THE EUROPEAN SOCIETY OF MEDICINE
Medical Research Archives, Volume 14 Issue 3

REVIEW ARTICLE

Maternal Obesity and Labor Progression: A Review of Physiologic Mechanisms and Clinical Implications

Tina Bui, DO[1], Guillermo Valenzuela, MD, MBA[1]

[1]Department of Women's Health, Arrowhead Regional Medical Center 400 North Pepper Ave, Colton, CA 92324
Phone: (909) 580 - 5282

OPEN ACCESS

PUBLISHED
31 March 2026

CITATION
Bui, T., Valenzuela, G., Maternal Obesity and Labor Progression: A Review of Physiologic Mechanisms and Clinical Implications. Medical Research Archives, [online] 14(3).

ISSN
2375-1924

ABSTRACT

Maternal obesity alters labor physiology through anatomic, hormonal, and myometrial mechanisms that influence uterine contractility and expulsive effort. This review synthesizes evidence describing how obesity modifies labor trajectories, including prolonged first and second stages, higher oxytocin requirements, and increased rates of operative delivery. Physiologic mechanisms include excess pelvic soft tissue, disrupted estrogen–progesterone balance, leptin-mediated signaling alterations, and myometrial dysfunction characterized by reduced myocyte density and impaired gap junction formation. These changes produce asynchronous uterine contractions and lower intrauterine pressures, often requiring individualized intrapartum management strategies. Current time-based labor definitions may not adequately reflect obesity-related physiologic differences, suggesting a need for tailored clinical approaches. Understanding these mechanisms may reduce unnecessary intervention and improve maternal and neonatal outcomes.

Introduction

Maternal obesity, defined as a body mass index (BMI) ≥ 30 kg/m², has increased dramatically over the past five decades, with prevalence more than doubling since the 1970s in the United States.[1,2] At our institution in San Bernardino County, California, more than 60% of adult women meet criteria for obesity, underscoring the growing clinical relevance of obesity in obstetric care.

Over the same period, cesarean delivery rates have increased from 5.5% in 1970 to more than 24%, despite minimal changes in average birth weight and a declining prevalence of large-for-gestational-age infants.[3] These trends suggest that factors beyond fetal size contribute to increasing operative delivery rates. Notably, the increase in cesarean delivery rates coincided with the widespread adoption of continuous fetal monitoring; however, the incidence of cerebral palsy has remained stable, raising questions about whether escalating obstetric intervention has meaningfully improved neonatal neurologic outcomes.[4,5]

Maternal obesity is associated with higher rates of labor induction, oxytocin augmentation, operative vaginal delivery, and cesarean delivery for labor dystocia.[6,7] These interventions are associated with increased postpartum morbidity, including postoperative wound infection, thromboembolic events, postpartum hemorrhage, endometritis, and impaired wound healing.[8]

Importantly, the association between obesity and cesarean delivery persists even after adjustment for fetal weight and comorbidities, suggesting that intrinsic alterations in labor physiology contribute independently to operative risk. Understanding obesity not merely as a risk factor but as a modifier of labor biology reframes intrapartum management from reactive intervention to physiologically informed care.

Despite the growing prevalence of obesity in pregnancy, intrapartum management continues to rely largely on time-based labor definitions that do not account for obesity-related physiologic differences. This review examines the anatomic, hormonal, and myometrial mechanisms by which obesity influences labor and explores clinical strategies to optimize management and reduce unnecessary operative intervention.

Anatomy and Pathophysiology

Is pelvic anatomy different in patients with obesity?

The maternal pelvis consists of the bony pelvic architecture and surrounding soft tissue structures, both of which influence fetal descent during the second stage of labor. Pelvic size and configuration are key determinants of the cardinal movements of labor, with the gynecoid pelvis traditionally considered the most favorable pelvic type.

In individuals with obesity, a proposed anatomic contributor to labor dystocia is increased adipose deposition within pelvic soft tissues, which may reduce the functional dimensions of the birth canal and impede fetal descent despite an otherwise adequate bony pelvis. However, studies controlling for birth weight have not demonstrated increased risks of shoulder dystocia or impaired fetal descent among patients with obesity, suggesting that pelvic soft tissue alone does not fully explain altered labor patterns.[9]

Direct measurement of pelvic soft tissue resistance remains limited. Imaging-based analyses suggest that central adiposity, rather than peripheral fat distribution, may be more relevant to labor mechanics, potentially influencing abdominal wall compliance and diaphragmatic excursion.[10] Reduced abdominal wall compliance may diminish the transmission of expulsive force during Valsalva maneuvers, thereby affecting pushing efficiency even when uterine contractility is preserved. These observations suggest that obesity-related differences in labor may reflect functional alterations in pressure generation and force transmission rather than fixed structural pelvic constraints. Consequently, the prolonged second stage of labor and higher rates of operative

intervention observed in patients with obesity likely reflect multifactorial influences, including altered pushing mechanics, neuromuscular efficiency, and intrapartum management decisions.

Is hormonal regulation of labor altered in patients with obesity?

Beyond anatomic factors, maternal obesity alters the hormonal and molecular pathways that regulate labor initiation and uterine contractility. Normal parturition is characterized by declining progesterone levels and increased concentrations of estrogen and corticotropin-releasing hormone (CRH), which together promote myometrial activation and coordinated uterine contractions.[11,12] In obesity, this process may be disrupted. Altered estrogen-progesterone balance, elevated leptin levels, and dysregulation of cortisol-CRH signaling have been proposed as contributors to delayed labor onset and increased induction rates.[13]

Experimental models demonstrate that obesity impairs coordinated myometrial activity. Diet-induced obesity in rodents is associated with asynchronous uterine contractions and prolonged labor, accompanied by altered expression and phosphorylation of connexin 43, a key gap junction protein required for synchronized uterine contractions.[14,15] In normal pregnancy, gap junction formation in the myometrium increases progressively over the final weeks of gestation, with a rapid surge in connexin-43 expression immediately preceding labor.[16] Because connexin-43 expression is regulated by steroid hormones, obesity-related hormonal dysregulation may delay the transition to a fully activated myometrium and impair coordinated myometrial contractility.[17]

Human studies further support obesity-associated myometrial dysfunction. Histologic analyses show reduced myocyte density and increased lipid accumulation within myometrial cells, which may compromise coordinated contractility.[18] Clinically, individuals with obesity often require higher oxytocin doses to achieve adequate uterine activity, suggesting reduced oxytocin receptor responsiveness or downstream signaling efficiency.[19] Additionally, the chronic inflammatory and insulin-resistant state characteristic of obesity may further disrupt calcium signaling and myometrial synchronization.[20, 21]

At the cellular level, obesity-associated hyperinsulinemia and elevated free fatty acids may impair L-type calcium channel function, reducing intracellular calcium influx required for effective myocyte contraction.[21] Proinflammatory cytokines such as interleukin-6 and tumor necrosis factor–α may also alter oxytocin receptor expression and downstream G-protein–coupled signaling pathways.[22] These molecular perturbations provide a mechanistic explanation for the clinically observed need for higher oxytocin dosing and slower contraction recruitment in patients with obesity.

Collectively, these findings suggest that maternal obesity influences labor progression through both anatomic and biologic mechanisms, providing a physiologic basis for prolonged labor and increased intervention rates.

Labor Progression by Stage

Maternal obesity is associated with measurable differences in labor progression across stages. Higher rates of labor induction are observed among patients with obesity, driven in part by increased prevalence of hypertensive disorders, diabetes, and post-term gestation. Although elective induction at 39 weeks has become increasingly common following the ARRIVE trial (A Randomized Trial of Induction Versus Expectant Management), obesity complicates intrapartum management by altering the expected pace and physiology of labor.[23]

How does maternal obesity affect the first stage of labor?

The first stage of labor is divided into latent and active phases, with the active phase beginning at approximately 6 cm of cervical dilation. Multiple

studies demonstrate that the first stage of labor is modestly prolonged in patients with obesity, with delays of approximately 30–60 minutes in spontaneous labor and up to 2.5 hours in induced labor compared with non-obese patients.[6,7] These differences are likely related to reduced uterine contractility and increased oxytocin requirements.

Current American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) definitions of failed induction and active-phase arrest are based on time thresholds that do not account for obesity-related differences in myometrial contractility. Standard labor curves, derived largely from cohorts with mixed body mass indices, may therefore misrepresent expected cervical dilation patterns in individuals with obesity. Contemporary analyses suggest that the onset and inflection point of active labor may occur later in this population, implying that current thresholds for diagnosing active-phase arrest could inadvertently classify physiologic but slower labor as pathologic.[22,24,25] Refinement of diagnostic criteria that incorporates these population-specific differences may help reduce unnecessary cesarean deliveries while maintaining maternal and neonatal safety.[22,24]

How does maternal obesity affect the second stage of labor?

Evidence regarding second-stage duration in patients with obesity remains inconsistent, in part because traditional definitions emphasize elapsed time rather than physiologic measures of expulsive effort. Current guidelines define arrest of descent primarily by pushing duration but do not account for maternal body mass index, periods of laboring down, rest intervals, or variations in pushing efficiency.

Successful vaginal delivery requires both coordinated uterine contractions and effective expulsive forces. In patients with obesity, excess abdominal and thoracic adiposity may mechanically limit the generation of optimal intra-abdominal pressure during pushing, resulting in lower intrauterine pressures per contraction compared with non-obese patients.

Despite this reduction in force, vaginal delivery frequently occurs through compensatory mechanisms such as an increased number of pushes over a longer cumulative duration. In observational cohorts, individuals with body mass index ≥35 kg/m² generated significantly lower pressures per contraction but achieved successful delivery by increasing total pushing efforts, suggesting that obesity primarily affects pushing efficiency rather than the absolute expulsive force required.[26,27] These observations support the hypothesis that obesity modifies the efficiency of force generation rather than fetopelvic proportionality. This distinction has clinical relevance: if obesity alters efficiency of force generation rather than fetopelvic proportionality, prolonged second stage may reflect physiologic adaptation instead of true labor arrest.

Incorporating measures of descent, rotation, and contraction adequacy in addition to elapsed time may therefore improve differentiation between dysfunctional labor and adaptive prolongation in this population. Physiologic metrics such as push count may further enhance assessment of second-stage progress beyond time alone, allowing clinicians to distinguish normal adaptive labor from arrest and potentially reduce unnecessary operative intervention.

Clinical Implications

When should labor be induced in patients with obesity?

The ARRIVE trial demonstrated that elective induction of labor at 39 weeks in low-risk, nulliparous patients was associated with a lower risk of cesarean delivery compared with expectant management, without an increase in adverse neonatal outcomes.[23] Following its publication, elective induction at 39–40 weeks has been widely adopted in clinical practice. Subsequent observational studies suggest that similar benefits extend to patients with obesity, particularly those

with class II and III obesity, with lower cesarean delivery rates compared with expectant management.[28] Additionally, planned delivery in this population has been associated with reduced rates of fetal macrosomia and stillbirth, supporting the consideration of elective induction as a risk-mitigating strategy in patients with obesity.

Do cervical ripening strategies differ in patients with obesity?

Common cervical ripening methods include prostaglandins and mechanical dilation. Current evidence does not support a single optimal ripening agent specific to patients with obesity. However, combination cervical ripening using pharmacologic and mechanical methods appears to shorten time to delivery compared with single-agent approaches. In patients with obesity, vaginal misoprostol combined with a Foley catheter has been associated with shorter time to delivery compared with buccal administration, without increased cesarean delivery rates.[29]

Are oxytocin requirements altered in patients with obesity?

Patients with obesity undergoing induction of labor often require progressively higher cumulative oxytocin doses as BMI class increases, likely reflecting alterations in myometrial contractility and reduced oxytocin receptor sensitivity. Prior studies demonstrate a stepwise increase in cumulative oxytocin dose with rising BMI class, with class III obesity requiring substantially higher doses than normal-weight patients.[19,26,27] In contrast, patients with obesity who require augmentation during spontaneous labor do not consistently exhibit increased oxytocin needs.[19] These findings underscore the importance of anticipating higher oxytocin needs during induction while avoiding premature diagnosis of labor arrest.

Does maternal obesity influence route of delivery?

Maternal obesity is not an indication for cesarean delivery, yet multiple studies demonstrate increased cesarean delivery rates, particularly during the second stage of labor.[6,7] Patients with obesity, especially those with BMI ≥ 35 kg/m², experience cesarean delivery rates approximately twice those of non-obese patients, with most procedures performed for arrest of descent or failure to progress.[26]

Because patients with obesity generate lower expulsive pressures during pushing, operative vaginal delivery may be considered to supplement maternal effort in appropriately selected cases. These observations highlight the importance of understanding obesity-related alterations in labor physiology when determining optimal timing and mode of delivery.

Collectively, these data suggest that intrapartum management in patients with obesity should emphasize physiologic assessment over rigid temporal criteria. Anticipation of higher oxytocin requirements, allowance for longer cervical dilation intervals when maternal and fetal status remain reassuring, and individualized evaluation of pushing effectiveness may reduce unnecessary operative delivery. At the same time, management strategies must balance patience with vigilance, recognizing that obesity modifies, but does not eliminate the fundamental principles of safe labor progression.

Knowledge Gaps and Future Directions

Despite growing evidence linking obesity to altered labor physiology, important knowledge gaps remain. Direct measurement of pelvic soft tissue resistance and abdominal wall compliance during labor is lacking. Objective quantification of pushing efficiency and intra-abdominal pressure generation in obese patients has not been systematically studied. Additionally, molecular characterization of oxytocin receptor density, calcium-channel activity, and gap-junction dynamics in human myometrium across BMI classes remains limited.

Randomized trials evaluating BMI-specific labor management strategies are also absent. Future research should examine whether modified arrest definitions, physiologic contraction metrics, or BMI-adjusted oxytocin protocols improve outcomes. Clarifying whether prolonged labor in obesity represents pathologic dysfunction or adaptive physiologic variation will be critical to refining clinical guidelines.

Conclusion

Maternal obesity alters labor physiology through anatomic, hormonal, and myometrial mechanisms that affect both uterine contractility and expulsive effort. These physiologic differences produce distinct labor trajectories that are not adequately captured by conventional time-based definitions of labor progress. Recognizing obesity as a modifier of labor physiology may enable more individualized intrapartum management, reduce unnecessary operative intervention, and improve maternal and neonatal outcomes.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Funding Statement:

This research received no external funding. The study was supported by the Department of Women's Health at Arrowhead Regional Medical Center.

Acknowledgments:

None.

References:

1.Emmerich SD, Fryar CD, Stierman B, Ogden CL. Obesity and severe obesity prevalence in adults: United States, August 2021-August 2023. NCHS Data Brief. 2024;(508):1-8.

2.Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Kit BK, Flegal KM. Prevalence of obesity in the United States, 2009-2010. NCHS Data Brief. 2012;(82):1-8.

3.Martin JA, Hamilton BE, Osterman MJK, Driscoll AK. Births: Final Data for 2018. Natl Vital Stat Rep. 2019;68(13):1-47.

4.Alfirevic Z, Devane D, Gyte GM, Cuthbert A. Continuous cardiotocography (CTG) as a form of electronic fetal monitoring (EFM) for fetal assessment during labour. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;2(2):CD006066. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006066.pub3

5.Nelson KB, Sartwelle TP, Rouse DJ. Electronic fetal monitoring, cerebral palsy, and caesarean section: assumptions versus evidence. BMJ. 2016;355:i6405. doi:10.1136/bmj.i6405

6.Frolova AI, Wang JJ, Conner SN, et al. Spontaneous Labor Onset and Outcomes in Obese Women at Term. Am J Perinatol. 2018;35(1):59-64. doi:10.1055/s-0037-1605574

7.Ellis JA, Brown CM, Barger B, Carlson NS. Influence of Maternal Obesity on Labor Induction: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J Midwifery Womens Health. 2019;64(1):55-67. doi:10.1111/jmwh.12935

8.Poobalan AS, Aucott LS, Gurung T, Smith WC, Bhattacharya S. Obesity as an independent risk factor for elective and emergency caesarean delivery in nulliparous women--systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. Obes Rev. 2009;10(1):28-35. doi:10.1111/j.1467-789X.2008.00537.x

9.Wong SP, Harer BH, Valenzuela G. Soft tissue effect on shoulder dystocia. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2005;193:S122.

10.Smit M, Werner MJM, Lansink-Hartgring AO, Dieperink W, Zijlstra JG, van Meurs M. How central obesity influences intra-abdominal pressure: a prospective, observational study in cardiothoracic surgical patients. Ann Intensive Care. 2016;6(1):99. doi:10.1186/s13613-016-0195-8

11.Mesiano S. Myometrial progesterone responsiveness. Semin Reprod Med. 2007;25(1):5-13. doi:10.1055/s-2006-956771

12.Norwitz ER, Robinson JN, Challis JR. The control of labor. N Engl J Med. 1999;341(9):660-666. doi:10.1056/NEJM199908263410906

13.Catalano PM, Shankar K. Obesity and pregnancy: mechanisms of short term and long term adverse consequences for mother and child. BMJ. 2017;356:j1. Published 2017 Feb 8. doi:10.1136/bmj.j1

14.Elmes MJ, Tan DS, Cheng Z, Wathes DC, McMullen S. The effects of a high-fat, high-cholesterol diet on markers of uterine contractility during parturition in the rat. Reproduction. 2011;141(2):283-290. doi:10.1530/REP-10-0378

15.Muir R, Ballan J, Clifford B, et al. Modelling maternal obesity: the effects of a chronic high-fat, high-cholesterol diet on uterine expression of contractile-associated proteins and ex vivo contractile activity during labour in the rat. Clin Sci (Lond). 2016;130(3):183-192. doi:10.1042/CS20150539

16.Garfield RE, Hayashi RH. Presence of gap junctions in the myometrium of women during various stages of menstruation. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1980;138(5):569-574. doi:10.1016/0002-9378(80)90288-4

17.Shynlova O, Nadeem L, Zhang J, Dunk C, Lye S. Myometrial activation: Novel concepts underlying labor. Placenta. 2020;92:28-36. doi:10.1016/j.placenta.2020.02.005

18.Gam CMBF, Larsen LH, Mortensen OH, et al. Unchanged mitochondrial phenotype, but accumulation of lipids in the myometrium in obese pregnant women. J Physiol. 2017;595(23):7109-7122. doi:10.1113/JP274838

19.Roloff K, Peng S, Sanchez-Ramos L, Valenzuela GJ. Cumulative oxytocin dose during induction of labor according to maternal body mass index. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2015;131(1):54-58. doi:10.1016/j.ijgo.2015.04.038

20.Wray S, Jones K, Kupittayanant S, et al. Calcium signaling and uterine contractility. J Soc Gynecol Investig. 2003;10(5):252-264. doi:10.1016/s1071-5576(03)00089-3

21.Carvajal JA, Oporto JI. The Myometrium in Pregnant Women with Obesity. Curr Vasc Pharmacol. 2021;19(2):193-200. doi:10.2174/1570161118666200525133530

22.Creanga AA, Catalano PM, Bateman BT. Obesity in Pregnancy. N Engl J Med. 2022;387(3):248-259. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1801040

23.Grobman WA, Rice MM, Reddy UM, et al. Labor Induction versus Expectant Management in Low-Risk Nulliparous Women. N Engl J Med. 2018;379(6):513-523. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1800566

24.Kominiarek MA, Zhang J, Vanveldhuisen P, Troendle J, Beaver J, Hibbard JU. Contemporary labor patterns: the impact of maternal body mass index. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2011;205(3):244.e1-244.e2448. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2011.06.014

25.Edwards SE, Cohen R, Zhao Z, Kishan R, Steelman M, Bianco A, McCarthy K, Glazer K, 30.

DeBolt CA. Characterizing labor progression and duration according to maternal body mass index. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2025;S0002-9378(25):00825-7. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2025.11.003

26.Bui TM, Witcik KM, Roloff KA, Ross MG, Valenzuela GJ. Push count: a novel and quantitative approach to assessing second-stage labor progress in obese and non-obese patients. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2025;38(1):2529438. doi:10.1080/14767058.2025.2529438

27.Bui TM, Witcik KM, Roloff KA, Ghayuri M, Valenzuela GJ. A prospective observational study comparing intrauterine pressure during the second stage of labor: Does body mass index affect pressure generated during pushing? Reprod Female Child Health. 2024;3(1):e67. doi:10.1002/rfc2.67

28.Palatnik A, Kominiarek MA. Outcomes of Elective Induction of Labor versus Expectant Management among Obese Women at ≥39 Weeks. Am J Perinatol. 2020;37(7):695-707. doi:10.1055/s-0039-1688471

29.Gomez Slagle HB, Kawakita T, Hoffman MK, Sciscione AC, Ma'ayeh M. Buccal versus Vaginal Misoprostol Combined with a Foley Catheter among Individuals with Obesity Undergoing Induction. Am J Perinatol. 2024;41(13):1748-1754. doi:10.1055/a-2308-2220