International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
SJIF (2020): 7.803

To Study Role of Vaginal Fluid Creatinine for the Detection of Premature Rupture of Membranes

D Singh[1], N Agarwal[2], S Arya[3], T Mahmood[4]

Abstract: ***Aim: To study role of vaginal fluid creatinine for the detection of premature rupture of membranes. Material & methods: A total of 80 pregnant women were enrolled in the study Group 1 (control group) consisted of 40 healthy women with no history of leaking per vaginum or leak detected per speculum or per vaginum examination and Group 2 (case group) consisted of 40 women with history of leaking per vaginum or leak detected per speculum or per vaginum examination. All patients were sampled for vaginal fluid creatinine by speculum examination. Sample processed. Vaginal fluid creatinine level was estimated& compared for its significance. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was used to establish the optimal cut-off concentrations for vaginal fluid creatinine, its cut off, accuracy, sensitivity & specificity. Result: The mean vaginal fluid creatinine in case group was 0.42+0.1 mg/dl and 0.18+0.08 mg/dl in control group respectively and its difference was statistically significant (p<0.001). The optimal cut off value was >0.25 mg/dl with 90% sensitivity, 87.5% specificity & 91.6% accuracy for diagnosis of PROM. Conclusion: Vaginal fluid creatinine is a rapid, simple, inexpensive, non-invasive & widely available test so that it can be easily incorporated in routine clinical use when the diagnostic dilemma of PROM is present.***

Keywords: creatinine, premature rupture of membranes, Prelabor rupture of membranes, PROM, PPROM, amniotic fluid

1. Introduction

Premature rupture of membranes (PROMs) constitutes one of the most important dilemmas which are difficult to diagnose in obstetric practice. Premature rupture of membranes is defined as spontaneous rupture of fetal membranes beyond 28 weeks of pregnancy but before the onset of uterine contractions. PROM is now known as Prelabour rupture of membranes. If PROM occurs before the 37 completed gestational week, it is called preterm PROM (PPROM) and accounts for about one fourth of all cases of ruptured membranes. [(1)] PROM occur in 8.0–10.0% of all pregnant women at term. A prolonged interval leads to increased maternal &fetal complications.60.0-80.0% of PROM happens in term pregnancies and 20.0-40.0% in pregnant women before the 37th week. [(1)] 3% of all pregnancies ends with PPROM, which results in about one third of all preterm deliveries in singleton pregnancies and it further increases in multiple pregnancies. [(2)]

Despite the advances in medicine and technology, PROM and especially PPROM are clinical condition associated with adverse prognosis of both the mother &fetus. Increased perinatal morbidity & mortality causes include prematurity, perinatal infections, umbilical cord compression, oligohydramnios, pulmonary immaturity. In addition, there are maternal risks such as increased caesarean section rate, choriodecidual infection, placental Abruption, retained placenta, endometritis, maternal sepsis & even death. Numerous risk factors are associated with PROM such as Smoking, history of sexually transmitted infections, lower socioeconomic status, vaginal bleeding, previous preterm delivery, polyhydramnios, multifetal pregnancy and after procedures like cerclage, and amniocentesis. [(3)] Current data suggest that in 47.0% of cases, clinicians are unsure about the diagnosis of PROM on the basis of patient history alone and clinical examination by sterile speculum examination. [(4)] A misdiagnosis often leads to a series of unnecessary or inappropriate interventions that may be harmful to both mother and fetus.

The conventional minimally invasive criterion for diagnosis of PROM is based on clinician's ability to see for three clinical signs on per sterile speculum examination:

1) Pooling of clear fluid seen in the posterior fornix of the vagina or leakage of the fluid seen coming through cervical os on per speculum examination.
2) Whether the discharge changes nitrazine paper from yellow to blue that indicate alkaline pH of cervico-vaginal discharge; and/or
3) Microscopic ferning seen on slide prepared from cervico vaginal discharge. [(5, 6)]

Although diagnosis of PROM can be easily made in the presence of obvious rupture of membranes while the conventional diagnostic interventions in suspected cases of PROM result in many false positive and false negative results that lead to unnecessary interventions such as hospital admission and induction of labor. [(7)]

Many biochemical diagnostic markers for PROM have been described, like measurement of vaginal PH, insulin growth factor binding protein-1 (IGFBP-1), fetal fibronectin tests, alpha fetoprotein (AFP), human chorionic gonadotropin (HCG), prolactin, creatinine, urea. [(5)] Amnisure test which detect PAMG-1 in cervicovaginal fluid has the best sensitivity and specificity. In spite of improved diagnostic potential of these markers, they have not become popular due to their high cost and complexity. [(5)]

The fetus starts to excrete urine in amniotic fluid at 8-10th weeks of gestation and fetal urine is major component in amniotic fluid in second half of pregnancy and therefore creatinine measurement can be done for diagnosis of premature rupture of membranes. [(8)]

The combination of traditionally non invasive methods of patient's history, per speculum examination, fern test and nitrazine test for assessment of patients with symptoms suggestive of PROM yields a sensitivity of only 93.0%. [(5)]

Sonography may be used to confirm PROM and may contribute in the diagnosis of PROM but is not 100% sensitive & specific. Vaginal bleeding, vaginal discharge, semen, and urine make the diagnosis of PROM difficult. [9] Despite the many advances in technology, diagnosis of PROM still needs integration of symptomatology, physical examination, laboratory testing.

The management of PROM patients remains controversial. Therefore, an accurate and early diagnosis of PROM becomes important to formulate management plan in these patients. [1, 8]

We hypothesized that vaginal fluid creatinine may be useful in diagnosis of PROM as fetal urine is the major source of amniotic fluid in the second half of pregnancy.

Aim

To study Role of vaginal fluid creatinine for the detection of pre mature rupture of membranes and to evaluate its reliability by comparison of creatinine level in vaginal fluid in both groups and to determine the cut off value of vaginal fluid creatinine and its clinical utility.

2. Material and Methods

This is a prospective case control study conducted on all patient presenting to the department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Shri ram murti Smarak institute of medical sciences, Bareilly in the labour room were recruited over a period of one and half years from November 2019 to April 2021.

Inclusion criteria

1) Antenatal women with single pregnancy
2) Gestational age between 37 to 42 weeks without fetal congenital anomaly
3) Without any severe medical illness

Exclusion criteria

1) PROM in patient having multiple pregnancy
2) Congenital fetal anomaly
3) Vaginal bleeding or spotting
4) History of vaginal infection
5) Meconium stained liquor
6) Intrauterine fetal demise
7) Women not willing to participate in the study

A **total** of **80** pregnant women who met above criteria were enrolled. Group 1 (Control group) consist of **40** healthy term pregnant women with no history of leaking per vaginum or leak detected per speculum or per vaginal examination and Group 2 (study group) consist of **40** pregnant women with clinical diagnosis of PROM with history of leaking per vaginum or confirmed leak detected on per speculum or per vaginal examination.

The Vaginal wash samples collected from subjects placed in the lithotomy position while maintaining good illumination. In the control group 3ml of sterile NS injected into the posterior fornix and the vaginal wash fluid aspirated using the same syringe. In the study group 5ml of sterile NS injected into the posterior fornix where leak was minimal and at least 3 ml of vaginal aspirate collected using the same syringe and directly fluid aspirated in which frank leak was present using syringe. Creatinine level was measured by Modified Jaffe chemical calorimetric method using the Mindray BS 480 analyser

3. Observations

Demographic Profile and clinical characteristics

Table 1: Comparison of Demographic Profile in both groups

Parameters Mean +SD/Percentage#	Groups		P value*
	Case (N=40)	Control (N=40)	
Age (years)	24.98+3.5	25.70+4.6	0.433
Gravida	1.68+0.9 (60%)	2.03 +1.1 (52.5%)	0.446
Parity	0.5+0.7	0.7+0.8	0.499
Occupation	Housewife (92.5%)	Housewife (90 %)	0.260
Socioeconomic status	Lower class (80 %)	Lower class (72.5 %)	0.431
Booking status	Booked (50%)	Booked (45%)	0.654
BMI (Kg/m^2)	23.3 + 2.2	22.7 +3.5	0.361
Gestational Age (weeks)	38.43 +1.2	39.0 +1.4	0.042

*Chi square test, # Independent sample t test

Majority of patients in both groups were in the age group of 21-25 years. Majority of patients in both groups were primigravida, housewives belonging to low socioeconomic status. Majority of mothers were in gestational age between 37-38+6 weeks in case group and 39-40+6 weeks in control group. The association was found to be non significant in above parameters in both groups (P>0.05)

Table 2: Comparison of clinical parameters in both groups

Parameters (Mean +SD) #	Groups		P value*
	Case (N=40)	Control (N=40)	
Pulse rate (BPM)	87.5±13.5	88.2±7.6	0.775
SBP (mmHg)	123.4±8.7	122.1±9.9	0.534
DBP (mmHg)	80.1±5.0	78.3±6.4	0.165
Temperature (Fahrenheit)	98.6±1.1	97.7±0.6	**<0.001**

*Chi square test, # Independent sample t tes

Comparative analysis of clinical parameters in both case & control groups did not show any statistical significance for pulse rate, respiratory rate and blood pressure. The mean temperature observed in case group was 98.6 F and 97.7 F in control group and this was calculated to have a p value of <0.001 which is highly significant.

Table 3: Comparison of blood parameters & AFI in both groups

Parameters (Mean +SD) #	Group		P value*
	Case (N=40)	Control (N=40)	
Hemoglobin (gm/dL)	11.2±1.4	10.8±1.5	0.221
TLC (cumm)	12014.0±2782.1	9399.90±2148.2	<0.001
Platelet count (×1000/mm^3)	216.98±26.70	199.03±27.87	0.004
AFI (cm) #	5.3±1.7	11.3±1.5	<0.001

*Chi square test, # Independent sample t test

Blood parameters like haemoglobin, TLC, DLC, platelet counts were studied in which TLC (cumm) count among the cases was found statistically significant in comparison to

control group with average TLC count of 12, 014 cumm in cases as against 9, 399.90 cumm in controls with p value of <0.001. The mean difference in platelet count in both the groups was statistically significant with average platelet count of 216.98 (x1000/ mm^3) in cases and 199.03 (x1000/ mm^3) in controls with p value of 0.004. Further investigation and studies are required considering the importance or significance of platelet, TLC, platelet/leucocyte ratio (PLR) as marker for prediction or diagnosis of PROM. On comparing mean difference of amniotic fluid index (AFI) it was observed to have significantly lower (p value <0.001) AFI value in case group than in the control group.

Table 4: Comparison and distribution of creatinine level in vaginal fluid in both groups

Vaginal fluid creatinine (mg/dl)	Group		P value*	P value*
	Case (N=40)	Control (N=40)		
<= 0.1	3 (7.5%)	15 (37.5%)	0.002	
0.11-0.2	1 (2.5%)	20 (50.0%)	<0.001	
0.21-0.3	7 (17.5%)	4 (10.0%)	0.329	
0.31-0.4	11 (27.5%)	1 (2.5%)	0.002	<0.001
>0.4	18 (45.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<0.001	
Mean±SD#	0.42±0.1	0.18±0.08	<0.001#	<0.001

*Chi square test, # Independent sample t test

In our study, the mean value of vaginal fluid creatinine was 0.42 ±0.1mg/dl in case group and0.18±0.08 mg/dl in control group respectively. The vaginal fluid creatinine in 90.0% of patients in case group was 0.21-0.4 mg/dl range and in 87.5% of patients in the control group, the range was 0.06-0.2 mg/dl. The difference in vaginal fluid creatinine was higher in study group as compared to control group and it was highly significant with p value of <0.001. On analysis of ROC curve, the sensitivity, specificity and accuracy of vaginal fluid creatinine for diagnosis of PROM was 90%, 87.5% and 91.6 % respectively with cut off value of > 0.25 mg/dl.





AFI in 5-9 cms range was noted in a majority of 67.5% patients in case group and only 4 10.0% in controls.10-14 cms amniotic fluid index was found in 90.0%of controls. AFI was found to have highly significant association between the groups. (<0.001).



Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was used to establish the optimal cut-off concentrations for vaginal fluid creatinine, hemoglobin, TLC and AFI. The sensitivity & the specificity of vaginal fluid creatinine to diagnose PROM (case) were 90% & 87.5% respectively. While it's overall accuracy was 91.6%, with a cut-off value > 0.25 mg/dl. The sensitivity & the specificity of amniotic fluid index (AFI) to diagnose PROM (case) were 97.5% & 92.5% respectively, while it's over all accuracywas 99.3% respectively, with a cut-off value of ≤ 7.5 cm. TLCaccuracy was 77.4%, with a cut-off value >9230/cumm, with sensitivity and specificity of 77.5% and 52.5% respectively. Other parameters platelet count and hemoglobin was poor predictor to diagnosis PROM with 82.5% and 52.5% sensitivity respectively and 60.0% and 57.5% specificity respectively.

4. Discussion

In our study, the mean maternal age of case group (with PROM) was 24.98±3.5 years and 25.70±4.6 years in control group (without PROM). The difference of mean was not significant between groups (P>0.05) with a range of 19-38 years. Similarly, Kariman N et alin their study also found the mean ages to be 26.25 ± 5.40, 25.46 ± 6.0 and 25.54 ± 4.69 in the confirmed PROM, suspected PROM and the healthy control group respectively. [(9)] Ghasemi M et al observed that average age of the study participants was 25.05+6 years in the confirmed PROM group and 25.85+5 years in the control group, with no statistically significant difference between the two groups. [(10)]

In our study, most of the women were primigravida in both groups i. e, 60% in case group and 52.5% in control group. The mean values of gravida was 1.68±0.9 of the case group, and mean value of gravida of control was 2.03±1.1. Paritywas 0.5±0.7 in cases and 0.7±0.8 in controls respectively. The P value was found to be not significant in both parameters between groups. These findings are in concordance with the study done by Kedar K et al who observed mean gravida status of the case group and the control group was 1.91 ± 0.83 and 2.04 ± 0.83 respectively and the p-value was observed to be > 0.05. [(11)] In our study, the mean gestational age in the case group was 38.43±1.2 weeks and in the control group was 39.0±1.4 weeks as per calculations from the dates of last menstrual period. As a result, no statistically significant difference between the groups was observed.

In our study the cases of low socioeconomic status were 80 % and middle socioeconomic status were 20%, and in control group 72.5 % in low socioeconomic status and 27.5 % in middle socioeconomic group, both groups were statistically not significant. Our study is comparable with the study by Shehla et al which is 68.23% and 31.77 % respectively. [(12)] Studies shown that risk of PROM increases with decrease antibacterial activity in the amniotic fluid of patients with low socio-economic status due to associated factors like malnutrition, over exertion, poor hygiene, stress,

high parity, recurrent UTI and anaemia. In our study, 50% of deliveries were booked and another 50% were unbooked in case group whereas 45 % deliveries were booked and 55 % were unbooked deliveries in control group. In our study, the only temperature parameter is significantly higher in case group than control (p<0.001) rest parameters were not significant. The mean value of temperature was 98.6+1.1F in case group and 97.7 + 0.6 F in control group. Similarly, Shruti Gupta et al showed maternal fever can be one of the clinical features present in patients with PROM. [13]

In our study, TLC (cumm) count among the cases was12014.0±2782.1 as against which TLC (cumm) count was 9399.90±2148.2 in the control group The mean difference of TLC was found significant difference in both groups (p<0.05). TLC accuracy was 77.4%, with a cut-off value >9230/cumm, with sensitivity and specificity was 77.5% and 52.5% respectively. WSereepapong et al showed that among women with or without chorioamnionitis with PROM, TLC count in case was 15, 000/cumm, sensitivity and specificity were 60 & 63 % respectively. [14]

In our study, the mean value of amniotic fluid index (AFI) was highly significant lower in the case group than in the control group (5.3±1.7 vs.11.3±1.5, p < 0.001). The sensitivity & the specificity of amniotic fluid index (AFI) to diagnose PROM (case) were 97.5% & 92.5% respectively, while it's over all accuracy, was 99.3% respectively, with a cut-off value of ≤ 7.5 cm. In our study, the mean value of amniotic fluid index (AFI) was significantly lower in the case group than in the control group (5.3±1.7 vs.11.3±1.5, p < 0.001). Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was used to establish the optimal cut-off concentrations for AFI. The sensitivity & the specificity of amniotic fluid index (AFI) to diagnose PROM (case) were 97.5% & 92.5% respectively, while it's over all accuracy was 99.3% respectively with a cut-off value of ≤ 7.5 cm. El-Garhy IT et al, the mean AFI was 4.30 ± 1.64 cm in group PROM. On the other hand, the mean AFI was 11.60 ± 2.60 cm in control group with highly significant difference between the two groups as regard AFI (P value < 0.001). [15]

In our study, and the mean value of vaginal fluid creatinine was significantly higher in study group than control group (0.42±0.1 vs.0.18±0.08, p < 0.001) respectively. The sensitivity & the specificity of vaginal fluid creatinine to diagnose PROM (case) were 90% & 87.5% respectively. While it's overall accuracy was 91.6% with a cut-off value > 0.25 mg/dl. In Kafaliand Oksuzlerstudy sensitivity, specificity, NPV and PPV were all 100% in detecting PROM by evaluation of vaginal fluid urea and creatinine concentration with cut off values of 12 and 0.6mg/dl respectively. [16] El-Garhy IT et al who found the mean vaginal fluid creatinine levels in PROM case and control groups using unpaired t test were 0.70 ± 0.88 mIU/ml and 0.04 ± 0.18 mIU/ml respectively. The difference was statistically significant (p value < 0.001) with sensitivity and specificity of 72% and 94% respectively. The cut off value was 0.25 mg/ dl which is comparable to our study cut off value of > 0.25 mg/dl. [15]

Table 5: Comparison of Mean+ SD, Sensitivity, Specificity, Cut off & P-value of various studies for vaginal fluid creatinine

Vaginal creatinine	Mean±SD		SENSITIVITY	SPECIFICITY	CUT OFF	P-VALUE
	CASE	CONTROL	%	%		
Gurbuz (2004)	0.2 ±0.01	0.1±0.12	100	100	0.12	<0.001
Kafali & Oksuzler(2007)	1.5±0.3	0.28±0.23	100	100	0.6	<0.001
Ghasemi(2016)	0.86±0.68	0.20±0.16	74.6	83	**0.25**	<0.001
Tigga MP & Malik S(2017)	0.27±0.31	0.12±0.09	100	92	>0.1641	<0.001
Gada MS(2018)	0.64±0.018	0.14±0.006	98	45	0.52	<0.001
Kedar K (2018)	1.22±0.28	0.36±0.26	100	91.25	0.668	<0.001
Urdaneta(2019)	1.09±0.35	0.36±0.17	78.3	78.7	**0.45**	<0.05
Veena Ramasamy(2020)	1.097±0.35	0.068±0.12	98.36	100	0.3	<0.001
Our study(2021)	0.4+0.1	0.18+0.08	90	87.5	**>0.25**	<0.001

5. Conclusion

In our study the vaginal fluid creatinine was significantly higher in study group in comparison to control group. The cut off value of >0.25 mg/dl was observed to establish a diagnosis of PROM. The specificity, sensitivity & accuracy of vaginal fluid creatinine was 87.5 %, 90 % & 91.6 % respectively indicating that it can be used as a biochemical marker for making a diagnosis of PROM. Vaginal fluid creatinine is a rapid, simple, inexpensive, noninvasive and widely available test, so that it can be easily incorporated in routine clinical use when the diagnostic dilemma of PROM is present. Moreover it can be used at primary health care settings. The lesser time taken to establish an accurate

diagnosis would ensure prompt treatment and favourable maternal and fetal outcome. In patients with insignificant leaking and decreased AFI, vaginal fluid creatinine estimation may be useful for definitive diagnosis & institute appropriate management. Our study thereby indicates that estimating vaginal fluid creatinine levels may be useful to make an accurate diagnosis of PROM even at rural health care facilities and ensure early referral to tertiary care centres if needed. It is definitely a possible alternative to conventional method and other biochemical markers for screening and diagnosis of PROM. It can probably become gold standard for diagnosis of PROM. The difference in the cut-off levels between the various studies may be attributed to the different sample sizes, inclusion criteria and the gestational age of studied patients. This study suggest further studies can be taken up with different gestational age groups for determination of cut-off value of vaginal fluid creatinine for diagnosing rupture of membranes in pregnancy.

References

[1] ACOG Committee on Practice Bulletins-Obstetrics. ACOG Practice Bulletin No.80: premature rupture of membranes. Clinical management guidelines for obstetrician-gynecologists. Obstet Gynecol.2007 Apr; 109 (4): 1007-19.
[2] Mercer BM. Preterm premature rupture of the membranes: current approaches to evaluation and management. ObstetGynecol Clin North Am.2005 Sep; 32 (3): 411-28.
[3] Sharma A, Sharma R, Agarwal T. Evaluation of urea and creatinine levels in vaginal wash fluid for the diagnosis of premature rupture of membranes. Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol.2020 Aug; 9 (8): 3449-57.
[4] Neil P & Wallace E. Is AmniSure useful in the management of women with prelabor rupture of membranes? Aust N Z J Obstet Gynecol.2010 Dec; 50 (6): 534-8.
[5] Caughey AB, Robinson JN, Norwitz ER. Contemporary diagnosis and management of preterm premature rupture of membranes. Rev ObstetGynecol 2008; 1 (1): 11-22.
[6] Park JS, Lee Si E, Norwitz ER. Non-invasive Testing for Rupture of the Fetal Membranes. US ObstetGynaecol.2007; 1 (1): 13-6.
[7] Kim YH, park YW, kwon HS, Kwon JY, Kim BJ. Vaginal fluid ß-Human chorionic gonadotropin level in the diagnosis of premature rupture of membranes. Acta ObstetGynecolScand.2005 Aug; 84 (8): 802-805.
[8] 8.11. Erdemoglu E, Mungan T. Significance of detecting insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1 in cervicovaginal secretions: comparison with nitrazine test and amniotic fluid volume assessment. Acta ObstetGynecol Scand.2004 Jul; 83 (7): 622-6. .
[9] Kariman N, Afrakhte M, Hedayati M, Fallahian M, AlaviMajd H. Diagnosis of premature rupture of membranes by assessment of urea and creatinine in vaginal washing fluid. IJRM.2013; 11 (2): 93-0.
[10] Ghasemi M, Jaami R, Alleyassin A, et al. The value of urea, creatinine, prolactin and beta sub-unit of human chorionic gonadotropin of vaginal fluid in the diagnosis of premature preterm rupture of membranes in pregnancy. Turk J ObstetGynecol.2016; 13 (2): 62-6.
[11] Kedar K, Patil J, Nimkar S. Urea and creatinine levels in vaginal fluid-a reliable marker for prelabour rupture of membranes. Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences.2018 Mar; 7 (20): 2456-2459.
[12] Shehla Noor, Ali Fawwad, Rubina Bashir, Ruqqia Sultana. Prevalence of PROM and its outcome. Journal of Ayub Medical College, Abbottabad.2007; 19 (4): 14-7.
[13] Shruti Gupta, Sunita Malik, Shailesh Gupta. Neonatal complications in women with premature rupture of membranes (PROM) at term and near term and its correlation with time lapsed since PROM to delivery. SAGE journal.2020; 50 (1): 8-11.
[14] Sereepapong W, Limpongsanurak S, Triratanachat S, Wannakrairot P, Charuruks N, Krailadsiri P. The role of maternal serum C-reactive protein and white blood cell count in the prediction of chorioamnionitis in women with premature rupture of membranes. J Med Assoc Thai.2001 Jun; 84.
[15] El-Garhy IT, Sabry NM, Abdel-Gahfar MA, Ahmed AA. Detection of Creatinine in Vaginal Fluid for Diagnosis of Preterm Premature Rupture of Membranes. The Egyptian Journal of Hospital Medicine.2019; 75 (5): 2894-2899.
[16] Kafali H, Oksüzler C. Vaginal fluid urea and creatinine in diagnosis of premature rupture of membranes. Arch Gynecol Obstet.2007 Mar; 275 (3): 157-60.