

## Records

Key Passage(s)    Context

[Download key passages/title pages as a PDF](#)

**[Johnston RA, Siddall RS \(1922\)](#)**. Is the usual method of preparing patients for delivery beneficial or necessary?  
American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology 4:645-650.

### Key passages

IS THE USUAL METHOD OF PREPARING PATIENTS FOR  
DELIVERY BENEFICIAL OR NECESSARY?

BY R. A. JOHNSTON AND R. S. SIDALL, BALTIMORE, MD.

it seemed plausible to assume that the routine preparation employed in our clinic might possibly be harmful rather than beneficial. In an effort to substantiate this assumption the routine preparation was purposely omitted in forty-four consecutive cases, and it was found only four of them or 9.1 per cent had a febrile reaction. In view of this, it was decided to extend our experience in this respect by omitting the routine antepartum preparation in every alternate patient, clipping only the vulval hairs, and then compare the results obtained in the two series. In instances where the temperature elevation could be definitely assigned to mastitis, pyelitis, or other causes than puerperal infection the cases were eliminated without serious change in relative results.

This was done in 389 cases, and the table below shows the results obtained.

TABLE VI

Routine preparation			No preparation		
Afebrile	164	83.7 per cent	Afebrile	169	87.6 per cent
Febrile	32	16.3 per cent	Febrile	24	12.4 per cent

In Table VII are given the results obtained by employing all cases used in this paper.

TABLE VII

Prepared			No preparation		
Total	Febrile	Per cent	Total	Febrile	Per cent
931	175	18.9			
(40 with catharsis	9	22.5	44	4	9.1
(44 no catharsis	8	20			
196	32	16.3	193	24	12.4
1207	224	18.7	237	28	11.8

From so limited a number of cases one scarcely dares to draw binding conclusions. However, as the incidence of vaginal examinations, premature rupture of membranes and perineal lacerations was the same as before, it seems permissible to conclude that slightly better results follow the omission of the routine preparation, and that contamination incident to its employment might explain the difference in morbidity. Further investigation along this line will not be amiss.