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Shoulder Dystocia

This is the second edition of this guideline. The first edition was published in 2005 under the same title.

1. Background

Shoulder dystocia is defined as a vaginal cephalic delivery that requires additional obstetric manoeuvres to deliver the fetus after the head has delivered and gentle traction has failed. An objective diagnosis of a prolongation of head-to-body delivery time of more than 60 seconds has also been proposed but these data are not routinely collected. Shoulder dystocia occurs when either the anterior, or less commonly the posterior, fetal shoulder impacts on the maternal symphysis, or sacral promontory, respectively.

There is a wide variation in the reported incidence of shoulder dystocia. Studies involving the largest number of vaginal deliveries (34,800 to 267,228) report incidences between 0.58% and 0.70%.

There can be significant perinatal morbidity and mortality associated with the condition, even when it is managed appropriately. Maternal morbidity is increased, particularly the incidence of postpartum haemorrhage (11%) as well as third and fourth-degree perineal tears (3.8%). Their incidences remain unchanged by the number or type of manoeuvres required to effect delivery.

Brachial plexus injury (BPI) is one of the most important fetal complications of shoulder dystocia, complicating 2.3% to 16% of such deliveries.

Most cases of BPI resolve without permanent disability, with fewer than 10% resulting in permanent neurological dysfunction. In the UK and Ireland, the incidence of BPI was 0.43 per 1000 live births. However, this may be an underestimate as the data were collected by paediatricians, and some babies with early resolution of their BPI might have been missed.

There is evidence to suggest that where shoulder dystocia occurs, larger infants are more likely to suffer a permanent BPI after shoulder dystocia.

A retrospective review of all BPIs in one American hospital reported an incidence of 1 in 1000 births, with a permanent injury rate of 0.1 per 1000. Another review of 33 international studies reported an incidence of BPI of 1.4 in 1000 births, with a permanent injury rate of 0.2 per 1000 births.

Neonatal BPI is the most common cause for litigation related to shoulder dystocia and the third most litigated obstetric-related complication in the UK.

The NHSLA (NHS Litigation Authority) has reported that 46% of the injuries were associated with substandard care. However, they also emphasised that not all injuries are due to excess traction by healthcare professionals, and there is a significant body of evidence suggesting that maternal propulsive force may contribute to some of these injuries.

Moreover, a substantial minority of BPIs are not associated with clinically evident shoulder dystocia. In one series, 4% of injuries occurred after a caesarean section, and in another series 12% of babies with a BPI were born after an uncomplicated caesarean section. When BPI is discussed legally, it is important to determine whether the affected shoulder was anterior or posterior at the time of delivery, because damage to the plexus of the posterior shoulder is considered unlikely to be due to action by the healthcare professional.
2. **Purpose and scope**

The purpose of this guideline is to review the current evidence regarding the possible prediction, prevention and management of shoulder dystocia; it does not cover primary prevention of fetal macrosomia associated with gestational diabetes mellitus. The guideline provides guidance for skills training for the management of shoulder dystocia, but the practical manoeuvres are not described in detail. These can be found in standard textbooks and course manuals such as PROMPT (PRactical Obstetric Multi-Professional Training), ALSO (Advanced Life Support in Obstetrics), MOET (Managing Obstetric Emergencies and Trauma) and others.

3. **Identification and assessment of evidence**

This RCOG guideline was revised in accordance with standard methodology for producing RCOG Green-top Guidelines. A search was performed in the OVID database, which included Medline, Embase, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, the Cochrane Control Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), the Database of Abstracts of Reviews and Effects (DARE), the ACP Journal Club, the National Guidelines Clearing House and the Confidential Enquiry into Maternal and Child Health (CEMACH) reports. The search was restricted to articles published between January 1980 and May 2011 and limited to humans and the English language. Search terms included: 'shoulder dystocia', 'macrosomia', 'McRoberts' manoeuvre', 'obstetric manoeuvres', 'complications, labour/delivery', 'brachial plexus injury', 'Erb’s palsy', 'Klumpke’s palsy', 'symphysisotony', 'Zavanelli manoeuvre', 'skill drills', 'rehearsal of obstetric emergencies' and 'medical simulation'. Reference lists of the articles identified were hand-searched for additional articles and some experts within the field were contacted. Relevant key original papers published prior to 1980 were also obtained and are referenced within this guideline.

Owing to the emergency nature of the condition, most published series examining procedures for the management of shoulder dystocia are retrospective case series or case reports. Areas lacking evidence are annotated as good practice points.

4. **Prediction**

4.1 *Can shoulder dystocia be predicted?*

Clinicians should be aware of existing risk factors in labouring women and must always be alert to the possibility of shoulder dystocia.

Risk assessments for the prediction of shoulder dystocia are insufficiently predictive to allow prevention of the large majority of cases.

A number of antenatal and intrapartum characteristics have been reported to be associated with shoulder dystocia (table 1), but statistical modelling has shown that these risk factors have a low positive predictive value, both singly and in combination. Conventional risk factors predicted only 16% of shoulder dystocia that resulted in infant morbidity. There is a relationship between fetal size and shoulder dystocia, but it is not a good predictor: partly because fetal size is difficult to determine accurately, but also because the large majority of infants with a birth weight of ≥4500g do not develop shoulder dystocia. Equally important, 48% of births complicated by shoulder dystocia occur with infants who weigh less than 4000g. Infants of diabetic mothers have a two- to four-fold increased risk of shoulder dystocia compared with infants of the same birth weight born to non-diabetic mothers.

A retrospective case-control study to develop a predictive model of risk for shoulder dystocia with injury was published in 2006. The authors reported that the best combination of variables to identify neonatal injury associated with shoulder dystocia were maternal height and weight, gestational age and parity and birthweight.
A score over 0.5 detected 50.7% of the shoulder dystocia cases with BPI, with a false positive rate of 2.7%. However, the statistical modelling for this prediction tool was based on actual birth weight and not estimated fetal weight. Clinical fetal weight estimation is unreliable and third-trimester ultrasound scans have at least a 10% margin for error for actual birth weight and a sensitivity of just 60% for macrosomia (over 4.5 kg). The use of shoulder dystocia prediction models cannot therefore be recommended.

Table 1. Factors associated with shoulder dystocia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-labour</th>
<th>Intrapartum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous shoulder dystocia</td>
<td>Prolonged first stage of labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrosomia &gt;4.5 kg</td>
<td>Secondary arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>Prolonged second stage of labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal body mass index &gt;30kg/m²</td>
<td>Oxytocin augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of labour</td>
<td>Assisted vaginal delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Prevention of shoulder dystocia**

5.1 **Management of suspected fetal macrosomia**

5.1.1 Does induction of labour prevent shoulder dystocia?

Induction of labour does not prevent shoulder dystocia in non-diabetic women with a suspected macrosomic fetus.

Induction of labour at term can reduce the incidence of shoulder dystocia in women with gestational diabetes.

There are a number of evidence-based reviews that have demonstrated that early induction of labour for women with suspected fetal macrosomia, who do not have gestational diabetes, does not improve either maternal or fetal outcome.

A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials of the effect of treatment in women with gestational diabetes concluded that the incidence of shoulder dystocia is reduced with early induction of labour.

The NICE diabetes guideline recommends that pregnant women with diabetes who have a normally grown fetus should be offered elective birth through induction of labour, or by elective caesarean section if indicated, after 38 completed weeks.

5.1.2 Should elective caesarean section be recommended for suspected fetal macrosomia to prevent brachial plexus injury (BPI)?

Elective caesarean section should be considered to reduce the potential morbidity for pregnancies complicated by pre-existing or gestational diabetes, regardless of treatment, with an estimated fetal weight of greater than 4.5 kg.

Infants of diabetic mothers have a two- to four-fold increased risk of shoulder dystocia compared with infants of the same birth weight born to non-diabetic mothers. A decision-analysis model estimated that in diabetic women with an EFW > 4.5 kg, 443 caesarean sections would need to be performed to prevent one permanent BPI. In comparison, 3695 caesarean sections would be required to prevent one permanent BPI in the non-diabetic population.
Estimation of fetal weight is unreliable and the large majority of infants over 4.5 kg do not experience shoulder dystocia. In the USA, a decision-analysis model estimated that in non-diabetic women with an EFW of >4 kg, an additional 23-45 caesarean deliveries would be required, at a cost of US$4.9 million, to prevent one permanent injury from shoulder dystocia. However, there is some difficulty in grouping all fetuses with an expected weight of >4.5 kg together: some fetuses will be much larger than this. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) has recommended that an estimated fetal weight of over 5 kg should prompt consideration of delivery by caesarean section, inaccuracy of methods of fetal size estimation notwithstanding.

The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence states that ‘ultrasound estimation of fetal size for suspected large-for-gestational-age unborn babies should not be undertaken in a low-risk population’.

5.2 What are the recommendations for future pregnancy?

What is the appropriate mode of delivery for the woman with a previous episode of shoulder dystocia?

Either caesarean section or vaginal delivery can be appropriate after a previous shoulder dystocia. The decision should be made jointly by the woman and her carers.

The rate of shoulder dystocia in women who have had a previous shoulder dystocia has been reported to be 10 times higher than the rate in the general population. There is a reported recurrence rate of shoulder dystocia of between 1% and 25%. However, this may be an underestimate owing to selection bias, as caesarean section might have been advocated for pregnancies after severe shoulder dystocia, particularly with a neonatal poor outcome.

There is no requirement to recommend elective caesarean birth routinely but factors such as the severity of any previous neonatal or maternal injury, predicted fetal size and maternal choice should all be considered and discussed with the woman and her family when making plans for the next delivery.

6. Management of shoulder dystocia

6.1 Preparation in labour: what measures should be taken when shoulder dystocia is anticipated?

All birth attendants should be aware of the methods for diagnosing shoulder dystocia and the techniques required to facilitate delivery.

6.2 How is shoulder dystocia diagnosed?

Birth attendants should routinely look for the signs of shoulder dystocia.

Timely management of shoulder dystocia requires prompt recognition. The attendant health carer should routinely observe for:
- difficulty with delivery of the face and chin
- the head remaining tightly applied to the vulva or even retracting (turtle-neck sign)
- failure of restitution of the fetal head
- failure of the shoulders to descend.

Routine traction in an axial direction can be used to diagnose shoulder dystocia but any other traction should be avoided.
Routine traction is defined as ‘that traction required for delivery of the shoulders in a normal vaginal delivery where there is no difficulty with the shoulders’. Axial traction is traction in line with the fetal spine i.e. without lateral deviation.

Evidence from cadaver studies suggests that lateral and downward traction, and rapidly applied traction, are more likely to cause nerve avulsion. In a Swedish series, downward traction on the fetal head was strongly associated with obstetric BPI, and had been employed in all cases of residual BPI at 18 months old. Therefore, downward traction on the fetal head should be avoided in the management of all births.

There is no evidence that the use of the McRoberts’ manoeuvre before delivery of the fetal head prevents shoulder dystocia. Therefore, prophylactic McRoberts’ positioning before delivery of the fetal head is not recommended to prevent shoulder dystocia.

6.3.1 How should shoulder dystocia be managed?

Shoulder dystocia should be managed systematically (see appendix 1).

Immediately after recognition of shoulder dystocia, additional help should be called.

The problem should be stated clearly as ‘this is shoulder dystocia’ to the arriving team.

Fundal pressure should not be used.

McRoberts’ manoeuvre is a simple, rapid and effective intervention and should be performed first.

Suprapubic pressure should be used to improve the effectiveness of the McRoberts’ manoeuvre.

An episiotomy is not always necessary.

The Confidential Enquiry into Stillbirths and Deaths in Infancy (CESDI) report on shoulder dystocia identified that 47% of the babies that died did so within five minutes of the head being delivered; however, in a very high proportion of cases, the fetus had a pathological cardiotocograph (CTG) prior to the shoulder dystocia. A group from Hong Kong have recently reported that in their series there was a very low rate of hypoxic ischaemic injury if the head-to-body delivery time was less than five minutes. It is important, therefore, to manage the problem as efficiently as possible to avoid hypoxic acidosis, and as carefully as possible to avoid unnecessary trauma.

Managing shoulder dystocia according to the RCOG algorithm (see appendix 2) has been associated with improved perinatal outcomes.

Help should be summoned immediately. In a hospital setting, this should include further midwifery assistance, including the labour ward coordinator or an equivalent experienced midwife, an experienced obstetrician, a neonatal resuscitation team and an anaesthetist.

Stating the problem early has been associated with improvements in outcomes in shoulder dystocia and improved performance in other obstetric emergencies.

Maternal pushing should be discouraged, as this may exacerbate impaction of the shoulders.

Fundal pressure should not be used during the management of shoulder dystocia. It is associated with a high neonatal complication rate and may result in uterine rupture.
The McRoberts’ manoeuvre is flexion and abduction of the maternal hips, positioning the maternal thighs on her abdomen. It straightens the lumbosacral angle, rotates the maternal pelvis towards the mother’s head and increases the relative anterior-posterior diameter of the pelvis. The McRoberts’ manoeuvre is an effective intervention, with reported success rates as high as 90%. It has a low rate of complication and is one of the least invasive manoeuvres, and therefore, if possible, should be employed first.

The woman should be laid flat and any pillows should be removed from under her back. With one assistant on either side, the woman’s legs should be hyperflexed. If the woman is in the lithotomy position, her legs will need to be removed from the supports. Routine traction (the same degree of traction applied during a normal delivery) in an axial direction should then be applied to the fetal head to assess whether the shoulders have been released.

If the anterior shoulder is not released with the McRoberts’ position and routine axial traction, another manoeuvre should be attempted.

Suprapubic pressure can be employed together with the McRoberts’ manoeuvre to improve success rates. Suprapubic pressure reduces the fetal bisacromial diameter and rotates the anterior fetal shoulder into the wider oblique pelvic diameter. The shoulder is then freed to slip underneath the symphysis pubis with the aid of routine axial traction.

Suprapubic pressure should ideally be applied by an assistant from the side of the fetal back in a downward and lateral direction just above the maternal symphysis pubis. This reduces the fetal bisacromial diameter by pushing the posterior aspect of the anterior shoulder towards the fetal chest. There is no clear difference in efficacy between continuous pressure and ‘rocking’ movement. Only routine traction should be applied to the fetal head when assessing whether the manoeuvre has been successful. Again, if the anterior shoulder is not released with suprapubic pressure and routine traction, then another manoeuvre should be attempted.

An episiotomy will not relieve the bony obstruction of shoulder dystocia but may be required to allow the healthcare professional more space to facilitate internal vaginal manoeuvres. The use of an episiotomy does not decrease the risk of BPI with shoulder dystocia.

An episiotomy should therefore only be considered if internal vaginal access of the healthcare professional’s whole hand cannot easily be achieved to facilitate manoeuvres such as delivery of the posterior arm or internal rotation of the shoulders.

6.3.2 What measures should be undertaken if simple techniques fail?

Internal manoeuvres or ‘all-fours’ position should be used if the McRoberts’ manoeuvre and suprapubic pressure fail.

If simple measures (the McRoberts’ manoeuvre and suprapubic pressure) fail, then there is a choice to be made between the all-fours position and internal manipulation.

Gaining access to the vagina for internal manoeuvres: the most spacious part of the pelvis is in the sacral hollow; therefore vaginal access should be gained posteriorly, into the sacral hollow. The whole hand should be entered posteriorly to perform internal rotation or delivery of the posterior arm. The woman should be brought to the end of the bed, or the end of the bed should be removed, to make vaginal access easier. Delivery can then be facilitated by rotation into an oblique diameter or when possible by a full 180 degree rotation of the fetal trunk or by delivery of the posterior arm.
Internal rotational manoeuvres were originally described by Woods\textsuperscript{64} and Rubin.\textsuperscript{63} Rotation can be most easily achieved by pressing on the anterior or posterior aspect of the posterior shoulder. Pressure on the posterior aspect of the posterior shoulder has the additional benefit of reducing the shoulder diameter by adducting the shoulders.\textsuperscript{63} The shoulders should be rotated into the wider oblique diameter, resolving the shoulder dystocia. If pressure on the posterior shoulder is unsuccessful, an attempt should be made to apply pressure on the posterior aspect of the anterior shoulder to adduct and rotate the shoulders into the oblique diameter.

Delivering the posterior arm reduces the diameter of the fetal shoulders by the width of the arm. The fetal wrist should be grasped and the posterior arm should be gently withdrawn from the vagina in a straight line.\textsuperscript{62} Delivery of the posterior arm is associated with humeral fractures with a reported incidence between 2% and 12%,\textsuperscript{11} but the neonatal trauma may be a reflection of the refractory nature of the case, rather than the procedure itself.\textsuperscript{8}

There are no randomised comparative studies available comparing delivery of the posterior arm and internal rotation. Some authors favour delivery of the posterior arm over other manoeuvres,\textsuperscript{59,66} particularly where the mother is large.\textsuperscript{67} Others have reported that rotational methods and posterior arm delivery were similarly successful, but rotational manoeuvres were associated with reductions in both BPI and humeral fractures\textsuperscript{68} compared to delivery of the posterior arm. Therefore, healthcare professionals should base their decision on their training, clinical experience and the prevailing circumstances.

‘All-fours’ technique: the ‘all-fours’ position has been described, with an 83% success rate in one case series.\textsuperscript{69}

The individual circumstances should guide the healthcare professional as to whether to try the ‘all-fours’ technique before or after attempting internal rotation and delivery of the posterior arm. For a slim mobile woman without epidural anaesthesia and with a single midwifery attendant, the ‘all-fours’ position is probably more appropriate, and clearly this may be a useful option in a community setting. For a less mobile woman with epidural anaesthesia in place, internal manoeuvres are more appropriate.

6.3.3 Persistent failure of first- and second-line manoeuvres: what measures should be taken if first- and second-line manoeuvres fail?

Third-line manoeuvres should be considered very carefully to avoid unnecessary maternal morbidity and mortality, particularly by inexperienced practitioners.

It is difficult to recommend an absolute time limit for the management of shoulder dystocia as there are no conclusive data available, but there appears to be a very low rate of hypoxic ischaemic injury up to five minutes.\textsuperscript{51}

Several third-line methods have been described for those cases resistant to all standard measures. These include cleidotomy (surgical division of the clavicle or bending with a finger), symphysiotomy (dividing the anterior fibres of symphyseal ligament) and the Zavanelli manoeuvre. It is rare that these are required.

Vaginal replacement of the head (Zavanelli manoeuvre), and then delivery by caesarean section has been described\textsuperscript{70,71} but success rates vary.\textsuperscript{72} Intuitively, the Zavanelli manoeuvre may be most appropriate for rare bilateral shoulder dystocia, where both the shoulders impact on the pelvic inlet, anteriorly above the pubic symphysis and posteriorly on the sacral promontory. The maternal safety of this procedure is unknown, however, and this should be borne in mind, knowing that a high proportion of fetuses have irreversible hypoxia-acidosis by this stage, and it may not reduce the risk of BPI.\textsuperscript{73}
Similarly, symphysiotomy has been suggested as a potentially useful procedure, both in the developing and developed world. However, there is a high incidence of serious maternal morbidity and poor neonatal outcome. Serious consideration should be given to these facts, particularly where practitioners are not trained in the technique.

Other techniques, including the use of a posterior axillary sling, have been recently reported but there are few data available.

6.4 What is the optimal management of the woman and baby after shoulder dystocia?

Birth attendants should be alert to the possibility of postpartum haemorrhage and severe perineal tears.

There is significant maternal morbidity associated with shoulder dystocia, particularly postpartum haemorrhage (11%) and third and fourth degree perineal tears (3.8%). Other reported complications include vaginal lacerations, cervical tears, bladder rupture, uterine rupture, symphyseal separation, sacroiliac joint dislocation and lateral femoral cutaneous neuropathy.

The baby should be examined for injury by a neonatal clinician.

BPI is one of the most important complications of shoulder dystocia, complicating 2.3% to 16% of such deliveries.

Other reported fetal injuries associated with shoulder dystocia include fractures of the humerus and clavicle, pneumothoraces and hypoxic brain damage.

An explanation of the delivery should be given to the parents (see section 9).

7. Risk management

7.1 Training

7.1.1 What are the recommendations for training?

All maternity staff should participate in shoulder dystocia training at least annually.

The fifth CESDI report recommended that a ‘high level of awareness and training for all birth attendants’ should be observed. Annual ‘skill drills’, including shoulder dystocia, are recommended jointly by both the Royal College of Midwives and the RCOG and are one of the requirements in the Clinical Negligence Scheme for Trusts (CNST) maternity standards.

Where training has been associated with improvements in neonatal outcome, all staff received annual training.

One study looked at retention of skill for up to one year following training using simulation. If staff had the ability to manage a severe shoulder dystocia immediately following training, the ability to deliver tended to be maintained at one year.

7.1.2 What is the evidence for the effectiveness of shoulder dystocia training?

Practical shoulder dystocia training has been shown to improve knowledge, confidence and management of simulated shoulder dystocia. Training has also been shown to improve the patients’ perception of their care during simulated shoulder dystocia.
The effect of training on actual perinatal outcomes have been variable: an eight year retrospective review of shoulder dystocia management before and after the introduction of annual shoulder dystocia training for all staff in one UK hospital demonstrated a significant reduction in neonatal injury at birth following shoulder dystocia (9.3% pre-training, 2.3% post-training).\textsuperscript{14} There are other reports of improvements after training,\textsuperscript{15,95} although in one recent USA study\textsuperscript{95} there was increase in the caesarean section rate - from a pre-training rate of 29.90% to a post-training rate of 40.14% - which could account for at least some of the effect.

However, training has also been associated with no change in outcome\textsuperscript{96} or even deterioration in neonatal outcome;\textsuperscript{97} hospitals should therefore monitor the neonatal injury rate after the introduction of training to ensure it is effective.

### 7.1.3 What measures can be taken to ensure optimal management of shoulder dystocia?

- **Manoeuvres should be demonstrated in direct view, as they are complex and difficult to understand by description alone.**

- **Higher fidelity training equipment should be used.**

Practical training using mannequins has been associated with improvements in management in simulation\textsuperscript{96,95} and in real life.\textsuperscript{14}

The largest trial of shoulder dystocia training found that before training only 43% of midwives and doctors could successfully manage a severe shoulder dystocia simulation within five minutes.\textsuperscript{93} Three weeks after a 40 minute simulation training session 83% of staff were able to successfully complete the delivery. Training on a high fidelity mannequin was more successful than training with lower fidelity rag doll and pelvis - with a significantly higher successful delivery rate (95% versus 72%), a shorter head-to-body interval and a lower total applied force successful delivery rate.\textsuperscript{94}

Moreover, the traction used in simulated shoulder dystocia can be excessive\textsuperscript{98,99} but training using models with force monitoring can reduce the traction used in simulated shoulder dystocia.\textsuperscript{98,100,101}

Shoulder dystocia training associated with improvements in clinical management and neonatal outcomes was multi-professional, with manoeuvres demonstrated and practiced on a high fidelity mannequin.\textsuperscript{14} Teaching used the RCOG algorithm (see appendix 2) rather than staff being taught mnemonics (e.g. HELPERR) or eponyms (e.g. Rubin’s and Woods’ screw).

### 7.2 Documentation

**Documentation should be accurate and comprehensive.**

The sixth CESDI annual report highlighted inadequate documentation in obstetrics, with potential medicolegal consequences.\textsuperscript{102} Poor documentation of shoulder dystocia management has been highlighted\textsuperscript{103,104} and it has been suggested that documentation should be included in shoulder dystocia training.\textsuperscript{105} The use of a structured pro forma has been suggested to improve accurate record keeping in the clinical setting\textsuperscript{105} and there is some evidence that they are effective.\textsuperscript{106}

An example is provided in appendix 3.

It is important to record within the birth record the:
- time of delivery of the head and time of delivery of the body
- anterior shoulder at the time of the dystocia
● manoeuvres performed, their timing and sequence  
● maternal perineal and vaginal examination  
● estimated blood loss  
● staff in attendance and the time they arrived  
● general condition of the baby (Apgar score)  
● umbilical cord blood acid-base measurements  
● neonatal assessment of the baby.
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Figure 1. The McRoberts' manoeuvre (from the SaFE study)

Figure 2. Suprapubic pressure (from SaFE study)

Figure 3. Delivery of the posterior arm (from the SaFE study)
Algorithm for the management of Shoulder Dystocia

CALL FOR HELP
Midwife Coordinator, additional midwifery help, experienced obstetrician, neonatal team and anaesthetist

Discourage pushing
Lie flat and move buttocks to edge of bed

McROBERTS’ MANOEUVRE
(Thighs to abdomen)

SUPRAPUBIC PRESSURE
(and routine axial traction)

Consider episiotomy if it will make internal manoeuvres easier
Try either manoeuvre first depending on clinical circumstances and operator experience

DEIVER POSTERIOR ARM

INTERNAL ROTATIONAL MANOEUVRES

Inform consultant obstetrician and anaesthetist

If above manoeuvres fail to release impacted shoulders, consider
ALL FOURS POSITION (if appropriate)
OR
Repeat all the above again

Consider cleidotomy, Zavanelli manoeuvre or symphysiotomy

Baby to be reviewed by neonatologist after birth and referred for Consultant Neonatal review if any concerns

DOCUMENT ALL ACTIONS ON PROFORMA AND COMPLETE CLINICAL INCIDENT REPORTING FORM.
APPENDIX 3

SHOULDER DYSTOCIA DOCUMENTATION

Date .................................................  Mother’s Name .........................................................
Time ......................................................  Date of birth .........................................................
Person completing form .................  Designation .................  Hospital Number .........................................................
Signature ..........................................................  Consultant .........................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Called for help at:</th>
<th>Emergency call via switchboard at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff present at delivery of head:</th>
<th>Additional staff attending for delivery of shoulders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures used to assist delivery</th>
<th>By whom</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Reason if not performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McRoberts’ position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suprapubic pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episiotomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of posterior arm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal rotational manoeuvre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of rotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of traction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other manoeuvres used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of delivery of head</th>
<th>Spontaneous</th>
<th>Instrumental – vacuum / forceps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of delivery of head</td>
<td>Time of delivery of baby</td>
<td>Head-to-body delivery interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetal position during dystocia</td>
<td>Head facing maternal left</td>
<td>Head facing maternal right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth weight</td>
<td>kg</td>
<td>Apgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cord gases</td>
<td>Art pH :</td>
<td>Art BE :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation to parents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>By</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neonologist called?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Neonologist arrived:</th>
<th>..................</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>...........................................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If neonatologist not called or didn’t arrive, give reason:</td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baby assessment after birth (maybe done by M/W):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any sign of arm weakness?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any sign of potential bony fracture?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby admitted to Neonatal Intensive Care Unit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by ..................................................</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes to any of these questions for review and follow up by Consultant neonatologist

Please copy x 2 copies: x1 maternal notes, x1 attached to AIMS form.
**APPENDIX 4**

Clinical guidelines are ‘systematically developed statements which assist clinicians and women in making decisions about appropriate treatment for specific conditions’. Each guideline is systematically developed using a standardised methodology. Exact details of this process can be found in Clinical Governance Advice No.1: Development of RCOG Green-top Guidelines (available on the RCOG website at http://www.rcog.org.uk/guidelines). These recommendations are not intended to dictate an exclusive course of management or treatment. They must be evaluated with reference to individual patient needs, resources and limitations unique to the institution and variations in local populations. It is hoped that this process of local ownership will help to incorporate these guidelines into routine practice. Attention is drawn to areas of clinical uncertainty where further research might be indicated.

The evidence used in this guideline was graded using the scheme below and the recommendations formulated in a similar fashion with a standardised grading scheme.

### Classification of evidence levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1++</td>
<td>High-quality meta-analyses, systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials or randomised controlled trials with a very low risk of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>Well-conducted meta-analyses, systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials or randomised controlled trials with a low risk of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Meta-analyses, systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials or randomised controlled trials with a high risk of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2++</td>
<td>High-quality systematic reviews of case-control or cohort studies or high-quality case-control or cohort studies with a very low risk of confounding, bias or chance and a high probability that the relationship is causal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>Well-conducted case-control or cohort studies with a low risk of confounding, bias or chance and a moderate probability that the relationship is causal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Case-control or cohort studies with a high risk of confounding, bias or chance and a significant risk that the relationship is not causal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-analytical studies, e.g. case reports, case series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expert opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grades of recommendations

- **A** At least one meta-analysis, systematic review or randomised controlled trial rated as 1++ and directly applicable to the target population; or
- A systematic review of randomised controlled trials or a body of evidence consisting principally of studies rated as 1+ directly applicable to the target population and demonstrating overall consistency of results
- **B** A body of evidence including studies rated as 2++ directly applicable to the target population, and demonstrating overall consistency of results; or
- Extrapolated evidence from studies rated as 1++ or 1+
- **C** A body of evidence including studies rated as 2+ directly applicable to the target population and demonstrating overall consistency of results; or
- Extrapolated evidence from studies rated as 2++
- **D** Evidence level 3 or 4; or
- Extrapolated evidence from studies rated as 2+

### Good practice point

- Recommended best practice based on the clinical experience of the guideline development group
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DISCLAIMER

The Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists produces guidelines as an educational aid to good clinical
practice. They present recognised methods and techniques of clinical practice, based on published evidence, for
consideration by obstetricians and gynaecologists and other relevant health professionals. The ultimate judgement
regarding a particular clinical procedure or treatment plan must be made by the doctor or other attendant in the light
of clinical data presented by the patient and the diagnostic and treatment options available within the appropriate
health services.

This means that RCOG Guidelines are unlike protocols or guidelines issued by employers, as they are not intended to
be prescriptive directions defining a single course of management. Departure from the local prescriptive protocols or
guidelines should be fully documented in the patient’s case notes at the time the relevant decision is taken.