

12.3. EVIDENCE BASE:

Should MIDWIVES insert and remove intrauterine devices (IUDs)?

Problem: Poor access to contraception Option: Midwives inserting and removing IUDs Comparison: Care delivered by other cadres or no care

Setting: Community/primary health care settings in LMICs with poor

access to health professionals

	CRITERIA	JUDGEMENT	EVIDENCE	COMMENTS AND QUERIES
	Are the anticipated desirable effects large?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	A systematic review (Polus 2012a) searched for studies that assessed the effects and safety of task shifting for family planning delivery in low and middle income countries. Another systematic review searched for studies that assessed the effects of midlevel providers, including midwives, in improving the delivery of health care services (Lassi 2012). However, none of these reviews identified any studies that assessed the effects of using midwives to insert and remove IUDs. We are therefore unable to draw any conclusions about	
BENEFITS & HARMS OF THE OPTIONS	Are the anticipated undesirable effects small?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	the desirable or undesirable effects of this intervention. Indirect evidence: One of these reviews (Polus 2012a) identified two studies from the Philippines and where IUD insertion by <u>auxiliary nurse midwives</u> was compared with IUD insertion by <u>doctors</u> . These studies show that the use of auxiliary nurse midwives probably leads to little or no difference in expulsion rates, removal	
RMS OF 1	What is the certainty of the	Very Low Moderate High No direct	rates, continuation rates and rates of unintended pregnancies (moderate certainty evidence). There may also be little or no difference in referral rates before and after IUD insertion. The studies did not assess pain at insertion, insertion failure, and complications at insertion.	
TTS & HA	anticipated effects?	□ □ □ □ ☑ □	The same review (Polus 2012a) also identified two studies from Brazil and Columbia where IUD insertion by nurses was compared with IUD insertion by doctors. These studies show that the use of nurses may lead to	
BENEF	Are the desirable effects large relative to the undesirable effects?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	little or no difference in expulsion rates and continuation rates (low certainty evidence), and probably leads to less pain (moderate certainty evidence). We are uncertain about the differences between nurses and doctors for removal rates, rates of unintended pregnancies, and complication rates (very low certainty evidence). Other outcomes show mixed results (low certainty evidence). Annex: pages 58 and 60 (Polus 2012a – Tables 1 and 2)	
			Main resource requirements	
3E			Resource Settings in which midwives already provide other care	
CE U	Are the resources	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies	Training Minimal training for midwives to insert and remove an IUD	
RESOURCE USE	required small?	no yes	Supervision and monitoring Regular supervision by senior midwife or doctor	
RES	əmanı		Supplies IUD, antiseptic solution, insertion equipment	
			Referral This may be needed for a small number of women	



	CRITERIA	JUDGEMENT	EVIDENCE	COMMENTS AND QUERIES
	Is the incremental cost small relative to the benefits?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies yes	The costs of this intervention by midwives are likely to be small in relation to the benefits	
ACCEPTABILITY	Is the option acceptable to most stakeholders?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes □ □ □ □	A systematic review of task-shifting in midwifery programmes (Colvin 2012) did not identify any studies that evaluated the acceptability of IUDs when inserted and removed by midwives. We are therefore uncertain about the acceptability of this intervention to key stakeholders. Indirect evidence: For other midwife-delivered interventions, the same review suggests the following: • Midwives and their supervisors and trainers generally felt midwives had no problem learning new medical information and practicing new clinical techniques. Midwives may also be motivated by being "upskilled" as it can potentially lead to increased status, promotion opportunities and increased job satisfaction (moderate certainty evidence) • However, midwives may be unwilling to take on tasks that require them to move beyond obstetric care, such as tasks related to family planning and sexual health, possibly because this is not viewed as part of their role and may entail an increased workload (moderate certainty evidence) • A lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities between midwives and other health worker cadres, as well as status and power differences may also lead to poor working relationships and 'turf battles' (moderate certainty evidence) A review of country case studies of task shifting for family planning (Polus 2012b), which mainly included LHW programmes, suggests that recipients appreciate the easy access that community-based provision of contraceptives provides and appreciate the use of female health workers in the delivery of contraceptives. However, the review also suggests that some health workers may introduce their own criteria when determining who should receive contraceptives, including criteria tied to the recipient's marital status and age. Other factors that may affect the uptake of the intervention are primarily tied to the contraceptives themselves rather than the use of specific types of health workers, including a lack of knowledge about different methods of contraception; religious and other beliefs re	
FEASIBILITY	Is the option feasible to implement?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes □ □ □ □ ☑ □	The intervention requires very few supplies (IUDs, insertion equipment, antiseptic solution). In addition, it is unlikely to require changes to norms or regulations. Some training and supervision is necessary. However, a systematic review (Colvin 2012) suggests that ongoing support, training and supervision was often insufficient in midwife taskshifting programmes (moderate certainty evidence). Annex: page 20 (Colvin 2012)	