



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Walsh, D., Spiby, H., Grigg, C. P., Dodwell, M., McCourt, C., Culley, L., Bishop, S., Wilkinson, J., Coleby, D., Pacanowski, L., et al (2018). Mapping midwifery and obstetric units in England. *Midwifery*, 56, pp. 9-16. doi: 10.1016/j.midw.2017.09.009

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/18417/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2017.09.009>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

1 Introduction & Background

2 Since 1993, maternity care policy in England has promoted women's choice of place of birth
3 (Cumberlege 1993). This became the national *choice guarantee* in Maternity Matters policy
4 document in 2007 (Department of Health 2007) with three options: birth in a maternity hospital
5 (obstetric unit or OU); birth in two types of midwifery unit (MU), either alongside [AMU] or
6 freestanding [FMU]; or birth at home. Midwifery units are home-like environments that avoid the
7 routine use of technology and are considered especially suitable for women with a straightforward
8 pregnancy and an anticipated normal birth. They are also referred to as 'birth centres' in the
9 international maternity care literature (Hermus, Boesveld et al. 2017). Alongside midwifery units are
10 situated within a hospital complex that has an existing OU. They may be in an adjacent corridor, on
11 another floor, in another wing and occasionally in a separate building. What they all share is the
12 facility to transfer labouring women to the obstetric units if complications occur in labour via
13 walking, wheelchair or bed (McCourt, Rayment et al. 2014). Freestanding midwifery units are
14 geographically separate from their host obstetric units and women transfer via ambulance if
15 complications develop in labour (Christensen and Overgaard 2017).

16
17 Midwifery units exist in many other national maternity care systems, and, over the past three
18 decades, a considerable body of evidence has accumulated demonstrating that both AMUs and
19 FMUs reduce labour and birth interventions in women (Walsh and Downe 2004, Hodnett, Downe et
20 al. 2012, Alliman and Phillippi 2016, Christensen and Overgaard 2017). Women who use them
21 express high levels of satisfaction and midwives who work in them a sense of well-being and
22 autonomy (Bernitz, Øian et al. 2016, McCourt, Rayment et al. 2016). Studies inside and outside of
23 the UK suggest they are also more cost effective (Bernitz, Aas et al. 2012, Schroeder, Petrou et al.
24 2012, Kenny, Devane et al. 2015).

25
26 The Department of Health (England) commissioned research into childbirth in different settings
27 (home, MUs, OUs) in 2004, specifically examining low risk women. The subsequent Birthplace in
28 England research programme consisted of a suite of studies including a mapping of MUs and OUs in
29 England, a prospective cohort study of perinatal and maternal outcomes by planned place of birth
30 and an economic evaluation of the cost effectiveness of different places of birth. The cohort study
31 reported that outcomes for low risk women were better and care was less costly if births were
32 planned in MUs, both AMUs and FMUs, rather than OUs, without compromising the safety of babies.
33 In particular, having a baby in a MU reduced caesarean section rates by two thirds (Brocklehurst,
34 Hardy et al. 2011). There was also a reduced risk of instrumental delivery or of receiving medical
35 interventions such as augmentation, epidural or spinal analgesia, general anaesthesia, or episiotomy
36 and significantly greater likelihood of having a normal birth (Brocklehurst et al., 2011b). The linked
37 economic study also found that cost per woman was less than traditional labour wards and care
38 more cost effective (Schroeder, Petrou et al. 2012).

39
40 Subsequently, the National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE), the body that develops clinical
41 guidelines for the English National Health Service (NHS), updated their guidelines on intrapartum
42 care and now advises low risk women that MUs are particularly suitable for them (NICE 2014).
43 Specifically the guidelines state that 'the maximum choice for women would comprise access to an
44 Obstetric Unit with an AMU and access to a FMU within the Trust boundaries or in a neighbouring
45 Trust'. However, despite the advantages of MUs, a NAO survey (National Audit Office 2013) found
46 that MUs were not equally distributed with only 11% of women giving birth in one while the vast
47 majority continued to give birth in OUs. In addition, MUs were not equally distributed across the
48 country. A third of local maternity services (also called Trusts) had no MUs, and, in those that did,
49 the percentage of women birthing in them as a proportion of all women birthing in the Trust was
50 extremely variable with only a few achieving over 20% (National Audit Office 2013).

51

52 The reasons for these variations are unclear. There may be a range of context-specific or more
53 general barriers to establishing and operating MUs. It is possible that financial constraints currently
54 impacting on the NHS (Iacobucci 2016), a shortage of midwives (Wise 2014) and the increasing
55 medicalisation of birth (Johanson, Newburn et al. 2002, Beech 2011) are among relevant factors.
56 Little is currently known about such barriers or what facilitates MU provision. However, the unequal
57 provision results in many low risk women birthing in OUs and therefore being exposed to an
58 increased risk of caesarean section and to a birth experience that is less satisfying (Hodnett, Downe
59 et al. 2012). In addition, local maternity services (Trusts) are not realising the cost savings of MUs.

60

61 The aim of this paper is to report on the types, numbers and utilisation of MUs in England 6 years on
62 from the Birthplace study and presents the results from the first part of a larger funded study of the
63 facilitators and barriers to optimal use of MUs. The paper compares the results with the Birthplace
64 Mapping survey (Redshaw, Rowe et al. 2011) and comments on the changes that have occurred over
65 that time. In addition, it discusses in more depth the potential utility of MUs to birth a greater
66 proportion of low risk women.

67

68 **Methods**

69

70 ***Definition of Alongside Midwifery Units***

71

72 To enable accurate mapping of service configuration it was first necessary to review how terms are
73 operationalized. Midwifery units are defined as a clinical location offering care to women with
74 straightforward pregnancies during labour and birth in which midwives take primary professional
75 responsibility for care. Whilst the definition of an FMU is clear (midwife led unit that is a
76 geographical distance from a host obstetric unit and therefore requires a vehicle transfer if
77 complications occur in labour), the definition of an AMU is less clear. The Birthplace Study defined it
78 as a midwifery unit where diagnostic and therapeutic medical services, including obstetric, neonatal
79 and anaesthetic care are available, should they be needed, in the same building, or in a separate
80 building on the same site (Redshaw, Rowe et al. 2011). Transfer will normally be by trolley, bed or
81 wheelchair. Follow-on research projects from Birthplace add that AMUs should be able to
82 accurately identify their admissions and births in their record systems (Rowe, Townend et al. 2013).
83 However, these criteria allow for a number of hybrid arrangements e.g.

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

Within our team, we had extensive discussions before agreeing the following criteria for defining AMUs for the mapping stage of our study:

1. Midwifery-led care setting
2. 'Low risk' women, with case by case exceptions only
3. Separate physical space from OU with minimum demarcation being a line on the floor that excludes, for example, having a AMU-style room within an obstetric labour ward
4. Only emergency secondary/tertiary level care is permissible within the space; epidurals, continuous electronic fetal monitoring, medical induction/augmentation require transfer to the adjacent obstetric unit
5. Does not provide care for labouring high risk women when OU short of rooms (unless exceptional circumstances)

103 6. Ability to measure number of births/year in AMU

104

105

106 These criteria are slightly more restrictive than the Birthplace study and we estimate that they
107 resulted in the exclusion of a very small number (possibly two or three) AMUs included in the
108 previous research. Our dataset therefore reflects this number.

109

110 **Data Collection**

111

112 Our data collection was aided by information provided by BirthChoiceUK and the consumer
113 organisation, 'Which?'. Both of these provide web-based information about maternity service
114 provision across the UK. BirthChoiceUK holds a database containing details of maternity unit
115 configurations, which was supplied to 'Which?' for the development of the 'Which? Birth Choice'
116 website (Which? Birth Choice, 2017). 'Which?' also audits MU provision and utilisation across the
117 UK. We entered into a data agreement with 'Which?' for them to share the details of maternity units
118 and configurations along with information they had collected about birth numbers in MUs in
119 England. We developed our own data collection proformas after consulting both the Birthplace
120 mapping data collection tool (Redshaw, Rowe et al. 2011) and pages on the 'Which? Birth Choice'
121 website relating to maternity units. Heads of Midwifery (HoMs) in the 134 Trusts across England
122 were sent a survey. We then telephoned the HoMs who provided current maternity service data for
123 entry into the survey. These calls, which lasted up to 30 minutes, took place over a three-month
124 period between March and May of 2016. Actual yearly number of births was completed using the
125 'Which? Birth Choice' data and sometimes subsequently updated in the telephone calls.

126

127 **Ethics**

128

129 This first stage of the research was classed as service evaluation and thus did not require ethics
130 committee approval.

131

132 **Sample**

133

134 One hundred and thirty four NHS Trusts providing all publicly funded maternity care in England were
135 contacted. Home birth was excluded.

136

137 **Analysis**

138 Descriptive summary statistics and narrative description of configuration, organisation, operation of
139 AMUs and FMUs were undertaken.

140

141 **Results**

142 All 134 Trusts participated in the survey (response rate 100%).

143 The results will be presented in four ways: number and type of MUs as an indicator of place of birth
144 choice; changes since the Birthplace study; the number of births/year in AMUs compared with
145 FMUs; and thirdly MU births as a percentage of all births within each individual Trust, excluding
146 home birth. The latter gives some indication of the utilisation of MUs as defined by percentage of
147 women on a midwifery-led pathway that birth in them.

148

149 1. *Number and Type of MUs*

150

151 It should be noted that the local configuration of maternity services (Trusts) in England is constantly
 152 evolving. There has been a tendency for Trusts to expand and merge so that there are now fewer
 153 Trusts in England providing maternity services than at the time of the Birthplace Mapping study in
 154 2010, reduced from 148 to 134. There has been a similar reduction in the overall number of OUs,
 155 reduced from 177 to 159. Many of the existing small OUs operate in areas that are more rural. Most
 156 Trusts have just one obstetric unit (n=106), but 25 Trusts now have two OUs and one Trust has
 157 three.

158
 159 One hundred and thirty-two Trusts have at least one OU and of these, 65% have at least one AMU.
 160 The majority of Trusts (52.2%) have one OU and one AMU. Almost 27% of Trusts have one OU and
 161 no AMU. Ten Trusts with 2 OUs have no AMUs. The Trust with three OUs, has two OUs with an
 162 attached AMU and one OU without an AMU. This accounts for all 97 AMUs (Table 1).

163
 164 Table 1. Numbers/Percentages of Trusts with Different Services Configurations: OUs and AMUs
 165 within the same Trust
 166

		Number of OUs in the Trust								Total	
		0		1		2		3			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No. of AMUs in the Trust	0	2*	1.5	36	26.9	10	7.5	0	0.0	48	35.8
	1	0	0.0	70	52.2	5	3.7	0	0.0	75	56.0
	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	7.5	1	0.7	11	8.2
Total No./% of Trusts		2	1.5	106	79.1	25	18.7	1	0.7	134	100.0

167
 168 *Two Trusts have no OU or AMU but provide maternity services with an FMU
 169

170 Only 29% of all Trusts (39 out of 134) have an FMU. Of these, six Trusts have two FMUs, five Trusts
 171 have three FMUs and two Trusts have four FMUs, with the majority of Trusts with FMUs having only
 172 one. Of these, there are two FMUs that are not part of a Trust with an OU. Multiple FMUs were
 173 found to exist exclusively in rural areas. In total, there are 61 FMUs (Table 2).

174
 175 Table 2. Numbers /Percentages of Trusts with Different Services Configurations: OUs and FMUs
 176 within the Same Trust
 177

		Number of OUs in the Trust								Total	
		0		1		2		3			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%

No. of FMUs in the Trust	0	0	0.0	79	59.0	16	11.9	0	0.0	95	70.9
	1	2	1.5	16	11.9	8	6.0	0	0.0	26	19.4
	2	0	0.0	5	3.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	6	4.5
	3	0	0.0	4	3.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	5	3.7
	4	0	0.0	2	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.5
Total No./% of Trusts		2	1.5	106	79.1	25	18.7	1	0.7	134	100.0

178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193

In summary, there are 23 Trusts with an AMU attached to an OU and at least one FMU


Within these 23 Trusts there are:

- Three Trusts with two AMUs and one FMU
- Eight Trusts one AMU and two FMUs
- Three Trusts with one AMU and three FMUs
- One Trust with one AMU and four FMUs

The clusters of FMUs e.g. three or more attached to five Trusts (hub and spoke arrangement) tend to exist in counties that are more rural.

The Flow Diagram below represents the current configuration.

Figure 1. Flow Chart of Trusts, AMUs, FMUs and OUs




194
195
196
197
198

2. Changes since the Birthplace Study

199 Over a six-year period, there has been an increase of 44 AMUs and 3 FMUs since the Birthplace
200 mapping survey under taken in 2010 (Redshaw, Rowe et al. 2011). The number of Trusts without an
201 MU has fallen from 75 (50%) to 32 (24%) and of the 32, twenty-seven have one OU and five have
202 two OUs (Figure 2).

203

204 Figure 2. Numbers of AMUs, FMUs, and Trusts without MUs in England: Change since Birthplace
205 Study



206

207

208


209

210 The increase in the number of MUs is reflected in a higher national percentage of all births occurring
211 in such units. In comparison with findings from the Birthplace Mapping study, MU births across
212 England increased from 5% to 14% of all births over the six-year period, almost entirely related to
213 the increase in AMU provision (Figure 3).

214

215 Figure 3. Percentage of Births in OUs and MUs: Change since Birthplace Study

216




217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227

3. *Number of births/year in MUs*

The number of births in each AMU varies considerably, from 100 births/year to 2000 births/year, but most range between 500 and 1000. Below we have categorised AMUs into bands based on their number of births/year (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Size of AMUs: Numbers of Births/Year




228
 229
 230
 231
 232

The differences in the number of births/year between AMUs is partly related to the number of births in their linked OU. For example, three of the five largest AMUs in England are linked to the three

233 largest OUs. But it is also dependent on each local maternity service’s ability to optimise access to
234 their AMUs. A later section of the findings highlights this.

235
236 The number of births in FMUs is much smaller than AMUs because they generally serve smaller
237 population areas, typically more rural communities (Redshaw, Rowe et al. 2011). They appear to
238 have more restrictive access criteria (Rowe, Fitzpatrick et al. 2012) e.g. women planning a vaginal
239 birth after a previous caesarean section are not encouraged to birth in FMUs but it became clear in
240 our survey that some local services allow this in AMUs as we asked a question about access criteria
241 for the two types of MU. The range was between 10 births/year to 650 births/year, with the
242 majority between 10 and 200 births. As above, we categorised FMUs into bands based on their
243 number of births/year (Figure 5).

244
245 Figure 5. Size of FMUs: Number of Births/Year
246




247
248
249
250 Thirty-six of the 61 FMUs (59%) are supporting fewer than 200 births/year. There has been a small
251 but steady trend towards metropolitan FMUs opening in a town or city where an obstetric unit (OU)
252 has closed over the past 15 years (Dodwell, 2013). Three FMUs with the highest number of births in
253 England were established in the last 5 years because of this change. Two other FMUs, supporting in
254 excess of 400 births, opened in large cities where existing obstetric units were situated.

255
256
257 **4. MU Percentage of all Births/linked Trust**
258

259 After excluding home birth, the number of MU births as a percentage of all births/ linked Trust gives
260 some indication of their optimum utilisation. This is based on the assumption that the best care for
261 women on a midwifery-led pathway includes access to MUs for labour and birth. For the purpose of
262 this paper, we calculated the number of MU births as a percentage of all Trust births, excluding
263 home births (in Trusts with both AMUs + FMUs, Trusts with just AMUs, Trusts with just FMUs) to
264 reflect utilisation. We then counted the number of Trusts who had MUs birthing women according
265 to different percentage bands (0 -5%, 5-10%, 10-15%, 15-20%, 20-15%, 25-30%, >30%). This revealed
266 wide variations (Figure 6).


267
268

269 Figure 6. Utilisation of MUs: Numbers of Trusts by Percentage Bands of MU Births/all Trust Births
 270



271
 272
 273 The Trust with the lowest percentage of all births in their MU(s) measured 4% and the Trust with the
 274 highest was 31%. Seventy two percent (72%) of MUs were birthing less than 20% of their total Trust
 275 births, excluding home births, with only 11% achieving above 25%. AMU utilisation (number of AMU
 276 births as a percentage of all attached Unit births) was similar (Figure 7).
 277

278 Figure 7. Utilisation of AMUs Numbers of OUs by Percentage Bands of AMU Births/all Units Births



279
 280
 281
 282
 283


284 *Trusts without any MUs*

285

286 Of the 32 Trusts without MUs, 5 consist of 2 OUs. Of these 5 Trusts, 4 have their OUs in different
287 towns or cities covered by the Trust and the other has 2 obstetric units in one large city. The size of
288 all these OUs vary from 1300 births/year to 5700 births/year (Figure 8).

289

290 Figure 8. Size of OUs without MUs: Number of Births/Year



291

292

293

294 Size of OUs does not appear to affect whether an AMU is established or not. Variations in choice of
295 MUs are particularly striking in large metropolitan areas where we found examples of a city having
296 two AMUs for a population of 10,000 births while a city in the same region with a similar number of
297 births had no MUs.

298

299 Discussion

300 Although significant improvements have occurred in both the availability and utilisation of MUs
301 across England since 2010, it is clear from this national mapping exercise that unequal provision
302 persists. There are only 23 Trusts in England (17%) that have an AMU and an FMU. According to
303 NICE Intrapartum Guidance (2014), optimum provision consists of having an AMU attached to each
304 Trust and the option of an FMU in 'the local area or in a neighbouring area'. As the guidance does
305 not define 'neighbouring area', it is not clear whether this means that every Trust should have an
306 FMU. The National Maternity Review (NHS England 2016) provided more policy guidance saying
307 "...women should have access to each of the birth settings recommended in NICE guidelines,
308 although all four may not necessarily be available within each local maternity system." Our mapping
309 results indicate that women's access to FMUs in particular, are poor in some major population
310 centres. This needs to be considered in the context of the recent publication of a sub-analysis of the
311 Birthplace study, which 'support the recommendation that 'low risk' women can be informed that
312 planned birth in an FMU is associated with a lower rate of instrumental delivery and a higher rate of
313 'straightforward vaginal birth' compared with planned birth in an AMU..' (p2) (Hollowell, Li et al.
314 2017). Furthermore, although improvements have occurred over the past 6 years regarding AMU
315 provision, 46 Trusts do not have an AMU.

316

317 Optimal utilisation of MUs is harder to define, as there is no consensus on what this means. One
318 approach is to assume that all women on a midwifery-led pathway should have access to MUs as
319 evidence concludes that labour and birth intervention rates are fewer, satisfaction with the birth
320 experience higher and costs reduced compared to OUs (Brocklehurst, Hardy et al. 2011, Hodnett,
321 Downe et al. 2012, Schroeder, Petrou et al. 2012). It follows that birthing as many suitable women as
322 possible in MUs should be an objective for maternity care providers. This approach to optimal
323 utilisation excludes women who have a preference for birthing in MUs, but are considered ineligible
324 because of risk factors. It is known that some women with risk factors that would normally exclude
325 them from planning an MU birth do utilise MUs e.g. women planning a vaginal birth after a previous
326 caesarean section (VBAC) (Lieberman, Ernst et al. 2004). Another approach to optimum utilisation
327 would be to examine the usage of individual birth rooms within a MU to see if the number of rooms
328 is commensurate with the daily number of births. This would enable a judgement to be made about
329 the rational use of space within birthing areas. However, we are more interested in investigating the
330 pathways for low risk women and have therefore chosen to examine the first approach.

331
332 Working out what percentage of childbearing women could birth in MUs is complicated. Any
333 calculation depends on numbers of healthy women at key markers during pregnancy and birth: in
334 early pregnancy, at onset of labour and at the birth. We were unable to find any robust UK data
335 stating the percentage of women suitable for a midwifery-led pathway after the health assessment
336 in early pregnancy. However, Sandall and colleagues' (Sandall, Murrells et al. 2014) population-
337 based cross-sectional study, on the maternity workforce and the implications for safety and quality
338 in maternity care in England 2010-11, showed 45% of women were eligible for midwifery-led care at
339 the end of pregnancy. During the intrapartum phase, a transfer rate to obstetric care from
340 midwifery care of 20% can be expected according to the Birthplace in England study (Brocklehurst,
341 Hardy et al. 2011). This leaves 36% of women remaining in midwifery care. Thus, a pragmatic
342 calculation of the percentage of women that potentially could birth in MUs after obstetric referrals
343 in pregnancy and during labour is 36%.

344
345 Very recently, the Lead for Women's & Children's Care at NHS England stated that achieving 30% of
346 all births either at home or in midwifery units was a reasonable target for maternity services
347 (Thomas, 2017). Home birth rates have hovered around 2% nationally for many years and even
348 Trusts that have specifically set an objective to increase them by another 2% have struggled (Noble
349 2015). We chose deliberately not to include home births in our study because in the past 10 years
350 the growth in non-institutional birth has been in MUs. In addition, MUs have been shown to be
351 particularly suitable for women have their first baby (Brocklehurst, Hardy et al. 2011).

352
353 In our study, only one Trust achieved over 30% of their total population birthing in MUs and a
354 relatively small number achieved between 20 and 30% (Figure 6). This suggests a level of under-
355 performance in realising the benefits of a midwifery-led pathway in the access, organisation and
356 operation of MUs. Numerous dimensions of local maternity care may impact on this from clinical
357 guidelines, staff interface with newly pregnant women, strategic leadership or organisational
358 culture (McCourt, Rance et al. 2011, McCourt, Rayment et al. 2014). In theory, optimising utilisation
359 of AMUs compared to FMUs should be easier to address because women in early labour arriving at
360 maternity units with an AMU are clinically assessed at that point and therefore could be sent to the
361 AMU if they are on a midwifery-led pathway. The reasons why some Trusts with an MU are
362 achieving over 20% of birth in these settings could be harnessed and adopted by others, which is
363 why the case studies component of our research is so important. This work is completed and
364 currently being analysed. MUs birthing more than 20% of their population were found across the
365 spectrum of size of Trusts as measured by their total births, though generally MUs linked to smaller
366 Trusts (<3000 births/year) were underutilised.

367
368 The other striking finding from this mapping exercise is that the increase in the percentage of
369 women birthing in midwifery units (up from 5% to 14% over the past 6 years) has occurred almost
370 exclusively in AMUs, rather than FMUs. There are now an extra 44 AMUs in England compared with
371 2010, while FMU numbers have only increased by three, from 58 to 61. Regarding FMUs, this figure
372 masks a more complex picture of closure of long-standing FMUs and of recently opened ones, as
373 well as completely new FMUs on the sites of previous OUs. The opening and closing of FMUs has
374 been tracked for a report to the Royal College of Midwives (Dodwell, 2013) which identified that in
375 England in February 2013 there were 59 freestanding midwife-led units (FMUs) compared with 53 in
376 April 2001. During these twelve years, 30 new units opened and 21 units were permanently closed. A
377 further three were temporarily closed, with the possibility that they will not reopen. Previous studies
378 have documented the cyclical struggle for survival of FMUs in England where their small size and
379 invisibility rendering them vulnerable to closure by their larger host organisations (Walsh 2006,
380 Deery et al. 2010). This is of interest, given evidence from the Birthplace study that FMUs
381 outperform AMUs regarding reductions in labour and birth interventions (Hollowell, Li et al. 2017).
382 They are also more cost effective than AMUs in relation to the primary outcome of neonatal adverse
383 outcome and the secondary outcome of maternal morbidity, though this is reduced if you compare
384 only low risk women without complications at the onset of labour (Schroeder, Petrou et al. 2012). In
385 addition, organisational research has found that midwifery satisfaction is very high in these settings
386 (McCourt, Rayment et al. 2016) and they are much less prone to problems of staff recruitment and
387 retention which are a contemporary challenge to the sustainability of the maternity workforce
388 (Kirkham, Morgan et al. 2006).

389
390 Inequality of provision of maternity services is especially noteworthy in Trusts with neither FMUs nor
391 AMUs. Though the number of Trusts without MUs has decreased from 75 to 32, this still means that
392 around 24% of all Trusts in England do not offer women this choice and, therefore, according to best
393 evidence, are exposing women to increased risk of caesarean section and running a more expensive
394 service, without any benefits in overall safety of the baby. Potentially, this could represent around
395 45,000 low risk women/year in England who could birth in an MU but currently have no access to
396 one.

397
398 Our case studies will explore these issues in more detail in the second stage of the project. During
399 this phase we are examining in-depth the characteristics and culture of 6 Trusts with varying levels
400 of access and utilisation of MUs with the aims of determining facilitators and barriers to the
401 establishment and utilisation of MUs.

402 403 **Strengths & Limitations**

404 Securing a 100% response rate is important when undertaking a service mapping of all provision of
405 MUs in England. However, service configurations are constantly changing, in terms of both Trusts
406 merging and the opening of AMUs and FMUs and the closing of FMUs in particular. Data on the
407 number of births in MUs were revised sometimes by HoMs when their initial figures were at
408 variance with 'Which?' data that we already had. Which? updates their data yearly and some HoMs
409 has access to more current data, though the variance was minor.

410 **Conclusion**

411 Maternity care policy has remained consistent since 2007 on the need for women to be offered
412 choice regarding place of birth in England, to specifically include MUs, both alongside and
413 freestanding as well as provision for home birth care. Since 2014, the NICE intrapartum guidelines

414 have recommended MUs for low risk women because they reduce labour and birth interventions,
415 notably caesarean section rates. Our mapping shows that there are now more MUs than ever before
416 and that the growth has been in AMUs. There has been an associated increase in the percentage of
417 birth in MUs in England by 9% over a 6-year period. However, the growth in MUs is unequally
418 distributed across the country and there remains a minority of Trusts without any and the provision
419 of FMUs is limited as compared with AMUs. In addition, the utilisation of MUs is extremely variable
420 and shows evidence of underutilisation with the majority providing birthing services for less than
421 20% of their total population. Best available evidence suggests this figure could be as high as 36%
422 with optimal utilisation but only one Trust in our survey exceeded 30%.

423

424 The stagnation in the numbers of FMUs is also concerning, given their marginally better evidence
425 base, both clinically and in cost-effectiveness, compared with AMUs.

426 One can extrapolate from these results that many low risk women continue to birth in OUs where
427 the risk of caesarean section and other birth interventions is increased, maternal satisfaction is
428 decreased and care is more expensive. We therefore recommend that providers urgently review
429 their MU provision and utilisation.

430

431 **References**

432

433 Alliman, J. & Phillippi, J. C. (2016) Maternal Outcomes in Birth Centers: An Integrative Review of the
434 Literature. *Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health*, 61, 21-51.

435 Beech, B. (2011) Challenging the medicalisation of birth. *AIMS Journal*, 23 (2), <http://aims.org.uk/Journal/Vol23No2/challengingmedicalisation.htm>, accessed on 12 April 2012.

436 Bernitz, S., Aas, E. & Øian, P. (2012) Economic evaluation of birth care in low-risk women. A
437 comparison between a midwife-led birth unit and a standard obstetric unit within the same
438 hospital in Norway. A randomised controlled trial. *Midwifery*, 28, 591-599.

440 Bernitz, S., Øian, P., Sandvik, L. & Blix, E. (2016) Evaluation of satisfaction with care in a midwifery
441 unit and an obstetric unit: a randomized controlled trial of low-risk women. *BMC Pregnancy
442 and Childbirth*, 16, 143.

443 Brocklehurst, P., Hardy, P., Hollowell, J., Linsell, L., Macfarlane, A., Mccourt, C., Marlow, N., Miller, A.,
444 Newburn, M. & Petrou, S. (2011b) Perinatal and maternal outcomes by planned place of
445 birth for healthy women with low risk pregnancies: the Birthplace in England national
446 prospective cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 343, d7400.

447 Christensen, L. F. & Overgaard, C. (2017) Are freestanding midwifery units a safe alternative to
448 obstetric units for low-risk, primiparous childbirth? An analysis of effect differences by parity
449 in a matched cohort study. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 17, 14.

450 Cumberlege, J. (1993) *Changing childbirth*, HM Stationery Office.

451 Deery, R., Hughes, D. & Kirkham, M. (2010) *Tensions and Barriers in Improving Maternity Care: The
452 Story of a Birth Centre*, Radcliffe Publishing.

453 Department of Health (2007) Maternity matters: choice, access and continuity of care in a safe
454 service. Department of Health London.

455 Dodwell, M. (2013) Trends in Freestanding Midwife-led Units in England and Wales. RCM: London.

456 Hermus, M. A. A., et al. (2017). "Defining and describing birth centres in the Netherlands - a
457 component study of the Dutch Birth Centre Study." *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 17(1):
458 210.

459 Hodnett, E. D., Downe, S. & Walsh, D. (2012a) Alternative versus conventional institutional settings
460 for birth. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 8, CD000012.

461 Hodnett, E. D., Downe, S., Walsh, D. & Weston, J. (2012b) Alternative versus conventional
462 institutional settings for birth. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 8.

463 Hollowell, J., Li, Y., Bunch, K. & Brocklehurst, P. (2017) A comparison of intrapartum interventions
464 and adverse outcomes by parity in planned freestanding midwifery unit and alongside
465 midwifery unit births: secondary analysis of 'low risk' births in the birthplace in England
466 cohort. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 17, 95.

467 Iacobucci, G. (2016) Public health-the frontline cuts begin. *BMJ: British Medical Journal (Online)*, 352.

468 Johanson, R., Newburn, M. & Macfarlane, A. (2002) Has the medicalisation of childbirth gone too
469 far? *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 324, 892.

470 Kenny, C., Devane, D., Normand, C., Clarke, M., Howard, A. & Begley, C. (2015) A cost-comparison of
471 midwife-led compared with consultant-led maternity care in Ireland (the MidU study).
472 *Midwifery*, 31, 1032-1038.

473 Kirkham, M., Morgan, R. & Davies, C. (2006) Why do midwives stay. *Department of Health via
474 Bedfordshire & Hertfordshire Workforce Development Confederation, Department of Health*.

475 Lieberman, E., Ernst, E. K., Rooks, J. P., Stapleton, S. & Flamm, B. (2004) Results of the national study
476 of vaginal birth after cesarean in birth centers. *Obstet Gynecol*, 104.

477 Mccourt, C., Rance, S., Rayment, J. & Sandall, J. (2011) Birthplace qualitative organisational case
478 studies: how maternity care systems may affect the provision of care in different birth
479 settings. *Birthplace in England research programme. Final report part, 6*.

480 Mccourt, C., Rayment, J., Rance, S. & Sandall, J. (2014) An ethnographic organisational study of
481 alongside midwifery units: a follow-on study from the Birthplace in England programme.
482 *Health Serv. Deliv. Res*, 2.

483 Mccourt, C., Rayment, J., Rance, S. & Sandall, J. (2016) Place of Birth and Concepts of Wellbeing: An
484 Analysis from Two Ethnographic Studies of Midwifery Units in England. *Anthropology in
485 Action*, 23, 17-29.

486 National Audit Office (2013) Maternity services in England. London: NAO.

487 NICE (2014) *Intrapartum Care: Care of Healthy Women and Their Babies During Childbirth (CG190)*,
488 London, NICE.

489 Noble, S. (2015) Promoting homebirth: Intermediate homebirth report. *British Journal of Midwifery*,
490 23, 276-280.

491 Redshaw, M., Rowe, R., Schroeder, L., Puddicombe, D., Macfarlane, A., Newburn, M., Mccourt, C.,
492 Sandall, J., Silverton, L. & Marlow, N. (2011) Mapping maternity care: the configuration of
493 maternity care in England. Birthplace in England research programme.

494 Rowe, R. E., Townend, J., Brocklehurst, P., Knight, M., Macfarlane, A., Mccourt, C., Newburn, M.,
495 Redshaw, M., Sandall, J., Silverton, L. & Hollowell, J. (2013) Duration and urgency of transfer
496 in births planned at home and in freestanding midwifery units in England: secondary analysis
497 of the Birthplace national prospective cohort study. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 13, 224.

498 Sandall, J., Murrells, T., Dodwell, M., Gibson, R., Bewley, S., Coxon, K., Bick, D., Cookson, G., Warwick,
499 C. & Hamilton-Fairley, D. (2014) The efficient use of the maternity workforce and the
500 implications for safety and quality in maternity care: a population-based, cross-sectional
501 study. *Health Serv Deliv Res*, 2.

502 Schroeder, E., Petrou, S., Patel, N., Hollowell, J., Puddicombe, D., Redshaw, M. & Brocklehurst, P.
503 (2012) Cost effectiveness of alternative planned places of birth in woman at low risk of
504 complications: evidence from the Birthplace in England national prospective cohort study.
505 *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 344.

506 Walsh, D. 2006. Improving Maternity Services: Lessons from a freestanding birth centre. London:
507 Radcliffe Publishing.

508 Walsh, D. & Downe, S. M. (2004) Outcomes of Free-Standing, Midwife-Led Birth Centers: A
509 Structured Review. *Birth*, 31, 222-229.

510 Which Birth Choice [http://www.which.co.uk/birth-
511 choice?gclid=EAlaIqobChMI08P2h5XH1QIVDRQbCh15FQSoEAAYASAAEgKhb_D_BwE&gclidsrc=
512 =aw.ds&dclid=CNS0zlyVx9UCFWuHUUQodNWcOQA](http://www.which.co.uk/birth-choice?gclid=EAlaIqobChMI08P2h5XH1QIVDRQbCh15FQSoEAAYASAAEgKhb_D_BwE&gclidsrc=aw.ds&dclid=CNS0zlyVx9UCFWuHUUQodNWcOQA) [Accessed March, 2017]

513 Wise, J. (2014) No one knows who is accountable for England's midwife shortage, MPs say. *BMJ:*
514 *British Medical Journal (Online)*, 348.

515

516