19. BÖLÜM

İNTRAPARTUM SONOGRAFİ

Dr. Esra KARTAL[1]

Son yıllarda ultrasonografinin obstetrikte kullanımı giderek artmakta ve yeni yapılan çalışmalar doğum eylemi yönetiminde sonografinin önemini ortaya koymaktadır. Ultrason cihazlarının yüksek çözünürlüklü, gerçek zamanlı, portatif, kolay ulaşılabilir olması doğum salonunda da kullanım avantajı sağlamaktadır. Günümüzde antepartum sonografi fetal biyometride, fetal anatominin değerlendirilmesinde, tahmini fetal ağırlık tahmininde, fetal prezentasyonun belirlenmesinde, çoğul gebelikleri, plasentanın konumunu, indüksiyon öncesi serviksi değerlendirmede, operatif doğumun başarısını ve indüksiyon başarısını öngörmede, amniyotik sıvı volümünü değerlendirmede, doppler ultrasonografide yaygın olarak kullanılmaktadır.

Ultrason yüksek frekanslı dalgaların doku ara yüzeyine rastladıktan sonra ordan yansıması, kırılması, zayıflaması veya emilmesi prensibine dayanmaktadır. Obstetrik görüntüleme için 3 ile 7 Mhz'lık (megahertz) mekanik titreşim gereklidir [(1)]. Yansıyan ultrason dalgaları prob tarafından alınır, işlenir ve bir görüntü oluşturulur. Obstetrik ultrasonda görüntüler yansımasız dalgayla dokudan proba gelen yansıma arasındaki gecikmeyi ölçen puls-eko yöntemi ile elde edilir. Tanısal ultrasonun belirgin zararlı etkileri olmaksızın geniş ölçüde güvenli olduğu düşünülmektedir [(2)]. AIUM (The American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine) 'halen ultrasonun kanıtlanmış biyolojik etkileri olmamasına rağmen bu biyolojik etkilerin gelecekte tanımlanabilme olasılığı mevcuttur' şeklinde belirtmektedir [(3)].

Ultrasonografi I. Dünya Savaşı sırasında denizaltılarını bulmak için kullanılmaya başlanmış, yumuşak doku ultrasonografisi üzerine yapılan tıbbi çalışmalar, 1940'ların sonunda ve 1950'lerin başında Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nde yapıl-

[1] Uzman Doktor, SBÜ Bursa Yüksek İhtisas Eğitim ve Araştırma Hastanesi Kadın Hastalıkları ve Doğum Kliniği Email:esrakartalegetip@gmail.com

KAYNAKLAR

1. Cosgrove DO. Ultrasound: General principles. In: Grainger and Allison's Diagnostic Radiology: A Textbook of Medical Imaging, 4th edition. Churchill Livingstone; 2001. pp. 43-57
2. Asim Kurjak, Frank A Chervenak. Donald School Textbook of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology.3rded. Jaypee Brothers Medical Publishers (P) LTD; New Delhi: 2011.
3. Laurel, MD. AIUM News Release: AIUM opposesuse of ultrasound for entertainment. 2002.
4. Oakley A. The History of Ultrasonography in Obstetrics. Birth.1986;13(1):8–13.
5. Kratochwil A, Zeibekis N. Ultrasonic pelvimetry. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 1972;51 (4):357-62.
6. Deutinger J, Bernaschek G. Vaginosonographic pelvimetry as a newmethod of the sonographic determination of internal pelvic measurements. Geburtshilfe und Frauenheilkunde. 1986;46(6):345-7.
7. Kalache KD, Duckelmann AM, Michaelis SA, et al. Transperineal ultrasound imaging in prolonged second stage of labor with occipito anterior presenting fetuses: how well does the "angle of progression" predict the mode of delivery? Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2009;33: 326–330.
8. Bultez T, Quibel T, Bouhanna P. Angle of fetal head progression measured using transperineal ultrasound as a predictive factor of vacuum extraction failure. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2016; 48: 86–91.
9. Sainz JA, Borrero C, Aquise A. Utility of intrapartum transperineal ultrasound to predict cases of failure in vacuum extractional temptand need of cesarean section to complete delivery. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med 2016; 29: 1348–1352.
10. Cuerva MJ, Bamberg C, Tobias P. Use of intrapartum ultrasound in the prediction of complicated operative forceps delivery of fetuses in nonocciput posterior position. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2014; 43: 687–692.
11. Kahrs BH, Usman S, Ghi T, Sonographic prediction of outcome of vacuum deliveries: a multicenter, prospective cohort study. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2017; 217(69):1–10.
12. Dupuis O, Ruimark S, Corrine D et al. Fetal head position during these condstage of labor: comparison of digital and vaginal examination and transabdominal ultrasonographic examination. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 2005;123: 193–197.
13. Tutschek B, Torkildsen EA, Eggebo TM. Comparison between ultrasound parameters and clinical examination to assess fetal headstation in labor. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2013; 41: 425–429.
14. Sherer DM, Miodovnik M, Bradley S,et al. Intrapartum fetal head position I: comparison between transvaginal digital examination and transabdominal ultrasound assessment during the active stage of labor. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2002;19: 258–263.
15. Benediktsdottir S, Salvesen,KÅ, Hjartardottir H,et al. Reproducibility and acceptability of ultrasound measurements of head-perineum distance. Acta Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica. 2017;97(1), 97–103.
16. Ramphul M, Ooi PV, Burke G,et al. Instrumental delivery and ultrasound: a multicentrer and omised controlled trial of ultrasound assessment of the fetal head position versus Standard care as an approach to prevent morbidity at instrumental delivery. BJOG 2014; 121: 1029–1038.
17. Eggebø TM, Heien C, Økland I,et al. Ultrasound assessment of fetal head-perineum distance before induction of labor. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2008; 32: 199–204.
18. Torkildsen EA, Salvesen KÅ, Eggebø TM. Prediction of delivery mode with transperineal ultrasound in women with prolonged first stage of labor. Ultrasound ObstetGynecol 2011; 37: 702–708.
19. Ghi T, Bellussi F, Azzarone C, et al. The "occiput-spineangle": a new sonographic index of fetal head deflexion during the first stage of labor. Am J ObstetGynecol. 2016;215(1):84.e1-84.e847.
20. Cunningham FG. Williams Obstetrics. 24th ed: McGraw Hill Education; 2015.
21. Vrouenraets FP, Roumen FJ, Dehing CJ, et al. Bishop score and risk of cesarean delivery after induction of labor in nulliparous women. Obstetrics&Gynecology, 1997;105(4), 690–697.

22. Youssef A, Ghi T, Pilu G. How to performultrasound in labor: assessment of fetal occiput position. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2013; 41: 476–478.
23. Blasi I, D'Amico R, Fenu V, et al. Sonographic assessment of fetal spine and head position during the first and second stages of labor for the diagnosis of persistent occiput posterior position: a pilot study. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2010;.doi:10.1002/uog.7504.
24. Henrich W, Dudenhausen J, Fuchs I, et al. Intrapartum translabial ultrasound (ITU): sonographic landmarks and correlation with successful vacuum extraction. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2006;28(6):753–60.
25. World Health Organization. Maternal Health and Safe Motherhood Programme. World Health Organization partograph in management of labour. Lancet 1994; 343: 1399-404.
26. Ghi T, Youssef A, Maroni E, et al. Intrapartum transperineal ultrasound assessment of fetal head progression in active second stage of labor and mode of delivery. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2013; 41:430–435.
27. Barbera A, Pombar X, Perugino G, et al. A new method to assess fetal head descent in labor with transperineal ultrasound. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2009;33:313–9.
28. Tutschek B, Braun T, Chantraine F, Henrich W. A study of progress of labor using intrapartum translabial ultrasound, assessing head station, direction, and angle of descent. BJOG 2011; 118: 62–69.
29. Dückelmann AM, Michaelis SA, Bamberg C,et al. Impact of intrapartal ultrasound to assess fetal head position ands tation on the type of obstetricali nterventions at full cervical dilatation. J MaternFetal Neonatal Med 2012; 25: 484– 488.
30. Levy R, Zaks S, Ben-Arie A, et al. Can angle of progression in pregnant women before onset of labor predict mode of delivery? Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2012;40(3):332–7.
31. Eggebø TM, Gjessing LK, Heien C, et al. Prediction of labor and delivery by transperineal ultrasound in pregnancies with prelabor rupture of membranes at term. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2006; 27: 387–391.
32. Maticot-Baptista D, Ramanah R, Collin A, et al. Ultrasound in the diagnosis of fetal head engagement. J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod.2009; 38: 474–480.
33. Ghi T, Farina A, Pedrazzi A, et al .Diagnosis of station and rotation of the fetal head in these condstage of labor with intrapartum translabial ultrasound. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2009; 33: 331–336.
34. Youssef A, Maroni E, Ragusa A, et al. Fetal head-symphysis distance: a simple and reliable ultrasound index of fetal head station in labor. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2013; 41: 419–424.
35. Dietz HP, Lanzarone V. Measuring engagement of the fetal head: validity and reproducibility of a new ultrasound technique. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2005; 25: 165–168.
36. Gilboa Y., Kivilevitch Z., Spira M., et al. Head progression distance in prolonged second stage of labor: relationship with mode of delivery and fetal head station. Ultrasound in Obstetrics&-Gynecology. 2013;41(4): 436–441.
37. Dückelmann AM, Bamberg C, Michaelis SA, et al. Measurement of fetal head descent usingt he "angle of progression" on transperineal ultrasound imaging is reliable regardless of fetal head stationon ultrasound expertise. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2010; 35:216–222.
38. Molina FS, Terra R, Carrillo MP, et al. What is the most reliable ultrasound parameter for assessment of fetal head descent? Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2010; 36:493-499.
39. Torkildsen EA, Salvesen KÅ, Eggebø TM. Agreement between two- and three-dimensional transperineal ultrasound methods in assessing fetal head descent in the firststage of labor. UltrasoundObstetGynecol.2012;39(3):310-315.
40. Ciaciura-Jarno M, Cnota W, Wójtowicz D, et al. Evaluation of selected ultrasonography parameters in the second stage of labor in prediction mode of delivery. Ginekol Pol. 2016; 87:448-453.
41. Friedman EA. Primigravid Labor: A graphico statistical analysis. Obstetrics&Gynecology. 1955;6(6):567-89.

42. Hassan W, Eggebø T, Ferguson M, et al.The sonopartogram: a novel method for recording progress of labor by ultrasound. Ultrasound in Obstetrics&Gynecology. 2014;43(2):189-94
43. Chor CM, Poon LCY, Leung TY. Prediction of labor outcome using serial transperineal ultrasound in the first stage of labor. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2019;32(1):31-37.
44. Marsoosi V, Pirjani R, Mansouri B, EslamianL,Jamal A, Heidari R, et al Role of 'angle of progression' in prediction of deliverymode. J ObstetGynaecolRes. 2015; 41:1693– 1699.
45. Tse WT, Chaemsaithong P, Chan, W et al. Labor progress determined by ultrasound is different in women requiring Cesarean delivery from those who experience a vaginal delivery following induction of labor. Am J of Obstet and Gynecol. 2019.
46. Chaemsaithong, P., Kwan, AHW., Tse W. Et al. Factors that affect ultrasound-determined labor progress in women under going induction of labor. American Journal of Obstetric sandGynecology. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2019.01.236
47. Akmal S, Tsoi E, Kametas N,et al. Intrapartum sonography to determine fetal head position. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2002;12(3):172-177.
48. Ghi T, Eggebø T, Lees C, et al. PracticeGuidelines: intrapartum ultrasound. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2018; 52: 128–139.
49. Rayburn W, Siemers K, Legino L, et al. Dystocia in Late Labor:Determining Fetal Position by Clinical and Ultrasonic Techniques. American Journal of Perinatology,1989; 6(03), 316–319.