Journal of Biomed Research

Nooh A, J Biomed Res. 2026;7(1):49-52.

Commentary

Induction of labor in contemporary obstetrics: Why evidence alone does not change practice?

Ahmed Nooh[1,*]

[1]Senior Consultant and Emeritus Professor in Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Crawley, West Sussex, United Kingdom

*Author for correspondence: Email: ahmednoohuk@yahoo.co.uk

Received date: April 17, 2026
Accepted date: April 28, 2026

Copyright: © 2026 Nooh A. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Background: Induction of labor (IOL) has become one of the most frequently performed interventions in modern obstetrics. In many healthcare systems, more than one-third of pregnancies now involve labor induction. Despite the availability of extensive clinical evidence and comprehensive national and international guidelines, substantial variation persists in the way induction is implemented across maternity services.

Objective: To examine induction of labor through the lens of implementation science and explore why discrepancies between evidence-based guidelines and real-world clinical practice continue to occur.

Discussion: Variation in induction practice reflects multiple interacting factors including organizational pressures, workforce capacity, clinical culture, and differences in local protocols. Implementation science provides a framework for understanding how evidence-based recommendations are translated into routine clinical care. Strategies such as standardized clinical pathways, digital decision-support systems, multidisciplinary engagement, and continuous audit may help reduce unwarranted variation in induction practice.

Conclusion: As induction of labor continues to increase globally, improving maternal and neonatal outcomes will depend not only on generating new clinical evidence but also on strengthening the implementation of existing knowledge across maternity systems.

Keywords: Induction of labor, Evidence-based obstetrics, Cervical ripening, Labor management, Obstetric guidelines, Maternal outcomes, Fetal monitoring, VBAC and induction, Prostaglandins, Mechanical methods of induction, Clinical audit, Obstetric practice variation

Introduction

Induction of labor (IOL) has transitioned from a selective intervention into a routine cornerstone of contemporary obstetric care. Over the past two decades, induction rates across high-income healthcare systems have risen substantially, driven by shifting maternal demographics, expanding clinical indications, and an increasing institutional focus on perinatal risk-reduction strategies [1–3]. In response, national and international bodies have produced increasingly sophisticated guidelines to standardize the indications, methods, and monitoring requirements of the procedure [1,3–6].

Despite this robust evidence base, clinical practice continues to demonstrate significant variability between institutions and even between clinicians within the same unit. This inconsistency is particularly evident in the choice of cervical-ripening methods, the thresholds for diagnosing failed induction, the quality of clinical documentation, and the nuances of patient counselling regarding risks and expectations [1,6]. Such gaps persist even in settings where clinical guidelines are well established and widely disseminated.

This article is originally published by ProBiologists, and is freely available at probiologists.com

This tension between evidence and implementation is not a new phenomenon. More than twenty years ago, an audit conducted at City Hospital, Birmingham, UK titled *"Induction of labour: how close to the evidence-based guidelines are we?"* highlighted these exact challenges [7]. While that study demonstrated good adherence in several domains, it also revealed persistent inconsistencies in ripening protocols and compliance with national guidance [7]. Although the obstetric landscape has been reshaped by new pharmacological techniques and mechanical methods since that time, the fundamental question remains: why does clinical practice continue to diverge from recommended standards?

By applying the principles of implementation science, this analysis moves beyond a traditional clinical review to examine why robust evidence-based guidelines frequently fail to translate into uniform practice within complex maternity systems [8–10]. It seeks to bridge the gap between "what we know" and "what we do" to enhance the safety and consistency of labor induction. Modern obstetric discourse suggests that this is no longer a problem of evidence generation, but rather a challenge of implementation [8,9].

Implementation science—the systematic study of methods that promote the integration of research findings into routine practice—offers a vital framework for understanding these persistent gaps [8,9]. This commentary revisits the themes of the original City Hospital audit [7], situating them within the complexities of modern maternity services. Rather than merely reviewing clinical evidence, it explores the systemic barriers to guideline adherence and reflects on how implementation strategies can better integrate professional judgement, clinical evidence, and woman-centered care to reduce unwarranted variation in practice.

Discussion

The expanding role of induction of labor

When earlier audits of induction practice were conducted in the early 2000s, induction rates of approximately 15–20% were typical in many UK maternity units [7]. In contrast, contemporary rates frequently exceed 30%, with similar trends reported internationally [2,3,11]. Several factors have contributed to this shift.

First, maternal demographics have changed substantially. Increasing maternal age, rising prevalence of obesity, and higher rates of metabolic disorders such as diabetes have expanded the clinical indications for induction [1,3]. Second, advances in fetal surveillance and a stronger focus on preventing stillbirth have encouraged earlier intervention in selected pregnancies [1]. Third, influential clinical trials demonstrating the safety of elective induction in certain low-risk populations have further broadened their use [12].

As a consequence, induction is no longer an occasional intervention but a central element of obstetric practice. This transformation has significant implications for maternity services. Procedures that were once performed selectively must now be delivered reliably and consistently across large patient populations. Such expansion inevitably exposes variations in clinical protocols, staffing capacity, and organizational infrastructure [11].

Importantly, increased procedural volume also magnifies the consequences of inconsistent practice. When induction becomes routine, small deviations from evidence-based protocols can affect large numbers of women and newborns. Ensuring consistency therefore becomes not merely a matter of professional preference but a fundamental component of patient safety and service quality [8–10].

The evidence-practice gap as an implementation challenge

The persistence of variation in induction practice illustrates a broader phenomenon widely recognized across healthcare systems: the gap between evidence generation and its adoption in clinical care [8–10]. Clinical guidelines summarize research findings and provide structured recommendations, yet publication alone rarely ensures uniform practice.

Implementation science suggests that translating evidence into routine care depends on multiple interacting factors. These include clinician experience and attitudes, organizational structures, resource availability, local culture, and external regulatory pressures [8,9]. Even well-designed guidelines may be inconsistently applied if they do not align with existing workflows or if clinicians lack the tools required to implement them effectively.

Induction of labor provides a clear example of this phenomenon. The evidence base supporting different cervical-ripening methods, monitoring protocols, and patient-selection criteria has grown substantially [1,2,6]. Nevertheless, observational studies continue to demonstrate wide variation in the methods used and in the clinical thresholds applied during induction [7,11,13].

Such variation may arise from differences in training, institutional policy, or local resource constraints [8–10]. In some settings, for example, limited staffing or bed availability may influence decisions regarding timing or method of induction. In others, historical practice patterns may persist even after new evidence emerges.

Understanding these contextual influences is essential if guidelines are to achieve their intended impact. Implementation strategies must therefore address not only what clinicians should do but also how healthcare systems enable them to do it [8–10].

Structural and organizational barriers to guideline implementation

Several structural factors within maternity services contribute to the difficulty of translating induction guidelines into consistent practice [8–10].

One important factor is clinical workload. Rising induction rates increase demand for labor ward resources, including monitoring equipment, midwifery staffing, and obstetric supervision [1,3]. When services operate near capacity, clinicians may adapt protocols in response to operational pressures. Although such adaptations may be pragmatic in the short term, they can gradually produce variation from established guidelines [8–10].

Another challenge relates to interdisciplinary coordination. Induction involves collaboration between obstetricians, midwives, and anesthetic teams. Differences in professional perspectives or communication pathways can influence how protocols are applied in practice. Implementation efforts therefore require engagement across the entire multidisciplinary team [9,10].

Training and experience also play a role. Accurate cervical assessment, for example, remains a critical step in selecting appropriate induction methods [6]. Variability in clinical experience may influence the interpretation of cervical favorability or the timing of escalation during induction.

Finally, data systems and documentation practices significantly influence guideline adherence [10]. Without reliable documentation, it becomes difficult to evaluate whether clinical decisions align with recommended standards or to identify opportunities for quality improvement.

Women's experience and shared decision-making

Modern obstetric care increasingly recognizes women's experience as a core outcome of maternity services [14,15]. Induction of labor is not merely a clinical procedure but a complex experience that can influence perceptions of control, satisfaction, and trust in the healthcare system.

Women undergoing induction frequently report longer hospital stays and higher levels of medical intervention [14,15]. While many inductions proceed safely, the process may involve prolonged cervical ripening, repeated examinations, and extended periods of monitoring. These factors can affect comfort, mobility, and psychological wellbeing.

For this reason, contemporary guidelines emphasize transparent counselling and shared decision-making [1,4–6]. Women should receive clear information regarding the reasons for induction, the expected duration of the process, potential interventions that may follow, and available alternatives. Such discussions enable women to participate meaningfully in decisions about their care.

Implementation science highlights the importance of embedding shared decision-making within clinical systems rather than relying solely on individual clinician behavior [8–10]. Decision aids, standardized counselling pathways, and documented consent frameworks may help ensure that patient preferences are consistently incorporated into induction planning.

Implementation opportunities in cervical ripening practice

Advances in cervical-ripening methods illustrate how evidence generation alone does not guarantee uniform clinical adoption [1,2,6]. Pharmacological agents such as prostaglandins remain widely used, while mechanical methods such as balloon catheters have gained increasing support due to favorable safety profiles in certain populations [1,6].

Comparative studies and systematic reviews have examined the relative effectiveness of these approaches, demonstrating broadly comparable outcomes with differing safety characteristics [2,6]. In practice, however, the choice of method often varies between institutions or individual clinicians [7,11,13].

Such variation reflects not only differences in clinical interpretation but also organizational considerations [8–10]. Availability of trained staff, local protocols, and regulatory approvals may influence which methods are routinely offered.

From an implementation perspective, improving consistency requires structured protocols that define indications, dosing regimens, monitoring requirements, and escalation pathways [1,6,8]. Embedding these protocols within electronic health records or digital decision-support systems may further support adherence and reduce unintended variation [9,10].

Monitoring, safety and system pressures

Continuous fetal monitoring and timely clinical review remain central to safe induction practice [1,3]. However, increasing service pressures may challenge the ability of maternity units to maintain these standards consistently [8–10].

Rising patient volumes, workforce shortages, and the complexity of modern obstetric populations can strain labor ward capacity [10]. Under such conditions, delays in clinical review or limitations in monitoring resources may occur. These operational pressures illustrate how system-level factors influence the implementation of evidence-based care [8–10].

Addressing these challenges requires not only clinical guidance but also organizational investment [1,3]. Adequate staffing levels, appropriate infrastructure, and effective escalation protocols are essential components of safe induction services [10].

Implementation science emphasizes the importance of feedback loops within healthcare systems [8–10]. Regular audit, real-time data monitoring, and multidisciplinary review processes allow institutions to identify deviations from expected standards and respond proactively [10].

Towards an implementation framework for obstetrics

Improving the consistency of induction practice requires a systematic approach that integrates evidence, organizational structure, and clinician engagement [8–10]. Several strategies may support this objective.

First, standardized clinical pathways can reduce unwarranted variation by clearly defining each stage of the induction process [1,9]. These pathways should incorporate evidence-based protocols while allowing appropriate flexibility for individual clinical circumstances.

Second, digital decision-support tools may assist clinicians by integrating guidelines directly into clinical workflows [9,10]. Automated prompts, structured documentation templates, and electronic checklists can help ensure that key elements of care are consistently addressed.

Third, continuous audit and feedback mechanisms enable healthcare teams to evaluate their performance relative to established standards [8–10]. Transparent reporting of outcomes such as induction-to-delivery intervals, Caesarean section rates, and maternal satisfaction can support targeted quality improvement initiatives.

Fourth, multidisciplinary engagement is essential [9,10]. Successful implementation depends on collaboration between obstetricians, midwives, managers, and policy makers. Shared ownership of protocols increases the likelihood that they will be adopted and sustained.

Finally, patient engagement must remain central [14,15]. Incorporating women's perspectives into service design ensures that induction pathways reflect not only clinical evidence but also the lived experiences of those receiving care.

Conclusion

The evolution of induction of labor over the past two decades illustrates both the strengths and limitations of evidence-based medicine in modern obstetrics. While the scientific understanding of induction methods has advanced substantially, variation in clinical practice remains widespread.

This persistent gap reflects not a failure of research but a challenge of implementation. Translating evidence into consistent clinical

practice requires attention to organizational structures, professional culture, documentation systems, and patient engagement. Without such considerations, even the most robust guidelines may fail to achieve their intended impact.

Viewing induction practice through the lens of implementation science provides a valuable framework for addressing these issues. By focusing on how evidence is integrated into real-world clinical environments, maternity services can move beyond guideline publication toward meaningful improvements in care delivery. Ultimately, reducing unwarranted variation in induction practice requires a paradigm shift that treats implementation as a rigorous discipline rather than an administrative byproduct.

Strengthening these systemic frameworks will ensure that scientific advancements result in equitable, safe, and woman-centered care across all obstetric settings. Ultimately, the goal is not merely to expand the scientific literature on labor induction but to ensure that existing knowledge is applied reliably and equitably. Achieving this objective will require coordinated efforts across clinical, organizational, and policy domains. If successful, these efforts have the potential to strengthen safety, reduce unwarranted variation, and enhance the experience of women undergoing one of the most common interventions in modern obstetrics.

Declarations

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Inducing Labour: NICE Guideline [NG207]. London: NICE; 2021.
2. Middleton P, Shepherd E, Crowther CA. Induction of labour for improving birth outcomes for women at or beyond term. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2018 May 9;5(5):CD004945.
3. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations for induction of labour. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2011 [Internet]. 2011.
4. Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG). Birth after previous caesarean birth. Royal Collegue of Obstetricians and Ginaecologists. 2015 Oct.
5. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 205: Vaginal Birth After Cesarean Delivery. Obstet Gynecol. 2019 Feb;133(2):e110–27.
6. Cervical Ripening in Pregnancy: ACOG Clinical Practice Guideline No. 9. Obstet Gynecol. 2025 Jul;146(1):148–60.
7. Nooh A, Baghdadi S, Raouf S. Induction of labour: how close to the evidence-based guidelines are we? J Obstet Gynaecol. 2005 Jul;25(5):451–4.
8. Grol R, Grimshaw J. From best evidence to best practice: effective implementation of change in patients' care. Lancet. 2003 Oct 11;362(9391):1225–30.
9. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. Implement Sci. 2009 Aug 7;4:50.
10. Pronovost PJ, Berenholtz SM, Needham DM. Translating evidence into practice: a model for large scale knowledge translation. BMJ. 2008 Oct 6;337:a1714.
11. Vogel JP, Souza JP, Gülmezoglu AM. Patterns and Outcomes of Induction of Labour in Africa and Asia: a secondary analysis of the WHO Global Survey on Maternal and Neonatal Health. PLoS One. 2013 Jun 3;8(6):e65612.
12. Grobman WA, Rice MM, Reddy UM, Tita ATN, Silver RM, Mallett G, et al. Labor Induction versus Expectant Management in Low-Risk Nulliparous Women. N Engl J Med. 2018 Aug 9;379(6):513–23.
13. Nooh A. Is it worth inducing labour in women with a previous caesarean delivery? J Obstet Gynaecol. 2012 Feb;32(2):141–4.
14. Bohren MA, Hofmeyr GJ, Sakala C, Fukuzawa RK, Cuthbert A. Continuous support for women during childbirth. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017 Jul 6;7(7):CD003766.
15. Declercq ER, Sakala C, Corry MP, Applebaum S, Herrlich A. Major Survey Findings of Listening to Mothers(SM) III: Pregnancy and Birth: Report of the Third National U.S. Survey of Women's Childbearing Experiences. J Perinat Educ. 2014 Winter;23(1):9–16.