Cochrane
Library

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Active versus expectant management in the third stage of labour (Review)

Prendiville WJP, Elbourne D, McDonald SJ

Prendiville WJP, Elbourne D, McDonald SJ.
Active versus expectant management in the third stage of labour.
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2009, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD000007.
DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD000007.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000007.pub2).

www.cochranelibrary.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HEADER	1
REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLICATION	1
FEEDBACK	1
WHAT'S NEW	2
HISTORY	2
INDEX TERMS	

[Intervention Review]

Active versus expectant management in the third stage of labour

Walter JP Prendiville¹, Diana Elbourne², Susan J McDonald³

¹Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Coombe Lying-In Hospital, Dublin 8, Ireland. ²Medical Statistics Unit, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK. ³Midwifery Professorial Unit, La Trobe University/Mercy Hospital for Women, Heidelberg, Australia

Contact address: Sonja Henderson, Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group, School of Reproductive and Developmental Medicine, Division of Perinatal and Reproductive Medicine, The University of Liverpool, First Floor, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Crown Street, Liverpool, L8 7SS, UK. sonjah@liverpool.ac.uk, s.l.henderson@liverpool.ac.uk.

Editorial group: Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.

Publication status and date: Withdrawn from publication for reasons stated in the review, published in Issue 7, 2010.

Citation: Prendiville WJP, Elbourne D, McDonald SJ. Active versus expectant management in the third stage of labour. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD000007. DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD000007.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000007.pub2).

Copyright © 2010 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLICATION

This review was withdrawn from *The Cochrane Library* 2009, Issue 3, because it was out of date. It has been updated by a new review ('Active versus expectant management for women in the third stage of labour') first published in *The Cochrane Library* 2010, Issue 7.

The editorial group responsible for this previously published document have withdrawn it from publication.

FEEDBACK

McAlpine, August 2002

Summary

I have some questions. In the four included studies, how many women were in each study and when were the studies done? Was a comparison made between maternity hospitals, birth centres, and home delivery? For postpartum haemorrhage of more than 500 mls, what does "relative risk 0.38, 95% confidence interval 0.32 to 0.46" mean in terms of numbers?

Why do you conclude that active management should be the 'routine' management of choice in a maternity hospital? What are the implications for other settings?

Reply

A new review team are currently preparing an update for this review and will respond to the feedback when the update has been completed. [Reply from Cecily Begley, June 2007]

Contributors

Summary of comments from Elizabeth McAlpine, August, 2002

Matthews, December 2004

Summary

My anecdotal observation, having changed my practice to include physiological management of the third stage, is that women who choose this option have a decrease in the amount of lochia postpartum and a shorter duration of vaginal discharge. I have not seen any studies that could confirm or refute this.

Reply

A new review team are currently preparing an update for this review and will respond to the feedback when the update has been completed.
[Reply from Cecily Begley, June 2007]

Contributors

Comment received from Mary Jo Matthews, December 2004

Van Wyk, 4 March 2009

Summary

This review was last updated in 2000, and comments sent in 2002 and 2004 have not been addressed. The authors stated in 2007 that an update is in progress. We are concerned about the validity of the review findings.

[Summary of feedback from Susan van Wyk on behalf of the Masters Clinical Epidemiology class, Stellenbosch University, February 2009]

Reply

A new review team are currently preparing an update for this review and will respond to the feedback received in 2002 and 2004 as part of their update.

[Reply from Sonja Henderson, Managing Editor, March 2009]

WHAT'S NEW

Date	Event	Description
16 June 2010	Amended	Updated published note - see Published notes

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 1, 1997

Review first published: Issue 1, 1997

Date	Event	Description
4 March 2009	Feedback has been incorporated	We have received feedback from Susan van Wyk on behalf of the Masters Clinical Epidemiology class, Stellenbosch University, about the validity of the findings of the current publication pending the completion of the update, as a result of which we have withdrawn the review from publication.
3 March 2009	Amended	Review withdrawn from publication in Issue 3, 2009.
5 August 2008	Amended	A note has been added to explain that this review is currently being updated following a new protocol which has been published in Issue 4, 2008 of <i>The Cochrane Library</i> .
22 January 2008	Amended	Converted to new review format. A note has been added to explain that this review is currently being updated following a new protocol which has been submitted for editorial approval to publish.
9 March 2000	New citation required and conclusions have changed	Substantive amendment