Avoid the use of routine episiotomy in spontaneous vaginal births.
Routine episiotomy has been shown to cause more harm than good. Studies demonstrate that restrictive episiotomy policies are associated with less posterior perineal trauma, less suturing, and fewer complications, with no difference for most pain measures or severe vaginal and/or perineal trauma. When the perineum is preventing delivery, particularly if the fetal heart rate is abnormal, an episiotomy may expedite a vaginal birth.

Don't do electronic fetal monitoring for low risk women in labour; use intermittent auscultation.
Continuous electronic fetal monitoring (EFM) leads to significantly greater rates of caesareans and operative vaginal deliveries in low risk patients compared to those monitored with intermittent auscultation. Intermittent auscultation results in no significant difference in the number of infant deaths during and shortly after labour, cerebral palsy rates, use of drugs for pain relief, and cord blood acidosis in low risk patients. Further, EFM restricts movement and positioning, excludes the option of using a birthing pool, and requires greater resource use to continuously interpret fetal heart rate tracings. EFM therefore increases risk of intervention and decreases choice without providing meaningful benefit to patient or neonatal outcomes in low risk patients.

Don't perform routine urinalysis (protein, glucose) at every antenatal visit (in low risk normotensive women).
Routine urinalysis (for glucose and protein) in low-risk pregnancies is not recommended. For screening of healthy pregnant women, urinalysis for glucose to assess the risk of developing gestational diabetes is not recommended due to low sensitivity. For assessing the potential development of preeclampsia in pregnant women, routine urine dipstick or urinalysis are not recommended as the test for albumin levels is unreliable. Do not rely on proteinuria to screen for gestational hypertension; periodically check the blood pressure.

Don't perform umbilical artery Doppler studies as a routine screening test in uncomplicated pregnancies with normal fetal growth.
Placental integrity, specifically vascular resistance, may be assessed by evaluating flow in the umbilical arteries using Doppler ultrasound. When this is done with high risk pregnancies the perinatal death rate is reduced and interventions may be appropriately timed or withheld. “High risk” in these investigations were principally intrauterine growth restriction and maternal hypertension. When Doppler studies were extended to low-risk pregnancies however there was no improvement in outcome and abnormal results were more likely to be false positives.

Don't routinely screen women with Pap smears if under 21 years of age or over 69 years of age.
Screening should be initiated at 21 years of age in asymptomatic, immunocompetent women. Studies have shown the largest number of false positive test results occurring in adolescents younger than 21 years and have the lowest incidence of cervical cancer. There is no protective effect in screening women younger than 21 years. There are few studies that address the age of cessation. Modelling studies have not shown increase in protective effect when screening women greater than 70 years who have had prior routine screening.

Don't routinely order hormone levels including estradiol, progesterone, follicle-stimulating hormone and luteinizing hormone in postmenopausal women or after a hysterectomy, either to diagnose menopause or to manage hormone therapy.
The frequency and severity of menopausal symptoms do not correlate to the levels of either follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH) or serum estradiol. Reproductive estrogen levels are typically much higher than required to reduce symptoms. Management with hormone therapy is based on using the lowest effective dose to reduce symptoms to an acceptable level. Relying on elevated FSH to make a diagnosis may result in women being denied effective therapy for disruptive symptoms; use of an unreliable test may in this way contribute to less than optimal care. Using blood levels to adjust hormone therapy
Don’t screen for ovarian cancer in asymptomatic women at average risk.
Screening for ovarian cancer does not improve clinical outcomes in asymptomatic women without a family history of the disease. Screening does not decrease all-cause mortality, ovarian cancer mortality or the risk of diagnoses of advanced stage ovarian cancer. There is no demonstrable benefit on mortality following transvaginal ultrasonography or routine pelvic screening examinations and the use of CA125 or other biomarkers for ovarian cancer but such screening resulted in false-positive tests, overdiagnosis, and overtreatment with inevitable complications.

Don’t offer hysterectomy to women with asymptomatic fibroids on the basis of risk malignancy.
Rapid growth of a fibroid is not a predictor of leiomyosarcoma. In women undergoing surgery for fibroids approximately 1 in 400 (0.25%) is at risk of having a leiomyosarcoma. However, growth and/or new onset of symptoms post-menopause should carry a higher index of suspicion for malignancy. Incidental uterine leiomyosarcomas have been encountered during routine resectoscopic myomectomy, though their incidence appears to be lower than that reported following hysterectomy (0.13%). Leiomyomas and leiomyosarcomas cannot reliably be distinguished clinically or by any imaging technique.

Don’t do any surgical intervention, including ablation, for abnormal uterine bleeding until medical management (including the progesterone intra-uterine system) has been offered and either declined or found unsuccessful.
There are several non-hormonal and hormonal agents that have proven to be effective in the treatment of abnormal uterine bleeding. Some of these may have the added benefit of providing symptom relief for dysmenorrhoea and offer contraceptive coverage. These agents may help stabilize anaemia and provide symptom relief alone, or may be utilized prior to surgical management of heavy menstrual bleeding. Medical management allows for early initiation of treatment in a primary care setting whereas surgical intervention may be limited by access to specialist consultation and operating facilities. All potential treatment options for abnormal uterine bleeding should be discussed with the patient and their side-effects, relative effectiveness, risks, costs and impact on fertility outlined so that an informed shared treatment decision can be made and a treatment plan instituted.
How the list was created

The Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada (SOGC) struck a small working group to oversee the Choosing Wisely Canada list development process. An initial list of recommendations was compiled from all published SOGC guidelines. The list was reviewed by the Choosing Wisely committee, who provided input and guidance. A long list was then created from four sources: SOGC guidelines, Choosing Wisely recommendations published by American societies (notably the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists), Canadian Choosing Wisely recommendations relevant to Ob/Gyn, and other proposals from SOGC members. The refined list was circulated to all members of the Clinical Practice – Obstetrics and Gynaecology committees then further refined by the Board of Directors. A list consisting of 24 recommendations (sorted based on specialty: obstetrics; gynaecology and generalist) was generated and circulated to the wider SOGC membership to obtain the final list.
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