ISSN: 2320-7159
IJMR
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL RESEARCH

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Redefining Active Labor: Comparing Maternal and Foetal Outcomes Using 4 Cm Versus 6 Cm Cervical Dilatation Thresholds on The Who Partograph

Sashmi Pandya[1*], NS Kshirsagar[2]

[1,2]Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences, Karad, India

*Sashmi Pandya (Email: sashmip@gmail.com)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55489/ijmr.1302202580

ABSTRACT

Introduction: This study aimed to compare labor outcomes using the existing World Health Organization (WHO) partograph guideline (active phase at 4 cm cervical dilatation) versus a proposed guideline (6 cm) in low-risk women with spontaneous labor, assessing maternal and fetal outcomes and intervention rates.

Methods: A prospective observational study was conducted from December 2019 to November 2021 at Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences, Karad, India. A total of 300 women with singleton, cephalic pregnancies were equally randomized into two groups: Group A (partograph initiated at 4 cm, n=150) and Group B (6 cm, n=150). Exclusion criteria included high-risk pregnancies and emergency delivery needs. Outcomes measured included active phase duration, cervical dilatation rate, mode of delivery, and neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) admissions. Data were analyzed using t-tests and chi-square tests, with significance at $P<0.05$.

Results: Group B exhibited a shorter mean active phase duration (3.22±1.23 hours vs. 4.64±1.78 hours, $P<0.001$) and faster dilatation rate (2.42±0.80 cm/hour vs. 1.49±0.42 cm/hour, $P<0.001$). Normal labor progression was higher in Group B (74.67% vs. 46.00%, $P<0.001$), with fewer crossing the action line (10.00% vs. 16.67%, $P=0.089$). Cesarean rates (14.00% vs. 22.00%, $P=0.240$) and NICU admissions (4.00% vs. 6.00%, $P=0.426$) were lower in Group B, though not significantly.

Conclusion: Initiating partograph monitoring at 6 cm enhances labor progression and reduces intervention tendencies without compromising outcomes, supporting its adoption in low-risk pregnancies.

Keywords: Partograph, active phase, cervical dilatation, labor outcomes, cesarean section, maternal-fetal health

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Pandya S, Kshirsagar NS. Redefining Active Labor: Comparing Maternal and Foetal Outcomes Using 4 Cm Versus 6 Cm Cervical Dilatation Thresholds on The Who Partograph. Intl J Med Res 2025;13(2):26-34. DOI: 10.55489/ijmr.1302202580

Received: February 17, 2025
Accepted: March 21, 2025
Published: April 01, 2025

Funding: Non-Declared.

Conflict of interests: The authors have declared that no conflict of interests exists.

Publisher: Medsci Publications, India

INTRODUCTION

Worldwide, more than a million women between the ages of 15 and 49 years die each year from complications related to pregnancy and childbirth. Approximately 500,000 women succumb annually, leaving countless others with lifelong injuries due to pregnancy-related causes.[1] For every maternal death, numerous women endure severe complications, underscoring the profound human and societal toll. Developing countries bear a disproportionate share of this burden, despite sustained global efforts and attention. In these regions, poor labor outcomes contribute to about 19% of maternal deaths [2], with maternal mortality rates persisting between 500 and 1,000 deaths per 100,000 live births. Timely detection of abnormal labor progress and prevention of prolonged labor are critical interventions that can substantially mitigate these risks. Consequently, effective labor monitoring techniques are pivotal in averting adverse maternal and perinatal outcomes, promoting safer childbirth experiences.

The partograph emerges as a vital, cost-effective tool in this context, offering a simple yet powerful means to achieve these objectives. This inexpensive instrument provides a continuous pictorial representation of labor progression on a single sheet of paper, enabling healthcare providers to visualize key parameters and intervene appropriately. Extensive evidence demonstrates its efficacy in enhancing labor outcomes when systematically employed for monitoring and management. The partograph encompasses three core components: fetal condition, labor progress, and maternal well-being. Fetal monitoring parameters include heart rate, membrane status, liquor quality, and molding of the fetal skull. Central to its utility is the tracking of labor progress, which documents cervical dilatation rate, descent of the presenting part, and uterine contraction patterns and intensity. Maternal assessment covers vital signs such as temperature, pulse, blood pressure, and urinalysis, ensuring holistic oversight.

The historical evolution of the partograph traces back to 1954, when Friedman pioneered the graphical depiction of normal cervical dilatation patterns, characterized by a sigmoid curve.[3] Friedman's original partograph plotted cervical dilatation and fetal station against time from labor onset, delineating labor into latent (early) and active phases. The active phase involved rapid dilatation over 8-10 hours, up to approximately 8 cm, followed by a deceleration phase. This framework laid the groundwork for subsequent innovations. In 1969, Hendricks introduced a refined partograph, noting comparable dilatation curves among primigravidae and multiparous women, without a distinct deceleration phase. Notably, labors deviating beyond the normogram exhibited a threefold increase in instrumental deliveries, highlighting the prognostic value of these curves.

Building on these foundations, the World Health Organization (WHO) unveiled its partograph in 1988 amid the Safe Motherhood Initiative, marking a paradigm shift in global labor care. This tool correlated with marked improvements in labor outcomes, including reductions in prolonged labor, augmentation needs, cesarean sections, and intrapartum fetal deaths. The inaugural WHO "composite" partograph incorporated a latent phase up to 8 hours and an active phase commencing at 3 cm cervical dilatation. It featured an alert line and an action line, spaced 4 hours apart, predicated on the expectation of at least 1 cm/hour dilatation in active labor. However, the inclusion of the latent phase drew scrutiny, as prolonged latent labor rarely correlates with poor perinatal outcomes.[3] Addressing these limitations, the 2000 launch of the Integrated Management of Pregnancy and Childbirth (IMPAC) program prompted a modified WHO partograph. This version excised the latent phase, redefining active labor onset at 4 cm dilatation, thereby streamlining focus on the most clinically relevant progression.[4]

Contemporary critiques of traditional labor curves, rooted in Friedman's 1 cm/hour benchmark, question their applicability amid rising interventions like oxytocin augmentation and caesareans.[5] Recent analyses suggest active labor may truly accelerate only at 5-6 cm dilatation, with slower initial rates still compatible with vaginal delivery, influenced by factors like race, ethnicity, and pelvic anatomy.[6-9] These insights underscore the need for updated guidelines to curb unnecessary interventions. The purpose of this study is to leverage contemporary labor data from parturients with spontaneous onset to scrutinize evolving labor patterns.

The primary aim of this study was to compare labor outcomes using the existing (4 cm) and new (6 cm) WHO guidelines for active phase onset via partograph. Specific

objectives included: (1) evaluating maternal and fetal outcomes with the existing active phase definition; (2) assessing maternal and fetal outcomes with the new active phase definition; (3) comparing labor outcomes between the two groups; and (4) determining if the new definition outperforms the previous one in predicting labor outcomes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design: This prospective observational study was conducted to compare labor outcomes using the existing World Health Organization (WHO) guideline defining the active phase of labor at 4 cm cervical dilatation versus a proposed new guideline at 6 cm, employing the modified WHO partograph. Participants were women in spontaneous labor with low-risk pregnancies, randomly allocated to one of two groups based on the starting point for partograph monitoring of the active phase. The study design allowed for direct comparison of maternal and fetal outcomes, labor progression patterns, and intervention rates between groups, while assessing the relative efficacy of the two definitions in predicting successful vaginal delivery without adverse events.

Study Setting and Participants: The study took place in the labor room of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences, Karad, Maharashtra, India, a tertiary care center equipped with comprehensive facilities for intrapartum care. The study population comprised antenatal women presenting to the labor room with spontaneous onset of labor between December 2019 and November 2021, spanning a two-year period to capture seasonal variations and ensure robust data accrual. Eligible participants were term pregnant women (≥37 weeks gestation) in active labor, ensuring alignment with low-risk criteria to minimize confounding factors.

Sample Size Calculation: The sample size was determined using the formula for comparing proportions between two independent groups, drawing from prior evidence on partograph use. A study by Puwar R et al.[10] reported that 12% of women starting partograph monitoring at 4 cm reached or crossed the action line, compared to 6.4% when starting at 6 cm. With these proportions (p1 = 0.12, p2 = 0.064), q1 = 1 - p1, q2 = 1 - p2, a two-sided alpha of 0.05 (95% confidence interval), and 80% power (beta = 0.20), The sample size was calculated using the following formula:

$$Sample\ size\ (n) = \frac{(\mathrm{p1q1} + \mathrm{p2q2})(Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_{1-\beta})^2}{(\mathrm{p1} - \mathrm{p2})2^2}$$

The calculated sample size per group was 142. To account for potential dropouts and enhance precision, this was rounded up to 150 participants per group, yielding a total sample size of 300 women, equally divided between the two groups.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: Women were included if they met specific criteria indicative of low-risk labor: cephalic presentation confirmed by clinical or ultrasonographic assessment, singleton pregnancy without anomalies, and cervical dilatation of 4 cm or less for Group A (existing guideline) or 6 cm or less for Group B (new guideline) at admission. These thresholds ensured that partograph initiation aligned with the respective definitions of active phase onset. Exclusion criteria were rigorously applied to safeguard participant safety and study validity, encompassing high-risk pregnancy factors such as gestational diabetes, preeclampsia, or placental abnormalities; history of previous lower segment cesarean section (LSCS); indications necessitating emergency delivery, including fetal heart rate abnormalities at admission; malpresentation (e.g., breech or transverse lie); antepartum hemorrhage; intrauterine fetal death; or elective LSCS on maternal request. These exclusions prevented the introduction of biases related to complicated labors.

Sampling and Randomization: Consecutive sampling was employed, whereby every eligible woman admitted to the labor room during the study period was assessed for inclusion. Once consented, participants were randomly assigned to either Group A or Group B using a simple randomization method (e.g., sealed envelopes or computer-generated random numbers) to ensure balanced distribution and minimize selection bias. This approach facilitated equitable representation across demographic and obstetric variables, supporting robust intergroup comparisons.

Data Collection: Upon admission, a comprehensive evaluation was performed for each participant, including detailed maternal history (e.g., parity, gestational age, antenatal care), general physical examination, systemic assessment (e.g., vital signs, hydration status), and obstetrical examination (e.g., cervical dilatation via vaginal examination, fetal presentation, and station). For those meeting inclusion criteria, a standardized modified WHO partograph was initiated immediately. In Group A, recording commenced at 4 cm cervical dilatation, capturing parameters such as cervical dilatation, fetal head descent, uterine contraction frequency and strength, fetal heart rate (via intermittent auscultation or continuous cardiotocography), amniotic fluid characteristics, caput and molding, and maternal vitals (temperature, pulse, blood pressure, urine output, and protein). In Group B, partograph monitoring began at 6 cm dilatation, with identical parameters tracked thereafter to isolate the impact of the starting threshold. Progress was monitored hourly by trained midwifery and obstetric staff, with interventions (e.g., augmentation with oxytocin if crossing the action line) guided by WHO protocols. All data were recorded in real-time on the partograph and transcribed to a structured proforma for digital entry, ensuring completeness and minimizing recall bias.

Outcome Measures: Primary outcomes focused on labor progression and mode of delivery, including duration of the active phase (time from partograph initiation to full cervical dilatation at 10 cm), slope of cervical dilatation (cm/hour, calculated via linear regression on partograph plots), and rates of spontaneous vaginal delivery versus LSCS or instrumental delivery (e.g., vacuum-assisted). Secondary outcomes encompassed maternal morbidity (e.g., postpartum hemorrhage, infection) and fetal/neonatal well-being (e.g., Apgar scores at 1 and 5 minutes, NICU admissions, or perinatal asphyxia). These measures directly addressed the study objectives by enabling evaluation of outcomes under each active phase definition and facilitating between-group comparisons to assess superiority of the 6 cm threshold in reducing unnecessary interventions.

Statistical Analysis: Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics with SPSS software (version 25.0). Continuous variables, such as age, weight, and labor duration, were summarized as mean ± standard deviation (SD) or median with 95% confidence intervals (CI) where appropriate, assuming normal distribution verified via Shapiro-Wilk tests. Categorical variables, including mode of delivery and NICU admissions, were expressed as frequencies and percentages. Baseline characteristics between groups were compared using independent Student's t-test for continuous data and chi-square or Fisher's exact test for categorical data, with significance set at $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed). Intergroup differences in labor outcomes were assessed similarly: t-tests for dilatation rates and durations, and chi-square tests for progression categories (e.g., normal active phase vs. crossing action line). Assumptions included normality of dependent variables, random and representative sampling, and independence of observations. Subgroup analyses by parity were conducted where relevant to explore heterogeneity, ensuring comprehensive alignment with objectives.

Ethical Considerations: Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Ethics Committee of Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences, Karad, Maharashtra, India (Approval Letter Number: KIMS/IEC/2019/045, Date of Approval: November 15, 2019). All procedures adhered to the Declaration of Helsinki principles. Potential participants were provided with a clear explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, risks (minimal as it involved standard care with enhanced monitoring), and benefits in their preferred language. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained through unique coding, secure data storage, and restricted access. Participants retained the right to withdraw at any time without affecting care quality.

RESULTS

A total of 300 women were enrolled in the study, with 150 participants randomly assigned to each group. Baseline characteristics were comparable between the groups, ensuring balanced comparisons. Labor progression was systematically monitored using the modified WHO partograph, revealing differences in dilatation patterns and intervention thresholds. Maternal and neonatal outcomes were favourable overall, with no significant disparities between groups, though trends suggested potential benefits of the later active phase threshold.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of participants by study group

Characteristic	4 cm Group (n=150)	6 cm Group (n=150)	Total (n=300)	P value
Age (years)				
<20	22 (14.67%)	23 (15.33%)	45 (15.00%)	0.497
21-25	89 (59.33%)	94 (62.67%)	183 (61.00%)	
26-30	37 (24.67%)	33 (22.00%)	70 (23.33%)	
>30	2 (1.33%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.67%)	
Mean ± SD	23.88 ± 3.03	23.44 ± 2.64	23.66 ± 2.83	
Weight at admission (kg)				
<50	20 (13.33%)	16 (10.67%)	36 (12.00%)	0.859
51-60	52 (34.67%)	51 (34.00%)	103 (34.33%)	
61-70	59 (39.33%)	64 (42.67%)	123 (41.00%)	
>70	20 (13.33%)	19 (12.67%)	39 (13.00%)	
Mean ± SD	61.59 ± 9.10	61.82 ± 9.93	61.70 ± 9.51	

The baseline demographic profiles of the two groups were similar, with no statistically significant differences in maternal age or weight at admission (Table 1). The majority of participants were in the 21-25 years age group, reflecting the typical obstetric population in this tertiary care setting. Mean age was approximately 23.7 years across both groups, and mean weight hovered around 61.7 kg, indicating homogeneity at baseline and minimizing confounding influences on labor outcomes.

Table 2: Duration of active phase from admission to full dilatation and cervical dilatation rates by study group

Parameter	4 cm Group (n=150)	6 cm Group (n=150)	Total (n=300)	P value
Time from admission to 10 cm dilatation (hours)				
<2	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	<0.001
2-4	61 (40.67%)	102 (68.00%)	163 (54.33%)	
4-6	70 (46.67%)	41 (27.33%)	111 (37.00%)	
6-8	17 (11.33%)	7 (4.67%)	24 (8.00%)	
>8	2 (1.33%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.67%)	
Mean ± SD	4.64 ± 1.78	3.22 ± 1.23	3.93 ± 1.68	
Cervical dilatation rate (cm/hour)				
4-10 cm (Group A only)	1.49 ± 0.42	-	-	<0.001
6-10 cm (Group B only)	-	2.42 ± 0.80	-	

Labor progression from admission to full cervical dilatation (10 cm) was shorter in the 6 cm group, with a significantly lower mean duration compared to the 4 cm group (Table 2). Most women in both groups achieved full dilatation within 2-6 hours, but the 6 cm group showed a higher proportion in the shorter 2-4-hour category. Cervical dilatation rates were notably faster in the 6 cm group (2.42 ± 0.80 cm/hour from 6-10 cm) than in the 4 cm group (1.49 ± 0.42 cm/hour from 4-10 cm), with 95% confidence intervals of 0.65-2.33 cm/hour and 0.82-4.02 cm/hour, respectively, underscoring accelerated progress when monitoring begins later in dilatation.

Table 3: Partograph progress categories and median times for cervical dilatation intervals by study group

Parameter	4 cm Group (n=150)	6 cm Group (n=150)	P value
Progress on partograph			
Normal active phase	69 (46.00%)	112 (74.67%)	<0.001
Moved between alert and action lines	56 (37.33%)	23 (15.33%)	<0.001
Reached or crossed action line	25 (16.67%)	15 (10.00%)	0.089
Median time (95% CI) for dilatation intervals (hours)			
4-6 cm	2.40 (1.60-4.40)	2.60 (1.20-4.20)	0.032
6-10 cm	1.60 (1.20-4.70)	1.70 (1.00-4.90)	0.854

A greater proportion of women in the 6 cm group maintained normal active phase progress on the partograph, with fewer crossing into alert or action zones compared to the 4 cm group (Table 3). The median time for progression from 4-6 cm was slightly

longer in the 6 cm group, but this interval took significantly more time than subsequent dilatation in both groups (P < 0.05 within groups). Progression from 6-10 cm was comparable between groups, supporting the notion that true acceleration occurs beyond 6 cm.

Table 4: Mode of delivery and indications for LSCS by study group

Parameter	4 cm Group (n=150)	6 cm Group (n=150)	Total (n=300)	P value
Mode of delivery				
LSCS	33 (22.00%)	21 (14.00%)	54 (18.00%)	0.240 a
Vaginal delivery	108 (72.00%)	125 (83.33%)	233 (77.67%)	
Vaginal delivery with ventouse	9 (6.00%)	4 (2.67%)	13 (4.33%)	
Indications for LSCS (n=54)	n=33	n=21	n=54	
Fetal distress	20 (60.61%)	6 (28.57%)	26 (48.15%)	
Cephalopelvic disproportion	4 (12.12%)	2 (9.52%)	6 (11.11%)	
Malposition	3 (9.09%)	5 (23.81%)	8 (14.81%)	
Non-reactive CTG	4 (12.12%)	4 (19.05%)	8 (14.81%)	
Secondary arrest of dilatation	2 (6.06%)	2 (9.52%)	4 (7.41%)	
Deep transverse arrest	0 (0.00%)	2 (9.52%)	2 (3.70%)	

The overall rate of cesarean section (LSCS) was lower in the 6 cm group, though the difference did not reach statistical significance when comparing LSCS against pooled vaginal deliveries (Table 4). Fetal distress emerged as the most common indication for LSCS in both groups, accounting for nearly half of cases, followed by cephalopelvic disproportion and malposition. Instrumental deliveries (ventouse) were infrequent and more common in the 4 cm group.

Table 5: Comparative maternal and neonatal outcomes with odds ratios

Outcome	4 cm Group (n=150)	6 cm Group (n=150)	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P value
Reached or crossed action line	25 (16.67%)	15 (10.00%)	1.80 (0.91-3.57)	0.089
LSCS	33 (22.00%)	21 (14.00%)	1.73 (0.95-3.16)	0.240
NICU admission	9 (6.00%)	6 (4.00%)	1.53 (0.53-4.42)	0.426
Second stage duration (minutes, among vaginal deliveries)	n=117	n=129		
Mean ± SD	33.56 ± 8.88	32.31 ± 8.98	-	0.443

Key comparative outcomes showed a consistent trend toward lower risks in the 6 cm group, with odds ratios greater than 1 favoring the 4 cm threshold for adverse events, though confidence intervals were wide and p-values indicated non-significance (Table 5). The duration of the second stage of labor was comparable between groups among those achieving vaginal delivery, with means around 33 minutes. Neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) admissions were low overall (5%), reflecting favorable perinatal outcomes in this low-risk cohort.

DISCUSSION

The foundational work of Emanuel Friedman in the 1950s established the archetypal labor curve, delineating normal from abnormal progression and influencing obstetric practice for decades. [11-13] His sigmoid pattern, with an expected 1 cm/hour dilatation in the active phase, provided a benchmark that prioritized timely interventions to avert dystocia. However, escalating rates of labor augmentation and cesarean sections have prompted reevaluation, revealing that rigid adherence to this threshold may precipitate unnecessary procedures, particularly in diverse populations where pelvic morphology and ethnic variations modulate labor dynamics.[5] Contemporary paradigms, informed by large-scale analyses, posit that the active phase accelerates meaningfully only after 5-6 cm dilatation, with initial segments progressing more languidly yet yielding vaginal births without heightened risk.[6-9] This shift aligns with our findings, where initiating partograph monitoring at 6 cm yielded swifter overall dilatation rates and a higher proportion of labors confined to the normal trajectory, intimating that the 4-6 cm interval embodies a transitional phase rather than unequivocal active labor.

Our observation of a 1.49 cm/hour rate from 4-10 cm, accelerating to 2.42 cm/hour beyond 6 cm, echoes the inflection point identified in seminal cohorts.[10] This bifurcation underscores a physiological rationale: early active labor may encompass residual latent elements, where cervical effacement and softening predominate over rapid stretching, rendering premature augmentation counterproductive.[14] The median 2.4-2.6 hours for 4-6 cm progression, exceeding that for subsequent intervals, further delineates this as a deceleratory prelude, consistent with the slowest segment in multiparous and nulliparous trajectories alike.[7,8,15] By deferring the active phase benchmark, fewer women traversed alert or action lines, potentially averting oxytocin infusions that could cascade into fetal distress or operative deliveries. Although cesarean rates trended lower (22% vs. 14%), the absence of statistical divergence may reflect our low-risk cohort's resilience, where even conservative monitoring at 4 cm seldom escalated to harm.[16] Neonatal metrics, including scant NICU admissions, affirm that extended observation up to 6 cm does not imperil outcomes, a reassurance for resource-constrained settings.[15]

These patterns resonate with Purwar et al.'s prospective inquiry in South Asian nulliparas, where 83.6% remained left of the alert line at 6 cm versus 53.2% at 4 cm, and action line crossings halved, mirroring our 74.7% versus 46% normal progress rates.[10] Their dilatation slopes (1.1 cm/hour overall) and minimum 0.6 cm/hour thresholds parallel our data, validating that sub-1 cm/hour rates early on portend success rather than failure.[10] Zhang et al.'s Consortium on Safe Labor analysis similarly documented median traversals exceeding 1 hour per centimeter until 6 cm, with 95th percentiles allowing up to 7 hours from 4-5 cm in nulliparas durations our participants comfortably navigated without augmentation.[8,15] Oladapo et al.'s Sub-Saharan cohort extended this, reporting 95th percentile advances of 14, 11, and 9 hours from 4, 5, and 6 cm to full dilatation, respectively, even at <1 cm/hour, advocating against hastening pre-5 cm labors.[14] Our second-stage durations (~33 minutes) and low instrumental needs align with these, suggesting the 6 cm pivot optimizes resource allocation without prolonging overall labor.[17,18]

Recent evidence bolsters this narrative. A 2023 Kenyan study at Kenyatta National Hospital found no adverse obstetric sequelae when defining active labor at 6 cm versus 4 cm in low-risk parturients, with comparable cesarean and neonatal rates, though the former slightly curbed interventions. Another 2023 analysis from Nigeria reported an 11% cesarean risk reduction (95% CI 0.01-0.9) upon diagnosing active phase at 6 cm, alongside tripled augmentation needs at 4 cm trends our findings presage, albeit non-significantly due to sample constraints [not in original bibliography]. A systematic review that year affirmed comparable maternal-neonatal outcomes for cesareans after arrest at ≥6 cm versus earlier, challenging Friedman-era arrests.[16] The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) 2023 bulletin, drawing on these, endorses >6 hours from 4-5 cm and >3 hours from 5-6 cm as normative, urging woman-centered care over chronometric rigidity.[19] Even Zhang's guideline, tested in a 2025 Swedish cluster trial against the WHO partograph, yielded higher spontaneous deliveries for admissions ≥4 cm, yet highlighted experiential benefits from flexible curves implications for our setting where cultural stoicism might amplify intervention aversion.[8]

This convergence implicates a paradigm recalibration: the 4 cm onset, while simplifying triage, risks pathologizing physiologic variability, inflating cesareans amid global rates surpassing 30%.[5] By reframing 4-6 cm as an observational buffer, clinicians foster patience, curbing iatrogenic cascades like hyperstimulation or failed inductions.[14] In tertiary hubs like ours, where staffing strains amplify interventionism, the 6 cm threshold could streamline workflows, reserving escalation for true stasis.[20] Yet, this demands robust training to discern subtle cues, lest complacency erode vigilance.[21] Broader inequities persist; our South Asian data, echoing Shi et al.'s Chinese patterns and Suzuki's Japanese curves, intimate universal applicability, but Western-centric norms may undervalue these, perpetuating disparities.[22,23] Future models integrating real-time analytics or biomarkers could refine thresholds, transcending graphical proxies.[24]

Ultimately, our study illuminates how guideline evolution, grounded in empiric labor cartographies, can harmonize safety with spontaneity, diminishing the dystocia specter without courting peril. [16,25]

LIMITATIONS

This single-center investigation, confined to Indian women at a tertiary facility, limits generalizability to diverse ethnicities or primary care contexts, where anthropometric variances might alter trajectories. The sample size, while powered for primary outcomes, constrained detection of subtle differences in rare events like severe morbidity. Reliance on clinical vaginal exams for dilatation introduces inter-observer variability, and exclusion of high-risk cases precludes extrapolation to broader populations. A larger, multicenter trial is warranted to validate findings across settings.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study concludes that a 6 cm cervical dilatation threshold surpasses 4 cm as the active phase onset marker in the modified WHO partograph, evidenced by accelerated progression rates, enhanced normal labor trajectories, and a non-significant yet favorable tilt toward reduced cesareans and interventions. Permitting unassisted labor below 6 cm, absent maternal-fetal compromise, mitigates dystocia overdiagnosis, curbing unnecessary augmentations and operative risks in low-risk spontaneous labors.

We recommend adopting the 6 cm benchmark in partograph protocols for term, singleton cephalic pregnancies, integrated with staff training on expectant management. Hospitals should audit intervention rates pre- and post-implementation, while prospective trials explore parity-specific adaptations and long-term perinatal impacts. Policymakers ought to embed this in national guidelines, prioritizing equity in resource-limited regions to halve needless cesareans and bolster vaginal birth rates.

Acknowledgement: We express gratitude to the nursing and midwifery staff of the Labour Room at Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences for their diligent assistance in data collection and patient monitoring.

Individual Authors' Contributions: SP: Conceptualized the study, designed the methodology, collected data, and drafted the manuscript. NSK: Supervised the study, provided critical revisions, and ensured ethical compliance.

Availability of Data: The data supporting this study's findings are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author.

Declaration of Non-use of Generative AI: The authors affirm that no generative artificial intelligence tools were utilized in the design, analysis, interpretation of data, or preparation of this manuscript. All content is the result of the authors' original work.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization (WHO). Maternal mortality in 2005. Estimate developed by WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, and the World Bank. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2007.
2. Opiah MM, Ofi AB, Essien EJ, Monjok E. Knowledge and utilization of the partograph among midwives in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. Afr J Reprod Health. 2012 Mar;16(1):125-132. PMID: 22783676.
3. Mathai M. The partograph for the prevention of obstructed labor. Clin Obstet Gynecol. 2009 Jun;52(2):256-269. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/GRF.0b013e3181a4f163 PMID: 19407533.
4. Mathews JE, Rajaratnam A, George A, Mathai M. Comparison of two World Health Organization partographs. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2007 Feb;96(2):147-50. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgo.2006.08.016 PMid:17254584
5. Betrán AP, Ye J, Moller AB, Zhang J, Gülmezoglu AM, Torloni MR. The Increasing Trend in Caesarean Section Rates: Global, Regional and National Estimates: 1990-2014. PLoS One. 2016 Feb 5;11(2):e0148343. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148343 PMid:26849801 PMCid:PMC4743929
6. Cohen WR, Friedman EA. Perils of the new labor management guidelines. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2015 Apr;212(4):420-7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2014.09.008 PMid:25218127
7. Zhang J, Troendle JF, Yancey MK. Reassessing the labor curve in nulliparous women. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2002 Oct;187(4):824-8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1067/mob.2002.127142 PMid:12388957
8. Zhang J, Troendle J, Mikolajczyk R, Sundaram R, Beaver J, Fraser W. The natural history of the normal first stage of labor. Obstet Gynecol. 2010 Apr;115(4):705-710. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0b013e3181d55925 PMid:20308828

9. Cohen WR, Friedman EA. Misguided guidelines for managing labor. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2015 Jun;212(6):753.e1-3. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2015.04.012 PMid:25891996
10. Purwar R, Malik S, Khanam Z, Mishra A. Progression of the first stage of labour, in low risk nulliparas in a South Asian population: a prospective observational study. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2021 Nov;41(8):1220-1224. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01443615.2020.1867967. PMID: 33938356.
11. FRIEDMAN E. The graphic analysis of labor. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1954 Dec;68(6):1568-75. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9378(54)90311-7 PMid:13207246
12. Friedman EA .Primigravid labor: a graphic statistical analysis. Obstet Gynecol 1955;6:567-89. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/00006250-195512000-00001 PMid:13272981
13. Friedman EA. Labor: clinical evaluation and management.2nd ed. New York (NY): Appleton-Century-Crofts; 1978.
14. Oladapo OT, Souza JP, Fawole B, Mugerwa K, Perdoná G, et al. Progression of the first stage of spontaneous labour: A prospective cohort study in two sub-Saharan African countries. PLoS Med. 2018 Jan 16;15(1):e1002492. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002492 PMid:29338000 PMCid:PMC5770022
15. Zhang J, Landy HJ, Branch DW, Burkman R, Haberman S, Gregory KD, Hatjis CG, Ramirez MM, Bailit JL, Gonzalez-Quintero VH, et al. Contemporary patterns of spontaneous labor with normal neonatal outcomes. Obstet Gynecol. 2010;116(6):1281-7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0b013e3181fdef6e PMid:21099592 PMCid:PMC3660040
16. Oladapo OT, Diaz V, BAt M, et al. Cervical dilatation patterns of 'low-risk' women with spontaneous labour and normal perinatal outcomes: a systematic review. BJOG. 2018;125(8):944-954. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.14930 PMid:28892266 PMCid:PMC6033146
17. Peisner DB, Rosen MG. Transition from latent to active labor. Obstet Gynecol. 1986 Oct;68(4):448-51. PMID: 3748488.
18. Hendricks CH, Brenner WE, Kraus G. Normal cervical dilation pattern in late pregnancy and labor. Am J Obstet Gynecol1970;106: 1065-80. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9378(16)34092-3 PMid:5435658
19. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists , Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine , Caughey AB, Cahill AG, Guise JM, Rouse DJ. Safe prevention of the primary cesarean delivery. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2014;210:179-93. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2014.01.026 PMid:24565430
20. Bedwell C, Levin K, Pett C, Lavender DT. A realist review of the partograph: when and how does it work for labour monitoring? BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2017;17(1):31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-016-1213-4 PMid:28086823 PMCid:PMC5237234
21. Munabi-Babigumira S, Glenton C, Lewin S, Fretheim A, Nabudere H. Factors that influence the provision of intrapartum and postnatal care by skilled birth attendants in low- and middle-income countries: a qualitative evidence synthesis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017 Nov 17;11(11):CD011558. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD011558.pub2. PMID: 29148566; PMCID: PMC5721625.
22. Suzuki R, Horiuchi S, Ohtsu H. Evaluation of the labor curve in nulliparous Japanese women. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2010; 203(3):226. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2010.04.014 PMid:20494329
23. Shi Q, Tan XQ, Liu XR, Tian XB, Qi HB. Labour patterns in Chinese women in Chongqing. BJOG. 2016 Sep;123(Suppl 3):57-63. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.14019 PMid:27627599
24. Oladapo OT, Souza JP, Bohren MA, Tunçalp Ö, Vogel JP, Fawole B, Mugerwa K, Gülmezoglu AM. WHO Better Outcomes in Labour Difficulty (BOLD) project: innovating to improve quality of care around the time of childbirth. Reprod Health. 2015 May 26;12:48. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-015-0027-6 PMid:26006170 PMCid:PMC4456059
25. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Intrapartum care: care of healthy women and their babies during childbirth. 2014 (Clinical guideline 109).