

WOLKITE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF MECINE AND HEALTH SCIENCE

DEPARTEMENT OF MIDWIFERY



PREVALENCE OF CAESAREN SECTION DELIVERY AND ASSOCIATED FACTORA
AMONG WOMEN GAVE BRITH IN THE LAST ONE YEAR AT BUTAJIRA GENERAL
HOSPITAL, GUARGE ZONE, SNNP, ETHIOPIA, 2019.

BY: 1. ASEFA SHIFERA.....025/08
2. HAWI TADESA.....107/08
3. RAHIMA EYADO.....191/08

JUNE, 2019

WOLKITE, ETHIOPIA

- **PREVALENCE OF CAESAREAN SECTION DELIVERY AND ASSOCIATED FACTOR AMONG WOMEN WHO GAVE BRITH IN THE LAST ONE YEAR AT BUTAJIRA GENERAL HOSPITAL, GURAGE ZONE, SNNP, ETHIOPIAN, 2019.**
- **ADVISOR: MR. SOLOMON SHITU (BSC, MSC).**
- **CO- ADVISOR: MS.ABERASH BEYENE (BSC)**
- **THE RESEARCH WAS SUMMATED WOLKITE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF MIDWIFERY FOR THE PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF BSC, DEGREE IN MIDWIFERY.**
- **2019**

Acknowledgment

We would like to express our deepest and profound thanks to our advisor Mr. Solomon Shitu (BSC, MSC) and Ms. Aberash Beyene (BSC) for their meticulous comment throughout all the processes of this study. Also we were like to thank you for Wolkite University, College of Medicine and Health science, Department of Midwifery for giving us this opportunity and for the necessary arrangement. Finally, we were like to thank you for Butajira General Hospital and staff work in registration card, gyneward and postnatal ward for their contribution during data collection.

Content of table

Acknowledgment	III
Content of table	IV
List of table	VII
List of figure	VIII
ACRONY / ABBREVIATIONS	IX
1. INTRODUCTION	- 1 -
1.1 Background	- 1 -
1.2, Statement of problem	- 3 -
1.3, significance of the study	- 5 -
2. Literature review	- 6 -
2.1 prevalence of CS delivery	- 6 -
2.2 Factor associated with cesarean section	- 7 -
2.2.1 Socio-demographic factor	- 7 -
2.2.2 Maternal and fetal factor	- 8 -
2.2.3 Obstetrics factor	- 8 -
2.2.4 Conceptual framework	- 9 -
3. OBJECTIVE	- 10 -
3.1 General objective	- 10 -
3.2 Specific objectives	- 10 -
4. METHODOLOGY	- 11 -
4.1 study area	- 11 -
4.2 study design and period	- 11 -
4.3 source population	- 11 -
4.4 study population	- 11 -
4.5 Eligibility criteria	- 11 -
4.5.1 Inclusion criteria	- 11 -
4.5.2 Exclusion criteria	- 12 -
4.6 Sampling	- 12 -

4.6.1 Sampling size determination.....	- 12 -
4.6.2 Sampling procedure	- 12 -
4.7, variable.....	- 13 -
4.7.1, Dependent variable	- 13 -
4.7.2, Independent variable	- 13 -
4.8, Operational definition	- 13 -
4.9 Data collection Method.....	- 13 -
4.10 Data quality control.....	- 14 -
4.11 Data processing and analysis procedure	- 14 -
4.12 Dissemination of the result	- 14 -
4.13 Ethical consideration.....	- 14 -
5. Result	- 15 -
5.1 Socio demographic characteristics.....	- 15 -
5.2 Obstetric characteristic.....	- 16 -
5.3. Predictor of cesarean section.....	- 19 -
6. Discussion	- 21 -
7. Strength and limitation of study.....	- 23 -
7.1 strength of study.....	- 23 -
7.2 Limitation of the study.....	- 23 -
9. Conclusion and Recommendation	- 24 -
9.1, Conclusion	- 24 -
9.2, Recommendation	- 24 -
Reference	- 25 -
Annex 1.....	- 31 -
Annex 2.....	- 32 -

List of table

Table 1: Socio demographic characteristics of women who gave birth in last one year at Butajira General Hospitals, Gurage Zone, Ethiopia 2019	- 15 -
Table 2: Obstetric characteristics of women who gave birth in last one year at Butajira general hospital, Garage Zone, Ethiopia 2019	- 16 -
Table 3: Indication of cesarean section among women who gave birth in last one year at Butajira General Hospital, Garage Zone, Ethiopia 2019.....	- 18 -
Table 4: Factors associated with caesarean section delivery in bivariate and multivariate logistic regression among women who gave birth in last one year at Butajira general hospital, Gurage Zone, Ethiopia 2019	- 19 -

List of figure

Figure 1 Conceptual framework on the prevalence and association factor of CS delivery which adopted from the literature review.....	- 9 -
---	-------

ACRONY / ABBREVIATIONS

ANC	Antenatal Care
APH	Ant partum Hemorrhage
CPD	Cephalic Pelvic Disproportion
CS	Cesarean Section
EDHS	Ethiopia Demographic Health Survey
MMR	Maternal Mortality Rate
NMR	Neonatal Mortality Rate
NRFHR	Non-reassurance Fetal Heart Rate
OL	Obstruct Labor
PROM	Pre rupture of Membrane
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SNNP	South Nation Nationality People
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Science
USA	United State of America
VBAC	Vaginal Brith after Cesarean-section
VD	Vaginal Delivery
WHO	World Health Organization

Abstract

Back ground: caesarean section is an operational procedure where by the fetus after the end of 28th week is delivered through an incision on the abdominal and uterine walls.

Objective: To assess prevalence of cesarean section delivery and associated factor among women who gave birth in the one last year at Butajira general hospital, Gurage Zone, SNNP, Ethiopia, 2019.

Methods: Institutional based retrospective cross- sectional study was conducted from April 25, 2019 to May 15, 2019 at Butajira general hospitals. The total sample size was 250. The data was collected by using structured questionnaire by systematic random sampling method from women record document that gave birth last one year at Butajira general hospital. Last. Data were entered and analyzed using SPSS version 21. Independent variables found to be significant in the bivariate logistic regression analysis at a cut-off point of p-value <0.25 with were included in the multivariate logistic regression models. Adjusted odds ratios with their 95% confidence intervals and p-value < 0.05 were considered to have significant association with CS. Finally, the data were described and presented using table's frequency, percentage and sentence.

Result: The prevalence of CS in Butajira general hospital was 21% with CI (15-25.8). The indication of CS in the study area was NRFHR (47.2%) which was followed by malposition and malpresentation (30.7%) and previous CS (28.8%).Independent variable such as fetal weight (AOR 6.871, 95%CI (1.996, 23.654),rural resident (AOR 2.744, 95%CI (1.235,6.096) and history of no previous stillbirth (AOR 0.133, 95%CI (0.033, 0.536) were significantly associated with CS.

Conclusion and recommendation: The prevalence of CS in study area (21%) was higher than the WHO recommendation 15% upper limit. In this study major CS indication was NRFHR, previous CS and abnormal position and presentation. Therefore, provide time for conservative management of fetal distress rather than rushing to operation theatre with a single episode of fetal heart rate abnormality, enhance manual correction in case of abnormal position and presentation by experienced physician and encourage VBAC in appropriate cases.

Key: Prevalence, Cesarean-section

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Caesarean section is an operational procedure where by the fetus after the end of 28th week is delivered through an incision on the abdominal and uterine walls. It does not include deliver through an abdominal incision of a fetus lying free in the abdominal cavity following uterine rupture or in secondary abdominal pregnancy (1). The first operational performed on patient is referred to as a primary cesarean section. When the operation is performed in subsequent pregnancies, it is called repeated CS. Caesarean section is normally performed when a vaginal delivery would be put the mother and baby life become at problem. So that, when adequately indicated it can prevent bad obstetrics outcomes and be a life-saving procedure for both the mother and the fetus (2). However, there is a growing concern about unnecessary CS; the increase the risk of maternal morbidity, neonatal admission to an intensive care unit (3).

The increase in CS rate was appreciated to be an American problem is becoming now international crisis. Cesarean section are rising from the 29% to 30.5% in 2004 to 2008 united state country (4).

Cesarean section was performed for many variety indications and associated factor. Because no single reason exist for obstetrics to recommend and performed the CS delivery(5).In pregnancies complicated by the fetal malpresentation, excessive fetal growth, multiple gestation, cord prolapsed ,placenta abruption, age of the mother, educational level and different of maternal infection(6). Cesarean section delivery can be save the life of fetus and mother. Even though, many study show the higher CS delivery prevalence not crucial associated with better per natal outcomes and has even increase the fetus and mother mortality rate when we are compared with the spontaneous vaginal delivery (6).

A cesarean section delivery is performed for both maternal and fetal indications, maternal indication include: repeat CS, obstructed labor ,pelvic abnormalities, placenta abnormality, ante partum hemorrhage, sever preeclampsia and failure of augmentation and induction(7).Fetal indication include: number fetus, fetal distress malpresentation, expected fetal weight. But, Sever congenital malformation is controversial indication for the CS delivery(8).Some experts noted no

relationship between mode of delivery and infant outcomes, while other have advocate cesarean section delivery of all infants with neural tube defect(9).

World Health Organization (WHO) the cesarean section delivery recommended rate was 10% to 15% according 2015. So that, the lower the prevalence suggest that unmet the recommend needed, while the higher of the prevalence rate was indicate the improper selection and when performed without medical indication (10).

A systematic review and ecological analysis were performed and concluded that at population level, CS rates higher than 10% were not associated with the reductions in maternal and newborn mortality rate (11).

The prevalence of CS delivery in Ethiopia regard to EDHS 2014, 2016 was 2.1%, 2% with regional variation from 0.5% to 22.9% and 0.5% to 21.8% respectively (12).

1.2, Statement of problem

Worldwide, approximately 830 women died every single day due to complications during pregnancy or childbirth in 2015 (13). Reducing the global maternal mortality ratio (MMR) from 216 per 100 000 live births in 2015 to less than 70 per 100 000 live births by 2030 (SDG) (14). Also, reducing the globally neonatal mortality rate(NMR)from 19 per 1000 live birth in 2015 to less than 12 per 1000 live birth by 2030 (SDG)(14). According to EHDS 2016 in Ethiopia MMR is 412 death per 100,000 live birth, there is improvement when was compare with EHDS 2011 which was 676 per 100,000 live birth (15).

Most maternal deaths are preventable as the necessary medical interventions are well known. It is therefore crucially important to increase women's access to quality care before, during and after childbirth (16). In 2016, millions of births globally were not assisted by a trained midwife, doctor or nurse, with only 78% of births were in the presence of a skilled birth attendant (17).Skilled assistance during delivery was 28% in 2016 EDHS in Ethiopia (17).In addition to this, prevalence of institutional delivery was 26% in EHDS 2016 in Ethiopia(17)

Increase in the primary CS delivery with no specified indication were faster than in the overall population and appear to be the result of changes in obstetrics practice rather than changes in the medical risk profile or increases in maternal request (19).The CS was performed without the medical indication has increase the risk of maternal and neonatal mortality when we are compare with the spontaneously vaginal delivery (20).

Cesarean section delivery is not simple as we think that save the maternal life. It is fourfold increase the maternal mortality rate, even without medical problem and obstetrics complication (21).Also elective CS had a 2.84 fold greater chance maternal death as compared with vaginal delivery. In United Kingdom two fold increased maternal mortality with CS was detected (22).

There was long term complication occurred with CS delivery. Those are recurrent CS, hysterectomy, maternal and fetal death (23).Previous CS increases the risk of the multiple placenta abnormalities like placental abruption, placental prevai, and adherent placental in subsequent pregnancies (23). First birth with single CS scar 30% increases the risk of placental abruption in the subsequent pregnancies (24). In addition to this, women who have less than four spontaneously vaginal delivery with single previous CS scar has 1.7 fold increase the risk of

placental prevai where as women who have four or more than four spontaneously vaginal delivered with single previous CS scar delivery nine fold increased the risk of placental prevai(24).

Cesarean section delivery reduces the maternal future fertility. The natural fertility rate subsequent to pregnant 17% lower than women vaginal delivered (25). Also women delivered by CS were found more likely have an ectopic pregnancy in next pregnancies (26).

Babies are also vulnerable to unnecessary risk from rising of the CS prevalence. The first danger to the baby is 1% to 9% enhance the surgeon to accidently lacerate 6% of non vertex presentation among non vertex presentation fetus (27). Women who delivered by CS delay breast feeding initiation in the first one hour. But early breast feeding has benefit both for the mother and fetus (28). Also, reduce the skin to skin contact which is used for improve early breastfeeding initiation, maintained and duration (29).

Cesarean section delivery is approximately twice increasing the maternal mortality and morbidity rate when we are compare with spontaneously vaginal delivery (30). Studies indicated that despite clinical pressure to delay delivery until 39 weeks gestations waiting to reach this benchmark before performing a repeat CS delivery may increase the maternal risk (31).

World Health organization states that no additional health benefits are associated with CS rate above 15%. With proper selection, appropriate timing and close supervision, trial of vaginal delivery after the previous cesarean section reduces the repeat cesarean section (32). In Ethiopia the national population based CS deliveries is rate 2%. But, regional varies from one to another with range 0.5% to 21.8%(33).

With the increase in the number of cesarean sections, the cost of maternity care has also markedly increased. A previously done systematic review found that the cost of a cesarean delivery is about twice the cost of a vaginal delivery (34). Also there is an increased risk of adverse effects with cesarean section, particularly if the medical complication is does not sever (35).

Therefore, the purpose of this study is aimed to assess prevalence and associated CS delivery in Butajira General Hospital.

1.3, significance of the study

Caesarean section can be life saving intervention for mother and baby when the vaginal birth is contraindicated. However; it is associated with increased mortality and place negatively impact on a woman future healthy. Birth by CS delivery also required extra demands on maternity services and provision of resource. Up on the completion, the finding of this study had importance for Gurage zone health office and Butajira general hospital and other organizations, to use the data for appropriate intervention. It was provide relevant information to health care providers on the magnitude and associated factors of CS which was make them to provide intensive professionally based care. And also, it can be useful for the one who was be interested to conduct further study on the topic using different study designs. Over all reproductive age mothers are benefited from the study by helping policy makers to design intervention according to the finding.

2. Literature review

2.1 prevalence of CS delivery

Cesarean sections have reached epidemic proportions in many countries worldwide. It has risen in different country for instance, 46% of china, 30.5% of USA and above 25% in the Asian and European countries (36). Around the world 40% country was have prevalence of CS delivery less than 10% and 10% of country from the world have prevalence of CS delivery between the 10% and 15% which is the only country meet the recommended CS delivery by WHO in 2015. Also approximately 50% country from the world have prevalence of CS greater to 15% which is not used for the reduction maternal and neonatal mortality according to WHO 2015 report rather leading for the long term mother problem(36).

The study conducted in the Nepal prevalence of CS delivery was 8.1% in 2006 and 10.7% in 2007. This could be due to the frequent use card tomogram to monitor the fetal heart variability rate which none reassuring. However the as continuous electronic fetal monitoring was not available at institution of Nepal the prevalence cesarean section due to fetal distress may have been less in these series as compare those developed country (36).

Study in the north Thailand the prevalence of CS was 23.6% in 2011. The associated factor for this study area was over diagnosis of cephalous pelvic disproportion (CPD) and subsequent repeated the CS delivery (37).

In the Africa the average of the CS prevalence was 7.3% with highest of the South Africa 15.4% and Mad scar 1.42% in 2009 and Malawi 4.53% in 2010 (38). In Egypt there was significant rise of cesarean section 10.1% in the 2000. However, hospital based cesarean delivery were much higher in 1987-8(13.9) increased to 22% in 2000. Besides; to this CS prevalence was slightly higher in private hospital the prevalence also increased consistently in public hospital (39).

Study in Namibia mission hospital the prevalence of CS delivery was 13% in 2010. The most prominent associated factor was CPD (35.4%) followed by fetal distress(16%)(40).

In Nigeria the CS prevalence was 27.1% in 2009, The emergency CS prevalence was 83.4% and the most associated factor were obstructed labor(OL)(45.4%), preeclampsia(18.85%) and fetal distress(11.5%)(41).

Regarding to 2016 EDHS in Ethiopia the national population based CS prevalence 2% with regional prevalence varying from the 0.5% to 21.8%.The overall institutional prevalence of CS delivery was 18% which varied between 46%in the private for profit sector and 15% in public sector. In Ethiopia for the prevalence of CS delivery 66% was maternal indication while as 34% was fetal indication (42).

The prevalence of CS delivery in Jimma University specialized hospital was 8% and the leading indication were CPD (44%), malpresentation and apposition (21%), repeated cesarean section (16%) APH (8%) and fetal distress (6%) (43).

In Tikur Anbessa teaching hospital in cesarean delivery prevalence was 10% .In this hospital association factor that leading to CS were repeated CS(32.4%),CPD(29%),placental prevail and abruption placenta(12.6%) from all CS account 74%(44).

2.2 Factor associated with cesarean section

2.2.1 Socio-demographic factor

A systematic review was conducted in different country conclude the majority of CS delivery women between 30 and 40 years old(45).The study done in the Japanese showed that CS delivery increase as advanced maternal age greater 35 years(46).A cross-sectional study survey conducted in Addis Ababa found women older than 30 years are more likely to have CS delivery when compare to the younger ones between 15-24 age(47).However, the study in Ethiopia based on EDHS 2011 CS rate did not showed the variation across the group of maternal age(48).

The study done in the different countries showed that direct proportion relationship between CS and higher education level (49).The study was made based by EDHS 2000, 2005 and 2011, the prevalence of CS delivery increases with raises the maternal education and house wealth income (50). The study which was conducted at Felegehiwot referral hospital by retrospective analysis of eligible patient records that included 2967 pregnant women undergoing cesarean section was higher among mothers in rural residence (AOR = 1.63, 95 % CI: 1.21, 2.20)(51).

2.2.2 Maternal and fetal factor

The study which was done in Norway associated factor of CS delivery varied by maternal, gestation age, and hospital delivery. Around seven account 77.7% of operational fetal distress(21.8%),failure to progress of the labor(20.7%),previous CS(8.9%),breech presentation(8.4%),maternal choice(7.6%) and failure of the induction and augmentation(6%)(51).

The study done in the government maternity hospital India in 2014 was showed that, from 8121eligible mother primary emergency CS contributes to 44.48% and repeat CS 26.15%.In this hospital the fetal distress the most common indication for primary CS followed by the CPD and big baby. Cephalic pelvic disproportion with pelvic abnormality and big baby were contributed to 50% for the elective CS (52).

The study conducted in Tanzania St.Joseph medical Hospital the indication overall for CS were prolonged or obstructed labor account 30% ,malpresentation of the baby 20%,fetal distress 11%.The most common indication in this study was prolonged and obstructed in nullparous and previous CS scar for multifarious(53).

Cross- section retrospective study in Atta Hospital, the leading indication of CS births was CPD 38.1%,previous CS 18.9%,malpresentation and mapposition7.1% and APH 6%.The maternal indication was account 68% while as fetal indication was account 32%(54)

2.2.3 Obestratics factor

The study conducted in south west Iran indicate that women who had two or more parities and one or two alive children have more CS delivery and also women who previous miscarriages and still births was 65.49% to CS delivery (55).According to study conducted in Eastern Ethiopia in Harare, indicate that previous CS delivery, parity of three or more, fetal birth weight greater to 4000g, Natal care (ANC) follow up were have more associated to CS delivery (56).

The study done at Felegehiwot hospital showed that CS was 9.8 higher if the women had abnormal presentations. In addition to this women who having previous CS delivery and fetal weight of 4000gm were 3.93 and 13.68 times more likely give CS birth respectively(57).The

Study was made based on the EDHS data 2014 the CS delivery rate reduced as the parity was increased. But, the CS delivery was 26.5% increase with the primipariuos (58).

2.2.4 Conceptual framework

Based on the above literature review CS delivery was affected by maternal and fetal factor, socio demographic factor and obestratics factor. They are summarized by the following conceptual framework.




Figure 1 Conceptual framework on the prevalence and association factor of CS delivery which adapted from the literature review

3. OBJECTIVE

3.1 General objective

To assess prevalence of cesarean section delivery and associated factor among women who give birth in the one last year at Butajira general hospital, Gurage Zone, SNNP, Ethiopia, 2019 from April 25 to May 15.

3.2 Specific objectives

To determine prevalence of cesarean section delivery at Butajira general hospital

To identify association factor with caesarean section delivery at Butajira general hospital

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 study area

The study was conducted in Butajira general hospital which is located in Butajira town of Guage zone, SNNP at 143km from Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia and 163km from Hawassa. Based on the 2007 Central Statistics Agency of Ethiopia, the total estimation of Butajira is 33,406, of whom 16,923 are men and 16,483 are women. The town population was 16,483 (58). There are one hospital and one health center. The hospital is composed of 5 specialists, 16 GPs, 1 dental GP, 4 public offices, 3 emergency surgeons, 45 BCS nurses, 38 clinical nurses, 12 pharmacists, 7 pharmacy technicians, 8 laboratory technicians, 6 laboratory technologists, 2 radiologists, 17 BCS midwives, 5 anesthesiologists, 8 health information technology and 3 psychiatric nursing. By using these health care providers, services include institutional delivery 250-300, ANC follow-up 250, postnatal care 200, immunization 200 and other medical-surgical treatment monthly (59).

4.2 study design and period

Institution-based retrospective cross-section study design was conducted from April 25, 2019 to May 15, 2019.

4.3 source population

Women who gave birth in the last one year at Butajira general hospital

4.4 study population

Women who gave birth in the last one year at Butajira general hospital and which fulfill inclusion criteria

4.5 Eligibility criteria

4.5.1 Inclusion criteria

- Women who gave birth after fetus viability or 28 weeks gestation

4.5.2 Exclusion criteria

- Women who were entry operation after the delivery of fetus due to different reason and incomplete information card were excluded. So that, 2 records cards were excluded from study.

4.6 Sampling

4.6.1 Sampling size determination

The sampling size determined by using the estimation of a single population proportion formula with the assumption of the 95% confidence level, Margin of error 5% and using proportion of value 18% taken from only one article of Ethiopia, Fesseh et al(60).

$$n = (Z_{\alpha/2})^2 pq / d^2$$
$$= (1.96)^2 (0.18) (0.82) / (0.05)^2$$
$$n = 227$$

Where: n=sample size of population

P=estimation population proportion

D=marginal of error which is taken to be 5%

Z=95% of the confidence interval

Then by adding 10% of the non response rate, the total sample size would be $227 + 23 = 250$

4.6.2 Sampling procedure

The sampling procedure was by systematic random sampling method.

The total number of the women delivered in last one year at Butajira general hospital was 3054, so we were calculate the K value.

$$K = N/n = 3054/250$$

$$K = 12.216$$

K=12 take the smallest sample size every 12 interval from the registration patient card until we were achieve the 250 of the estimate sample size. By using lottery method k=3 was selected so during data collection 3, 15, 27....from 3054 patient card was selected. Among 250 patient cards 2 cards was discarded because of incomplete information.

4.7, variable

4.7.1, Dependent variable

- Cesarean section

4.7.2, Independent variable

- Socio-demographic factor
- Obsestratics factor
- Maternal and fetal factor
- Medical complication

4.8, Operational definition

Incompletes registration document-is the patient card which has not contain what service take, socio-demographic and out of delivery case card (61).

Completed registration document-is the patient card which has contain socio-demographic and delivery service taken in last one year (61).

Caesarean section-is the expulsion of fetus, membrane and placental by incision both abdomen and uterus (61).

4.9 Data collection Method

The data was collected through systematic random sampling method from registered on patient card in postnatal and gynecology ward which have obsestratics factor, maternal and fetal factor, socio-demographic factor and medical complication. The information was obtain from delivery registration patient card in postnatal and gynecology ward at Butajira general hospital among women gave brith September 1, 2017 – August 30, 2018. The structured questionnaire were prepared by the English version and supervised by advisor. The data collection was done by member group. During data collection, the patient registration cards which had incompleteness information were discarded.

4.10 Data quality control

Data quality control was entered by checking completeness of the information and cross-checking the collected data daily with the member group. The completed questionnaires were collected every day by the member and recheck for completeness for timely feedback.

4.11 Data processing and analysis procedure

The data was cleaned, coded, entered and analysis by SPSS version 21. Then, the result was presented by table frequency, percentage and sentence. Logistic regression was carried out to identify factors associated with women undergone CS. Independent variables found to be significant in the bivariate logistic regression analysis at a cut-off point of p-value < 0.25 with 95% confidence interval were included in the multivariate logistic regression models. Adjusted odds ratios with their 95% confidence intervals and p-value < 0.05 were considered to have significant association with CS.

4.12 Dissemination of the result

The result of the study was presented to Wolkite University, College of medicine and health science and Department of midwifery. The soft copy and hard copy were submitted to the Midwifery department. Then copy of the result was given for the Hospital, wolkite university library and interested individual.

4.13 Ethical consideration

We were get permission from wolkite University College of medicine and health science department of midwifery. Also; we were asked the permission the Butajira general hospitals and they are allowed to conduct. The collected information from the registration patient card was keeping the privacy of the patient.

5. Result

5.1 Socio demographic characteristics

The participant responses rate was 99.2 %(248) involved. The age of the study participants ranged from 17-44 years. The majority of participants 164(66.2%) were between 20-30 years old with the mean age of the study participants was 29.5 years (+_1.110SD).The majority of participants 243 (98%) were married. As resident status most participant 164(66.1%) was rural [table 1].

Table 1: Socio demographic characteristics of women who gave birth in last one year at Butajira General Hospitals, Gurage Zone, Ethiopia 2019

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age n= 248		
15-19	14	5.6
20-24	84	33.9
25-29	80	32.3
30-34	45	18.1
35-39	21	8.5
40-44	4	1.6
Marital status n=248		
Married	243	98
Single	5	2
Residence n=248		
Rural	164	66.1
Urban	84	33.9

5.2 Obstetric characteristic

Among the total study (248), more than half 155(62.5%) were between gravid 2 and 3 followed by 48(19.4%) of the mothers were primigravida and 12(4.8%) were more than 3 gravid. About 130(52.4%) were para two and 32(12.9%) para three and above. In case of antenatal care 185(74.5%) had ANC follow up for their current pregnancy? For majority of women the gestational age 212(85.5%) were term and 14(5.6%) post term. Only 12(4%) of participants had previous history of still birth and 21(8.5%) of women had history of previous miscarriage. Out of the 248 participant 245(98.8%) had documented pantograph [Table 2].

Table 2: Obstetric characteristics of women who gave birth in last one year at Butajira general hospital, Gurage Zone, Ethiopia 2019 (N=248)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gravid		
One	48	19.4
Two-Three	155	62.5
Greater Three	45	18.1
Parity		
One	86	34.7
Two	130	52.4
Three and above	32	12.9
multiple gestation		
Yes	2	0.8
No	246	99.2
Number of fetus		
One	246	99.2
Two	2	0.8
Previous miscarriage		
Yes	21	8.5
No	227	91.5

Previous stillbirth		
Yes	12	4.8
No	236	95.2
Gestational age		
<37 Week	22	8.9
37-42 Week	212	85.5
>42 Week	14	5.6
Antenatal care follow up		
Documented	185	74.6
Undocumented	63	25.4
Pantograph		
Documented	245	98.8
Undocumented	3	1.2
Mode o delivery		
VD	196	79
CS	52	21.0
Type of CS n=52		
Emergency	34	13.7
Elective	18	7.3
Current CS		
Primary	37	71.2
Repeat	15	28.8
Number of previous		
One	12	23.1
Two	3	5.7
Fetal weight		
<2500	57	23.0
2500-4000	191	77.0

Prevalence of cesarean section delivery

The overall prevalence of CS in the study setting was 52(21%) with confidence interval (15-25.8). Among them 37(71.2%) of the mothers had primary CS while 15 (28.8%) had repeat CS. Cesarean-section was performed for emergency reasons in 34(65.4%), where as elective CS was 18(34.6%). From maternal indication 16(30.7%) is accounted by malposition and malpresentation which is followed by previous CS 15(28.8%) and CPD 7(13.5%). Among the fetal indication NRFHR is 17(47.2%) followed by pos-term 9(25%)[Table 3].

Table 3: Indication of cesarean section among women who gave birth in last one year at Butajira General Hospital, Gurage Zone, Ethiopia 2019

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Maternal CS indication n=52		
Failure of induction and augmentation	4	7.7
DM	1	2
CPD	7	13.5
APH	5	9.6
Previous CS	15	28.8
Sever preeclampsia	4	7.7
Malpation and malpresentation	16	30.7
Fetal indication n=36	Frequency	Percentage
NRFHR	17	47.2
Cord porlapse	5	13.9
Meconium aspiration syndrome	5	13.9
Post-term	9	25

5.3. Predictor of cesarean section

The level of association was computed using bivariate logistic regression analysis. Variables that fulfill the criteria of bivariate analysis were entered to multivariate logistic regression model. Fetal weight, rural resident and no history of previous stillbirths were significantly associated with CS after adjusting for other variables in the final model. Mothers those have fetal weight (2500-4000) gm 6.8times more likely undergo CS where as compared with those who fetal weight are less then to 2500gm AOR 6.871,95%CI(1.996,23.654).Also, mothers, who are live in rural area, were 2.7times more likely to undergone CS as compared with urban mothers AOR 2.744, 95%CI (1.235, 6.096).Besides to this, mothers who have no history of previous stillbirth 13.3% less likely undergo CS then mother who have history of previous stillbirth AOR 0.133,95%CI(0.033,0.536) [Table4].

Table 4: Factors associated with caesarean section delivery in bivariate and multivariate logistic regression among women who gave birth in last one year at Butajira general hospital, Gurage Zone, Ethiopia 2019

Variable	Caesarean- section		COR CI 95%	AOR CI 95%
	Yes n (%)	No n (%)		
Age				
15-20	4(28.6)	10(71.4)	0.400(0.041-3.900)	1.134(0.106-12.187)
21-25	17(20.2)	67(79.8)	0.254(0.033-1.934)	0.482(0.062-3.770)
26-30	20(25)	60(75)	0.333(0.044-2.523)	0.503(0.066-3.851)
31-35	7(15.6)	38(84.4)	0.184(0.022-1.534)	0.365(0.042-3.139)
36-40	2(9.5)	19(91.5)	0.105(0.009-1.210)	0.202(0.017-2.403)
41-45	2(50)	2(50)	1	1
Residence				
Urban	73(87)	11(13)	1	1
Rural	123(75)	41(25)	2.212(1.017-4.571)	2.744(1.235-6.096)*
Gestational age				

<37	2(9.1)	20(90.9)	1	1
37-42	164(77.4)	48(22.6)	2.927(0.660-12.972)	1.247(0.247-6.302)
>42	2(14.3)	12(85.7)	1.667(0.207-13.428)	0.577(0.062-5.494)
Fetal weight				
<2500	4(7)	53(93)	1	1
2500-4000	48(25.1)	143(74.9)	4.448(1.529-12.935)	6.871(1.996, 23.654) **
Previous still birth				
Yes	6(50)	6(50)	1	1
No	46(19.5)	190(80.5)	0.511(0.148, 1.767)	0.133(0.033, 0.536) ***

***Significant at P-value=0.013, **Significant at P-value=0.002,
***Significant at P-value=0.005**

6. Discussion

The prevalence of CS was 21.0% with confidence interval (15-25.8). It was in line with the study conducted in the Asian and Europe, north Thailand, South Africa (25%, 23.6%, 15.4%) respectively (36, 37). However, it was higher than the study conducted in the Nepal, Tikur Anbessa hospital and Jimma University Specialized Hospital (10.7%, 10% and 8%) respectively (36, 43, 44) whereas lower than study was conducted in the China, USA, Nigeria and Attat Hospital (46%, 30.5%, 27.1% and 27.6%) respectively (36, 38). Included this finding and the study conducted in different country was higher as compared with the rate that WHO recommended which is 15% (35).

The major indication for CS in the study area was NRFHR (47.2%) which was followed by malposition and malpresentation (30.7%) and previous CS (28.8%). This finding was higher than study which was conducted in Norway hospital, Jimma university specialized hospital and Attat hospital (21.8%, 21%, 18.9%) respectively (51, 43, 54). This difference might be due to decrease trial of vaginal birth after CS and time not given for conservative management of fetal distress.

Mothers who have no history of previous stillbirth are significantly associated with CS which is different with study conducted in the Felegehiwot referral hospital (56). Mothers who have no history of previous stillbirth are 13.3% less likely to undergo CS as compared with mothers who have history of previous stillbirth, AOR 0.133 (0.033, 0.536). This may be due to mothers who have no history of previous stillbirth are less likely to develop pregnancy complication such as diabetes, hypertension and preeclampsia than mother who have history of previous stillbirth (56).

This study showed that positive association between maternal rural residence and CS. Mothers who are live in rural area 2.7 times more likely to undergo CS as compared with urban mother AOR 2.744, 95%CI (1.235, 6.096). This study was in line with the study conducted in the Felegehiwot referral Hospital AOR 1.63, 95% (1.21-2.20) (51). This may be due to lack health institution, education, absences of transportation than urban living women.

Another factor observed among the studies is fetal weight which is (2500-4000) gm, are 6.8 times more likely undergone CS whereas compared with those who fetal weight is less than 2500gm AOR 6.871, 95%CI (1.996, 23.654). It was different with the study conducted in the

Felegehiwot referral hospital (57). This finding may be due to fetal weight (2500-4000)gm are more likely cause obstetrics complication than fetal weight less than 2500gm.

Finally, this study showed that positive association between the mother who was rural residence, fetal weight and CS delivery, while as showed negative association between mothers who have no history of previous stillbirth and CS. In this study was NRFHR, malpresentation and malposition, and previous CS are more indication of CS than other indication.

7. Strength and limitation of study

7.1 strength of study

- Most of the questionnaire adopted from previous studies review and contextualized according to the objective.
- This study has no language barrier.

7.2 Limitation of the study

- Inability to obtain some socio-demographic factor
- The study did not address about the views and practices of service providers related to CS delivery.

9. Conclusion and Recommendation

9.1, Conclusion

Based on this finding it was concluded that the prevalence of CS delivery in Butajira General Hospital was 21.0% which is higher when compared to the WHO recommended optimum upper limit of 15% prevalence. In the multivariate logistic regression factors fetal weight rural area history of previous stillbirth were significantly associated with CS.

9.2, Recommendation

For Health worker

- ❖ Trial of vaginal birth after CS should be encouraged in appropriate cases
- ❖ Time should be given for conservative management of NRFHR rather than rushing to operation theatre with a single episode of fetal heart rate abnormality.

For Butajira health office

- ❖ The CS rate should be maintained within the optimum range by introducing early diagnosis complication of labor and management

For Researcher

- ❖ Future studies need to examine the role of healthy worker and their influence on the increasing CS delivery rate.

For Women

- ❖ The women should be fully informed about the risks associated with medically unjustified CS delivery.

Reference

1. Arulkumaran S (2007). Obstetric Proceeding: in Dewhurst's Textbook of Obstetrics and Gynecology. In: D Keith editor. 7th ed. United States: Edmonds Blackwell publishing
2. Souza JP, Gülmezoglu A, Lumbiganon P, Laopaiboon M, Carroli G, et al. (2010). WHO Global Survey on Maternal and Prenatal Health Research Group, et al. Caesarean section without medical indications is associated with an increased risk of adverse short-term maternal outcomes: the 2004–2008 WHO Global Survey on Maternal and Prenatal Health. BMC Med 8: 71.3
3. Villard J, Carroli G, Azalea N, Donner A, Wojdyla D, et al. (2007). World Health Organization 2005 Global Survey on Maternal and Prenatal Health Research Group, et al. Maternal and neonatal individual risks and benefits associated with caesarean delivery: multicentre prospective study. BMJ; 335: 1025.
4. Hemminge E, Merilainen J .Long term effects of cesarean sections: Ectopic pregnancies and placental problems. AM J ObstetGynecol1996; 174:1569-1574.
5. Green JE MacLean F, Usher SR. Cesarean section study of Latin American Hospital. Am J obstetGynaecol 1982; 142.
6. Magnaun EF: Winchester MI. Factors adversely affecting pregnancy outcome. Am J prenatal 1995; 12: 464.
Epidemiology 2007; 21: 98-113.
7. Notion FC: Cnattingius S, Bergson p, et al. Cesarean section delivery in the 1980s: international comparison by indication. Am J ObstetGynecol. Feb 1994; 179(2): 495 -504. [Medline].
8. Hankins GD, Clerk SM, Munn MB. Cesarean section on request at 39 weeks: impact on shoulder dystopia, fetal trauma, neonatal encephalopathy, and intrauterine fetal demise. Seminperinatol. Oct 2006, 30(5):276- 87.
9. Sakala EP, Andree I. Optimal route of delivery for meningomyelocele .ObstetGynecolSurv. Apr 1990; 45(4): 209-12.

10. Department of Reproductive Health and Research World Health Organization. WHO statement of on the cesarean section rates: WHO/RHR/15.02:Geneva:WHO,2015
11. Betran AP, Torloni MRJ, Yu J, Denux-Tharaux C, Oledar O et al, what is optimal cesarean section at the population level? A systematic review ecological studies report healthy 2015.
12. Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia, Mini Demographic and Health Survey, Addis Ababa and 2014. Access date 4/12/2016
13. Trends in maternal mortality: 1990 to 2015. Estimates by WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank Group and the United Nations Population Division. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2015 (<http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/monitoring/maternal-mortality-2015/en/>, accessed 23 March 2017).
14. Alkema L, Chou D, Hogan D, Zhang S, Muller A-B, Gemmill et al. Global, regional, and national levels and trends in maternal mortality between 1990 and 2015, with scenario-based projections to 2030: a systematic analysis by the UN Maternal Mortality Estimation Inter-Agency Group. *Lancet*. 2016; 387(10017):462–74 (<http://www.thelancet.com/pb/assets/raw/Lancet/pdfs/S0140673615008387.pdf>, accessed 23 March 2017).
15. Levels & Trends in Child Mortality. Report 2015. Estimates developed by the UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation. United Nations Children's Fund, World Health Organization, World Bank and United Nations. New York (NY): United Nations Children's Fund; 2015 (http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/Child_Mortality_Report_2015_Web_9_Sept_15.pdf, accessed 22 March 2017).
17. Central Statistical Agency (CSA) [Ethiopia] and ICF. 2017. 2016 Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey
18. Central Statistical Agency (CSA) [Ethiopia] and ICF. 2017. 2016 Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey
19. Harper MA, Byington RP, Espeland MA, Naughton M, Meyer R, Lane K. Pregnancy related death and health care services. *ObstetGynecol*. Aug 2003; 102(2): 273-8.[Medline].

20. Hamilton BE, Martin JA, Sutton PD. Births: preliminary data for 2003. *Natal Vital Stat Rep.* Nov 23 2004; 53 (9):1-17.
21. Bent.ran AP, marialdiM,LaverJA,bing -shenW,Thomas I, et ,al rate of c/s :analysis of global regional and national estimates .paedietreperi at .epidermal 21 2007 98-113.
22. Marfatlal SJ, NarendrabhiMM. Analysis of mode of delivery in women with previous one cesarean section, *J ObstetGynecol India* 2009; 59(2): 136-139.
23. Zelop C, Heffner LJ.(2004).The downside of the cesarean delivery: short and long term complication.
24. Sur S, Mackenzie's IZ. (2005).Does discussion of possible scar influence preferred mode of delivery after the cesarean section
25. Collin SM, Marshall T, Filippi V (2006).Cesarean section delivery and subsequent fertility
- 26.Mollison J,Porter M,Campbell D et al. 2009.Primary mode of delivery and subsequent pregnancy.
27. Maymon R, Halperin R, Mendlovic S et al. (2005).Ectopic pregnancy on the cesarean section scar.
28. Victor CG, Horta BL, et al (2007).Evidence long term effect of the breastfeeding.
29. Moore ER, Anderson Chet al.(2012):Early skin to skin contact for the mother and their healthy of infant.
30. Marfatlal SJ, NarendrabhiMM. Analysis of mode of delivery in women with previous one cesarean section, *J ObstetGynecol India* 2009; 59(2): 136-139.
31. He wick, C. Repeat cesarean delivery optimal before 39 weeks. *Meds cape medical news.* Available at <http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/820391>. Accessed February 19, 2014.
32. Tory kolas, DagHofossAnng ictorK. Daltveit, stain T. Nielsen, Tory Henrikisen, rene Hager, ingendingemarsson. *American Journal of obstetrics and gynecology* volume 188, issue for page 864 -70 April 2003.SS.

33. Josiah J. MutthirpatrickH. Drau, Innocent Arousal/WWW.Ajol.info index .PHP/tog/article/view/4540. 3
34. Nepal Journals of obis .Ginny .volume (4). No 1(2009) Anechoic. Keechi. OM hoots. Vi Nubba, fookogbo, PMEzeobi, Candor .ore
35. Henderson J, McCandlish R, Kumiega L, Petrou S. Systematic review of economic aspects of alternative modes of delivery. BJOG. 2001 Feb; 108 (2):149-57.
36. Ecker JL, Frigoletto FD Jr. Cesarean delivery and the risk-benefit calculus. N Engle J Med. 2007 Mar 1; 356(9):8858
37. Hemminge E, Merilainen J .Long term effects of cesarean sections: Ectopic pregnancies and placental problems. AM J ObstetGynecol1996; 174:1569-1574.
38. Nepal Journals of obis .Ginny .volume (4). No 1(2009) Anechoic. Keechi. OM hoot. Vi Nubba, fookogbo, PMEzeobi, Candor .ore
39. Kathrynchu, Hilde corter, Fernandomaldonads, TshtingMashnt, Nathan ford and migualtrelles .2012 slept 4. Do; 10.1371/Compone. 0044484.
40. D"Africa.com /stray /2012 11270907.htmh.
41. World Health Statistics 2012. Part III. Global Health Indicators <http://www.who.int/gho/publications/worldhealthstatistics/2012/en/> [2013, January 30].
42. Ally.1995Jam:7211; 60-3 WWW.Nabinim nH.gou/pumd7781560.
43. SamsoneGebremedhine full text I trend and socio-demographic differential of cesarean section in AdissAbaba, Ethiopia.
44. SamsoneGebremedhine full text I trend and socio-demographic differential of cesarean section in AdissAbaba, Ethiopia.
45. Tads' E, Adana M, Bayou M (2011) Caesarean section deliveries at TikurAnbessa Teaching Hospital, Ethiopia. Into J GynaecolObstet 115:

46. Kathrynchu, Hilde corter, Fernandomaldonads, TshtingMashnt, Nathan ford and migualtrelles .2012 slept 4. Do; 10.1371/Cornpone. 0044484.
47. R.Subhashini, N. Umea. Changing trends in caesarean delivery. IAIM, 2015, (2)(3): 96-102
48. Linn Belcher and SirilStokke (2009-2011) indications used for CS in St. Joseph Medical Hospital in Moshe, Tanzania. Access date7/12 2016
49. Mages A , Ade me B, Access G , Prevail e no e and Outcome of Caesarean Section in Attar Hospital Garage Zone , S NNPR, Ethiopia. Arc h Me d. 2015; 7:4. Access date 15/12 2016
49. Soto-Vega E, Casco S, Chamizal K, Flores-Hernandez D, Landing V, Guillén-Florez A Rising Trends of Cesarean Section Worldwide: A Systematic Review.(2015). *ObstetGynecolInt J* 3(2): 00073. DOI: 10.15406/ogij.2015.03.00073 access date 24/12/201618.
50. S. Suzuki and M. Nakata. Factors Associated with the Recent Increasing Caesarean Delivery Rate at Japanese Prenatal Center. *ISRN Obstetrics and Gynecology* Volume 2013, Article ID 863282, 4 pages. Access date15/12 2016
51. Bayou YT, Machala YJS, Thupayagale-Tshweneagae G. Patterns of caesarean-section delivery in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *AfrJPrm Health Care Fame Med.* 2016; 8(2), a953. <http://dx.doi.Org/10.4102/phcfm.v8i2.953>. Access date30/12 2016 32
52. Gebremedhin Trend and socio-demographic differentials of Caesarean section rate in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: analysis based on Ethiopia demographic and health surveys data. *Reproductive Health* (2014) 11:14 access date 30/11/2016.
53. Soto-Vega E, Casco S, Chamizal K, Flores-Hernandez D, Landing V, Guillén-Florez A Rising Trends of Cesarean Section Worldwide: A Systematic Review.(2015). *ObstetGynecolInt J* 3(2): 00073. DOI: 10.15406/ogij.2015.03.00073 access date 24/12/201618
54. Gebremedhin Trend and socio-demographic differentials of Caesarean section rate in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: analysis based on Ethiopia demographic and health surveys data. *Reproductive Health* (2014) 11:14 access date 30/11/2016.

55. Neumann M, Adcock G, Azad Kieta. Prevalence and determinants of caesarean section in private and public health facilities in underserved South Asian communities: cross-sectional analysis of data from Bangladesh, India and Nepal. *BMJOpen* 2014;4:e005982. Doi: 10.1136/bmjopen2014005982. Access date 21/12 2016
56. Tsega F, Manistee B, Desire Y, Mengesha MM. Prevalence of Caesarean Section in Urban Health Facilities and Associated Factors in Eastern Ethiopia: Hospital Based Cross Sectional Study. 2015. *J Prig Child Health* 2: 169. doi:10.4172/2376-127X.1000169. Access date 15/12 2016
57. Abebi F, Asheboro N, Gizachew A, factors leading to caesarean section at Felegehiwot referral Hospital , North West Ethiopia, *Reproductive health*, 2015 vol.13. . Access date 17/12 2016
58. Central swastika agency 2007: Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Region
59. Managament and human resource at Butajira general hospital.
60. Fesseha N1, Get chews A, Half M, Gebrehiwot Y, Bailey P (2011) a national review of cesarean delivery in Ethiopia. *Into J Gynaecol Obstet* 115: 106-11162
61. Bago BJ (2018) Prevalence and Its Associated Factors among Women Undergone Operative Delivery at Hawassa University Comprehensive Specialized Hospital, Southern Ethiopia, 2017. *Gynaecol Obstet* 8: 461. doi:10.4172/2161-0932.1000461

Annex 1

-Information and consent form before begin the questioner

Wolkite University, College of medicine and healthy science, department of midwifery consent form for study on Assessment of prevalence of caesarean section and associate factor in Butajira general hospital, Gurage Zone, SNNP, Ethiopian,2019.

Good morning/after noon. My name is, I want interview with for data collect on study. This study is Assessment of prevalence caesarean section and associated factor in Butajira General Hospital, for partial fulfillment of BSC degree in Midwifery from Wolkite University. It is my pleasure notifies you that you have been selected to participate in this study. We are doing the research on those mothers who give brith by CS in these months. I am asking you few questions related with CS.Your name will be not written in this form and the information you will be given to us is keep confidential. If you do not want to answer all or some question, you have the right. However, your willingness to answer all question will be have important I my study and the mother problem is solved. It does not take more then 8-10 minute.

Would you participate in study?

Yes No

If answer is yes, thank you respondent and continue interview.

If answer is no, thank you respondent and go to next respondent

Annex 2

-Questionnaire to assessment of prevalence of CS and associated factor, Butajira general hospital, Gurage Zone, SNNP Ethiopian, 2019.

Part one-Socio-demographic factor

No	Questionnaire	Multiple choice
1	Age	
2	Martial status	1.single 2.married
3	Residence	1.urban 2.rural

Part 2-ObestatRICTIS factor

4	Gravid	1.one 2.two-three 3.four-five 4.more than five	
5	Parity	1.one 2.two-three 3.more than 3	
6	Previous still brith	1.yes 2.no	
7	Previous miscarriage	1.yes 2.no	
8	ANC follow up	1.documented 2.undocumented	

9	Pantographic follow up	1.ducemented 2.undocumented	
10	Mode of delivery	1.VD 2.C/S	
11	Types of c/s	1.elective 2.emergance	
12	Current types of CS	1.primary 2.secondary	
13	Number of previous CS	1.one 2.two 3.three more than	
14	Current CS indication	1.obstruct labor 2.CPD 3.APH 4.previous CS 5.malposition malpresentation	and
		6.sever preeclampsia 7.breech presentation 8.failure labor progress 9.DM 10,cadiac disease	

Part 3-Fetal factor

15	Fetal weight		
16	Multiple gestation	1.yes 2.no	
17	Number of fetus	1.one 2.two 3.three or more	
18	Fetal weight of twin A and B		
19	Gestational age delivered fetus	1.less than 37 2.37-42 3.greater 42	
20	Indication of fetal factor for CS	1.NRFHR 2.cord porlapse and presentation 3.meconium syndrome 4.large fetal weight 5.post term	

