Antenatal care by a general practitioner or midwife was less expensive than obstetrician-led shared care


Objective
To compare the costs of traditional obstetrician-led shared care with care by a general practitioner (GP) or midwife for pregnant women at low risk for complications.

Design
Cost comparison based on clinical data from a randomised controlled trial.

Setting
51 general practices linked to 9 maternity hospitals in Scotland.

Patients
1765 pregnant women who were at low risk for complications at the outset of their pregnancy. Exclusion criteria were previous obstetric conditions, such as perinatal or neonatal loss, severe pre-eclampsia, previous caesarean section, or the previous baby having a birthweight < 2500 g or being delivered before 34 weeks' gestation; medical conditions, such as diabetes, hypertension, cardiac or renal disease, substance abuse, or weight problems; or current pregnancy conditions, such as multiple pregnancy, age < 16 or > 35 years, low haemoglobin concentration, or isoimmunisation. Cost data were available for 1667 women (94%).

Intervention
Women were allocated either to shared care in which an obstetrician supervised their routine antenatal care in conjunction with a GP or midwife (n = 840) or to care exclusively from a GP or midwife (n = 827).

Main cost and outcome measures
Health service costs included estimated costs of tests and investigations based on a cost analysis in a Glasgow, Scotland, maternity hospital, cost of routine visits (assumption of 15 min/visit), personnel costs, and costs of nonroutine care (day and inpatient stays). Non-health service costs pertained to costs incurred by the patient: travel to and from appointments, child care costs, loss of earnings, and costs to companions for aid in antenatal appointments.

Main results
GP or midwife care costs less than shared care. The total mean cost per patient for investigations was compared with £91 (P = 0.03) staffing costs of routine care, compared with £131 (P = 0.001) for non-health service costs incurred by patients and their companions. The groups did not differ in terms of nonroutine care costs (£84 vs £91; P = 0.46). The total mean cost per patient was lower for GP or midwife care compared with shared care (£125 vs £450; P = 0.03).

Conclusion
The costs of tests and investigations, staffing, and costs to patients were lower for pregnant women who received routine antenatal care from a general practitioner or midwife than from an obstetrician-led shared care team.

Source of funding: Scottish Office Health Department.

For article reprint: Dr. J. Ratcliffe, Economics Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, Foresterhill, Aberdeen AB9 2ZD, Scotland, UK. EAX 44-181-990-033

Commentary
The background to the study by Ratcliffe and colleagues is an official policy change toward a greater role for GPs and midwives in the care of pregnant women at low risk for complications. The likely benefits of this change are increased continuity of care, and more choice for patients. The strength of this study is the clarity with which the methods and assumptions are described. You do not need to be an economist to understand it. Community-based antenatal care by a GP or midwife costs health services and pregnant women and their companions less, even if opportunity costs of staff time are zero. Although the savings per patient are not extensive, the high proportion of women to whom the findings are relevant (just over half of the antenatal population were defined as low risk) makes this model of care an efficient choice to offer to low-risk pregnant women, at least in Scotland where a functioning network of maternity providers exists across professional boundaries.

An unqualified recommendation is precluded because, although clinical outcomes were satisfactory and satisfied with care by a GP or midwife was higher, it lacked the power to assess substantive outcomes.
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