

12.3. EVIDENCE BASE:

Should NURSES insert and remove intrauterine devices (IUDs)?

Problem: Poor access to contraception Option: Nurses 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
BENEFITS & HARMS OF THE OPTIONS	Are the anticipated desirable effects large?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies 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. The review also identified two studies from Brazil and Columbia where IUD insertion by <u>nurses</u> was compared with IUD insertion by <u>doctors</u> . These studies show that the use of nurses may lead to 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	
	Are the anticipated undesirable	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	doctors for removal rates, rates of unintended pregnancies, and complication rates (very low certainty evidence). Other outcomes show mixed results (low certainty evidence).	
	effects small?		Outcomes Impacts Certainty of the anticipated effect	
OPTIONS	What is the certainty of the	Very Low Moderate High No direct Varies	Expulsion rates There may be little or no difference between nurses and doctors Low	
F THE (anticipated effects?	ipated 🗌 🗎 🖂	Removal rates We are uncertain if there are any differences between nurses and doctors Very low	
BENEFITS & HARMS OF THE OPTIC			Unintended pregnancies We are uncertain if there are any differences between nurses and doctors Very low	
			Continuation rates There may be little or no difference between nurses and doctors Low	
	Are the desirable effects large	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies	Pain at insertion The use of nurses probably leads to less pain at insertion of IUDs Moderate	
	relative to the undesirable effects?	no yes	Insertion failure The use of nurses to insert IUDs showed mixed results Low	
			Complication rates We are uncertain if there are any differences between nurses and doctors Very low	
			Annex: page 58 (Polus 2012a – Table 1)	



	CRITERIA	JUDGEMENT	EVIDENCE	COMMENTS AND QUERIES
RESOURCE USE	Are the resources required small?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	Main resource requirements Resource Settings in which nurses already provide other care Training Minimal training for nurses to insert and remove an IUD Supervision and monitoring Regular supervision by senior midwife or doctor Supplies IUD, antiseptic solution, insertion equipment Referral This may be needed for a small number of women	
	Is the incremental cost small relative to the benefits?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	Indirect evidence from the review referred to above (Laurant 2012) suggests that, compared to doctor-led care: Overall, studies showed lower costs for nurse-led care Consultation length was longer for nurses For the frequency of consultations, results were mixed For most studies there were no differences in the use of healthcare services and prescriptions	



ACCEPTABILITY	Is the option acceptable to most stakeholders?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	A systematic review of doctor-nurse substitution (Rashidian 2012) did not identify any studies that evaluated the acceptability of IUDs when inserted and removed by nurses. We are therefore uncertain about the acceptability of this intervention to key stakeholders. Indirect evidence: For other maternal and child health interventions, the same review suggests that: Nurses may be motivated to offer advanced care by increased recognition and job satisfaction (moderate certainty evidence) Recipients may regard nurses as more accessible and better at listening and caring than doctors (moderate certainty evidence). For tasks that are considered sensitive (such as pelvic exams) patients may prefer (female) nurses, although views may vary (low certainty evidence). They may also prefer nurses for services that require more attention and time (low certainty evidence). However, in some settings, recipients may experience nurses as too overworked to explain things to recipients (low certainty evidence) In addition, some recipients may have concerns about nurses' competence and willingness to provide high quality care compared to doctors (low certainty evidence). Doctors may welcome the contribution of nurses where it reduces doctors' workloads (moderate certainty evidence). Doctors may also welcome the transfer of certain repetitive tasks to nurses (e.g. pap smears) and nurses seem to be happy with these tasks (low certainty evidence). Doctors may also be comfortable with nurse prescribing, believing that it improves the continuity of care that patients receive (low certainty evidence). However, a lack of clarity about nurse roles and responsibilities in relation to other health workers may be a challenge (low certainty evidence) A review of country case studies of task shifting for family planning (Polus 2012b), which mainly included LHW programmes, suggests that some health workers may introduce their own criteria when determining whos should receive contraceptives, including criteria teld to the recipient's marita	
EASIBILITY	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 (Rashidian 2012) suggests that nurses may be unprepared or not adequately trained or supervised when they are given advanced and substitution roles (low certainty). Annex: page 43 (Rashidian 2012)	