

1 **Title: A Prospective Cohort Study Towards Improving Enhanced Recovery After Cesarean**  
2 **(ERAC) Pathways.**

3 **Authors:** L Cojocaru, S Alton, A Pahlavan, M Coghlan, H Seung, A Trilling, S Crimmins, K  
4 Goetzinger.

- 5 1) Liviu Cojocaru, MD: Division of Maternal-Fetal Medicine. Department of Obstetrics,  
6 Gynecology and Reproductive Science, University of Maryland School of Medicine,  
7 Baltimore, MD, USA. ([lcojocaru@som.umaryland.edu](mailto:lcojocaru@som.umaryland.edu)) (ORCID No: 0000-0003-1558-  
8 702X).
- 9 2) Autusa Pahlavan, MD: Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Johns Hopkins  
10 University, Baltimore, MD, USA. ([apahlav2@jhmi.edu](mailto:apahlav2@jhmi.edu))
- 11 3) Suzanne Alton, BSN, RNC-OB: Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive  
12 Science, University of Maryland Medical Center, Baltimore, MD, USA.  
13 ([salton@umm.edu](mailto:salton@umm.edu))
- 14 4) Martha Coghlan, MD: Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Science,  
15 University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA.  
16 ([martha.coghlan@umm.edu](mailto:martha.coghlan@umm.edu))
- 17 5) Hyunuk Seung, MS: Department of Pharmacy Practice and Sciences, University of  
18 Maryland School of Pharmacy, Baltimore, MD, USA. ([hseung@rx.umaryland.edu](mailto:hseung@rx.umaryland.edu))
- 19 6) Ariel Trilling, MD: Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Science,  
20 University of Pittsburg School of Medicine, Pittsburg, PA, USA. ([trillingar2@upmc.edu](mailto:trillingar2@upmc.edu))

- 21 7) Bhavani S Kodali, MD: Division of Obstetric Anesthesiology. Department of  
22 Anesthesiology, University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA.  
23 ([bkodali@som.umaryland.edu](mailto:bkodali@som.umaryland.edu))
- 24 8) Sarah Crimmins, DO: Division of Maternal-Fetal Medicine. Department of Obstetrics,  
25 Gynecology and Reproductive Science. University of Maryland School of Medicine,  
26 Baltimore, MD, USA. ([scrimmins@som.umaryland.edu](mailto:scrimmins@som.umaryland.edu))
- 27 9) Katherine Goetzinger, MD: Division of Maternal-Fetal Medicine. Department of  
28 Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Science, University of Maryland School of  
29 Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA. ([kgoetzinger@som.umaryland.edu](mailto:kgoetzinger@som.umaryland.edu))

30 **Correspondence to:** Liviu Cojocaru, MD: Division of Maternal-Fetal Medicine. Department of  
31 Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Science, University of Maryland School of Medicine,  
32 Baltimore, MD, USA.  
33 ([lcojocaru@som.umaryland.edu](mailto:lcojocaru@som.umaryland.edu)) (telephone number: 9172261295).

## ABSTRACT

34 **Objective:** To evaluate whether Enhanced Recovery After Cesarean (ERAC) pathways reduces  
35 inpatient and outpatient opioid use, pain scores and improves the indicators of postoperative  
36 recovery.

37 **Study design:** This is a prospective cohort study of all patients older than 18 undergoing an  
38 uncomplicated cesarean delivery (CD) at an academic medical center. We excluded complicated  
39 CD, patients with chronic pain disorders, chronic opioid use, acute postpartum depression, or  
40 mothers whose neonate demised before their discharge. Lastly, we excluded non-English and  
41 non-Spanish speaking patients. Our study compared the outcomes in patients before (pre-ERAC)  
42 and after (post-ERAC) implementation of an ERAC pathways. Primary outcomes were inpatient  
43 morphine milligram equivalent (MME) use and the patient's delta pain scores. Secondary  
44 outcomes were outpatient MME prescriptions as well as indicators of postoperative recovery.

45 **Results:** Of 308 patients undergoing CD from October 2019 to September 2020, 196 were  
46 enrolled in the pre-ERAC cohort and 112 in the post-ERAC cohort. Patients in the post-ERAC  
47 cohort were less likely to require opioids in the postoperative period compared to the pre-ERAC  
48 cohort (35.7% vs. 18.4%,  $p<0.001$ ). In addition, there was a significant reduction in the MME  
49 per stay in this cohort [16.8 MME (11.2-33.9) vs. 30 MME (20-49),  $p<0.001$ ]. In the post-ERAC  
50 cohort, there was also a reduction in the number of patients who required prescribed opioids at  
51 the time of discharge (86.6 vs. 98%,  $p<0.001$ ) as well as in the amount of MMEs prescribed [150  
52 MME (112-150) vs. 150 MME (150-225),  $p<0.001$ ; different shape of distribution]. Patients in  
53 the post-ERAC cohort had lower delta pain scores [2.2 (1.3-3.7) vs. 3.3 (2.3-4.7),  $p<0.001$ ].

54 **Conclusion:** Our study has illustrated that our ERAC pathways reduced inpatient and outpatient  
55 opioid use as well as patient-reported pain scores while improving indicators of postoperative  
56 recovery.

57 **Keywords:** cesarean section, obstetrics, quality of care, maternal health, enhanced recovery after  
58 surgery.

59 **Introduction**

60 Cesarean delivery (CD) is one of the most common surgical procedures in the United States<sup>1</sup>.

61 Given patient expectations and misconceptions regarding the safety of labor, the medico-legal  
62 environment, and the limitations of modern technologies, the rate of CD is unlikely to decrease

63 in the near future<sup>2,3</sup>. Consequently, standardizing care remains a top priority in health care

64 quality and safety initiatives<sup>4</sup>. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) or, more specifically

65 for obstetrics, Enhanced Recovery after Cesarean (ERAC) pathways have emerged as a

66 multidisciplinary standardized bundled care approach to improve maternal outcomes<sup>5</sup>.

67 Furthermore, there is evidence that ERAS help to address racial disparities by standardizing

68 care<sup>6</sup>. Despite this, ERAS pathways have not been fully embraced in obstetrics<sup>7</sup>, leaving

69 significant space for improvement<sup>8</sup>. Moreover, most of the studies have not extended ERAC

70 pathways to specific populations such as opioid-naive patients, patients with postpartum

71 depression, or patients receiving Magnesium Sulfate, allowing aforementioned confounders to

72 affect the magnitude of the measured outcome.

73 Persistent opioid use in opioid-naive women after cesarean has become an alarming trend, where

74 1:50 to 1:300 women are at risk of chronic opioid use<sup>9,10</sup>. Substance abuse has been cited as a

75 major risk factor for pregnancy-associated deaths<sup>11,12</sup>. Additionally, rising opioid use in

76 pregnancy consequentially results in an increased incidence of neonatal abstinence syndrome<sup>13</sup>.

77 Multimodal analgesia has been shown to decrease opioid use after cesarean<sup>14</sup>. However, non-

78 opioid medications such as Gabapentin have not been yet incorporated into standard practice,

79 despite data suggesting reduced postoperative opioid use<sup>15,16</sup> and endorsement by American

80 College by Obstetricians and Gynecologists<sup>17</sup>.

81 Beyond opioid use, engaging patients in early ambulation and feeding has an additional positive  
82 impact on recovery<sup>18-20</sup>. A distinct difference in the obstetric population that may interfere with  
83 early ambulation and feeding is the postpartum Magnesium Sulfate use in patients with  
84 preeclampsia.

85 We aimed to reduce inpatient opioid use, outpatient opioid use, and reduce pain scores while  
86 improving the indicators of postoperative recovery and maximizing patient education.

87 Furthermore, the specifics of our protocol are intended to decrease the knowledge gaps in ERAC  
88 pathways.

## 89 **Methods**

90 This is a prospective cohort study of all patients older than 18 undergoing an uncomplicated  
91 cesarean delivery (CD) at an academic medical center. The Institutional Review Board at  
92 university of Maryland, Baltimore, approved the study under the protocol HP-00088872. The  
93 article was prepared following Reporting on ERAS Compliance, Outcomes, and Elements  
94 Research (RECOVER)<sup>21</sup> and Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in  
95 Epidemiology (STROBE)<sup>22</sup>. Data were collected and entered into a secure database, Research  
96 Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) software<sup>23,24</sup>, hosted by our institution.

97 Our study compared the outcomes in patients before (pre-ERAC) and after (post-ERAC)  
98 implementation of the ERAC pathways. Implemented core measures are described below, while  
99 the full ERAC pathways are available in Appendix 1.

100 Based on the reported information from clinical informatics on average opioid use in patients  
101 after cesarean, power analysis revealed that in order to detect a 50 % decreased in MME use per  
102 stay (90% chance) at a  $p < 0.05$  statistical significance level, 112 patients in each cohort would  
103 be necessary.

104 Patient enrollment pre-ERAC occurred from October 2019 until February 2020. During this time  
105 period, the ERAC pathways were created, and all the necessary logistics for the implementation  
106 were prepared. The interventions were designed in accordance with Enhanced Recovery After  
107 Surgery (ERAS) Society guidelines for CD<sup>20,25,26</sup>. In March of 2020, the ERAC pathways were  
108 implemented on our Obstetric Care Unit (OBCU). We allowed a “wash-out period” of two  
109 months to permit staff adjustment and implementation of this new protocol. Following this  
110 period, post-ERAC enrollment occurred from May 2020 until September 2020.

111 Patient satisfaction surveys were administered during both pre- and post-ERAC periods as part  
112 of the implementation.

113 Exclusion criteria included CD done under general anesthesia, those complicated by massive  
114 transfusion events (defined as transfusion of six or more PRBC's), bowel injury, CD requiring  
115 recovery in the intensive care unit, and skin incision other than Pfannenstiel. It is thought that  
116 these factors may result in higher opioid use and protracted recovery. Additionally, to further  
117 reduce the factors that can result in increased opioid use, we excluded patients with chronic pain  
118 disorders, chronic opioid use, acute postpartum depression, or mothers whose neonate demised  
119 before their discharge. Since we routinely provided patient recovery questionnaires in English  
120 and Spanish, we excluded patients who did not speak one of the two languages.

121 We collected: patient’s demographic information; past obstetrical, medical, and surgical history;  
122 the presence of mental health disorders and substance abuse (including urine toxicology results  
123 which is sent routinely upon admission); delivery information, delivery complications  
124 (chorioamnionitis, uterine incision extension, blood transfusion) and surgical complications  
125 (surgical site infection, postpartum hemorrhage, ileus or small bowel obstruction); neonatal  
126 information; inpatient opioid use along with pain scores as well as the amount of prescribed

127 opioids; date and time of the ERAC interventions as described below in the secondary outcomes;  
128 and lastly, follow up data on postpartum follow up and readmission.

### 129 *ERAC team*

130 Our multidisciplinary team consisted of representatives from obstetrics, obstetric anesthesiology,  
131 nursing leaders, patient-controlled analgesia services, pharmacy, project development, food and  
132 hospitality services, clinical informatics, data and analytics, clinical practices and professional  
133 development, materials management, patient experience advocacy, and other ancillary services.

### 134 *Implementation*

135 Team leaders met regularly to discuss the ERAC pathways' interventions, logistics of the  
136 implementation, the progress of the project, as well as the staff and patient feedback. The ERAC  
137 leaders were also responsible for staff educations. Physician education was done primarily at the  
138 Obstetrics & Gynecology department meetings. Nursing education was completed at the monthly  
139 and quarterly nursing meetings and on an individual basis. Moreover, education continued during  
140 other events, ranging from morning and evening sign-outs to email communications and grand  
141 rounds.

### 142 *Electronic medical records*

143 A substantial change was made in our electronic medical record system (Epic Hyperspace®) to  
144 accommodate the implementation of our ERAC pathways into our clinical practice. All existing  
145 cesarean section order sets were reviewed and updated to include all new changes. An ERAC  
146 flowsheet was created to provide easy access to the MME usage and pain scores. This flowsheet  
147 also was used to evaluate the patient's pain control and the quantity of outpatient opioid  
148 prescriptions. In addition, the flowsheet simplified nursing entry of all ERAC interventions.

149



150 *Core measure*

151 Current practice was reviewed, and deficiencies were analyzed. Based on this review, a formal  
152 ERAC pathways were implemented. The focus was placed on essential and deficient areas. Four  
153 main areas were identified to require changes: multimodal analgesia, preoperative fasting time,  
154 early ambulation, and patient education. Details of each pathway are available in Appendix 1.

- 155 1. Routine use of Gabapentin was added to the multimodal analgesia protocol. The addition  
156 took place after a review of the available literature and consultation with neonatology and  
157 lactation services to confirm safety profiles.
- 158 2. Fasting before CD was reduced to six hours for light meals (examples are given in both  
159 patient's education guide and instructional video) and two hours for fluids. A  
160 carbohydrate drink (50 grams) was routinely administered two hours before CD in non-  
161 diabetic mothers. After CD, the default diet was clear fluids and crackers within one hour  
162 and a light meal within four hours of arrival to the Post Anesthesia Care Unit (PACU).
- 163 3. The goals for ambulation were standardized to include specific instruction rather than  
164 "early ambulation was encouraged". The goals were set for 0-24 hours(h), 24-48h, and  
165 more than 48h. The goals were adjusted based on clinical circumstances (i.e., patients  
166 requiring Magnesium Sulfate).
- 167 4. A paramount component of our ERAC pathways was patient education. We wanted to  
168 improve not only patient recovery but also their autonomy. The details of our ERAC  
169 program and goals of care were included in a patient education guide and instructional  
170 video that are available in English and Spanish at <http://umm.edu/ERAC>. The reading  
171 grade level was fourth grade for the patient video and fifth grade for the patient education  
172 guide (assessed with Flesch-Kincaid grading). This was in accordance with the Health

173 Literacy guidelines for patient education materials. The patient education guide was  
174 provided during prenatal care visits as well as preoperative assessment. Those who  
175 missed education during prenatal care were educated on the obstetrical care unit during  
176 their preoperative visit. Video distribution was available at the outpatient clinical sites  
177 and all hospital patient rooms through our Telephone Initiated Guided Response video  
178 system.

### 179 *Compliance*

180 Compliance was established at three levels:

- 181 1. ERAC champions were identified and were responsible for providing staff support and  
182 supervising compliance in the OBCU.
- 183 2. With the creation of the ERAC flowsheet, electronic data extraction of MME use and pain  
184 scores as well as secondary outcomes were periodically performed by the clinical informatics  
185 team at the request of the ERAC leaders. This information was used to assess compliance with  
186 documentation and assess the ERAC pathways' efficacy.
- 187 3. Random charts were reviewed in detail to assess compliance with documentation.

### 188 *Outcomes*

189 The primary outcomes were inpatient morphine milligram equivalent (MME) use and patient-  
190 reported pain scores. The MME was calculated per hospital day and per entire hospital stay. Pain  
191 was reported as delta pain ( $\Delta P$ ) and represented the difference between the patient's reported pain  
192 and the patient's pain goal.

193 Secondary outcomes were outpatient MME prescription, fasting time for liquids and solids  
194 (fasting time before surgery), time to feeding (the time to first feed after arrival to PACU), time  
195 to indwelling urinary catheter removal, time to ambulation, and time to hospital discharge.

196 *Statistical analysis*

197 Descriptive statistics were used for frequency, median, and mean. Baseline demographics and  
198 outcomes were compared between pre-ERAC and post-ERAC cohorts using  $\chi^2$  test or Fisher's  
199 exact test for categorical variables and the Wilcoxon rank-sum test or Student's t-test for  
200 continuous variables. Normality of distribution was established using the Kolmogorov-Smirnoff  
201 test. The associations between ERAC implementation and inpatient MME use and delta pain  
202 score for each postoperative day were measured using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. Analysis was  
203 then stratified by Magnesium Sulfate use, maternal obesity, depression, and neonatal disposition  
204 (newborn nurse vs. neonatal intensive care unit), as these parameters may affect post-surgical  
205 goals. A negative binomial mixed model was adopted to solve right-skewed and over-dispersion  
206 of inpatient MME use. This model was used to evaluate the associations between inpatient MME  
207 use and ERAC implementation as well as to adjust for covariates. The goodness-of-fit Pearson  
208  $\chi^2$  was evaluated for the model fit of the negative binomial mixed model. The least square means  
209 were computed for postoperative days 0 to 4 to detect any differences in the inpatient MME use.  
210 A multinomial logistic regression model was conducted to control for potential confounders,  
211 identified either historically or through bivariate analysis. The odds ratio with a 95% confidence  
212 interval (CI) was used to measure the magnitude of the association. The variance inflation factor  
213 (VIF) and correlation coefficients were used to identify multicollinearity. The Hosmer-  
214 Lemeshow test and the area under the receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve were used  
215 to assure goodness-of-fit and the discriminatory power for the logistic model. Analyses were  
216 performed with SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

217

218

## 219 **Results**

220 A total of 308 patients undergoing CD were enrolled in the study, 196 in the pre-ERAC cohort  
221 and 112 in the post-ERAC cohort. Baseline characteristics were comparable with regards to age,  
222 race and ethnicity, gravity, parity, and most pre-existing medical conditions. There was a higher  
223 incidence of diabetes mellitus in the pre-ERAC cohort (12.8 vs. 3.6%,  $p=0.008$ ). The rate of  
224 obesity was also higher in the post-ERAC cohort [35.8 (30.9-41) vs. 33.3 (28.3-40.2),  $p<0.001$ ]  
225 (Table 1). Similarly, the rate of prior laparotomy history other than CD was higher in the post-  
226 ERAC cohort (9.8% vs. 4.1%,  $p=0.04$ ). Indication for CD was similar between cohorts, except  
227 that the post-ERAC cohort had a lower incidence of delivery for placental abnormality (0.9% vs.  
228 6.1%,  $p=0.04$ ). There was no difference in CD time, quantitative blood loss, or delivery and  
229 surgical complications between the two cohorts (Table 2 and 3). In addition, there was no  
230 difference in neonatal birth weight, Apgar score, or umbilical cord blood gases (Supplemental  
231 Table 1).

### 232 **Morphine Milligram Equivalents used**

233 There was a higher percentage of no postpartum opioids use in the post-ERAC cohort compared  
234 to the pre-ERAC cohort (35.7% vs. 18.4%,  $p<0.001$ ). Furthermore, there was a significant  
235 reduction in the MME per day (postoperative days 1 to 4) and per stay [16.8(11.2-33.9) vs.  
236 30(20-49),  $p<0.001$ ] in the post-ERAC cohort (Table 4.1). The magnitude of difference was  
237 reduced in patients with depression and was only statistically significant for postoperative days 1  
238 to 2. Consequentially, in patients with depression, there was a smaller difference in MME use per  
239 stay as well [17.8(8.4-38) vs. 36.3(25.2-54.8),  $p=0.03$ ] (Table 4.1).

240 The number of patients who required prescribed opioids at the time of discharge was  
241 significantly decreased in the post-ERAC cohort (86.6 vs. 98%,  $p<0.001$ ). The post-ERAC

242 patients also had fewer MMEs prescribed [150 (112-150) vs. 150 (150-225),  $p<0.001$ ; different  
243 shape of distribution] compared to the pre-ERAC cohort (Table 5).

#### 244 **Delta pain scores**

245 The patients in the post-ERAC cohort had lower delta pain scores on postoperative days 1 to 4 as  
246 well as lower overall delta pain scores [2.2 (1.3-3.7 vs. 3.3 (2.3-4.7),  $p<0.001$ ] (Table 4.2).

#### 247 **Secondary outcomes** (Table 6.1).

##### 248 *-Fasting time*

249 Preoperative fasting time for clear liquids was significantly less in the post-ERAC [7.9h (3.4,  
250 12.3) vs. 11.0h (7.7, 14.9),  $p<0.001$ ]. There was no significant difference in the fasting time for  
251 solids [12.9h (9.6, 16.9) vs. 12.9h (9.9, 16.1),  $p=0.8$ ]. However, time to feeding postoperatively  
252 occurred significantly sooner in the post-ERAC cohort [2.1h (1.0, 6.0) vs. 9.7h (6.8, 12.9),  
253  $p<0.001$ ].

##### 254 *-Time to indwelling urinary catheter removal*

255 The time to indwelling urinary catheter removal was statistically significant less in the post-  
256 ERAC cohort [10.1h (7.2,13.7) vs. 12.5h (10.9,17.8),  $p<0.001$ ].

##### 257 *-Time to ambulation*

258 The time to ambulation was also statistically significant less in the post-ERAC cohort [9.5h  
259 (6.6,16.9) vs. 16.0h (11-22.6),  $p<0.001$ ]. When we stratified by Magnesium Sulfate use, this  
260 difference persisted in those who did not receive Magnesium Sulfate [9.5h (6.6,16.9) vs. 16.0h  
261 (11,22.6),  $p<0.001$ ]. In those who did receive post-operative Magnesium Sulfate, time to  
262 ambulation was similar between the two cohorts [25.4h (22.7,28.1) vs. 25.7h (24.5,26.6,  $p=0.6$ ]  
263 (Table 6.2)..

##### 264 *-Time to discharge*

265 The time to discharge was statistically significant less in the post-ERAC cohort [72.4h (62.7,  
266 82.7) vs. 76.1h (69.9,90),  $p=0.002$ ]. When stratified by NICU admission and magnesium Sulfate  
267 use, the difference was not statistically significant (Table 6.2).

## 268 **Multivariate analysis**

269 Inpatient MME used was noted to be right-skewed and over-dispersed. In order to achieve  
270 patterns in the data which would be more interpretable and meet the assumptions of inferential  
271 statistics, a negative binomial mixed model was conducted. Only statistically significant  
272 variables from the bivariate analysis were included (Supplementary Table 2). To help assess the  
273 fit of the model, we used the goodness-of-fit Pearson  $\chi^2$ . The  $\chi^2/DF$  was 0.48, which yielded a  $p$ -  
274 value of 1. The non-significant  $p$ -value suggests that the negative binomial model is a good fit  
275 for the data. The measure of over-dispersion dropped from 12.9 (Poisson model) to 0.48  
276 (negative binomial model), indicating that over-dispersion was no longer a problem.

277 After adjusting for confounders, patients in the post-ERAC cohort were still less likely to use  
278 opioids on postoperative days 1, 2, 3, and per total stay. Delivery complications were an  
279 independent predictor for increased opioid use (Supplementary Table 3).

280 Additionally, for each hour decrease in time to feeding, there was a 5% decrease in opioid use,  
281 while for each unit increase in pain scores, patients were twice as likely to use opioids.

282 For outpatient opioid use, we categorized prescribed MME based on a 150 cut-off due to  
283 frequency of distribution. We adjusted for BMI, race/ethnicity, depression, toxicology results,  
284 inpatient MME use, time to discharge, and pain goals. The overall model was significant  
285 (likelihood  $\chi^2$  (11) = 22.9 with a  $p=0.02$ ) and pseudo  $R^2$  of 12.7%. The Hosmer and Lemeshow  
286  $\chi^2$  (8) statistics was 9.1, with a  $p$ -value of 0.3. The area under the receiver-operating curve  
287 (AUC) was 0.68, denoting a fair model fit. Being in the post-ERAC cohort was the only

288 predictor of decreased inpatient MME use [OR 0.38 (0.18-0.76), p=0.006]. The patients in the  
289 post-ERAC cohort were 38% less likely to be prescribed more than 150 MME compared to pre-  
290 ERAC cohort.

## 291 **Discussion**

### 292 **Principal findings**

293 Implementation of our ERAC pathways have significantly reduced inpatient and outpatient  
294 opioid use while reducing patient pain scores. Although the relative reduction in opioid use  
295 might appear lower than in other studies, our study demonstrated either a more substantial  
296 absolute reduction in opioid use was more substantial<sup>27</sup> or a greater reduction in the pain scores  
297 <sup>14</sup>. Furthermore, we were able to implement Gabapentin as part of our standard pain management  
298 algorithm with no reported adverse events. Thus, we continue to use it as a part of our  
299 multimodal analgesia.

300 Preoperative fasting time for clear liquids was significantly reduced in our post-ERAC cohort,  
301 and although while the fasting time for solids remained unchanged pre and post-ERAC, this is  
302 likely related to the delays in the start of elective cases or policies related to feeding while  
303 laboring (e.g., clear liquids only if the patient is on Magnesium Sulfate). The benefits of oral  
304 intake in labor are related to physiological and psychological advantages<sup>28</sup>. Prolonged fasting  
305 with resulting ketosis and ketoacidosis has been found to result in prolonged labor, increased  
306 need for induction and augmentation in nulliparous women, forceps deliveries, and increased  
307 blood loss<sup>29,30</sup>. On the contrary, oral hydration in labor has been shown to decrease maternal  
308 urine ketones at delivery and may have a benefit on the uterus and placental perfusion<sup>31</sup>.  
309 To remove barriers for early ambulation, we planned early discontinuation of intravenous fluids  
310 and early removal of indwelling urinary catheters. In addition, since effective pain relief per se

311 does not automatically lead to increased ambulation, we set up mobilization goals at 0 to 8 h, 8 to  
312 24 h, and more than 24 h. Instructions are described in detail in Appendix 1. Although provider  
313 discretion was allowed for patients who received postpartum Magnesium Sulfate, feeding, early  
314 indwelling urinary catheter removal, and early mobilization were encouraged. This resulted in a  
315 significant reduction of time to feeding, time to removal of the indwelling urinary catheters, and  
316 time to ambulation. It has been demonstrated that early feeding results in improved maternal  
317 satisfaction, accelerated return of bowel function, reduced time to ambulation, and decreased  
318 length of stay<sup>20</sup>. Early removal of indwelling urinary catheters has been associated with a lower  
319 incidence of urinary tract infection, early ambulation, and decreased length of stay<sup>19</sup>.  
320 Consequently, early ambulation has the potential benefits of rapid return of bowel function,  
321 reduced risk of thromboembolism, and decreased length of stay<sup>20</sup>.  
322 Finally, time to discharge was significantly reduced in the post-ERAC group; however, the  
323 clinical significance of this reduction is less clear. Factors other than maternal recovery influence  
324 the time of discharge, including neonatal monitoring and disposition. Nevertheless, several-hour  
325 differences in the time to discharge can affect insurance coverage beyond 72 hours, thereby  
326 affecting overall hospital cost<sup>32</sup>.  
327 Most importantly, we made patient education the foundation of our protocol implementation.  
328 Since most patient education materials are written at reading levels considerably higher than that  
329 of the average United States adult<sup>33</sup>, we made it a priority to achieve an optimal reading level for  
330 our ERAC education materials(at or below 5<sup>th</sup> grade)<sup>34</sup>. Patient education has become a  
331 cornerstone of successful ERAC implementation<sup>8</sup>, which starts during prenatal care, continues  
332 throughout hospitalization, and follows through the postpartum care. This is aimed to attend



333 patients' emotional needs that are often unrecognized in their struggle to regain control of their  
334 health and well-being<sup>35</sup>.

### 335 **Strengths**

336 One of the main strengths is the prospective nature of our study. In addition, our pathways  
337 contain several elements that have not been previously reported:

- 338 1. Inclusion of non-elective CD. Most of the reported studies included elective CD, and  
339 only some urgent CD<sup>36,37</sup>, leaving out unscheduled non-urgent cases. Although  
340 multimodal pain regimens have been studied in the settings of non-elective CD<sup>38</sup>, they  
341 have not been applied along with ERAC pathways. Our algorithm can be applied across  
342 all uncomplicated CD categories, including those CDs performed during labor.
- 343 2. Integration of Gabapentin as part of the multimodal analgesia within the ERAC  
344 pathways. Gabapentin has been studied as an analgetic after CD, but not in the context of  
345 ERAC pathways<sup>15,16</sup>.
- 346 3. Use of a realistic approach to the patient pain goals (by studying the difference between  
347 the patient's pain goals and the patient's pain scores). While a previous study reported  
348 delta pain, that study regimen did not demonstrate an actual reduction in pain scores<sup>27</sup>.
- 349 4. Patient-centered implementation. A patient's education guide and instructional video  
350 were created at the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> reading level with approval from the patient's advocacy  
351 department. The translation was done in Spanish to ensure inclusion of the Hispanic  
352 population. This population has been reported to have decreased pain control after CD<sup>39</sup>.  
353 Furthermore, we routinely offered patient satisfaction surveys to every patient on  
354 postoperative day one and the day of discharge.

355

356 **Limitations**

357 One of the limitations of our study is the enrollment of only uncomplicated CD. Based on our  
358 results, it seems reasonable that this algorithm can be applied to complicated CD; however, our  
359 study was not designed to evaluate this population specifically. As with any quality improvement  
360 (QI) initiative, there is a potential for performance bias (after implementing the QI, the post-  
361 intervention cohort receives more attention during medical care). Another limitation is that we  
362 did not verify the opioid prescription dispensed from the pharmacy. Our study did not include  
363 long-term postoperative follow-up; therefore, we were unable to identify additional difficulties in  
364 recovery after discharge from the hospital. However, as part of our Obstetrical Transitional Care  
365 Program, patients receive phone calls from a dedicated nursing team assessing their recovery  
366 from CD on a routine basis. We did not identify more difficulties with pain control in the post-  
367 implementation period, nor did we note any difference in the re-admission rates. Finally, the  
368 study did not evaluate the cost analysis of our interventions, which will be a crucial next step in  
369 determining the success of these pathways in health care utilization.

370 **Conclusion**

371 In conclusion, our study has illustrated that our ERAC pathways reduced inpatient and outpatient  
372 opioid use while reducing pain scores and improving indicators of postoperative recovery.  
373 Specifically, we focused on patient education as being the foundation of our successful protocol  
374 implementation. Future efforts to expand these pathways to additional populations will be  
375 paramount as we move forward to streamline health care utilization while improving overall  
376 patient experience.

377 **Acknowledgments:** The authors are grateful to Dr. Christopher Harman for his unconditional  
378 support in implementing this project. We are thankful to Ms. Elizabeth Groncki, who greatly  
379 facilitated the project development. Also, we are appreciative of Tracy Keith's and Cara  
380 Sullivan's nursing leadership during the implementation of this project. Gena Stanek helped  
381 prepare the patient's educational materials to the recommended reading level, and Alexandra  
382 Bessent translated it into an engaging patient's guide and instructional video.

383 **Disclosure:** The authors report no conflict of interest.

384 **Contribution to authorship:** LC and KG drafted the manuscript. HS performed the statistical  
385 analysis and ensured its correct interpretation. All authors contributed to the writing, editing, and  
386 approving the final version.

## References

1. Pfunter A WL, Stocks C. Most Frequent Procedures Performed in U.S. Hospitals, 2010: Statistical Brief #149. 2013 Feb. In: Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Statistical Briefs [Internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2006 Feb.
2. Clark SL, Garite TJ, Hamilton EF, Belfort MA, Hankins GD. "Doing something" about the cesarean delivery rate. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Sep 2018;219(3):267-271. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2018.04.044
3. Boerma T, Ronsmans C, Melesse DY, et al. Global epidemiology of use of and disparities in caesarean sections. *The Lancet*. 2018;392(10155):1341-1348. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31928-7
4. Burgansky A, Montalto D, Siddiqui NA. The safe motherhood initiative: The development and implementation of standardized obstetric care bundles in New York. *Semin Perinatol*. Mar 2016;40(2):124-31. doi:10.1053/j.semperi.2015.11.019
5. Patel K, Zakowski M. Enhanced Recovery After Cesarean: Current and Emerging Trends. *Curr Anesthesiol Rep*. Mar 2 2021:1-9. doi:10.1007/s40140-021-00442-9
6. Wahl TS, Goss LE, Morris MS, et al. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) Eliminates Racial Disparities in Postoperative Length of Stay After Colorectal Surgery. *Ann Surg*. Dec 2018;268(6):1026-1035. doi:10.1097/sla.0000000000002307
7. Ituk U, Habib AS. Enhanced recovery after cesarean delivery. *F1000Res*. 2018;7:F1000 Faculty Rev-513. doi:10.12688/f1000research.13895.1
8. Bollag L, Nelson G. Enhanced Recovery After Cesarean (ERAC) - beyond the pain scores. *Int J Obstet Anesth*. Aug 2020;43:36-38. doi:10.1016/j.ijoa.2020.05.006
9. Bateman BT, Franklin JM, Bykov K, et al. Persistent opioid use following cesarean delivery: patterns and predictors among opioid-naive women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Sep 2016;215(3):353.e1-353.e18. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.03.016
10. Peahl AF, Dalton VK, Montgomery JR, Lai Y-L, Hu HM, Waljee JF. Rates of New Persistent Opioid Use After Vaginal or Cesarean Birth Among US Women. *JAMA Network Open*. 2019;2(7):e197863-e197863. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.7863
11. VDH. Virginia Department of Health. Pregnancy-associated deaths from drug overdose in Virginia, 1999-2007: a report from the Virginia Maternal Mortality Review Team. <http://www.vdh.virginia.gov/content/uploads/sites/18/2016/04/Final-Pregnancy-Associated-Deaths-Due-to-Drug-Overdose.pdf>
12. DHMH. Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. Maryland maternal mortality review 2016 annual report. [http://healthymaryland.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/MMR\\_Report\\_2016\\_clean-copy\\_FINAL.pdf](http://healthymaryland.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/MMR_Report_2016_clean-copy_FINAL.pdf).
13. Patrick SW, Schumacher RE, Benneyworth BD, Krans EE, McAllister JM, Davis MM. Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome and Associated Health Care Expenditures: United States, 2000-2009. *JAMA*. 2012;307(18):1934-1940. doi:10.1001/jama.2012.3951
14. Smith AM, Young P, Blosser CC, Poole AT. Multimodal Stepwise Approach to Reducing In-Hospital Opioid Use After Cesarean Delivery: A Quality Improvement Initiative. *Obstet Gynecol*. Apr 2019;133(4):700-706. doi:10.1097/aog.0000000000003156
15. Moore A, Costello J, Wiczorek P, Shah V, Taddio A, Carvalho JC. Gabapentin improves postcesarean delivery pain management: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Anesth Analg*. Jan 2011;112(1):167-73. doi:10.1213/ANE.0b013e3181fdf5ee

16. Felder L, Saccone G, Scuotto S, et al. Perioperative gabapentin and post cesarean pain control: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. Feb 2019;233:98-106. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2018.11.026
17. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 750: Perioperative Pathways: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery. *Obstet Gynecol*. Sep 2018;132(3):e120-e130. doi:10.1097/aog.0000000000002818
18. Stethen TW, Ghazi YA, Heidel RE, et al. Walking to recovery: the effects of missed ambulation events on postsurgical recovery after bowel resection. *J Gastrointest Oncol*. Oct 2018;9(5):953-961. doi:10.21037/jgo.2017.11.05
19. Aref NK. Does timing of urinary catheter removal after elective cesarean section affects postoperative morbidity?: a prospective randomized trial. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. Jan 30 2019;1-6. doi:10.1080/14767058.2019.1569619
20. Macones GA, Caughey AB, Wood SL, et al. Guidelines for postoperative care in cesarean delivery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) Society recommendations (part 3). *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Sep 2019;221(3):247.e1-247.e9. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2019.04.012
21. Elias KM, Stone AB, McGinagle K, et al. The Reporting on ERAS Compliance, Outcomes, and Elements Research (RECOVER) Checklist: A Joint Statement by the ERAS® and ERAS® USA Societies. *World Journal of Surgery*. 2019/01/01 2019;43(1):1-8. doi:10.1007/s00268-018-4753-0
22. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. Apr 2008;61(4):344-9. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008
23. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. Jul 2019;95:103208. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
24. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. Apr 2009;42(2):377-81. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
25. Caughey AB, Wood SL, Macones GA, et al. Guidelines for intraoperative care in cesarean delivery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Society Recommendations (Part 2). *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Dec 2018;219(6):533-544. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2018.08.006
26. Wilson RD, Caughey AB, Wood SL, et al. Guidelines for Antenatal and Preoperative care in Cesarean Delivery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Society Recommendations (Part 1). *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Dec 2018;219(6):523.e1-523.e15. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2018.09.015
27. Hedderson M, Lee D, Hunt E, et al. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery to Change Process Measures and Reduce Opioid Use After Cesarean Delivery: A Quality Improvement Initiative. *Obstet Gynecol*. Sep 2019;134(3):511-519. doi:10.1097/aog.0000000000003406
28. Maharaj D. Eating and drinking in labor: should it be allowed? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. Sep 2009;146(1):3-7. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2009.04.019
29. Dumoulin JG, Foulkes JE. Ketonuria during labour. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol*. Feb 1984;91(2):97-8. doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.1984.tb05889.x
30. Ludka LM, Roberts CC. Eating and drinking in labor. A literature review. *J Nurse Midwifery*. Jul-Aug 1993;38(4):199-207. doi:10.1016/0091-2182(93)90003-y
31. Okutomi T, Kato R. [Preoperative oral hydration for pregnant women]. *Masui*. Jul 2011;60(7):799-806.

32. Brumfield CG, Sheffield JS, Hauth J, DuBard M, Shannon S. 72-hour discharge after cesarean delivery: results in a selected Medicaid population. *J Matern Fetal Med.* Mar-Apr 1998;7(2):72-5. doi:10.1002/(sici)1520-6661(199803/04)7:2<72::Aid-mfm4>3.0.Co;2-l
33. Stossel LM, Segar N, Gliatto P, Fallar R, Karani R. Readability of patient education materials available at the point of care. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2012;27(9):1165-1170. doi:10.1007/s11606-012-2046-0
34. Advancing Effective Communication, Cultural Competence, and Patient- and Family-Centered Care: A Roadmap for Hospitals. The Joint Commission. 2010
35. Poland F, Spalding N, Gregory S, McCulloch J, Sargen K, Vicary P. Developing patient education to enhance recovery after colorectal surgery through action research: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open.* 2017;7(6):e013498. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013498
36. Baluku M, Bajunirwe F, Ngonzi J, Kiwanuka J, Tendo S. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Versus Standard of Care Recovery for Emergency Cesarean Deliveries at Mbarara Hospital, Uganda. *Anesth Analg.* Mar 2020;130(3):769-776. doi:10.1213/ane.0000000000004495
37. Mullman L, Hilden P, Goral J, et al. Improved Outcomes With an Enhanced Recovery Approach to Cesarean Delivery. *Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2020;136(4):685-691. doi:10.1097/aog.0000000000004023
38. Holland E, Bateman BT, Cole N, et al. Evaluation of a Quality Improvement Intervention That Eliminated Routine Use of Opioids After Cesarean Delivery. *Obstet Gynecol.* Jan 2019;133(1):91-97. doi:10.1097/aog.0000000000003010
39. Johnson JD, Asiodu IV, McKenzie CP, et al. Racial and Ethnic Inequities in Postpartum Pain Evaluation and Management. *Obstet Gynecol.* Dec 2019;134(6):1155-1162. doi:10.1097/aog.0000000000003505

## Tables

**Table 1. Demographic and medical characteristics.**

	<b>Total (n=308)</b>	<b>preERAC (n=196)</b>	<b>postERAC (n= 112)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Age, mean(SD)</b>	30.6(6.1)	30.6(6.4)	30.7(5.5)	0.9
<b>Race, n(%)</b>				0.2
Hispanic	17(5.5)	7(3.6)	10(8.9)	
non-Hispanic Black	195(63.3)	121(61.7)	74(66.1)	
non-Hispanic White	81(26.3)	56(28.6)	25(22.3)	
Asian	10(3.3)	8(4.1)	2(1.8)	
other	5(1.6)	4(2.0)	1(0.9)	
<b>BMI, median(IQR)</b>	33.3(28.3, 40.2)	32.1(27.5, 39.5)	35.8(30.9, 41)	0.0002
<b>Gravida, median(IQR)</b>	3(2, 4)	3(2, 4)	3(2, 4)	0.3
<b>Para, median(IQR)</b>	1(0, 2)	1(0, 2)	1(0, 1.5)	0.1
<b>Aborta, median(IQR)</b>	1(0, 2)	1(0, 2)	0.5(0, 1)	0.6
<b>Medical problems</b>				
<b>DM, n(%)</b>	29(9.4)	25(12.8)	4(3.6)	0.008
<b>HTN, n(%)</b>	61(19.8)	36(18.4)	25(22.3)	0.4
<b>Asthma, n(%)</b>	67(21.8)	42(21.4)	25(22.3)	0.9
<b>CKD, n(%)</b>	2(0.7)	2(1.0)	0	0.5
<b>PIH, n(%)</b>	61(19.8)	45(23.0)	16(14.3)	0.07
<b>GDM, n(%)</b>	20(6.5)	7(3.6)	13(11.6)	0.006
<b>Cardiovascular disease, n(%)</b>	7(2.3)	4(2.0)	3(2.7)	0.7
<b>Autoimmune, n(%)</b>	4(1.3)	2(1.0)	2(1.8)	0.6
<b>Neurologic disease, n(%)</b>	12(3.9)	6(3.1)	6(5.4)	0.4
<b>Thyroid disorder, n(%)</b>	5(1.6)	3(1.5)	2(1.8)	1.0
<b>MDD, n(%)</b>	69(22.5)	48(24.5)	21(18.9)	0.3
on medications, n(%)	22(31.9)	17(35.4)	5(23.8)	0.3
positive toxicology, n(%)	31(10.1)	18(9.2)	13(11.6)	0.5
<b>Other medical conditions, n(%)</b>	17(5.5)	9(4.6)	8(7.1)	0.3

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; BMI: body mass index; DM: diabetes mellitus; HTN: hypertension; GDM: gestational diabetes mellitus; MDD: major depressive disorder; SD: standard deviation; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

**Table 2. Surgical characteristics.**

		<b>Past surgical history</b>			<b>p-value</b>
		<b>Total (n=308)</b>	<b>preERAC (n=196)</b>	<b>postERAC (n= 112)</b>	
<b>No prior surgery, n(%)</b>					0.5
	no	154(50)	95(48.5)	59(52.7)	
	yes	154(50)	101(51.5)	53(47.3)	
<b>CS, n(%)</b>		144(46.8)	91(46.4)	53(47.3)	0.9
	number of CS, n(%)				0.4
	1	96(66.7)	59(64.8)	37(69.8)	
	2	33(22.9)	24(26.4)	9(17.0)	
	3	14(9.7)	7(7.7)	7(13.2)	
	4	1(0.7)	1(1.1)	0	
<b>Laparotomy, n(%)</b>		19(6.2)	8(4.1)	11(9.8)	0.04*
	number of laparotomies, n(%)				1.0
	1	16(84.2)	8(100)	8(72.7)	
	2	1(5.3)	0	1(9.1)	
	3	1(5.3)	0	1(9.1)	
	4	1(5.3)	0	1(9.1)	
		<b>Indication for CS</b>			
<b>Elective, n(%)</b>		102(33.1)	59(30.1)	43(38.4)	0.1
<b>Arrest of labor, n(%)</b>		40(13.0)	22(11.2)	18(16.1)	0.2
<b>NRFHT, n(%)</b>		64(20.8)	39(19.9)	25(22.3)	0.6
<b>Malpresentation, n(%)</b>		35(11.4)	24(12.2)	11(9.8)	0.5
<b>Maternal indication, n(%)</b>		53(17.2)	37(18.9)	16(14.3)	0.3
<b>Placental abnormality, n(%)</b>		13(4.2)	12(6.1)	1(0.9)	0.04*
<b>Other indication, n(%)</b>		12(3.9)	8(4.1)	4(3.6)	1.0
<b>Blood loss, median(IQR)</b>		759(520, 1067)	763(507, 1047)	751(522, 1123)	0.9

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; CS: cesarean section; NRFHT: non-reassuring fetal heart tracing; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.



**Table 3. Delivery and surgical complications.**

		<b>Delivery complications</b>			
		<b>Total (n=308)</b>	<b>preERAC (n=196)</b>	<b>postERAC (n= 112)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>No delivery complication, n(%)</b>					0.2
	no	46(14.9)	25(12.8)	21(18.8)	
	yes	262(85.1)	171(87.2)	91(81.3)	
<b>Chorioamnionitis, n(%)</b>		14(4.6)	9(4.6)	5(4.5)	1.0
<b>Extension of the uterine incision, n(%)</b>		13(4.2)	11(5.6)	2(1.8)	0.1
<b>Transfusion of blood products, n(%)</b>		9(2.9)	5(2.6)	4(3.6)	0.7
<b>Other complications, n(%)</b>		19(6.2)	5(2.6)	14(12.5)	0.0005*
		<b>Surgical complications</b>			
<b>No surgical complications, n(%)</b>					0.7
	no	101(32.8)	63(32.1)	38(33.9)	
	yes	207(67.2)	133(67.9)	74(66.1)	
<b>SSI, n(%)</b>		4(1.3)	3(1.5)	1(0.9)	1.0
<b>PPH, n(%)</b>		97(31.5)	62(31.6)	35(31.3)	0.9
<b>SBO, n(%)</b>		0	0	0	1.0
<b>Other surgical complication, n(%)</b>		11(3.6)	8(4.1)	3(2.7)	0.8

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; SSI: surgical site infection; PPH: postpartum hemorrhage; SBO: small bowel obstruction; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

**Table 4.1 Distribution of no postpartum MME use.**

	MME, median(IQR)					
	Day 0 (n=308)	Day 1 (n=307)	Day 2 (n=307)	Day 3 (n=230)	Day 4 (n=61)	Overall average (n=308)
<b>Total</b>	0(0, 0.6)	15(0,30)	15(0, 37.5)	15(0, 30)	15(0, 30)	12.5(0.6, 28.4)
<b>No MME use, n(%)</b>	229(74.4)	102(33.2)	105(34.2)	82(35.7)	17(27.9)	76(24.7)
<b>preERAC</b>	<b>(n=196)</b>	<b>(n=195)</b>	<b>(n=195)</b>	<b>(n=160)</b>	<b>(n=45)</b>	<b>(n=196)</b>
<b>No MME use, n(%)</b>	0(0, 6.8)	22.5(5, 45)	22.5(0, 52.5)	15(0, 33.8)	15(7.5, 30)	20.5(5.6, 35.2)
<b>postERAC</b>	<b>(n=112)</b>	<b>(n=112)</b>	<b>(n=112)</b>	<b>(n=70)</b>	<b>(n=16)</b>	<b>(n=112)</b>
<b>No MME use, n(%)</b>	141(71.9)	47(24.1)	51(26.2)	41(25.6)	9(20)	36(18.4)
<b>p-value</b>	0(0, 0)	3.8(0, 15)	7.5(0, 15)	0(0, 15)	3.8(0, 18.8)	4.3(0, 15.4)
	88(78.6)	55(49.1)	54(48.2)	41(58.6)	8(50)	40(35.7)
	0.2	<0.0001*	<0.0001*	<0.0001*	0.03*	<0.0001*
MME, median(IQR) in patients with MDD						
Patient with MDD	Day 0 (n=69)	Day 1 (n=68)	Day 2 (n=68)	Day 3 (n=55)	Day 4 (n=14)	Overall average (n=69)
<b>Total</b>	0(0, 25.2)	15(3.7, 45.5)	22.5(5, 45)	15(0, 30)	15(7.5, 30)	18(15, 39.4)
<b>No MME use, n(%)</b>	44(63.8)	16(23.5)	16(23.5)	17(30.9)	3(21.4)	11(15.9)
<b>preERAC</b>	<b>(n=48)</b>	<b>(n=47)</b>	<b>(n=47)</b>	<b>(n=39)</b>	<b>(n=11)</b>	<b>(n=48)</b>
<b>No MME use, n(%)</b>	0(0, 26.3)	30(15, 60)	30(10, 52.5)	15(7.5, 30)	15(7.5, 30)	25.3(7.9, 47.0)
<b>postERAC</b>	<b>(n=21)</b>	<b>(n=21)</b>	<b>(n=21)</b>	<b>(n=16)</b>	<b>(n=3)</b>	<b>(n=21)</b>
<b>No MME use, n(%)</b>	29(60.4)	8(17.0)	9(19.2)	8(20.5)	1(9.1)	6(12.5)
<b>p-value</b>	0(0, 7.5)	7.5(0, 15)	7.5(0, 22.5)	15(0, 11.3)	0(0, 45)	8.4(1.5, 17.5)
	15(71.4)	8(38.1)	7(33.3)	9(56.3)	2(66.7)	5(23.8)
	0.4	0.007*	0.005*	0.009*	0.3	0.01*

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; MDD: major depressive disorder; MME: morphine milligram equivalent; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

**Table 4.2 Distribution of pain score.**

	Delta pain score, median(IQR)					
	<b>Day 0 (n=299)</b>	<b>Day 1 (n=308)</b>	<b>Day 2 (n=307)</b>	<b>Day 3 (n=264)</b>	<b>Day 4 (n=78)</b>	<b>Overall average (n=308)</b>
<b>Total</b>	1.8(0.6, 3.2)	3.3(1.9, 5)	3.8(2, 5)	3.3(1.6, 5)	3.3(2, 5.4)	3.0(1.7, 4.4)
<b>preERAC</b>	<b>(n=196)</b>	<b>(n=196)</b>	<b>(n=195)</b>	<b>(n=182)</b>	<b>(n=54)</b>	<b>(n=196)</b>
<b>postERAC</b>	1.7(0.6, 3.3)	3.8(2.6, 5.1)	4.1(2.4, 5.3)	3.9(2.3, 5.5)	3.6(2.7, 5.9)	3.3(2.3, 4.7)
	<b>(n=103)</b>	<b>(n=112)</b>	<b>(n=112)</b>	<b>(n=82)</b>	<b>(n=24)</b>	<b>(n=112)</b>
<b>p-value</b>	2(0.8, 3)	2(1, 4)	3(1, 4.3)	2(1, 4)	2.3(0.5, 4)	2.2(1.3, 3.7)
	0.7	<0.0001*	0.0001*	<0.0001*	0.005*	<0.0001*

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; MDD: major depressive disorder; MME: morphine milligram equivalent; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

**Table 5. Distribution of prescribed outpatient opioids.**

	<b>Total (n=308)</b>	<b>preERAC (n=196)</b>	<b>postERAC (n= 112)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Opioids outpatients, n (%)</b>				<0.001
no	19(6.2)	4(2)	15(13.4)	
yes	289(93.8)	192(98)	97(86.6)	
<b>Prescribed MME, median (IQR)</b>	150(150, 188)	<b>(n=184)</b> 150(150, 225)	<b>(n= 97)</b> 150(112, 150)	<0.001

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; MME: morphine milligram equivalents; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

**Table 6.1 Recovery outcomes and follow up.**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Total (n=308)</b>	<b>preERAC (n=196)</b>	<b>postERAC (n= 112)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Cesarean delivery time, median(IQR)*</b>	64.5(52, 85)	64.5(52, 88)	64.5(51, 82.5)	0.6
<b>Fasting time (clear liquid), median(IQR)*</b>	10.4(5.4, 14.2)	11.0(7.7, 14.9)	7.9(3.4, 12.3)	0.0001*
<b>Fasting time (solid food), median(IQR)*</b>	12.9(9.8, 16.3)	12.9(9.9, 16.1)	12.9(9.6, 16.9)	0.8
<b>Time to feeding, median(IQR)*</b>	7.5(3.1, 11.8)	9.7(6.8, 12.9)	2.1(1.0, 6.0)	<0.0001*
<b>Time to indwelling catheter removal, median(IQR)*</b>	12(9.9, 15.9)	12.5(10.9, 17.8)	10.1(7.2, 13.7)	<0.0001*
<b>Time to ambulation, median(IQR)*</b>	14.1(9, 21.7)	16(11, 22.6)	9.5(6.6, 16.9)	<0.0001*
<b>Time to discharge, median(IQR) †</b>	74.2(68.1, 87.5)	76.1(69.9, 90)	72.4(62.7, 82.7)	0.002*
<b>Postpartum visit, n(%)</b>	253(82.1)	164(83.7)	89(79.5)	0.4
<b>Readmission, n(%)</b>	12(3.9)	8(4.1)	4(3.6)	1.0

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; MME: morphine milligram equivalents; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

\* in minutes; † in hours.

**Table 6.2. Time to ambulation and discharge adjusted for Magnesium Sulfate use neonatal NICU admission.**

Time	Magnesium Sulfate			No Magnesium Sulfate		
	preERAC (n=32)	postERAC (n=14)	<i>p</i> -value	preERAC (n=161)	postERAC (n=98)	<i>p</i> -value
Time to ambulation, median(IQR)	25.7(24.5, 26.6)	25.4(22.7, 28.1)	0.6	14.4(10.5, 19.1)	9.3(6.5, 14.5)	<0.0001*
Time to discharge, median(IQR)	86.1(73.9, 96.2)	76.4(69.8, 108.9)	0.7	74.9(69, 83.9)	72.1(61.7, 79.7)	0.003*
Time	NICU admission			No NICU admission		
	preERAC (n=76)	postERAC (n=37)	<i>p</i> -value	preERAC (n=112)	postERAC (n=75)	<i>p</i> -value
Time to ambulation, median(IQR)	17.1(10.5, 25.8)	9.6(7.7, 19.2)	0.006*	15.4(11.1, 20.7)	9.5(6.5, 16.4)	<0.0001*
Time to discharge, median(IQR)	78.7(69.3, 95.2)	86(73.8, 96.4)	0.2	75.2(70.1, 81)	69(54, 74.3)	<0.0001*

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; NICU: neonatal intensive care unit; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

**Supplemental Table 1. Neonatal Outcomes.**

	<b>Total (n=308)</b>	<b>preERAC (n=196)</b>	<b>postERAC (n= 112)</b>	<b><i>p</i>-value</b>
<b>Gestational age, median(IQR)</b>	268(253, 275)	268(251, 276)	268(256, 274)	0.7
<b>Neonatal gender, n(%)</b>				0.9
male	151(49.0)	97(49.5)	54(48.2)	
female	157(51.0)	99(50.5)	58(51.8)	
<b>Birth weight, median(IQR)</b>	3125(2510, 3470)	3110(2370, 3455)	3163(2667, 3525)	0.1
<b>Apgar at 1 min, median(IQR)</b>	8(7, 8)	8(7, 8)	8(8, 8)	0.8
<b>Apgar at 5 mins, median(IQR)</b>	9(9, 9)	9(9, 9)	9(9, 9)	0.6
<b>pH artery, median(IQR)</b>	7.22(7.17, 7.26)	7.22(7.17, 7.27)	7.22(7.18, 7.26)	0.4
<b>BE artery, median(IQR)</b>	-4.15(-6.4, -2.9)	-4.15(-6.3, -2.75)	-4.2(-6.5, -2.9)	0.8
<b>pH vein, median(IQR)</b>	7.29(7.24, 7.32)	7.29(7.24, 7.33)	7.29(7.25, 7.32)	0.6
<b>BE vein, median(IQR)</b>	-3.3(-5.1, -2.2)	-3.5(-5.3, -2.1)	-3.2(-4.7, -2.3)	0.6

BE: base excess; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

**Supplemental Table 2. Bivariate analysis of the outcomes.**

Variables	Outcomes, median(IQR)					
	Inpatient MME	Pain scores	Outpatient MME	Time to ambulation	Time to feeding	Time to discharge
<b>ERAC implementation</b>						
preERAC	20.5(5.6, 35.2)	3.3(2.3, 4.7)	150(150, 225)	16(11, 22.6)	9.7(6.8, 12.9)	76.1(69.9, 90)
postERAC	4.3(0, 15.4)	2.2(1.3, 3.7)	150(112.5, 150)	9.5(6.6, 16.9)	2.1(1, 6)	72.4(62.7, 82.7)
<b>p-value</b>	<0.0001*	<0.0001*	<0.0001*	<0.0001*	<0.0001*	0.002*
<b>Obesity</b>						
non-obese	14.4(2.4, 30)	3.1(1.8, 4.4)	150(150, 225)	15.2(10.6, 19.6)	9.1(4.7, 12.5)	75.2(69, 87.1)
obese	11.3(0, 28.2)	3.0(1.7, 4.4)	150(150, 150)	13.3(8.7, 22)	6.5(2.2, 11.8)	73.8(68.1, 90.3)
<b>p-value</b>	0.4	0.4	0.04*	0.3	0.007*	0.8
<b>MDD</b>						
no	11.3(0, 26.3)	2.9(1.7, 4.2)	150(150, 187.5)	14.1(9.1, 22)	7.2(3.1, 11.7)	74.3(67.8, 88.1)
yes	18(5, 39.4)	3.5(2.4, 5.0)	150(150, 187.5)	14.3(9, 20.2)	8.7(2.6, 12)	74.6(69.1, 88.7)
<b>p-value</b>	0.02*	0.005*	0.9	0.9	0.4	0.6
<b>Magnesium Sulfate use</b>						
no	11.6(1, 27)	3(1.8, 4.4)	150(150, 150)	12.2(8.3, 17.6)	7.5(3, 11.3)	73.8(67.4, 83.4)
yes	19.5(0, 33.8)	2.8(1.6, 3.8)	150(150, 225)	25.7(24.4, 26.7)	11.4(3.7, 14.8)	83.9(71.9, 97.4)
<b>p-value</b>	0.3	0.4	0.06	<0.0001*	0.03*	0.0003*

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; MME: morphine milligram equivalents; MDD: major depressive disorder; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.

\*statistically significant; p-values were computed using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test.



**Supplemental Table 3. Multivariate analysis for inpatient MME**

<b>Effect</b>	<b>Estimate (SE)</b>	<b>Rate ratio</b>	<b>95% confidence limit</b>	<b>p-value</b>
postERAC vs. preERAC	-0.91(0.39)	0.40	(0.18, 0.87)	0.02
Day 1 vs. Day 0	1.14(0.22)	3.13	(2.04, 4.81)	<0.0001
Day 2 vs. Day 0	1.25(0.23)	3.49	(2.22, 5.53)	<0.0001
Day 3 vs. Day 0	0.84(0.24)	2.32	(1.44, 3.72)	0.0005
Delivery complications	0.89(0.31)	2.44	(1.32, 4.46)	0.004
Time to feeding	-0.05(0.022)	0.95	(0.91, 0.99)	0.002
Overall average dela pain scores	0.68(0.073)	1.97	(1.68, 2.28)	<0.0001

ERAC: enhanced recovery after cesarean; IQR: interquartile range; n: number.