

Results of Topic Selection Process & Next Steps

The nominator, Lamaze International, is interested in a new evidence review on the effectiveness of childbirth education on cesarean delivery and related intermediate outcomes to promote education to health care providers and policy-makers.

Due to limited program resources, the program is unable to develop a review at this time. No further activity on this nomination will be undertaken by the Effective Health Care (EHC) Program.

Topic Brief

Topic Number and Name: 0827 Childbirth education impact on cesarean section rates

Nomination Date: 09/21/2018

Topic Brief Date: 02/14/2019

Authors Allison Schmidt Rose Relevo

Conflict of Interest: None of the investigators have any affiliations or financial involvement that conflicts with the material presented in this report.

Background

As the U.S. general fertility rate declined in 2016, the cesarean delivery rate dropped as well¹. Despite this, the U.S. has one of the highest cesarean section rates in the world; the U.S. rate is nearly double the rates of Norway and the Netherlands². The 2016 cesarean delivery rate was 31.9%, a decline from both the previous year and the 2009 peak rate of 32.9%¹. However, the World Health Organization recommends the ideal cesarean delivery rate to be between 10% and 15%. In addition higher cesarean delivery rates are not associated with reduced maternal or newborn mortality rates³. Cesarean deliveries may be performed due to medical indications such as labor dystocia, abnormal or indeterminate fetal heart rate tracing, or suspected fetal macrosomia⁴. Other reasons unrelated to medical necessity such as patient preference and health care practice variation can also increase the rate of cesarean deliveries⁴. While all deliveries are potentially harmful to the mother and child, the risk for several potential harms such as hemorrhage, uterine rupture, shock, infection, and long-term harms such as placental abnormalities in subsequent pregnancies was greater for cesarean delivery compared to vaginal delivery⁴. Additionally, cesarean deliveries are expensive. In 2013, the average total cost of a cesarean delivery for a woman with commercial insurance was \$27,866 compared to \$18,329 for a vaginal delivery, while total Medicaid cost for a cesarean delivery was \$50,373 and \$29,800 for a vaginal delivery.⁵

A 2012 Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) systematic review examined strategies to reduce cesarean section rates using interventions implemented during pregnancy or during labor. Only one included study involved childbirth education during pregnancy, specifically focused on how to push in labor, and reported no difference in cesarean rate between the group who received the structured education and the control group receiving usual care⁶. In a 2012 survey, 53% of mothers reported having taken a childbirth class for at least one of their pregnancies⁷. However, a variety of antenatal education is available to pregnant women, and the content in these interventions related to cesarean delivery also varies. A review that further evaluates the literature and identifies the components of efficacious programs that reduced cesarean deliveries without indication could help improve the content and structure of childbirth education programs.

Nominator and Stakeholder Engagement

This nominator, Lamaze International, provided feedback on key questions and population, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICOs). They suggested altering the key questions to compare the effectiveness of childbirth education interventions by characteristics such as frequency and quality. However, given the variety of interventions described in the literature and the range of detail used to describe them, this did not seem possible. Based on consultation with a topic expert, we added a key question focused on the common components of efficacious childbirth education interventions (including frequency and duration) as that would be useful to health systems.

Key Questions and PICOs

The key questions for this nomination are:

- 1. What is the effect of childbirth education on a woman's psychosocial health (e.g., fear of childbirth, breastfeeding), physical health (e.g., pain, perineal trauma), health care utilization (e.g., length of hospital stay, delivery interventions) and satisfaction with birth experience?
- 2. What is the effectiveness of childbirth education to reduce cesarean deliveries?
- 3. What are the essential components of efficacious childbirth education interventions?a) People delivering the intervention
 - b) Content of education
 - c) Frequency and duration of education

- d) Setting/Location
- e) Organizational context (e.g., large group vs small group, lecture-based vs discussion)4. What are the harms associated with childbirth education interventions?

To define the inclusion criteria for the key questions, we specify the PICOs of interest (Table 1).

Table 1.	Key	Questions and	PICO
----------	-----	---------------	------

Key Questions	What is the effect of childbirth education on a woman's psychosocial health (e.g. fear of childbirth, breastfeeding), physical health (e.g. pain, perineal trauma), health care utilization (e.g. length of hospital stay, delivery interventions) and satisfaction with birth experience?	What is the effectiveness of childbirth education to reduce cesarean deliveries?	What are the essential components of efficacious childbirth education interventions? a) People delivering the intervention b) Content of education c) Frequency and duration of education d) Setting/Location e) Organizational context (e.g., large group vs small group, lecture-based vs discussion)	What are the harms associated with childbirth education interventions?
	Low-risk (NTSV) pregnant women	Low-risk (NTSV) pregnant women	Low-risk (NTSV) pregnant women	Low-risk (NTSV) pregnant women
	Childbirth education on birth outcomes including mode of delivery; antenatal education; prenatal education; birth preparation sessions	Childbirth education on birth outcomes including mode of delivery; antenatal education; prenatal education; birth preparation sessions	N/A	Childbirth education on birth outcomes including mode of delivery; antenatal education; prenatal education; birth preparation sessions
	No childbirth education; usual care; other interventions such as pamphlets or decision aids; self- driven research	No childbirth education; usual care; other interventions such as pamphlets or decision aids; self- driven research	N/A	No childbirth education; usual care; other interventions such as pamphlets or decision aids; self- driven research
	Psychosocial health outcomes (e.g. fear of childbirth, breastfeeding), physical health outcomes (e.g. pain, perineal trauma), health care utilization (e.g. length of hospital stay, delivery interventions) and satisfaction with birth experience	Rate of a primary cesarean delivery; cesarean delivery harms; rate of cesarean delivery by indication	N/A	Psychosocial health outcomes (e.g. fear of childbirth, breastfeeding), physical health outcomes (e.g. pain, perineal trauma), health care utilization (e.g. length of hospital stay, delivery interventions) and satisfaction with

		birth experience; cost of education;
		time spent on education

Abbreviations: NTSV = nulliparous, term, singleton, and vertex

Methods

We assessed nomination 0827 Childbirth education impact on cesarean section rates, for priority for a systematic review or other AHRQ EHC report with a hierarchical process using established selection criteria. Assessment of each criteria determined the need to evaluate the next one. See Appendix A for detailed description of the criteria.

- 1. Determine the appropriateness of the nominated topic for inclusion in the EHC program.
- 2. Establish the overall *importance* of a potential topic as representing a health or healthcare issue in the United States.
- 3. Determine the *desirability of new evidence review* by examining whether a new systematic review or other AHRQ product would be duplicative.
- 4. Assess the *potential impact* a new systematic review or other AHRQ product.
- 5. Assess whether the *current state of the evidence* allows for a systematic review or other AHRQ product (feasibility).
- 6. Determine the *potential value* of a new systematic review or other AHRQ product.

Appropriateness and Importance

We assessed the nomination for appropriateness and importance.

Desirability of New Review/Duplication

We searched for high-quality, completed or in-process evidence reviews published in the last three years on the key questions of the nomination. See Appendix B for sources searched.

Impact of a New Evidence Review

The impact of a new evidence review was qualitatively assessed by analyzing the current standard of care, the existence of potential knowledge gaps, and practice variation. We considered whether it was possible for this review to influence the current state of practice through various dissemination pathways (practice recommendation, clinical guidelines, etc.).

Feasibility of New Evidence Review

We conducted a literature search in PubMed from December 2013 to December 2018. See Appendix C for the PubMed search strategy and links to the ClinicalTrials.gov search.

We reviewed all identified titles and abstracts for inclusion and classified identified studies by key question and study design to assess the size and scope of a potential evidence review.

Value

We assessed the nomination for value. We considered whether or not the clinical, consumer, or policymaking context had the potential to respond with evidence-based change; and if a partner organization would use this evidence review to influence practice.

Results

See Appendix A for detailed assessments of all EPC selection criteria.

Appropriateness and Importance

This is an appropriate and important topic. The 2016 U.S. cesarean delivery rate, at 31.9%, is over double the ideal population cesarean delivery rate of 10-15%.^{1, 3} Cesarean deliveries pose significant health risks and are typically more expensive than vaginal delivery.⁵

Desirability of New Review/Duplication

A new evidence review would not be duplicative of an existing product. See Table 2, Duplication column.

Impact of a New Evidence Review

A new systematic review may have high impact. There is wide variation in childbirth education interventions described in the literature, both in description of the interventions and the in the content and format of the education interventions.⁴

Feasibility of a New Evidence Review

A new evidence review is feasible. A total of 18 primary studies⁸⁻²⁵ were identified that would address key question 1. Eleven⁸⁻¹⁸ were randomized control trials, while the remaining seven were comprised of pre/post^{19, 20}, quasi-experimental^{21, 22}, cross-sectional survey²³, prospective²⁴, and observational²⁵ studies. Four clinical trials²⁶⁻²⁹ were identified that would address key question 1.

Ten primary studies^{10, 11, 14, 15, 20, 23, 25, 30-32} were identified that would address key question 2, comprised of five randomized control trials^{10, 11, 14, 15, 30}, two cohort studies^{31, 32}, a cross-sectional survey²³, a pre/post study²⁰, and an observational study²⁵. One relevant clinical trial³³ for key question 2 was identified.

One cohort study³¹ was identified that would address key question 3.

None of the studies that were reviewed clearly addressed key question 4.

See Table 2, Feasibility column.

Key Question	Duplication (12/2013-12/2018)	Feasibility (12/2013-12/2018)
KQ 1: What is the effect of childbirth education on a woman's psychosocial health, physical health, health care utilization, and satisfaction	Total number of identified systematic reviews: 0	Size/scope of reviewRelevant Studies Identified: 18RCT: 11 ⁸⁻¹⁸ Pre/post: 2 ^{19, 20} Quasi-experimental: 2 ^{21, 22} Cross-sectional survey: 1 ²³ Prospective: 1 ²⁴ Observational: 1 ²⁵
with birth experience?		 <u>Clinicaltrials.gov:</u> 4 Active: 2^{26, 27} Complete: 1²⁸ Other: 1²⁹

Table 2. Key	Questions and	Results for Du	uplication and	Feasibility
--------------	---------------	----------------	----------------	-------------

Key Question	Duplication (12/2013-12/2018)	Feasibility (12/2013-12/2018)
KQ 2: What is the effectiveness of childbirth education to reduce cesarean deliveries?	Total number of identified systematic reviews: 0	Size/scope of review Relevant Studies Identified: 10 • RCT: 5 ^{10, 11, 14, 15, 30} • Cohort: 2 ^{31, 32} • Cross-sectional survey: 1 ²³ • Pre/post: 1 ²⁰ • Observational: 1 ²⁵ <u>Clinicaltrials.gov: 1</u> • Complete: 1 ³³
KQ 3: What are the essential components of efficacious childbirth education interventions?	Total number of identified systematic reviews: 0	Size/scope of review Relevant Studies Identified: 1 • Cohort: 1 ³¹ <u>Clinicaltrials.gov:</u> 0
KQ 4: What are the harms associated with childbirth education interventions?	Total number of identified systematic reviews: 0	Size/scope of review Relevant Studies Identified: 0 <u>Clinicaltrials.gov:</u> 0

Abbreviations: KQ=Key Question; RCT=randomized control trial

Value

The potential for value is high, as childbirth education interventions are amendable to evidencebased change, and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists agreed to partner on this topic if it were to go forward as an evidence review.

Summary of Findings

- <u>Appropriateness and importance:</u> The topic is both appropriate and important.
- <u>Duplication</u>: A new review would not be duplicative of an existing product.
- <u>Impact</u>: A new systematic review has high impact potential. There is variation in childbirth education interventions described in the literature.
- <u>Feasibility</u>: A new review is feasible. The evidence base is likely small. We identified 21 primary studies and 5 clinical trials that address at least one key question.
- <u>Value</u>: The potential for value is high because along with the nominator, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the American Academy of Family Physicians expressed interest in being a partner on this topic if it moves forward for an evidence review.

References

- 1. Martin JA, Hamilton BE, Osterman MJK. Births in the United States, 2016. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health 2017. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/databriefs/db287.htm.
- 2. Gunja MZ, Tikkanen R, Seervai S, et al. What Is the Status of Women's Health and Health Care in the U.S. Compared to Ten Other Countries? . Commonwealth Fund; 2018. <u>https://doi.org/10.26099/wy8a-7w13</u>.
- 3. World Health Organization, Human Reproduction Programme. WHO statement on caesarean section rates. World Health Organization; 2015. p. 8. <u>https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal_perinatal_health/cs-statement/en/</u>.
- Caughey AB, Cahill AG, Guise JM, et al. Safe prevention of the primary cesarean delivery. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2014 Mar;210(3):179-93. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2014.01.026. PMID: 24565430. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24565430.
- 5. Truven Health Analytics. The Cost of Having a Baby in the United States.; 2013. http://transform.childbirthconnection.org/reports/cost/.
- Hartmann KE, Andrews JC, Jerome RN, et al. Strategies to Reduce Cesarean Birth in Low-Risk Women Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US). Rockville (MD): 2012. <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK114734/</u>
- Declercq ER, Sakala C, Corry MP, et al. Major Survey Findings of Listening to Mothers(SM) III: Pregnancy and Birth: Report of the Third National U.S. Survey of Women's Childbearing Experiences. J Perinat Educ. 2014 Winter;23(1):9-16. doi: 10.1891/1058-1243.23.1.9. PMID: 24453463. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24453463.
- Abbasi P, Mohammad-Alizadeh Charandabi S, Mirghafourvand M. Comparing the effect of e-learning and educational booklet on the childbirth self-efficacy: a randomized controlled clinical trial. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2018 Mar;31(5):644-50. doi: 10.1080/14767058.2017.1293031. PMID: 28282777. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28282777.
- Brixval CS, Thygesen LC, Axelsen SF, et al. Effect of antenatal education in small classes versus standard auditorium-based lectures on use of pain relief during labour and of obstetric interventions: results from the randomised NEWBORN trial. BMJ Open. 2016 Jun 10;6(6):e010761. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010761. PMID: 27288375. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27288375.
- 10. Doyle O, McGlanaghy E, Palamaro-Munsell E, et al. Home based educational intervention to improve perinatal outcomes for a disadvantaged community: a randomised control trial. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 2014 Sep;180:162-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2014.06.006. PMID: 25027267. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25027267.
- 11. Fenwick J, Toohill J, Gamble J, et al. Effects of a midwife psycho-education intervention to reduce childbirth fear on women's birth outcomes and postpartum psychological wellbeing. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2015 Oct 30;15:284. doi: 10.1186/s12884-015-0721-y. PMID: 26518597. <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26518597</u>.
- 12. Toohill J, Fenwick J, Gamble J, et al. A randomized controlled trial of a psychoeducation intervention by midwives in reducing childbirth fear in pregnant women. Birth. 2014 Dec;41(4):384-94. doi: 10.1111/birt.12136. PMID: 25303111. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25303111.
- 13. Duncan LG, Cohn MA, Chao MT, et al. Benefits of preparing for childbirth with mindfulness training: a randomized controlled trial with active comparison. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2017 May 12;17(1):140. doi: 10.1186/s12884-017-1319-3. PMID: 28499376. <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28499376</u>.

- 14. Levett KM, Smith CA, Bensoussan A, et al. Complementary therapies for labour and birth study: a randomised controlled trial of antenatal integrative medicine for pain management in labour. BMJ Open. 2016 Jul 12;6(7):e010691. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010691. PMID: 27406639. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27406639.
- 15. Yohai D, Alharar D, Cohen R, et al. The effect of attending a prenatal childbirth preparedness course on labor duration and outcomes. J Perinat Med. 2018 Jan 26;46(1):47-52. doi: 10.1515/jpm-2016-0345. PMID: 28245192. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28245192.
- 16. Jakubiec D, Jagielska K, Karmowski M, et al. Effect of attending childbirth education classes on psychological distress in pregnant women measured by means of the General Health Questionnaire. Adv Clin Exp Med. 2014 Nov-Dec;23(6):953-7. doi: 10.17219/acem/37351. PMID: 25618123. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25618123.
- 17. Rouhe H, Salmela-Aro K, Toivanen R, et al. Life satisfaction, general well-being and costs of treatment for severe fear of childbirth in nulliparous women by psychoeducative group or conventional care attendance. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2015 May;94(5):527-33. doi: 10.1111/aogs.12594. PMID: 25627259. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25627259.
- Turkstra E, Mihala G, Scuffham PA, et al. An economic evaluation alongside a randomised controlled trial on psycho-education counselling intervention offered by midwives to address women's fear of childbirth in Australia. Sex Reprod Healthc. 2017 Mar;11:1-6. doi: 10.1016/j.srhc.2016.08.003. PMID: 28159118. <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28159118</u>.
- 19. Byrne J, Hauck Y, Fisher C, et al. Effectiveness of a Mindfulness-Based Childbirth Education pilot study on maternal self-efficacy and fear of childbirth. J Midwifery Womens Health. 2014 Mar-Apr;59(2):192-7. doi: 10.1111/jmwh.12075. PMID: 24325752. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24325752.
- 20. Kizilirmak A, Baser M. The effect of education given to primigravida women on fear of childbirth. Appl Nurs Res. 2016 Feb;29:19-24. doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2015.04.002. PMID: 26856483. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26856483.
- 21. Sercekus P, Baskale H. Effects of antenatal education on fear of childbirth, maternal self-efficacy and parental attachment. Midwifery. 2016 Mar;34:166-72. doi: 10.1016/j.midw.2015.11.016. PMID: 26656473. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26656473.
- 22. Karabulut O, Coskuner Potur D, Dogan Merih Y, et al. Does antenatal education reduce fear of childbirth? Int Nurs Rev. 2016 Mar;63(1):60-7. doi: 10.1111/inr.12223. PMID: 26612181. <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26612181</u>.
- Shi Y, Wang D, Yuan Y, et al. The effect of prenatal education curriculum on mother's prenatal examination utilization, delivery mode and recovery status: a cross-sectional survey in China. Environ Health Prev Med. 2015 Nov;20(6):397-403. doi: 10.1007/s12199-015-0480-4. PMID: 26201848. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26201848.
- 24. Akca A, Corbacioglu Esmer A, Ozyurek ES, et al. The influence of the systematic birth preparation program on childbirth satisfaction. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2017 May;295(5):1127-33. doi: 10.1007/s00404-017-4345-5. PMID: 28303340. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28303340.
- 25. Martinez-Galiano JM, Delgado-Rodriguez M. Influence of an education program of pregnant women on delivery. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2014 May;27(7):719-23. doi: 10.3109/14767058.2013.836486. PMID: 23962180. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23962180.
- 26. National Taiwan University of Nursing and Health Sciences. Mindfulness-Based Childbirth and Parenting Education on Pregnant Women. CTgov. NCT03185910; 2017. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03185910?term=childbirth&recrs=adef&intr=childbirth+education&gndr=Female&age=1&sfpd_s=12%2F20%2F2013&draw=1&rank=3.</u>

- 27. Northwestern University. Bump on the Ball: Impact of a Prenatal Exercise & Education Program on Birth Outcomes & Maternal Quality of Life. CTgov. NCT02334397; 2015. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02334397?term=childbirth&recrs=adef&intr=childbirth+education&gndr=Female&age=1&sfpd_s=12%2F20%2F2013&draw=1&rank=8.</u>
- 28. Karolinska Institutet. Mindfulness Based Childbirth and Parenting Education RCT of Effects on Parent and Child Health (MBCP). CTgov. NCT02441595; 2015. https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02441595?term=childbirth&recrs=adef&intr=childbirth+education&gndr=Female&age=1&sfpd_s=12%2F20%2F2013&draw=2&rank=11.
- 29. Veringa IK, de Bruin EI, Bardacke N, et al. 'I've Changed My Mind', Mindfulness-Based Childbirth and Parenting (MBCP) for pregnant women with a high level of fear of childbirth and their partners: study protocol of the quasi-experimental controlled trial. BMC Psychiatry. 2016 Nov 7;16(1):377. doi: 10.1186/s12888-016-1070-8. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5100329/. PMID: 27821151.
- 30. Toohill J, Callander E, Gamble J, et al. A cost effectiveness analysis of midwife psychoeducation for fearful pregnant women - a health system perspective for the antenatal period. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2017 Jul 11;17(1):217. doi: 10.1186/s12884-017-1404-7. PMID: 28693447. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28693447.
- 31. Cantone D, Lombardi A, Assunto DA, et al. A standardized antenatal class reduces the rate of cesarean section in southern Italy: A retrospective cohort study. Medicine (Baltimore). 2018 Apr;97(16):e0456. doi: 10.1097/md.000000000010456. PMID: 29668615. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29668615.
- Cantone D, Pelullo CP, Cancellieri M, et al. Can antenatal classes reduce the rate of cesarean section in southern Italy? Women Birth. 2017 Apr;30(2):e83-e8. doi: 10.1016/j.wombi.2016.09.004. PMID: 27686842. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27686842.
- 33. Ilam University of Medical Sciences. The Effect of Educational Intervention on Delivery Type Selection in Pregnant Women at Kermanshah, Iran. CTgov. NCT02929875; 2016. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02929875?term=childbirth&recrs=adef&intr=childbi</u> <u>rth+education&gndr=Female&age=1&sfpd_s=12%2F20%2F2013&draw=1&rank=10</u>.
- 34. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Births and Natality. In: National Center for Health Statistics, editor; 2017. <u>https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/births.htm</u>.

Appendix A. Selection Criteria Assessment

Selection Criteria	
1a. Does the nomination represent a health care drug, intervention, device, technology, or health care system/setting available (or soon to be available) in the U.S.?	Yes, childbirth education is available to pregnant women in the U.S., often through a health system.
1b. Is the nomination a request for a systematic review?	Yes
1c. Is the focus on effectiveness or comparative effectiveness?	Yes
1d. Is the nomination focus supported by a logic model or biologic plausibility? Is it consistent or coherent with what is known about the topic?	Yes
2a. Represents a significant disease burden; large proportion of the population	Yes, the U.S. cesarean delivery rate is over double the ideal population cesarean delivery rate of 10-15%. ^{1,3} In 2016 there were 3,945,875 births in the U.S, and so this topic potentially affects millions of people a year. ³⁴
2b. Is of high public interest; affects health care decision making, outcomes, or costs for a large proportion of the US population or for a vulnerable population	Yes, cesarean deliveries pose significant health risks, and are on average more expensive than vaginal delivery ⁵ .
2c. Represents important uncertainty for decision makers	Yes, there is variation in format and content of childbirth education and that variation may have different effects on cesarean delivery rates.
2d. Incorporates issues around both clinical benefits and potential clinical harms	Yes
2e. Represents high costs due to common use, high unit costs, or high associated costs to consumers, to patients, to health care systems, or to payers	Yes, the total average cost for a cesarean delivery under commercial insurance was \$27,866 compared to \$18,329 for vaginal delivery. ⁵ The average total Medicaid cost for a cesarean delivery was \$50,373 compared to \$29,800. ⁵ Cesarean delivery on average is more expensive.
3. Would not be redundant (i.e., the proposed topic is not already covered by available or soon-to-be available high-quality systematic review by AHRQ or others)	Yes, the topic is not already covered by an available or soon-to-be available high-quality systematic review.
As the standard of care upplear (suidelines not	Voc. there is variation in childhirth advantian
available or guidelines inconsistent, indicating an information gap that may be addressed by a new evidence review)?	interventions described in the literature. ⁴
4b. Is there practice variation (guideline inconsistent with current practice, indicating a potential implementation gap and not best addressed by a new evidence review)?	There is no evidence that practice varies from guidance.
E. Effectively utilizes existing assessed as 1	
 b. Effectively utilizes existing research and knowledge by considering: Adequacy (type and volume) of research for conducting a systematic review 	studies ⁸⁻²⁵ and 4 clinical trials ²⁶⁻²⁹ that would address KQ1.

- Newly available evidence (particularly for updates or new technologies)	We identified 10 primary studies ^{10, 11, 14, 15, 20, 23, 25, 30-32} and 1 clinical trial ³³ that would address KQ2.
	We identified one primary study ³¹ that would address KQ3.
6. Value	
6a. The proposed topic exists within a clinical, consumer, or policy-making context that is amenable to evidence-based change	Yes, childbirth education interventions are amenable to evidence-based change.
6b. Identified partner who will use the systematic review to influence practice (such as a guideline or recommendation)	Yes, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the American Academy of Family Physicians agreed to partner on this topic if it were to go forward as an evidence review.

Abbreviations: KQ=Key Question

Appendix B. Search for Evidence Reviews (Duplication)

Listed below are the sources searched, hierarchically

Primary Search
AHRQ: Evidence reports and technology assessments
https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/; https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/ta/index.html;
https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/evidence-based-reports/search.html
VA Products: PBM, and HSR&D (ESP) publications, and VA/DoD EBCPG Program
https://www.hsrd.research.va.gov/publications/esp/
Cochrane Systematic Reviews
http://www.cochranelibrary.com/
HTA (CRD database): Health Technology Assessments
http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/crdweb/
PubMed
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed
Secondary Search
AHRQ Products in development
https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/
VA Products in development
https://www.hsrd.research.va.gov/publications/esp/
Cochrane Protocols
http://www.cochranelibrary.com/
PROSPERO Database (international prospective register of systematic reviews and protocols)
http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/

Appendix C. Search Strategy & Results (Feasibility)

Feasibility	
MEDLINE(PubMed) searched on:	
December 14, 2018	
Concept	
Childbirth Education	("Prenatal Education"[Mesh])
	OR (((((("Labor Pain"[Mesh]) OR "Labor,
	Obstetric"[Mesh]) OR "Pregnancy
	Outcome"[Mesh]) OR "Parturition"[Mesh]) OR
	"Pregnant Women"[Mesh]))
	AND "Patient Education as Topic"[Mesh])
Limits: Female Adults and last 5 years	Filters activated: published in the last 5 years,
	Humans, Female, Adult: 19+ years.
Total N=185	
SR N=6	Systematic[sb]
RCT N=81	(((((((groups[tiab])) OR (trial[tiab])) OR
	(randomly[tiab])) OR (drug therapy[sh])) OR
	(placebo[tiab])) OR (randomized[tiab])) OR
	(controlled clinical trial[pt])) OR (randomized
	controlled trial[pt])
Other N=98	
clinicalTrials.gov	144 Studies found for: childbirth childbirth
	education Studies with Female Participants
	Adult First posted on or after 12/20/2013

Clinical Trials:

https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/results?cond=&term=childbirth&type=&rslt=&recrs=a&recrs=f&recrs= d&recrs=e&age_v=&age=1&gndr=Female&intr=childbirth+education&titles=&outc=&spons=&le ad=&id=&cntry=&state=&city=&dist=&locn=&strd_s=&strd_e=&prcd_s=&prcd_e=&sfpd_s=12%2 F20%2F2013&sfpd_e=&lupd_s=&lupd_e=&sort=