Prevention of preterm birth (PTB) in twins Cerclage vs. others methods to prevent PTB

In conclusion



• Cerclage does not reduce the rate of preterm

birth in unselected twin cohorts.

• Cerclage should not be used in the prevention

of preterm birth in twin pregnancy.

Indication		Gestational age placement (wl	of Preterm birth ks) Reduction	Perinatal outcome	
History- indicated cerclage	Prior STL and PTB	/or 12-14	17% (no cerclage) to 13% (cerclage) decrease in PTB < 33 wk ¹	17% to 9% decrease in mortality ¹	
Ultrasound- indicated cerclage	Short cervix (CL < 25 mm TVU) and pr PTB	16-23 1 on rior	41% to 28% (30% decrease) in PTB < 35 wk	25% to 16% (36% decrease) in morbidity and mortality ¹	
Physical examination- indicated cerclage	Dilated cervix manual or speculum examination	on 16-23	100% to 54% decrease in PTB < 34 wk ; 92% reduction in PTB < 28 wk, 4- 10 wk prolongation of pregnancy	71% to 31% decrease in neonatal death	

MRC/RCOG. Br J Obstet Gynecol. 993;100:516–523.

Berghella et al. Cerclage for short cervix on ultrasound in singleton gestations with prior preterm birth: meta-analysis of trials using individual patient-level data.Obstet Gynecol. 2011;117:663–671.

Althuisius et al. Cervical incompetence prevention randomized cerclage trial: mergency cerclage with bed rest versus bed rest alone. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2003;189:907–910.

Pereira et al. Expectant management compared with physical-examination indicated cerclage (EMPEC) in selected women with a dilated cervix at 14-25 weeks: results from the EM-PEC international cohort study. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2007;197:483.e1–483.e8.



Cervical stitch (cerclage) for preventing preterm birth in multiple pregnancy



5 RCT; N:128 pregnant women with multiple gestation (twins 122, triplets 6)

Aim: To assess whether the use of a cervical cerclage in multiple gestations, improves obstetrical and perinatal outcomes.



Rafael T, Berghella V, Alfirevic Z. Cochrane 2014

Delivery <28 wks 5 RCT N: 128 women

Study or subgroup	Cerclage	No Cerclage	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% CI		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
I Twin only-indicated					
Dor 1982	1/22	2/23		30.9 %	0.52 [0.05, 5.36]
Subtotal (95% CI)	22	23		30.9 %	0.52 [0.05, 5.36]
Total events: (Cerclage), 2 ((No Cerclage)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.5$	5 (P = 0.59)				
2 Twin and history-indicated	(prior Ob/Gyn histo	ory)			
MRC/RCOG 1993	1/12	1/16		13.5 %	1.33 [0.09, 19.23]
Subtotal (95% CI)	12	16		13.5 %	1.33 [0.09, 19.23]
Total events: (Cerclage), (No Cerclage)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	1				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.2$	(P = 0.83)				
3 Ultrasound-indicated					
Althuisius 200 I	0/8	0/9			Not estimable
Berghella 2004	3/3	0/1		10.5 %	3.50 [0.31, 39.71]
Rust 2001	4/13	2/15		29.3 %	2.31 [0.50, 10.62]
Subtotal (95% CI)	24	25		39.8 %	2.62 [0.72, 9.51]
Total events: 7 (Cerclage), 2 ((No Cerclage)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.08$, c	$df = (P = 0.78); ^2$	=0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.4$	17 (P = 0.14)				
4 Physical exam-indicated					
Subtotal (95% CI)	0	0			Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Cerclage), 0 ((No Cerclage)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: not app	olicable				
5 Triplets					
Rust 2001	1/3	1/3		15.8 %	1.00 [0.10, 9.61]
Subtotal (95% CI)	3	3		15.8 %	1.00 [0.10, 9.61]
Total events: (Cerclage), ((No Cerclage)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	:				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.0$	(P = 1.0)				
Total (95% CI)	61	67	-	100.0 %	1.54 [0.63, 3.81]
			0.01 0.1 10 100		
			Favours cerclage Favours no cercla		- 1.54 (U.6.3 ·

3.81)

Delivery <32 wks 4 RCT N: 83 women

n/N n/N M-H,Fixed,95% CI M-H,Fixed,95 I Twin only-indicated Subtotal (95% CI) 0 0 Subtotal (95% CI) 0 0 Not estimated Total events: 0 (Cerclage), 0 (No Cerclage) Heterogeneity: not applicable Total events	% CI able
I Twin only-indicated Subtotal (95% CI) 0 0 Not estimated Total events: 0 (Cerclage), 0 (No Cerclage) Heterogeneity: not applicable Total for memory of applicable	able
Subtotal (95% CI) 0 0 Not estimate Total events: 0 (Cerclage), 0 (No Cerclage) Heterogeneity: not applicable Heterogeneity: not applicable	able 2.61] 51]
Total events: 0 (Cerclage), 0 (No Cerclage) Heterogeneity: not applicable	2.61]
Heterogeneity: not applicable	2.61]
Test for evently effect net explicable	2.61]
test for overall ellect not applicable	2.61] 51]
2 Twin and history-indicated (prior Ob/Gyn history)	2.61] 61]
MRC/RCOG 1993 1/12 4/16 34.9 % 0.33 [0.04, 2	61]
Subtotal (95% CI) 12 16 34.9 % 0.33 [0.04, 2.0	51]
Total events: I (Cerclage), 4 (No Cerclage)	
Heterogeneity: not applicable	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.05$ (P = 0.30)	
3 Ultrasound-indicated	
Althuisius 200 I I/8 I/9 9.6 % I.13 [0.08, I 5	5.19]
Berghella 2004 3/3 0/1 68 % 3.50 [0.3 I , 39	9.71]
Rust 2001 7/13 3/15 28.4 % 2.69 [0.87, 8	3.34]
Subtotal (95% CI) 24 25 \checkmark 44.7 % 2.48 [0.96, 6.3	37]
Total events: (Cerclage), 4 (No Cerclage) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.45, df = 2 (P = 0.80); l ² =0.0%	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.059)	
4 Physical exam-indicated	
Subtotal (95% CI) 0 0 Not estimate	able
Total events: 0 (Cerclage), 0 (No Cerclage)	
Heterogeneity: not applicable	
Test for overall effect: not applicable	
5 inplets	
Rust 2001 2/3 2/3 2/3 20.4 % 1.00 [0.32, 3	3.10]
Subtotal (95% CI) 3 3 20.4 % 1.00 [0.32, 3.	10]
Total events: 2 (Cerclage), 2 (No Cerclage)	
Heterogeneity: not applicable	
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.0 (P = 1.0)	
Total (95% CI) 39 44 100.0 % 1.43 [0.72, 2.5	83]
Total events: 14 (Cerclage), 10 (No Cerclage)	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.06, df = 4 (P = 0.40); l ² = 2%	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = 0.31) OR: 1.43 (0.72	2 – 2.83
Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 3.61, df = 2 (P = 0.16), P = 45%	

Cervical stitch (cerclage) for preventing preterm birth in multiple pregnancy



5 RCT; N:128 pregnant women with multiple gestation (twins 122, triplets 6)

Aim: To assess whether the use of a cervical cerclage in multiple gestations, improves obstetrical and perinatal outcomes.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS: For multiple gestations, there is no evidence that cerclage is an effective intervention for preventing preterm births and reducing perinatal deaths or neonatal morbidity

Rafael T, Berghella V, Alfirevic Z. Cochrane 2014



Prevention of preterm birth in twins RCT: pessary vs expectant

- Twin pregnancies: live fetuses at 20⁺⁰ 24⁺⁶ wks
- No major defects, no severe TTTS / sFGR
- Mother: <u>></u>16 yrs, able to consent
- No regular painful contractions, PPROM, cerclage in situ
- Information leaflet: 11-13 and 20-24 w
- Measurement of cervical length
- Internet-based allocation (computer-generated random number list)
- High vaginal swab and Rx for infection before pessary insertion
- Follow up every 4 wks
- Pessary removal: 37 wks, elective birth, or preterm labor

Logistic regression analysis (including effect of cervical length):

- Assume pessary reduces spontaneous birth <34 weeks by 30%
- Need for randomization: 1,180 patients to demonstrate significance (at 5% level, with power of 85%).



Outcome 1ry: Spont birth <34 wks 2ry: Perinatal death Neonatal morbidity Neonatal therapy



Prevention of preterm birth in twins RCT: pessary vs expectant





Prevention of preterm birth in twins RCT: pessary vs expectant

Characteristics	Pessary group (n=588)	Expectant group (n=589)	P value
Age in yrs, median (IQR)	33.1 (29.5-36.7)	33.2 (29.1-36.6)	0.704
Weight in Kg, median (IQR)	67.0 (60.0-76.3)	68.0 (60.0-79.0)	0.211
Height in cm, median (IQR)	165 (160-170)	164 (160-169)	0.073
Race: Caucasian, n (%)	497 (84.2)	483 (81.9)	0.313
Conception: Spontaneous, n (%)	373 (63.2)	366 (62.0)	0.718
Smoking, n (%)	45 (7.6)	53 (9.0)	0.460
No previous cervical surgery, n (%)	571 (96.8)	566 (95.9)	0.535
Monochorionic, n (%)	111 (18.8)	111 (18.8)	>0.999
Randomisation GA in wks, median (IQR)	22.6 (21.4-23.9)	22.7 (21.4-23.9)	0.803
Cervical length in mm, median (IQR)	32.0 (27.0-36.0)	32.0 (27.0-37.0)	0.447
Cervical length <25 mm, n (%)	107 (18.1)	108 (18.3)	>0.999

Prevention of preterm birth in twins RCT: pessary vs expectant





Group: Pessary

588 584 576 569 555 536 484 351 111 3 0

Prevention of preterm birth in twins RCT: pessary vs expectant



Group: Expectant

107	103	100	99	94	85	77	51	16	1	1
Group:	Pess	ary								
106	102	96	92	86	79	67	44	13	1	0



Group: Expectant

481 480 478 475 468 450 410 314 102 2 1

Group: Pessary

482 482 480 477 469 457 417 307 98 2 0



Prevention of preterm birth in twins RCT: pessary vs expectant



	Pessary	Expectant	
Outcome	(n=1,176)	(n=1,178)	<i>p</i> value
Fetal death	12 (1.0%)	18 (1.5%)	0.361
Neonatal death	17 (1.4%)	14 <mark>(1.2%)</mark>	0.714
Perinatal death	29 (2.5%)	<mark>32 (2.7%)</mark>	0.801
Neonatal morbidity *	114 (9.7%)	98 (8.3%)	0.274
Neonatal therapy **	202 (17.2%)	201 (17.1%)	0.985

* Intraventricular hemorrhage, respiratory distress syndrome, retinopathy of prematurity, or necrotizing enterocolitis

** Ventilation, phototherapy, treatment for proven or suspected sepsis, or blood transfusion



In twin pregnancies with any cervical length, insertion of cervical pessary at 21-23 wks:

- Does not reduce the rate of preterm birth
- Does not reduce perinatal death or neonatal morbidity





Take home message

- Prevention should be the primary goal in prenatal care.
- Identification of the risk factors involved are useful measures in secondary prevention:
 - Cervical insufficiency;
 - Prior preterm birth (PTB);
 - Short cervical length at midtrimester scan;
 - Multiple gestation.

Strategy in the prevention of PTB:

- Cerclage: cervical insufficiency
- Vaginal progesterone: prior PTB ou short cervix

Cerclage should not be used in the prevention of PTB in twin pregnancy.