

TITLE Timing and outcomes of an indication-only use of intravenous cannulation during spontaneous labor

Authors

Joanne Motino Bailey, CNM PhD

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Michigan Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Carrie Bell, MD

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Michigan Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ruth Zielinski CNM, PhD, FACNM

School of Nursing, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Corresponding author

Joanne Motino Bailey, CNM PhD

Director, Nurse Midwifery

9-109 VVWH

1540 E Medical Center Drive

Ann Arbor, MI 48109-4264

734-930-2925

jabailey@umich.edu

Manuscript Word Count: 2580

Biographical Sketches

Joanne Motino Bailey, CNM, PhD, is Director of Nurse-Midwifery at Michigan Medicine and Collegiate Lecturer in the Department of Women's Studies at the University of Michigan.

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/jmwh.13046](https://doi.org/10.1111/jmwh.13046).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Carrie Bell, MD is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at Michigan Medicine.

Ruth Zielinski CNM, PhD, FACNM is a Clinical Associate Professor/program lead in the University of Michigan School of Nursing Midwifery Education Program.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the Michigan Medicine Nurse Midwifery Service for their commitment to quality data collection on midwifery practice.

PRECIS Using an indication-only approach to establishing intravenous access in patients receiving midwifery care during labor and birth did not result in increased incidence of postpartum hemorrhage.

QUICK POINTS

- Although placement of an intravenous (IV) cannula for women in labor is a common practice there is limited data to support this as routine practice.
- Indication-only IV cannulation for women in spontaneous labor resulted in 28% of patients never requiring IV access during their admission.
- IV access established during labor and birth prior to a diagnosis of postpartum hemorrhage or excessive bleeding is not associated with decreased blood loss or higher postpartum hematocrit and hemoglobin levels when compared with IV placement at the time of the postpartum hemorrhage.

ABSTRACT

Introduction: In the United States, most women presenting in spontaneous labor undergo intravenous cannulation on admission to hospital labor and delivery units. There is limited evidence for this routine practice in pregnant women at low risk for adverse outcomes during labor or birth.

Methods: A retrospective, exploratory, descriptive study of an indication-only practice of intravenous (IV) cannulation on admission for women presenting in spontaneous labor and cared for by a nurse-midwife service was performed. Descriptive data included the timing of IV cannula placement (admission, during labor or postpartum period, or not at all), and indications for placement. Maternal outcomes of interest were estimated blood loss, postpartum hemorrhage rates and management; neonatal outcome was 5 minute Apgar scores.

Results: Records for 1069 women cared for by nurse-midwives who presented in spontaneous labor and were reviewed. In this cohort, 445 (41.6%) had IV access established on admission, 325 (30.4%) had an IV placed during labor or postpartum, and 299 (28%) never had IV access during their hospital stay. For the 325 women with IV cannulas placed after admission, 25 (7.7%) were placed urgently for excessive postpartum bleeding. Further analysis of the subset of women who had a postpartum hemorrhage after vaginal birth (defined as > 500 mL estimated blood loss) indicated that urgent IV cannulation was not associated with a lower mean postpartum hemoglobin or hematocrit, nor an increase in blood transfusion rate when compared to women who had an IV placed earlier in their labor course.

Discussion: Indication-only IV cannulation for women experiencing an uncomplicated labor and birth is a reasonable practice in settings where IV access can be established urgently if needed.

Word count 281

KEYWORDS spontaneous labor, intravenous access, IV cannulation, saline-lock, indication-only, postpartum hemorrhage

INTRODUCTION

Although the actual number of women who have an intravenous (IV) cannula placed during labor is unknown, 62% of women in the United States Listen to Mother's survey reported receiving IV fluids during labor.¹ For low-risk women admitted in spontaneous labor, routine hospital admission orders often include placement of an IV, irrespective of a clear need for intravenous access. Women considered low-risk are those who have an uncomplicated pregnancy with a single fetus in vertex presentation at term and have no a-

priori risk factors for complications during labor or birth.² It is unclear that routine placement of an IV in a low risk woman is beneficial or reduces risk for mother or fetus.

Intravenous cannulation, often referred to as a “saline-lock” (flushed with 10 mL of normal saline to prevent occlusion)³ establishes IV access via a capped catheter. Because IV access has already been established, subsequent need for fluids and medications can be addressed more quickly in cases of emergent surgery, fetal distress, or maternal hemodynamic instability. The objective of this retrospective descriptive analysis is to explore outcomes in a nurse-midwifery practice where IV cannulation in low risk women presenting in active labor is done based on indication rather than as a routine practice.

BACKGROUND

Establishing intravenous access became routine during the mid 20th century as part of managing labor and birth as a surgical procedure. This management also included sedation (twilight sleep), routine episiotomy, and forceps use.⁴ Women were instructed not to eat or drink to prevent risk of aspiration and consequently intravenous fluids were routinely administered.⁵ Since that time, many of these interventions are no longer common practice, yet routine IV cannulation continues to be standard practice in many hospital based labor and delivery units. The administration of IV fluids and restriction of oral nutrition and/or fluids is also common practice.⁶ While current postpartum hemorrhage (PPH) prevention guidelines do not include routine placement of IV cannula for access,^{7,8,9} an additional rationale for routine IV cannulation is the ability to institute rapid fluid resuscitation during PPH as well as for ease of oxytocin and other medication administration if needed. Several studies have examined the effect of different rates and types of IV fluids on the duration of labor and rates of cesarean birth,^{10,11} however, the benefit of these protocols for emergency care during childbirth has not been studied.

Although establishing IV access may be viewed as a benign intervention, the procedure does induce a risk of infection, superficial phlebitis, or thrombus.¹² Even with anesthetic use, IV placement is painful.¹³ Cost associated per each IV cannulation is estimated to be between \$69 and \$237.¹⁴ Whether an indication-based approach versus routinely establishing IV access during labor is associated with delay of treatment or an increase in the incidence of adverse effects is unknown. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore timing of IV placement and if an indication-only protocol for IV cannulation is associated with increased maternal blood loss or lower newborn Apgar scores. A retrospective, descriptive analysis of women presenting in spontaneous labor to a university

hospital and cared for by nurse-midwives was performed. The primary outcome was to describe the timing and indication for IV placement when an indication-only approach is used. Secondary outcomes included estimated blood loss, postpartum hemoglobin and hematocrit, and five minute Apgar scores.

METHODS

This was a retrospective descriptive analysis of maternity care outcomes from a large midwestern university hospital. Ongoing data collection had been occurring by the nurse-midwifery service for quality improvement and to assess outcomes of care for the last 35 years. The nurse-midwifery service is a collaborative practice model with independent midwifery care during the antepartum, intrapartum and postpartum period unless medical complications necessitate physician consultant involvement. This nurse-midwifery service cares for approximately 700 women giving birth each year, with an overall 22% induction rate and 17% cesarean rate.¹⁵

From January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2016, data were reviewed from women admitted in spontaneous labor and receiving care with the nurse-midwifery service. Women included in the study presented in spontaneous labor, were established nurse-midwifery service patients, without medication-requiring gestional diabetes or hypertension, greater than 34 weeks gestation with a singleton, vertex fetus, with reassuring fetal status at time of admission. Women presenting for induction of labor and women who presented in labor but were not a candidate for vaginal birth at time of admission (eg, breech presentation, placenta previa, Category III fetal heart rate pattern, evidence of placental abruption) were excluded from this analysis.

The nurse-midwifery service recommends IV cannulation at time of admission in labor only if there is an indication, for example, history of PPH or prior cesarean birth. Commonly, during labor, birth, and postpartum, IV access is recommended for concerning changes in maternal and/or fetal status. Some women decline placement of an IV cannula despite this recommendation, for example when a woman has a previous cesarean birth or has excessive postpartum bleeding. In these situations, ongoing discussion, shared decision making, and risk assessment continues while respecting individual autonomy and choice. Women presenting for care in the hospital labor and birth unit have a complete blood count and type and screen collected routinely on admission. A repeat complete blood count is collected only if indication, such as after a PPH or cesarean birth.

During the period of data collection at this facility, postpartum blood loss was visually estimated rather than quantified. An estimated blood loss of greater than 500 milliliters (mL) was defined as a PPH for vaginal births. During antenatal care, active management of third stage labor with 10 Units of oxytocin given intramuscularly for all women immediately post vaginal delivery is discussed. If a woman declines active management of the third stage, it is documented in the record and in the quality improvement database.

For this study, Institutional Review Board approval was obtained with a waiver of informed consent. Then, a review of the quality improvement data base was completed to identify low risk women admitted in spontaneous labor, singleton pregnancy, vertex fetus and greater than 34 weeks. Next, a focused chart review in the electronic health record was completed to document the timing and indication of IV placement. Descriptive data obtained included age, number of pregnancies, number of births, body mass index, gestational age at onset of labor, mode of birth, and 5-minute Apgar score. Admission complete blood counts and subsequent blood counts were collected for women who experienced PPH following vaginal birth. Estimated blood loss was recorded.

Timing of IV placement was divided into three groups: 1) IV placement at the time of admission, 2) IV placement later in labor or postpartum, and 3) no IV placement during the intrapartum and postpartum period. For all IV placements, the indication was documented. Indications for urgent IV placement were concerning immediate maternal or fetal status changes, including category III fetal heart rate pattern, active maternal bleeding, severe hypertension, signs or symptoms of hemodynamic instability including acute changes in maternal pulse, blood pressure, oxygen saturation and syncope. The electronic medical record was reviewed by two of the three authors to confirm the information. For all of these indications.

Additionally, for all patients with a documented immediate PPH of 500mL or more after vaginal birth, admission and postpartum hemoglobin and hematocrit, use of uterotonics, blood transfusion, and management of the post partum hemorrhage was collected for review. Data was analyzed in SPSS version 24 with frequencies, mean, chi-square, t-test and ANOVA.

RESULTS

During the time period between January 2015 to December 2016, 1069 women presented in spontaneous labor at or after 34 weeks gestation with a singleton, vertex fetus. (Table 1). The women were predominately privately insured (78.1%), white (81.7%),

multiparous (62.8%) and with a BMI less than 30 kg/m² (85.1%). Mean age was 30.3 years and mean gestational age at the onset of labor was 40 weeks. Less than half (41.9%) received neuraxial analgesia. Fetal monitoring with exclusive intermittent auscultation was utilized for 297 (27.8%) of the women. The cesarean birth rate for this cohort of low risk women was 7.5%. Five newborns were assigned an Apgar score of less than seven at five minutes of life (0.5%).

Of the 1069 women included in this analysis, 445 (41.6%) had IV cannulation at admission, 325 (30.4%) had IV cannulation later (either during labor or postpartum), and 299 (28%) never had IV access established. There were anticipated differences in labor management practices associated with required IV placement such as need for group B streptococcus (GBS) prophylaxis or placement of neuraxial analgesia. Notably, women monitored only with intermittent auscultation were much less likely to have an IV placed (161 of 297 [54.2%]) compared with women who had continuous electronic fetal monitoring during their labor (138 of 772 [17%]).

For postpartum maternal outcomes, analysis was conducted using the subset of women who had a vaginal birth (n = 989). Active management of the third stage of labor (AMTSL) with 10 units of oxytocin administered intramuscularly immediately following the birth is recommended for all patients at this institution regardless of IV access. However, 28.6% of women in the overall sample declined AMTSL and a significantly higher number of women who never had IV access declined AMTSL when compared to women who had an IV placed on admission or an IV placed in labor (45.2% vs 22.8% and 18.8% respectively, $P < .001$). Postpartum hemorrhage with estimated blood loss greater than or equal to 500mL occurred in 108 women (11.3%) overall.

The timing and indications for intravenous placement are presented in Table 2. The most common indications for IV placement on admission were: GBS colonization requiring antibiotic prophylaxis, trial of labor after cesarean and presence of risk factors for PPH (which were defined as history of PPH, blood clotting disorder, or parity > 4). For women who received IV cannulation during the labor process, the most common reasons were maternal request for neuraxial analgesia or intravenous pain medication. There were no urgent IV placements during labor.

During the postpartum period, 36 women had intravenous cannulas placed and of those, 27 women required urgent placement. The postpartum urgent placements accounted for 8.3% of

all IV placements. Indications for urgent placement were excessive postpartum bleeding (25 women) and syncope unrelated to PPH (2 women).

Of the 108 women with a PPH after vaginal birth, 70 women already had an IV placed and 38 women did not have an IV at the time the PPH was identified. Most women with a PPH had an estimated blood loss of 500 mL or more but less than 1000 mL, however 32 (29.6%) had an estimated blood loss greater than or equal to 1000 mL. (Table 3) Of these 38 women who did not have an IV, 15 declined placement of an IV cannula despite recommendation for placement secondary to excessive bleeding although only one woman with an estimated blood loss of 1000 mL or more declined IV placement.

The outcomes of the subgroup of women experiencing PPH after vaginal delivery were evaluated. For this cohort of women, the mean hemoglobin was 12.2g/dL and hematocrit was 35.7% on admission. Following birth, the mean hemoglobin was 9.9 g/dL and hematocrit was 29.1% for this cohort. There were no significant differences in the admission to postpartum change in hemoglobin and hematocrit values between women with an IV placed earlier in the labor course, placed urgently, and women who declined IV placement.

Misoprostol administered per rectum was the most common uterotonic used to treat PPH (66.7%) followed by intramuscular methergine (22.2%). Intravenous oxytocin was not used as a single agent to treat PPH, however in some cases it was used secondarily if the patient had IV oxytocin infusing during labor (18 of 108 women, [18.5%]). Patients with urgent IV placement were more likely to receive misoprostol when compared to those who had an IV already in place (91.3% versus 61.4% respectively; $P=.015$). Of the 108 women with PPH, 13 were transferred to an operating room, with 4 women ultimately receiving a dilation and curettage procedure to evacuate the uterus. Seven women required a transfusion with 2 units of blood (6.5% of all women with a PPH), 6 of whom had IV placement on admission and one who had urgent IV placement for PPH. There were not significant differences in the need for transfusion, transfer to the operating room, or need for dilatation and curettage when women who already had an IV placed were compared to women who had an urgent placement. None of the 15 women who declined urgent IV placement required blood transfusion, transfer to the operating room, or dilatation and curettage.

Six women declined both active management of third stage and IV cannulation at the time of PPH. In this cohort, one woman received no uterotonics, one was given misoprostol per rectum only, 2 had IM oxytocin only and 2 had both misoprostol and IM oxytocin. All 6 women had no further complications during their hospital stay.

DISCUSSION

In this retrospective, descriptive study, we explored the outcome of the policy to establish IV access based on specific indications for women who were low-risk for labor complications at the onset of labor, admitted in spontaneous labor at a gestational age of 34 weeks or greater. Less than half of the women (41.6%) had an IV cannula placed on admission and 28% never required IV access. However, for women who had a PPH, there was no difference in postpartum hemoglobin or hematocrit values regardless of whether IV access was ever placed. This would suggest that for women who are low risk presenting in spontaneous labor, IV access on admission may not be mandatory, particularly in high resourced facilities.

To our knowledge, there are no published studies of the impact of routine IV cannulation compared to indication-only IV access for women who are low-risk and in spontaneous labor. A review of the literature regarding outcomes of establishing IV access in emergency departments, indicates that many IV insertions were never utilized which led to preventable complications and financial burden from unnecessary IV cannulation.¹⁶ The authors concluded that there is a culture in emergency departments of misperceived risk and lack of confidence that results in routine IV placements. The same may be applicable to the culture in maternity care units where healthy, laboring women have an IV placed as a routine practice.

The majority of women in the United States give birth in a hospital,¹⁷ and while no source could be found for actual numbers, establishing IV access is often part of the hospital admission process or protocol. Results of this study indicate that a policy of establishing IV access when there is an indication instead of routinely for low risk spontaneously laboring woman may be a safe and reasonable practice. This practice would result in a cost and time savings, decrease patient discomfort, and facilitate mobility during labor and birth. Potential risk of venous complications would be avoided.

This study, while the first to explore the outcomes of indication-only IV access in labor, is not without limitations. This was a retrospective, observational study utilizing a data collection tool used for quality improvement purposes with targeted medical chart review. Data on the number of attempts at IV cannulation was missing for many of the 27 urgent placements, preventing analysis of whether or not waiting for IV access results resulted in a more difficult placement under an urgent clinical situation. Although there was no significant difference in hematologic outcomes, need for blood transfusion, or operating room

management between women who had an IV placed on admission or during labor and those who had an IV placed for PPH a difference in clinical symptoms such as syncope is not known. Women included in the study were predominately white, privately insured, healthy, and at low risk for complications, thus the results may not apply to women from other demographic groups. Finally, the setting for this study was in a high resourced, high volume hospital, therefore, results may not be generalizable to lower resourced or smaller settings.

CONCLUSION

Professional organizations have called for decreasing unnecessary intervention and respecting individual's choices during childbirth.^{18,19} Respectful maternity care includes honoring laboring women's choices for their birth, including avoiding interventions such as routine IV placement. While further study is needed, a policy of indication-only IV access during spontaneous labor is reasonable in a higher resourced setting, fiscally responsible, and supports physiologic birth, particularly for women who desire minimal intervention during birth.

REFERENCES

1. Declercq ER, Sakala C, Corry MP, Applebaum S, Herrlich A. Major survey findings of Listening to MothersSM III: Pregnancy and Birth. *J Perinat Educ*. 2014;23(1):9-16. doi:10.1891/1058-1243.23.1.9
2. Obstetric Care Consensus No. 2. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;125(2):502-515. doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000460770.99574.9f
3. Goossens GA. Flushing and locking of venous catheters: Available Evidence and Evidence Deficit. *Nurs Res Pract*. 2015;2015:985686. doi:10.1155/2015/985686
4. Michaels PA. Childbirth and trauma, 1940s-1980s. *J Hist Med Allied Sci*. 2018;73(1):52-72. doi:10.1093/jhmas/jrx054
5. Behrman BL. A reclamation of childbirth. *J Perinat Educ*. 2003;12(3):vi-x. doi:10.1624/105812403X106900
6. American College of Nurse-Midwives. Providing oral nutrition to women in Labor. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2016;61(4):528-534. doi:10.1111/jmwh.12515

7. Weeks A. The prevention and treatment of postpartum haemorrhage: what do we know, and where do we go to next? *BJOG An Int J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2015;122(2):202-210. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.13098
8. World Health Organization: Reproductive Health and Research. *WHO Recommendations for the Prevention and Treatment of Postpartum Haemorrhage.*; 2012. doi:10.1016/j.ijgo.2013.06.024
9. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists Committee on Practice Bulletins-Obstetrics. Practice bulletin No. 183: Postpartum hemorrhage. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2017;130(4):e168-e186. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002351
10. Dawood F, Dowswell T, Quenby S. Intravenous fluids for reducing the duration of labour in low risk nulliparous women. *Cochrane database Syst Rev.* 2013;(6):CD007715. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD007715.pub2
11. Direkvand-Moghadam A, Rezaeian M. Increased intravenous hydration of nulliparas in labor. *Int J Gynecol Obstet.* 2012;118(3):213-215. doi:10.1016/j.ijgo.2012.03.041
12. Stuart RL, Cameron DRM, Scott C, et al. Peripheral intravenous catheter-associated *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia: more than 5 years of prospective data from two tertiary health services. *Med J Aust.* 2013;198(10):551-553. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23725270>. Accessed August 15, 2018.
13. Griffith RJ, Jordan V, Herd D, Reed PW, Dalziel SR. Vapocoolants (cold spray) for pain treatment during intravenous cannulation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016;4:CD009484. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009484.pub2
14. Nguyen TM, Hirsh DA, Khan NS, Massey R, Simon HK. Potential impact of peripheral intravenous catheter placement on resource use in the pediatric emergency department. *Pediatr Emerg Care.* 2010;26(1):26-29. doi:10.1097/PEC.0b013e3181cd149a

15. Roosevelt L, Bailey JM, Low LK. Retrospective review of nurse-midwifery care at a large university health system. *J Perinat Neonatal Nurs.* 2015;29(4):296-304. doi:10.1097/JPN.0000000000000133
16. Gledstone-Brown L, McHugh D. Review article: Idle “just-in-case” peripheral intravenous cannulas in the emergency department: Is something wrong? *Emerg Med Australas.* 2018;30(3):309-326. doi:10.1111/1742-6723.12877
17. MacDorman MF, Declercq E, Mathews TJ, Stotland N. Trends and characteristics of home vaginal birth After cesarean delivery in the United States and selected states. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2012;119(4):737-744. doi:10.1097/AOG.0b013e31824bb050
18. ACNM, MANA, NACPM. Supporting healthy and normal physiologic childbirth: A Consensus Statement by ACNM, MANA, and NACPM. *J Perinat Educ.* 2013;22(1):14-18. doi:10.1891/1058-1243.22.1.14
19. Approaches to limit intervention during labor and birth. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 766. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. *Obstet Gynecol* 2019;133:e164–73.

Table 1: Demographic, antenatal and labor characteristics of women admitted in spontaneous labor N=1069

	Total	IV Placed On Admission	IV placed later	No IV placed
Total N (%)		445 (41.6)	325 (30.4)	299 (28.0)
Mean age in years (range)	30.3 (15-47)	30.6 (15-47)	29.3 (16-42)	30.7 (17-43)
Insurance n (%)				
Private	835 (78.1)	348 (78.2)	244 (75.1)	243 (81.3)
Medicaid	222 (20.8)	94 (21.1)	76 (23.4)	52 (17.4)

None	12 (1.1)	3 (0.7)	5 (1.5)	4 (1.3)
Race/Ethnicity n (%)				
White	873 (81.7)	356 (80.0)	264 (81.2)	253 (84.6)
Black	106 (9.9)	51 (11.5)	31 (9.5)	24 (8.0)
Other	90 (8.4)	38 (8.5)	30 (9.2)	22 (7.4)
Parity n (%)				
Nulliparous women	398 (37.2)	147 (33.1)	164 (50.4)	87 (29.1)
Multiparous women	671 (62.8)	298(66.9)	161 (49.6)	212 (70.9)
GBS+ n (%)				
Yes	287 (26.8)	270 (60.7)	4 (1.2)	13 (4.3)
No	736 (68.8)	157 (35.3)	309 (95.1)	270 (90.3)
Unknown	46 (4.3)	18 (4.0)	12 (3.7)	16 (5.4)
BMI n (%)				
≤ 29.9 kg/m ²	908 (85.1)	372 (83.8)	270 (83.1)	266 (89.3)
≥ 30.0 kg/m ²	159 (14.9)	72 (16.2)	55 (16.9)	32 (10.7)
History of prior cesarean birth n (%)				
Yes	107 (10.0)	66 (15.3)	26 (8.0)	13 (4.3)
No	962 (90.0)	377 (84.7)	299 (92.0)	286 (95.7)
EGA, Mean (Range), weeks	40 (34-43)	40 (35-43)	40 (35-43)	40 (36-42)
Neuraxial analgesia n (%)				
Yes	448 (41.9)	200 (44.9)	248 (76.3)	0 (0.0)
No	621 (58.1)	245 (55.1)	77 (23.7)	299 (100.0)
Fetal Monitoring n (%)				
Only IA	297 (27.8)	85 (19.1)	51 (17.2)	161 (53.8)
cEFM	772 (72.2)	360 (80.9)	274(84.3)	138 (46.1)
Cesarean birth n (%)				

Yes	80 (7.5)	49 (15.0)	31 (7)	0 (0.0)
No	989 (92.5)	395 (85)	294 (93)	299 (100)
5 minute Apgar <7 n (%)				
Yes	5 (0.5)	3 (0.6)	2 (0.6)	0 (0.0)
No	1064 (99.5)	442 (99.4)	323 (99.4)	299 (100)
AMTSL n (%)^a				
Yes	675 (71.4)	304 (77.2)	211 (81.2)	160 (54.8)
No	271 (28.6)	90 (22.8)	49 (18.8)	132 (45.2)
PPH n (%)^b				
Yes	108 (11.3)	37 (9.0)	56 (20.2)	15 (5.0)
No	881 (88.7)	376 (91.0)	221 (78.8)	284 (95.0)

Abbreviations: BMI, Body Mass Index; EGA, Estimated Gestational Age; GBS, Group Beta Strep; IA, intermittent auscultation; cEFM, continuous electronic fetal monitoring, AMTSL active management of third stage of labor: PPH postpartum hemorrhage

^aTotal n = 946, 43 missing cases cesarean births are excluded

^bTotal n = 989 cesarean births are excluded

Table 2: Timing and indication for placement of intravenous access n=770

	Total n = 770 n (%)	IV on Admission n = 445 n (%)	IV placed later during labor or postpartum n = 325 n (%)
Indication on admission			
GBS positive	279 (36.2)	274 (61.6)	5 (1.5)
TOLAC	41 (5.3)	40 (9.0)	1 (0.3)
PPH risk	19 (2.4)	19 (4.3)	0
No rationale documented	8 (1.0)	8 (1.8)	0
Other indication ^a	6 (0.7)	6 (1.3)	0

Intrapartum indication			
Neuraxial analgesia	303 (39.3)	67 (15.0)	236 (72.6)
Opioid pain relief	47 (6.1)	16 (3.6)	31 (9.5)
Hydration	9 (1.0)	5 (1.1)	4 (1.2)
Category II FHR	7 (0.9)	5 (1.1)	2 (0.6)
Augmentation	6 (0.8)	1 (0.2)	5 (1.5)
Preeclampsia	5 (0.6)	3 (0.7)	2 (0.6)
Unstable fetal presentation	2 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.3)
Cesarean birth ^b	1 (0.1)	0	1 (0.3)
Fever	1 (0.1)	0	1 (0.3)
Postpartum indication			
Excessive bleeding	25 (3.2)	n/a	25 (7.7) ^c
Laceration repair requiring neuraxial analgesia	5 (0.6)	n/a	5 (1.5)
Retained placenta removal	2 (0.2)	n/a	2 (0.6)
Syncope	2 (0.2)	n/a	2 (0.6) ^c
Dizziness	1 (0.1)	n/a	1 (0.3)
Non specific chest pressure	1 (0.1)	n/a	1 (0.3)

Abbreviations: FHR, Fetal heart rate; GBS, Group b streptococcus; PPH, postpartum hemorrhage; TOLAC, Trial of labor after cesarean; n/a, not applicable

^a laboring woman's request (1), nausea management (1), IV steroid administration (1), maternal tachycardia (1), maternal bradycardia (1), known fetal anomalies (2)

^b After experiencing an arrest of descent during labor, an IV was placed at time of decision to proceed with cesarean birth

^c urgent IV placement

Table 3: Women with postpartum hemorrhage after vaginal birth n=108

	Total n = 108	IV already placed n = 70	Urgent IV placed n = 23	Declined urgent IV n = 15	P
Estimated Blood Loss n (%)					

500-999 mL	76 (70.4)	50 (71.4)	12 (52.2)	14 (93.3)	
≥1000 mL	32 (29.6)	20 (28.6)	11 (47.8)	1 (6.7)	
Admission Hct, mean (SD)^a	35.7 (3.4)	35.7 (3.7)	35.7 (3.3)	35.9 (1.5)	.99
Admission Hgb Mean (SD)^a	12.2 (1.4)	12.2 (1.5)	12.2 (1.3)	12.2 (0.9)	.99
Postpartum Hct, mean (SD)^b	29.1 (4.4)	28.8 (4.2)	28.7 (5.0)	31.7 (2.2)	.16
Postpartum Hgb Mean (SD)^b	9.9 (1.7)	9.8 (1.6)	9.7 (1.9)	10.8 (1.0)	.17
Interventions n (%)					
AMTSL	78 (72.2)	57 (81.4)	12 (52.2)	9 (60)	.01
Misoprostol	72 (66.7)	43 (61.4)	21 (91.3)	8 (53.3)	.02
Methergine	24(22.2)	15 (21.4)	9 (39.1)	0 (0.0)	.02
Oxytocin IV	20 (18.5)	14 (20)	6 (26.1)	0 (0)	.11
Oxytocin IM	18 (16.7)	8 (11.4)	6 (26.1)	4 (26.7)	.14
Transfer to operating room	13 (12)	10 (14.3)	3 (13)	0 (0.0)	.30
Transfusion	7 (6.5)	6 (8.6)	1 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	.42
Dillitation & curretage	4 (3.7)	2 (2.9)	2 (8.7)	0 (0.0)	.31

Abbreviations: AMTSL, active management third stage labor; Hct, hematocrit; Hgb,

hemoglobin; IM, intramuscular; IV, intravenous

^a n = 94 due to missing data

^b n = 78 due to missing data