



Evaluation of cases of premature rupture of membranes

Dr. Saloni Bharadia (Jr. Resident)¹

Dr. Gauri Shinde (Assistant Professor)¹

Dr. Digvijay Kadam (Assistant Professor)¹

¹ Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Krishna Institute Of Medical Sciences, KVV, Karad. Maharashtra.

Corresponding author - Dr. Saloni Bharadia (Jr. Resident)

Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Krishna Institute Of Medical Sciences, KVV, Karad. Maharashtra.

(Received: 07 October 2023

Revised: 12 November

Accepted: 06 December)

KEYWORDS

*Pregnancy,
Obstetrics,
Premature Rupture
of Membranes,*

Abstract:

In the domain of obstetrics, the untimely breach of gestational membranes, previously acknowledged as Premature Rupture of Membranes (PROM) and now coined as "pre-labour rupture of membranes," delineates the rupture transpiring after the 37th week but antecedent to the initiation of labour. The fissure of membranes anterior to the 37th week marks a distinctive category known as Preterm PROM (PPROM). The lion's share of neonatal morbidity and mortality is ascribed to prematurity. PROM, contributing to roughly one-third of all premature deliveries, entangles 3% of gestations. PROM is entwined with a notable spectrum of morbidity and mortality. Managing pregnancies with PROM entails an added layer of complexity. Pre-labour rupture of membranes is typified by its succinct latency, augmented vulnerability to intrauterine infection, and an escalated likelihood of umbilical cord compression. Expectant mothers contending with preterm PROM confront an elevated susceptibility to conditions such as chorioamnionitis and placental abruption. An array of diagnostic modalities encompasses the aseptic speculum examination, the nitrazine test, the ferning test, and cutting-edge methodologies such as the Amnisure test and the Actim test. Despite the array of existing tests, there persists a demand for innovative, non-invasive, swift, and precise diagnostic tools. Hospitalization, amniocentesis for infection exclusion, and, when warranted, the administration of prenatal corticosteroids and broad-spectrum antibiotics present viable treatment alternatives. Consequently, the clinician overseeing a gravid individual confronted with PROM assumes a pivotal role in the strategic management, necessitating a comprehensive awareness of potential complications and preemptive measures to curtail risks and amplify the likelihood of a favourable denouement. The proclivity of PROM for recurrent manifestations in subsequent pregnancies unveils an opportunity for preventative interventions. Moreover, the evolution of prenatal and neonatal care methodologies persists in augmenting outcomes for both women and their offspring. The crux of this exposition is to encapsulate the intricacies associated with the assessment and administration of PROM.

Introduction:

The inner confines of the gravid intrauterine cavity are enveloped by the foetal membranes, denoted as the placental or amniochorionic membranes. These crucial foetal tissues delineate distinct domains, the maternal and fetoplacental compartments. Comprising the amnion, the deepest stratum within the intraamniotic cavity, and the chorion, intertwining with the maternal decidua to craft the placental tissue, foetal membranes are connected by a collagen-rich extracellular matrix [1,2].

Ordinarily, membrane rupture occurs concomitant with the progression of labour, specifically at the complete dilatation of the cervix. However, pre-labour rupture of membranes deviates from this norm, unfolding post the 37th week but preceding the onset of labour. [3] Defined as the rupture transpiring before the 37th week of pregnancy, preterm premature rupture of membranes (Preterm PROM) poses a notable obstetric quandary, often underestimated, with an incidence of approximately 3%-4% across all pregnancies. Notably, it significantly contributes to 40% to 50% of all preterm births [45]. In contrast to conditions like preeclampsia



and gestational diabetes, the prevalence of PROM surpasses them. Moreover, preterm PROM assumes a more substantial role in neonatal mortality and morbidity compared to other disorders [6].

Despite substantial strides in prenatal interventions over the past three decades, there has been a surge in the rates of PROM and the consequential rise in preterm deliveries. This comprehensive review endeavours to scrutinize and expound upon the intricate facets of PROM, with a primary focus on its evaluation and diagnostic methodologies. [7]

The complex intricacies of the intrauterine cavity during gravidity are orchestrated by the presence of foetal membranes, colloquially known as placental or amniochorionic membranes. These integral tissues delineate distinct compartments, namely the maternal and fetoplacental domains. Comprising the amnion, nestled as the deepest layer within the intraamniotic cavity, and the chorion, intricately connecting with the maternal decidua to construct the placental tissue, foetal membranes find cohesion through a collagen-rich extracellular matrix [8,9].

Normal Labor versus Pre-labour Rupture of Membranes
Under conventional circumstances, the rupture of membranes aligns with the unfolding of labour, specifically at the point of full dilatation of the cervix. However, the trajectory diverges with pre-labour rupture of membranes, an eventuality manifesting post the 37th week but antecedent to the initiation of labour. This deviation encompasses preterm premature rupture of membranes (Preterm PROM), demarcated by its occurrence before the 37th week of pregnancy. This obstetric phenomenon, with an incidence hovering around 3%-4% in all pregnancies, assumes a noteworthy role, contributing substantially to the prevalence of 40% to 50% of all preterm births [10,11].

Comparative Significance and Impact

In juxtaposition to conditions such as preeclampsia and gestational diabetes, the prominence of PROM takes precedence. Noteworthy is the paramount role it plays in neonatal mortality and morbidity, eclipsing the impact of other obstetric disorders [12].

Contemporary Challenges and Evolving Trends

Despite commendable advancements in prenatal care over the past thirty years, there is a discernible surge in

the incidence of PROM and the consequential escalation in preterm deliveries. This comprehensive review endeavours to delve into the multifaceted landscape of PROM, casting a discerning eye on its intricate evaluation and evolving diagnostic modalities. [13,14]

Methodology

In our pursuit of comprehensive information, we conducted a meticulous exploration of the Medline and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) databases via the Cochrane Library, utilizing PubMed as our primary gateway. The search strategy tailored for PubMed was intricately crafted for each specific database, encompassing the following criteria: "premature rupture of membrane" (Title/Abstract) AND "chorioamnionitis" (Title/Abstract) OR "nitrazine test" (Title/Abstract) OR "amnisure test" (Title/Abstract) OR "preterm PROM" (Title/Abstract). In addition to electronic searches, we undertook a comprehensive screening of references lists within identified articles and potential sources to unearth further relevant studies. [15]

The inclusion criteria for our study comprised original research conducted in English, with a focus on assessing risk factors, diagnosis, and management of premature rupture of membranes. To adhere to a systematic and transparent approach, we embraced the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) methodology, visually depicted in Figure 1. This methodical framework ensured a rigorous and organized exploration of the available literature, fostering a nuanced understanding of the subject matter at hand. [16]

Risk Evaluation

Central to the comprehensive assessment of pre-labour rupture of membranes (PROM) is a meticulous examination of associated risk factors. A proactive approach to mitigating PROM-related complications involves the prediction and elimination of these risk factors. Noteworthy risk elements encompass a history of preterm birth in prior pregnancies, behavioural factors such as cigarette smoking, the presence of polyhydramnios, urinary and sexually transmitted infections, prolonged use of chronic steroids, twin pregnancies, a history of previous PROM, antepartum vaginal bleeding, incidents of direct abdominal trauma,



collagen vascular disorders like Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, and systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). Additional contributors to the risk profile include a low basal metabolic rate (BMI), anaemia, and individuals with a low socioeconomic status [17, 18].

It's imperative to recognize that specific invasive procedures can inadvertently inflict damage to the membranes, resulting in leakage. Procedures like amniocentesis, chorionic sampling, and cervical cerclage, though uncommon, are potential instigators of preterm PROM [4]. The recurrence rate for preterm PROM stands at a significant 16% to 32%, contrasting with the lower 4% recurrence rate observed in women with a history of previous term deliveries [5-7]. A comprehensive visualization of the risk factors and etiopathogenesis of premature rupture of membranes is depicted in Figure 2, offering a comprehensive overview of the multifaceted landscape associated with this obstetric phenomenon. [19]

Diagnostic Evaluation

In the meticulous pursuit of patient evaluation, the confirmation of diagnosis stands as the primary endeavour. Anchored in history-taking and a thorough physical examination, the diagnostic process for pre-labour rupture of membranes (PROM) or preterm PROM (PPROM) unfolds. A pregnant woman's account of a sudden gush of fluid from the vagina leading to clothing saturation raises the suspicion of PROM or PPRM. The fluid's description, often characterized as clear or pale yellow by the patient, initiates the diagnostic journey. [20]

Sterile Per Speculum Examination

The initial step in the diagnostic odyssey is the sterile per speculum examination. This examination serves as the cornerstone, with the obstetrician relying on adept skills to identify three pivotal clinical signs:

Pooling of Fluid: Observable accumulation of fluid in the vaginal vault or fluid seeping from the cervical os.

Nitrazine Paper Test: A test where a blue coloration suggests the presence of alkaline fluid, indicative of amniotic fluid.

Fern Test: In this microscopic examination, a sample of amniotic fluid is fixed on a slide, revealing a distinct fern-like pattern. [21]

Limitations and Diagnostic Challenges

While these clinical indicators provide valuable insights, it's crucial to acknowledge their limitations. The nitrazine test, despite its ubiquity, carries a propensity for false positives. Similarly, the fern test, reliant on microscopic crystallization of amniotic fluid, presents challenges, with false negatives attributed to technical errors or contamination with blood and false positives to contamination with cervical mucus, semen, or fingerprints [22].

Alternative Diagnostic Avenues

In the realm of diagnostic validity, cost considerations, and technical simplicity, the nitrazine test maintains its prominence despite its limitations. The reported sensitivity and specificity of the fern test fluctuate, emphasizing its reliance on technical precision and the absence of external contaminants. In instances where conventional tests for PROM fall short in providing a confirmatory diagnosis, alternative methods, such as the amnio-dye test, come into play. The infusion of indigo carmine into the amniotic cavity, with subsequent leakage of blue fluid per vagina, serves as a confirmatory indicator. However, it's imperative to note the intrinsic risks associated with the amnio-dye test, including placental abruption, bleeding, spontaneous abortion, infection, and sepsis, given its invasive nature [23].

Emerging Diagnostic Frontiers

Beyond traditional diagnostic methodologies, emerging tests contribute to the evolving landscape. The Amnisure test, leveraging the detection of placental alpha microglobulin 1 (PAMG1), offers a non-invasive and swift alternative. PAMG1, a glycoprotein with placental origin prevalent in amniotic fluid, proves to be a reliable marker due to its low concentration in maternal blood. The Actim PROM test, focusing on insulin-like growth factor binding protein 1 (IGFBP-1) in vaginal fluid, emerges as a bedside test supplementing clinical diagnoses. Notably, its sensitivity and specificity surpass that of the Amnisure test, and a negative result essentially rules out intact membranes. However, a potential downside lies in elevated IGFBP-1 levels in cervicovaginal secretions in cases of imminent preterm labor, even without ruptured membranes [24].



Holistic Considerations in Diagnosis

As diagnostic paradigms evolve, comprehensive patient evaluation extends beyond singular tests. For instance, a negative Actim PROM test may prompt additional assessments, such as c-reactive protein (CRP) and white blood cell (WBC) counts, to rule out infections. It's imperative to acknowledge the nuanced challenges posed

by membrane stretching, leading to elevated IGFBP-1 levels even in the absence of ruptured membranes [24]. In essence, the diagnostic journey for PROM navigates a dynamic landscape, balancing established methodologies with emerging technologies to ensure precision, non-invasiveness, and clinical relevance.

Table 1: Risk Evaluation of Pre-labor Rupture of Membranes (PROM)

Risk Factors	Associated Factors and Conditions
History of preterm birth	Behavioural factors: cigarette smoking
Polyhydramnios	Urinary and sexually transmitted infections
Chronic steroid use	Twin pregnancies
Previous PROM	Antepartum vaginal bleeding
Direct abdominal trauma	Collagen vascular disorders: Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, SLE
Low basal metabolic rate (BMI)	Anaemia
Low socioeconomic status	Invasive procedures: amniocentesis, chorionic sampling, cervical cerclage
Recurrence rate: 16% to 32%	Lower recurrence rate (4%) in women with previous term deliveries

Table 2: Diagnostic Evaluation of Pre-labour Rupture of Membranes (PROM)

Diagnostic Process	Clinical Signs and Examinations
History-taking and physical examination	Sudden gush of fluid, often clear or pale yellow
Sterile per speculum examination	Pooling of fluid, Nitrazine Paper Test (alkaline fluid), Fern Test (fern-like pattern)
Limitations and Challenges	Nitrazine test may yield false positives; Fern test prone to false negatives and positives due to technical errors or contamination
Alternative Diagnostic Avenues	Amnio-dye test (invasive, with risks: placental abruption, bleeding, spontaneous abortion, infection, and sepsis)
Emerging Diagnostic Frontiers	Amnisure test (detects placental alpha microglobulin 1 - PAMG1), Actim PROM test (focuses on insulin-like growth factor binding protein 1 - IGFBP-1)
Holistic Considerations	Negative Actim PROM test may prompt additional assessments like CRP and WBC counts to rule out infections

Table 3: Holistic Considerations in the Diagnosis of Pre-labor Rupture of Membranes (PROM)

Comprehensive Patient Evaluation	Additional Assessments After Negative Actim PROM Test
Beyond singular tests	C-reactive protein (CRP) and white blood cell (WBC) counts to rule out infections
Challenges of membrane stretching	Elevated IGFBP-1 levels may occur even in the absence of ruptured membranes



Diagnostic Journey

Balancing established methodologies with emerging technologies to ensure precision, non-invasiveness, and clinical relevance

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the evolving landscape of managing pre-labour rupture of membranes (PROM) has seen substantial advancements, emphasizing precision, tailored interventions, and a proactive stance towards potential complications. The contemporary approach, as outlined in recent guidelines, involves expectant management, judicious use of antibiotics, careful consideration of corticosteroids, dynamic induction of labour strategies, and critical evaluation of tocolytics.

Expectant management takes centre stage, particularly in preterm and late preterm PROM cases, with a comprehensive protocol involving admission, corticosteroid administration, selective tocolysis, and vigilant monitoring for potential complications such as chorioamnionitis. The antibiotic regimen, a crucial aspect of PROM therapy, undergoes nuanced evaluation, considering the risk of bacterial contamination and potential life-threatening complications.

Corticosteroids emerge as crucial contributors to favourable outcomes, especially in reducing neonatal morbidity. Induction of labour strategies, utilizing agents like oxytocin and misoprostol, becomes pivotal in averting risks associated with prolonged membrane rupture. Tocolytics, although lacking concrete evidence of benefit, find a role in specific clinical scenarios, necessitating a careful balance between risks and benefits.

The quest for predicting the latency period post-membrane rupture remains a challenge, with ongoing research focusing on refining protocols, enhancing diagnostic precision, and tailoring interventions for optimal maternal and neonatal outcomes. Progesterone supplementation and cervical assessments offer promising preventive measures in women with a history of preterm birth.

In this dynamic landscape of PROM management, ongoing research endeavours continue to shape the future of obstetric care. The emphasis on personalized, evidence-based approaches underscores the commitment to improving outcomes for both mothers and newborns. As advancements unfold, clinicians are poised to navigate this evolving field with a comprehensive

understanding, ensuring the best possible care for patients facing the complexities of pre-labour rupture of membranes.

References:

1. Esim E, Turan C, Unal O, Dansuk R, Cengizglu B. Diagnosis of premature rupture of membranes by identification of beta-HCG in vaginal washing fluid. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2003; 107:37-40.
2. Kim YH, Park YW, Kwon HS, Kwon JY, Kim BJ. Vaginal fluid beta-human chorionic gonadotropin level in the diagnosis of premature rupture of membranes. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 2005; 84:802-5.
3. Kishida T, Yamada H, Negishi H, Sagawa T, Makinoda S, Fujimoto S. Diagnosis of premature rupture of the membranes in preterm patients, using an improved AFP kit: comparison with ROM-check and/or nitrazine test. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 1996; 69:77-82.
4. Petrunin DD, Griaznova IM, Petrunina IuA, Tatarinov IuS. Immunochemical identification of organ-specific human placental alpha1-globulin and its concentration in amniotic fluid [Article in Russian]. *Akush Ginekol (Mosk).* 1977; 1:62-4.
5. Cousins LM, Smok DP, Lovett SM, Poeltler DM. AmniSure placental alpha microglobulin-1 rapid immunoassay versus standard diagnostic methods for detection of rupture of membranes. *Am J Perinatol.* 2005; 22:317-20.
6. Boltovskaia MN, Zaráiskii EI, Fuks BB, et al. Histochemical and clinical-diagnostic study of placental alpha1-microglobulin using monoclonal antibodies [Article in Russian]. *Biull Eksp Biol Med.* 1991; 112:397-400.
7. Lee SE, Park JS, Norwitz ER, Kim KW, Park HS, Jun JK. Measurement of placental alpha-microglobulin-1 in cervicovaginal discharge to diagnose rupture of membranes. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2007; 109:634-40.
8. Abdelazim IA. Insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1 (Actim PROM test) for detection of



- premature rupture of fetal membranes. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res.* 2014; 40:961-7.
9. Kubota T, Takeuchi H. Evaluation of insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1 as a diagnostic tool for rupture of the membranes. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res.* 1998; 24:411-7.
10. Marcellin L, Anselem O, Guibourdenche J, et al. Comparison of two bedside tests performed on cervicovaginal fluid to diagnose premature rupture of membranes [Article in French]. *J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod (Paris).* 2011; 40:651-6.
11. Rutanen EM, Kärkkäinen TH, Lehtovirta J, et al. Evaluation of a rapid strip test for insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1 in the diagnosis of ruptured fetal membranes. *Clin Chim Acta.* 1996; 253:91-101.
12. Darj E, Lyrenäs S. Insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1, a quick way to detect amniotic fluid. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 1998; 77:295-7.
13. Akercan F, Kazandı M, Sendag F, Cirpan T, Mgoyi L, Terek MC, Sagol S. Value of cervical phosphorylated insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1 in the prediction of preterm labor. *J Reprod Med.* 2004; 49:368-72.
14. Lembet A, Eroglu D, Ergin T, Kuscü E, Zeyneloglu H, Batioglu S, Haberal A. New rapid bedside test to predict preterm delivery: phosphorylated insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1 in cervical secretions. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 2002; 81:706-12.
15. Prelabor Rupture of Membranes: ACOG Practice Bulletin, Number 217. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2020;135:e80-97.
16. Gomez R, Romero R, Nien JK, et al. Antibiotic administration to patients with preterm premature rupture of membranes does not eradicate intra-amniotic infection. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med.* 2007; 20:167-73.
17. Seelbach-Goebel B. Antibiotic therapy for premature rupture of membranes and preterm labor and effect on fetal outcome. *Geburtshilfe Frauenheilkd.*
18. Jazayeri A, Jazayeri MK, Sutkin G. Tocolysis does not improve neonatal outcome in patients with preterm rupture of membranes. *Am J Perinatol.* 2003;20:189-193. - PubMed
19. Meller CH, Izbizky G, Otaño L. Update on the use of magnesium sulphate for fetal neuroprotection in preterm birth. *Arch Argent Pediatr.* 2015; 113:345-351. - PubMed
20. Bouet PE, Brun S, Madar H, et al. Implementation of an antenatal magnesium sulfate protocol for fetal neuroprotection in preterm infants. *Sci Rep.* 2015; 5:14732. - PMC - PubMed
21. De Silva DA, Sawchuck D, von Dadelszen P, Basso M, Synnes AR, Liston RM, Magee LA. Magnesium sulphate for eclampsia and fetal neuroprotection: a comparative analysis of protocols across Canadian tertiary perinatal centres. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can.* 2015; 37:975-987. - PubMed
22. Kamyar M, Manuck TA, Stoddard GJ, Varner MW, Clark E. Magnesium sulfate, chorioamnionitis, and neurodevelopment after preterm birth. *BJOG.* 2016; 123:1161-1166. - PubMed
23. Bryant A, Sinclair T, Murtha A. Prediction of the latency period by cervical length in preterm premature rupture of membranes. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2004; 191:0. [https://www.ajog.org/article/S0002-9378\(04\)01416-4/fulltext](https://www.ajog.org/article/S0002-9378(04)01416-4/fulltext)
24. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, et al. Obstetric care consensus No. 8: Interpregnancy care. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2019; 133:0-72.