## Fetal Pulse Oximetry Fails to Lower C-Section Rate

BY DAMIAN MCNAMARA

Miami Bureau

MIAMI — Fetal pulse oximetry failed to significantly decrease the cesarean delivery rate or to improve neonatal outcomes in a randomized, multicenter study of more than 5,000 women, Dr. Steven L. Bloom said at the annual meeting of the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine.

"Unfortunately, the results of this study ... suggest that fetal oximetry has not re-

alized its promise of reducing cesarean births," said Dr. Bloom, who presented the findings on behalf of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units Network in Bethesda, Md.

Dr. Bloom and his associates randomized 2,629 nulliparous women at term in early labor to an "open oximetry" group; physicians delivering the babies of the women in this group could view fetal oxygen saturation values. For comparison,

investigators randomized another 2,712 women to a "masked oximetry" group. The oximetry was an adjunct to continuous electronic fetal monitoring.

A total of 692 women in the open group and 747 women in the masked group delivered via cesarean section (26.3% vs. 27.5%). A nonreassuring fetal heart rate was the reason for cesarean section for 187 women in the open group and 214 women in the masked group (7.1% vs. 7.9%). Dystocia was the reason for 490 women in the

open group and 521 women in the masked group (18.6% vs. 19.2%).

"The overall cesarean rate, as well as the rates of cesarean deliveries for specific indications, was not different," said Dr. Bloom, interim chair of the department of obstetrics and gynecology at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center. Dallas.

A study published in 2000 had shown that the rate of cesarean delivery for nonreassuring fetal heart rate was reduced significantly from 10% to 5% with the addition of fetal pulse oximetry. That study also showed a doubling of the rate of cesarean section due to dystocia, so there was no significant reduction in the overall cesarean rate—26% with fetal heart rate monitoring alone vs. 29% with fetal heart rate monitoring plus oximetry (Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol.

2000;183:1049-

Fetal pulse oximetry could 'escalate the cost of medical care without necessarily improving clinical outcome,' according to an ACOG statement.

Based on these earlier findings, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists in 2001 issued a Committee Opinion stating that it did not endorse adoption of fetal pulse

oximetry into clinical practice, citing concerns that the device could "escalate the cost of medical care without necessarily improving clinical outcome." ACOG also recommended further study of the device

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration required additional research when it granted conditional approval for the fetal pulse oximeter device in 2000.

Results of the first large, randomized trial since 2000 are not encouraging.

Dr. Bloom and his associates designed the study to assess whether knowledge of fetal oxygen saturation values in the perinatal period would significantly change the overall cesarean rate. Any changes in cesarean rate for a nonreassuring fetal heart rate or dystocia, as well as any impact on maternal and infant safety, were secondary objectives.

Infant outcomes did not differ significantly: 0.7% of each group was intubated in the delivery room and 0.3% of each group had confirmed sepsis. In addition, 0.2% of the open group and 0.1% of the masked group had 5-minute Apgar scores of 3 or less; 0.6% of the open group and 0.5% of the masked group had an umbilical artery pH less than 7; and 4.8% of the open group and 5.4% of the masked group were admitted to the neonatal intensive care unit.

There was no significant difference in maternal morbidity between groups. In each group, 10.7% experienced chorioamnionitis; 4.3% of the open group and 4.4% of the masked group had postpartum endometritis; and 0.2% of the open group and 0.1% of the masked group had a wound complication.

## Table 3. Adverse Events Reported in Controlled Clinical Trials in at Least 2% of Patients Receiving ARICEPT® and at a Higher Frequency than Placebo-treated Patients

Body System/Adverse Event	Placebo (n=355)	ARICEPT® (n=747)	
Percent of Patients with any Adverse Event	72	74	
Body as a Whole			
Headache	9	10	
Pain, various locations	8	9	
Accident	6	7	
Fatigue	3	5	
Cardiovascular System			
Syncope	1	2	
Digestive System			
Nausea	6	11	
Diarrhea	5	10	
Vomiting	3	5	
Anorexia	2	4	
Hemic and Lymphatic System			
Ecchymosis	3	4	
Metabolic and Nutritional Systems			
Weight Decrease	1	3	
Musculoskeletal System			
Muscle Cramps	2	6	
Arthritis	1	2	
Nervous System			
Insomnia	6	9	
Dizziness	6	8	
Depression	<1	3	
Abnormal Dreams	0	3	
Somnolence	4	2	
Urogenital System	••	-	
Frequent Urination	1	2	
Other Adverse Events Observed During Clinical Trials	ADICEDE® has been admin	intered to a ser 1700 indi-	iduala duvina aliaia

The part Univariation

1 2

Other Adverse Events Observed During Clinical Trials ARICEPT® has been administered to over 1700 individuals during clinical trials worldwide. Approximately 2000 of these patients have been treated for a least of a morth. Approximately 300 patients in the trial state included approximately 300 patients in treated for a least of 67 morths. Af7 patients treated for 100 patients have been treated for a least of 67 morths. Af7 patients treated for 68 morths and 100 patients treated for 68 morths. Af7 patients treated for 68 morths and 100 patients treated for 68 morths and 100 patients treated for 68 morths and 100 patients for 69 patients treated for 68 morths and 100 patients for 69 patients for 69

ARICETY® (Donepezil Hydrochloride) Orally Disintegrating Tablets
Brid Surmany—see package insert for till prescribing information. INDICATIONS AND USAGE ARICETY® is indicated for the treatment of mild to moderate dementia of the Alzheimer's type. CONTRAINDICATIONS AND USAGE ARICETY® is indicated for the treatment of mild to moderate dementia of the Alzheimer's type. CONTRAINDICATIONS ARICETY® is contraindicated in patients with known hypersensitivity to donegaged succinification for to piperidine derivatives. WARRININGS Anesthesis: ARICETY® is a colinious because of their inhibitor. Silvey to eaggered succinifyorition-lay the mass deteadinor during earshesia. Canadicac conduction abnormalities. Shroped episodes have been reported in association with the use of ARICETY®. Gastrointestinal Conditions.\* Through their primary action, cholinesterase inhibitors may be expected to increase declined to increased cholinering cardity. Threetoe, patients should be monitored closely for symptoms of active or occult gestrointestinal bleeding, especially those at increased risk for developing ubers, e.g., those with a history of user disease or those receiving oncourrent norshore by patients and the properties of a predicated expected to increase generated and in-Inflammatory drugs (NSADIS). Clinical statistics of ARICETY® has shown no increase, relative to plazabo, in the incidence of either peptic user disease or gastrointestiral bleeding, especially those at increased risk for developing ubers, e.g. those with a sinsipy of user disease or those receiving oncourrent or many through the patients of the properties of the patients of

## Table 1. Most Frequent Adverse Events Leading to Withdrawal

from Controlled Clinical Trials by Dose Group					
Dose Group	Placebo	5 mg/day ARICEPT®	10 mg/day ARICEPT®		
Patients Randomized Event/% Discontinuing	355	350	315		

vomiting	<1%	<1%	2%
defined as those occurring at a by ARICEPT® 's cholinomimeti adverse events were often of mild There is evidence to sugges open-label study was conducte dose of 10 mg/day over a 6-we over one week in the controlled	frequency of at least 5% in patients c effects. These include nausea, dia intensity and transient, resolving dut it hat the frequency of these cor d with 269 patients who received p ek period. The rates of common adv	s receiving 10 mg/day and twice the arrhea, insomnia, vomiting, muscle ing continued ARICEPT® treatment mon adverse events may be a alacebo in the 15 and 30-week studerse events were lower than those e to those seen in patients on 5 m	P The most common adverse events, ne placebo rate, are largely predicted caren, fatigue and anorexia. These without the need for dose modification. Iffected by the rate of thration. An iffected by the rate of thration. An iffection in the seem of the properties. These patients were titrated to a seen in patients litrated to 10 mg/day g/day. See Table 2 for a comparison

Table 2. Comparison of Rates of Adverse Events in Patients

Titrated to 10 mg/day Over 1 and 6 Weeks					
	No titration		One week titration	Six week titration	
Adverse Event	Placebo (n=315)	5 mg/day (n=311)	10 mg/day (n=315)	10 mg/day (n=269)	
Nausea	6%	5%	19%	6%	
Diarrhea	5%	8%	15%	9%	
Insomnia	6%	6%	14%	6%	
Fatigue	3%	4%	8%	3%	
Vomiting	3%	3%	8%	5%	
Muscle cramps	2%	6%	8%	3%	
Δηρισονία	2%	3%	7%	3%	

Adverse Events Reported in Controlled Trials The events cited reflect experience gained under closely monitored conditions of clinical trials in a highly selected patient population. In actual clinical practice or in other clinical trials, these frequency estimates may not applicable as the conditions of use, reporting behavior, and the kinds of patients treated may differ. Table 3 lists treatment emergent signs and symptoms that were reported in at least 2% of patients in placebo-controlled trials who received ARICEPT® and for which the rate of occurrence was greater for ARICEPT® assigned than placebo assigned patients. In general, adverse events occurred more frequently in female patients and with advancing ace.



200337 Revised February 2005

R240147B © 2005 Eisai Inc. and Pfizer Inc. All rights reserved.