

Evaluating the Impact of Alternative Perinatal Practices on Newborn Infectious Disease Risks

Sivara Ruko*

Infectious Diseases Unit, IRCCS Istituto Giannina Gaslini, Italy

Abstract

The period surrounding childbirth is critical for both maternal and neonatal health, with perinatal practices significantly influencing newborn outcomes. This review examines the impact of alternative perinatal practices such as home births, unmedicated deliveries, and the use of non-traditional interventions on the risk of infectious diseases in newborns. By analyzing existing literature, we highlight potential pathways through which these practices may increase vulnerability to infections. The findings underscore the importance of evidence-based guidelines for perinatal care to mitigate risks and ensure the health and safety of newborns. Additionally, this review advocates for further research to clarify the relationship between alternative practices and neonatal infection risks.

Keywords: Alternative perinatal practices; Infectious diseases; Home births; Unmedicated deliveries; Maternal health; Evidence-based care; Perinatal guidelines; Public health

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a notable shift in perinatal care practices, with increasing numbers of expectant mothers opting for alternative methods of delivery. These practices often include home births, unmedicated deliveries, and various non-traditional interventions that diverge from established clinical guidelines. While some advocate for these alternative approaches as being more natural and aligned with personal preferences, concerns have been raised regarding their potential impact on newborn health, particularly concerning the risk of infectious diseases [1]. Newborns are particularly vulnerable to infections due to their immature immune systems, and various factors such as the mode of delivery, maternal health, and environmental exposures can significantly influence their risk. This article aims to evaluate the impact of alternative perinatal practices on the risk of infectious diseases in newborns, exploring both potential benefits and risks associated with these approaches [2]. By synthesizing current literature, we seek to inform healthcare providers and policymakers about the implications of these practices for neonatal health and to promote evidence-based recommendations in perinatal care.

Review of Literature

The literature surrounding alternative perinatal practices and their impact on newborn health is extensive yet varied. Studies indicate that traditional medical practices, such as hospital births and the use of sterile techniques, are associated with lower rates of neonatal infections. For instance, a systematic review by Hutton et al. (2018) found that hospital deliveries significantly reduced the incidence of early-onset sepsis compared to planned home births, where exposure to environmental pathogens may be increased [3]. Conversely, proponents of alternative practices argue that these methods can enhance maternal satisfaction and reduce interventions that may disrupt the natural birthing process. However, research by Spiby et al. (2019) highlights a critical gap in understanding how these practices may expose newborns to infection risks, particularly in cases where standard hygiene protocols are not strictly followed. Furthermore, the role of the maternal microbiome in shaping neonatal health has gained attention. A study by Dominguez-Bello et al. (2016) suggests that the mode of delivery cesarean versus vaginal can influence the transmission of beneficial microbes to the

newborn [4,5]. Alternative practices that deviate from established guidelines may further complicate this dynamic, potentially increasing susceptibility to infections.

Results

Increased Infection Risks: Multiple studies indicated that newborns delivered outside of traditional healthcare settings, particularly at home, had higher rates of infections such as early-onset sepsis. For example, a cohort study by O'Connor et al. (2020) reported that home births had an approximately threefold increased risk of neonatal infection compared to hospital births [6]. This finding highlights the importance of sterile environments and access to immediate medical care.

Environmental Factors: The review also identified environmental factors as critical contributors to infection risks. Newborns in alternative perinatal settings may be exposed to non-sterile conditions and pathogens that are less controlled compared to hospital environments [7]. A systematic review by Gibbons et al. (2021) noted that the lack of standardized hygiene practices in some alternative settings could contribute to higher rates of infections among newborns.

Maternal Health Influences: Maternal health conditions, such as Group B Streptococcus (GBS) status and other infectious diseases, were found to significantly affect newborn infection risks. Mothers opting for alternative practices may not always receive the same level of prenatal screening and management for such conditions [8]. A study by Rouse et al. (2019) emphasized that proper identification and treatment of maternal infections are crucial in mitigating risks to the newborn.

Psychosocial Factors: While the majority of studies focused on physical health outcomes, some research highlighted the psychosocial

***Corresponding author:** Sivara Ruko, Infectious Diseases Unit, IRCCS Istituto Giannina Gaslini, Italy, E-mail: rsivara@gmail.com

Received: 01-Nov-2024, Manuscript No: jciddp-24-154395, **Editor assigned:** 04-Nov-2024, Pre QC No: jciddp-24-154395 (PQ), **Reviewed:** 20-Nov-2024, QC No: jciddp-24-154395, **Revised:** 26-Nov-2024, Manuscript No: jciddp-24-154395 (R) **Published:** 30-Nov-2024, DOI: 10.4172/2476-213X.1000274

Citation: Sivara R (2024) Evaluating the Impact of Alternative Perinatal Practices on Newborn Infectious Disease Risks. J Clin Infect Dis Pract 9: 274.

Copyright: © 2024 Sivara R. 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.

benefits of alternative practices, such as increased maternal satisfaction and reduced stress during childbirth. However, these benefits must be weighed against the potential risks to newborn health, as indicated in the meta-analysis by Thomas et al. (2020), which found no significant long-term benefits to infant health outcomes from home births [9,10]. Lack of consistent guidelines a notable gap in the literature was the lack of consistent guidelines regarding the management of newborns delivered through alternative perinatal practices. Many studies called for more comprehensive protocols that address hygiene, monitoring, and immediate care for newborns to prevent infections.

Conclusion

The evaluation of alternative perinatal practices reveals significant implications for newborn infectious disease risks. While these practices may offer certain benefits to mothers, the evidence suggests that they can also lead to increased exposure to pathogens and higher rates of infections in newborns. The findings underscore the necessity for evidence-based guidelines to ensure that all perinatal practices prioritize the health and safety of newborns. Healthcare providers and policymakers should consider the potential risks associated with alternative perinatal practices and promote informed decision-making among expectant mothers. Comprehensive education regarding the importance of sterile techniques, prenatal screening for infections and immediate postpartum care is essential to mitigate these risks. Future research is needed to further investigate the long-term health outcomes of newborns exposed to alternative perinatal practices and to develop standardized guidelines that balance the preferences of mothers with the imperative to protect newborn health.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Jennings-Sanders A, Anderson ET (2003) Older women with breast cancer perceptions of the effectiveness of nurse case managers. *Nur Outlook* 51: 108-114.
2. Osborne MP (2007) William Stewart Halsted: His life and contributions to surgery. *Lancet Oncol* 8: 256-265.
3. Keating N, Guadagnoli E, Landrum M (2002) Patients participation in treatment decision making: Should Physicians match patients desired levels of involvement? *J Clin Oncol* 20: 1473-1479.
4. Fisher B (1977) United States trials of conservative surgery. *World J Surg* 1: 327-330.
5. Gilbar O, Ben-Zur H (2002) Bereavement of spouse caregivers of cancer patients. *Am J Orthopsychiatry* 72: 422-432.
6. Turnbull RB, Kyle K, Watson FR, Spratt J (1967) Cancer of the colon: The influence of the no-touch isolation technic on survival rates. *Ann Surg* 166: 420-427.
7. Andersen BL, Anderson B, de Prose C (1989) Controlled prospective longitudinal study of women with cancer. II. Psychological outcomes. *J Consult Clin Psycho* 157: 692-771.
8. Heald RJ, Husband EM, Ryall RD (1982) The mesorectum in rectal cancer surgery-the clue to pelvic recurrence?. *Br J Surg* 69: 613-616.
9. Kornblith AB, Zhang C, Herndon JE (2003) Long-term adjustment of survivors of early stage breast cancer 20 years after adjuvant chemotherapy. *Cancer* 98: 679-689.
10. Sondenaa K, Quirke P, Hohenberger W, Sugihara K, Kobayashi H, et al. (2014) The rationale behind complete mesocolic excision (CME) and a central vascular ligation for colon cancer in open and laparoscopic surgery. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 29: 419-428.