## British Journal of Medicine & Medical Research



21(10): 1-7, 2017; Article no.BJMMR.33980 ISSN: 2231-0614, NLM ID: 101570965

## Knowledge, Awareness and Acceptance of Labor Analgesia among Antenatal Women in a Remote Island: A Questionnaire Based Study

Avinash Prakash<sup>1\*</sup>, Anita Yadav<sup>2</sup>, Habib Md Reazaul Karim<sup>1</sup>, Sarasa Kumar Sahoo<sup>1</sup>, Pinky Jena<sup>2</sup> and Kumar Aman<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Anaesthesiology, Andaman and Nicobar Islands Institute of Medical Sciences, Port Blair, India. <sup>2</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Andaman and Nicobar Islands Institute of Medical Sciences, Port Blair, India. <sup>3</sup>Department of Anaesthesia, Indira Gandhi ESI Hospital, Jhilmil, Delhi, India.

#### Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Authors AP, AY and HMRK designed the study, performed the statistical analysis wrote the protocol. Authors AY and PJ collected data and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors SKS and KA managed the literature searches and analysis. Authors AP and HMRK revised and edited the final version. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/BJMMR/2017/33980 <u>Editor(s):</u> (1) Claudio Poggio, Department of Clinical, Surgical, Diagnostic and Pediatric Sciences, Section of Dentistry, Italy. <u>Reviewers:</u> (1) Lalit Gupta, Maulana Azad Medical College, Delhi University, New Delhi, India. (2) Somchai Amornyotin, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand. (3) Martin Potgieter, University of Limpopo, South Africa. Complete Peer review History: <u>http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/19264</u>

> Received 7<sup>th</sup> May 2017 Accepted 26<sup>th</sup> May 2017 Published 31<sup>st</sup> May 2017

**Original Research Article** 

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** It has been a decade since the year 2007 was dedicated towards painless motherhood. However the use and acceptance of labor analgesia is still very rare in developing countries.

**Objective:** The present study was aimed to assess the knowledge, acceptance and reasons for rejection of labor analgesia among the expectant mothers.

Methods: The present observational study was conducted after approval from the institute. All

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: E-mail: dr.avinash04@gmail.com;

antenatal women who attended antenatal clinic were approached during January to March 2017. Data was collected from the consented women using a pretested questionnaire. Data were expressed in absolute numbers and percentage scale. Measures of central tendencies were calculated for quantitative data using INSTAT software and p < 0.05 was considered significant for comparison.

**Results:** Response from 280 women with mean  $\pm$  SD age and gestational age of 25.49  $\pm$  4.89 years and 28.25  $\pm$  8.75 weeks respectively were analyzed. 126 were primi or multiparous; 56 graded labor pain as unbearable yet only 30 (23.81%) wanted labor analgesia. Only 20 (7.14%) prospective mothers were having knowledge of labor analgesia. The nulliparous wanted significantly less labor analgesia compared to primi and multiparous (p 0.003). Desire to bear natural birth was the commonest reason to refuse painless labor. One quarter of the participants believed that labor analgesia was bad for child and against the will of God.

**Conclusion:** Knowledge and acceptance of labor analgesia is poor although women who had previous experience were significantly more inclined towards it. Misinformation and myths is also a major contributor for non acceptance of labor analgesia.

Keywords: Vaginal delivery; pregnancy and childbirth; analgesia; reasons for; acceptance or rejection.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

For most women, childbirth is a highly anticipated, joyful experience. However, it is also accompanied by the most severe pain a woman will ever experience. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and the American Society of Anaesthesiologists have collectively noted that "parturition is the only circumstance in which it is considered acceptable to experience severe pain, amenable to safe relief, while under a physician's care". [1] The International Association for the Study of Pain declared 2007 to 2008 the global year against pain in women, with the slogan "real women, real pain". They highlighted the importance of treating pain among parturients and the substantial public health impact that could occur if this pain is neglected [2].

Pain – free labor is nearly universal in high income countries. However, in low – income countries where women are mostly burdened with high pregnancy rates and short interpregnancy intervals, pain relief in labor remains a distant reality. [3] young women in some cultures believed that labor pain is natural and inevitable and that the ability to accept and endure it is a sign of womanhood. [4] the present study was aimed to assess the acceptance and knowledge of antenatal women towards labor analgesia inhabiting in a remote Island and to find out the reason for not opting for it.

#### 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present prospective, questionnaire based, cross sectional observational study was conducted after obtaining approvals from the institute research and ethical authority in a tertiary care hospital situated in an Islands of India. Antenatal women of any gravida and parity attending antenatal clinic during January 2017 to March 2017 for antenatal check up were approached and consented patients were enrolled for the study. Data were collected by pre-validated and pre-tested using а questionnaire tool printed in English. Sociodemographic and obstetrical data were entered by the data collector. The questionnaire was then handed over to the patients and requested to fill it up or tick the options from the questionnaire which ever they think appropriate / correct for the variables with regard to knowledge and acceptance of labor analgesia and the reasons for not opting labor in subsequent delivery. If the participant were not in favour of accepting labor analgesia, the reasons for the non acceptances were asked and written / noted. The participants who were unable to read or understand the questions: the study investigators were available to assist the participants to clarify doubts or make them understood in their own language (i. e. Hindi and Bengali). Patient who do not understand either of English, Hindi and Bengali; who attended antenatal clinic for termination of pregnancy; Who were in active labor and legally protected special tribal group of people were excluded. Qualitative data / descriptive responses were expressed in absolute numbers and percentage scale. Inter guartile range was calculated for gravid and parity. Mean, median, standard deviation (SD) and 95% lower and upper limit were also calculated for quantitative data using INSTAT software (Graph Pad Prism Software, La Zolla, CA, USA). A value of p < 0.05 was considered as significant.

## 3. RESULTS

Three hundred fifty antenatal women were approached, 280 (80%) women consented for the participation in study. The women were in the age group of 16 to 44 years with mean  $\pm$  SD age of 25.49  $\pm$  4.89 years. Majority (51.07%) of the participants were multigravida / nullipara. The mean  $\pm$  SD gestational age of the antenatal women were 28.25  $\pm$  8.75 weeks. The demographic, socioeconomic and obstetric parameters are presented in Table 1.

# Table 1. Socio-demographic and obstetrical variables of the study participants

Age [Mean (95% Cl)] years $25.49 (24.92 - 26.07)$ Age groups (Years) $15 - 24$ $130 (46.42\%)$ $15 - 24$ $130 (46.42\%)$ $25 - 34$ $134 (47.85\%)$ $35 - 44$ $16 (5.71\%)$ Residence $\mathbb{P}$ Rural $163 (58.21\%)$ Urban $117 (41.78\%)$ Religion $\mathbb{P}$ Hinduism $229 (81.78\%)$ Islam $29 (10.35\%)$ Christianity $22 (7.85\%)$ Education $\mathbb{P}$ Illiterate $6 (2.14\%)$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42\%0)$ Up to Secondary $95 (33.92\%)$ Graduation and above $66 (23.57\%)$ Occupation $\mathbb{P}$ Student $4 (1.42\%)$ Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $28.25 (27.22 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 $	Characteristics [N = 280]	Number (%)
Age groups (Years) $15 - 24$ $130 (46.42\%)$ $25 - 34$ $134 (47.85\%)$ $35 - 44$ $16 (5.71\%)$ ResidenceImage: Constraint of the state of	Age [Mean (95% CI)] years	25.49 (24.92 –
Age groups (Years) $15 - 24$ $130 (46.42\%)$ $25 - 34$ $134 (47.85\%)$ $35 - 44$ $16 (5.71\%)$ ResidenceImage: Constraint of the state of		26.07)
15 - 24 $130 (46.42%)$ $25 - 34$ $134 (47.85%)$ $35 - 44$ $16 (5.71%)$ ResidenceImage: Constraint of the state	Age groups (Years)	
25 - 34 $134 (47.85%)$ $35 - 44$ $16 (5.71%)$ Residence $117 (41.78%)$ Rural $163 (58.21%)$ Urban $117 (41.78%)$ Religion $117 (41.78%)$ Hinduism $229 (81.78%)$ Islam $29 (10.35%)$ Christianity $22 (7.85%)$ Education $111 (41.78%)$ Illiterate $6 (2.14%)$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42%0)$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42%0)$ Up to Secondary $67 (23.92%)$ Up to Higher secondary $95 (33.92%)$ Graduation and above $66 (23.57%)$ Occupation $22 (7.85%)$ Student $4 (1.42%)$ Housewife $254 (90.71%)$ Working $22 (7.85%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2/1 (2-1)$ Primigravida $1337 (48.92%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0/1(1-0)$ Nulli $154 (55%)$ Primi $102 (36.42%)$ Multi $24 (8.56%)$ Gestation age (Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% CI)] $29.27$ $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28%)$ $229$ $155 (55.35%)$ Type of family $203 (79.64%)$	15 – 24	130 (46.42%)
$35 - 44$ $16 (5.71\%)$ ResidenceRural $163 (58.21\%)$ Urban $117 (41.78\%)$ ReligionHinduism $229 (81.78\%)$ Islam $29 (10.35\%)$ Christianity $22 (7.85\%)$ EducationIlliterateIlliterate $6 (2.14\%)$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42\%0$ Up to Secondary $67 (23.92\%)$ Up to Secondary $95 (33.92\%)$ Graduation and above $66 (23.57\%)$ OccupationStudentStudent $4 (1.42\%)$ Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2/1 (2-1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0/1(1-0)$ Nulli $24 (8.56\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age (Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% CI)] $29.27$ $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ $\geq 29$ $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $203 (79.64\%)$	25 – 34	134 (47.85%)
ResidenceRural $163 (58.21\%)$ Urban $117 (41.78\%)$ ReligionHinduism $229 (81.78\%)$ Islam $29 (10.35\%)$ Christianity $22 (7.85\%)$ EducationIlliterateIlliterate $6 (2.14\%)$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42\%0$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42\%0$ Up to Secondary $97 (23.92\%)$ Graduation and above $66 (23.57\%)$ Occupation $U$ Student $4 (1.42\%)$ Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2/1 (2-1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0/1(1-0)$ Nulli $24 (8.56\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age (Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% CI)] $29.27$ $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ $\geq 29$ $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $23 (79.64\%)$	35 – 44	16 (5.71%)
Rural163 (58.21%)Urban117 (41.78%)Religion117 (41.78%)Hinduism229 (81.78%)Islam29 (10.35%)Christianity22 (7.85%)Education111Illiterate6 (2.14%)Up to Primary46 (16.42%0Up to Primary67 (23.92%)Graduation and above66 (23.57%)Occupation50Student4 (1.42%)Housewife254 (90.71%)Working22 (7.85%)Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)]2 / 1 (2 - 1)Primigravida137 (48.92%)Multigravida143 (51.07%)Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)]0 / 1(1 - 0)Nulli154 (55%)Primi102 (36.42%)Multi24 (8.56%)Gestation age (Weeks)28.25 (27.22 - [Mean (95% CI)] $3 - 28$ 110 (39.28%) $\geq 29$ 155 (55.35%)Type of familyJointJoint57 (20.35%)Nuclear223 (79.64%)	Residence	
Urban $117 (41.78\%)$ ReligionHinduism $229 (81.78\%)$ Islam $29 (10.35\%)$ Christianity $22 (7.85\%)$ EducationIlliterateIlliterate $6 (2.14\%)$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42\%0$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42\%0$ Up to Secondary $67 (23.92\%)$ Up to Higher secondary $95 (33.92\%)$ Graduation and above $66 (23.57\%)$ Occupation $22 (7.85\%)$ Student $4 (1.42\%)$ Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age (Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% CI)] $29.27$ $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ $\geq 29$ $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $J$ Joint $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Rural	163 (58.21%)
ReligionHinduism $229 (81.78\%)$ Islam $29 (10.35\%)$ Christianity $22 (7.85\%)$ EducationIlliterateIlliterate $6 (2.14\%)$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42\%0$ Up to Primary $67 (23.92\%)$ Up to Secondary $67 (23.92\%)$ Graduation and above $66 (23.57\%)$ Occupation $V$ Student $4 (1.42\%)$ Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $29.27$ $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ $\geq 29$ $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $J23 (79.64\%)$	Urban	117 (41.78%)
Hinduism $229 (81.78\%)$ Islam $29 (10.35\%)$ Christianity $22 (7.85\%)$ Education $111111111111111111111111111111111111$	Religion	
Islam29 (10.35%)Christianity22 (7.85%)Education1Illiterate6 (2.14%)Up to Primary46 (16.42%0Up to Secondary67 (23.92%)Up to Higher secondary95 (33.92%)Graduation and above66 (23.57%)Occupation $4$ (1.42%)Housewife254 (90.71%)Working22 (7.85%)Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)]2 / 1 (2 - 1)Primigravida137 (48.92%)Multigravida143 (51.07%)Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)]0 / 1(1 - 0)Nulli154 (55%)Primi102 (36.42%)Multi24 (8.56%)Gestation age (Weeks)28.25 (27.22 -[Mean (95% CI)]29.27)5 - 1215 (5.35%)13 - 28110 (39.28%)≥29155 (55.35%)Type of familyJointJoint57 (20.35%)Nuclear223 (79.64%)	Hinduism	229 (81.78%)
Christianity       22 (7.85%)         Education       Illiterate       6 (2.14%)         Up to Primary       46 (16.42%0         Up to Secondary       67 (23.92%)         Up to Higher secondary       95 (33.92%)         Graduation and above       66 (23.57%)         Occupation       Student       4 (1.42%)         Housewife       254 (90.71%)         Working       22 (7.85%)         Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)]       2 / 1 (2 − 1)         Primigravida       1337 (48.92%)         Multigravida       143 (51.07%)         Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)]       0 / 1(1 − 0)         Nulli       154 (55%)         Primi       102 (36.42%)         Multi       24 (8.56%)         Gestation age (Weeks)       28.25 (27.22 −         [Mean (95% CI)]       29.27)         5 – 12       15 (5.35%)         13 – 28       110 (39.28%)         ≥29       155 (55.35%)         Type of family       Joint       57 (20.35%)         Nuclear       223 (79.64%)	Islam	29 (10.35%)
EducationIlliterate6 (2.14%)Up to Primary46 (16.42%0Up to Secondary67 (23.92%)Up to Higher secondary95 (33.92%)Graduation and above66 (23.57%)Occupation5000000000000000000000000000000000000	Christianity	22 (7.85%)
Illiterate $6 (2.14\%)$ Up to Primary $46 (16.42\%0$ Up to Secondary $67 (23.92\%)$ Up to Higher secondary $95 (33.92\%)$ Graduation and above $66 (23.57\%)$ Occupation $14 (1.42\%)$ Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age (Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% CI)] $29.27$ ) $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ ≥29 $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Education	
Up to Primary46 (16.42%0Up to Secondary67 (23.92%)Up to Higher secondary95 (33.92%)Graduation and above66 (23.57%)Occupation $4$ (1.42%)Housewife254 (90.71%)Working22 (7.85%)Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)]2 / 1 (2 - 1)Primigravida143 (51.07%)Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)]0 / 1(1 - 0)Nulli154 (55%)Primi102 (36.42%)Multi24 (8.56%)Gestation age (Weeks)28.25 (27.22 -[Mean (95% CI)]29.27)5 - 1215 (5.35%)13 - 28110 (39.28%)≥29155 (55.35%)Type of familyJointJoint57 (20.35%)Nuclear223 (79.64%)	Illiterate	6 (2.14%)
Up to Secondary $67 (23.92\%)$ Up to Higher secondary $95 (33.92\%)$ Graduation and above $66 (23.57\%)$ Occupation $142\%$ Student $4 (1.42\%)$ Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age (Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% CI)] $29.27$ ) $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ ≥29 $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Up to Primary	46 (16.42%0
Up to Higher secondary Graduation and above95 (33.92%) 66 (23.57%)Occupation66 (23.57%)Student4 (1.42%)Housewife254 (90.71%)Working22 (7.85%)Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida137 (48.92%)Multigravida143 (51.07%)Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli154 (55%)Primi102 (36.42%)Multi24 (8.56%)Gestation age ( Weeks)28.25 (27.22 -[Mean (95% Cl)]29.27)5 - 1215 (5.35%)13 - 28110 (39.28%)≥29155 (55.35%)Type of familyJointJoint57 (20.35%)Nuclear223 (79.64%)	Up to Secondary	67 (23.92%)
Graduation and above $66 (23.57\%)$ OccupationStudent4 (1.42%)Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age ( Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% CI)] $29.27$ ) $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ ≥29 $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Up to Higher secondary	95 (33.92%)
OccupationStudent4 (1.42%)Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age ( Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% Cl)] $29.27$ ) $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ ≥29 $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Graduation and above	66 (23.57%)
Student4 (1.42%)Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age ( Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% Cl)] $29.27$ ) $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ ≥29 $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $J$ Joint $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Occupation	
Housewife $254 (90.71\%)$ Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age ( Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - $ [Mean (95% Cl)] $29.27$ ) $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ ≥29 $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Student	4 (1.42%)
Working $22 (7.85\%)$ Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida $137 (48.92\%)$ Multigravida $143 (51.07\%)$ Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli $154 (55\%)$ Primi $102 (36.42\%)$ Multi $24 (8.56\%)$ Gestation age ( Weeks) $28.25 (27.22 - 28.25 (27.22 - 28.25))$ [Mean (95% Cl)] $29.27$ $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ $\geq 29$ $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of family $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Housewife	254 (90.71%)
Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $2 / 1 (2 - 1)$ Primigravida137 (48.92%)Multigravida143 (51.07%)Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli154 (55%)Primi102 (36.42%)Multi24 (8.56%)Gestation age ( Weeks)28.25 (27.22 -[Mean (95% Cl)]29.27)5 - 1215 (5.35%)13 - 28110 (39.28%)≥29155 (55.35%)Type of familyJointJoint57 (20.35%)Nuclear223 (79.64%)	Working	22 (7.85%)
Primigravida       137 (48.92%)         Multigravida       143 (51.07%)         Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)]       0 / 1(1 - 0)         Nulli       154 (55%)         Primi       102 (36.42%)         Multi       24 (8.56%)         Gestation age ( Weeks)       28.25 (27.22 -         [Mean (95% Cl)]       29.27)         5 - 12       15 (5.35%)         13 - 28       110 (39.28%)         ≥29       155 (55.35%)         Type of family       Joint         Joint       57 (20.35%)         Nuclear       223 (79.64%)	Gravida [median / IQR (Q3-1)]	2 / 1 (2 – 1)
Multigravida       143 (51.07%)         Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)]       0 / 1(1 - 0)         Nulli       154 (55%)         Primi       102 (36.42%)         Multi       24 (8.56%)         Gestation age ( Weeks)       28.25 (27.22 -         [Mean (95% Cl)]       29.27)         5 - 12       15 (5.35%)         13 - 28       110 (39.28%)         ≥29       155 (55.35%)         Type of family       Joint         Joint       57 (20.35%)         Nuclear       223 (79.64%)	Primigravida	137 (48.92%)
Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)] $0 / 1(1 - 0)$ Nulli154 (55%)Primi102 (36.42%)Multi24 (8.56%)Gestation age ( Weeks)28.25 (27.22 -[Mean (95% Cl)]29.27)5 - 1215 (5.35%)13 - 28110 (39.28%)≥29155 (55.35%)Type of familyJointJoint57 (20.35%)Nuclear223 (79.64%)	Multigravida	143 (51.07%)
Nulli         154 (55%)           Primi         102 (36.42%)           Multi         24 (8.56%)           Gestation age (Weeks)         28.25 (27.22 –           [Mean (95% Cl)]         29.27)           5 – 12         15 (5.35%)           13 – 28         110 (39.28%)           ≥29         155 (55.35%)           Type of family         Joint           Joint         57 (20.35%)           Nuclear         223 (79.64%)	Parity [median / IQR (Q3-1)]	0 / 1(1 – 0)
Primi       102 (36.42%)         Multi       24 (8.56%)         Gestation age (Weeks)       28.25 (27.22 -         [Mean (95% Cl)]       29.27)         5 - 12       15 (5.35%)         13 - 28       110 (39.28%)         ≥29       155 (55.35%)         Type of family       Joint         Joint       57 (20.35%)         Nuclear       223 (79.64%)	Nulli	154 (55%)
Multi       24 (8.56%)         Gestation age (Weeks)       28.25 (27.22 -         [Mean (95% Cl)]       29.27)         5 - 12       15 (5.35%)         13 - 28       110 (39.28%)         ≥29       155 (55.35%)         Type of family       Joint         Joint       57 (20.35%)         Nuclear       223 (79.64%)	Primi	102 (36.42%)
Gestation age ( Weeks)       28.25 (27.22 –         [Mean (95% Cl)]       29.27)         5 – 12       15 (5.35%)         13 – 28       110 (39.28%)         ≥29       155 (55.35%)         Type of family       Joint         Joint       57 (20.35%)         Nuclear       223 (79.64%)	Multi	24 (8.56%)
[Mean (95% Cl)] $29.27$ ) $5 - 12$ $15 (5.35\%)$ $13 - 28$ $110 (39.28\%)$ $\geq 29$ $155 (55.35\%)$ Type of familyJoint $57 (20.35\%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64\%)$	Gestation age ( Weeks)	28.25 (27.22 –
5 - 12 $15 (5.35%)$ $13 - 28$ $≥29$ $155 (55.35%)$ Type of family Joint $57 (20.35%)$ Nuclear $223 (79.64%)$	[Mean (95% CI)]	29.27)
13 - 28       110 (39.28%)         ≥29       155 (55.35%)         Type of family         Joint       57 (20.35%)         Nuclear       223 (79.64%)	5 – 12	15 (5.35%)
≥29 155 (55.35%) <b>Type of family</b> Joint 57 (20.35%) Nuclear 223 (79.64%)	13 – 28	110 (39.28%)
Type of family         57 (20.35%)           Joint         223 (79.64%)	≥29	155 (55.35%)
Joint 57 (20.35%) Nuclear 223 (79.64%)	Type of family	
Nuclear 223 (79.64%)	Joint	57 (20.35%)
	Nuclear	223 (79.64%)

Out of 280 women, 154 (55%) of the women were nulliparous and 126 (45%) women had parity ranging between one and five. All multiparous women had at least one previous hospital delivery. 44.44% of the women with experience of previous labor graded labor pain as unbearable and excruciating pain yet none of them received labor analgesia in their subsequent delivery / deliveries too (Table 2).

#### Table 2. Women with experience of labor pain and grading of pain as per them

Parameters	Number (%)[N = 126]
History of previous hospital delivery	126 (100%)
History of previous LSCS	26 (9.28%)
Grading of labor pain	
Excruciating / unbearable	56 (44.44%)
Severe	70 (55.55%)
Moderate	0
Mild	0

#### Table 3. Knowledge of labor analgesia among the participants

Questions	Frequency (%)
Ever heard about pain relief in labor?	
Yes	20 (7.14%)
No	260 (92.85%)
Source of information about	
labor analgesia	[N = 20]
Friends & relatives	17 (85%)
ANM nurse	02 (10%)
Media	01 (5%)
Doctor	00
Literature	00
Different methods of labor	
analgesia	[N=20]
Inhalation of gas	9 (45%)
Injection in the lower back	7 (35%)
IV/IM injections	4 (20%)
TENS	0
Relaxing/deep breathing exercise	0
Other methods	0
Availability of services in the	
hospital	[N = 280]
Yes	18 (6.42%)
No	223 (76.64%)
Do not know	39 (13.92%)
(ANM- ante natal and midwifery, TENS-	Transcutaneous

(N – total number, CI – confidence interval, IQR – inter quartile range) electrical nerve stimulation)

Only 20 (7.14%) participants were aware about painless labor; 80% heard about painless labor during their current pregnancy. 18 (6.43%) participants were aware regarding the availability of labor analgesia facility in their hospital. The knowledge of methods for labor analgesia was also limited with knowledge about use inhalational gases as the most common method. None of the participants had knowledge of more than one method for labor analgesia. Majority (85%) of them received information about labor analgesia from friends and relatives (Table 3).

#### Table 4. Eagerness for and reasons not for opting labor analgesia among the participants

	Number (%)	
Do you want labor analgesia?	[N=280]	
Yes	46 (16.43)	
No	234 (83.47)	
Reasons cited for not opting		
labor analgesia	[N=234]	
To experience natural birth	126 (53.85)	
Harmful to baby	30 (12.82)	
Against the will of God	28 (11.97)	
Refusal by family	17 (7.26)	
Methods do not work	12 (5.13)	
No response	21 (8.97)	
(N- Total number)		

Interestingly, 234 (83.47%) did not want labor

analgesia either in present / subsequent vaginal delivery citing different reasons (Table 4). 53.85% of those who did not want labor analgesia wanted to experience natural child birth. The desire to experience natural birth without analgesia was higher among nulliparous women than the women who had suffered previous pain (63.77% versus 39.58%). 30 (23.81%) women with experience of previous labor pain wanted labor analgesia as compared to 16 (10.39%) nulliparous women in their upcoming delivery. The difference was statistically significant (p 0.003).

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The pain of labor is associated with reflex increases in blood pressure, oxygen consumption and liberation of catecholamine, which could adversely affect uterine blood flow. The healthy parturient tolerates the increase in cardiac work, but high risk mothers, with cardiopulmonary disease etc. may not tolerate these changes. For them effective analgesia may contribute to better outcomes. [5] There are wide ranges of labor analgesia techniques available like inhalational nitrous oxide, opioids, regional analgesia, breathing exercises, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, acupuncture, etc. [3]. Epidural analgesia is regarded as gold standard [3]. However in the present cohort none of them had exact knowledge about it although they thought that giving injection in the back as a technique.

In developed countries, issues are focused on the choice of methods of labor analgesia and its complications, [6] while in developing countries like India child birth is still viewed as a physiological process managed with as little interference as possible. Many women still do not know that labor pain can be relieved. In the present study 92.86% of antenatal women had no idea about labor pain relief. This high level of lack of knowledge was found even in studies done in other part of India [7-10].

Women suffer from the agony of labor pain because of lack of awareness, unbound fears and limited knowledge about the availability of the analgesia service. In present study, all multigravida mothers had previous hospital delivery and hundred percent graded labor pain either as severe or unbearable pain yet none of them voluntarily wanted labor analgesia services for their subsequent delivery. Such low levels of utilization may be partly due to lack of knowledge, however it was found that even a very high number of women still were ready to bear the pain in their upcoming labor. It is prevalent in low resource settings too [11,12]. However it was also noted that the desire to bear the labor pain was much lower in women with previous experience which indicates that labor is a big source of pain and anxiety. This can lead to unnecessarily choosing knife over normal delivery in their subsequent delivery unless they have the knowledge that labor pain can be relieved. A study has shown that 50% of caesarean delivery on maternal request in multigravida women was the result of their previous bad experience of pain [13]. It has been observed that healthcare providers in developing countries are either ignorant or consider educating women on pain relief methods during labor as a low priority issue [7]. This apparent neglect is emphasized further by the observation that even women who had prior antenatal visits with health care providers did not have increased awareness. In present study too, none of the

antenatal women got information about labor analgesia from doctors is also indicating so.

A study from South Africa showed that women gained knowledge of pain relief from previous experience or from friends and relatives [14]. Similar results indicating the major source of information being from their friends and relatives were found in earlier studies too [15,16]. In contrary, a study done in Northern Nigeria showed the majority of women have heard of pain relief mostly from their caregivers and during the current pregnancy [12]. The level of awareness was also high in the said study which could be attributed to increasing discussions on the topic during antenatal visits.

Due to ever rising population in India, there is a lack of one to one care during delivery. Care givers do not get adequate time to prioritize the issue due to high volume of cases per caregiver. There should be mass media coverage for providing information about labor analgesia. Information could be disseminated through pamphlets or booklets distributed at antenatal clinics or making use of social media explaining the role and benefit of labor analgesia for the lay person.

Women in present study were mainly aware of either inhalation of gas or injection in the lower back as methods to provide pain relief in labor. In the Nigerian study, 80% of the respondents were aware of opiates as obstetric analgesia, but only 10% and 14% were aware of epidural and inhalation respectively [16]. Although the participants knew about the injection in back, none of the participants were aware about exact term 'epidural analgesia'. The finding of knowledge about inhalational analgesia was not found in previous study conducted in another part of the same country [7].

The commonest reason given by women for not selecting labor analgesia for their subsequent delivery was similar to the studies done by Nabukenya et al., Naithani et al. and Olayemi et al. [6,7,17]. However the study of Nabukenya et al showed that mother will love the baby if given birth naturally and so were not in favor of accepting labor analgesia. [6] In the present study none of the prospective mother thought so. Womanhood is assessed based on the ability of the woman to pass through the labor successfully and deliver vaginally, and are more concerned about the delivery of a healthy baby than the pain. 12.82% mother's did not opt for

labor analgesia because they think that it is harmful to baby and even educated mother believed that suppressing labor pain is against the will of God. These kinds of myths and belief can only be eliminated by mass dissemination of knowledge.

The present study is however limited with the fact that the present study was done with single centre participants. Although the numbers of participants enrolled were adequate to give > 80% power to the study yet the sampling was nonrandomized in nature. The study was also based on questionnaire which was even translated by investigator sometimes which may have effect on the answer pattern by the participants. The knowledge and acceptance depends on multiple factors like education level, income of the family previous exposure etc [10]. Even belief is very much affected by religion. As Labor analgesia is associated with religious belief so study in larger population and subgroup analysis is indicated.

Although the study is limited, the present study findings have a good clinical implication. There was very low acceptance and knowledge even in educated mothers which indicates that mere school education should not taken for granted that they will accept labor analgesia in future. They also need to be given information equally as uneducated and unexposed participants. We need to target out education against the myths and misbelieves with evidence. The most ironical finding that none of the participants received information from doctors is actually a wakeup call for changing the practice pattern for the benefit of the patients.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The level of knowledge and methods of labor analgesia are very less among the pregnant women. All women believe that labor pain is severe or unbearable yet desire to bear the labor pain is very prevalent. Around 24.7% women even felt that labor analgesia is harmful to baby and against the will of God. Dissemination of knowledge in antenatal period by health care givers is limited and needs to be improved.

## CONSENT

All authors declare that informed consent was obtained from the participants both for data enrolling in the study and for publication of the data obtained without disclosing identity.

#### ETHICAL APPROVAL

We declare that the study was submitted to institute research review board and subsequently to the Institute Ethical Board. The study was conducted by using a questionnaire tool and with due permission from the participants. No ethical issues were present in the study.

## **COMPETING INTERESTS**

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

- Goetzl LM. ACOG. Committee on practice bulletins-obstetrics. ACOG practice bulletin. Clinical management guidelines for obstetrician-gynecologists number 36, obstetric analgesia and anesthesia. Obstet Gynecol. 2002;100(1):177-91.
- Landau R, Ciliberto C. Modern labor analgesia. Pain: Clinical Updates. 2011;19(4):1-5.

(Accessed 5 May 2017)

Available:<u>http://www.iasp-</u> pain.org/PublicationsNews/NewsletterIssu e.aspx?ItemNumber=2077

 Karn S, Yu H, Karna S, Chen L, Qiao D. Women's awareness and attitudes towards labor analgesia influencing practice between developed and developing countries. Advances in Reproductive Sciences. 2016;4:46-52.

DOI: 10.4236/arsci.2016.42007

- Obuna JA, Umeora OJ. Perception of labor pain and utilization of obstetric analgesia by Igbo women of Southeast Nigeria. J Obstet Anaesth Crit Care. 2014;4:18-22. DOI:10.4103/2249-4472.132815
- Doshi HU, Tralika P, Gupta AG, Akalkotkar A. Epidural analgesia in high risk patients during labor. J K Science. 2009;11(3): 130-32.
- Nabukenya MT, Kintu A, Wabule A, Muyingo MT, Kwizera A. Knowledge, attitudes and use of labour analgesia among women at a low-income country antenatal clinic. BMC Anesthesiology. 2015;15:98.

DOI: 10.1186/s12871-015-0078-9

7. Naithani U, Bharwal P, Chauhan SS, Kumar D, Gupta S Kirti. Knowledge, attitude and acceptance of antenatal women toward labor analgesia and caesarean section in a medical college hospital in India. J Obstet Anaesth Crit Care. 2011;1:13-20.

DOI: 10.4103/2249-4472.84250

- Shidhaye RV, Galande MV, Bangal VB, Joshi SS, Shidhaye UR. Awareness and attitude towards labour analgesia of Indian pregnant women. Anaesth Pain and Intensive Care. 2012;16(2):131-6.
- James JN, Prakash KS, Ponniah M. Awareness and attitudes towards labour pain and labour pain relief of urban women attending a private antenatal clinic in Chennai, India. Indian J Anaesth. 2012;56(2):195-8.

DOI: 10.4103/0019-5049.96331

 Poomalar GK, Sameera L. Awareness of labour analgesia among antenatal women in semi urban area. Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol. 2016;5: 2612-2617.

DOI: 10.18203/2320-1770.ijrcog20162631

- 11. Mung'ayi V, Nekyon D, Karuga R. Knowledge, attitude and use of labour pain relief methods among women attending antenatal clinic in Nairobi. East Afr Med J. 2008;85(9):438-41.
- 12. Ogboli-Nwasor EO, Adaji SE. Between pain and pleasure: Pregnant women's knowledge and preferences for pain relief in labor, a pilot study from Zaria, Northern Nigeria. Saudi J Anaesth. 2014;8:20-4. DOI: 10.4103/1658-354X.144059
- Karim HMR, Bhattacharyya P, Yunus M. Patient profile and unmet needs of labor analgesia in the parturients undergo cesarean delivery on maternal request. The New Indian Journal of OBGYN 2016;2(2):83-7.

(Accessed 5 May 2017)

Available:<u>http://journal.barpetaogs.co.in/pd</u> <u>fs/2283.pdf</u>

 Mugambe JM, Nel M, Hiemstra LA, Steinberg WJ. Knowledge of and attitude towards pain relief during labour of women attending the antenatal clinic of Cecilia Makiwane Hospital, South Africa. SA Fam Practice. 2007;49(4):16-16d.

DOI: 10.1080/20786204.2007.10873535

 Aksoy M, Aksoy AN, Dostbil A, Celik MG, Ince I. The relationship between fear of childbirth and women's knowledge about Prakash et al.; BJMMR, 21(10): 1-7, 2017; Article no.BJMMR.33980

painless childbirth. Obstet Gynecol Int. 2014;2014:7.

(Article ID: 274303) DOI: 10.1155/2014/274303

 To WW. Quality assurance subcommittee in obstetrics and gynaecology, hospital authority, Hong Kong. A questionnaire survey on patients' attitudes towards epidural analgesia in labour. Hong Kong Med J. 2007;13(3):208-15.

17. Olayemi O, Aimakhu CO, Udoh ES. Attitudes of patients to obstetric analgesia at the University College Hospital, Ibadan, Nigeria. J Obstet Gynecol. 2003;23(1): 38–40.

© 2017 Prakash et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history: The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here: http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/19264