	ns

Table 3 Legend. Patient preferences for future mode of delivery and willingness to be involved in a future randomised trial of vaginal birth after caesarean or elective repeat caesarean delivery.

Statistical significance was taken as $p < 0.05$. ns=Not significant.

VBAC= vaginal birth after caesarean. RCT= randomised controlled trial.

EMCS = emergency caesarean section. ELSCS= elective caesarean section.

Supplementary File 1. The questionnaire survey completed by patients.

Questionnaire

1. What reason below best fits with the reason you had the caesarean section? (Please tick beside most appropriate answer)

1. Fetal Distress i.e. there was concern about the baby in labour
2. Failure to Progress/Failed induction of labour/Very slow or poor progress in labour
3. Maternal medical reason (e.g. diabetes, low lying placenta)
4. Baby in the wrong position (e.g. breech, transverse)
5. No success with delivery of the baby with forceps or vacuum
6. Other
7. Don't know

2. Was it a planned procedure in advance (called elective) or what was it an emergency? _____

3. Are you satisfied that the caesarean section was the best option, for you in those circumstances, for the delivery of the baby?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Not sure
4. Not satisfied
5. Very unsatisfied

4. Do you feel the care you received was professional and supportive from the doctors?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Not sure
4. Not satisfied
5. Very unsatisfied

PTO

1
2
3 **5. Do you feel the care you received was professional and supportive from the**
4 **midwifery team?**
5

- 6
7 1. Very satisfied
8 2. Satisfied
9 3. Not sure
10 4. Not satisfied
11 5. Very unsatisfied
12

13
14 **6. Are you satisfied that you received adequate information about the reason for**
15 **caesarean section at the time of your delivery?**
16

- 17
18 1. Very satisfied
19 2. Satisfied
20 3. Not sure
21 4. Not satisfied
22 5. Very unsatisfied
23

24
25 **7. Are you satisfied that you received adequate information and counselling in the**
26 **postnatal period (i.e. after delivery)?**
27

- 28
29 1. Very satisfied
30 2. Satisfied
31 3. Not sure
32 4. Not satisfied
33 5. Very unsatisfied
34

35
36
37 **8. What would be your preferred option for a future delivery?**
38

- 39 1. Normal labour and delivery
40 2. Repeat planned caesarean section
41 3. Undecided
42

43
44
45 **9. If you have a future pregnancy, discussion will take place between you and your**
46 **doctor about the best method of delivery again, i.e. a normal labour and delivery or**
47 **a repeat caesarean section. Sometimes the answer is not always clear. If there is a**
48 **research study on this topic, which assigns you to one or the other option, would you**
49 **agree to participate?**
50

- 51 1. Yes
52 2. No
53

54
55 *(If you did opt into a research study you would have the power to opt out at any time if you*
56
57

1
2
3 *changed your mind. This question is for research purposes only and will not affect your*
4 *future care in any way.)*
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract Done - P1 (Title) and P2 (Abstract) (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found Included P2
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported P5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses P6
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper Included P6 and 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection Included P6 and 7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up Included in P6 and 7 <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable Included P7 and P8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Included P7 and P8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias NA
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at P6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why P7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding

P7 and 8

(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions

P7 and P8

(c) Explain how missing data were addressed

P13

(d) *Cohort study*—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed

NA

Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed

Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

Continued on next page

Results

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed P8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders P9
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest NA
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) P9
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time P9 and P10
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included Main results presented P9 and 10 and Tables 1,2 and 3 (P18-20)
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized Main results presented P9 and 10 and Tables 1,2 and 3 (P18-20)
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses P10

Discussion

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives P10 and P11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias P11 and P12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence P11 and 12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results P11 and P12

Other information

Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based NA
---------	----	--

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.