# Comparative Study of Pfannenstiel Cesarean Section versus Misgav Ladach Cesarean Section in Anugrah Narayan Magadh Medical College and Hospital, Gaya, Bihar

## Seema Singh, Jyoti Bala

Assosciate Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Anugrah Narayan Memorial Magadh Medical College and Hospital, Gaya, Bihar, India

#### **Abstract**

**Objective:** The objective of the study was to assess the advantage of Misgav Ladach cesarean section in comparison to Pfannenstiel cesarean section.

Materials and Methods: The study was done over 12 months on 100 elective and emergency cesarean section.

Results: The duration of surgery, blood loss, and post-operative pain were significantly less in Misgav Ladach group.

Conclusion: Misgav Ladach technique of cesarean has many advantages and should be routinely used.

Key words: Cesarean section, Misgav Ladach, Pfannenstiel

#### INTRODUCTION

There is continuous search for new techniques in each operation. The technique should be safe, of short duration, simple, low cost, less post-operative morbidity and mortality.

Timonen *et al.* found that in Pfannenstiel cesarean section lag time to delivery was 8-10 min. On the other hand, Misgav Ladach Cesarean section offers the benefit of the incision to delivery interval being 4 min or less. It is best for very common indication of cesarean section which is fetal distress. In this operation, there is minimal use of sharp instruments, so blood loss is minimum. Uterus is sutured in a single layer, which also reduces the duration and cost of surgery. Post-operative pain is also less.

#### Access this article online



Month of Submission: 05-2017
Month of Peer Review: 06-2017
Month of Acceptance: 06-2017
Month of Publishing: 07-2017

In view of the advantages claimed for the above technique, this study was undertaken to assess its efficiency, safety, duration, blood loss, need of suture material, and post-operative stay and to compare it with Pfannenstiel cesarean section in women undergoing primary cesarean section.

### **MATERIAL AND METHOD**

All women posted for elective or emergency primary cesarean section were included in this study for common indication. They were divided into 2 Groups. 50 women went through Misgav Ladach and the other 50 went through Pfannenstiel cesarean section. Women with the previous cesarean section, obstructed labor, previous abdominal surgery, Placenta previa, Abruptio placenta, and rupture uterus were not included in the study. Informed consent was taken. All the operative procedure done was performed under spinal or general anesthesia. Operation time measured and blood loss was measured by used gauze, packs, and suction both. Suture material also counted. Pre- and post-operative care was similar in both groups.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Seema Singh, Shiv Hospital, 176 A P Colony, Gaya, Bihar, India. Phone: +91-9431039367, E-mail: drseemasingh12@gmail.com

Table 1: Difference between the two techniques

| Steps                 | Group 1 (Pfannenstial) | Group 2 (Misgav<br>Ladach) |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Type of skin incision | Pfannenstial           | Joel Cohen                 |
| Subcutaneous tissue   | Cut with scissors      | Digital separation         |
| Rectus sheath         | Cut with scissors      | Digital separation         |
| Rectus muscle         | Cut and separated      | Opened by stretching       |
| Peritoneum            | Cut with scissors      | Digital separation         |
| Uterine incision      | Cut with scissors      | Digital separation         |
| Uterine sutured       | 2 layers               | One layers                 |
| Muscle sutured        | No                     | No                         |
| Skin sutured          | 7-8                    | 3 stitches                 |

Table 2: Suture used and duration of surgery

| Number of sutures used        | Group 1 | Group 2 |
|-------------------------------|---------|---------|
| Only one suture               | 5       | 45      |
| 2 suture                      | 42      | 5       |
| More than 2                   | 3       |         |
| Mean duration operation (min) | 30±2    | 19±3    |

Table 3: Blood loss

| Blood loss | Group 1 ( <i>n</i> =50) | Group 2 (n=50) |
|------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| <250       | 5                       | 25             |
| 250-500    | 25                      | 15             |
| 500-750    | 12                      | 5              |
| 750-1000   | 6                       | 3              |
| >1000      | 2                       | 2              |

### **RESULT**

Table 1 shows the difference between two techniques and Table 2 shows the duration of operation and suture material used. Shortest duration of surgery was 15 min in Group 1 and 11 minutes in Group 2.

Table 3 shows the amount of blood loss which is significantly less in Group 2. There were two women in each group with blood loss of more than 1000 ml, and one had blood transfusion in Group-1. Group-1 had double layer closure of uterus so more suture material was used. Post-operative pain was assessed by decreased use of analgesic in Group 2.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Every obstetric department has to evaluate the means of reducing the time for cesarean section. Reduction in operating time, reduced the incidence of post-operative febrile morbidity and fewer adhesions of subsequent cesarean section. The originator of Misgav-Ladach method of cesarean section at General Hospital in Jerusalem compared it to a Pfannenstiel cesarean section.2 The amount of blood loss was decreased due to decreased use of knife and the technique also protects vessels. In the present studies, mean blood loss in Misgav Ladach technique was 294 ± 200 ml compare to Pfannenstiel group in which it was 455 ± 200 ml. Reduction in blood loss by the Misgav Ladach procedure has been previously shown by Darj and Nordstram<sup>3</sup> who in randomized study comparing 50 elective cesarean section reported the average bleeding with Misgav Ladach procedure to be for 448 ml and with Pfannenstiel procedure 608 ml. Moblization was earlier in Group 2 patient and also oral analgesic was less required in Group 2 patient.

# **CONCLUSION**

In this way, we see that Misgav Ladach technique is suitable for both emergency and elective operation. The reduction in pain and the speed of recovery enables the mother to look after the newborn. Hence, we should use this technique at all centers.

#### REFERENCES

- Timonen S, Castren O, Kivalo I. Caesarean section. Low transverse (Pfannenstiel) or low midline incision? Ann Chir Gynaecol Fenn 1970;59:173-6.
- Holmgren G, Sjöholm L. The Misgav Ladach method of caesarean section: Evolved by Joel-Cohen and Michael Stark in Jerusalem. Trop Doct 1996;26:150-7.
- Darj E, Nordström ML. The Misgav Ladach method for cesarean section compared to the Pfannenstiel method. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand 1999;78:37-41.

How to cite this article: Singh S, Bala J. Comparative Study of Pfannenstiel Cesarean Section versus Misgav Ladach Cesarean Section in Anugrah Narayan Memorial Magadh Medical College and Hospital, Gaya, Bihar. Int J Sci Stud 2017;5(4):5-6.

Source of Support: Nil, Conflict of Interest: None declared.