

## Effects of hydrotherapy during labour

*Juan Carlos Sanchez-Garcia, Raquel Rodríguez-Blanke*

To enable PROSPERO to focus on COVID-19 submissions, this registration record has undergone basic automated checks for eligibility and is published exactly as submitted. PROSPERO has never provided peer review, and usual checking by the PROSPERO team does not endorse content. Therefore, automatically published records should be treated as any other PROSPERO registration. Further detail is provided [here](#).

### Citation

Juan Carlos Sanchez-Garcia, Raquel Rodríguez-Blanke. Effects of hydrotherapy during labour. PROSPERO 2024 Available from <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/view/CRD42023399625>

## REVIEW TITLE AND BASIC DETAILS

---

### Review title

Effects of hydrotherapy during labour

### Original language title

Efectos de la hidroterapia durante el parto

### Review objectives

What is the effect of immersion or hydrotherapy during the first stage of labour on maternal health?

### Keywords

first, immersion, labor stage

## SEARCHING AND SCREENING

---

### Searches

PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, CINAHL

## Study design

RCT

## ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

---

### Condition or domain being studied

immersion or hydrotherapy during the first stage of labour

### Population

Pregnant women in the first stage of labour

### Intervention(s) or exposure(s)

We selected peer-reviewed, Randomised Clinical Trial (RCT) methodology articles on pregnant women who received water immersion in the first stage of labour (dilatation), with no restrictions on the language of publication.

### Comparator(s) or control(s)

Women who have given birth under existing protocols, which do not involve immersion or hydrotherapy

### Context

All study settings will be included in the review.

## OUTCOMES TO BE ANALYSED

---

### Main outcomes

This systematic review aimed to assess the literature on the application of hydrotherapy or water immersion in the first stage of labour and maternal health outcomes.

### Additional outcomes

None

## DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

---

### Data extraction (selection and coding)

After carrying out the search strategy, the articles found were transferred to the Mendeley web application using the Mendeley web importer tool. They were then organised by folders, according to the database from which they had been obtained, and all duplicates were removed.

The included studies were RCTs that met the objective of the search. Two reviewers independently examined the title, abstract and keywords of each study identified in the

search, and applied the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The same procedure was applied to potentially eligible full-text articles. Differences between reviewers were resolved by discussion or by a third reviewer.

Data on quality, patient characteristics, interventions and relevant outcomes were extracted independently by two reviewers.

### **Risk of bias (quality) assessment**

The assessment of methodological quality was carried out using the PEDro scale (Physiotherapy Evidence Database), as the methodology corresponded to a Randomised Clinical Trial (RCT). This scale provides information on the clinical scientific evidence and scores it on the basis of certain indicators, adding 1 point to each one if they are present and 0 points if not, giving a total score of 10 points. If the clinical trial scores between 9 and 10, it is of very good quality; if it scores between 6 and 8, it is of good quality; if it scores between 4 and 5, it is of fair quality; and if it scores below 4, it is of poor quality. In the case of the articles chosen for this systematic review, the values range between 5 and 9, thus receiving an average score of 7.18, indicating that the average scientific quality is considered to be of "good quality".

## **PLANNED DATA SYNTHESIS**

---

### **Strategy for data synthesis**

Two reviewers independently extracted the following data from each included article: number of participants, participant characteristics, intervention, results, conclusions and findings.

They also assessed the strengths and weaknesses of each RCT.

RobotReviewer software was used to extract data and compare the results with the findings.

### **Analysis of subgroups or subsets**

None planned

## **REVIEW AFFILIATION, FUNDING AND PEER REVIEW**

---

### **Review team members**

- Mr Juan Carlos Sanchez-Garcia, University of Granada
- Dr Raquel Rodríguez-Blanque, University of Granada

### **Review affiliation**

University of Granada

### **Funding source**

No funds

### **Named contact**

Juan Carlos Sanchez-Garcia. Juan Oro, 12, Granada 18100 - Spain -  
jsangar@ugr.es

## TIMELINE OF THE REVIEW

---

### Review timeline

Start date: 21 February 2023. End date: 06 April 2023

### Date of first submission to PROSPERO

14 February 2023

### Date of registration in PROSPERO

25 February 2023

## CURRENT REVIEW STAGE

---

### Publication of review results

The intention is to publish the review once completed. The review will be published in English

### Stage of the review at this submission

Review stage	Started	Completed
Pilot work		
Formal searching/study identification		
Screening search results against inclusion criteria		
Data extraction or receipt of IP		
Risk of bias/quality assessment		
Data synthesis		

### Review status

The review is currently planned or ongoing.

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

---

### Additional information

This review is being undertaken as part of the planning for a randomized trial.

### PROSPERO version history

- Version 1.1 published on 25 Feb 2023
- Version 1.0 published on 25 Feb 2023

**Review conflict of interest**

None known

**Country**

Spain

**Medical Subject Headings**

Female; Humans; Hydrotherapy; Immersion; Labor, Obstetric; Maternal Health; Pregnancy

**Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors**

unknown

**Disclaimer**

The content of this record displays the information provided by the review team. PROSPERO does not peer review registration records or endorse their content.

PROSPERO accepts and posts the information provided in good faith; responsibility for record content rests with the review team. The owner of this record has affirmed that the information provided is truthful and that they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information may be construed as scientific misconduct.

PROSPERO does not accept any liability for the content provided in this record or for its use. Readers use the information provided in this record at their own risk.

Any enquiries about the record should be referred to the named review contact