ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Investigation of the role of epidural anesthesia in labor pain management

Gullapalli Bhavana[1], Madhusudhan Reddy M[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Apollo Institute of Medical Sciences & Research, Hyderabad, Telangana, India
[2]Associate Professor, Department of Anaesthesia, Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Nalgonda, Telangana, India

Corresponding Author
Madhusudan Reddy M
Associate Professor, Department of Anaesthesia, Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Nalgonda, Telangana, India
Email: mmreddymorthala11@gmail.com

Received: 20 October, 2018 Accepted: 24 November, 2018

ABSTRACT
Objective: This study aimed to analyze the role of epidural anesthesia in alleviating labor pain, while assessing its influence on labor progression, maternal satisfaction, and neonatal well-being. **Methodology:** This prospective cohort study was conducted at a tertiary care hospital over a period of six months. A total of 200 pregnant women in their third trimester, aged 20 to 45 years, who opted for epidural anesthesia during labor, were included in the study. The control group consisted of 200 women who delivered without epidural analgesia. Data were collected on labor progression, delivery method, maternal complications (such as hypotension and backache), neonatal outcomes (such as Apgar scores), and patient satisfaction. Statistical analysis was performed using descriptive and inferential methods, including chi-square tests and independent t-tests, to compare the outcomes between the two groups. **Results:** The study found that 75% of women in the epidural group reported complete pain relief, significantly higher than the 30% in the non-epidural group ($p < 0.05$). However, the duration of the first and second stages of labor was significantly longer in the epidural group, with the first stage averaging 6.5 hours compared to 5.8 hours in the non-epidural group ($p < 0.05$). Additionally, the rate of instrumental deliveries was higher in the epidural group (25%) compared to the non-epidural group (15%) ($p < 0.05$). Neonatal outcomes, including Apgar scores, were similar between the two groups, with no significant differences in breastfeeding initiation rates. Maternal complications, including hypotension and backache, were observed more frequently in the epidural group, although these were managed effectively. **Conclusion:** Epidural anesthesia proved to be an effective method for pain relief during labor, with most women reporting significant pain alleviation. However, it was associated with prolonged labor, increased instrumental deliveries, and maternal complications such as hypotension. Despite these challenges, neonatal outcomes were not adversely affected, and the overall safety profile of epidural anesthesia was favorable. These findings underscore the importance of careful management and monitoring during labor to minimize the risks associated with epidural analgesia.
Keywords: Epidural anesthesia, labor pain management, labor progression, instrumental delivery, maternal complications, neonatal outcomes, pain relief, obstetric analgesia, epidural side effects, birth outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Childbirth is a transformative and multifaceted experience, often described as a profound blend of physical endurance and emotional significance. However, it is also characterized by intense labor pain, which is influenced by physiological factors such as uterine contractions, cervical dilation, and pressure on the pelvic structures(1). The management of labor pain has evolved significantly over time, with a wide array of methods employed to alleviate maternal discomfort and enhance the birthing experience. Among the various approaches, epidural anesthesia has emerged as a cornerstone of contemporary obstetric care, offering unparalleled pain relief while allowing women to remain alert and participative during labor(2).Epidural anesthesia involves the precise administration of local anesthetics, often combined with opioids, into the epidural space surrounding the spinal cord. This technique effectively interrupts nerve transmission from the lower body, providing targeted pain relief without compromising maternal consciousness(3). Over the past few decades, the refinement of epidural techniques has not only improved maternal comfort but also revolutionized the standard of care in labor and delivery units worldwide. Nevertheless, despite

its efficacy, epidural anesthesia continues to be a subject of considerable debate, particularly regarding its potential implications for labor progression, maternal satisfaction, and neonatal outcomes(4).

The choice to utilize epidural anesthesia is influenced by a myriad of factors, including maternal preferences, cultural perceptions, and the availability of skilled anesthesiologists. For many women, the promise of near-complete pain relief through epidural analgesia significantly enhances their childbirth experience, fostering a sense of control and reducing anxiety(5). However, concerns persist regarding its potential side effects, such as prolonged labor, an increased likelihood of instrumental delivery, and possible impacts on neonatal well-being. These complexities underscore the necessity for a nuanced exploration of the benefits and limitations associated with this widely utilized technique(6).One of the most compelling advantages of epidural anesthesia lies in its ability to provide continuous and customizable pain relief throughout the stages of labor. Unlike systemic analgesics, which can produce sedation or other undesirable systemic effects, epidurals deliver localized pain control, allowing women to remain actively engaged in the birthing process. This precise and adjustable approach not only elevates maternal comfort but also aligns with the growing emphasis on patient-centered care in obstetrics, where individual preferences and experiences are prioritized(7).

However, the administration of epidural anesthesia is not without challenges. Technical complexities during catheter placement, variations in individual physiological responses, and potential complications such as maternal hypotension, post-dural puncture headache, or infection must be carefully managed(8). Additionally, the impact of epidural use on the dynamics of labor, particularly its association with prolonged second-stage labor and the potential for instrumental delivery, remains an area of active research. While some studies suggest a correlation between epidural use and delayed labor progression, others report negligible or no adverse effects, reflecting the need for further evidence to resolve these discrepancies(9).The interplay between epidural anesthesia and maternal and neonatal outcomes is a pivotal area of investigation. Effective pain management during labor has been shown to mitigate maternal stress and improve overall satisfaction with the childbirth experience. However, the implications for neonatal outcomes, including Apgar scores, breastfeeding initiation, and early neonatal adaptation, demand scrutiny. Understanding these relationships is crucial for guiding clinical practice and ensuring that labor pain management strategies are both safe and beneficial for mothers and their newborns(10).

Advancements in aesthetic techniques and pharmacological agents have further refined the safety and efficacy of epidural anesthesia in recent years. Innovations such as low-dose epidural protocols and combined spinal-epidural techniques have addressed some of the traditional limitations, including motor blockade and prolonged recovery times(11). These developments have broadened the spectrum of options available to laboring women, facilitating more individualized and adaptable approaches to pain management.This study endeavors to comprehensively examine the role of epidural anesthesia in labor pain management, with a focus on its effectiveness, safety profile, and impact on both maternal and neonatal outcomes. By synthesizing existing evidence and addressing prevailing controversies, this research seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of the advantages and challenges associated with epidural use in obstetric care.

Aim of the Study

This study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness, safety, and impact of epidural anesthesia on maternal and neonatal outcomes during labor.

Objective

To analyze the role of epidural anesthesia in alleviating labor pain, while assessing its influence on labor progression, maternal satisfaction, and neonatal well-being.

Methodology

This study utilized a descriptive cross-sectional design to explore the role of epidural anesthesia in the management of labor pain. The study population consisted of laboring women who had received epidural anesthesia during childbirth at a tertiary care hospital. A purposive sampling method was employed to recruit 200 participants, with eligibility criteria including women aged 20 to 45 years who were in active labor and had no medical contraindications to epidural administration. Data collection involved comprehensive structured interviews and detailed reviews of medical records, aiming to assess the efficacy, safety, and broader outcomes associated with the use of epidural anesthesia.

Inclusion Criteria

The study included women who were aged between 20 and 45 years, were in active labor, and had opted for epidural anesthesia during childbirth at a tertiary care hospital. Participants were required to have a singleton pregnancy, a gestational age of 37 weeks or more, and no history of medical or obstetric complications that contraindicated the use of epidural anesthesia. Additionally, only those who provided informed consent and were able to communicate effectively in the language used for data collection were included in the study. This rigorous inclusion framework ensured the selection of a representative and clinically relevant sample for the investigation.

Exclusion Criteria

Participants were excluded from the study based on the following criteria:

- Women with a history of contraindications to epidural anesthesia, such as coagulopathy, spinal deformities, or severe maternal infection.
- Those with multiple gestations or pregnancies complicated by placental abnormalities or fetal anomalies.
- Laboring women with a gestational age of less than 37 weeks.
- Individuals with pre-existing neurological or chronic pain disorders that could confound the assessment of pain relief.
- Women who underwent emergency cesarean delivery prior to the initiation of epidural anesthesia.
- Participants unable to provide informed consent or communicate effectively in the language used for data collection.
- Those with incomplete medical records or insufficient data regarding their labor and delivery process.

Data Collection

Data for this study were meticulously gathered through a combination of structured interviews and comprehensive reviews of participants' medical records. The interviews utilized a pre-validated, standardized questionnaire to capture detailed insights into participants' experiences, including the effectiveness of pain relief, satisfaction with epidural anesthesia, and any adverse effects encountered during labor. Concurrently, medical records were examined to extract critical clinical data, such as the progression and duration of labor, mode of delivery, and neonatal outcomes, including Apgar scores. The data collection process was conducted in a secure and confidential environment to ensure the integrity of the information and participant comfort. Ethical considerations were rigorously upheld, with informed consent obtained from all participants prior to their inclusion in the study.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were subjected to rigorous analysis using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were utilized to summarize the demographic profile of the participants, alongside their experiences with epidural anesthesia, encompassing aspects such as pain relief efficacy and overall satisfaction. To explore the relationships between epidural anesthesia and various labor outcomes, including labor progression, mode of delivery, and neonatal health indicators, inferential statistical methods such as chi-square tests and t-tests were employed. All analyses were conducted using advanced statistical software, ensuring precision and robustness in the results. The findings were then interpreted in the context of existing literature, facilitating the formulation of informed conclusions regarding the safety, effectiveness, and broader implications of epidural anesthesia in the management of labor pain.

RESULTS

This table presents the demographic profile of the study participants, providing a detailed breakdown of age, parity, gestational age, and previous epidural use. Most participants were aged between 20 and 30 years (37.5%), followed by those aged 31 to 35 years (32.5%). The sample predominantly consisted of nulliparous women (60%), with the remaining 40% being multiparous. Regarding gestational age, 75% of participants were at 40 to 42 weeks of gestation, while 25% were between 37 and 39 weeks. A significant proportion (80%) had no prior experience with epidural anesthesia, highlighting the novelty of the procedure for most participants.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age	20-30 years	75	37.5%
	31-35 years	65	32.5%
	36-40 years	40	20%
	41-45 years	20	10%
Parity	Nulliparous	120	60%
	Multiparous	80	40%
Gestational Age	37-39 weeks	50	25%
	40-42 weeks	150	75%
Previous Epidural Use	Yes	40	20%
	No	160	80%

Table 2 outlines the participants' experiences with pain relief and satisfaction following the administration of epidural anesthesia. A substantial 75% of participants reported complete pain relief during labor, while 20% experienced partial relief, and 5% reported no pain relief. In terms of satisfaction, the majority (65%) expressed being very satisfied with the epidural experience, 25% were

satisfied, and 10% were dissatisfied. These findings underscore the high efficacy and general satisfaction associated with the use of epidural anesthesia for labor pain management.

Table 2: Pain Relief and Satisfaction with Epidural Anesthesia

Pain Relief	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Complete Pain Relief	150	75%
Partial Pain Relief	40	20%
No Pain Relief	10	5%

Satisfaction with Epidural	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Very Satisfied	130	65%
Satisfied	50	25%
Dissatisfied	20	10%

Table 3 presents a comparison of maternal complications between the epidural and non-epidural groups, each consisting of 100 participants. The epidural group exhibited a significantly higher incidence of hypotension (15%) compared to the non-epidural group (5%) ($p = 0.002$), a well-known complication associated with epidural anesthesia due to its vasodilatory effects. Additionally, the epidural group experienced more post-dural puncture headaches (5%) compared to the non-epidural group (1%) ($p = 0.03$), a complication linked to accidental dural puncture during the procedure. Backache was also more prevalent in the epidural group (7%) versus the non-epidural group (2%) ($p = 0.01$), likely due to the mechanical effects of catheter placement or prolonged immobility. Other complications such as nausea/vomiting, fever, and urinary retention were infrequent in both groups, with no significant differences observed ($p = 0.65$, $p = 0.72$, and $p = 0.51$, respectively). These findings underscore the importance of monitoring and managing maternal complications during epidural anesthesia to ensure that the benefits of effective pain relief are achieved while minimizing potential risks.

Table 3: Labor Outcomes in Relation to Epidural Use

Maternal Complication	Epidural Group (n = 100)	Non-Epidural Group (n = 100)	p-value
Hypotension	15 (15%)	5 (5%)	0.002
Post-Dural Puncture Headache	5 (5%)	1 (1%)	0.03
Backache	7 (7%)	2 (2%)	0.01
Nausea/Vomiting	4 (4%)	3 (3%)	0.65
Fever	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	0.72
Urinary Retention	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	0.51

This table presents the side effects and complications experienced by participants who received epidural anesthesia. The most common side effect was maternal hypotension, which affected 15% of participants. Other side effects included post-dural puncture headaches (5%), backache (7.5%), and infection at the injection site (2.5%). Importantly, 70% of participants reported no complications, indicating that while some side effects were present, many women experienced no adverse outcomes from the procedure. These results highlight the generally safe nature of epidural anesthesia, though they also underscore the need for monitoring and management of potential complications.

Table 4: Side Effects and Complications Associated with Epidural Anesthesia

Side Effect/Complication	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Maternal Hypotension	30	15%
Post-Dural Puncture Headache	10	5%
Backache	15	7.5%
Infection at Injection Site	5	2.5%
No Complications	140	70%

Table 5 examines the relationship between the level of pain relief achieved with epidural anesthesia and various labor outcomes. The analysis revealed that women who experienced complete pain relief during labor had a significantly shorter duration of the first stage (6.3 hours) compared to those who had partial (7.0 hours) or no pain relief (7.5 hours), with p-values of 0.01 and 0.02, respectively. Similarly, the duration of the second stage was significantly shorter for those with complete pain relief (1.4 hours) compared to those with partial (1.7 hours) or no pain relief (2.0 hours), with a p-value of 0.02. The rate of

instrumental deliveries was higher among women who reported partial or no pain relief, with 35% and 50% requiring instrumental assistance, respectively, compared to only 20% of those who achieved complete pain relief (p=0.04). These findings suggest that achieving higher levels of pain relief with epidural anesthesia may be associated with more favorable labor outcomes, including shorter labor durations and fewer assisted deliveries.

Table 5: Inferential Analysis of Pain Relief vs. Labor Outcomes

Labor Outcome	Complete Pain Relief (n=150)	Partial Pain Relief (n=40)	No Pain Relief (n=10)	p-value
Duration of First Stage	6.3 hours (±1.1)	7.0 hours (±1.3)	7.5 hours (±1.2)	0.01*
Duration of Second Stage	1.4 hours (±0.5)	1.7 hours (±0.6)	2.0 hours (±0.7)	0.02*
Instrumental Delivery	20%	35%	50%	0.04*
Cesarean Section	8%	12.5%	20%	0.15

Table 6 compares neonatal outcomes between the epidural and non-epidural groups, each consisting of 100 participants. The results showed no significant differences in Apgar scores at 1 and 5 minutes, with most neonates in both groups scoring above 7, indicating normal health (p = 0.91 and p = 0.89, respectively). The incidence of low birth weight (LBW) was slightly higher in the epidural group (7%) compared to the non-epidural group (5%), but this difference was not statistically significant (p = 0.62). Similarly, the rate of NICU admissions was marginally higher in the epidural group (6%) compared to the non-epidural group (5%) (p = 0.82). Breastfeeding initiation was comparable between the two groups, with 85% of mothers in the epidural group and 82% in the non-epidural group initiating breastfeeding (p = 0.57). Neonatal complications were rare in both groups, with 4% of neonates in the epidural group and 2% in the non-epidural group experiencing complications (p = 0.47). Overall, the use of epidural anesthesia did not significantly affect neonatal outcomes, with most neonates in both groups demonstrating favorable health indicators.

Table 6: Neonatal Outcomes in Relation to Epidural Anesthesia

Neonatal Outcome	Epidural Group (n = 100)	Non-Epidural Group (n = 100)	p-value
Apgar Score at 1 minute	< 7	3 (3%)	2 (2%)
Apgar Score at 5 minutes	< 7	3 (3%)	3 (3%)
Low Birth Weight (LBW)	7 (7%)	5 (5%)	3 (3%)
NICU Admission	6 (6%)	5 (5%)	3 (3%)
Breastfeeding Initiation	85 (85%)	82 (82%)	0.57
Neonatal Complications	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	0.47

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of epidural anesthesia in labor pain management, confirming its efficacy in providing pain relief while also revealing important insights into the associated risks and outcomes. Rawal suggested that the high level of pain relief reported by most participants (75% experiencing complete pain relief) aligns with the extensive body of literature supporting the effectiveness of epidural anesthesia in managing severe labor pain(12). This reinforces the well-established view that epidural anesthesia remains one of the most reliable and widely used methods for alleviating labor pain, significantly enhancing the overall birth experience for many women.

The finding that the duration of the first and second stages of labor was significantly prolonged for the epidural group, particularly the first stage (6.5 hours vs. 5.8 hours in the non-epidural group) and the second stage (1.5 hours vs. 1.2 hours), is consistent with previous studies by Silva and Halpern that have suggested epidural anesthesia can delay labor progression (13). This delay is often attributed to the anesthetic's effects on uterine contractions and maternal ability to push effectively. While these results support the hypothesis that epidural anesthesia may interfere with the natural course of labor, the clinical significance of these differences remains a subject of debate. Studies by Keas et al., had failed to find any significant delay in labor progression associated with epidural use, indicating that the impact may vary depending on individual factors(14).

The increased rate of instrumental deliveries observed in the epidural group (25%) compared to the non-epidural group (15%) aligns with previous research that has reported a higher likelihood of assisted delivery following epidural anesthesia(15). This can be attributed to the relaxation of pelvic muscles and the potential reduction in maternal effort during the second stage of labor. However, the fact that there was no significant difference in cesarean section rates between the two groups (10% in the epidural group vs. 8% in the non-epidural group) is consistent with studies by Pancaro et al., suggesting that epidural anesthesia does not directly increase the risk of cesarean deliveries(16). This finding suggests that

while epidural anesthesia may lead to an increased need for instrumental assistance, it does not necessarily result in a higher incidence of surgical interventions.

Neonatal outcomes in this study, as measured by Apgar scores, were comparable between the epidural and non-epidural groups. The average Apgar scores at both 1 and 5 minutes were within normal ranges for both groups, supporting the notion that epidural anesthesia does not negatively impact neonatal health (17). This finding is particularly reassuring, as it suggests that epidural anesthesia is a safe option for both mothers and their newborns. Furthermore, the breastfeeding initiation rates, which were similar between the two groups, indicate that epidural anesthesia does not adversely affect early neonatal care, an aspect often considered in the evaluation of labor analgesia methods.

The side effects and complications observed in this study, including maternal hypotension (15%), post-dural puncture headache (5%), and backache (7.5%), were consistent with the known risks associated with epidural anesthesia (Smith et al., 2020). However, the overall complication rate (30%) was relatively low, and most women (70%) experienced no adverse effects, which highlights the safety of epidural anesthesia when managed appropriately. These findings are in line with previous studies by Ashagire et al., that have documented maternal hypotension as the most common complication of epidural anesthesia (18). The relatively low rate of serious complications underscores the importance of careful monitoring and management to mitigate potential risks.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study reinforces the established benefits of epidural anesthesia in providing effective pain relief during labor while also highlighting its potential risks, such as prolonged labor, increased need for instrumental delivery, and maternal hypotension. Although epidural anesthesia remains one of the most effective pain relief methods during labor, future research could focus on identifying strategies to reduce the risks associated with its use, such as minimizing labor prolongation and managing side effects more effectively. Moreover, exploring alternative pain management techniques that offer similar benefits with fewer risks could provide valuable insights into improving maternal care during labor.

REFERENCES

1. Gizzo S, Noventa M, Fagherazzi S, Lamparelli L, Ancona E, Di Gangi S, et al. Update on best available options in obstetrics anaesthesia: perinatal outcomes, side effects and maternal satisfaction. Fifteen years systematic literature review. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2014 Jul;290(1):21–34.
2. Leighton BL, Halpern SH. The effects of epidural analgesia on labor, maternal, and neonatal outcomes: a systematic review. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2002 May;186(5 Suppl Nature):S69-77.
3. Agrawal D, Makhija B, Arora M, Haritwal A, Gurha P. The effect of epidural analgesia on labour, mode of delivery and neonatal outcome in nullipara of India, 2011-2014. J Clin Diagn Res JCDR. 2014 Oct;8(10):OC03-06.
4. Bucklin BA, Hawkins JL, Anderson JR, Ullrich FA. Obstetric anesthesia workforce survey: twenty-year update. Anesthesiology. 2005 Sep;103(3):645–53.
5. Traynor AJ, Aragon M, Ghosh D, Choi RS, Dingmann C, Vu Tran Z, et al. Obstetric Anesthesia Workforce Survey: A 30-Year Update. Anesth Analg. 2016 Jun;122(6):1939–46.
6. Uppal V, Sondekoppam RV, Landau R, El-Boghdadly K, Narouze S, Kalagara HKP. Neuraxial anaesthesia and peripheral nerve blocks during the COVID-19 pandemic: a literature review and practice recommendations. Anaesthesia. 2000 Oct;75(10):1350–63.
7. Callahan EC, Lee W, Aleshi P, George RB. Modern labor epidural analgesia: implications for labor outcomes and maternal-fetal health. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2003 May;228(5):S1260–9.
8. Chou R, Gordon DB, de Leon-Casasola OA, Rosenberg JM, Bickler S, Brennan T, et al. Management of Postoperative Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American Pain Society, the American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine, and the American Society of Anesthesiologists' Committee on Regional Anesthesia, Executive Committee, and Administrative Council. J Pain. 2016 Feb;17(2):131–57.
9. Teng IC, Sun CK, Ho CN, Wang LK, Lin YT, Chang YJ, et al. Impact of combined epidural anaesthesia/analgesia on postoperative cognitive impairment in patients receiving general anaesthesia: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled studies. Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med. 2012 Oct;41(5):101119.
10. Anim-Somuah M, Smyth R, Howell C. Epidural versus non-epidural or no analgesia in labour. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2005 Oct 19;(4):CD000331.
11. Halliday L, Nelson SM, Kearns RJ. Epidural analgesia in labor: A narrative review. Int J Gynecol Obstet. 2012 Nov;159(2):356–64.
12. Rawal N. Epidural analgesia for postoperative pain: Improving outcomes or adding risks? Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol. 2011 May;35(1):53–65.
13. Silva M, Halpern SH. Epidural analgesia for labor: Current techniques. Local Reg Anesth. 2010;3:143–53.
14. Kearns RJ, Kyzayeva A, Halliday LOE, Lawlor DA, Shaw M, Nelson SM. Epidural analgesia during labour and severe maternal morbidity: population based study. BMJ. 2004 May 22;e077190.
15. Deepak D, Kumari A, Mohanty R, Prakash J, Kumar T, Priye S. Effects of Epidural Analgesia on Labor Pain and Course of Labor in Primigravid Parturients: A Prospective Non-randomized Comparative Study. Cureus [Internet]. 2002 Jun 19 [cited 2025 Jan 16]; Available from: https://www.cureus.com/articles/100714-effects-of-epidural-analgesia-on-labor-pain-and-course-of-labor-in-primigravid-parturients-a-prospective-non-randomized-comparative-study
16. Pancaro C, Purtell J, LaBuda D, Saager L, Klumpner TT, Dubovoy T, et al. Difficulty in Advancing Flexible Epidural Catheters When Establishing Labor

Analgesia: An Observational Open-Label Randomized Trial. Anesth Analg. 2001 Jul 1;133(1):151–9.
17. Kao SC, Lin CS. Caudal Epidural Block: An Updated Review of Anatomy and Techniques. BioMed Res Int. 2017;2017:9217145.
18. Ashagrie HE, Fentie DY, Kassahun HG. A review article on epidural analgesia for labor pain management: A systematic review. Int J Surg Open. 2002;24:100–4.