Depósito de investigación de la Universidad de Sevilla

https://idus.us.es/

Esta es la versión aceptada del artículo publicado en:

This is a accepted manuscript of a paper published in:

Birth: Issues in Perinatal Care (2020): December 2020

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/birt.12505

Copyright:

El acceso a la versión publicada del artículo puede requerir la suscripción de la revista.

Access to the published version may require subscription.

“This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Benet M, Escuriet R, palomar-Ruiz L, Ruiz-Berdún D, León-Larios F. Women’s agenda for the improvement of childbirth care: Evaluation of the Babies Born Better survey data set in Spain. *Birth*. 2020; 47(4): 365-377, which has been published in final form at doi.org/10.1111/birt.12505. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions. This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley’s version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited."

Women's agenda for the improvement of childbirth care: evaluation of the Babies Born Better Survey dataset in Spain

Journal:	*Birth*
Manuscript ID	Birth-20-02-23.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Article
Keywords:	maternity care, women, birth

Abstract:	Background: Public Patient Involvement (PPI) generates knowledge about the health-illness process through the incorporation of people's experiences and priorities. The Babies Born Better (BBB) Survey is a pan-European online questionnaire that can be used as a PPI tool for preliminary and consultative forms of citizens' involvement. The purpose of this research was to identify which practices support positive birth experiences and which ones women want changed. Methods: The BBB Survey was distributed in virtual communities of practice and through social networks. The version launched in Spain was used to collect data in 2014 and 2015 from women who had given birth in the previous five years. A descriptive, quantitative analysis was applied to the sociodemographic data. Two open-ended questions were analyzed by qualitative content analysis using a deductive and inductive codification process. Results: A total of 2,841 women participated. 41.1% of the responses concerned the category "Care received and experienced", followed by "Specific interventions and procedures" (26.6%), "Involved members of care team" (14.2%) and "Environmental conditions" (9 %). Best practices were related to how care is provided and received, and the main areas for improvement referred to specific interventions and procedures. Conclusions: This survey proved a useful tool to map the best and poorest practices reported. The results suggest a need for improvement in some areas of childbirth care. Women's reports on negative experiences included a wide range of routine clinical interventions, avoidable procedures and the influence exerted by professionals on their decision-making.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Women's agenda for the improvement of childbirth care: evaluation of the Babies Born Better Survey dataset in Spain

Abstract

Background: Public Patient Involvement (PPI) generates knowledge about the health-illness process through the incorporation of people's experiences and priorities. The Babies Born Better (BBB) Survey is a pan-European online questionnaire that can be used as a PPI tool for preliminary and consultative forms of citizens' involvement. The purpose of this research was to identify which practices support positive birth experiences and which ones women want changed.

Methods: The BBB Survey was distributed in virtual communities of practice and through social networks. The version launched in Spain was used to collect data in 2014 and 2015 from women who had given birth in the previous five years. A descriptive, quantitative analysis was applied to the sociodemographic data. Two open-ended questions were analyzed by qualitative content analysis using a deductive and inductive codification process.

Results: A total of 2,841 women participated. 41.1% of the responses concerned the category "Care received and experienced", followed by "Specific interventions and procedures" (26.6%), "Involved members of care team" (14.2%) and "Environmental conditions" (9 %). Best practices were related to how care is provided and received, and the main areas for improvement referred to specific interventions and procedures.

Conclusions: This survey proved a useful tool to map the best and poorest practices reported. The results suggest a need for improvement in some areas of childbirth care. Women's reports on negative experiences included a wide range of routine clinical interventions, avoidable procedures and the influence exerted by professionals on their decision-making.

For Review Only

1.Introduction

In recent decades, the debates on guiding principles and maternity service quality have focused on three aspects: 1) the need to reverse the trend towards medicalization and interventionism; 2) meaningful consumer engagement as regards user participation in decision-making; and 3) respect for women's points of view when setting the agenda for maternity care research and service improvement (1-3).

Several studies have highlighted the need to include user experiences in the quality assessment of maternity services, in addition to outcomes data (4-7). The needs and areas for improvement identified by women deserve consideration when designing and implementing innovations in maternity care services (8-10). This is critical because women´s satisfaction with their birth experiences may affect their health, their relationship with the newborn, and the whole family system (4,11). According to international and national recommendations for maternity services, higher levels of satisfaction and better health outcomes are linked to patient-focused approaches (12,13), interdisciplinarity and teamwork, integrated and skilled care (14,15), continuous and personalized care provided by a midwife, and birth within a family or specialized setting (6). When women are involved in the process and make their own decisions about childbirth, higher rates of satisfaction are described (16,17). Such women-focused recommendations and their associated health outcomes justify women's involvement in the improvement of the maternity services and support their contributions to research and maternity care agendas (18).

This concurs with Public Patient Involvement (PPI) policies, which highlight this need to engage the community in the design and evaluation of health services and research processes. The expansion of PPI policies is visible in the proliferation of theoretical and methodological frameworks that seek to "to make PPI effective in practice", ensure "it contributes positively to the research process" and broadens "the scale of its impact" (19,20). Even though PPI is a polysemic umbrella term that generates a wide range of practices, it is clearly committed to legitimizing the importance of people's knowledge of health-illness processes in the design, implementation and evaluation of

For Review Only

53 health services and research (21). This kind of knowledge is described as experiential expertise (22)
54 and refers to "the ultimate source of patient-specific knowledge – often implicit, lived experiences of
55 individual patients with their bodies and their illnesses as well as with care and cure".

56 We consider the Babies Born Better (BBB) Survey (https://www.babiesbornbetter.org/) a
57 useful PPI tool for preliminary research on health services quality assessment when user-relevant
58 topics have been identified and prioritized. The BBB Survey is a pan-European online questionnaire
59 that seeks to collect the views and experiences of women who have given birth in the previous five
60 years. As it is designed to obtain real time data on maternity care, this questionnaire allows
61 consultative forms of citizen participation (16, 23). This form of involvement has been described as
62 "asking consumers about their views and using them to inform decision-making". Although the
63 consultative approach to PPI with an online questionnaire does not guarantee full engagement in
64 research or health services improvement, it does reach a large number of people. This makes its
65 contribution valuable since it provides a broad picture at European and regional levels, serving to
66 identify the best and worst birth care practices. Thus, the online questionnaire draws on women's
67 experiences to set a "thematic agenda" concerning what works for whom and in what circumstances.

68 In Spain, the current national guidelines on sexual and reproductive healthcare (24, 25) were
69 designed to transform sexual and reproductive healthcare models in the National Health Service. They
70 take into account the demands of both women and health professionals and the recommendations of
71 international organizations. However, the biomedical birth model persists in Spain; this model entails
72 the regular use of technological intervention in normal birth and the exclusion of women from the
73 decision-making process (26, 27).

74 Given the Spanish context, the aim of this study was to identify which practices resulted in
75 positive experiences for the women who answered the BBB questionnaire in Spain and which ones
76 respondents considered to be in need of change. Accordingly, we aimed to: 1) identify and prioritize
77 areas or themes relevant to women (what women talk about); and 2) to draw a map of semantic fields
78 related to these themes (how women talk about them).

For Review Only

2. Methods

2.1. BBB Survey

The BBB survey is a European Union funded project linked to COST-Action IS0907, which aims to "advance scientific knowledge about ways of improving maternity care provision and outcomes for mothers, babies and families" (28). It has involved researchers from Australia, China, South Africa and 26 countries in Europe. The main goal of the survey is to identify women's experiences of positive and negative childbirth practices across Europe, with the aim of identifying ways of improving maternity care provision and its health outcomes.

The questionnaire contained 17 questions organized into 5 themes: a) sociodemographic profile (age, country and city of residence, reasons for immigration (if applicable), parity, and birth date); b) pregnancy details (weeks of gestation and pregnancy-related problems); c) birth details (birth setting and institution, and type of birth professional); d) care experiences during childbirth (positive and negative aspects); and e) final comments. These questions took various forms, including simple yes/no responses, multiple-choice questions, and the opportunity to respond freely in writing (as regards "care experience").

The survey tool was an online questionnaire hosted by SurveyMonkey® (29). The questionnaire was prepared by a group of researchers, and subsequently reviewed and improved by a wide range of stakeholders, including academics, activists, and people with diverse personal and professional backgrounds. The survey tool was translated into 23 languages for use across Europe and beyond. It was translated into Spanish by native speakers (the authors) and subsequently verified and refined using back translation to improve its reliability. Some transcultural adaptations were introduced in the items related to the Spanish NHS organization, birth setting, and birth professionals.

The questionnaire was launched in February 2014 and advertised via social media, online forums, blogs, and mothering and midwifery websites.

For Review Only

2.2. Participants and data collection

Women were invited to participate through social media and virtual communities of practice. A snowball sampling strategy was used for recruitment. The inclusion criteria covered women aged 18 and above who had given birth in the previous five years and were resident in Spain, regardless of their first language. We assumed that women could remember relevant details of their childbirth experience if it had occurred within the previous five years. The exclusion criteria omitted women who had not given birth in Spain, as well as those whose responses were in a language with no available translation. The study only included those questionnaires where over two thirds of the questions were answered.

Before answering the questionnaire, the women were asked to sign a consent form and were informed that all data-processing would be subject to the applicable data protection laws of Ireland, the EU and the USA (29,30). All data were collected in 2014 and 2015. Ethical approval for the BBB Survey was granted by an Ethics Committee.

2.3. Analysis

After data cleaning to remove incomplete records from the database, qualitative and quantitative analyses were carried out. The BBB questionnaire in Spain had 3,617 respondents, and 2,869 (79.32%) were accepted for analysis after data cleaning. The women excluded were those who had not given birth in the previous five years (36), whose age was invalid (115), who failed to answer at least two thirds of the questionnaire (578), and those who provided inconsistent answers (19) (such as responses related to the hospital facilities in a home birth).

2.4. Quantitative data

Exploratory and descriptive analyses (frequencies and percentages) were applied to the variables: sociodemographic profile, parity (primiparous or multiparous), place of childbirth (hospital, adjoining midwifery unit, freestanding midwifery unit, at home, others), birth professionals

For Review Only

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

131 (obstetricians, midwives, nurses, others), and pregnancy-related problems. IBM SPSS version 19.0
132 was used for data analysis (31).
133

134 ***2.5. Qualitative data***

135 Two open-ended questions in the BBB questionnaire were included in the qualitative analysis. One
136 focused on what women considered the best parts of their childbirth care experiences and the other
137 explored what they would change. As both questions admitted three free-text responses, the potential
138 text corpus to be analyzed comprised 17,214 answers. However, 16% were blank, and so the final
139 corpus contained 14,411 answers.

140 Qualitative content analysis (32-34) was used to identify and quantify themes and subthemes.
141 This choice of analytical approach was justified by: a) the research goal – to map areas of childbirth
142 care needing improvement by focusing on what women talk about (theme identification) and the way
143 they talk about these themes (semantic fields or sub-themes); and b) the large amount of qualitative
144 data. All analyses were carried out in Spanish by the authors and the results translated for publication.

145 The analysis proceeded as follows: step one: reading of the full set of responses to obtain an
146 overview; step two: codification of each answer by combining deductive and inductive procedures;
147 step three: identification of themes and categorization; step four: intra and inter-code comparison and
148 subsequent recodification to ensure the internal consistency of codes and sub-categories; and step
149 five: merging of sub-categories to summarize results (34).

150 The codification was both deductive and inductive to ensure the comparability of results with
151 BBB surveys from other countries as well as internal validity and contextual appropriateness. For the
152 deductive codification, we used maternity care terms defined by the scientific literature and published
153 results from other BBB surveys (35,36). The inductive codification served to create codes from the
154 written answers. The result of these two methods was a coding framework prepared by the authors
155 (Table 1). Each category was divided into sub-categories and the responses separated into positive
156 and negative types to distinguish best and worst practices. Response often highlighted multiple

For Review Only

relevant features of the care provided. Accordingly, some responses were included in more than one sub-category if they referred to different aspects of the birth experience.

3. Results

3.1. Participants' sociodemographic profile

A total of 2,841 participants (99%) answered the questionnaire in Spanish, 0.8% in English and 0.2% in Bulgarian. 2,620 women were born in Spain (91.3%) while 8.7% were immigrants who moved to Spain to seek a better life (32.9%), to join their parents (27.6%), to work or study (13.54%), or due to a relationship (8.85%).

Among the participants, 1,722 (60.8%) were primiparous, and 21.9% reported pregnancy or birth-related problems. These included preterm birth, risk of spontaneous abortion and gestational diabetes. The mean age was 34.44 years old (SD=4.24), and mean parity was 1.48 children (SD=1.66). Most women (90.55%) gave birth in a hospital, the rest (9.45%) at home or in midwife-led unit (not covered by the Spanish NHS). Assistance was provided by a midwife or a combination of doctor and midwife in most cases (96.19%).

3.2. Women's experiences of care

A total of 14,411 answers were analyzed. Nearly half (41.1%) concerned the category "Care received and experienced" followed by "Specific interventions and procedures" (26.6%), "Involved members of care team" (14.2%) and "Environmental conditions" (9%). Nearly 6% of responses were overall evaluations such as "everything was good, very good or excellent" or "there is nothing to change" whereas 1.5% of answers stated that "everything was bad" or "there was no care" (Figure 1). Table 2 shows the number of responses included in each sub-category and category, and the percentage of responses assigned to each category and sub-category.

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

183 ***3.3. Positive childbirth experiences***

184 Regarding the best practices identified, the most common category was "Care received and
185 experienced" (28.4%), followed by "Involved members of care team" (10.1%) and "Specific
186 interventions and procedures" (9.4%), as shown in Figure 1.

187 In the category "Care received and experienced" most responses referred to "Respectful care,
188 intimacy and sense of agency" (31%), which included statements concerning the consideration of
189 women's needs and wishes, respect for their right to choose, and women's autonomy and self-
190 determination, as well as the right to intimacy and dignity during health procedures. The second most
191 frequent sub-category was "Professional behavior and attitude" (26%), which describes parturient-
192 professional interactions in terms of kindness, empathy, care, understanding, and so on (Figure 2).

193 In the category "Involved members of care team", 46.3% of the women's responses referred
194 to "Professional involvement", indicating that professional engagement at childbirth was positive;
195 31.6% of the answers belonged in the subcategory "Presence of a partner or close person", and refers
196 to allowing the presence and involvement of these people during labor and birth. The competence
197 and interdisciplinarity of health professionals were addressed by 23.7% of the responses (Figure 3).

198 Most answers in the category "Specific interventions and procedures" referred to "Normal
199 birth facilitation without interventionism" (44.3%), followed by "Bonding practices" (28.6%). The
200 women's statements about normal birth facilitation evaluated interventions that facilitate normal birth
201 as positive– for example, free movement and choice of birthing position (Figure 4).

202 Although there were few responses dealing with "Environmental conditions" (< 5%), two
203 thirds of these answers belonged in the sub-category "Setting, infrastructure and resources", which
204 encompasses place of birth, infrastructures, and resources available in the maternity wards (Figure
205 5). Together these categories describe the factors that women felt contributed to positive or desirable
206 birth experiences.

207

208

For Review Only

3.4. Changes needed in childbirth care

Concerning the more negative aspects of care or the changes identified as needed by respondents, the most common categories were "Specific interventions and procedures" (17.2%) and "Care received and experienced" (12.7%); "Environmental conditions" (5.4%) and "Involved members of care team" (4.2%) were less frequently identified.

In the "Specific interventions and procedures" category most responses focused on the sub-category "Normal birth facilitation without interventionism" (65.9%), while "Bonding practices" (17.5%) and "Support to breastfeeding" (8.5%) received fewer mentions (Figure 4).

Regarding "Normal birth facilitation without interventionism", a comparison of the number of positive and negative responses showed that women identify this issue more frequently in terms of the need for change; 1,631 answers indicate a need to for change and 601 answers convey positive experiences. Figure 6 shows a sub-analysis of those interventions that participants think need improvement, the most frequent being freedom of movement during labor and woman's choice of birthing position (326), anesthetic procedures and their alternatives (161), use of oxytocin (117) and labor induction (111), fetal monitoring during labor (109), and episiotomy (111). A significant number of women made express reference to fundal pressure as undesirable (77)– an ill-advised procedure according also to several national and international health organizations.

Over one third of the responses in the category "Care received and experienced" were related to "respectful care, intimacy and sense of agency", while 28.1% and 26.5% concerned "Communication" and "Professional behavior and attitude", respectively.

Regarding the "Environmental conditions" category, two thirds of the answers focused on improvements needed in the birth setting, hospital infrastructures or available resources (61%), and 23% of the responses were related to changes in the stay (both in the labor and/or postnatal wards) (figure 5). Answers referring to "NHS coverage and social aspects" were relatively rare at only 0.5% of the total responses. These comments focused on some women's requests that home births be covered by the NHS.

For Review Only

For Review Only

Nearly half the answers in the category "Involved members of care team" referred to the sub-category "Professional involvement" (47.9%) and specifically to negative experiences with the kind of professional involved or his/her professional performance. The sub-category "Presence of a partner or close person" accounted for the 44.1% of responses, with a focus on a lack of involvement due to organizational and structural barriers, restrictive protocols, or personal issues.

4. Discussion

The results of this study led to the development of a thematic agenda based on what women report as best practices and what they consider as in need of improvement. The overall picture obtained from the BBB survey reveals: 1) new areas for research and new priorities for reproductive health policies; 2) areas for improvement in childbirth care and maternity services; and 3) the need for support for those groups pushing for improvements in birth care. In this sense, the online BBB questionnaire would be a suitable tool for consultative forms of involvement during the first stages of the PPI cycle when user-related topics are identified and prioritized.

The findings from this study concur with other studies that highlight the need to explore in greater detail what service users consider high-quality care and to involve them in planning and improvement of maternity services to achieve more woman-centered models of care (13).

4.1. A woman-centered agenda for childbirth care improvement

The subjective experience of care is especially important to women, and this is the area where they most demand improvements. The nature of issues such as respectful care, intimacy, and a sense of agency, and also the health professionals' behavior (including communication), is central to women´s satisfaction or displeasure. This finding aligns with some previous studies that show that women desire health professionals with a more humanistic vision of childbirth care (12), as well as those who can bring soft skills into play (37). Several studies also claim that the subjective aspects of care (trusting, supportive relationships, communication, and care continuity) play a decisive role in

1
2 261 positive experiences, carrying greater weight in positive assessments than do specific procedures (3,4,
3
4 262 12, 38-41). In terms of service improvement and further research, it is clear that continuity care and
5
6
7 263 woman-centered care are strongly desired in maternity services (2).
8
9 264 The second most relevant topic for the participants in this study concerned specific
10
11 265 interventions during childbirth. Nearly one fifth of all responses advocated for changes in normal
12
13
14 266 birth facilitation. The women criticized, rejected, or questioned several medical practices. These
15
16 267 included the following: not allowing free movement or choice of birthing position, lack of anesthetic
17
18 268 alternatives, lack of attendance by companions, use of oxytocin, continuous fetal monitoring, and
19
20
21 269 episiotomy. Although it is neither possible to assess whether all these practices were necessary nor
22
23 270 whether the women were well informed about the reasons why interventions were proposed, the large
24
25 271 number of negative responses suggests these are major area of conflict and misunderstanding between
26
27
28 272 health professionals and women. These issues should be examined in greater detail in further research.
29
30 273 Several women reported the use of fundal pressure even though it is not recommended (or
31
32 274 even forbidden) by national and international organizations. As Rubashkin et al. (42) reported, this
33
34
35 275 technique is still used in Spanish maternity wards, and women have a limited say in the matter. In
36
37 276 terms of service improvement, health providers should be encouraged to abandon such non-evidence-
38
39 277 based obstetric interventions as they entail potential harm to mothers and babies. Practices performed
40
41
42 278 during birth must be evidence-based and follow international recommendations.
43
44 279 Bonding practices were evaluated both positively and negatively, but several answers pointed
45
46 280 to their poor quality or complete absence following a cesarean birth. Relatedly, women described as
47
48
49 281 negative or undesirable practices which prevented supportive companions (family, friends, doulas
50
51 282 etc.) from being present during cesarean births. Several studies have shown that women positively
52
53 283 value support from relatives during perinatal care (43, 44), and existing studies document safety and
54
55
56 284 higher levels of satisfaction provided by "gentle" or "family-centered" cesarean births (45, 46).
57 285 Support for breastfeeding is still a pending issue. The results show that for a positive
58
59
60 286 experience, women need more information and support. As other authors have suggested, the first

For Review Only

hours after birth are crucial to breastfeeding, and skin-to-skin contact has positive effects on breastfeeding, bonding, and maternal satisfaction (47). Thus, strategies to better facilitate breastfeeding should be encouraged.

As reported in other studies, environmental conditions are also important. We found that women value the birth setting, infrastructures, and available resources in maternity wards and censure their poor quality or total absence. Maternity care satisfaction is often higher in countries where adequate services and infrastructures are provided (26). Furthermore, the characteristics of the care provider, in terms of capacity and commitment to establish a supportive environment, are central to a positive experience during childbirth (40).

A small number of respondents referred to non-coverage of home births by the Spanish NHS and the lack of social recognition given this type of birth. Previous research done in Spain showed that one of the main reasons for choosing a home birth was a previous negative birth experience, especially when excessive, unnecessary interventions were involved (41). Birth options available through the NHS in Spain need to be evaluated for congruence with women's expectations around choice and coverage of birth setting.

4.2. Limitations and strengths

One limitation of our questionnaire was that it focused only on childbirth care and not on care during pregnancy or the postnatal period. Consequently, we have only described a fraction of the whole process, in which any stage may influence satisfaction with the others.

The convenience sampling method and representativeness are limitations that demand attention depending on the research goals. We anticipated that women with extreme or strong opinions – owing to positive or negative/traumatic experiences – would be more likely to participate and complete the questionnaire. In addition, we identified a high percentage of participation among women who gave birth at home or in midwife-led unit, over-representing the numbers in Spain (9.45% of respondents but roughly 1% of all births in Spain). This may be due, in part, to the

For Review Only

dissemination strategy through women's associations. Conversely, the sample is fairly representative of types of birth and obstetric interventions, as confirmed by the national statistics on pregnant women in Spain, with the exception of ethnicity. However, these limitations must be put into the context of the research goals and methodology. We carried out a qualitative content analysis to identify and prioritize women-identified and relevant topics with the aim of mapping what matters to women, how they talk about it, what they value, as well as what they consider to be in need of change. In this sense, we sought a diversity of points of view to make the thematic agenda as large and broad as possible. Consequently, women who had home births were included in the analysis in order to map non-institutionalized practices and to increase understanding about the kinds of care experiences that are valued in this setting. As such, it should be noted that our aim is not to generalize the results to the overall population of Spain, but rather to construct a thematic agenda for childbirth care improvement and to inform further research through hypothesis generation and the identification of woman-centered priorities.

Evidence suggests that women are less critical about the care received when asked about it by the health providers directly involved in their maternity care. Hence, using an online questionnaire that encourages women to answer freely and honestly was this study's main strength. Since the questionnaire was distributed by researchers who do not provide care to women, gratitude bias was minimized (5,13). As several studies suggest, the assessment of satisfaction with the childbirth experience should be carried out some time after birth. Accordingly, women who had given birth in the previous five years were included in the sample. Although this approach entails some degree of recall bias, we think this length of time gives women enough time to reflect on their experiences and to evaluate them.

Women´s views about maternity care in different countries have been reported and published internationally. Despite the difficulty in comparing maternal satisfaction across different models of maternity care, the BBB questionnaire serves to explore some of the best and worst practices across Europe and beyond as identified by service users themselves.

For Review Only

1
2 339 **5. Conclusions**
3
4 340 The BBB questionnaire is a useful tool for mapping both desirable and undesirable practices as
5
6
7 341 reported by women and could be used for future research to help identify the areas within maternity
8
9 342 care delivery systems most in need of improvement. The practices the participants valued most
10
11 343 concerned their care experience in terms of respect, intimacy, sense of agency and professional
12
13 344 attitude. The women affirmed a need for change in normal birth facilitation and reported negative
14
15
16 345 experiences related to a wide range of routine or avoidable clinical interventions and limitations on
17
18 346 their decision-making. Normal birth facilitation that avoids unnecessary interventions and that centers
19
20 347 the subjective experience of care is urgently needed in Spain if babies are truly to be born better.
21
22
23 348
24
25 349 **6.Conflict of interest**
26
27 350 None declared. Ethical Approval.
28
29
30 351
31
32 352 **7.References**
33
34 353 1.Benoit C, Declercq E, Murray SF, Sandall J, Van Teijlingen E, Wrede S. Maternity care as a
35
36
37 354 global health policy issue. In *The Palgrave international handbook of healthcare policy and*
38
39 355 *governance* (pp. 85-100). London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2015.
40
41 356
42
43 357 2.Todd AL, Ampt AJ, Roberts C L. "Very Good" ratings in a survey of maternity care: Kindness
44
45
46 358 and understanding matter to Australian women. *Birth.* 2017; *44*(1) 48-57.
47
48 359
49
50 360 3.Henderson J, Redshaw M. Who is well after childbirth? Factors related to positive outcome. *Birth.*
51
52
53 361 2013; 40(1): 1-9.
54
55 362
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

4. Redshaw M, Martin C R, Savage-McGlynn E, Harrison S. Women's experiences of maternity care in England: preliminary development of a standard measure. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth.* 2019; 19(1): 167.

5. Van Teijlingen ER, Hundley V, Rennie A M, Graham W, Fitzmaurice A. Maternity satisfaction studies and their limitations: "What is must still be best". *Birth*. 2003; 30(2): 75-82.

6.Macpherson I, Roqué-Sánchez MV, Legget FO, Fuertes F, Segarra I. A systematic review of the relationship factor between women and health professionals within the multivariant analysis of maternal satisfaction. *Midwifery*. 2016; 41*:* 68-78.

7. Jackson S. Successfully implementing total quality management tools within healthcare: what are the key actions? *Int J Health Care Qual Assur.* 2001; 14(4): 157-163.

8. Blazquez RA, Corchon S, Ferrandiz EF. Validity of instruments for measuring the satisfaction of a woman and her partner with care received during labor and childbirth: Systematic review. *Midwifery*. 2017; 55: 103-112.

9. Rijnders M, Baston H, Schönbeck Y, Van Der Pal K, Prins M, Green J, Buitendijk S. Perinatal factors related to negative or positive recall of birth experience in women 3 years postpartum in the Netherlands. *Birth*. 2008; 35(2): 107-116.

10. Waldenström U, Hildingsson I, Rubertsson C, Rådestad I. A negative birth experience: prevalence and risk factors in a national sample. *Birth*. 2004; 31(1):17-27.

For Review Only

11. Larkin P, Begley CM, Devane D. 'Not enough people to look after you': an exploration of women's experiences of childbirth in the Republic of Ireland. *Midwifery*. 2012; 28(1): 98-105.

12. Baldisserotto ML, Theme Filha MM, da Gama SG. Good practices according to WHO's recommendation for normal labor and birth and women's assessment of the care received: the "birth in Brazil" national research study 2011/2012. *Reproductive health*. 2016; 13(Suppl 3):124. doi:10.1186/s12978-016-0233-x

13. Perriman N, Davis D. Measuring maternal satisfaction with maternity care: A systematic integrative review: What is the most appropriate reliable and valid tool that can be used to measure maternal satisfaction with continuity of maternity care? *Women Birth.* 2016; 29(3): 293-299.

14. Renfrew MJ, Homer CSE, Downe S, McFadden A, Muir N, Prentice T, et al. An Executive Summary for The Lancet's Series "Midwifery." *Lancet*. 2014;1–8.

15. Koblinsky M, Moyer CA, Calvert C, Campbell J, Campbell OMR, Feigl AB, et al. Quality maternity care for every woman, everywhere: a call to action. *The Lancet*. 2016;388(10057):2307–20.

16. Downe S, Finlayson K, Oladapo OT, Bonet M, Gülmezoglu AM. What matters to women during childbirth: A systematic qualitative review. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(4):1–17.

17. Hodnett ED. Pain and women's satisfaction with the experience of childbirth: a systematic review. *Am J Obst Gynecol.* 2002; 186(5): S160-S172.

18. Smith E, Ross F, Donovan S, Manthorpe J, Brearley S, Sitzia J, et al. Service user involvement in nursing, midwifery and health visiting research: A review of evidence and practice. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2008;45(2):298–315.

For Review Only

19. National Institute for Health Research. Patient and public involvement in health and social care research: A handbook for researchers [Internet]. London; 2014. Available from: https://www.rds-yh.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/RDS_PPI-Handbook_2014-v8-FINAL-11.pdf

20. Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Herron-Marx S, Hughes J, Tysall C, et al. Mapping the impact of patient and public involvement on health and social care research: A systematic review. *Heal Expect*. 2014;17(5):637–50.

21. Harris J, Croot L, Thompson J, Springett J. How stakeholder participation can contribute to systematic reviews of complex interventions. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2016; 70(2): 207–214.

22. Caron-Flinterman JF, Broerse JEW, Bunders JFG. The experiential knowledge of patients: a new resource for biomedical research? *Socl Sci Med.* 2005; 60(11): 2575–2584.

23. Boote J, Telford R, Cooper C. Consumer involvement in health research: A review and research agenda. *Health Policy*. 2002;61(2):213–36.

24. *EAPN al Parto Normal EDA en el Sistema Nacional de Salud*. Madrid: Ministerio de Sanidad y Consumo; 2007.

25. ENSSR de España G. *Estrategia Nacional de Salud Sexual y Reproductiva*. Madrid: Ministerio de Sanidad Política Social e Igualdad; 2011.

For Review Only

26. Goberna-Tricas J, Banús-Giménez MR, Palacio-Tauste A, Linares-Sancho S. Satisfaction with pregnancy and birth services: the quality of maternity care services as experienced by women. *Midwifery.* 2011; 27(6): e231-e237.

27. Hodnett ED, Downe S, Walsh D. Alternative versus conventional institutional settings for birth. *Cochrane database Syst Rev*. 2012.

28. COST European Cooperation in Science & Technology [Internet]. Brussels: COST Association; c2020. IS0907 - Childbirth Cultures, Concerns, and Consequences: Creating a dynamic EU framework for optimal maternity care; [cited 2020 Aug 28]; Available from: https://www.cost.eu/actions/IS0907/#tabs|Name:overview

29.SurveyMonkey, n.d. Security statement. Retrieved from https://www.surveymonkey.com /mp/policy/security/

30.SurveyMonkey. Privacy policy. 2015. Retrieved from http://help.surveymonkey.com/articles /en_US/kb/I-am-in-Europe-How-do-SurveyMonkey-s-privacy-practices-comply-withlaws-in-the-EU

31. IBM Corp. Released 2010. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 19.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

32. Berelson B. *Content analysis in communication research*. Illinois: Free Press; 1952.

33.Gbrich C. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Introduction,* 1st ed. London: SAGE Publications; 2007.

For Review Only

34. Vaismoradi M, Turunen H, Bondas T. Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nurs Health Sci*. 2013; 15 (3):398-405.

35. Skoko E, Ravaldi C, Vannacci A, Nespoli A, Akooji N, Balaam MC ... S. Findings from the Italian Babies Born Better (B3) survey. *Minerva ginecol*. 2018; 70 (6): 663-675

36. Luegmair K, Zenzmaier C, Oblasser C, König-Bachmann M. Women's satisfaction with care at the birthplace in Austria: Evaluation of the Babies Born Better survey national dataset. *Midwifery*. 2018;59: 130-140.

37. Benet M, Escuriet R, Alcaraz-Quevedo M, Ezquerra S, Pla M. The extent of the implementation of reproductive health strategies in Catalonia (Spain) (2008-2017). *Gac Sanit.* 2019; 33(5): 472-479.

38. Henderson J, Redshaw M. Change over time in women's views and experiences of maternity care in England 1995–2014: A comparison using survey data. *Midwifery.* 2017; 44: 35-40.

39. Bowers J, Cheyne H, Mould G, Page M. Continuity of care in community midwifery. *Health Care Manag Sci*. 2015; 18(2):195-204.

40. Karlström A, Nystedt A, Hildingsson I. The meaning of a very positive birth experience: focus groups discussions with women. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth.* 2015; 15(1): 251.

For Review Only

41. Leon-Larios F, Nuno-Aguilar C, Rocca-Ihenacho L, Castro-Cardona F, Escuriet R. Challenging the status quo: Women's experiences of opting for a home birth in Andalucia Spain. *Midwifery*. 2019; 70: 15-21.

42. Rubashkin N, Torres C, Escuriet R, Dolores Ruiz-Berdún M. "Just a little help": A qualitative inquiry into the persistent use of uterine fundal pressure in the second stage of labor in Spain. *Birth*. 2019; 46 (3): 517-522.

43. Gungor I, Beji NK. Development and psychometric testing of the scales for measuring maternal satisfaction in normal and caesarean birth. *Midwifery*. 2012; 28(3): 348-357.

44. Donate-Manzanares M, Rodríguez-Cano T, Gómez-Salgado J, Rodríguez-Almagro J, Hernández-Martínez A, Barrilero-Fernández E, Beato-Fernández L. Quality of Childbirth Care in Women Undergoing Labour: Satisfaction with Care Received and How It Changes over Time. *J Clin Med.* 2019; 8(4):434.

45. Onsea J, Bijnens B, Van Damme S, Van Mieghem T. Exploring Parental Expectations and Experiences Around "Gentle" and "Standard" Caesarean Section. *Gynecol Obstet Invest.* 2018; 83(5): 437-442.

46. Magee SR, Battle C, Morton J, Nothnagle M. Promotion of family-centered birth with gentle cesarean delivery. *J Am Board Fam Med.* 2014; 27(5): 690-693.

47. Stevens J, Schmied V, Burns E, Dahlen H. Immediate or early skin-to-skin contact after a Caesarean section: a review of the literature. *Matern Child Nutr.* 2014; 10(4): 456-473.

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Description of categories and subcategories in the final coding framework

Categories / Subcategories	Description of items and attributes included in each category
1. Care received and experienced	
Overall maternity care and childcare	Positive statements: they refer to a positive valuation of general care and professional assistance before, during and after the birth. General care for the baby. Negative: lack of this general care and assistance or negative valuation.
Support and accompaniment	Positive statements: accompaniment, support or help provided by the health professionals Negative: poor quality or lack of accompaniment, support, or help
Communication	Positive statements: health professionals listen actively and possess the communication skills needed to inform, dialogue, advise and guide. The quantity and quality of the information provided is appropriate. Negative: poor communication skills or lack of them. Not enough information. Conversations among professionals as if women weren't present.
Feelings of safety and trust	Positive statements: health professionals' actions make women feel secure and give them confidence. Negative: lack of security and trust
Respectful care, intimacy, and sense of agency	Positive statements: taking into account women's needs and wishes, respecting the right to choose and to decision-making, preserving intimacy and dignity; only well-known and wanted persons present; women's autonomy and self-determination, asking permission before any procedure. Negative: insufficient presence or lack of the above items. Paternalism, coercion or threats.
Professional behavior and attitude	Positive statements: when health professionals are empathic, friendly, kind, attentive, dedicated, understanding, caring, careful, interested, discreet, humane, and so on. Negative: insufficient presence or lack of the above attributes. Dehumanization or depersonalization.
Time and availability	Positive statements: ready availability of professionals, suitable time spent and commitment, the continuous presence of the obstetrician or midwife, patience and time guaranteed when needed. Calm atmosphere. Negative: insufficient presence, time spent, availability and continuity. Lack of respect for length of labor. Hurried atmosphere.
2. Involved members of care team	
Professional involvement	Positive statements: the involvement of any kind of health professionals (or a specific person) is valued positively. Which professionals are involved or not is also valued (for example, the non-involvement of an obstetrician if birth is assisted by a midwife). Negative: the kind of professionals involved, with their actions valued negatively.
Competence Interdisciplinarity	Positive statements: professionalism, competence, experience, expertise, qualifications, specific knowledge and skills, interdisciplinarity, teamwork and team dynamics. Negative: insufficient presence or lack of the above attributes. Inconsistencies in the criteria of different professionals.
Presence of a partner or close person	Positive statements: presence or involvement of a parent (or other accompanying person) at birth Negative: poor level or lack of involvement
3.Specific interventions and procedures	
Normal birth facilitation without interventionism	Positive statements: facilitation of normal birth with few or no interventions and absence of invasive procedures. De-medicalization. Free movement during labor and election of birthing position. Consideration of the birth plan. Negative: interventions are valued negatively (type and quantity). Non-recommended or unnecessary procedures are used. Obsolete protocols and their obligatory application.
Effective medical interventions	Positive statements: quick and timely response of medical staff during birth, reduction of pain by anesthesia. Medical interventions are valued positively. Negative: lack of medical interventions, ineffective procedures, or delayed response.
Support to breastfeeding	Positive statements: information, giving advice and support to breastfeeding. Negative: insufficient presence or lack of above items. Inconsistencies in the explanations or advice.
Bonding practices	Positive statements: no unnecessary separation, skin-to-skin contact, close and uninterrupted bond with the baby. Negative: insufficient presence or lack of above items. Especially as regards C-section.
4. Environmental conditions	
Setting, infrastructures and resources	Positive statements: the place of birth, delivery and postnatal ward, single rooms, and equipment (balls, birthing pool) are valued positively. Negative: poor quality, low availability, or absence of above items.
Stay in the maternity wards	Positive statements: general atmosphere in the labor and birth ward: silence/music, temperature, illumination. Postnatal ward: accommodation, visiting times, cleanliness, quality of food and comfort. Negative: poor quality or lack of above items.
NHS coverage and social aspects	Only negative statements: home birth is not covered by the Spanish NHS. Poor social and public acceptance of this option.
Organizational aspects	Positive statements: organization of care provided and working conditions of staff are valued positively. Negative: The above items are negatively valued.
5. General and specific statements	
Overall valuations	Positive statements: everything was good, very good or excellent. Positive birth experience. There is nothing to change. Positive references to baby's well-being. Negative statements: nothing was good, there was no care, everything was bad, negative references to baby's well-being
Specific or vague responses	All those statements that could be classified in the above categories but were considered too specific or vague, or one-word answers with unclear meaning.
DK/DA	Blank answers (no completion of the three responses).

For Review Only

Table 2. Number and percentage of responses for each category and subcategory

Categories and subcategories	Best Practices (N)	Best Practices (% category)	Best Practices (Total %)	Changes (N)	Changes (% category)	Changes (Total %)
1.Care received and experienced	**4092**		**28.4%**	**1827**		**12.7%**
Overall maternity care and childcare	516	13%	3.6%	140	8.6%	1.0%
Support and accompaniment	341	8%	2.4%	80	4.9%	0.6%
Communication	286	7%	2.0%	457	28.1%	3.2%
Feelings of safety and trust	223	5%	1.5%	15	0.9%	0.1%
Respectful care, intimacy, and sense of agency	1273	31%	8.8%	598	36.8%	4.1%
Professional behavior and attitude	1064	26%	7.4%	431	26.5%	3.0%
Time and availability	523	13%	3.6%	221	13.6%	1.5%
2. Involved members of care team	**1450**		**10.1%**	**601**		**4.2%**
Professional involvement	671	46.3%	4.7%	288	47.9%	2.0%
Competence and Interdisciplinarity	344	23.7%	2.4%	52	8.7%	0.4%
Presence of a partner or close person	458	31.6%	3.2%	265	44.1%	1.8%
3.Specific interventions and procedures	**1358**		**9.4%**	**2475**		**17.2%**
Normal birth facilitation without interventionism	601	44.3%	4.2%	1631	65.9%	11.3%
Effective medical interventions	270	19.5%	1.9%	217	8.7%	1.5%
Support to breastfeeding	117	8.5%	0.8%	213	8.5%	1.5%
Bonding practices	395	28.6%	2.7%	437	17.5%	3.0%
4. Environmental conditions	**586**		**4.1%**	**777**		**5.4%**
Setting, infrastructures and resources	387	66.0%	2.7%	474	61.0%	3.3%
Stay in the maternity wards	195	33.3%	1.4%	179	23.0%	1.2%
NHS coverage and social aspects	0	0.0%	0.0%	74	9.5%	0.5%
Organizational aspects	7	1.2%	0.0%	54	6.9%	0.4%
5. General statements	**914**		**6.3%**	**331**	**43%**	**2.3%**
Overall valuations	815	89.2%	5.7%	213	64.4%	1.5%
Specific or vague responses	99	10.8%	0.7%	118	35.6%	0.8%
6. DK/DA	**2803 (16 % of all responses)**					

N = number of responses included in each subcategory and category; % category = percentage of responses assigned to each subcategory in relation to the total amount of responses included in its category; % best practices / changes = percentage of responses coded in each category / subcategory in relation to the total amount of responses analyzed excluding DK/DA (14411)

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Category distribution



Only

Figure 2. Care received and experienced



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 3. Involved members of care team



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 4. Specific interventions and procedures



Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 5. Environmental conditions



For Peer Review Only

Figure 6. Sub-analysis of negative experiences of care (changes needed)



iew Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only