

**Submission to the 'Inquiry into Health Funding'
Standing Committee on Health and Ageing
House of Representatives**

Professor Lesley Barclay, AO
Health Services Development
Institute of Advanced Studies

Dr Suzanne Belton
Research Associate

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to respond to the Inquiry into Health Funding. We will not address all of the terms of reference but our comments will focus on the following:

d) how best to ensure that a strong private health sector can be sustained into the future, based on positive relationships between private health funds, private and public hospitals, medical practitioners, and other health professionals and agencies in various levels of government; and

e) while accepting the continuation of the Commonwealth commitment to the 30% and Senior's Private Health Insurance Rebates, and lifetime Health Cover, identify innovative ways to make private health insurance a still more attractive option to Australians who can afford to take some responsibility for their own health cover.

Our main points are:

1. The medicalisation of pregnancy and childbirth and its current definition as an illness.
2. The subsequent medical management of pregnancy and childbirth in hospitals by health professionals.
3. The rising obstetric medical and surgical interventions during pregnancy and childbirth.
4. The difference in intervention rates between privately insured and public patients during pregnancy and childbirth.
5. The lack of evidence-based practice in some areas of obstetrics and midwifery.
6. The over-use of obstetricians and doctors in care than can be provided equally well or better by midwives.
7. The presentation to patients of a palette of expensive interventions that add cost as 'choice'.
8. The lack of private health insurance coverage for midwifery care.

The recourse to technological interventions for many healthy young women at a high cost, for what is a non-medical problem or normal /natural life event such as pregnancy and childbirth is an unnecessary burden on our health system. Our concern is particularly antenatal care and birth. The 'construction' of healthy women and their unborn infants as patients ^{1,2} has a profound impact on costs and avoidable injury. For more than 20 years researchers have argued that women's natural life

processes, especially concerning reproduction, have been medicalised. By this is meant that women are subject to processes where normal physiological events become defined and treated as medical problems, usually in terms of illnesses or disorders³⁻⁵.

In comparable countries, for example New Zealand and the United Kingdom, governments alarmed by the cost of medicalised childbirth and reassured by the evidence of safety, are encouraging a return to professionally managed home birth or birthing centres often with midwives in key service provision roles. In Australia for the first time governments are now auspicing alternative birthing services in a number of states. For some women and infants pregnancy and childbirth are compromised by ill health and abnormality and medical or surgical intervention (such as the major abdominal surgery of caesarean section) is needed to ensure the health and safety of mother or infant. However, for the majority of women pregnancy and birth are uneventful, in a medical sense, are not pathological, and can be successfully managed with a minimum of medical and technological intervention.

Paradoxically to be healthy and wealthy, and purchasing private health insurance, increases women's risk of morbidity in birth. Current Australian health policy and medical insurance schemes encourage hospital birth for the majority of women under the care of a specialist obstetrician, who may not be present at the birth. An increasing array of medical technology is available to monitor the progress of pregnancy and foetal development, provide genetic screening of the foetus and newborn infants and to enable foetal surgery to correct a variety of anatomic and non-anatomic defects^{2,6,7}. These developments have the potential to further inflate national health costs in both the private and public sectors.

Links between private insurance and abnormal births

Policy changes to encourage private medical cover, including the *Lifetime Health Cover*, have increased membership of private funds to around 43 percent and had the effect of increasing the number of services performed particularly in private hospitals. This includes antenatal, birth and postnatal care for healthy young women and is contributing to increasing levels of interventions during birth. According to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare⁸ there are over 250,000 hospital admissions for this population group annually in Australia. A significant minority of these women (35.1 percent) experience some form of operative birth (23.3 percent caesarean and 11.8 percent forceps, vacuum extraction and/or vaginal breach delivery). The operative birth rate is 10 percent higher than the top of the range recommended by the World Health Organisation⁹. A recent Australian study found that intervention rates were higher for medically 'low risk' women giving birth in private hospitals with a private obstetrician¹⁰. The associated higher costs for birth have also been calculated in another study showing that the relative cost of birth increased by up to 50 percent for low risk primiparous women and up to 36 percent for low risk multiparous women as labour interventions accumulated. The authors noted that "the Commonwealth government is actively promoting private medical care for childbearing women, with both rebates and tax incentives, with little regard for the impact of private obstetric care on length of hospital stay and other health service utilization"¹¹. Evidence suggests that increased private health insurance has increased the use of

obstetric interventions for many young, healthy women and the morbidity rates for them and their infants. Of course this has also increased costs.

Increasing rates of obstetric medical intervention

Evidence shows that in western countries, including Australia, obstetric medical intervention is increasing with a tendency for cascade with one intervention leading to the likelihood of another^{11,12}. Pregnancy and normal vaginal delivery are being redefined, falsely, in this country as a risk to be managed for all women with increased routine obstetric intervention and more sophisticated antenatal screening. The efficacy, implications and cost effectiveness of such interventions are currently being debated in various medical or socio/medical journals and reports, or have been proven to be ineffective^{11,13}. For example, the routine and widespread use of ultrasound to monitor foetal progress has been the subject of particular scrutiny and various studies have concluded that screening ultrasonography has not improved perinatal outcomes^{14,15}.

Major medical technological breakthroughs in reproductive health are already rapidly increasing net health expenditure. As a result arguably unnecessary universal applications of technology occur including the routine and overuse of ultrasonography and unnecessary operative birth compared to normal vaginal birth. The benefit, cost effectiveness and evidence base for the use of some routinely and widely used technology is not demonstrated. Access to technology is not equal, nor is it based on the use of technology or obstetric interventions according to need or reasoned, evidence based, at risk criteria. Health insurance increases rates of intervention, risks of morbidity and costs around birth.

Increasing rates of obstetric surgical intervention

Evidence also shows that not all interventions can be termed beneficial. For example epidural analgesia provides efficacious pain relief during labour but can result in prolonged labour and increased use of oxytocin augmentation, instrumental births and caesarean section^{11,12,16}. The Australian Council For Safety and Quality in Health Care¹⁷ includes caesarean birth within a group of techniques such as the over prescribing of antibiotics that are yet to be proven as 'appropriate', actually relevant to the patients' needs and based on established standards. They state that caesarean section is the most common surgical procedure in Australia, rates are rapidly increasing across Australia and are higher for mothers treated as private patients in both public and private hospitals. Caesarean section is appropriate in some instances but it is associated with risks such as maternal mortality, neonatal respiratory distress and post operative complications^{18,19}. There is also evidence of increased risk of maternal morbidity for women undergoing elective caesarean section compared with vaginal delivery for low risk births²⁰⁻²².

Consumer choice?

Increased obstetric interventions during pregnancy and childbirth are being framed as legitimate consumer choices, even rights, for women, including those without medical indication. Again arguments about the right to choose and those citing both the ethics and evidence for the interventions and the risks involved in obstetric intervention are currently under discussion in various medical journals²¹⁻²³. We would also argue that a market or business model of service delivery to privately insured women as 'customers' is also driving increased use of technology and often unnecessary

obstetric 'doctor-led' interventions for healthy women having normal pregnancies. The market place is being defined without the benefit of informed consumerism that usually protects against monopolist exploitation^{24,25}.

Evidence-based health care

The evidence is clear that there are alternative, safe, less technology driven, ways to manage pregnancy and childbirth which are also more cost effective than current practice in Australia. These include home birth, continuity of midwifery care and one-to-one midwifery care^{26,27}. These models have been proven to reduce caesarean section, neonatal nursery admission and costs, and have been recommended in various government reports²⁸⁻³¹. Variations of these models are being practiced in some states in Australia and are available and encouraged in Britain, New Zealand, Sweden, Canada and the Netherlands. There is no reason why these models of less expensive and equally safe care could not be funded through the private sector.

The current inquiry in health funding by the Standing Committee on Health and Ageing enables the complexity of this aspect of the health care system to be examined, but it also needs to be considered with other issues including an ageing health workforce, decreasing numbers of obstetricians and midwives, increasing insurance costs, and ethical issues. We would contend that at some stage policy makers will need to make decisions about where to allocate funding for maternal and infant health to ensure that all women and their infants receive appropriate, beneficial and cost-effective care while those most 'at risk' receive the benefits of the advances in medical technology. A reallocation of resources from the costly funding of unnecessary and overused technology and obstetric intervention for healthy women to women and infants who are at risk of adverse outcomes may be a better use of public funds and private insurance schemes.

In summary, the key drivers of increased obstetric intervention and use of medical technology are that the majority of Australian women give birth in hospital where 'doctor-led' interventions are increasing. Increased private medical insurance, admission to private hospitals and less concern with cost encourages women to become consumers of an increased range of available medical technology, while for obstetricians it makes sound business sense to perform these procedures. Mothers/parents now offered expensive health insurance premiums which raise expectations of 'choices', do not cover their out of pocket expenses, do not provide access to continuity of midwifery care, and are producing a cascading and costly effect of obstetric interventions.

Cc to President of the Australian College of Midwives

References

1. Williams, C. Framing the fetus in medical work: rituals and practices. *Social Science & Medicine* **60**, 2085-2095 (2005).
2. Harrison, M. R. Fetal surgery: trials, tribulations, and turf. *Journal of Pediatric Surgery* **38**, 275-82 (2003).

3. Conrad, P. Medicalization and social control. *Annual Review of Sociology* **18**, 209-232 (1992).
4. Oakley, A. *The Captured Womb: A History of the Medical Care of Pregnant Women* (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1984).
5. Turner, B. S. & with Colin Samson. *Medical Power and Social Knowledge* (Sage, London, 1995).
6. Levy, H. L. & Albers, S. Genetic screening of newborns. *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics* **01**, 139-177 (2000).
7. Flake, A. W. & Harrison, M. R. Fetal surgery. *Annual Review of Medicine* **46**, 67-78 (1995).
8. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (Canberra, 2004).
9. AbouZahr, C. & Wardlaw, T. Maternal mortality at the end of a decade: signs of progress? *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation* **79**, 561-573 (2001).
10. Roberts, C. L., Tracy, S. & Peat, B. Rates for obstetric intervention among private and public patients in Australia: population based descriptive study. *British Medical Journal (BMJ)* **321**, 137-41 (2000).
11. Tracy, S. K. & Tracy, M. B. Costing the cascade: estimating the cost of increased obstetric intervention in childbirth using population data. *British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* **110**, 717-724 (2003).
12. Roberts, C. L., Algert, C. S., Douglas, I., Tracy, S. K. & Peat, B. Trends in labour and birth interventions among low-risk women in New South Wales. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* **42**, 176-181 (2002).
13. Johanson, R., Newburn, M. & Macfarlane, A. Has the medicalisation of childbirth gone too far? *British Medical Journal (BMJ)* **324**, 892-895 (2002).
14. Ewigman, B. G. et al. Effects of prenatal ultrasound screening on perinatal outcome. *New England Journal of Medicine* **329**, 821-827 (1993).
15. Roberts, T. et al. Antenatal ultrasound screening for fetal abnormalities: a systematic review of studies of cost and cost effectiveness. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* **109**, 44 (2002).
16. Oats, J. J. N. Operative vaginal delivery - forceps or ventouse? *Obstetrics and Gynaecology* **6**, 193-194 (2004).
17. Australian Council for Safety and Quality in Health Care. (Commonwealth of Australia, 2004).
18. Shearer, E. L. Cesarean section: medical benefits and costs. *Social Science & Medicine* **37**, 1223-1231 (1993).
19. Morrison, J., Rennie, J. M. & Milton, P. J. Neonatal respiratory morbidity and mode of delivery at term: influence of timing of elective caesarean section. *British Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* **102**, 101-106 (1995).
20. Lilford, R. J., Van Coeverden De Groot, H. A., Moore, P. J. & Bingham, P. The relative risks of caesarean section (intrapartum and elective) and vaginal delivery: a detailed analysis to exclude the effects of medical disorders and other acute pre-existing physiological disturbances. *British Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* **97**, 883-892 (1990).
21. Bewley, S. & Cockburn, J. Commentary I. The unethics of 'request' caesarean section. *British Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* **109**, 593-596 (2002).
22. Bewley, S. & Cockburn, J. Commentary II The unfacts of 'request' caesarean section. *British Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* **109**, 597-605 (2002).

23. Tippett, C. Primary elective caesarean section: patient's choice or obstetrician's dilemma? *The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists* **6**, 188-189 (2004).
24. Barclay, L., Andre, C. A. & Glover, P. A. Women's business: the challenge of childbirth. *Midwifery* **5**, 122-133 (1989).
25. Perkins, B. B. *The Medical Delivery Business: Health Reform, Childbirth, and the Economic Order* (Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick NJ, 2004).
26. Homer, C. et al. Collaboration in maternity care: a randomized controlled trial comparing community-based continuity of care with standard hospital care. *British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* **108**, 16-22 (2001).
27. Homer, C., Matha, D. V., Jordan, L. G., Wills, J. & Davis, G. K. Community-based continuity of midwifery care versus standard hospital care: a cost analysis. *Australian Health Review* **24**, 85-93 (2001).
28. NHMRC. (Australian Government Printing Service, Canberra, 1996).
29. Senate Community Affairs Reference Committee. (Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, 1999).
30. Department of Health Western Australia. (Health Department of Western Australia, Perth, 1990).
31. Victorian Department of Health. (Victorian department of Health, Melbourne, 1990).

Lesley Barclay, AO
Professor; Health Services Development
Institute of Advanced Studies
Charles Darwin University
Darwin, NT 0909
Australia

Dr Suzanne Belton
Research Associate

