

1 **Implementation of Robson classification for caesarean section using health**  
2 **insurance claims: the experience of Indonesia**

3

4 Levina Chandra Khoe<sup>1</sup>, Euis Ratna Sari<sup>2</sup>, Dwirani Amelia<sup>3</sup>, Tauhid Islamy<sup>3</sup>, Amila

5 Megraini<sup>2</sup>, Mardiaty Nadjib<sup>4</sup>, Budi Wiweko<sup>4</sup>, Indah Suci Widyahening<sup>1,5\*</sup>

6

7

8

9

10 <sup>1</sup> Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta,  
11 Indonesia

12 <sup>2</sup> Center for Health Economics and Policy Studies (CHEPS), Universitas Indonesia, Depok,  
13 Indonesia

14 <sup>3</sup> Indonesian Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Jakarta, Indonesia

15 <sup>4</sup> Indonesian Health Technology Assessment Committee, Ministry of Health of the Republic  
16 of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

17 <sup>5</sup> Primary Health Care Research and Innovation Center, Indonesia Medical Education and  
18 Research Institute (IMERI), Faculty of Medicine Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

19

20 \* Corresponding author:

21 Email: [indah\\_widyahening@ui.ac.id](mailto:indah_widyahening@ui.ac.id) (ISW)

## 22 **Abstract**

23 Robson classification has been recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) as a  
24 monitoring tool for caesarean section (CS), however, it has not been implemented in Indonesia.  
25 In this study, we hypothesize that the National Health Insurance (NHI) claims data can be used  
26 to classify pregnant women into several obstetric groups. This study aims to examine the use  
27 of NHI claims database for analyzing CS according to the WHO manual for Robson  
28 classification. This study is a cross-sectional analysis using delivery claims from NHI sample  
29 set data from 2017 to 2018. We categorized the International Classification of Diseases (ICD)  
30 10 codes in the claims data according to the Robson classification system using the following  
31 variables: multiple pregnancy, fetal presentation, previous obstetric record, previous CS  
32 record, gestational age, and onset of labor. Data was analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics. A  
33 total of 31,375 deliveries were included in the analysis. Overall, mean age of mothers was  
34  $29.2 \pm 5.9$  years. The CS rate in this population was 37.0% in 2017 and 38.7% in 2018. Highest  
35 CS rate was found in nulliparous (group 2: 26.6%) and multiparous women (group 4: 24.8%)  
36 if labour induced or had prelabour CS, followed by multiparous women with previous uterine  
37 scar (group 5: 22.5%). We found an alarmingly high rate of CS among Indonesian women.  
38 Implementation of Robson classification in the National Health Insurance claims data is  
39 feasible and should be considered by the policy makers as an audit tool to identify the groups  
40 that contributes the most to the CS rate.

41

42

## 43 **Introduction**

44 Historically, caesarean section (CS), a procedure to deliver baby through surgery, was  
45 performed as an attempt to save mothers and newborns [1]. However, in modern days, deciding  
46 on delivery mode is no longer determined merely by medical indications, but include non-  
47 medical reasons, such as mothers worried about normal deliveries, families who cannot bear  
48 to see mothers in pain, or limited support for vaginal birth [2-4]. With the increase in the variety  
49 of reasons for CS, it is not surprising that the number of CS has raise steadily. Globally, the  
50 rate of CS has increased 19.4% from 1990 to 2018 [5]. Similar trend happens in Indonesia,  
51 where the CS rates have risen from 10% in 2007 to 17% in 2017 based on the population survey  
52 [3]. Report from the medical claims showed an even higher rate of CS, i.e., 34.8% after the  
53 implementation of National Health Insurance in 2014 [6]. Both figures indicate higher rate of  
54 CS above the optimum range of 10-15% according to the World Health Organization (WHO)  
55 [6].

56  
57 In 2001, Robson introduced the classification system of CS rates based on the obstetric  
58 characteristics of women, such as the category of pregnancy, previous obstetric record, the  
59 course of labour and delivery, and the gestation of pregnancy[7]. This classification system  
60 allows comparison of CS rates across different institutions and countries, as recommended by  
61 the WHO[8]. It has also been reviewed as the most appropriate classification system to identify  
62 why and on whom CS are being performed [9]. Few studies had been performed to assess the  
63 CS rate in large hospitals in Jakarta and Bali. They found that the CS rate in one hospital in  
64 Jakarta was 48.0% and in Bali 34.3%, much higher than the national average, i.e., 17.7% [10-  
65 12]. The most common indication for CS was preterm pregnancies, followed by  
66 malpresentation, and CS in previous pregnancy [10, 11].

67

68            Though, in 2018, the Basic Health Research (Riskesdas) has presented the CS rate at  
69 population level (17.7%), there is a paucity of data on indications for caesarean in Indonesia.  
70 It is difficult to draw conclusions regarding why CS rate is increasing and what strategies  
71 should be implemented to control this phenomenon. Alternatively, routinely collected data,  
72 such as insurance claims data, contains information on the pattern of obstetric service delivery.  
73 Data recorded in the National Health Insurance (NHI) claims only includes those who are  
74 members of the insurance, and it already covers more than 90% of total Indonesian population.  
75 Exploration of these rich data will be useful to identify which subpopulation is driving the high  
76 CS based on the Robson classification systems. Our study aims to assess the CS rate at national  
77 level, to identify the contribution of specific obstetric population to CS rate according to  
78 Robson classification, and to examine the use National Health Insurance claims database for  
79 analyzing CS rate according to Robson classification. The information derived from this study  
80 would be valuable to inform policy makers for strategies to monitor the CS rate across different  
81 hospitals in Indonesia.

82

## 83 **Methods**

### 84 **Study design**

85 This is a cross-sectional study, carried out through review of the National Health Insurance  
86 (NHI) claims sample set from 2017 to 2018.

87

### 88 **Data source**

89 In 2020, the Social Security Agency for Health (BPJS-K) published a sample set of NHI claims  
90 data that could be accessed by the public. The source of this data comes from health facilities,  
91 both at primary and secondary level. The BPJS-K has selected approximately one percent of

92 all members in accordance with proportionate stratified random sampling from the database.  
93 The samples selected from the database were individuals who are newly registered as NHI  
94 members in 2017 and 2018 with total members of 16,147,772 (2017) and 16,616,415 (2018).  
95 Family is used as a sampling unit. The strata used in the sampling method is developed based  
96 on combination of two variables: (1) unit of primary health care and (2) family category. Data  
97 was classified into three family categories: (1) families who never utilized any healthcare  
98 services; (2) families who utilized the primary care; and (3) families who utilized both primary  
99 and secondary care. This selection process resulted in a sample of families 56,791 units (2017)  
100 and 60,164 units (2018). The next step of sampling method is to select the individuals in each  
101 sampling unit. This step produces a total 134,966 individuals (2017) and 139,326 individuals  
102 (2018). For this analysis, we included all women in the International Classification of Disease,  
103 10<sup>th</sup> Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-10 CM) in the code range O00-O9A for pregnancy,  
104 childbirth, and the puerperium.

105

## 106 **Robson classification system**

107 We used the Robson classification systems as recommended by the WHO and the International  
108 Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO). The women in our sample set are categorized  
109 into one of ten groups classification according to their obstetric characteristics. The detail in  
110 each group is described in Table 1.

111

112 **Table 1. Ten Groups Classification System**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>1</b>	Nulliparous women with a single cephalic pregnancy, $\geq 37$ weeks gestation in spontaneous labour
<b>2</b>	Nulliparous women with a single cephalic pregnancy, $\geq 37$ weeks gestation who either had labour induced or were delivered by caesarean section before labour

3	Multiparous women without a previous uterine scar, with a single cephalic pregnancy, $\geq 37$ weeks gestation in spontaneous labour
4	Multiparous women without a previous uterine scar, with a single cephalic pregnancy, $\geq 37$ weeks gestation who either had labour induced or were delivered by caesarean section before labour
5	All multiparous women with at least one previous uterine scar, with a single cephalic pregnancy, $\geq 37$ weeks gestation
6	All nulliparous women with a single breech pregnancy
7	All multiparous women with a single breech pregnancy, including women with previous uterine scars
8	All women with multiple pregnancies, including women with previous uterine scars
9	All women with a single pregnancy with a transverse or oblique lie, including women with previous uterine scars
10	All women with a single cephalic pregnancy $<37$ weeks gestation, including women with previous uterine scars

113

114

## 115 **Variables**

116 The dataset contains the demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, marital status, type of  
117 membership), primary and secondary diagnoses identified by the International Classification  
118 of Diseases (ICD) codes. All personal information has been removed to protect the individual's  
119 privacy. Currently the NHI has not implemented the Robson ten-groups classification.  
120 Therefore, we develop a novel procedure to make the classification based on the ICD-10 codes  
121 as shown in Fig 1. The variables necessary for applying the Robson classification in the claims  
122 data are as follows: 1) multiple pregnancy; 2) fetal presentation  
123 (transverse/oblique/breech/cephalic); 3) previous obstetric record (nulliparous/multiparous); 4)  
124 previous CS record (with / without uterine scar); 5) gestational age ( $< 37$  weeks /  $\geq 37$  weeks);  
125 and 6) onset of labor and delivery (induced/CS before labor/spontaneous).

126

127 **Fig 1. Classification of Women in the Robson Classification using ICD-10 codes**

128 Source: Modified from the flowchart for the classification of women in the Robson Classification[8]

129

130 **Ethics**

131 This study was approved by the Health Research Ethics Committee, University of Indonesia  
132 and Cipto Mangunkusumo Hospital number KET-472/UN2.F1/ETIK/PPM.00.02/2020. Data  
133 used in this study was obtained from the sample claims data, provided by the Indonesian Social  
134 Health Security Agency (BPJS Kesehatan) for the purpose of this study in June 2020. The data  
135 contains no personally identifiable information (de-identified data).

136

137 **Data analysis**

138 Data was exported to and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 24 (IBM Corp., N.Y.,  
139 USA). We reported the characteristics of women and calculated the overall CS rate by dividing  
140 the total number of cesarean deliveries with the total number of births. The women were  
141 categorized into one of the ten Robson groups according to the coding in Figure 1. For each  
142 group, we estimated the CS rate and its contribution to the overall CS rate. We used the WHO  
143 Robson implementation manual to interpret the results.

144

145 Before interpreting the CS rate, we assessed the quality of data and the type of obstetric  
146 population. The WHO suggests that the size of group 9 should be less than 1%[8]. If it is higher,  
147 it is probable that there were some misclassifications in this group. The CS group in group 9  
148 should be 100%, if it is not, then it is assumed that there could be also a misclassification.

149 We assess the type of obstetric population by comparing the size of each Robson group with  
150 the Robson guideline[8].

## 151 **Result**

### 152 **Characteristics of women**

153 A total of 31,375 deliveries were analyzed in this study. The mean age of women were 29.2  
154 years (SD 5.9). The mean age of women with CS deliveries were significantly higher than  
155 women with vaginal birth deliveries, i.e., 29.7 years (SD 5.8) versus 28.5 years (SD 6.0) ( $p <$   
156 0.05). The characteristics of women are given in Table 2.

157

158 **Table 2. Characteristics of women in the Indonesian National Health Insurance (NHI)**  
159 **claims sample set (2017 to 2018; n total = 31,375).**

Characteristic	n	%
<b>Maternal age (years)</b>		
• < 15	40	0.1
• 15-35	26,367	84.0
• 36-49	4,953	15.8
• $\geq 50$	15	0.0
<b>Parity</b>		
• Nulliparous	14,654	46.7
• Multiparous	16,721	53.3
<b>Gestational age</b>		
• Preterm	426	1.4
• Term/Post-term	30,949	98.6
<b>Mode of delivery</b>		
• Vaginal delivery	11,585	36.9
• Instrumental delivery	1,353	4.3
• Caesarean delivery	18,437	58.8
<b>Number of fetuses</b>		
• Singleton	30,965	98.7
• Multiple	410	1.3
<b>Fetal lie and presentation</b>		
• Cephalic	28,828	91.9

• Breech	1,426	4.5
• Transverse/oblique	1,121	3.6
<b>Onset of labour</b>		
• Spontaneous	16,203	51,6
• Non-spontaneous	15,172	48,4
<b>Previous CS</b>		
• Yes	4,573	14,6
• No	26,802	85,4
<b>Type of facilities</b>		
• Public	18,207	58,0
• Private	13,168	42,0

160

## 161 CS rate in each group

162 In terms of the group size, women in the group 3 made the largest contribution to the overall  
 163 obstetric population, i.e., 22.2%. This was followed by group 1 and group 2, which accounted  
 164 for 18.9% and 17.7%, respectively. The proportion of CS among all deliveries was 37.0% in  
 165 2017 and 38.7% in 2018, consecutively. Using the Robson classification system, we identified  
 166 the largest contributing group to the overall CS rate was group 2 (26.6%), followed by group  
 167 4 (24.8%), and group 5 (22.5%). The distribution of CS delivery is provided in Table 3.

168

169 **Table 3. Distribution of CS delivery in the Indonesian National Health Insurance (NHI)**  
 170 **claims sample set (2017 to 2018) according to the Robson classification system (n total =**  
 171 **31,375).**

Group	Group size (%)	Group CS rate (%)	Absolute group contribution to overall CS rate (%)	Relative contribution of group to overall CS rate (%)
1	18.9	18.9	3.6	6.1
2	17.7	87.9	15.6	26.6
3	22.2	15.8	3.5	6.0
4	17.1	85.4	14.6	24.8

<b>5</b>	13.6	97.2	13.2	22.5
<b>6</b>	2.0	78.1	1.6	2.7
<b>7</b>	2.5	76.9	1.9	3.2
<b>8</b>	1.3	76.6	1.0	1.7
<b>9</b>	3.5	98.5	3.5	5.9
<b>10</b>	1.2	28.9	0.4	0.6

172 Note: Group size (%) = n of women in the group / total N of women delivered in the hospital x 100;  
173 group CS rate (%) = n of CS in the group / total N of women delivered in the group x 100; absolute  
174 group contribution to overall CS rate (%) = n of CS in the group / total N women delivered in the  
175 hospital x 100; relative contribution of group to overall CS rate (%) = n of CS in the group / total N of  
176 CS in the hospital x 100

177

## 178 **Discussion**

179 More than one-third of women who delivered at hospitals in Indonesia went through CS  
180 procedures (37.0% in 2017 and 38.7% in 2018). These high CS rates have raised a question  
181 whether this CS procedure was deemed necessary and appropriate according to medical  
182 indications. This number is much higher than the average CS rate at global level (19.9%)[13]  
183 and among other South-east Asian countries (1.51%-31.78%)[14]. Nevertheless, the result  
184 should be interpreted cautiously since it did not reflect CS rate at population level, and merely  
185 included deliveries at secondary care level and women who were members of NHI.

186

187 Before we could interpret the CS rate in each group, we should assess the quality of  
188 data and type of obstetric population. The WHO suggests that the size of group 9 should be  
189 less than 1%[8]. However, we found in this study that it was more than 1%. It is probable that  
190 women with breech were misclassified to be allocated into transverse/oblique group. The CS  
191 group in group 9 should be 100%, but we found the CS rate was 98.5%. Thus, we assumed that  
192 there could be a misclassification in the categorization of Robson group.

193

194           The next step is to assess the type of obstetric population. The size of group 1 and 2  
195 (nulliparous women) in this study was 36.6%. It was still in accordance with the Robson  
196 guideline, i.e., 35-42%[8]. While the size of group 3 and 4 (multiparous women) was 39.3%,  
197 higher than the recommended percentage (30%)[8]. The size of group 5 (previous CS) was  
198 13.6% - related to the CS rate among nulliparous women in the previous year. Considering the  
199 overall CS rate was high, it is acceptable that the size of group 5 will also be high (more than  
200 10%). The size of group 6 and 7 was 4.5%, slightly higher than the recommended percentage  
201 (3-4%). The size of group 8 (multiple pregnancies) was 1.3%, which is still appropriate. The  
202 size of group 10 (preterm) was 1.2%, it is within the guidelines (<5%). The ratio of the size of  
203 group 1 versus group 2 is around 1.

204

205           Multiparous women without previous caesarean section (Robson group 3) made up the  
206 biggest portion of all obstetric population in Indonesia. With over than 270 million population  
207 and rank 4<sup>th</sup> as the largest population in the world, the Indonesian's fertility rate is 2.3 live  
208 births per women, higher than its neighboring countries, like Singapore, Malaysia, and  
209 Thailand. Yet, in comparison with other countries with similarly low Human Development  
210 Index (HDI), the size of multiparous women in Indonesia is lower, 22.2% versus 43.7%[15].  
211 These might have been associated with the implementation of family planning in Indonesia,  
212 with contraception prevalence rate has increased from 40% (1990) to 63% (2017) and the  
213 unmet need for family planning has reduced from 17% (1991) to 10.6% (2017). The  
214 contribution of this group to overall CS rate is considerably low, which means more women in  
215 this group delivered through spontaneous labor.

216

217           The highest contributor to the overall CS rate were nulliparous women (group 2) and  
218 multiparous women (group 4) who either had labor induced or were delivered by CS procedure

219 before labour. Almost all women (> 85%) belong to these groups would end up with CS  
220 procedure. The result was higher than a WHO study in 21 countries and a study in two hospitals  
221 in Brazil that found less than 10% of CS rate in group 2 and 4[15, 16]. Antenatal care is  
222 essential for pregnant women to provide screening and tests to detect high risk pregnancy[17].  
223 In Indonesia, every pregnant woman is recommended to at least have four antenatal care visits  
224 during their pregnancy: one visit in the first trimester, one visit in the second semester, and two  
225 visits in the third trimester[18]. Four antenatal care visits as suggested by the Indonesian  
226 Ministry of Health is in line with the WHO antenatal care model in 2002[19]. The standard of  
227 Indonesian antenatal care covers the following procedures, such as measuring mothers' weight,  
228 upper arm circumference, fundal height, monitoring blood pressure and fetal heart rate,  
229 identifying fetal presentation, administering tetanus toxoid immunization, providing iron  
230 tablets, conducting laboratory tests, providing health education, and making appropriate  
231 referrals[20]. The new guideline by the WHO suggests more frequent antenatal care visits, i.e.,  
232 8 visits, for a positive pregnancy experience[21]. Unfortunately, even using the previous WHO  
233 manual, there were about 25% of pregnant women who had not completed the four antenatal  
234 care visits [22]. Additionally, many still did not have good maternal knowledge, including the  
235 knowledge on pregnancy emergency sign, sign of childbirth, preparation for complications and  
236 childbirth[23].

237

238 Women who experienced CS procedure in their previous pregnancy (group 5) also  
239 made substantial contribution in the overall CS rate. Our findings showed that the CS rate in  
240 this group was higher than the WHO study, a study in Canada and one tertiary hospital survey  
241 in Indonesia [15, 24, 25]. The high CS rates in group 1 (nulliparous women in spontaneous  
242 labor) could drive the increase rate of CS in subsequent pregnancies (group 5) [26]. Factors  
243 that might be associated with the increase CS rate in the first pregnancy are advanced maternal

244 age[27], obesity[28], hypertension during pregnancy[29], fear of pain in labor,  
245 convenience[30], physician-induced demand[31], and inappropriate maternity care[32, 33]. In  
246 our study, only 15.8% of the mothers were in the age group above 35 years old. Other factors  
247 could not be identified in the claims data.

248

249 By having CS in the first pregnancy, women have higher chance to experience another  
250 CS[34]. Vaginal birth can be a safe option for women with previous cesarean delivery[35]. The  
251 success rate of vaginal birth after caesarean section (VBAC) varies from one study to another,  
252 ranging from 50%[36] to 85%[35]. Despite the high success, the utilization rate of VBAC is  
253 still low. In United States, only 8.2% women went for VBAC in 2007[37]. However, there is  
254 no data currently available to reflect the utilization rate of VBAC in Indonesia. The low VBAC  
255 rate has been assumed to associate with concerns on VBAC complications, such as uterine  
256 rupture, blood transfusion, puerperal sepsis, and surgical injury[38]. Additionally, the low rate  
257 is influenced by the women's lack of knowledge on VBAC, fear of childbirth, and physician's  
258 fear on the medico-legal liability[39, 40]. There are also concerns on the lack of skills and  
259 infrastructures, particularly in area with low resources [32, 41, 42].

260

261 To our knowledge, this is the first study that investigate the caesarean deliveries using  
262 Robson classification at the national level. Since Indonesia does not have an integrated medical  
263 record systems across hospitals, the use of claims data to reflect the CS rate at national level  
264 and monitor the CS trend at hospital and province level should be considered in the national  
265 policy, as the implementation is feasible as shown in our study. However, we are aware of the  
266 limitation in this study, such as the possible of misclassification of women into one of the  
267 Robson groups. The CS rate in group 9 was higher than WHO recommendation, and this could  
268 indicate poor data quality. Further modification in the coding system should be done to monitor

269 the obstetric practices in all hospitals in Indonesia. Additionally, our study only reflected the  
270 CS rate at secondary care level, but unable to provide findings at primary care level.

271

272

## 273 **Conclusion**

274 Using claims data, we conclude that more than half of women who delivered in the hospitals  
275 went through CS procedure. This study provides a preliminary investigation to assess the use  
276 of Robson classification system to identify which obstetric groups that contribute to the CS  
277 rate at national level. Our findings showed that implementing Robson classification in the  
278 claims data is feasible and useful to present evidence at hospital, regional, and national level.  
279 Therefore, we suggest embedding the Robson classification in the National Health Insurance  
280 claims application, thus, it will be able to identify the potential of unnecessary CS procedure.

281

## 282 **Acknowledgements**

283 Not applicable

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

## 293 **References**

294

- 295 1. Todman D. A history of caesarean section: From ancient world to the modern era. Aust  
296 N Z J Obstet Gynaecol. 2007; **47**(5): 357-361. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1479-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1479-828X.2007.00757.x)  
297 [828X.2007.00757.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1479-828X.2007.00757.x)
- 298 2. D'Souza R. Caesarean section on maternal request for non-medical reasons: Putting the  
299 UK National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence guidelines in perspective. Best  
300 Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol. 2013; **27**(2): 165-177.  
301 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2012.09.006>
- 302 3. Wiklund I, Edman G, Andolf E. Cesarean section on maternal request: reasons for the  
303 request, self-estimated health, expectations, experience of birth and signs of depression  
304 among first-time mothers. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2007; **86**(4): 451-456.  
305 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016340701217913>
- 306 4. Penna L, Arulkumaran S. Cesarean section for non-medical reasons. Int J Gynecol  
307 Obstet. 2003; **82**(3): 399-409. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-7292\(03\)00217-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-7292(03)00217-0)
- 308 5. Betran AP, Ye J, Moller AB, Souza JP, Zhang J. Trends and projections of caesarean  
309 section rates: global and regional estimates. BMJ Glob Health. 2021; **6**(6): e005671.  
310 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-005671>
- 311 6. Appropriate technology for birth. Lancet. 1985; **2**(8452): 436-7. PMID: 2863457
- 312 7. Robson MS. Classification of caesarean sections. Fetal Matern Med Rev. 2001; **12**(1):  
313 23-39. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0965539501000122>
- 314 8. World Health Organization. Robson Classification: Implementation Manual. Geneva,  
315 Switzerland: WHO; 2017. Available from:  
316 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241513197>

- 317 9. Torloni MR, Betran AP, Souza JP, Widmer M, Aller T, Gulmezoglu M, et al.  
318 Classifications for Cesarean Section: A Systematic Review. *PLoS One*. 2011; **6**(1):  
319 e14566. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0014566>
- 320 10. Sungkar A, Santoso BI, Surya R, Fattah ANA. Classifying cesarean section using  
321 Robson Classification: An Indonesian tertiary hospital survey. *Majalah Obstetri dan*  
322 *Ginekologi*. 2019; **27**(2): 66-70. <https://doi.org/10.20473/mog.V27I22019.66-70>
- 323 11. Sugianto JKA, Suwardewa TGA, Adnyana IBP, Surya IGNHW. Cesarean Section  
324 Characteristics Based on Robson Classification at Sanglah Hospital. *Eur J Med Health*  
325 *Sci (Bruss)*. 2022; **4**(1): 97-102. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejmed.2022.4.1.1171>
- 326 12. National Population and Family Planning Board (BKKBN), Central Bureau of  
327 Statistics (BPS), Ministry of Health (Kemenkes), ICF. Indonesia Demographic and  
328 Health Survey 2017. Jakarta, Indonesia: BKKBN, BPS, Kemenkes, and ICF; 2018.  
329 Available from: <https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR342/FR342.pdf>
- 330 13. Alipour A, Hantoushzadeh S, Hessami K, Saleh M, Shariat M, Yazdizadeh B, et al. A  
331 global study of the association of cesarean rate and the role of socioeconomic status in  
332 neonatal mortality rate in the current century. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2022; **22**(1):  
333 821. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-022-05133-9>
- 334 14. Verma V, Vishwakarma RK, Nath DC, Khan HTA, Prakash R, Abid O. Prevalence and  
335 determinants of caesarean section in South and South-East Asian women. *PLoS One*.  
336 2020; **15**(3): e0229906. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0229906>
- 337 15. Vogel JP, Betran AP, Vindevoghel N, Souza JP, Torloni MR, Zhang J, et al. Use of the  
338 Robson classification to assess caesarean section trends in 21 countries: a secondary  
339 analysis of two WHO multicountry surveys. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2015; **3**(5): e260-  
340 e270. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(15\)70094-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(15)70094-X)


- 341 16. Bolognani CV, Reis LBSM, Dias A, Calderon IMP. Robson 10-groups classification  
342 system to access C-section in two public hospitals of the Federal District/Brazil. *PLoS*  
343 *One*. 2018; **13**(2): e0192997. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0192997>
- 344 17. EBCOG Scientific Committee. The public health importance of antenatal care. *Facts*  
345 *Views Vis Obgyn*. 2015; **7**(1): 5-6. PMID: 25897366
- 346 18. Ministry of Health (Kemenkes). Indonesia Health Profile 2018. Jakarta, Indonesia:  
347 Kemenkes; 2019. [cited 2023 20 August]. Available from:  
348 [https://www.kemkes.go.id/article/view/19070400001/profil-kesehatan-indonesia-](https://www.kemkes.go.id/article/view/19070400001/profil-kesehatan-indonesia-tahun-2018.html)  
349 [tahun-2018.html](https://www.kemkes.go.id/article/view/19070400001/profil-kesehatan-indonesia-tahun-2018.html).
- 350 19. World Health Organization. WHO antenatal care randomized trial: manual for the  
351 implementation of the new model. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2002. Available from:  
352 <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/42513>
- 353 20. Ministry of Health (Kemenkes). Guidelines for integrated antenatal care. Jakarta,  
354 Indonesia: Kemenkes; 2020. Available from: <https://repository.kemkes.go.id/book/147>
- 355 21. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive  
356 pregnancy experience. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2016. Available from:  
357 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241549912>
- 358 22. Idris H, Sari I. Factors associated with the completion of antenatal care in Indonesia: A  
359 cross-sectional data analysis based on the 2018 Indonesian Basic Health Survey.  
360 *Belitung Nurs J*. 2023; **9**(1): 79-85. <https://doi.org/10.33546/bnj.2380>
- 361 23. Anis W, Amalia RB, Dewi ER. Do mothers who meet the minimum standard of  
362 antenatal visits have better knowledge? A study from Indonesia. *J Educ Health Promot*.  
363 2022; **11**: 134. [https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp\\_671\\_21](https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_671_21)

- 364 24. Kelly S, Sprague A, Fell DB, Murphy P, Aelicks N, Guo Y, et al. Examining caesarean  
365 section rates in Canada using the Robson classification system. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can.*  
366 2013; **35**(3): 206-214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1701-2163\(15\)30992-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1701-2163(15)30992-0)
- 367 25. Sungkar A, Santoso BI, Surya R, Fattah ANA. Classifying cesarean section using  
368 Robson Classification: An Indonesian tertiary hospital survey. *Majalah Obstetri dan*  
369 *Ginekologi.* 2019; **27**(2): 66-70. <https://doi.org/10.20473/mog.V27I22019.66-70>
- 370 26. Tontus HO, Nebioglu S. Improving the Caesarean Decision by Robson Classification:  
371 A Population-Based Study by 5,323,500 Livebirth Data. *Ann Glob Health.* 2020; **86**(1):  
372 101. <https://doi.org/10.5334/aogh.2615>
- 373 27. Rydahl E, Declercq E, Juhl M, Maimburg RD. Cesarean section on a rise-Does  
374 advanced maternal age explain the increase? A population register-based study. *PLoS*  
375 *One.* 2019; **14**(1): e0210655. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210655>
- 376 28. Muto H, Ishii K, Nakano T, Hayashi S, Okamoto Y, Mitsuda N. Rate of intrapartum  
377 cesarean section and related factors in older nulliparous women at term. *J Obstet*  
378 *Gynaecol Res.* 2018; **44**(2): 217-222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jog.13522>
- 379 29. Rénes L, Barka N, Gyurkovits Z, Paulik E, Németh G, Orvos H. Predictors of caesarean  
380 section - a cross-sectional study in Hungary. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med.* 2018; **31**(3):  
381 320-324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767058.2017.1285888>
- 382 30. Zewude B, Siraw G, Adem Y. The Preferences of Modes of Child Delivery and  
383 Associated Factors Among Pregnant Women in Southern Ethiopia. *Pragmat Obs Res.*  
384 2022; **13**: 59-73. <https://doi.org/10.2147/POR.S370513>
- 385 31. Bhatia M, Dwivedi LK, Banerjee K, Dixit P. An epidemic of avoidable caesarean  
386 deliveries in the private sector in India: Is physician-induced demand at play? *Soc Sci*  
387 *Med.* 2020; **265**: 113511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113511>

- 388 32. Sungkar A, Basrowi RW. Rising trends and indication of Caesarean section in  
389 Indonesia. *World Nutrition Journal*. 2020; **4**(1-2): 1.  
390 <https://doi.org/10.25220/WNJ.V04.S2.0001>
- 391 33. Islam MA, Shanto HH, Jabbar A, Howlader MH. Caesarean Section in Indonesia:  
392 Analysis of Trends and Socio-Demographic Correlates in Three Demographic and  
393 Health Surveys (2007–2017). *Dr. Sulaiman Al Habib Med J*. 2022; **4**(3): 136-144.  
394 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44229-022-00011-0>
- 395 34. Mascarello KC, Matijasevich A, Barros AJD, Santos IS, Zandonade E, Silveira MF.  
396 Repeat cesarean section in subsequent gestation of women from a birth cohort in Brazil.  
397 *Reprod Health*. 2017; **14**(1): 102. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-017-0356-8>
- 398 35. Reif P, Brezinka C, Fischer T, Husslein P, Lang U, Ramoni A, et al. Labour and  
399 Childbirth After Previous Caesarean Section: Recommendations of the Austrian  
400 Society of Obstetrics and Gynaecology (OEGGG). *Geburtshilfe Frauenheilkd*. 2016;  
401 **76**(12): 1279-1286. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0042-118335>
- 402 36. Kiwan R, Qahtani NA. Outcome of vaginal birth after cesarean section: A retrospective  
403 comparative analysis of spontaneous versus induced labor in women with one previous  
404 cesarean section. *Ann Afr Med*. 2018; **17**(3): 145-150.  
405 [https://doi.org/10.4103/aam.aam\\_54\\_17](https://doi.org/10.4103/aam.aam_54_17)
- 406 37. MacDorman M, Declercq E, Menacker F. Recent trends and patterns in cesarean and  
407 vaginal birth after cesarean (VBAC) deliveries in the United States. *Clin Perinatol*.  
408 2011; **38**(2): 179-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clp.2011.03.007>
- 409 38. Fitzpatrick KE, Kurinczuk JJ, Bhattacharya S, Quigley MA. Planned mode of delivery  
410 after previous cesarean section and short-term maternal and perinatal outcomes: A  
411 population-based record linkage cohort study in Scotland. *PLoS Med*. 2019; **16**(9):  
412 e1002913. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002913>

- 413 39. Firoozi M, Tara F, Ahanchian MR, Roudsari RL. Clinician's and women's perceptions  
414 of individual barriers to vaginal birth after cesarean in Iran: A qualitative inquiry.  
415 Caspian J Intern Med. 2020; **11**(3): 259-266. <https://doi.org/10.22088/cjim.11.3.259>
- 416 40. Lundgren I, Healy P, Carroll M, Begley C, Mattered A, Gross MM, et al. Clinicians'  
417 views of factors of importance for improving the rate of VBAC (vaginal birth after  
418 cesarean section): a study from countries with low VBAC rates. BMC Pregnancy and  
419 Childbirth. 2016; **16**(1): 350. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-016-1144-0>
- 420 41. Tsakiridis I, Mamopoulos A, Athanasiadis A, Dagklis T. Vaginal Birth After Previous  
421 Cesarean Birth: A Comparison of 3 National Guidelines. Obstet Gynecol Surv. 2018;  
422 **73**(9): 537-543. <https://doi.org/10.1097/OGX.0000000000000596>
- 423 42. Black M, Entwistle VA, Bhattacharya S, Gillies K. Vaginal birth after cesarean  
424 section: why is uptake so low? Insights from a meta-ethnographic synthesis of women's  
425 accounts of their birth choices. BMJ Open. 2016; **6**(1): e008881.  
426 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008881>
- 427

**START HERE**



Figure