

9.1. EVIDENCE BASE:

Should AUXILIARY NURSE MIDWIVES deliver neonatal resuscitation?

Problem: Poor access to neonatal care

Option: Auxiliary nurse midwives delivering neonatal resuscitation 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
BENEFITS & HARMS OF THE OPTIONS	Are the anticipated desirable effects large?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes			
	Are the anticipated undesirable effects small?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes □ □ □ □	A systematic review searched for studies that assessed the effects of midlevel providers, including auxiliary nurse midwives, in improving the delivery of health care services (Lassi 2012). However, this review did not identify any studies that assessed the effects of using auxiliary nurse midwives for this intervention. We are therefore unable to draw any conclusions about the desirable or undesirable effects of this intervention.		
	What is the certainty of the anticipated effects?	Very Low Moderate High low No direct evidence Varies □ □ □ □ □ □			
BENE	Are the desirable effects large relative to the undesirable effects?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes			
			Main resource requirements		
RESOURCE USE	Are the resources required small?		Resource	Settings in which auxiliary nurse midwives already provide other care	
			Training	1-2 days of practice-based training in neonatal resuscitation	
		No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	Supervision and monitoring	Regular supervision by midwife or nurse	
			Supplies	Resuscitation bag and mask	
쥰			Referral	Transportation, adequate referral centre offering neonatal care	



	CRITERIA	JUDGEMENT	EVIDENCE	COMMENTS AND QUERIES
	Is the incremental cost small relative to the benefits?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	Uncertain as there is no direct evidence on effectiveness	
ACCEPTABILITY	Is the option acceptable to most stakeholders?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes □ □ □ □ □	We are not aware of any systematic reviews that considered the acceptability of auxiliary nurse midwife interventions. We are therefore uncertain about the acceptability of this intervention to key stakeholders. Indirect evidence: Three systematic reviews (Glenton, Khanna 2012; Glenton, Colvin 2012, Rashidian 2012) explored factors that influence the success of task-shifting to lay health workers and nurses. These reviews suggest that the acceptability of such programmes to key stakeholders may be mixed: Nurses may be motivated to take on new tasks by increased recognition and job satisfaction (moderate certainty evidence) (Rashidian 2012). Recipients, LHWs and other health workers may find the delivery of drugs and vaccines by LHWs to be acceptable, although the importance of training and supervision is emphasised (low certainty evidence). Some LHWs voiced concerns about possible social or legal consequences if something went wrong. These concerns were at least partly addressed through support and supervision (low certainty evidence) (Glenton, Khanna 2012). Activities that demand that the LHW is present at specific times, for instance during labour and birth, lead to irregular and unpredictable working conditions. At least one study shows that this may have direct implications for LHWs' expectations regarding incentives (low certainty evidence) (Glenton, Colvin 2012). Annex: page 33 (Glenton, Khanna 2012); page 26 (Glenton, Colvin 2012); page 43 (Rashidian 2012)	
FEASIBILITY	Is the option feasible to implement?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	Significant additional work may be required to add the intervention to the tasks of auxiliary nurse midwives. It is likely to need changes in regulations; significant changes to supplies and training; and development of appropriate treatment algorithms. Also, implementation would require access to a referral system with trained and equipped healthcare professionals and facilities. Significant training and supervision provided by skilled health cadres would likely be needed. However, systematic reviews of lay health worker, nurse and midwife programmes suggest that sufficient training and supervision is often lacking (Glenton, Colvin 2012; Colvin 2012; Rashidian 2012). Annex: page 26 (Glenton, Colvin 2012); page 20 (Colvin 2012); page 43 (Rashidian 2012)	