The principle of universality and value-based maternity care: a population-level matched study of costs and outcomes for private obstetric and public models of care

Emily J. Callander[1,2], Joanne Enticott[2], Ben W. Mol[3], Shakila Thangaratinam[4,5], Jenny Gamble[6,7], Stephen Robson[8], Helena Teede[2]

[1]School of Public Health, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

[2]Monash Centre for Health Research and Implementation, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

[3]Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, School of Clinical Sciences, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

[4]Institute of Life Course and Medical Sciences, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom

[5]Liverpool Women's National Health Service Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

[6]Centre for Healthcare and Communities, Coventry University, United Kingdom

[7]School of Nursing and Midwifery, Griffith University, Australia

[8]College of Health and Medicine, Australia National University, Australia

Corresponding author

Emily Callander

PO Box 123

Ultimo NSW 2007

Australia

+61 4 20 057 011

emily.callander@uts.edu.au

Word count: 2988

Key Messages

- More frequent adverse outcomes in the public model of care included stillbirth/ neonatal death; intensive care admission; perineal damage; haemorrhage, versus the private obstetric model of care.
- There were higher costs in the public model of care.
- There is significant inequality across health outcomes and costs in maternity care, contextualised by differences in continuity, provider, mode of birth and setting.

Abstract

Background

Public maternity models of care in high income countries are usually multi-professional with non-continuity. Private care usually involves obstetric-led continuity models. The comparative outcomes across these models, is not known. We aimed to compare value across health outcomes and costs of care in public hospital birth/ model of care and private hospital birth/ model of care.

Methods

We analysed maternal and neonatal outcomes from pregnancy onset to four weeks post-birth in unique whole-of-population linked perinatal data assets, Maternity2000 (covering three states and 78% of Australian births, n= 867,334, 2016 to 2019) for health outcomes and Maternity1000 (one State, 21% births, n= 148,466, 2016 to 2018) for cost and outcome analyses. Tightly matched cohorts were generated, analysed and reinforced with bootstrapping of 50 re-matched datasets and sensitivity analyses.

Results

Matching generated 184,146 births per model of care. Higher adverse outcomes in the public compared to the private obstetric model of care, including 786 more stillbirths or neonatal deaths (OR 2.0, 95% CI: 1.8 – 2.1), 2,251 more neonatal intensive care admissions (OR 2.9, 95% CI: 2.7 – 3.0), 2,780 more APGAR score <7 at 5 minutes (OR 2.0, 95% CI: 2.0 – 2.1),

3,327 more 3rd or 4th degree perineal tears (OR 2.9, 95% CI: 2.7 – 3.1) and 10,530 additional maternal haemorrhages (OR 2.7, 95% CI: 2.6 – 2.8). Obesity and mode of birth correlated with neonatal death. Mean cost in AUD per pregnancy episode was $5,888 higher in public versus private care ($28,645, 95% CI: 28,417 – 28,874 versus $22,757, 95% CI: 22,624 – 22,890), equating to $1.77 billion in extra annual cost to government if all care was provided in the public model of care. Findings persisted across bootstrapping, sensitivity analyses and socioeconomic quintiles.

Conclusions

Maternity healthcare has been transformational historically in improving outcomes, yet we have shown significant disparity and inequality in outcomes and costs, challenging universal value-based care, with higher adverse health outcomes and costs in the public compared to the private model of care. To identify and address drivers of observed disparities, actions could include an independent inquiry, further research including timely transparent data use.

Introduction

Advances in the standard of living and maternity care have heralded dramatic improvements in maternal and neonatal health outcomes over the last 100 years, but with significant disparity (1, 2). In higher income countries, vulnerabilities include escalating obesity, which align to broader societal trends, and are concentrated in disadvantaged populations (3). These adversely impact maternal and neonatal outcomes, with devastating impacts on families and increasing health system and economic burden. This highlights the need for adaptive, responsive models of care that deliver value-based healthcare across the domains of *patient and provider experience, quality of care and outcomes, efficiency and sustainability* (4).

Maternity models of care are complex, with best practice characterised by stakeholder/end-user codesign, evidence-based care with defined outcomes, ongoing monitoring, evaluation and improvement (5). Flawed approaches to care (6-8), have delivered catastrophic pregnancy outcomes. Independent inquiry highlighted a failure to investigate, learn and improve. The midwifery continuity model has been compared to standard maternity care in public healthcare settings, (9) with positive outcomes and cost-effectiveness. Yet implementation and scale up remains challenging. There is otherwise a dearth of exploration of broader models of care . In this context, operationalising data in a can explore and optimise models of care across population, profession, continuity and setting. This is key to investigation, learning and improvement of maternity care (20).

Operationalising data in a system that learns and improves is especially relevant to complex maternity models of care in Australia, which includes universal public healthcare supplemented by private care, with embedded mandatory maternity data reporting. Common models include multi-professional, mostly non-continuity care with birth in public hospitals (‘public models of care)’ and obstetric led, continuity of care with birth in private hospitals (‘private models of care’). Leveraging our unique linked population level data assets, we aimed to i) quantify differences in value-based care across health outcomes and costs between private and public models of care in Australia, comparing tightly matched cohorts by demographic/eco-social and clinical characteristics, including across socioeconomic groups; ii) explore relationships between potential drivers and adverse outcomes.

Methods

Study design and participants

This retrospective observational study was conducted across the Australian healthcare system, which aims for equity of access as a fundamental principal, delivered through a dual public and private care system (10), for ~300,000 births annually. A description of the Australian maternity system is provided in Supplement 1.

Data source

The analysis comparing outcomes between births in the public and private model of care used the unique Maternity2000 linked data asset, linking routine administrative data on births (covering the pregnancy, birth and postpartum) occurring between January 2016 and December 2019, across the three most populous states in Australia covering 78% of annual births nationally. Women giving birth and their babies were identified from the Perinatal Data Collection, a mandatory dataset of all births, which includes women's demographic and clinical characteristics prior to and during pregnancy, birth, and postpartum. These data were linked to multiple inpatient, outpatient and emergency department datasets across all private and public hospitals for both the woman and neonate, from onset of pregnancy to 4 weeks post-partum.

The analysis comparing costs between births in the public and private model of care, used the unique Maternity1000 data asset (11). This linked data was for all births occurring between January 2016 and June 2018 in one Australian state with 21% of annual births nationally. Women giving birth and their babies were identified from the Perinatal Data Collection, with linkage to the same datasets as Maternity2000, again from onset of pregnancy to 4 weeks post-partum. These data were additionally linked to the MBS and PBS claims records, covering all non-hospital services and prescription pharmaceutical use.

Birth outcomes

Fetal and neonatal outcomes included: stillbirth; neonatal death (death within 28 days of birth); admission to neonatal intensive care unit (NICU); APGAR score <7 at 5 mins; APGAR score <4 at 5 mins; birthweight in 5th centile or less; birthweight in 6th – 10th centile; hypoxic-ischemic encephalopathy (ICD-10-AM code block: P91); birth trauma – including brachial plexus injury, fractured clavicle or humerus or other long bones, peripheral nervous system damage (ICD-10-AM code block: P13.3, P13.4, P14); intrauterine hypoxia (ICD-10-AM code block: P20); other perinatal morbidity – meconium aspiration syndrome, congenital pneumonia or respiratory distress syndrome (ICD-10-AM code block: P24.0, P22, P23). Maternal birth outcomes included: perineal damage – 3rd/4th degree tear; haemorrhage in the woman ICD-10-AM code block: O67, O72), retained placenta (ICD-10-AM code block: O73); and rupture of uterus (ICD-10-AM code block: O71). NICU admission was unavailable for one state.

Identification of costs

All health service use covering pregnancy, birth and to 4 weeks postpartum were identified from Maternity1000, along with the corresponding costs, which were summed and presented by different funders: public hospital; MBS; PBS; private health insurers; and individuals through out-of-pocket fees(12). Costs were adjusted for inflation and presented in 2021/22 Australian dollars ($1=0.53 Great British Pounds and 0.67 United States Dollars).

Matching populations through strata matching

Matching was used to mimic randomization and to control for key baseline differences in the population of women who gave birth in the public and private models of care, in both datasets. Matching using simple random sampling without replacement from women who gave birth in a public model of care was conducted based on the number of women who gave birth in a private model of care in each stratum group of age, body mass index (BMI), born in a non-English speaking country, socio-economic status, rurality of residence, identification as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, smoking after 20 weeks' gestation, parity, plurality, Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART) use, and pre-existing diabetes, gestational diabetes, hypertension or preeclampsia. ART and BMI were not available for matching for one state. This produced two equal sized samples with the same distribution of characteristics in the stratum.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were completed for demographic and clinical characteristics using the matched cohort from Maternity2000.

Odds ratios of the likelihood of each outcome for public model of care compared to private model of care were calculated on matched cohorts. Bootstrapping with 50 rematched datasets was conducted, and the odds ratios produced with each dataset assessed. This bootstrapping generated 50 samples with different matched pairings, ensuring that the findings are not spurious and do not arise from a single matched sample.

Multiple sensitivity analysis were run with the data limited to 1) an intention to treat population, where births at >28 weeks, with women who gave birth in a public hospital with no private obstetric consultations compared to women who initiated care with a private obstetrician prior to 20 weeks' gestation (any women who were transferred to care in the public system were still classified as being in the private model of care); and 2) a very low risk population including only women between 21 and 35 years, healthy BMI (18.50 – 24.99kg/m^2), non-smoker after 20 weeks' gestation, singleton pregnancy, no ART use, and no pre-existing diabetes, gestational diabetes, hypertension or preeclampsia, stratified by nulliparous and multiparous women. The matching was then reconducted and results generated. Further sensitivity analysis stratified outcomes by 1) nulliparous women; 2) multiparous women; 3) nulliparous women giving birth at >=37 weeks' gestation; 4) multiparous women giving birth at >=37 weeks' gestation; 5) infants born at different gestational ages; and 6) infants born at different gestational ages with and without congenital abnormalities. Results were also stratified by area-based socioeconomic quintile.

Differences in mean cost between public model of care and private model of care in the matched cohorts were analysed. Bootstrapping with 50 rematched datasets was conducted, and the means and difference in means between the two groups produced with each dataset assessed. Three sensitivity analyses were run on the analysis of costs, to assess difference in 1) women who gave birth in a public hospital with no private obstetric consultations compared to women who initiated care with a private obstetrician prior to 20 weeks' gestation; 2) in a very low risk population (defined above); and 3) with NICU admissions excluded, given its high cost. Matching was then repeated. Results were stratified by area-based socioeconomic quintile.

Descriptive statistics of the number of stillbirths and neonatal deaths that occurred in different birthweight centile groups, gestational age groups, with congenital anomalies, and with an APGAR score of <4 at 5 minutes. An analysis of the likelihood of neonatal death was conducted with multivariable logistic regression, using mode of birth, onset of labour, private model of care, age group, BMI group, born in a non-English speaking country, geographically-based socio-economic status, rurality of residence, identification as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, smoking after 20 weeks' gestation, parity, plurality, ART use, pre-existing diabetes or gestational diabetes, hypertension and preeclampsia as

covariates. This analysis was completed on the full matched cohort, across both model of care. SAS 9.4 was used for all analysis.

Results

Outcomes analysis

Overall, there were 661,455 births in public model of care and 202,236 births in private model of care in the four-year study period in the three States. Matching produced two equal cohorts of 184,146 women in the public and private model of care, with similar characteristics (Table 1).

In the public model of care, there were 778 more stillbirths or neonatal deaths (0.9% versus 0.4%; OR 2.0 (95% CI: 1.8 – 2.1)), 2,301 more babies admitted to NICU (3.5% versus 1.3%; OR 2.9 (95% CI:2.7 – 3.0)), 2,747 more babies with APGAR score <7 at 5 minutes (3.0% versus 1.5%; OR 2.0 (95% CI: 2.0 – 2.1)) compared to private model of care births (Table 2). In the public model of care, there were also 3,373 more women with 3rd or 4th degree perineal tears (2.5% versus 0.7%; OR 2.9 (95% CI: 2.7 – 3.1)), and 10,627 more with haemorrhage (9.6% versus 3.8%; OR 2.7 (95% CI: 2.6 – 2.8)) compared to private model of care births. Mode of birth is presented in Table 2, showing lower caesarean sections (31.6% versus 47.9%, p<.0001) and vaginal birth with vacuum (7.2% versus 9.9%, p<.0001), but higher

induction of labour (32.5% versus 31.1%, p<.0001) in the private model of care. All clinical outcomes show an effect favouring the private versus the public model of care (Table 2), with a binomial probability of this occurring by chance of 0·0001 (1 in 8,192).

Bootstrapping with 50 rematched samples yielded similar results (Table 2). Sensitivity analysis on intention to treat in the private system was completed in one state with available data. Here, women who initiated private obstetric antenatal care and then transferred to the public model were classified in the private model of care, and results were similar to the primary analysis (Table 2). Further sensitivity analysis showed consistent findings across maternal risk and parity, and for infants born over 28 weeks and at 37 weeks gestation and above without congenital abnormalities (Table S1 and S2). Stratifying by socioeconomic quintile, the odds of poor neonatal and maternal outcomes remained consistently higher in the public compared to the private model of care (Table S3).

Cost analysis

Overall, there were 110,041 public model of care births and 38,425 private model of care births in the one state with linked available cost data (Table S4). Matching produced two equal-size cohorts of 33,857 women with similar characteristics (Table S4).

Mean costs per birth in AUD for each birth and postpartum episode was $28,645 (95% CI: $28,417 – 28,874) for public model of care and $22,757 (95% CI: $22,624 - $22,890) for private model of care (Table 3). Bootstrapped analysis demonstrated that mean costs per pregnancy, birth and postpartum episode was $5,929 (95%CI: $5,789 - $6,081) higher for public model of care compared to private model of care (Table 3). Figure 1 shows the difference in average cost to different funders. Based upon the annual number of births in Australia (315,507), if the 25% of women currently accessing the private model of care were to move to the public model of care, costs to government funders would be $1.77 billion higher per year.

In the sensitivity analysis with the intention to treat selection of women in the private mode of care, mean costs per birth remained comparatively higher for public model of care ($28,391, 95% CI: $20,104 - $31,448 versus $23,432, 95% CI: $18,628 - $25,479). In the sensitivity analysis limited to low-risk women, and excluding births with a NICU admission, mean costs per birth remained comparatively higher for public model of care (Table S5). Costs also remained consistently higher when stratified by socioeconomic status for women in the public model of care group than the private model of care (Table S6).

Associations with adverse outcomes

In the overall matched cohort of 376,986 birth across three states, factors associated with stillbirth or neonatal death are identified in Table 4. Vulnerabilities including maternal BMI category, age and maternal birth in a non-English speaking country, were associated with birth outcomes. Mode of delivery was associated with stillbirth or neonatal death, with caesarean section having an adjusted odds ratio (aOR) of 0.3 (0.3 – 0.4) and induction having an aOR of 2.5 (2.2 – 2.8). The private model of care had an aOR of 0.7 (0.7 – 0.8) for neonatal death. Higher stillbirths and neonatal deaths in public hospitals than in private hospitals, was observed across all birthweight centile and gestational age groups, those with congenital anomalies, and those with an APGAR score of <4 at 5 minutes (Table S7).

Discussion

Given increasing maternal vulnerabilities and rising costs of maternity care, we used unique population-level linked administrative data to compare value-based care across outcomes and costs. In a matched Australian population, a multiprofessional, non-continuity public model of care was compared to the obstetric led, continuity private model of care. All 13 clinical outcomes were better in the private versus the public model of care, with a probability of all being due to chance of 0·0001, supporting true differences. Additional neonatal adverse outcomes in the public model of care included 786 more stillbirths or neonatal deaths, 2,251 NICU admissions, 2,780 APGAR scores <7 at 5 minutes. Additional maternal adverse outcomes in the public model of care included 3,169 with 3rd or 4th degree tears and 10,530

haemorrhages. More induction of labour and less caesarean section occurred in the public model of care. These outcomes were delivered for at least $5,929 per birth more in the public model of care; with additional annual costs of $1.77 billion to government if all women in the private obstetric model of care were to move to the public model of care. An intention to treat analysis for those who started in private care showed consistent results, as did bootstrapping, multiple sensitivity analyses and stratification by socioeconomic status. On the overall matched cohort, maternal vulnerabilities including higher BMI, as well as mode of birth were associated with neonatal death, including an inverse association with caesarean section birth.

To our knowledge, this is the first report on value-based differences in matched populations across outcomes and costs, between the multiprofessional, non-continuity public model of care and obstetric led, continuity private model of care. In unmatched populations, a prior Australian study identified poorer outcomes in public compared to private hospital births (13). Another Australian study compared public hospital midwifery care continuity (best costs and outcomes), multiprofessional (worst costs and outcomes) and obstetric antenatal care, showing APGARs<7 (2.1%, 3.4% and 2.3% respectively) and neonatal death or stillbirth (0.41%, 1.73%, 1.05%) respectively (14). Other studies reported outcomes for non-continuity obstetric or midwifery care without significant differences in outcomes (15-17), potentially indicating the critical role of continuity of care provider in outcomes. Randomised trials on models of care have focused on continuity of midwifery-led model of care,

compared to other public models of care and show lower costs and equivalent or better outcomes (9). Consistently, the current study shows comparative lower adverse events in the private obstetric continuity of care model, with potential benefits including clear provider responsibility and strong relational aspects between women and providers, with evidence of better experience (18).

The current study shows that higher BMI and mode of birth were associated with neonatal death. In the context of the continued rise in caesarean section rates, the public health system in Australia, the UK and elsewhere has focused on promoting 'normal birth'(6, 19). Here, we demonstrate higher caesarean rates in a model of care with better outcomes and costs, alongside inverse correlations between stillbirth or neonatal death, mandating further research on appropriate indications in the context of rising maternal risks. Other key correlates of adverse outcomes included rapidly rising maternal obesity, driven by eco-social factors, highlighting the need for further research and contemporary population data to inform policies on mode of birth .

Limitations include a lack of clarity on the drivers of the observed differential outcomes as current administrative data doesn't provide insights on the complexity of models of care and costs. We are unable to match for all differences between populations, however measurable parameters suggested well balanced populations. The key strength of this study is the robust

propensity matching and the use of administrative data to uniformly capture costs for births in the public and private obstetric models of care, including all funding sources, improving the accuracy of reported costs. This allowed capture of all health service use costs throughout pregnancy and birth, aligned to the concept of value-based healthcare across the full healthcare episode, rather than focusing on birth alone(4).

Improving value across costs and outcomes is a fundamental priority in maternity care (4, 20). Using unique population level, linked data assets, we have demonstrated significantly worse outcomes for women and neonates, and higher costs, in public compared to private obstetric models of care. Potential drivers include differences in continuity of care, rising maternal vulnerabilities and mode of birth. Overall, this study highlights the need for further research, embedded in clinical care. Given the stark disparities and inequality in outcomes between models of care, we propose that a National Maternity Learning Health System are vital to embed implementation and comparative effectiveness research in practice, identify drivers and enable rapid improvement in models of care and outcomes.

Author contributions

EC conceived the original study idea and undertook the analysis. EC and HT drafted the manuscript. EC, JE, BM and HT co-designed the analysis. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the findings, and edited the final manuscript.

Declaration of interests

We have no competing interest to declare.

Funding statement

EC, BM and HT received salary support and grant funding from National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Investigator Grant (APP2009326 and APP1159536 respectively).

Ethics statement

For Maternity1000, ethics approval was obtained from the Townsville Hospital and Health Service Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) (HREC/16/QTHS/223), James Cook University HREC (H7246) and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare HREC (EO2017-1-338). We also obtained Public Health Act Approval (RD007377). The Maternity2000 project received human research ethics approval from the New South Wales Health Service Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) (HREC/ETH00684/2020.11), and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Ethics Committee (EO2020/4/1167). We

also received Public Health Act Approval (PHA 20-00684). No identifiable patient information was provided to the authors.

Data sharing statement

Our data access approvals specifically prohibit any data sharing, and thus data sharing is not possible.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge and thank the Consultative Councils Unit and the Consultative Council on Obstetric and Paediatric Mortality and Morbidity (CCOPMM); the Queensland Statistical Services Branch; the Centre for Health Record Linkage and NSW Ministry of Health for the data and support provided to this project. The opinions and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and may not reflect those of CCOPMM, Queensland Health, New South Wales Ministry of Health or Victoria Health.

The authors also acknowledge and thank for their support with data extraction.

References

1. Gapminder, World Health Organisation, Organisation for Economics Cooperation and Development. Maternal mortality ratio, 1847 to 2017. London: Our World in Data; 2024.
2. United Nations. Infant mortality rate, 1950 to 2021, World Population Prospects Geneva: United Nations; 2022.
3. Sheikh J, Allotey J, Kew T, Khalil H, Galadanci H, Hofmeyr GJ, et al. Vulnerabilities and reparative strategies during pregnancy, childbirth, and the postpartum period: moving from rhetoric to action. eClinicalMedicine. 2024;67.
4. **Callander E**, Teede H, Enticott E. Value in maternal care: Using the Learning Health System to facilitate action. Birth. 2022;doi: 10.1111/birt.12684.
5. Jones AR, Tay CT, Melder A, Vincent AJ, Teede H, editors. What are models of care? A systematic search and narrative review to guide development of care models for premature ovarian insufficiency. Seminars in Reproductive Medicine; 2020: Thieme Medical Publishers, Inc.
6. Ockenden D. Independent Review of Maternity Services at Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital NHS Trust. 2019.
7. Duncombe G, Weaver E, Sidebotham M, Hardiman L. Mackay HHS obstetrics and gynaecology investigation report. Mackay: Mackay Hospital and Health Service; 2022.
8. Kirkup B. Reading the signals Maternity and neonatal services in East Kent – the Report of the Independent Investigation. London; 2022.
9. Sandall J, Turienzo CF, Devane D, Soltani H, Gillespie P, Gates S, et al. Midwife continuity of care models versus other models of care for childbearing women. Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2024(4).
10. Department of Health and Aged Care. National Health Reform Agreement 2020-2025. Canberra: Australian Government; 2020.
11. Callander EJ, Fox H. What are the costs associated with child and maternal healthcare within Australia? A study protocol for the use of data linkage to identify health service use, and health system and patient costs. BMJ open. 2018;8(2):e017816.
12. **Callander EJ**, Fox H. What are the costs associated with child and maternal healthcare within Australia? A study protocol for the use of data linkage to identify health service use, and health system and patient costs. BMJ open. 2018;8(2).
13. Robson SJ, Laws P, Sullivan EA. Adverse outcomes of labour in public and private hospitals in Australia: a population-based descriptive study. Medical Journal of Australia. 2009;190(9):474-7.
14. Tracy SK, Welsh A, Hall B, Hartz D, Lainchbury A, Bisits A, et al. Caseload midwifery compared to standard or private obstetric care for first time mothers in a public teaching hospital in Australia: a cross sectional study of cost and birth outcomes. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2014;14:1-9.
15. Bernitz S, Rolland R, Blix E, Jacobsen M, Sjøborg K, Øian P. Is the operative delivery rate in low-risk women dependent on the level of birth care? A randomised controlled trial. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2011;118(11):1357-64.
16. Souter V, Nethery E, Kopas ML, Wurz H, Sitcov K, Caughey AB. Comparison of midwifery and obstetric care in low-risk hospital births. Obstetrics & Gynecology. 2019;134(5):1056-65.

17. Begley C, Devane D, Clarke M, McCann C, Hughes P, Reilly M, et al. Comparison of midwife-led and consultant-led care of healthy women at low risk of childbirth complications in the Republic of Ireland: a randomised trial. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2011;11:1-10.
18. McLachlan HL, Forster D, Davey MA, Farrell T, Flood M, Shafiei T, et al. The effect of primary midwife-led care on women's experience of childbirth: results from the COSMOS randomised controlled trial. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2016;123(3):465-74.
19. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care and Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. The Fourth Australian Atlas of Healthcare Variation. Sydney: ACSQHC; 2021.
20. Sudhof L, Shah NT. In Pursuit of Value-Based Maternity Care. Obstet Gynecol. 2019;133(3):541-51.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of women before and after matching, all women giving birth in three states, 2016- 2019

	Pre-Matching				Post-Matching			
	Public model of care (n= 661,455)		Private model of care (n=202,236)		Public model of care (n=184,146)		Private model of care (n=184,146)	
	N	***%***	***N***	***%***	***N***	***%***	***N***	***%***
Age Group								
Less than 20 years	23692	3.6	289	0.1	225	0.1	225	0.1
21 - 35 years	481464	73.0	122018	59.8	114741	62.3	114741	62.3
More than 35 years	154511	23.4	81717	40.1	69174	37.6	69174	37.6
Mean age (SD)	30.4 (5.5)		33.6 (4.3)		32.3 (5.2)		33.4 (4.2)	
*BMI Group^*								
Underweight	16417	4.6	6489	5.4	4835	4.8	4835	4.8
Healthy range	168666	46.8	67867	56.8	58233	57.5	58233	57.5
Overweight	90942	25.3	27444	23.0	23420	23.1	23420	23.1
Obese	84136	23.4	17601	14.7	14733	14.6	14733	14.6
Mean BMI (SD)	34.8 (89.5)		26.6 (41.5)		30.2 (70.3)		26.7 (41.9)	
Mother identifies as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	36648	5.6	1002	0.5	807	0.4	807	0.4
Born in non-English speaking country	200723	30.4	53534	26.2	50361	27.4	50361	27.4
Smoked after 20 weeks' gestation	59784	9.1	956	0.5	717	0.4	717	0.4
Nulliparous	253231	38.4	89423	43.8	81487	44.3	81487	44.3
Singleton pregnancy	641123	97.2	197552	96.8	179369	97.4	179369	97.4
Assisted Reproductive Technology utilised^	9683	2.7	14810	12.4	7194	7.1	7194	7.1
Socioeconomic quintile								
1 (Most disadvantaged)	146981	22.3	14263	7	13498	7.3	13498	7.3
2	146067	22.2	22432	11	20281	11.0	20281	11.0
3	146940	22.2	40060	19.7	37986	20.6	37986	20.6

4	127159	19.3	51308	25.2	47801	26.0	47801	26.0
5 (least disadvantaged)	88040	13.4	74117	36.3	63686	34.6	63686	34.6
Rurality of residence								
Major city	464029	70.3	173613	85.1	158688	86.2	158688	86.2
Inner regional area	123944	18.8	18260	9.0	15292	8.3	15292	8.3
Outer regional area	52236	7.9	7422	3.6	6584	3.6	6584	3.6
Rural and remote	7344	1.1	953	0.5	807	0.4	807	0.4
Diabetes (Pre-existing or gestational)	90033	13.65	20337	9.96	18370	10.0	18370	10.0
Hypertension	18417	2.8	6371	3.1	5272	2.9	5272	2.9
Preeclampsia^	7553	2.1	2022	1.7	1460	1.4	1460	1.4

^Not available for one state; BMI= Body Mass Index

Table 2: Clinical birth outcomes of women and babies, matched cohort of women giving birth in public and private models of care in three states 2016- 2019

Clinical Outcomes	Matched Results							Bootstrapped results**		Intention to treat analysis based on model of care at 28 weeks, one state, only births >28 weeks	
	Public model of care (n=188,493)		Private model of care (n=188,493)		Excess in public hospitals	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
	N	%	N	%							
Stillbirth or neonatal death***	1584	0.9	806	0.4	778	2.0	(1.8 – 2.1)	2.0	(1.9 – 2.1)	4.5	(2.7 – 7.6)
Stillbirth***	1103	0.6	634	0.3	469	1.7	(1.6 – 1.9)	1.8	(1.7 – 1.8)	Not reportable	
Neonatal death***	481	0.3	172	0.1	309	2.8	(2.4 – 3.3)	2.8	(2.6 – 3.0)	Not reportable	
Neonatal Intensive Care Admission^***	3584	3.5	1283	1.3	2301	2.9	(2.7 – 3.0)	2.9	(2.8 – 2.9)	4.4	(3.7 – 5.1)
APGAR Score <7 at 5mins***	5448	3.0	2701	1.5	2747	2.0	(2.0 – 2.1)	2.0	(2.0 – 2.0)	1.9	(1.7 – 2.2)
APGAR Score <4 at 5mins***	934	0.9	565	0.6	369	1.7	(1.5 – 1.8)	1.7	(1.6 – 1.8)	3.2	(2.2 – 4.6)
Birthweight, <5th centile***	9224	5.0	6806	3.7	2418	1.4	(1.3 – 1.4)	1.4	(1.2 – 1.4)	1.3	(1.2 – 1.4)
Birthweight, 5th – 10th centile***	9203	5.0	8186	4.5	1017	1.1	(1.1 – 1.2)	1.1	(1.1 – 1.2)	1.1	(1.0 – 1.2)
Hypoxic ischaemic encephalopathy ***	103	0.1	49	0.0	54	2.1	(1.5 – 3.0)	1.9	(1.6 – 2.1)	Not reportable	
Trauma***	140	0.1	46	0.0	94	3.0	(2.2 – 4.2)	2.8	(2.4 – 3.2)	4.9	(4.1 – 6.0)
Hypoxia***	560	0.3	110	0.1	450	5.1	(4.2 – 6.3)	5.3	(5.0 – 5.5)	7.0	(3.8 – 12.8)
Other***	10486	5.7	6372	3.5	4114	1.7	(1.6 – 1.7)	1.7	(1.7 – 1.7)	1.4	(1.3 – 1.5)
Perineal damage#***	4557	2.5	1284	0.7	3273	2.9	(2.7 – 3.1)	2.9	(2.9 – 3.0)	2.9	(2.5 – 3.3)
3rd degree tear***	4324	2.4	1205	0.7	3119	2.9	(2.7 – 3.1)	2.9	(2.9 – 3.0)	Not reportable	

4th degree tear***	233	0.1	79	0.0	154	2.3	(1.8 – 3.0)	2.3	(2.1 – 2.5)	Not reportable	
Maternal haemorrhage***	17594	9.6	6967	3.8	10627	2.7	(2.6– 2.8)	2.7	(2.6 – 2.7)	1.9	(1.8 – 2.0)
Ruptured uterus*	84	0.1	50	0.0	34	1.7	(1.2 – 2.4)	1.9	(1.7 – 2.2)	Not reportable	
Retained placenta***	2198	1.2	615	0.3	1583	3.6	(3.3 – 3.9)	3.6	(3.5 – 3.7)	1.0	(0.8 – 1.3)
Birth Interventions											
Induction of labour***	59853	32.5	57289	31.1	2564	1.1	(1.1 – 1.1)	1.1	(1.1 – 1.1)		
Caesarean section – any***	58220	31.6	88139	47.9	-29919	0.5	(0.5 – 0.5)	0.5	(0.5 – 0.5)		
Planned caesarean section ***	34203	18.6	65232	35.4	-31029	0.4	(0.4 – 0.4)	0.4	(0.4 – 0.4)		
Unplanned caesarean section ***	24023	16.0	22909	19.3	1114	0.8	(0.8 – 0.8)	0.8	(0.8 – 0.8)		
Vaginal birth with forceps***	12166	6.6	8322	4.5	3844	1.1	(1.1 – 1.2)	1.5	(1.5 – 1.5)		
Vaginal birth with vacuum***	13188	7.2	18228	9.9	-5040	0.5	(0.5 – 0.5)	0.7	(0.7 – 0.7)		

*significant at the <0.05 level; *** significant at the <0.0001 level; ^Neonatal intensive care admission data for one state not available; suggest change to # Perineum damage denominator excludes those who had a planned caesarean section; caesarean section – unplanned denominator excludes births with planned caesarean section. ** Bootstrapping generated 50 samples with variations in matched pairings, ensuring that the findings are not spurious and do not arise from a single matched sample.

Table 3: Mean cost per birth different funders, matched cohort of women giving birth in public and private hospitals in one state, 2016 – 2018

Costs	Matched Results				Bootstrapped results**	
	Public model of care (n= 33,857)		Private model of care (n=33,857)		Difference	95% CI
	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI		
Total cost	$28,645	(28,417 – 28,847)	$22,757	(22,624 – 22,890)	$5,929	(5,789 – 6,081)
Public hospitals funders	$26,499	(26,273 – 26,724)	$1,739	(1,629 – 1,849)	$24,867	(24,724 – 25,015)
Private health insurers	$111	(99 – 122)	$12,921	(12,862 – 12,981)	-$12,827	(-12,838 – -12,816)
Medicare	$1,564	(1,552 – 1,576)	$3,812	(3,791 – 3,832)	-$2,261	(-2,268 – -2,255)
Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme	$99	(92 – 107)	$135	(128 – 143)	-$36	(-42 - -28)
Patient out-of-pocket	$472	(463 – 481)	$4,285	(4,266 – 4,304)	-$3,850	(-3,856 – -3,845)

** Bootstrapping generated 50 samples with variations in matched pairings, ensuring that the findings are not spurious and do not arise from a single matched sample.

Table 4: Independent associations with stillbirth or neonatal death in matched cohorts of women giving birth in public and private models of care in three states 2016 - 2019

	aOR	95% CI	
Private model of care	0.7	0.7	0.8
Caesarean section birth	0.3	0.3	0.4
Induction of labour	2.5	2.2	2.8
Age Group			
Less than 20 years	2.8	1.4	5.7
21 - 35 years	REFERENCE		
More than 35 years	1.3	1.2	1.5
BMI Group			
Underweight	1.6	1.3	2.0
Healthy range	REFERENCE		
Overweight	1.1	1.0	1.3
Obese	2.1	1.9	2.4
Mother identifies as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	1.4	0.6	2.9
Born in non-English speaking country	1.4	1.2	1.6
Smoked after 20 weeks' gestation	1.9	1.1	3.2
Nulliparous	1.1	1.0	1.2
Singleton pregnancy	0.1	0.1	0.1
Assisted Reproductive Technology utilised	1.8	1.5	2.1
Socioeconomic quintile	1.3	1.1	1.6
1 (Most disadvantaged)	1.0	0.9	1.3
2	1.2	1.0	1.4
3	1.0	0.9	1.2
4	1.1	1.0	1.3
5 (least disadvantaged)	REFERENCE		
Rurality			
Major city	REFERENCE		
Inner regional	1.0	0.8	1.2
Outer regional	0.9	0.7	1.2
Rural and remote	1.0	0.6	2.0
Diabetes (Pre-existing or gestational)	0.5	0.4	0.7
Hypertension	0.3	0.2	0.5
Preeclampsia	1.1	0.8	1.6

aOR=adjusted odds ratio; CI-confidence interval

model of care= Model of Care, BMI= Body Mass Index

Figure 1: Mean cost per birth to different funders, matched cohort of women giving birth in public and private model of care in one state, 2016 – 2018



	Public Hospital Births	Private Hospital Births
Patient out of pocket	$472	$4,285
PBS	$99	$135
Medicare	$1,564	$3,812
Private Health Insurers	$111	$12,921
Public Hospitals Funders	$26,499	$1,739

PBS= Pharmaceutical Benefits Schedule