

# Quantification of Blood Loss: AWHONN Practice Brief Number 1

An official practice brief from the Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses

AWHONN 2000 L Street, NW, Suite 740, Washington, DC 20036, (800) 673-8499

AWHONN periodically updates practice briefs. For the latest version go to <http://www.AWHONN.org>. The information herein is designed to aid nurses in providing evidenced-based care to women and newborns. These recommendations should not be construed as dictating an exclusive course of treatment or procedure. Variations in practice may be warranted based on the needs of the individual patient, resources, and limitations unique to the institution or type of practice.

## Recommendation

AWHONN recommends that cumulative blood loss be formally measured or quantified after every birth.

## Magnitude of the Problem

- A leading cause of maternal morbidity and mortality is failure to recognize excessive blood loss during childbirth (The Joint Commission, 2010).
- Women die from obstetric hemorrhage because effective interventions are not initiated early enough (Berg et al., 2005; Della Torre et al., 2011).
- New York State Department of Health (2004, 2009) issued health advisories informing health care providers to prevent maternal deaths by improving recognition of and response to hemorrhage.

## Inaccuracy of Visual Estimation of Obstetric-Related Blood Loss or Estimated Blood Loss (EBL)

Visual estimation of blood loss (EBL) is common practice in obstetrics; however, the inaccuracy of EBL has been well established:

- As early as the 1960s, researchers demonstrated that visual EBL resulted in underestimation and overestimation (Brant, 1967; Pritchard, 1965).
- Visual EBL most commonly results in errors of underestimation (Al Kadri, Anazi, & Tamim, 2011; Brant, 1967; Duthie et al., 1990; Patel et al., 2006; Pritchard, 1965).
- Visual EBL consistently resulted in underestimation of large volumes (Brant, 1967; Duthie et al., 1990; Stafford, Dildy, Clark, & Belfort, 2008) of greater than 1000 ml (Stafford et al., 2008). With smaller volumes, EBL resulted in overestimation compared to direct measurement (Dildy et al., 2004).

- The use of visual EBL can result in underestimation of blood loss by 33–50% (Patel et al., 2006).
- With training, clinicians initially improved accuracy with visual EBL (Dildy et al., 2004) but experienced skill decay within nine months of training completion (Toledo, Eosakul, Goetz, Wong, & Grobman, 2012).
- Provider specialty, age, or years of experience were not related to accuracy of visual EBL (Al Kadri et al., 2011; Toledo, McCarthy, Hewlett, Fitzgerald, & Wong, 2007), and medical students as well as experienced clinicians made similar errors (Dildy et al., 2004).

## Implications of Inaccurate Evaluation of Blood Loss

- Accurate and timely recognition of excessive blood loss by clinicians is crucial because it leads to the initiation of blood transfusions and other maternal resuscitative efforts.
- Many clinicians rely on the flawed, imprecise method of visual EBL.
- Inaccurate measurement of postpartum blood loss has the following implications:
  - Overestimation can lead to costly, invasive, and unnecessary treatments such as blood transfusions that expose women to unnecessary risks.
  - Underestimation can lead to delay in delivering lifesaving hemorrhage interventions.

## Quantification of Blood Loss (QBL)

- QBL is an objective method used to evaluate excessive bleeding.

**Table 1: Tips for Quantification of Blood Loss (QBL)**

Quantification of maternal blood loss is a team effort.

1. Create a list of dry weights for delivery items that may become blood-soaked with directions on how to calculate blood loss.
2. Begin QBL immediately after the infant's birth (prior to delivery of the placenta) and assess and record the amount of fluid collected in a calibrated under-buttocks drape or suction canister. Keep in mind that most of the fluid collected prior to birth of the placenta is amniotic fluid, urine, and feces. If irrigation is used, deduct the amount of irrigation from the total fluid that was collected.
3. Record the total volume of fluid collected in the under-buttocks drape or suction canister.
4. Subtract the pre-placenta fluid volume from the post-placenta fluid volume to more accurately determine the actual blood lost. Keep in mind that most of the fluid collected after the birth of the placenta is blood.
5. Add the fluid volume collected in the drapes and canister to the blood volume measured by weighing soaked items to determine the cumulative volume of blood loss or QBL.
6. Weigh all blood-soaked materials and clots to determine cumulative volume. *1 gram weight = 1 milliliter blood loss volume*
7. The equation used when calculating blood loss of a blood soaked item is *WET Item Gram Weight – DRY Item Gram Weight = Milliliters of Blood within the item*

*Note.* Although a gram is a unit of mass and a milliliter is a unit of volume, the conversion from one to the other is simple.

- Methods to quantify blood loss, such as weighing, are significantly more accurate than EBL (Al Kadri et al., 2011). The use of a calibrated drape had an error rate of less than 15% (Toledo et al., 2007).
- QBL reduces the likelihood that clinicians will underestimate the volume of blood lost and delay early recognition and treatment. See Tables 1 and 2.

### Suggested Equipment

- Calibrated under-buttocks drapes to measure blood loss
- Dry weight card, laminated and attached to all scales, for measurement of items that may become blood-soaked when a woman is in labor or after giving birth

**Table 2: Tips for Quantification of Blood Loss (QBL) During Cesarean Births**

1. Begin the process of QBL when the amniotic membranes are ruptured or after the infant is born.
2. Suction and measure all amniotic fluid within the suction canister of collected fluid before delivery of the placenta.
3. After delivery of the placenta, measure the amount of blood lost in the suction canister and drapes. At this point, most of the blood will be accounted for. Notify the team and document the amount of blood lost in milliliters.
4. Prior to adding irrigation fluid, ensure that the scrub team communicates when irrigation is beginning. Remember that some of the normal saline will be absorbed into the tissues. For this reason, not all of the fluid will be suctioned out of the abdomen and accounted for.
5. One of two methods can be used to suction the irrigation fluid: Continue to suction into the same canister and measure the amount of irrigation fluid OR Provide another suction tube to collect the irrigation separately into another canister.
6. Weigh all blood-soaked materials and clots. Calculate the weight and convert to milliliters.
7. At the conclusion of the surgery, add the volume of quantified blood calculated by weight with the volume of quantified blood in the suction canister to determine total QBL.
8. Note that lap pads dampened with normal saline contain minimal fluid. When they become saturated with blood, weigh them as you would a dry lap pad.
9. QBL will never be exact. However, it is more accurate to do some measurements than to rely solely on visual estimates.

- Scales to weigh blood-soaked items placed ideally in every labor and operating room and on the postpartum unit; save costs by using the scales used to weigh newborns
- Formulas inserted into the electronic charting system that automatically deduct dry weights from wet weights of standard supplies such as chux and peri-pads

### REFERENCES

Al Kadri, H. M., Anazi, B. K., & Tamim, H. M. (2011). Visual estimation versus gravimetric measurement of postpartum blood loss: A

- prospective cohort study. *Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 283(6), 1207–1213.
- Berg, C. J., Harper, M. A., Atkinson, S. M., Bell, E. A., Brown, H. L., Hage, M. L., . . . Callaghan, W. M. (2005). Preventability of pregnancy-related deaths: Results of a statewide review. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 106(6), 1228–1234. doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000187894.71913.e8
- Brant, H. A. (1967). Precise estimation of postpartum hemorrhage: Difficulties and importance. *British Medical Journal*, 1(5537), 398–400.
- Della Torre, M., Kilpatrick, S.J., Hibbard, J.U., Simonson, L., Scott, S., Koch, A., . . . Geller, S. E. (2011). Assessing preventability for obstetric hemorrhage. *American Journal of Perinatology*, 28(10), 753–760. doi:10.1055/s-0031-1280856
- Dildy, G. A., 3rd, Paine, A. R., George, N. C., & Velasco, C. (2004). Estimating blood loss: Can teaching significantly improve visual estimation? *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 104(3), 601–606.
- Duthie, S., Ven, D., Yung, G., Guang, D., Chan, S., & Ma, H. (1990). Discrepancy between laboratory determination and visual estimation of blood loss during normal delivery. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 38, 119–124.
- New York State Department of Health. (2004). *Health advisory: Prevention of maternal deaths through improved management of hemorrhage*. New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.health.ny.gov/professionals/protocols\\_and\\_guidelines/maternal\\_hemorrhage/docs/health\\_advisory\\_update.pdf](https://www.health.ny.gov/professionals/protocols_and_guidelines/maternal_hemorrhage/docs/health_advisory_update.pdf)
- New York State Department of Health. (2009). *Health advisory: Prevention of maternal deaths through improved management of hemorrhage*. New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.poughkeepsiejournal.com/assets/pdf/BK13600763.PDF>
- Patel, A., Goudar, S. S., Geller, S. E., Kodkany, B. S., Edlavitch, S.A., Wagh, K., . . . Derman, R. J. (2006). Drape estimation vs. visual assessment for estimating postpartum hemorrhage. *International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics*, 93(3), 220–224.
- Pritchard, J. (1965). Changes in the blood volume during pregnancy and delivery. *Anesthesiology*, 26(4), 393–399.
- The Joint Commission. (2010). Preventing maternal death. *Sentinel Event Alert*, 44, 1–4. Retrieved from [http://www.jointcommission.org/assets/1/18/SEA\\_44.PDF](http://www.jointcommission.org/assets/1/18/SEA_44.PDF)
- Stafford, I., Dildy, G., Clark, S., & Belfort, M. (2008). Visually estimated and calculated blood loss in vaginal and cesarean delivery. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 199, 519.e1–519.e7. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2008.04.049
- Toledo, P., Eosakul, S., Goetz, K., Wong, C., & Grobman, W. (2012). Decay in blood loss estimation skills after web-based didactic training. *Simulation in Healthcare*, 7, 18–21.
- Toledo, P., McCarthy, R., Hewlett, B., Fitzgerald, P., & Wong, C. (2007). The accuracy of blood loss estimation after simulated vaginal delivery. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 105, 1736–1740.

## Additional Resources

- Brace, R. A., & Wolf, E. J. (1989). Normal amniotic fluid volume changes throughout pregnancy. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 161(2), 382–388.
- Gabel, K. T., & Weeber, T. A. (2012). Measuring and communicating blood loss during obstetric hemorrhage. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing*, 41(4), 551–558.