

ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at http://www.journalijdr.com



International Journal of DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH

International Journal of Development Research Vol. 5, Issue, 07, pp. 5024-5028, July, 2015

Full Length Research Article

DEMOGRAPHIC AND OBSTETRIC DETERMINANTS OF CAESAREAN SECTION AMONG PATIENTS IN LTH, OGBOMOSO

*Kola M. Owonikoko, Muibata Adeniran, Aramide M. Tijani and Samuel Akinola

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso, Oyo State Nigeria

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Article History: Received 26 th April, 2015 Received in revised form 21 st May, 2015 Accepted 09 th June, 2015 Published online 30 th July, 2015	 Background: Public health concerns have heightened due to the increasing rate of caeserean section (CS). Aim:To identify demographic and obstetric determinants of CS in aTeaching Hospital. Material and Methods: The records of all cases of Caesarean delivery carried out in LAUTECH Teaching Hospital (LTH), Ogbomoso between January 2011 and December 2013 were retrieved. Data from the records were entered and subjected to simple descriptive statistical analysis using
<i>Key words:</i> Demographic, Obstetric, Determinant Factors and Caesarean section.	 SPSS version 16, measures of association was carried out using chi-square and student t-test, all put at P value < 0.05. Results: A total of 1,097 deliveries were recorded for the period of the study. A total of 244 caesarean sections (CS) were performed during the period giving the CS rate of 22.2%. Majority 115(72%) of the patients had emergency caesarean section. The modal age –group among the women who undertook CS was 25 – 29 years. Most of the women who had CS were booked pregnant women 163(75.8%). Forty-four percent of the women with CS were primiparous.
	Cephalopelvic disproportion, previous CS, and fetal distress were the commonest indication for CS with 24.2%, 17.7% and 14.0%, respectively. Emergence CS was statically significant with being a single mother (P <0.001), body weight more than 70Kg (P = 0.026), primiparous (P< 0.001) and 1or 2previous CS (P<0.001). Conclusion: The rate of CS in this study can be compared to those obtainable in other parts of World. Previous CS and cephalopelvic disproportion were the most common indication for CS. Strategies to improve antenatal care and post natal care should be strengthened to reduce the risk

Copyright © 2015 Kola M Owonikoko et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

and complications that could arise from \hat{CS} .

INTRODUCTION

One of the major focus of the millenium development goals (MDGs) is the reduction of both maternal and infant mortality (WHO, 2007; WHO, 2000 and UN, 2009). However, access to skilled attendants and crucial intervention during pregnancy and childbirth in developing countries health sectors are still grossly inadequate (Inyang-Etoh *et al.*, 2013 and Kwawukume, 2001). CS is usually employed as a salvage surgical procedure to facilitate the delivery of fetus when the benefit to deliver outweighs the risk of continuing the pregnancy. The rate of CS has been on the increase around the world through the years (Jaiyesimi *et al.*, 2003; Mutihir *et al.*, 2005; Pang *et al* 2007 and Leung *et al.*, 2001). This could largely be due to a shift in emphasis from the method and technique of delivery to a greater concern about perinatal

outcome following delivery. Patients' preference for CS is regarded as a common cause behind increasing elective caesarean delivery rate especially in the developed countries (WHO, 2007; Pang et al., 2007). The incidence of CS globally ranges from 10% to up to 35% (WHO, 2002; Mutihir et al., 2005 and Lee et al., 2004). The CS rate rose from 4% in the 1970s to 21.5% in 2001 in the United Kingdom, from 30.3% in 1978-1979 to 50.8% in 1994 in Brazil, from 11.1% in 1988 to 38.1% in 2000 in South Korea, and from 4.7 to 22.5% over the past three decades in Shanghai.4.6-8 In Hong Kong, the CS rate rose from 16.6 to 27.4% between 1987 and 1999, representing a 65% increase over 12 years (Pang et al., 2007; Leung et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2004; Igberase et al., 2009; Dobson, 2001 and Gomes et al., 1999). The rising caesarean section rate in developed countries could be attributed to the use of continuous cardiotocographic monitoring during labor, defensive practice and repeat caesarean sections; in a developing country like Nigeria, primary caesarean sections result largely from severe pre-eclampsia, eclampsia and

^{*}Corresponding author: Kola M Owonikoko,

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso, Oyo State Nigeria.

cephalopelvic disproportion (Lee et al., 2005; Tang et al., 2006 and Festin et al., 2009). One other important reason of growing rate of CS can be attributed to the increase of institutional - setting births (Nwobodo et al., 2011; Ozumba et al., 1993). Among other reasons, demographic profiles of mothers, fear of litigation among caregivers physician's convenience, insurance facility and mode of hospital payment and profit-oriented private health care system are found to be associated to the rise of CS delivery (Ugwu et al., 2011; Sufang et al., 2007 Tollanes et al., 2009). CS rate have been reported to be higher in private hospitals in developing countries with the ulterior motive of the recurring financial gains (Karim et al., 2011 and Kaur et al., 2013). Cephalopelvicdisproportion, repeat caesarean sections and fetal distress have been noted as the most ccommon indications for caesarean section in Nigeria (Inyang-Etoh et al., 2013; Jaiyesimi et al., 2003 and Igberase et al., 2009. The purpose of this study is to identify the demographic, past and present obstetric determinants of caesarean section in LTH Ogbomoso.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The records of all cases of Caesarean delivery carried out in LTH, Ogbomoso between January 2011 and December 2013 were retrieved. Information extracted from the records included socio-demographic status of the patients, anthropometric parameters, past obstetric history, intra-partum events, indication for caesarean section, type of caesarean section and past medical history. The operating theatre records as well as data pertaining to the number of deliveries during this study period were obtained. These were entered and subjected to simple descriptive statistical analysis using SPSS version 16, measures of association was carried out using chi-square and student t-test, all put at P value of less than 0.05.The approval for this study was obtained from the Ethical Committee of LTH Ogbomoso.

RESULTS

A total of 1,097 deliveries were recorded for the period of the study. A total of 244 CS were performed during the study period giving the prevalence of 22.2%. Two hundred and fifteen case notes with complete information required were eventually included in the study from the 244 case notes retrieved. This gives a case retrieval rate of 88.1%. Table 1 shows the socio-demographic status of the patient. The mean age in years of the patients was 28.31±4.08 with majority (47.9%) of the patient in the 25 - 29age group. Larger proportion were Yoruba (89.3%) and 82.3% are married. Majority are educated up to secondary school level (48.4%) with 34.9% of the patient with skilled labor and 38.1% of partner/husbands were unskilled. Table 2 shows the anthropometric parameters of the patients. The mean height in meters was 1.59±0.16 with majority (76.3%) having a height greater than 1.5 metres. The mean weight in kg was $73.01 \pm$ 5.27 with larger proportion (56.7) within 70 - 89kg weight. Majority of the patient 163(75.8%) were booked. One hundred and twenty (55.8%) were multiparous and 95(44.2%) were primiparous. Seventy-six (35.3%) had had previous vaginal delivery while 139(64.7%) had their previous deliveries by CS.

Table 1. Socio-demographic status of patients

Variable	Frequency $(n = 215)$	Percentage (%)
Age in years		
Mean Age = 28.31 ± 4.08		
15-19	6	2.8
20-24	46	21.4
25-29	103	47.9
30-34	51	23.7
35 and above	9	4.2
Marital Status		
Single	38	17.7
Married	177	82.3
Tribe		
Yoruba	192	89.3
Igbo	19	8.8
Others (Which include Hausa & Fulani)	4	1.9
Religion		
Christian	151	70.2
Muslim	59	27.4
Traditionalist	5	2.3
Educational Status		
Primary	21	9.8
Secondary	104	48.4
Tertiary	90	41.9
Occupation		
Unskilled	73	34.0
Skilled	75	34.9
Professional	67	31.2

Table 2. Anthropometric parameters of the patients

Variable	Frequency $(n = 215)$	Percentage (%)
Height in meters (m)		
Mean height = 1.59 ± 0.16		
<1.5	51	23.7
≥1.5	164	76.3
Weight in Kg		
Mean weight = 73.01 ± 5.27		
<50	7	3.3
50 - 69	72	33.5
70 - 89	122	56.7
90 and above	14	6.5
50 - 69 70 - 89 90 and above	72 122 14	33.5 56.7 6.5

The last delivery was by emergency CS in 155(72.1%) patients and elective in the remaining 60 patients. Majority 155(72.1%) of the patients had an emergency CS while 66(27.9%) had elective CS during the study period. Table 3 shows Caesarean section profile of the patient. The mean gestational age at CS in weeks was 38.90±1.46, with majority (79.5%) within the 38.0 - 42.0 weeks gestational age. Cephalopelvic disproportion was the indication for 24.2% of CS. The mean cervical dilation at CS was 4.16±2.90cm with majority (61.9%) had cervical dilation greater than 4cm. Sixty-nine (32.1%) had a station of presenting part of zero (0) when CS was done. Only 14.4% had induction of labor before CS with a higher proportion of them (74.2%) had misoprostol and oxytocin. Thirty eight percent had augmentation labor before CS. Table 4 shows the type of caesarean section and the socio-demographic characteristics of the patients. Marital status of the patient showed a significant relationship with the type of caesarean section had (p value <0.01) while age, educational status and occupation did not show any statistical relationship. Table 5 shows the type of caesarean section with the anthropometric parameters of the patients. Weight in kg of the patients was statistical significantly related to the type of caesarean section. Height did not show any statistical relationship.

Table 3. Caesarean section profile of the patient

Gestational age at CS in weeks (C) Mean GA = 38.90 ± 1.46 34.0 - 37.6 44 20.5 $38.0 - 42.0$ 171 79.5 Indication for the CS 7 3.0 Fetal distress 30 14.0 Antepartum hemorrhage 15 7.0 Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy 23 10.7 Postdatism 7 3.3 Failed induction of labor 8 3.7 Cephalopelvic disproportion 52 24.2 Malpresentation 43 20.0 Previous CS 37 17.2 Cervical dilatation in cm Mean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 3 or less 82 38.1 4 or more 133 61.9 No of times patient had hadCS 1 102 47.4 2 83 38.6 3 30 14.0 Induction of labor before CS 31 14.4 14.4 Method on induction of labor 82 38.1 4.4 Ripe	Variable	Frequency $(n = 215)$	Percentage
Mean GA = 38.90 ± 1.46 $34.0 - 37.6$ 44 20.5 $38.0 - 42.0$ 171 79.5 Indication for the CS 7 7.6 Fetal distress 30 14.0 Antepartum hemorrhage 15 7.0 Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy 23 10.7 Postdatism 7 3.3 Failed induction of labor 8 3.7 Cephalopelvic disproportion 52 24.2 Malpresentation 43 20.0 Previous CS 37 17.2 Cervical dilatation in cm Mean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 3 or less 82 38.1 4 or more 133 61.9 No of times patient had hadCS 1 102 47.4 2 83 38.6 30 14.0 Induction of labor before CS 31 14.4 44.4 Method on induction of labor 82 38.1 4 4 or more 133 61.9 82 38.6 31 </td <td>Gestational age at CS in weeks</td> <td>(</td> <td>(,)</td>	Gestational age at CS in weeks	((,)
Autor of 1Construct $34.0 - 37.6$ 44 20.5 $38.0 - 42.0$ 171 79.5 Indication for the CS 171 79.5 Fetal distress 30 14.0 Antepartum hemorrhage 15 7.0 Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy 23 10.7 Postdatism 7 3.3 Failed induction of labor 8 3.7 Cephalopelvic disproportion 52 24.2 Malpresentation 43 20.0 Previous CS 37 17.2 Cervical dilatation in cm $Mean = 4.16 \pm 2.90$ 3 or less 82 38.1 4 or more 133 61.9 No of times patient had hadCS 1 1 102 47.4 2 83 38.6 3 30 14.0 Induction of labor before CS 31 14.4 Method on induction of labor 82 38.1 Agent used for augmentation of labor 82 38.1 Agent used for augmentation of labor 82 100.0	Mean $GA = 38.90 \pm 1.46$		
101120.5Indication for the CS17179.5Indication for the CS73.0Fetal distress3014.0Antepartum hemorrhage157.0Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy2310.7Postdatism73.3Failed induction of labor83.7Cephalopelvic disproportion5224.2Malpresentation4320.0Previous CS3717.2Cervical dilatation in cm73.3Mean = 4.16 \pm 2.90361.93 or less8238.14 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS1102110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	34.0 - 37.6	44	20.5
Indication for the CSIndication for the CSFetal distress3014.0Antepartum hemorrhage157.0Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy2310.7Postdatism73.3Failed induction of labor83.7Cephalopelvic disproportion5224.2Malpresentation4320.0Previous CS3717.2Cervical dilatation in cmMean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less8238.14 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS1110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	38.0 - 42.0	171	79.5
Fetal distress3014.0Antepartum hemorrhage157.0Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy2310.7Postdatism73.3Failed induction of labor83.7Cephalopelvic disproportion5224.2Malpresentation4320.0Previous CS3717.2Cervical dilatation in cmMean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less8238.14 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS1110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Indication for the CS		
Antepartum hemorrhage157.0Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy2310.7Postdatism73.3Failed induction of labor83.7Cephalopelvic disproportion5224.2Malpresentation4320.0Previous CS3717.2Cervical dilatation in cmMean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less8238.14 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS1110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Fetal distress	30	14.0
Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy2310.7Postdatism73.3Failed induction of labor83.7Cephalopelvic disproportion5224.2Malpresentation4320.0Previous CS3717.2Cervical dilatation in cm733Mean = 4.16 ± 2.90 361.93 or less8238.14 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS1102110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Antepartum hemorrhage	15	7.0
Postdatism73.3Failed induction of labor83.7Cephalopelvic disproportion5224.2Malpresentation4320.0Previous CS3717.2Cervical dilatation in cmMean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less8238.14 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS1110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor2374.2Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Hypertensive disorders in pregnancy	23	10.7
Failed induction of labor8 3.7 Cephalopelvic disproportion52 24.2 Malpresentation43 20.0 Previous CS 37 17.2 Cervical dilatation in cm $Mean = 4.16 \pm 2.90$ 3 or less3 or less82 38.1 4 or more133 61.9 No of times patient had hadCS 1 1 102 47.4 283 38.6 3 30 14.0 Induction of labor before CS 31 14.4 Method on induction of labor 25.8 Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin 8 25.8 Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin 23 74.2 Augmentation of Labor 82 38.1 Agent used for augmentation of labor 82 100.0	Postdatism	7	3.3
Cephalopelvic disproportion5224.2Malpresentation4320.0Previous CS3717.2Cervical dilatation in cm7Mean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less823 or less8238.14 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS1110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor825.8Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Failed induction of labor	8	3.7
Malpresentation4320.0Previous CS3717.2Cervical dilatation in cmMean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less8238.14 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS1110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor825.8Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Cephalopelvic disproportion	52	24.2
Previous CS 37 17.2 Cervical dilatation in cmMean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less 82 3 or less 82 4 or more 133 4 or more 133 61.9 No of times patient had hadCS 1 102 47.4 2 83 36.6 3 30 14.0 Induction of labor before CS 31 14.4 Method on induction of laborRipening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin 8 25.8 Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin 23 74.2 Augmentation of Labor 82 Oxytocin 82 100.0	Malpresentation	43	20.0
Cervical dilatation in cmMean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less823 or less824 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS110247.42833014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of laborRipening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin82374.2Augmentation of Labor82Oxytocin82100.0	Previous CS	37	17.2
Mean = 4.16 ± 2.90 3 or less 82 38.1 4 or more 133 61.9 No of times patient had hadCS 1 102 47.4 2 83 38.6 3 36.6 3 30 14.0 14.0 Induction of labor before CS 31 14.4 Method on induction of labor 8 25.8 Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin 8 25.8 Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin 23 74.2 Augmentation of Labor 82 38.1 Agent used for augmentation of labor 0 0.00	Cervical dilatation in cm		
$\begin{array}{ccccc} 3 \text{ or less} & 82 & 38.1 \\ 4 \text{ or more} & 133 & 61.9 \\ \text{No of times patient had hadCS} & & & \\ 1 & 102 & 47.4 \\ 2 & 83 & 38.6 \\ 3 & 30 & 14.0 \\ \text{Induction of labor before CS} & 31 & 14.4 \\ \text{Method on induction of labor} & & \\ \text{Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin} & 8 & 25.8 \\ \text{Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin} & 23 & 74.2 \\ \text{Augmentation of Labor} & 82 & 38.1 \\ \text{Agent used for augmentation of labor} & & \\ \text{Oxytocin} & 82 & 100.0 \\ \end{array}$	$Mean = 4.16 \pm 2.90$		
4 or more13361.9No of times patient had hadCS10247.4110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor825.8Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	3 or less	82	38.1
No of times patient had hadCS110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor825.8Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	4 or more	133	61.9
110247.428338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor3114.4Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	No of times patient had hadCS		
28338.633014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor825.8Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	1	102	47.4
33014.0Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor14.0Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	2	83	38.6
Induction of labor before CS3114.4Method on induction of labor825.8Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	3	30	14.0
Method on induction of labor825.8Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Induction of labor before CS	31	14.4
Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin825.8Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Method on induction of labor		
Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin2374.2Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor82100.0	Ripening with Foley's catheter +oxytocin	8	25.8
Augmentation of Labor8238.1Agent used for augmentation of labor38.1Oxytocin82100.0	Ripening with misoprostol + oxytocin	23	74.2
Agent used for augmentation of labor Oxytocin 82 100.0	Augmentation of Labor	82	38.1
Oxytocin 82 100.0	Agent used for augmentation of labor		
	Oxytocin	82	100.0

Table 6 shows the type of caesarean section with obstetric profile of the patients. Number of times patient had had CS and Cervical dilatation in cm showed statically significant relationship with the type of caesarean section (p value <0.001). Although the mean gestational age in weeks of the patients that had elective caesarean section was marginally lower than those that had emergency caesarean section, this difference was not statistically significant (p-value = 0.289). The mean difference in the cervical dilation at CS of the two types of caesarean section had by the patients was statistically significant (p-value <0.001). Also, there was statistical significant relationship between the parity of the patients and type of caesarean section had (p value < 0.001).

DISCUSSION

The rate of caeserean section has been on the increase and several factors have been identified to be responsible for this trend (Inyang-Etoh *et al.*, 2013; Kwawukume 2001& 2002). The overall ceaserean section rate in Nigeria is between 9.9 - 34.5% (Inyang-Etoh *et al.*, 2013; Ibrahim *et al.*, 2009 and Abiodun *et al.*, 2009). The rate obtained in this study was 22.2 % which falls in between the earlier reported range. Majority (72%) of the patients had emergency caeserean section. This is because most of the ceaserean section in Nigeria are performed as an emergency procedure to salvage the lives of

Table 4.	Type of	Caesarean	section a	nd the	socio-demo	graphic	characteris	tics of the	patients
						B			

	Types of Caesarean Section					
Variables	Emergency N(%)	Elective N(%)	Df	Pearson Chi-Square (x^2)	P-value	
Age in years						
Less than 26	52(70.3%)	52(70.3%)	1	0.186	0.666	
26 and above	103(73.0%)	103(73.0%)				
Marital status						
Single	38(100.0%)	0(0.0%)	1	17.868	< 0.001*	
Married	117(66.1%)	60(33.9%)				
Educational Status						
Primary	14(66.7%)	7(33.3%)	2	2.346	0.309	
Secondary	80(76.9%)	24(23.1%)				
Tertiary	61(67.8%)	29(32.2%)				
Occupation						
Unskilled	58(79.5%)	15(20.5%)	2	3.414	0.181	
Skilled	53(70.7%)	22(29.3%)				
Professional	44(65.7%)	23(34.3%)				

Table 5. Type of Caesarean section with anthropometric parameters of the patients

	Type of Caesarean Section						
Variables	Emergency N(%)	Elective N(%)	Df	Pearson Chi-Square (x^2)	P-value		
Height in metres							
<1.5m	35(68.6%)	16(31.4%)	1	0.399	0.528		
≥1.5m	120(73.2%)	44(26.8%)					
Weight in Kg							
< 70	64(81.0%)	15(19.0%)	1	4.939	0.026*		
70 and above	91(66.9%)	45(33.1%)					

*Statistically Significant

Table 6. Type of Caesarean section with Obstetric profile of the patients

	Types of Caesarean Section					
Variables	Emergency N (%)	Elective N (%)	Df	Pearson Chi-Square (x^2)	P-value	
No of times patient had had CS						
1	58(56.9%)	44(43.1%)				
2	75(90.4%)	8(9.6%)	2	25.551	< 0.001*	
3	22(73.3%)	8(26.7%)				
Gestational age in weeks	38.96 ± 1.66	38.73 ± 0.73		1.062	0.289	
Cervical dilation at CS	5.45±2.12	1.83 ± 1.80	212	1.005	<.0.001*	
Parity			215	14.904		
Primiparous	58(61.1%)	37(38.9%)	213	10 212		
Multiparous	97(80.8%)	23(19.2%)		10.312	< 0.001*	
kQtatiatian II. Qinnifian at						

*Statistically Significant

patients on referral from primary health care centres and those who had inadequate ante-natal care. The percentage of those who had emergency CS in this study is higher than what was obtained in a similar study (66.4%) undertaken at the University of Calabar (Inyang-Etoh et al., 2013). However higher emergency CS rate of 78.2%, 93.7% and 85.2% were recorded for studies conducted in Sokoto, Enugu and Jos, respectively (Mutihir et al., 2005; Nwobodo et al., 2011 and Ugwu et al., 2011). Furthermore, CS rate is expected to be high in Teaching Hospitals because of the number of expertise, and high rate of referral from primary and secondary health care centres. Other reasons of high rate of CS in this study included cases of referred patients who came in critical condition with history of trial of labour or complicated medical disorders. Emergency CS was done to save the life of mother and fetus.

Fetal distress, cephalopelvic disproportion and previous CS were the most common indication observed in this study. These were buttressed in similar studies conducted in Nigeria (Inyang-Etoh et al., 2013 and Nwobodo et al., 2011). This result (24.2% for cephalopelvic disproportion) is within the reported range of the findings of other studies in Nigeria where it remained the most common (25.6% and 15.5% respectively) as indication for emergency CS (Ikeako et al., 2009; Geidem et al., 2009). However, fear of childbirth on the part of the patients and fear of litigation on the part of medical personel are the most common causes of increase in CS rates in the developed nations (Nieminen et al., 2009). The modal age -group among the women who undertook CS in this study (25 - 29 years) is in tandem with those reported in previous studies in Nigeria (Inyang-Etoh et al., 2013; Jaiyesimi et al., 2003; Igberesa et al., 2009; Ikeako et al., 2009; Ozumba et al., 1993 and Ugwu et al., 2011). Forty-four percent of the women were primiparous while 55.8% were multiparous (Inyang-Etoh et al., 2013). observed similar trend of about 55.3% being multiparous while primiparous women who undertook CS accounted for 44.7% of the study population. The observed trend is also in support of the previous studies carried out in Nigeria (Ikeako et al., 2009 and Ugwu et al., 2011).

Previous studies have suggested that the height of a woman could serve as a crude index of the size of her pelvic cavity (Inyang-Etoh et al., 2013; Pang et al., 2007). The mean height in this study was 1.59 ± 0.16 m. Majority (76.3%) had height greater than 1.5m. Recent study opined that poverty and malnutrition, which is widespread in developing countries Nigeria inclusive, could be responsible for why girls do not attain optimal skeletal growth and pelvic maturity before they commence motherhood (Inyang-Etoh et al., 2013). The mean weight recorded in this study was 73.01 ± 5.27 kgwith a larger proportion of the study population (56.7%) had weight ranging between 70 and 89kg. This result is close to those obtained by Inyang – Etoh et al 2013 in which60.0% of the their study populace weighted between 70-89kg. The result of this study has revealed that most of the women who undertook CS were booked pregnant women (76%) while only 24% were unbooked. This is higher than findings from other Nigerian studies which reported 40.5% and 57.5%, respectively for booked and un booked women (Igberase et al., 2009 and Ugwu et al., 2011). It is however close to that of Inyang -Etoh et al., 2013 who observed that a vast majority (79.3%) of the women had booked and obtained antenatal care in the centre. This could be premised on the assumption that women have confidence in services rendered in tertiary health care centres as compared to the primary and the secondary health care centres. Also, some of the reffering centres are affiliated to the LAUTECH Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso.

Conclusion

This study has shown that the rate of caeserean section in Ogbomoso can be compared to those obtainable in other parts of Nigeria. The modal age –group among the women who undertook CS in this study (25 - 29 years) and were mostly primiparous. Most CS were emergencies. Fetal distress and cephalopelvic disproportion, were the most common indication for emergency CS while previous CS could be a major reason for elective CS.

Recommendation

Strategies to improve antenatal care and post natal care should be strengthened to reduce the risk and complications that could arise from CS. Government and NGOs should targetinterventions towards improving the continuum of care for obstetric risk groups, especially multiple gestation, breech and preterm births.

Limitation of Study

The study might be affected from small sample size because of the age of the Teaching Hospital (being a newly established center). Case records not containing adequate patients' record were excluded.

REFERENCES

- Abiodun, O.M and Balogun O.R. 2009. A review of Caeserean Sections Associated with Perinatal Mortality at the University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital, Ilorin, Nigeria, *Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice*, 12(3): 248 – 251.
- Dobson R. 2001. Caesarean section rate in England and Wales hits 21. BMJ, 323:951.
- Festin, M.R., Laopaiboon, M., Pattanittum, P., Ewens, M.R., Henderson, D.J., and Crowther, C.A. 2009. Caesarean section in four East-Asian countries: Reasons for, Rates, Associated care practices and and Health outcomes. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 17(9): 9-17.
- Geidem, A.D, Andu, B.U, Kawuwa, B.M and Obed, J.Y. 2009. Rising trend and indications of caesarean section at the University of Maiduguri Teaching hospital, Nigeria. Annals of African Medicine, 8(2): 127-132
- Gomes, U.A, Silva, A.A, Bettiol, H, Barbieri, M.A. 1999. Risk factors for the increasing caesarean section rate in Southeast Brazil: a comparison of two birth cohorts, 1978-1979 and 1994. *Int J Epidemiol*, 28: 687-694.
- Ibrahim, H.M., Jimoh, A.A.G., Isiaka-Lawal, S., Okesina, S., Balogun, O.R. and Raji, H.A. 2009. Caesarean Section at the University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital: A 2 Year Review. *Nigerian Journal of Health Sciences*, 2: 19 – 22.
- Igberase G.O, Ebeigbe P.N and Andrew B.O. 2009. High caesarean section rate: a ten year experience in a Tertiary Hospital in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Niger J Clin .Pract.*, 13(12):294-299.

- Ikeako, L.C., Nwajiaku, L. and Ezegwui, H.U. 2009. Caesarean section in a Secondary Health hospital in Awka, Nigeria. *Nigeria Medical Journal*, 50(3):64-67.
- Inyang-Etoh, E.C and Etuk, S.J. 2013. Demographic and Obstetric Determinants of Emergency Caesarean Section Among Women In Calabar, Nigeria. Global Research *Journal of Medical Sciences*, 3(1): 20–24,
- Jaiyesimi, R.A.K. and Ojo, O.E. 2003. Caesarean Section. In: Okonofua FE and Odunsi K (Eds) Contemporary Obstetrics and Gynecology for developing countries. Ibadan. *Intec Printers Ltd.*, pp. 593-619.
- Karim, F., Ghazi, A., Ali, T., Aslam, R., Afreen, U., and Farhat, R. 2011. Trends and determinants of Caesarean Section. *Journal of Surgery Pakistan (International)*, 16 (1): 22 – 27.
- Kaur, J., Singh S. and Kaur, K. 2013. Current trend of caesarean sections and vaginal births. *Advances in Applied Science Research*, 4(4):196-202.
- Kwawukume, E.Y. 2001. Caesarean section in developing countries. Best Practice Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2001, 15(1): 165-178.
- Kwawukume, E.Y. 2002. Caesarean section in the tropics. In: Kwawukume EY and Emuveyan EE. (Eds). Comprehensive Obstetrics and in the Tropics. Dansoman. 1st Edition. Asante and Hitcher Printing Press Ltd., 321 – 329.
- Lee, S.I, Khang, Y.H, Lee, M.S. 2004. Women's attitudes toward mode of delivery in South Korea—a society with high cesarean section rates. Birth 2004, 31:108-116.
- Lee, S.I., Khang, Y.H., Yun, S., and Jo, M.W. 2005. Rising rates, changing relationships: caesarean section and its correlates in South Korea, 1988-2000. BJOG, 112: 810-819.
- Leung, G.M, Lam, T.H, Thach, T.Q, Wan, S, Ho, L.M. 2001. Rates of cesarean births in Hong Kong: 1987-1999. Birth, 28:166-172.
- Mutihir, J.T, Para, P.H and Ujah, I.A.D. 2005. Elective caesarean section at the Jos University Teaching hospital. *Tropical Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 22: 39-41.

- Nieminen, K., Stephansson, O., and Ryding, E.L. 2009. Women's fear of childbirth and preference for cesarean section across-sectional study at various stages of pregnancy in Sweden. Acta Obstetriciaet Gynecologica. 88: 807-813.
- Nwobodo EI, Isah AU and Panti A. (2011) Elective caesarean section in a Tertiary Hospital in Sokoto, north-western Nigeria. *Nigerian Medical Journal*, 52(54): 263 -269.
- Ozumba, B.C. and Mbadiwe, IJ. 1993. Preterm caesarean section in Nigerian obstetric practice. *J Natl Med. Assoc.*, 11(85):857-860.
- Pang, S.W.M., Leung, D.T.N., Leung, T.N., Lai, C.Y., Lau, T.K. and Chung, T.K.H. 2007. Determinants of preference for elective caesarean section in Hong Kong Chinese pregnant women. *Hong Kong Med J*, 13(2), 100 – 105.
- Sufang G., Padmadas S. S., Fengmin Z., Brown J. J., Stones R. W. 2007. Delivery Setting and Caesarean Section Rates in China", *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*; 85(10): 755-762.
- Tang S, XiaoyanL,andZhuochun W. 2006 Rising cesarean delivery rate in primiparous women in urban China: Evidence from three nationwide household surveys. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 195: 1527–32.
- Tollanes M.C. 2009. Increased Rate of Caesarean sections Causes and consequences, Tidsskr Nor Laegeforen. 129(13): 1329-1331.
- Ugwu, EOA, Obioha, U.C.E, Ohezie, O.A and Ugwu, A.O. 2011. A five year survey of Caesarean delivery at a Nigerian Tertiary hospital. *Ann Med Health Sci Res*, 1: 77-83.
- United Nations. 2009. The Millennium Development Goals Report 2009. [Available: http:// www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/MDG_Report_2009_EN G.pdf].
- World Health Organization. 2000. Managing Complications in Pregnancy and Childbirth.
- World Health Organization. 2007. WHO Recommended Interventions for Improving Maternal and Newborn Health. WHO/MPS/07.05.
