

Evidence tables for review question: What are the benefits and risks of different places of birth for women at different BMI thresholds?

Brocklehurst, 2011

Bibliographic Reference Brocklehurst P; Hardy P; Hollowell J; Linsell L; Macfarlane A; McCourt C; Marlow N; Miller A; Newburn M; Petrou S; Puddicombe D; Redshaw M; Rowe R; Sandall J; Silverton L; Stewart M; Perinatal and maternal outcomes by planned place of birth for healthy women with low risk pregnancies: the Birthplace in England national prospective cohort study.; BMJ (Clinical research ed.); 2011; vol. 343

Study details

Country/ies where study was carried out	England
Study type	Prospective cohort study
Study dates	April 2008 - April 2010
Inclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women attended by an NHS midwife during labour in their planned place of birth
Exclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • women who had elective caesarean section • women who had caesarean section before onset of labour • preterm labour (<37 weeks' gestation) • multiple pregnancy • women who were 'unbooked' (had no antenatal care) • Stillbirths occurring before the start of care in labour
Patient characteristics	<p><u>Age - mean (SD)</u></p> <p>Obstetric unit: 28.2 (6) Home: 31.1 (5.2)</p>

Freestanding midwifery unit: 28.8 (5.8)
Alongside midwifery unit: 28.3 (5.7)

Parity - nulliparous

Obstetric unit: 54%
Home: 27.2%
Freestanding midwifery unit: 46%
Alongside midwifery unit: 50.1%

Gestational age - mean (SD)

Obstetric unit: 39.8 (1.1)
Home: 39.8 (1.0)
Freestanding midwifery unit: 39.8 (1.0)
Alongside midwifery unit: 39.7 (1.0)

BMI - mean (SD):

Obstetric unit: 24.4 (4.0)
Home: 24.0 (3.7)
Freestanding midwifery unit: 24.1 (3.7)
Alongside midwifery unit: 24.0 (3.8)

Ethnicity:

White

Obstetric unit: 81.7%
Home: 94.8%
Freestanding midwifery unit: 91.6%
Alongside midwifery unit: 80.9%

Asian

Obstetric unit: 7.1%
Home: 0.7%

	<p>Freestanding midwifery unit: 3.6% Alongside midwifery unit: 7.2%</p> <p>Black/African/Caribbean Obstetric unit: 4.7% Home: 1.5% Freestanding midwifery unit: 1.2% Alongside midwifery unit: 4.3%</p> <p>Mixed Obstetric unit: 1.7% Home: 1.7% Freestanding midwifery unit: 1.1% Alongside midwifery unit: 1.8%</p> <p>Other Obstetric unit: 4.8% Home: 1.4% Freestanding midwifery unit: 2.5% Alongside midwifery unit: 6.0%</p> <p><u>Confounders:</u> Effect estimates adjusted for maternal age, ethnic group, understanding of English, marital or partner status, body mass index, deprivation score quintile, parity (previous pregnancies ≥ 24 weeks), and weeks of gestation</p>
Intervention(s)/control	<p>Planned place of birth at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obstetric unit • Home • Freestanding midwifery unit • Alongside midwifery unit
Sources of funding	Not industry funded
Sample size	N=64538 low risk women

Obstetrics unit: n= 19706
Home: n=16840
Freestanding midwifery units: n=11282
Alongside midwifery units: n=16710

NHS: national health service; SD: standard deviation;

Outcomes

Primary outcomes

Outcome	Obstetric Unit, , N = 19706	Home, , N = 16840	Freestanding midwifery unit, , N = 11282	Alongside midwifery unit, , N = 16710
Admission to a higher level of care	n = 117	n = 58	n = 24	n = 82
No of events				
Admission to a higher level of care	adjusted OR 1	adjusted OR 0.77 (0.36 to 1.65)	adjusted OR 0.32 (0.13 to 0.84)	adjusted OR 1.17 (0.46 to 2.99)
Adjusted OR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Spontaneous vertex vaginal birth (number)	n = 14645	n = 15590	n = 10150	n = 14413
No of events				
Spontaneous vertex vaginal birth (number)	adjusted OR 1	adjusted OR 3.61 (2.97 to 4.38)	adjusted OR 3.38 (2.70 to 4.25)	adjusted OR 2.22 (1.76 to 2.81)
Adjusted OR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Instrumental birth Forceps or ventouse	n = 2842	n = 714	n = 686	n = 1524

Outcome	Obstetric Unit, , N = 19706	Home, , N = 16840	Freestanding midwifery unit, , N = 11282	Alongside midwifery unit, , N = 16710
No of events				
Intrapartum caesarean section (number)	n = 2158	n = 458	n = 405	n = 727
No of events				
Intrapartum caesarean section (number)	adjusted OR 1	adjusted OR 0.31 (0.23 to 0.41)	adjusted OR 0.32 (0.24 to 0.42)	adjusted OR 0.39 (0.29 to 0.53)
Adjusted OR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Blood transfusion	n = 241	n = 101	n = 67	n = 136
No of events				
Blood transfusion	adjusted OR 1	adjusted OR 0.72 (0.47 to 1.12)	adjusted OR 0.48 (0.32 to 0.73)	adjusted OR 0.75 (0.55 to 1.02)
Adjusted OR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Transferred - Nulliparous (number) transfer before and after delivery	N/A	n = 2057	n = 1884	n = 3360
No of events				
Transferred - Multiparous (number) Transfer before and after delivery	N/A	n = 1472	n = 573	n = 1041
No of events				

OR: odds ratio

1. Confounders adjusted for: maternal age, ethnic group, understanding of English, marital or partner status, body mass index, deprivation score quintile, parity (previous pregnancies ≥24weeks), and weeks of gestation

Critical appraisal – ROBINS-I

Section	Question	Answer
1. Bias due to confounding	Risk of bias judgement for confounding	Low <i>(No confounding expected)</i>
2. Bias in selection of participants into the study	Risk of bias judgement for selection of participants into the study	Low <i>(All eligible participants were included in the study and start of follow up and start of intervention coincide.)</i>
3. Bias in classification of interventions	Risk of bias judgement for classification of interventions	Low <i>(Intervention status is well defined and based on information collected at the time of the intervention (BMI on booking).)</i>
4. Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Risk of bias judgement for deviations from intended interventions	Moderate <i>(There may be some unbalanced co-interventions taking place across the different obstetric units, however, they would be in line with current practice in the UK and the variation would be a natural variation reflective of what is seen in practice so unlikely to have a big impact)</i>
5. Bias due to missing data	Risk of bias judgement for missing data	Low <i>(Data was reasonably complete.)</i>
6. Bias in measurement of outcomes	Risk of bias judgement for measurement of outcomes	Low <i>(Methods of outcome assessment are comparable across groups, and the outcome measure was unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received by study participants.)</i>
7. Bias in selection of the reported result	Risk of bias judgement for selection of the reported result	Low <i>(Pre-registered protocol reports all confounders to be used in the analysis, and intended outcomes.)</i>
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias variation across outcomes	No variation

Section	Question	Answer
Overall bias	Directness	Directly applicable

BMI: body mass index

Hollowell, 2014

Bibliographic Reference Hollowell, J.; Pillas, D.; Rowe, R.; Linsell, L.; Knight, M.; Brocklehurst, P.; The impact of maternal obesity on intrapartum outcomes in otherwise low risk women: secondary analysis of the Birthplace national prospective cohort study; BJOG : an international journal of obstetrics and gynaecology; 2014; vol. 121 (no. 3); 343-55

Study details

Country/ies where study was carried out	See Brocklehurst 2011
Study type	Prospective cohort study
Study dates	See Brocklehurst 2011
Inclusion criteria	See Brocklehurst 2011
Exclusion criteria	See Brocklehurst 2011
Patient characteristics	<p><u>Mean age (SD)</u> Underweight <18.5kg/m²: 25.4 (5.6) Normal weight 18.5 – 24.9kg/m² : 28 (6.0) Overweight 25-29.9kg/m²: 28.8 (5.9) Obese 30-35kg/m²: 28.2 (5.8) Very obese >35kg/m²: 28.1 (5.9)</p> <p><u>Nulliparous</u> Underweight: 59.6% Normal weight: 56.0% Overweight: 50.6%</p>

Obese: 48.3%
Very obese: 42.5%

Gestational age – mean (SD)

Underweight: 39.5 (1.2)
Normal weight: 39.7 (1.1)
Overweight: 39.8 (1.1)
Obese: 39.9 (1.1)
Very obese: 39.9 (1.1)

Ethnicity

White

Underweight: 78.2%
Normal weight: 81.7%
Overweight: 81.5%
Obese: 83.4%
Very obese: 87.7%

Asian

Underweight: 11.1%
Normal weight: 7.4%
Overweight: 7.5%
Obese: 5.5%
Very obese: 3%

Black/Caribbean/African

Underweight: 2.8%
Normal weight: 3.9%
Overweight: 5.7%
Obese: 6%
Very obese: 6.3%

Mixed

Underweight: 1.7%

	<p>Normal weight: 1.5% Overweight: 1.5% Obese: 1.5% Very obese: 1.5%</p> <p>Other Underweight: 6.1% Normal weight: 5.5% Overweight: 3.8% Obese: 3.3% Very obese: 1.3%</p> <p>Confounders: Maternal age, ethnic group, understanding of English, marital or partner status, Index of Multiple Deprivation score, parity (previous pregnancies ≥ 24 weeks), gestation at delivery</p>
Intervention(s)/control	<p>Intervention: Women who planned birth in an obstetric unit, with BMI ranges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $< 18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$ • $25-29.9 \text{ kg/m}^2$ • $30-35 \text{ kg/m}^2$ • $>35-40 \text{ kg/m}^2$ <p>Control: Women who planned birth in an obstetric unit, with BMI range:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $18.5 - 24.9 \text{ kg/m}^2$ <p>(Supplementary data provided data for women who planned birth at home, freestanding midwifery unit, or alongside midwifery unit with the same BMI comparisons)</p>
Sources of funding	Not industry funded
Sample size	N=17230 women who planned birth in an obstetric suite without risk factors (other than BMI $> 35 \text{ kg/m}^2$)

	Underweight n=577 Normal weight n=8936 Overweight n=4778 Obese n=1955 Very obese n=984
Other information	Data extracted for the outcome 'obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes combined' was assumed to be adjusted. There seemed to be a typo in the study table 5 referring to these ratios as 'unadjusted'. Outcomes from this cohort have been reported in the secondary report by Hollowell 2015 as they include BMI information, therefore the outcomes from the primary report have not been included in the analysis for this review

BMI: body mass index; SD: standard deviation

Outcomes

Outcomes – Obstetric unit

Outcome	Underweight BMI < 18.5 kg/m ² , N = 577	Normal weight BMI 18.5–24.9 kg/m ² , N = 8936	Overweight BMI 25–29.9 kg/m ² , N = 4778	Obese BMI 30–35 kg/m ² , N = 1955	Very obese BMI > 35 kg/m ² , N = 984
Maternal admission to higher level care	n = 5	n = 57	n = 28	n = 11	n = 5
No of events					
Maternal admission to higher level care	aRR 1.63 (0.72 to 3.69)	aRR 1	aRR 0.78 (0.41 to 1.49)	aRR 0.88 (0.50 to 1.54)	aRR 0.71 (0.25 to 2.03)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)					
Instrumental delivery	n = 79	n = 1397	n = 635	n = 249	n = 84
No of events					
Instrumental delivery	aRR 0.95 (0.79 to 1.13)	aRR 1	0.87 (0.80 to 0.95)	aRR 0.86 (0.74 to 1.00)	aRR 0.70 (0.57 to 0.86)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)					

Outcome	Underweight BMI < 18.5 kg/m², N = 577	Normal weight BMI 18.5–24.9 kg/m², N = 8936	Overweight BMI 25–29.9 kg/m², N = 4778	Obese BMI 30–35 kg/m², N = 1955	Very obese BMI > 35 kg/m², N = 984
Intrapartum caesarean birth	n = 39	n = 846	n = 588	n = 260	n = 135
No of events					
Intrapartum caesarean birth	aRR 0.83 (0.61 to 1.13)	aRR 1	aRR 1.34 (1.20 to 1.50)	aRR 1.52 (1.30 to 1.79)	aRR 1.69 (1.35 to 2.12)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)					
Maternal blood transfusion	n = 6	n = 112	n = 61	n = 25	n = 9
No of events					
Maternal blood transfusion	aRR 1.03 (0.48 to 2.21)	RR 1	aRR 0.96 (0.62 to 1.48)	aRR 1.00 (0.65 to 1.53)	aRR 0.77 (0.40 to 1.50)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)					
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes combined – nulliparous Instrumental birth, intrapartum caesarean birth, augmentation, general anaesthesia, maternal blood transfusion, third/fourth-degree tear, maternal admission to higher level care	n = 150	n = 2524	n = 1277	n = 535	n = 225
No of events					
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes combined – nulliparous Instrumental birth, intrapartum caesarean birth, augmentation, general anaesthesia, maternal blood transfusion, third/fourth-degree tear, maternal admission to higher level care	aRR 0.94 (0.82 to 1.09)	aRR 1	aRR 1.04 (0.99 to 1.08)	aRR 1.12 (1.05 to 1.18)	aRR 1.08 (0.99 to 1.18)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)					

Outcome	Underweight BMI < 18.5 kg/m², N = 577	Normal weight BMI 18.5–24.9 kg/m², N = 8936	Overweight BMI 25–29.9 kg/m², N = 4778	Obese BMI 30–35 kg/m², N = 1955	Very obese BMI > 35 kg/m², N = 984
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes combined – multiparous	n = 32	n = 666	n = 465	n = 212	n = 117
No of events					
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes combined – multiparous	aRR 0.87 (0.57 to 1.31)	aRR 1	aRR 1.16 (1.02 to 1.32)	aRR 1.22 (1.05 to 1.42)	aRR 1.24 (0.97 to 1.59)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)					
Admission to a neonatal unit or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death – nulliparous	n = 9	n = 180	n = 76	n = 39	n = 28
No of events					
Admission to a neonatal unit or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death – nulliparous	aRR 0.72 (0.36 to 1.46)	aRR 1	aRR 0.88 (0.62 to 1.24)	aRR 1.18 (0.80 to 1.74)	aRR 2.00 (1.31 to 3.05)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)					
Admission to a neonatal unit or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death – multiparous	n = 5	n = 68	n = 46	n = 19	n = 15
No of events					
Admission to a neonatal unit or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death – multiparous	aRR 1.13 (0.40 to 3.19)	aRR 1	aRR 1.19 (0.88 to 1.61)	aRR 1.26 (0.69 to 2.28)	aRR 1.83 (1.22 to 2.75)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)					

a(RR): adjusted risk ratio; BMI: body mass index

1. Confounders adjusted for: maternal age, ethnic group, understanding of English, marital or partner status, Index of Multiple Deprivation score, parity (previous pregnancies ≥ 24 weeks), gestation at delivery

Outcomes – Home

Outcome	Underweight BMI < 18.5 kg/m², N = 318	Normal weight BMI 18.5–24.9 kg/m², N = 8051	Overweight BMI 25–29.9 kg/m², N = 3723	Obese BMI 30–35 kg/m², N = 1211	Very obese BMI >35 – 40 kg/m², N = 265
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes combined Instrumental birth, intrapartum caesarean birth, augmentation, general anaesthesia, maternal blood transfusion, third/fourth-degree tear, maternal admission to higher level care No of events	n = 29	n = 901	n = 396	n = 109	n = 19
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes combined Instrumental birth, intrapartum caesarean birth, augmentation, general anaesthesia, maternal blood transfusion, third/fourth-degree tear, maternal admission to higher level care Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)	aRR 0.97 (0.68 to 1.41)	aRR 1	aRR 1.03 (0.93 to 1.14)	aRR 1.04 (0.89 to 1.22)	aRR 0.95 (0.59 to 1.52)
Neonatal unit admission or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death No of events	n = 7	n = 135	n = 70	n = 22	n = 5
Neonatal unit admission or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)	aRR 1.11 (0.47 to 2.63)	1	aRR 1.09 (0.81-1.47)	aRR 1.36 (0.80 to 2.29)	aRR 1.17 (0.49 to 2.81)

a(RR): adjusted risk ratio; BMI: body mass index

1. Confounders adjusted for: maternal age, ethnic group, understanding of English, marital or partner status, Index of Multiple Deprivation score, parity (previous pregnancies ≥24weeks), gestation at delivery

Outcomes – freestanding midwifery unit

Outcome	Underweight BMI < 18.5 kg/m², N = 234	Normal weight BMI 18.5–24.9 kg/m², N = 5584	Overweight BMI 25–29.9 kg/m², N = 2650	Obese BMI 30–35 kg/m², N = 911	Very obese BMI >35 - ≤40 kg/m², N = 62
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes Instrumental birth, intrapartum caesarean birth, augmentation, general anaesthesia, maternal blood transfusion, third/fourth-degree tear, maternal admission to higher level care No of events	n = 25	n = 813	n = 369	n = 86	n = 4
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes Instrumental birth, intrapartum caesarean birth, augmentation, general anaesthesia, maternal blood transfusion, third/fourth-degree tear, maternal admission to higher level care Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)	aRR 0.98 (0.61 to 1.57)	aRR 1	aRR 1.10 (0.98 to 1.22)	aRR 0.74 (0.61 to 0.89)	aRR 0.80 (0.33 to 1.94)
Neonatal unit admission or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death No of events	n = 5	n = 95	n = 50	n = 19	n = 3
Neonatal unit admission or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)	aRR 1.29 (0.46 to 3.61)	aRR 1	aRR 1.15 (0.78 to 1.69)	aRR 1.33 (0.79 to 2.25)	aRR 3.95 (1.07- to 14.6)

a(RR) adjusted risk ratio: BMI: body mass index

1. Confounders adjusted for: maternal age, ethnic group, understanding of English, marital or partner status, Index of Multiple Deprivation score, parity (previous pregnancies ≥24weeks), gestation at delivery

Outcomes – alongside midwifery unit

Outcome	Underweight BMI < 18.5 kg/m ² , N = 434	Normal weight BMI 18.5–24.9 kg/m ² , N = 8140	Overweight BMI 25–29.9 kg/m ² , N = 3735	Obese BMI 30–35 kg/m ² , N = 1253	Very obese BMI > 35 - ≤40 kg/m ² , N = 136
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes Instrumental birth, intrapartum caesarean birth, augmentation, general anaesthesia, maternal blood transfusion, third/fourth-degree tear, maternal admission to higher level care No of events	n = 88	n = 1647	n = 690	n = 212	n = 14
Obstetric interventions and adverse maternal outcomes Instrumental birth, intrapartum caesarean birth, augmentation, general anaesthesia, maternal blood transfusion, third/fourth-degree tear, maternal admission to higher level care Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)	aRR 1.08 (0.83 to 1.42)	aRR 1	aRR 1.02 (0.93 to 1.13)	aRR 1.00 (0.86 to 1.16)	aRR 0.89 (0.50 to 1.57)
Neonatal unit admission or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death No of events	n = 3	n = 144	n = 77	n = 30	n = 1
Neonatal unit admission or intrapartum stillbirth/early neonatal death Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)	aRR 0.33 (0.13 to 0.86)	aRR 1	aRR 1.15 (0.78 to 1.68)	aRR 1.33 (0.75 to 2.37)	aRR 0.62 (0.15 to 2.59)

a(RR) adjusted risk ratio: adjusted risk ratio; BMI: body mass index

1. Confounders adjusted for: maternal age, ethnic group, understanding of English, marital or partner status, Index of Multiple Deprivation score, parity (previous pregnancies ≥24weeks), gestation at delivery

Critical appraisal – ROBINS-I

Section	Question	Answer
1. Bias due to confounding	Risk of bias judgement for confounding	Low <i>(No confounding expected.)</i>
2. Bias in selection of participants into the study	Risk of bias judgement for selection of participants into the study	Low <i>(All eligible participants were included, and start of follow up and intervention coincide.)</i>
3. Bias in classification of interventions	Risk of bias judgement for classification of interventions	Low <i>(Intervention status is well defined and definition is based solely on information collected at the time of the intervention.)</i>
4. Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Risk of bias judgement for deviations from intended interventions	Moderate <i>(There may be some unbalanced co-interventions taking place across the different obstetric units, however, they would be in line with current practice in the UK and the variation would be a natural variation reflective of what is seen in practice so unlikely to have a big impact.)</i>
5. Bias due to missing data	Risk of bias judgement for missing data	Low <i>(Data was reasonably complete.)</i>
6. Bias in measurement of outcomes	Risk of bias judgement for measurement of outcomes	Low <i>(Methods of outcomes assessment were comparable across groups. The outcome measure was unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention.)</i>
7. Bias in selection of the reported result	Risk of bias judgement for selection of the reported result	Low <i>(Confounders, analysis and intended outcomes are as specified in the pre-registered protocol.)</i>
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias variation across outcomes	No variation
Overall bias	Directness	Directly applicable

Hollowell, 2015

Bibliographic Reference Hollowell, J.; Rowe, R.; Townend, J.; Knight, M.; Li, Y.; Linsell, L.; Redshaw, M.; Brocklehurst, P.; Macfarlane, A.; Marlow, N.; McCourt, C.; Newburn, M.; Sandall, J.; Silvert; The Birthplace in England national prospective cohort study: further analyses to enhance policy and service delivery decision-making for planned place of birth; 2015

Study details

Country/ies where study was carried out	See Brocklehurst 2011
Study type	Prospective cohort study
Study dates	See Brocklehurst 2011
Inclusion criteria	See Brocklehurst 2011
Exclusion criteria	See Brocklehurst 2011
Patient characteristics	See Brocklehurst 2011
Intervention(s)/control	<p><u>For mode of birth:</u></p> <p>Intervention: Planned place of birth at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home • FMU • AMU <p>Control: Planned place of birth at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OU <p><u>For transfer to obstetric unit:</u></p>

	<p>Intervention: Women who planned birth at home, FMU or AMU, with BMI ranges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • < 18.5 kg/m² • 25-29.9 kg/m² • 30-35 kg/m² • >35-40 kg/m² <p>Control: Women who planned birth at home, FMU or AMU, with BMI range:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.5 – 24.9kg/m²
Sources of funding	See Brocklehurst 2011
Sample size	<p>N=61335</p> <p>nulliparous, n=27312</p> <p>multiparous, n=34023</p>

AMU: alongside midwifery unit; BMI: body mass index; FMU: freestanding midwifery unit; OU: obstetric unit

Outcomes

Outcome	Obstetric unit , , N = 5916	Home , , N = 3237	Freestanding midwifery unit, , N = 3909	Alongside midwifery unit, , N = 5747
Mode of birth – straightforward birth – nulliparous vaginal birth without instruments, without caesarean,	n = 5916	n = 3237	n = 3909	n = 5747

Outcome	Obstetric unit , , N = 5916	Home, , N = 3237	Freestanding midwifery unit, , N = 3909	Alongside midwifery unit, , N = 5747
without 3 rd or 4 th degree perineal trauma or blood transfusion				
No of events				
Mode of birth – straightforward birth – nulliparous vaginal birth without instruments, without caesarean, without 3rd or 4th degree perineal trauma or blood transfusion	aRR 1	aRR 1.32 (1.26 to 1.39)	aRR 1.28 (1.23 to 1.34)	aRR 1.18 (1.12 to 1.23)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Mode of birth - straightforward birth - multiparous	n = 7475	n = 11301	n = 5704	n = 7529
No of events				
Mode of birth - straightforward birth - multiparous	aRR 1	aRR 1.10 (1.09 to 1.12)	aRR 1.10 (1.08 to 1.12)	aRR 1.07 (1.05 to 1.09)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Mode of birth - instrumental birth - nulliparous	n = 2201	n = 575	n = 604	n = 1275
No of events				
Mode of birth - instrumental birth - nulliparous	aRR 1	aRR 0.51 (0.44 to 0.59)	aRR 0.49 (0.41 to 0.60)	aRR 0.73 (0.62 to 0.86)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Mode of birth - instrumental birth - multiparous	n = 482	n = 107	n = 69	n = 185
No of events				
Mode of birth - instrumental birth - multiparous	aRR 1	aRR 0.15 (0.12 to 0.20)	aRR 0.19 (0.13 to 0.27)	aRR 0.46 (0.35 to 0.60)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				

Outcome	Obstetric unit , , N = 5916	Home, , N = 3237	Freestanding midwifery unit, , N = 3909	Alongside midwifery unit, , N = 5747
Mode of birth - caesarean birth - nulliparous	n = 1545	n = 356	n = 342	n = 618
No of events				
Mode of birth - caesarean birth - nulliparous	aRR 1	aRR 0.57 (0.47 to 0.70)	aRR 0.51 (0.42 to 0.61)	aRR 0.59 (0.48 to 0.71)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Mode of birth - caesarean birth - multiparous	n = 446	n = 78	n = 44	n = 85
No of events				
Mode of birth - caesarean birth - multiparous	aRR 1	aRR 0.15 (0.10 to 0.21)	aRR 0.18 (0.12 to 0.26)	aRR 0.24 (0.17 to 0.36)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Transfer to obstetric unit - BMI <18.5 – nulliparous	N/A	n = 28/80	n = 36/120	n = 90/242
No of events		aRR 0.79 (0.58 to 1.07)	aRR 1.12 (0.80 to 1.57)	aRR 1.02 (0.78 to 1.34)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Transfer to obstetric unit - BMI <18.5 – multiparous	N/A	n = 28/237	n = 11/112	n = 25/194
No of events		aRR 1.27 (0.84 to 1.92)	aRR 0.97 (0.51 to 1.87)	aRR 1.21 (0.77 to 1.91)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Transfer to obstetric unit - BMI 18.5 - 24.9 - nulliparous	N/A	n = 1050/2344	n = 931/2723	n = 1764/4385
No of events		aRR 1	aRR 1	aRR 1
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				

Outcome	Obstetric unit , , N = 5916	Home, , N = 3237	Freestanding midwifery unit, , N = 3909	Alongside midwifery unit, , N = 5747
Transfer to obstetric unit - BMI 18.5 - 24.9 - multiparous	N/A	n = 579/5702	n = 243/2842	n = 460/3765
No of events		aRR 1	aRR 1	aRR 1
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Transfer to obstetric unit - BMI 25 - 29.9 - nulliparous	N/A	n = 438/902	n = 404/1091	n = 707/1699
No of events		aRR 1.05 (0.96 to 1.15)	aRR 1.11 (1.00 to 1.25)	aRR 1.02 (0.92 to 1.12)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Transfer to obstetric unit - BMI 25 - 29.9 - multiparous	N/A	n = 361/2833	n = 143/1542	n = 256/2053
No of events		aRR 1.17 (1.03 to 1.32)	aRR 1.10 (0.88 to 1.39)	aRR 1.00 (0.86 to 1.16)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Transfer to obstetric unit - BMI 30 – 35 - nulliparous	N/A	n = 115/252	n = 105/333	n = 211/518
No of events		aRR 1.03 (0.88 to 1.22)	aRR 0.92 (0.77 to 1.10)	aRR 1.01 (0.84 to 1.20)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				
Transfer to obstetric unit - BMI 30 – 35 - multiparous	N/A	n = 138/955	n = 42/572	n = 96/745
No of events		aRR 1.29 (1.08 to 1.54)	aRR 0.83 (0.62 to 1.12)	aRR 0.89 (0.68 to 1.17)
Adjusted RR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				

a(RR): adjusted risk ratio; BMI: body mass index

1. Confounders adjusted for: maternal age, ethnic group, understanding of English, marital or partner status, Index of Multiple Deprivation score, parity (previous pregnancies ≥ 24 weeks), gestation at delivery

Critical appraisal – ROBINS-I

Section	Question	Answer
1. Bias due to confounding	Risk of bias judgement for confounding	Low <i>(No confounding expected)</i>
2. Bias in selection of participants into the study	Risk of bias judgement for selection of participants into the study	Low <i>(All eligible participants were included in the study and start of follow up and intervention coincide.)</i>
3. Bias in classification of interventions	Risk of bias judgement for classification of interventions	Low <i>(Intervention status is well defined and based solely on information collected at the time of the intervention.)</i>
4. Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Risk of bias judgement for deviations from intended interventions	Moderate <i>(There may be some unbalanced co-interventions taking place across the different obstetric units, however, they would be in line with current practice in the UK and the variation would be a natural variation reflective of what is seen in practice so unlikely to have a big impact.)</i>
5. Bias due to missing data	Risk of bias judgement for missing data	Low <i>(Data was reasonably complete.)</i>
6. Bias in measurement of outcomes	Risk of bias judgement for measurement of outcomes	Low <i>(The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups and unlikely to be included by knowledge of the intervention.)</i>
7. Bias in selection of the reported result	Risk of bias judgement for selection of the reported result	Low <i>(Confounders and intended outcomes were specified in the pre-registered protocol.)</i>
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias variation across outcomes	No variation

Section	Question	Answer
Overall bias	Directness	Directly applicable

Rowe, 2018

Bibliographic Reference Rowe, Rachel; Knight, Marian; Kurinczuk, Jennifer J.; Outcomes for women with BMI>35kg/m² admitted for labour care to alongside midwifery units in the UK: A national prospective cohort study using the UK Midwifery Study System (UKMidSS); PLoS ONE; 2018; vol. 13 (no. 12); e0208041

Study details

Country/ies where study was carried out	England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland.
Study type	Prospective cohort study
Study dates	January to December 2016
Inclusion criteria	<p>Intervention group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women with a BMI >35kg/m² at booking appointment (first antenatal appointment). • Admitted to an alongside midwifery unit and gave birth in the same admission. <p>Comparison cohort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m² at booking appointment (first antenatal appointment). • Admitted to an alongside midwifery unit and gave birth in the same admission.
Exclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women admitted assessment in the alongside midwifery unit but then discharged before giving birth. • Women admitted for assessment in the alongside midwifery unit and seen for obstetric triage. • Women whose BMI data was unclear and could not be confirmed by the midwife looking after them.

Patient characteristics	<p>N=3071</p> <p><u>Parity</u></p> <p>Women with a BMI >35kg/m²: Nulliparous n= 312 (28%) Multiparous n=808 (72%)</p> <p>Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m²: Nulliparous n=890 (46%) Multiparous n=1056 (54%)</p> <p><u>Age</u></p> <p>Women with a BMI >35kg/m²: <35 n= 963 (86%) ≥35 n= 159 (14%)</p> <p>Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m²: <35 n=1630 (84%) ≥35 n= 319 (16%)</p> <p><u>Gestation at admission</u></p> <p>Women with a BMI >35kg/m²:</p> <p>36-37 weeks n= 48 (4%) >37 weeks n= 1074 (96%)</p> <p>Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m²: 36-37 weeks n= 91 (5%) >37 weeks n= 1858 (95%)</p>
--------------------------------	---

	<p><u>No pre-existing risk factors</u> Women with a BMI >35kg/m² n=980 (87%) Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m² :n=1803 (90%)</p> <p><u>BMI at booking</u> Women with a BMI >35kg/m²: 35.1-40 kg/m² = 92.2% 40.1-45 kg/m² = 6.5% >45 kg/m² = 1.3%</p> <p>Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m²: <18.5 kg/m² = 4.1% 18.5-24.9 kg/m² = 54.9% 25-29.9 kg/m² = 30% 30-35.0 kg/m² = 11%</p> <p><u>Confounders:</u></p> <p>Maternal age, ethnic group, gestational age at admission (completed weeks), Children in Low-income Families Measure quintile, parity (previous pregnancies ≥24 weeks), pre-existing risk factors (none, ≥1 clear, ≥1 possible).</p>
Intervention(s)/control	<p><u>Intervention - Severely obese group</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women with a BMI of >35 kg/m² admitted for labour in an alongside midwifery unit. <p><u>Control - comparison group</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women with a BMI of ≤35 kg/m² admitted for labour in the same alongside midwifery units. • The comparison group was selected by recording data for the two women with a BMI of ≤35 kg/m² who had been admitted to the alongside midwifery unit immediately before the woman selected for the women with a BMI of >35 kg/m² group.
Sources of funding	Not industry funded

Sample size	N=3071 Women with a BMI >35kg/m ² : n=1122 Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m ² : n=1949
--------------------	--

BMI: body mass index

Outcomes

Outcome	Women with a BMI >35kg/m², , N = 1122	Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m², , N = 1949
Maternal admission for higher level care - nulliparous	n = 10	n = 20
No of events		
Maternal admission for higher level care - nulliparous	aRR 1.34, 95% CI (0.44 to 4.11)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Maternal admission for higher level care – multiparous	n = 9	n = 17
No of events		
Maternal admission for higher level care – multiparous	aRR 0.71, 95% CI (0.27 to 1.86)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Intrapartum caesarean birth – nulliparous	n = 43	n = 73
No of events		
Intrapartum caesarean birth – nulliparous	aRR 1.62, 95% CI (0.98 to 2.67)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Intrapartum caesarean birth – multiparous	n = 10	n = 7
No of events		
Intrapartum caesarean birth – multiparous	aRR 1.88, 95% CI (0.56 to 6.21)	aRR 1

Outcome	Women with a BMI >35kg/m², , N = 1122	Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m², , N = 1949
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Category 1 or 2 Caesarean birth – nulliparous	n = 38	n = 58
No of events		
Category 1 or 2 Caesarean birth – nulliparous	aRR 1.80, 95% CI (1.05 to 3.08)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Category 1 or 2 Caesarean birth – multiparous	n = 8	n = 5
No of events		
Category 1 or 2 Caesarean birth – multiparous	aRR 2.10, 95% CI (0.48 to 9.11)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Instrumental birth - nulliparous	n = 43	n = 155
No of events		
Instrumental birth - nulliparous	aRR 0.83, 95% CI (0.53 to 1.30)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Instrumental birth - multiparous	n = 12	n = 26
No of events		
Instrumental birth - multiparous	aRR 0.6, 95% CI (0.22 to 1.61)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Straightforward vaginal birth - nulliparous	n = 212	n = 621
No of events		

Outcome	Women with a BMI >35kg/m², , N = 1122	Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m², , N = 1949
Straightforward vaginal birth - nulliparous	aRR 0.96, 95% CI (0.86 to 1.06)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Straightforward vaginal birth - multiparous	n = 776	n = 986
No of events		
Straightforward vaginal birth - multiparous	aRR 1.03, 95% CI (0.99 to 1.07)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Postpartum haemorrhage - nulliparous (≥1500ml)	n = 16	n = 15
No of events		
Postpartum haemorrhage - nulliparous (≥1500ml)	aRR 3.01, 95% CI (1.24 to 7.31)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Postpartum haemorrhage - multiparous (≥1500ml)	n = 15	n = 21
No of events		
Postpartum haemorrhage - multiparous (≥1500ml)	aRR 0.89, 95% CI (0.41 to 1.94)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Shoulder dystocia - nulliparous	n = 3	n = 11
No of events		
Shoulder dystocia - nulliparous	aRR 0.79, 95% CI (0.14 to 4.51)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Shoulder dystocia - multiparous	n = 12	n = 17

Outcome	Women with a BMI >35kg/m², , N = 1122	Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m², , N = 1949
No of events		
Shoulder dystocia - multiparous	aRR 0.84, 95% CI (0.31 to 2.23)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Neonatal unit admission - nulliparous	n = 12	n = 29
No of events		
Neonatal unit admission - nulliparous	aRR 0.92, 95% CI (0.38 to 2.23)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Neonatal unit admission - multiparous	n = 19	n = 20
No of events		
Neonatal unit admission - multiparous	aRR 1.10, 95% CI (0.46 to 2.68)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Initiation of breastfeeding - nulliparous	n = 229	n = 693
No of events		
Initiation of breastfeeding - nulliparous	aRR 0.97, 95% CI (0.87 to 1.07)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Initiation of breastfeeding - multiparous	n = 502	n = 747
No of events		
Initiation of breastfeeding - multiparous	aRR 0.92, 95% CI (0.85 to 1.00)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		

Outcome	Women with a BMI >35kg/m ² , , N = 1122	Women with a BMI ≤35kg/m ² , , N = 1949
Transfer - nulliparous during labour or after birth	n = 151	n = 375
No of events		
Transfer - nulliparous during labour or after birth	aRR 1.18, 95% CI (0.98 to 1.43)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		
Transfer - multiparous during labour or after birth	n = 118	n = 134
No of events		
Transfer - multiparous during labour or after birth	aRR 1.12, 95% CI (0.84 to 1.49)	aRR 1
aRR (adjusted for confounders ¹)		

a(RR): adjusted risk ratio; CI: confidence interval

1. Confounders adjusted for: maternal age, ethnic group, gestational age at admission (completed weeks), Children in Low-income Families Measure quintile, parity (previous pregnancies ≥24 weeks), pre-existing risk factors (none, ≥1 clear, ≥1 possible).

Critical appraisal – ROBINS-I

Section	Question	Answer
1. Bias due to confounding	Risk of bias judgement for confounding	Low (No confounding expected.)
2. Bias in selection of participants into the study	Risk of bias judgement for selection of participants into the study	Low (All eligible women were included, and start up and follow up time coincide.)

Section	Question	Answer
3. Bias in classification of interventions	Risk of bias judgement for classification of interventions	Low <i>(Intervention status is well defined and definition is based solely on information collected at the time of intervention.)</i>
4. Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Risk of bias judgement for deviations from intended interventions	Moderate <i>(There may be some unbalanced co-interventions taking place across the different alongside midwifery units, however, they would be in line with current practice in the UK and the variation would be a natural reflection of what is seen in practice so unlikely to have a big impact.)</i>
5. Bias due to missing data	Risk of bias judgement for missing data	Low <i>(Data was sufficiently complete)</i>
6. Bias in measurement of outcomes	Risk of bias judgement for measurement of outcomes	Low <i>(The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups and unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention.)</i>
7. Bias in selection of the reported result	Risk of bias judgement for selection of the reported result	Low <i>(The adjusted effect estimates have been analysed according to the confounders specified in the protocol, and all intended outcomes.)</i>
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias variation across outcomes	No variation
Overall bias	Directness	Directly applicable

Stephenson-Famy, 2018

Bibliographic Reference

Stephenson-Famy, Alyssa; Masarie, Kaitlin S.; Lewis, Ali; Schiff, Melissa A.; What are the risk factors associated with hospital birth among women planning to give birth in a birth center in Washington State?; Birth (Berkeley, Calif.); 2018; vol. 45 (no. 2); 130-136

Study details

Country/ies where study was carried out	United States
Study type	Retrospective cohort study
Study dates	January 1st 2004 and December 31st 2011
Inclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women planning birth in a birth centre • Who delivered a singleton, vertex delivery and at 37 or more weeks gestation
Exclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women who had a preterm birth • Women with a previous caesarean birth • Nonvertex presentation • Multiple gestations • Fetal death
Patient characteristics	<p><u>Age <35</u> 85.4%</p> <p><u>Ethnicity</u> White: 93.7% African American/American Indian/Alaska Native: 2.6% Asian: 3.7%</p> <p><u>Non-Hispanic/Hispanic</u> 96% non-Hispanic 4% Hispanic</p> <p><u>Parity</u> Nulliparous: 45.3%</p>

	<u>Confounders</u>
	Maternal age, non-Hispanic/Hispanic, marital status, maternal education, BMI, insurance status
Intervention(s)/control	Planned place of birth in a free-standing birth centre (midwife)
Sample size	N=7118 women planning birth in a birth centre

BMI: body mass index

Outcomes

Outcome	BMI <18.5, N =	BMI 18.5 - 24.9, N =	BMI 25.0 - 29.9, N =	BMI ≥ 30 , N =
Transfer to hospital - nulliparous	aOR 0.6 (0.3 to 1.5)	OR 1	aOR 1.9 (1.4 to 2.5)	aOR 2.3 (1.6 to 3.2)
adjusted OR (adjusted for confounders ¹)				

a(OR): adjusted odds ratio; BMI: body mass index

1. Confounders adjusted for: maternal age, non-Hispanic/Hispanic, marital status, maternal education, BMI, insurance status.

Critical appraisal

Section	Question	Answer
1. Bias due to confounding	Risk of bias judgement for confounding	Low <i>(The authors adjusted for the confounders that were statistically significant. These confounders were all the important confounders.)</i>
2. Bias in selection of participants into the study	Risk of bias judgement for selection of participants into the study	Low <i>(All eligible women were included. Start of follow up and start of intervention coincide.)</i>
3. Bias in classification of interventions	Risk of bias judgement for classification of interventions	Moderate <i>(Intervention definition is based solely on information collected at the time of intervention and taken from information recorded on birth certificates. However, the study reports that recording of planned place of birth on certificates has not been assessed for accuracy so</i>

Section	Question	Answer
		<i>there may be inaccuracies when reporting planned place of birth, which might have an effect of the transfer to hospital rates)</i>
4. Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Risk of bias judgement for deviations from intended interventions	Moderate <i>(There may be unbalanced co-interventions among the different birth centres that would lead to a different rate of transfer for different women.)</i>
5. Bias due to missing data	Risk of bias judgement for missing data	Moderate <i>(There is not enough information regarding missing information but the authors describe a regression model that only included non-missing data.)</i>
6. Bias in measurement of outcomes	Risk of bias judgement for measurement of outcomes	Low <i>(The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups, and unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention.)</i>
7. Bias in selection of the reported result	Risk of bias judgement for selection of the reported result	Moderate <i>(There are concerns regarding the possibility of selecting results based on multiple analysis, as there is no protocol available to determine whether all the confounders which were classified as important were used. There were also no adjusted estimates reported for the multiparous group, only for all women and nulliparous.)</i>
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Moderate
Overall bias	Risk of bias variation across outcomes	No variation
Overall bias	Directness	Directly applicable