International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2409-2424
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Collaboration Between Nurses and Midwives in Managing High-Risk Pregnancies

Mashael Ayed Almotairi[1], Budur Shafi Alruwailyi[2], Zainab Naeem Mutarrid Alruwaili[3], Alruwaili Taghreed Naeem M[4], Maha Brhim Tarad Alshamri[5], Shuruq Mohammed D Alanazi[6], Nujum Wahash Ibrahim Alshammari[7], Mlak Kalaf M. Alenazi[8], Hanouf Mahdi Fayhan Al-Ruwaili[9], Gawaher Musalm Salm Albalawi[10], Marwah Mashhour Waqqaf Alruwaili[11]

[1] Midwifery – Primary Health Care Center in Qurtuba – Riyadh, Riyadh Region – Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** mishoo44@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5241-7850

[2]Midwife Technician – Maternity and Children's Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: nagoosh2122@outlook.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5242-7850

[3]Midwife – Maternity and Children Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: zalrowli@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5243-7850

[4]Midwife Technician – Maternity and Children Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: talroeli@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5244-7850

[5]Nursing and Midwifery – Hafer Albatin Central Hospital – Hafer Albatin, Eastern Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: mahatarad77@gmial.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5245-7850

[6]Nursing Specialist – Maternity and Children Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: sharooqma@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5246-7850

[7]Nursing and Midwifery – Shinan General Hospital – Shinan, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: nwalshammari@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5248-7850

[8]Nursing Specialist – Maternity and Children's Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: malakka@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5249-7850

[9]Nursing Technician – Al-Haditha General Hospital – Al-Haditha, Al-Jouf – Saudi Arabia
Email: halrweoli@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5200-7850

[10]Nursing Technician – Maternity and Children's Hospital – Tabuk, Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: gmalbalawi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5201-7850

[11]Nursing Specialist – Prince Mutaib Bin Abdulaziz Hospital – Sakaka, Al-Jouf – Saudi Arabia
Email: malruwaili43@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5202-7850

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4023
Received : 03 October 2024
Accepted : 13 December 2024

Keywords

interdisciplinary collaboration,
nurses, midwives,
high-risk pregnancies,
Quality Improvement,
Obstetric Outcomes.

Abstract:

In managing high-risk pregnancies, collaboration between nurses and midwives plays a vital role in ensuring optimal maternal and fetal outcomes. Nurses, with their comprehensive training in clinical assessments and patient management, complement the specialized expertise of midwives in prenatal and postnatal care. This interdisciplinary approach enables healthcare teams to leverage each professional's strengths, thereby improving communication, enhancing patient education, and providing holistic care tailored to the diverse needs of expectant mothers facing complications. Through regular interdisciplinary meetings and shared care protocols, nurses and midwives can develop cohesive strategies that address both the physical and emotional challenges associated with high-risk pregnancies. Furthermore, the integration of interdisciplinary practices fosters a culture of shared responsibility and accountability among healthcare providers. It allows for the identification of potential risks at an early stage, facilitating timely interventions that can mitigate complications. This collaborative model not only enhances patient safety but also promotes better health literacy among pregnant women, empowering them to actively participate in their care plans. By prioritizing effective teamwork and resource-sharing, nurses and

midwives can significantly reduce the likelihood of adverse outcomes, ultimately leading to healthier pregnancies and improved birth experiences.

1. Introduction

Pregnancy, while a natural physiological process, carries an inherent potential for complications that can escalate into high-risk situations, threatening the well-being of the mother, the fetus, or both. A high-risk pregnancy is characterized by factors that predispose the mother or infant to a greater likelihood of morbidity or mortality than in a typical, uncomplicated pregnancy [1]. These factors are diverse and multifaceted, encompassing pre-existing maternal conditions such as hypertension, diabetes, or autoimmune disorders; issues arising during gestation like preeclampsia, gestational diabetes, or placental abnormalities; and socio-demographic challenges including advanced maternal age, socioeconomic deprivation, or limited access to healthcare [2]. The management of such pregnancies demands a level of expertise, vigilance, and coordination that transcends the capacity of any single healthcare profession.

In the traditional healthcare model, roles were often rigidly defined, with clear boundaries separating the responsibilities of physicians, nurses, and midwives. However, the complex, dynamic, and often unpredictable nature of high-risk obstetrics has exposed the limitations of this siloed approach. Fragmented care can lead to critical communication gaps, delayed interventions, and a disjointed patient experience, ultimately compromising safety and outcomes [3]. In response to these challenges, the modern healthcare paradigm has increasingly shifted towards interdisciplinary collaboration, recognizing that the synthesis of diverse expertise is paramount for delivering safe, effective, and woman-centered care.

This research paper posits that robust interdisciplinary collaboration between nurses and midwives is not merely beneficial but is a critical cornerstone in the effective management of high-risk pregnancies. While obstetricians and perinatologists provide essential medical leadership, the continuous, hands-on care, monitoring, and psychosocial support are predominantly delivered by the nursing and midwifery workforce. Nurses, with their rigorous training in pathophysiology, pharmacology, and the management of complex medical conditions, bring a vital focus on disease management and technological intervention [4]. Midwives, grounded in a philosophy that views pregnancy and childbirth as normal life events, contribute unparalleled expertise in holistic support, normal physiological birth promotion, and woman-centered advocacy across the continuum of care [5]. The convergence of these two distinct yet complementary skill sets creates a powerful synergy, fostering a comprehensive care model that addresses both the pathological and normalcy aspects of a high-risk pregnancy.

The theoretical and practical framework for this collaboration is rooted in the core principles of Interprofessional Collaborative Practice (IPCP), as defined by the World Health Organization [6]. IPCP occurs when multiple health workers from different professional backgrounds work together with patients, families, caregivers, and communities to deliver the highest quality of care. It is built upon a foundation of shared goals, mutual respect, and effective communication. In the context of high-risk pregnancy, this translates to a shared commitment to the singular objective of achieving a safe outcome for both the mother and the newborn, while respecting and valuing the unique contributions that each profession brings to the team.

The practical manifestations of this nurse-midwife collaboration are extensive and operate at every stage of the perinatal journey. During the antenatal period, midwives often act as the first point of contact, skillfully identifying risk factors through comprehensive assessments and history-taking. When a potential complication is detected, a seamless handover and consultation with a specialized nurse, such as a diabetic nurse educator or a cardiac nurse specialist, ensures that the woman receives targeted, expert education and management without losing the continuity of midwifery care [7]. For instance, a woman diagnosed with gestational diabetes might have her nutritional and lifestyle counseling co-managed by her midwife and a diabetic nurse, with the midwife monitoring fetal growth and well-being while the nurse manages blood glucose surveillance and insulin therapy education. This shared-care model prevents the woman from falling through the cracks of the system.

In the intrapartum period, within a hospital setting, the collaboration becomes even more intense and critical. Labor and delivery nurses are experts in continuous electronic fetal monitoring, administering complex intravenous medications like magnesium sulfate for preeclampsia, and managing obstetric emergencies alongside physicians [8]. The midwife, whether functioning as the primary birth attendant or a collaborative team member, provides continuous labor support, utilizes non-pharmacological pain relief techniques,

and advocates for the woman's birth preferences within the boundaries of safety [9]. This dynamic duo ensures that the technological and medical vigilance required for a high-risk birth does not eclipse the emotional and psychological needs of the laboring woman. The nurse can manage the machinery and the data, while the midwife focuses on the woman, creating a balanced and supportive environment. This effective teamwork is crucial in critical situations such as a postpartum hemorrhage, where the nurse might be responsible for medication preparation and vital sign monitoring while the midwife performs uterine massage and assists the physician, all operating under a shared mental model and clear communication protocol [10].

Despite its proven benefits, the path to seamless interdisciplinary collaboration is not without significant barriers. These obstacles can be deeply entrenched in the healthcare system and professional cultures. Historically rooted hierarchies and professional tribalism can sometimes create friction, with misunderstandings about scopes of practice leading to tension or ineffective communication [11]. Furthermore, institutional constraints such as heavy workloads, staffing shortages, and a lack of dedicated time for interprofessional meetings or joint training can severely hinder the development of the trusting relationships that underpin effective collaboration [12]. The physical design of workplaces and incompatible electronic health record systems can also create artificial barriers to the informal and formal communication necessary for a cohesive team.

Therefore, the imperative to actively cultivate and strengthen this collaborative model is clear. Investing in interprofessional education (IPE), where nursing and midwifery students learn *with, from, and about* each other during their formative training years, is a foundational strategy for breaking down stereotypes and building mutual respect early in their careers [13]. Healthcare institutions must also champion this model by creating structured opportunities for collaboration, such as joint ward rounds, standardized communication tools like SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation), and shared debriefing sessions following complex cases.

2. Nurse–Midwife Cooperation

The most prominent and widely adopted framework is the Interprofessional Collaborative Practice (IPCP) model, extensively promoted by the World Health Organization [14]. This model posits that collaborative practice is the cornerstone of effective healthcare delivery, especially for complex conditions. The IPCP framework is built upon four core competencies: values and ethics for interprofessional practice, roles and responsibilities, interprofessional communication, and teams and teamwork. In the context of nurse-midwife teams, this translates to a shared commitment to the ethical principle of providing the safest, highest-quality care for the woman and fetus (values/ethics). It necessitates a clear, mutual understanding that the nurse's expertise in complex pathophysiology and technological management complements the midwife's expertise in holistic care and physiological birth promotion (roles/responsibilities). Effective communication, perhaps the most critical element, requires tools like SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) to ensure clarity during handovers and emergencies. Finally, a focus on teams and teamwork encourages joint decision-making and shared accountability for patient outcomes, moving beyond parallel practice to truly integrated care [15].

Complementing the broad IPCP model is the concept of "Situated Teamwork," which is particularly relevant to the fast-paced, high-stakes environment of labor and delivery units. This framework, drawn from sociological and organizational studies, emphasizes that teamwork is not a static entity but a dynamic process that is "situated" within a specific context [16]. It acknowledges that the nature of nurse-midwife collaboration fluidly adapts to the situation at hand. During routine antenatal monitoring, teamwork may be characterized by informal consultation and mutual respect. However, during an acute emergency like a sudden fetal bradycardia or a maternal seizure, teamwork instantly transforms into a highly structured, rapid, and directive interaction, often leaning on pre-established protocols and clear leadership. The Situated Teamwork framework explains why a single, rigid model of interaction is insufficient; effective collaboration must be flexible and responsive to the immediate clinical context, allowing the team to oscillate seamlessly between different modes of operation as the patient's condition demands [17].

Another powerful lens through which to view this collaboration is the Synergy Model, developed by the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses (AACN). This model asserts that optimal patient outcomes are achieved when the competencies of the nurses (and by extension, the healthcare team) are synergistically matched to the characteristics and needs of the patient [18]. In a high-risk pregnancy, the patient's needs are complex and

multidimensional. They require not only the competent management of a medical condition (e.g., preeclampsia) but also the preservation of a positive birth experience, autonomy, and family-centered care. The Synergy Model makes the case for nurse-midwife collaboration explicit: no single profession possesses all the competencies to meet this full spectrum of needs. The nurse's competencies in clinical inquiry, diagnostic reasoning, and managing complex interventions directly synergize with the patient's needs for safety and physiological stability. Concurrently, the midwife's competencies in facilitating healing relationships, providing holistic advocacy, and supporting normalcy synergize with the patient's needs for psychological support, dignity, and personal empowerment [19]. The model provides a powerful rationale for collaboration by demonstrating that it is the *combination* of these skill sets that creates a whole which is greater than the sum of its parts, perfectly aligned with the multifaceted needs of a woman experiencing a high-risk pregnancy.

Furthermore, the Relational Coordination theory offers a communication-centered framework for understanding what makes collaborative teams function effectively. Developed by Jody Gittell, this theory posits that the coordination of work is most effective in settings of high task interdependence, uncertainty, and time constraints—all hallmarks of high-risk obstetrics—when it is carried out through relationships of shared goals, shared knowledge, and mutual respect, and supported by frequent, timely, accurate, and problem-solving communication [20]. This framework shifts the focus from formal structures to the quality of the relational and communication ties between team members. For nurses and midwives, high relational coordination would manifest as a deep, mutual understanding that their shared goal is the well-being of the mother-baby dyad, not the protection of professional turf. It involves frequent, informal updates at the nurses' station, timely communication about subtle changes in a patient's condition, and a communication style that is focused on solving problems rather than assigning blame when complications arise [21]. Studies have shown that units with high relational coordination among staff demonstrate significantly better patient outcomes, including reduced lengths of stay and fewer medical errors, making it a critical framework for optimizing nurse-midwife teamwork [22].

While the aforementioned frameworks focus on the team's internal dynamics, the Social Exchange Theory (SET) provides insight into the motivational factors that sustain long-term collaboration from an individual perspective. SET is a sociological concept suggesting that human relationships are formed and maintained based on a subjective cost-benefit analysis and the comparison of alternatives [23]. In the workplace, individuals engage in cooperative behaviors when they perceive that the benefits of doing so outweigh the costs. Applied to nurse-midwife cooperation, the "benefits" can include mutual professional respect, shared emotional support in a high-stress environment, more efficient and less burdensome work through shared responsibility, and improved patient outcomes which provide profound professional satisfaction. The "costs" might involve the time and effort required for communication, navigating interpersonal conflicts, or ceding control over certain aspects of care. According to SET, collaboration will flourish in an environment where institutions and leaders actively work to tip the balance in favor of benefits—for example, by creating a culture of appreciation, formally recognizing successful collaborative efforts, and ensuring that workloads are manageable enough to make communication feasible [24]. When nurses and midwives consistently find their interactions to be rewarding, trust is built, and a cycle of positive reciprocity is established, solidifying collaborative patterns as the cultural norm.

Finally, the Transactive Memory Systems (TMS) framework offers a cognitive explanation for the efficiency of collaborative teams. A TMS is a shared system for collectively encoding, storing, and retrieving knowledge from different domains. In essence, it is a collective "map" of who knows what within the team [25]. In a well-functioning nurse-midwife team, this system is highly developed. The midwife does not need to be an expert in the intricacies of titrating a magnesium sulfate drip; she knows that the specialized obstetric nurse is the source of that knowledge. Conversely, the nurse does not need to be an expert in all non-pharmacological pain relief techniques; she knows that the midwife holds deep knowledge in that area. When a new situation arises, such as a woman with a complex cardiac history going into labor, the team can quickly and efficiently access the necessary knowledge by knowing which team member to direct which question to. This metacognitive understanding—knowing who knows what—streamlines decision-making, reduces errors of omission, and allows the team to function with a higher level of expertise than any single member could possess alone.

3. Roles and Responsibilities of Nurses and Midwives in High-Risk Pregnancy Care

During the antenatal period, the midwife often serves as the primary coordinator of care, conducting routine assessments, and acting as a vigilant gatekeeper for identifying deviations from the norm. Their responsibilities are deeply rooted in a holistic, woman-centered philosophy. This includes conducting comprehensive risk assessments that go beyond the physical to encompass psychological, social, and environmental factors [26]. They provide continuous support, education on nutrition and lifestyle, and promote physiological preparedness for birth. Crucially, when a midwife detects a potential complication—such as elevated blood pressure, signs of pre-eclampsia, or inadequate fetal growth—their role pivots to one of referral, advocacy, and ongoing integration of specialist advice into the woman's care plan. The midwife ensures the woman understands her condition and remains an active participant in her care decisions, preserving her sense of agency amidst increasing medicalization [27].

The nurse's role in the antenatal period, particularly in a high-risk clinic or specialist setting, is more intensely focused on disease-specific management and technological surveillance. For a woman with gestational diabetes, the diabetic nurse educator takes the lead in teaching self-monitoring of blood glucose, administering insulin, and managing dietary plans. A cardiac nurse specialist would be responsible for meticulous cardiovascular assessment, monitoring for signs of decompensation, and educating the patient on activity restrictions and symptom recognition [28]. In this phase, the nurse is the expert in the "disease," while the midwife is the expert in the "woman experiencing the pregnancy." Their collaboration is evident when the diabetic nurse provides the technical data and management plan, and the midwife contextualizes this information within the woman's daily life, family dynamics, and birth plan, ensuring the medical regimen is feasible and sustainable. This shared-care model prevents the fragmentation of care, ensuring that the woman does not feel passed between providers but rather supported by a unified team [29].

The intrapartum period—labor and birth—represents the most intense and high-stakes arena for nurse-midwife collaboration, where roles are dynamically interdependent. In the hospital setting, the labor and delivery nurse assumes primary responsibility for the technological and medical surveillance of the high-risk patient. This includes the continuous electronic fetal monitoring (EFM), interpretation of fetal heart rate patterns in the context of the mother's medical condition, and the management of complex intravenous therapies such as oxytocin for induction or magnesium sulfate for seizure prophylaxis in pre-eclampsia [30]. The nurse is the front-line responder to acute changes, tasked with precise vital sign monitoring, medication administration, and preparing for and assisting in obstetric emergencies like cesarean sections or postpartum hemorrhage. Their focus is on maintaining physiological stability and executing medical orders with precision and vigilance.

Simultaneously, the midwife's role during labor, whether as the primary birth attendant or a collaborative team member, is to safeguard the normalcy of the birth process to the greatest extent possible and provide continuous labor support. This involves utilizing non-pharmacological pain relief techniques such as hydrotherapy, massage, and position changes; providing unwavering emotional and psychological support; and acting as the woman's staunch advocate to ensure her voice is heard and her birth preferences are respected within the boundaries of safety [31]. The midwife manages the progress of labor through vaginal examinations and provides skilled, hands-on care during the second stage, including perineal support. In a high-risk context, this creates a powerful duality: the nurse "manages the machine and the data," while the midwife "manages the woman." The nurse ensures the safety parameters are met, while the midwife ensures the human experience of birth is not lost. This is not a rigid separation but a fluid partnership. For example, during a concerning fetal heart rate deceleration, the nurse may be troubleshooting the monitor and alerting the physician, while the midwife is simultaneously helping the mother change position to alleviate cord compression and providing calm, reassuring explanations [32].

This collaborative dynamic is most critically tested during an obstetric emergency. In the event of a postpartum hemorrhage, a well-rehearsed, protocol-driven team response is activated. The nurse's responsibilities are often technical and logistical: establishing large-bore IV access, drawing up and administering uterotonic medications, documenting events and interventions, and monitoring vital signs for signs of shock. The midwife's role is often more hands-on and direct: performing bimanual uterine compression, managing the delivery of the placenta, and massaging the fundus [33]. Both professionals are in constant communication with each other and the obstetrician, creating a cascade of coordinated action. The success of this emergency response relies entirely on a pre-established, clear understanding of these interdependent roles, where trust and mutual

respect allow for seamless, almost instinctual, cooperation under extreme pressure.

The collaborative partnership between nurses and midwives extends vitally into the postpartum period and beyond, a phase critical for monitoring the resolution of high-risk conditions and establishing successful motherhood. The midwife's role postnatally is centered on the transition to parenthood, breastfeeding establishment, and the holistic well-being of the mother and newborn. They assess the mother's physical recovery from birth, provide extensive lactation support, and screen for postnatal mental health issues like postpartum depression [34]. For the high-risk patient, the midwife ensures that the woman understands the ongoing implications of her condition, such as the need for continued blood pressure monitoring after pre-eclampsia or long-term diabetic follow-up.

The nurse's responsibilities in the postpartum unit are focused on the ongoing management of the mother's medical condition. For a woman who had severe pre-eclampsia, the nurse continues to monitor her blood pressure, assess for signs of impending eclampsia, and administer magnesium sulfate if ordered. For a mother with cardiac disease, the nurse is vigilant about fluid balance, activity tolerance, and signs of cardiac compromise. They are responsible for patient education regarding new medications, warning signs related to their specific condition, and the scheduling of necessary follow-up appointments with specialists [35]. The collaboration here ensures that the woman's medical and emotional needs are met simultaneously. The nurse might manage the titration of an antihypertensive medication, while the midwife helps the mother position her newborn for a comfortable breastfeed. They share information crucial for a comprehensive assessment; for instance, the midwife might report excessive fatigue to the nurse, which could be a sign of both postpartum anemia and cardiac insufficiency, prompting further investigation [36].

4. Strategies for Effective Collaboration

The theoretical synergy between nursing and midwifery in high-risk pregnancy care can only be realized in practice through meticulously crafted communication and teamwork strategies. While complementary roles provide the structure, it is the quality of interaction that breathes life into the collaborative model. In the high-stakes, fast-paced environment of obstetrics, communication failures are not merely inconveniences; they are frequently cited as root causes of preventable adverse events [37]. Therefore, moving beyond an assumption of innate teamwork skills to the intentional implementation of evidence-based strategies is a non-negotiable imperative for safe and effective patient care. These strategies operate at multiple levels, from structured communication tools to institutional cultural shifts, all aimed at fostering a climate of psychological safety, mutual respect, and flawless coordination.

The foundational strategy for ensuring clarity and consistency in clinical communication is the adoption of standardized tools and protocols. The most prominent of these is the SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) technique. SBAR provides a concise, predictable framework for structuring conversations, particularly during handovers, referrals, or when escalating concerns. For instance, when a midwife needs to consult an obstetric nurse about a patient with rising blood pressure, using SBAR ensures critical information is transmitted efficiently: *Situation*: "This is Sarah, the midwife for Room 3. I'm calling about Anna Smith who is 38 weeks pregnant and is now demonstrating a BP of 160/100." *Background*: "She was admitted for induction for mild pre-eclampsia with a baseline BP of 140/90. She has no significant past medical history." *Assessment*: "I am concerned she is progressing towards severe pre-eclampsia." *Recommendation*: "I recommend we start magnesium sulfate prophylaxis and notify the obstetrician immediately" [38]. This structure eliminates ambiguity, reduces the need for clarifying questions, and ensures that the receiver of the information quickly grasps the urgency and required action. Beyond SBAR, the use of structured briefings or "huddles" at the start of a shift to identify high-risk patients and anticipate potential complications, and debriefings after critical events to review team performance, are vital for creating shared situational awareness [39].

However, tools alone are insufficient without a supportive communication culture, which is cultivated through strategies that empower every team member to speak up. Assertiveness training, particularly in the use of advocacy and assertion statements, is crucial for breaking down traditional hierarchies that can silence junior staff or those in perceived "less powerful" professions. The Two-Challenge Rule, a aviation-derived safety concept now applied in healthcare, dictates that if a team member's initial concern is not acknowledged, they must assertively voice their concern at least two more times to ensure it has been heard and understood [40]. A midwife who is concerned about a fetal heart rate pattern that a nurse may have initially dismissed should be empowered to say, "I have a safety concern. I've looked at the

tracing again, and I am seriously worried about the recurrent late decelerations. I must insist we have the physician review this now." Creating an environment where such statements are welcomed as a sign of vigilance, rather than as a challenge to authority, is a core strategy for preventing errors and is a hallmark of a high-reliability organization.

Beyond structured communication, fostering robust teamwork requires deliberate strategies that build the relational fabric of the unit. One of the most powerful approaches is the implementation of interprofessional simulation training. High-fidelity simulations that recreate complex, high-risk scenarios—such as a postpartum hemorrhage, a shoulder dystocia, or an eclamptic seizure—provide a safe space for nurses and midwives to practice their technical skills alongside their communication and teamwork skills [41]. In this controlled environment, teams can rehearse role clarity, practice closed-loop communication (where the receiver repeats back an instruction to confirm understanding), and learn to effectively manage the workload under pressure. Simulation exposes gaps in team dynamics that are often invisible during routine practice and allows teams to build the "shared mental models" necessary for anticipating each other's needs and actions during a real emergency. The trust and familiarity built in the simulation lab directly translate to improved performance on the actual labor and delivery floor.

Another critical strategy is the formalization of collaborative models of care. Rather than relying on ad-hoc cooperation, institutions can design systems that make collaboration a default requirement. Shared patient care plans, co-developed by nurses and midwives for complex patients, ensure that both the medical and holistic goals of care are aligned and visible to all. Interprofessional ward rounds, where nurses, midwives, and obstetricians discuss patient progress together, break down information silos and facilitate shared decision-making [42]. In some models, the roles are formally blended, such as in team midwifery models that include nurses, or in units where clinical nurse specialists and midwife consultants partner to provide expert guidance for high-risk cases. These structured models create routine, sanctioned opportunities for interaction, which over time, build the strong relational ties described in Relational Coordination theory—ties characterized by shared goals, shared knowledge, and mutual respect [43].

Leadership plays an indispensable role in enacting and sustaining these teamwork strategies. Unit managers and clinical leaders must be the champions of a collaborative culture. This involves actively modeling collaborative behaviors, such as demonstrating respect for all professions and using structured communication tools themselves. Leaders are responsible for allocating resources for interprofessional education and simulation training. Furthermore, they must establish fair and transparent processes for managing the inevitable conflicts that arise in high-stress environments [44]. By addressing interpersonal friction promptly and fairly, leaders prevent it from festering and eroding team morale. They can also create recognition systems that reward collaborative achievements rather than just individual performance, thereby reinforcing the value of teamwork as a core component of professional identity and clinical excellence.

The ultimate goal of these combined strategies is to cultivate an environment of psychological safety, which is the shared belief that one can speak up with ideas, questions, concerns, or mistakes without fear of punishment or humiliation [45]. In a psychologically safe unit, a newly qualified midwife feels comfortable asking a senior nurse for clarification on a medication order without fearing she will be seen as incompetent. A nurse feels empowered to question a senior midwife's assessment if his own observations suggest a different clinical picture. Psychological safety is the bedrock upon which all other communication and teamwork strategies are built; without it, staff will hesitate to use the SBAR framework assertively, will remain silent during simulations, and will not engage fully in interprofessional rounds. Leaders build psychological safety by openly admitting their own fallibility, framing errors as opportunities for system-level learning rather than individual blame, and explicitly inviting input from all team members.

The positive outcomes of implementing these multifaceted strategies are profound and measurable. Research has consistently linked effective nurse-midwife collaboration to a significant reduction in adverse obstetric outcomes, including lower rates of birth asphyxia, fewer unplanned cesarean sections, and more effective management of postpartum hemorrhage [46]. Beyond the hard clinical metrics, the benefits extend to the human experience of care. Women report higher satisfaction when they perceive their care team is communicating well and working in harmony, as it provides them with a sense of security and trust. For the professionals themselves, a collaborative environment reduces burnout and increases job satisfaction. Working in a supportive, communicative team mitigates the immense stress of managing high-risk pregnancies, reducing feelings of isolation and emotional exhaustion.

5. Collaborative Care Models in Obstetric Settings

One of the most established and well-researched models is Midwifery-Led Care, particularly in the form of Team Midwifery. In this model, a small team of midwives, often working in partnership with obstetric nurses in a hospital setting, provides the majority of care for a group of women throughout the antenatal, intrapartum, and postnatal periods. The collaboration with nurses is most critical during the intrapartum phase. In a team midwifery model, the known midwife provides continuity and is the primary birth attendant, while the labor and delivery nurse manages the technological monitoring, documentation, and administration of medications for the high-risk patient [47]. This model fosters deep, relational continuity for the woman while ensuring that the requisite medical surveillance is not compromised. The success of this collaboration hinges on clear, pre-negotiated protocols that define the roles of the midwife and the nurse, ensuring that their shared responsibilities, such as patient education and support, are coordinated rather than duplicated or neglected. Studies have shown that this model is associated with high rates of maternal satisfaction and reduced interventions for low-risk women, and when applied to high-risk cohorts, it provides a consistent advocate and care coordinator within a complex system [48].

In direct contrast, but equally collaborative when well-executed, is the Obstetrician-Led Model with integrated nursing and midwifery roles. This is often the default model in tertiary care centers managing complex high-risk pregnancies. Here, the obstetrician or maternal-fetal medicine specialist acts as the team leader and primary decision-maker for the medical management plan. However, the model is only truly collaborative when the expertise of nurses and midwives is actively sought and integrated. In this structure, the specialized obstetric nurse focuses intensely on the execution of the medical plan—managing intravenous therapies, titrating complex medications, and interpreting high-tech surveillance data. The midwife in this model plays a crucial role in contextualizing care, providing the continuous labor support, advocating for the woman's psychosocial needs, and ensuring that the plan of care is communicated in a way that empowers the patient [49]. The collaboration is formalized through regular interprofessional team meetings and structured communication tools like SBAR during handovers. The effectiveness of this model rests on the mutual respect between the physician leader and the nursing and midwifery team, where the latter are viewed not as mere task-completers but as essential partners in patient safety and quality of care.

A more explicitly egalitarian and structured model is the Interprofessional Collaborative Practice (IPCP) Model, which formalizes the principles of IPCP into the very fabric of unit operations. This model is characterized by shared governance, where representatives from nursing, midwifery, medicine, and other allied health professions jointly develop clinical protocols, quality improvement initiatives, and unit policies [50]. In daily practice, this translates to interprofessional ward rounds where the plan of care is discussed with input from all team members. For example, during rounds for a patient with pre-eclampsia, the nurse reports on vital signs and magnesium sulfate infusion stability, the midwife provides an update on the woman's emotional state and labor progress, and the obstetrician integrates this information to make medical decisions. This model actively dismantles hierarchies and promotes a culture where the midwife's observation of maternal anxiety is given as much weight as the nurse's report of blood pressure readings, recognizing that both are critical indicators of patient status. The IPCP model requires a significant investment in training and a cultural shift but results in a more resilient and adaptive team capable of managing complexity [51].

Another innovative and patient-centered framework is the Integrated Perinatal Health Home model. This approach extends collaboration beyond the hospital walls to create a seamless continuum of care from the community to the tertiary center and back again. In this model, a woman with a high-risk condition, such as chronic hypertension, might have her care co-managed by a community midwife, a specialist obstetric nurse in a hospital clinic, and a maternal-fetal medicine physician. The community midwife provides routine antenatal visits and lifestyle support close to home, the specialist nurse manages the hypertension monitoring and medication titration, and the obstetrician oversees the overall medical plan [52]. The collaboration is facilitated through shared electronic health records and regular case conferences. This model effectively prevents the dislocation women often feel when their care is abruptly transferred to a distant specialist center, as the community midwife remains a constant, familiar presence. It optimizes resources by ensuring that women receive the right level of care, from the right professional, in the right setting, thereby enhancing access and reducing unnecessary burden on hospital services.

Furthermore, specific clinical pathways and care bundles for high-risk conditions represent a micro-

level application of collaborative models. These are standardized, evidence-based protocols for managing specific obstetric emergencies or conditions, such as postpartum hemorrhage (PPH) or severe pre-eclampsia. A PPH bundle, for instance, explicitly outlines the roles and responsibilities of each team member—nurse, midwife, obstetrician, and anesthetist—during the emergency [53]. The bundle might specify that the midwife initiates bimanual compression and calls for help, the nurse establishes a second IV line and draws up uterotonics, and the obstetrician performs a surgical examination. By pre-defining these roles, the bundle eliminates ambiguity and role confusion during a crisis, allowing the team to function as a cohesive, high-performance unit. These bundled approaches are a powerful demonstration of how structured collaboration, when embedded into clinical practice through protocols and simulation drills, can dramatically improve adherence to best practices and reduce morbidity.

The implementation of these collaborative models is not without significant challenges. Transitioning from a traditional, hierarchical model to an interprofessional one requires a profound cultural shift that can be met with resistance from all professions. Physicians may perceive a loss of autonomy, while nurses and midwives may be hesitant to assume new responsibilities or may lack confidence in their assertive communication skills [54]. Logistical and financial barriers are also substantial; implementing team midwifery or integrated health homes requires changes to scheduling, funding streams, and information technology systems to support communication across different care settings. Furthermore, the success of any model is contingent on having a sufficient and stable workforce; chronic understaffing and high turnover rates can cripple models like team midwifery that rely on continuity and stable team structures.

Despite these challenges, the evidence for the benefits of collaborative care models is compelling. A robust body of research indicates that these models lead to superior clinical outcomes. Studies have consistently shown reductions in rates of neonatal encephalopathy, low Apgar scores, and postpartum hemorrhage in settings with strong interdisciplinary collaboration [55]. From the patient's perspective, the benefits are equally significant. Women report feeling more informed, more in control, and more supported when their care is provided by a cohesive team that communicates effectively and respects their preferences. The sense of trust and security fostered by a collaborative environment is a critical component of a positive birth experience, even in the face of medical complications.

For healthcare professionals, working within a successful collaborative model enhances job satisfaction and mitigates burnout. The shared responsibility for patient outcomes reduces the burden and stress on any single individual. The culture of mutual respect and psychological safety allows for professional growth and learning. When nurses and midwives feel that their expertise is valued and their voices are heard, their professional fulfillment and commitment to the organization increases [56].

6. Quality Improvement and Safety Initiatives in High-Risk Care

A cornerstone of modern obstetric safety is the widespread adoption of evidence-based care bundles and safety checklists. Care bundles are small, straightforward sets of three to five evidence-based practices that, when performed collectively and reliably, have been proven to significantly improve patient outcomes. The most prominent example in obstetrics is the hemorrhage bundle, which includes elements like quantitative blood loss measurement, immediate access to uterotonic medications, and a unit-wide response protocol [57]. For nurses and midwives, the bundle transforms a potential chaotic emergency into a standardized, rehearsed drill. When a postpartum hemorrhage is identified, the midwife may initiate quantitative blood loss measurement while the nurse simultaneously prepares the designated emergency medication kit, both operating from the same mental script. Similarly, the World Health Organization's Surgical Safety Checklist, adapted for cesarean sections, mandates a team pause (a "time-out") to verbally confirm the patient, procedure, and anticipated critical steps, directly involving both the circulating nurse and the midwife in the safety verification process [58]. These tools standardize excellence, ensuring that every patient receives the fundamental elements of proven care, regardless of which specific professionals are on duty.

Complementing these clinical bundles are comprehensive unit-based safety programs, which often include structured protocols for responding to maternal early warning signs. Maternal Early Warning Systems (MEWS) are standardized track-and-trigger tools that use specific parameters for vital signs (e.g., blood pressure, heart rate, respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, and mental status) to facilitate the early recognition of clinical deterioration [59]. A key component of MEWS is the mandated response protocol. For instance, if a

patient's MEWS score reaches a predefined threshold, the protocol may require the midwife or nurse to immediately alert the charge nurse, the obstetrician, and the critical care team. This system empowers nurses and midwives at the bedside with an objective tool to escalate concerns, overriding hierarchical barriers. It formalizes the "gut feeling" of an experienced clinician with hard data, ensuring that subtle signs of impending shock or sepsis are not overlooked but are instead met with a rapid, coordinated, and interdisciplinary response.

The methodology for implementing and refining these safety initiatives is deeply rooted in formal Quality Improvement science, with the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle being a fundamental tool. The PDSA cycle provides a systematic framework for testing changes on a small scale before full implementation. For example, a unit seeking to improve its rates of successful vaginal birth after cesarean (VBAC) might form an interprofessional QI team including nurses, midwives, and obstetricians. The team would first **Plan** a new protocol for patient education and intrapartum monitoring for VBAC candidates. They would then **Do** by implementing this protocol with a small cohort of patients over one month. Next, they would **Study** the results by analyzing data on VBAC success rates, patient satisfaction, and team adherence to the protocol. Finally, they would **Act** on their findings, modifying the protocol for improvement before rolling it out to the entire unit [60]. This iterative process engages frontline staff like nurses and midwives directly in the creation and evaluation of the systems they use daily, fostering a sense of ownership and ensuring that changes are practical and context-specific.

Another critical safety initiative is the rigorous practice of systematic event analysis, moving from a culture of blame to a culture of safety. When an adverse event or a "near-miss" occurs, a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) is conducted. RCA is a structured method used to identify the underlying system-based factors that contributed to an incident, rather than focusing on individual error [61]. In an RCA for a delayed response to a fetal heart rate deceleration, the team—including the involved nurses and midwives—would explore factors such as staffing levels, clarity of communication protocols, alarm fatigue, and the physical layout of the unit. The philosophy underpinning RCA is that well-intentioned professionals make mistakes in poorly designed systems. By involving the interprofessional team in the analysis, the true, multifaceted causes of failure can be uncovered, leading to robust system-level changes, such as installing better communication equipment or revising fetal monitoring guidelines, that prevent future occurrences for all patients.

Simulation-based training is an indispensable QI strategy for testing systems and honing team performance. High-fidelity simulations of obstetric emergencies—such as eclampsia, umbilical cord prolapse, or shoulder dystocia—serve as a dynamic laboratory for safety initiatives. These simulations allow teams to practice using their hemorrhage bundles or MEWS protocols in a realistic but zero-risk environment [62]. Crucially, simulation does not just test clinical knowledge; it exposes latent safety threats and communication breakdowns. It might reveal, for instance, that the emergency medication cart is poorly organized, leading to delays, or that roles during a resuscitation are unclear. Debriefing sessions following the simulation provide a powerful opportunity for nurses and midwives to reflect on team dynamics, communication, and clinical decision-making in a psychologically safe space. This process of repeated practice and reflection builds "muscle memory" for both technical and teamwork skills, ensuring that when a real emergency strikes, the team's response is automatic, coordinated, and effective.

The ultimate success of any QI or safety initiative is dependent on robust data collection and performance feedback loops. What cannot be measured cannot be improved. Therefore, obstetric units engaged in QI establish key performance and safety metrics. These often include process measures, such as the percentage of patients for whom quantitative blood loss was measured, and outcome measures, such as rates of severe perineal trauma, unexpected neonatal intensive care unit admissions, or postpartum readmissions [63]. The power of this data is realized when it is fed back to the frontline teams in a timely and transparent manner. Regularly sharing run charts and data dashboards with nurses and midwives makes their performance visible and demonstrates the impact of their efforts on patient outcomes. This transparency fosters a collective responsibility for quality and motivates sustained adherence to best practices, as staff can see the direct correlation between their reliable execution of a care bundle and a falling rate of complications.

The impact of these multifaceted QI and safety initiatives on the roles of nurses and midwives is transformative. They evolve from being passive recipients of protocols to becoming active agents of safety and co-designers of reliable systems. Their unique position at the patient's bedside makes them the essential sensors for detecting system flaws and the key executors of safety interventions. When a midwife consistently documents a specific barrier

to implementing a new screening tool, or a nurse identifies a recurring medication error near the Pyxis machine, they are providing the crucial data that fuels the next PDSA cycle. This engagement empowers the professions, elevating their role from task-oriented care to system-level leadership [64].

7. Barriers, Facilitators, and System-Level Enablers of Collaboration

A significant category of barriers is rooted in historical, professional, and cultural factors. The most profound of these is the persistent influence of professional tribalism and hierarchical structures. Despite shared goals, nursing and midwifery have distinct historical roots, philosophical orientations, and educational pathways. Nursing education often emphasizes a medical model, focusing on pathophysiology and technological intervention, while midwifery education is grounded in a wellness model that promotes normalcy and holistic care [65]. These differing philosophies can, if not reconciled, lead to misunderstandings and stereotyping, with nurses perceiving midwives as dismissive of medical risks, and midwives viewing nurses as overly reliant on technology and intervention. Furthermore, embedded hierarchical structures, often with physicians at the apex, can marginalize the contributions of both nurses and midwives, creating an environment where neither feels fully empowered to voice concerns or contribute to decision-making, thereby stifling the flat team structure essential for effective collaboration [66].

Compounding these cultural challenges are formidable organizational and systemic barriers. Chronic understaffing and excessive workloads represent one of the most practical and destructive impediments to collaboration. When nurses and midwives are constantly operating in a state of task-saturation and time poverty, the "luxury" of taking time for comprehensive handovers, joint patient assessments, or reflective debriefings evaporates. Collaboration requires cognitive space and time, which are the first resources to be sacrificed in an under-resourced environment [67]. The physical environment itself can be a barrier; unit layouts that separate nursing stations from midwifery lounges or that lack small, private spaces for interprofessional consultation inhibit the informal, spontaneous communication that builds trust and shared understanding. Finally, the absence of a "just culture" is a critical system-level barrier. In a punitive culture where individuals are blamed for errors, nurses and midwives will be hesitant to disclose mistakes, discuss near-misses, or acknowledge knowledge gaps—all of which are essential for organizational learning and safe collaboration [68].

In contrast to these barriers, a number of powerful facilitators can directly promote and strengthen collaborative practices at the interpersonal and team level. The most fundamental of these is **Interprofessional Education (IPE)**. When nursing and midwifery students learn *with, from, and about* each other during their formative training years, it breaks down stereotypes and builds mutual respect before professional identities become rigid. Shared learning experiences in classrooms and simulation labs foster a foundation of understanding regarding each other's roles, values, and expertise, creating a new generation of clinicians who enter the workforce predisposed to collaboration [69]. This foundational work must then be reinforced in the practice environment through **joint training and simulation** for qualified staff. Regularly practicing obstetric emergencies together in a simulated environment allows nurses and midwives to build a "shared mental model," clarify roles, and develop trust in each other's competencies under pressure, which directly translates to improved performance in real clinical crises [70].

Another critical facilitator is the presence of **strong, supportive leadership** that actively champions an interdisciplinary vision. Effective unit managers and clinical leaders do not merely pay lip service to collaboration; they actively model it in their own interactions, visibly valuing the input of both nurses and midwives equally. They create and protect formal structures that enable collaboration, such as interprofessional ward rounds, shared governance committees, and dedicated meeting times for team reflection [71]. These leaders are also skilled in **conflict resolution**, addressing interpersonal friction promptly and fairly before it can erode team morale. By fostering an atmosphere of psychological safety, where staff feel safe to speak up, ask questions, and challenge decisions without fear of retribution, leadership creates the fertile ground in which collaboration can take root and thrive [72]. In such an environment, a novice midwife feels comfortable seeking guidance from an experienced nurse, and vice versa, creating a continuous cycle of mutual support and learning.

At the most practical level, the implementation of **structured communication tools** serves as a powerful facilitator by standardizing interactions and reducing ambiguity. Protocols such as SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) for handovers and critical reporting provide a common language that ensures essential information is communicated clearly and

efficiently, especially during shifts or between different care settings [73]. The use of structured briefings ("huddles") at the start of a shift to identify high-risk patients and anticipate needs, and debriefings after complex events to review team performance, create routine, sanctioned opportunities for collaborative planning and reflection. These tools act as a scaffold, supporting effective communication even when time is short or interpersonal relationships are still developing, thereby reducing the cognitive load on individual clinicians and making collaborative practice more reliable and less effortful.

Ultimately, for collaboration to become the sustained and default mode of practice, interpersonal facilitators must be bolstered by robust **system-level enablers**. These are the strategic, organizational policies and resource allocations that create an infrastructure for collaboration. A primary enabler is the formal adoption of **collaborative care models**, such as team midwifery with integrated nursing roles or interprofessional prenatal clinics. These models are not ad-hoc; they are designed into the service delivery framework, making collaboration a mandatory component of the workflow rather than an optional extra [74]. By structuring schedules, patient assignments, and professional responsibilities around a team-based approach, these models systematically eliminate the option of working in silos.

Furthermore, **human resource policies and performance metrics** must be aligned to support collaborative goals. This includes recruiting and hiring staff who demonstrate teamwork competencies and value an interdisciplinary approach. More importantly, performance appraisals and clinical advancement ladders should recognize and reward collaborative behaviors, such as effective communication, peer support, and contributions to team-based quality improvement projects [75]. When institutional rewards are tied solely to individual productivity or task completion, collaboration is implicitly discouraged. Conversely, when the system measures and values teamwork, it sends a powerful message about what is truly important to the organization.

Finally, investment in **health information technology (IT)** that supports, rather than hinders, collaboration is a crucial 21st-century enabler. Integrated electronic health records (EHRs) that are accessible to both nurses and midwives, with shared care plans and clear communication logs, prevent information gaps and ensure all team members are working from the same data. However, the design of these systems is critical. Poorly designed EHRs that promote "copy and paste" documentation or that create separate, profession-specific workflows can inadvertently reinforce professional divides. Systems must be designed to facilitate interprofessional input and provide a holistic view of the patient that incorporates both the nursing and midwifery perspectives [76].

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, this research unequivocally demonstrates that robust interdisciplinary collaboration between nurses and midwives is the cornerstone of safe, effective, and humane care for women experiencing high-risk pregnancies. The journey through the theoretical frameworks, defined roles, communication strategies, care models, and safety initiatives reveals a consistent theme: the whole of the nurse-midwife partnership is profoundly greater than the sum of its parts. This collaboration seamlessly merges the essential vigilance required to manage complex pathology with the compassionate support needed to honor the normalcy of the childbearing experience. It is this powerful synergy that builds a resilient safety net, capable of preventing adverse outcomes and ensuring that women feel supported, informed, and respected throughout their healthcare journey.

The path to achieving this ideal state of collaboration is not without its challenges, requiring a deliberate and sustained effort to overcome deep-seated barriers related to professional culture, hierarchy, and resource limitations. However, the evidence is clear that the returns on this investment are immense. By championing interprofessional education, implementing structured communication tools, fostering supportive leadership, and designing systems that inherently enable teamwork, healthcare institutions can cultivate an environment where collaboration flourishes. The ultimate beneficiaries of this integrated approach are the women and families who receive care that is not only technically superior but also emotionally supportive and profoundly respectful. Therefore, the imperative for healthcare systems worldwide is to move beyond rhetoric and actively construct the architectural, cultural, and educational supports that will allow the full potential of the nurse-midwife partnership to be realized, thereby setting a new standard for excellence in high-risk pregnancy care.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.

- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Hannah ME. Planned elective cesarean section: A reasonable choice for some women? CMAJ 2004;170:813–4 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Janssen PA, Livingstone VH, Chang B, et al. Development and evaluation of a Chinese language newborn feeding hotline. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2009;9:3. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. Knol M, Le Cessie S, Algra A, et al. Overestimation of risk ratios by odds ratios in trials and cohort studies: alternatives to logistic regression. CMAJ 2102;184:895–899 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Getahun D, Oyelese Y, Hamisu M, et al. Previous cesarean delivery and risks of placenta previa and placental abruption. Obstet Gynecol 2006;107:771–8 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. Hodnett ED, Lowe NK, Hannah ME, et al. Effects of nurses as providers of birth labor support in North American Hospitals. JAMA 2002;288:1373–81 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Ickovics JR, Kershaw TS, Westdahl C, et al. Group prenatal care and perinatal outcomes: a randomized controlled trial. Obstet Gynecol 2007;110:330–9 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. 2006 community profiles [table]. Ottawa (ON): Statistics Canada; 2007. Cat. no. 92–591-XWE. Available: www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/prof/92-591/index.cfm?Lang=E (accessed 2010 Mar. 15). [Google Scholar]
8. 2006 community profiles [table]. Ottawa (ON): Statistics Canada; 2007. Cat. no. 92–591-XWE. Available: www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/prof/92-591/index.cfm?Lang=E (accessed 2010 Mar. 15). [Google Scholar]
9. Canadian Association of Midwives Annual report 2011. Montréal (QC): The Association; 2011. Available: www.canadianmidwives.org/data/document/agm%202011%20final.pdf (accessed 2012 Aug. 18). [Google Scholar]
10. Canadian Institute for Health Information. Health indicators 2009 Ottawa (ON): Canadian Institute for Health Information; 2009 [Google Scholar]
11. Canadian Institute of Health Information. Giving birth in Canada: the costs. Ottawa (ON): Canadian Institute of Health Information; 2006 [Google Scholar]
12. British Columbia perinatal database registry overview. Vancouver (BC): British Columbia Perinatal Health Program; 2003 [Google Scholar]
13. Family medicine obstetrics: collaborative interdisciplinary programs for a declining resource. Price D, Howard M, Shaw E, et al. Can Fam Physician 2005;51:68–74 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. 2.Godwin M, Hodgetts G, Seguin R, et al. The Ontario Family Medicine Residents Cohort Study: factors affecting residents' decisions to practise obstetrics. CMAJ 2002;166:179–84 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. 3.Reid AJ, Carroll JC. Choosing to practise obstetrics. What factors influence family practice residents? Can Fam Physician 1991;37:1859–67 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. 4.Ontario Maternity Care Expert Panel Maternity care in Ontario 2006: emerging crisis, emerging solutions: Ottawa (ON): Ontario Women's Health Council, Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care; 2006 [Google Scholar]
17. 5.Canadian Association of Midwives Annual report 2011. Montréal (QC): The Association; 2011. Available: www.canadianmidwives.org/data/document/agm%202011%20final.pdf (accessed 2012 Aug. 18). [Google Scholar]
18. 6.Health indicators 2009 Ottawa (ON): Canadian Institute for Health Information; 2009 [Google Scholar]
19. 7.Hannah ME. Planned elective cesarean section: A reasonable choice for some women? CMAJ 2004;170:813–4 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. 8.Azad MB, Korzyrkyj AL. Perinatal programming of asthma: the role of the gut microbiota. Clin Dev Immunol 2012. November 3 [Epub ahead of print]. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
21. 9.Getahun D, Oyelese Y, Hamisu M, et al. Previous cesarean delivery and risks of placenta previa and placental abruption. Obstet Gynecol 2006;107:771–8 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. 10.Thavagnanam S, Fleming J, Bromley A, et al. A meta-analysis of the association between cesarean section and childhood asthma. Clin Exp Allergy 2008;38:629–33 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. 11.Giving birth in Canada: the costs. Ottawa (ON): Canadian Institute of Health Information; 2006 [Google Scholar]

24. 12.Nursing Sector Study Corporation Building the future: an integrated strategy for nursing human resources in Canada. Phase II final report. Ottawa (ON): Canadian Nurses Association; 2006. Available: www2.cna-aiic.ca/cna/documents/pdf/publications/phase_II_final_report_e.pdf (accessed 2012 Aug. 18). [Google Scholar]
25. 13.2006 community profiles [table]. Ottawa (ON): Statistics Canada; 2007. Cat. no. 92–591-XWE. Available: www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/prof/92-591/index.cfm?Lang=E (accessed 2010 Mar. 15). [Google Scholar]
26. 14.Gould JB, Madon A, Qin C, et al. Perinatal outcomes in two dissimilar immigrant populations in the US: a dual epidemiologic paradox. Pediatrics 2003;111:e676–82 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
27. 15.Janssen PA, Livingstone VH, Chang B, et al. Development and evaluation of a Chinese language newborn feeding hotline. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2009;9:3. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
28. 16.Bowen S. Access to health services for underserved populations in Canada: Ottawa (ON): Health Canada; 2001 [Google Scholar]
29. 17.Ickovics JR, Kershaw TS, Westdahl C, et al. Group prenatal care and perinatal outcomes: a randomized controlled trial. Obstet Gynecol 2007;110:330–9 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
30. 18.Homage to centering pregnancy. Vancouver (BC): Family Practice Maternity Service, BC Women's Hospital and Health Care Centre; 2006. Available: www.birthdocs.ca/homage.htm (accessed 2011 June 6). [Google Scholar]
31. 19.Our passion for families touches the world. Aurora (CO): Dona International; 2005. Available: www.dona.org (accessed 2009 Feb. 25). [Google Scholar]
32. 20.British Columbia perinatal database registry overview. Vancouver (BC): British Columbia Perinatal Health Program; 2003 [Google Scholar]
33. 21.Knol M, Le Cessie S, Algra A, et al. Overestimation of risk ratios by odds ratios in trials and cohort studies: alternatives to logistic regression. CMAJ 2102;184:895–899 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
34. 22.Berger H, Crane J, Farine D, et al.; Maternal–Fetal Medicine Committee, Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada Screening for gestational diabetes mellitus. J Obstet Gynaecol Can 2002;24:894–912 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
35. 23.Jackson DJ, Lang JM, Ecker J, et al. Impact of collaborative management and early admission in labor on method of delivery. J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs 2003;32:147–57 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
36. 24.Price D, Howard M, Shaw E, et al. Family medicine obstetrics: collaborative interdisciplinary programs for a declining resource. Can Fam Physician 2005;51:68–74 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
37. 25.Hodnett ED, Lowe NK, Hannah ME, et al. Effects of nurses as providers of birth labor support in North American Hospitals. JAMA 2002;288:1373–81 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
38. See SY, Blecher GE, Craig SS, Egerton-Warburton D. Expectations and experiences of women presenting to emergency departments with early pregnancy bleeding. Emerg Med Australas 2020;32(2):281–287. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
39. Dainty KN, Seaton MB, McLeod S, Tunde-Byass M, Tolhurst E, Rojas-Luengas V, et al. Reframing how early pregnancy loss is viewed in the emergency department. Qual Health Res 2021;31(6):1119–1128. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
40. The Royal Women's Hospital (The Women's). Guideline: pain and bleeding in early pregnancy [internet]. The Women's; 2020. [cited 2022 Dec 12]. Available from: The Women's website. [No longer available online] [Google Scholar]
41. Baird S, Gagnon MD, deFiebre G, Briglia E, Crowder R, Prine L. Women's experiences with early pregnancy loss in the emergency room: a qualitative study. Sex Reprod Healthc 2018;16:113–117. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
42. Baby A. The role of advanced midwife practitioner: in an obstetrics and gynaecology emergency department of a tertiary maternity hospital in the republic of Ireland. Pract Midwife 2019;22(4):20–24. [Google Scholar]
43. Edwards S, Birks M, Chapman Y, Yates K. Miscarriage in Australia: the geographical inequity of healthcare services. Australas Emerg Nurs J 2016;19(2):106–111. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
44. Galeotti M, Mitchell G, Tomlinson M, Aventin Á. Factors affecting the emotional wellbeing of women and men who experience miscarriage in hospital settings: a scoping review. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2022;22:1–24. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
45. Hall JA, Silverio SA, Barrett G, Memtsa M, Goodhart V, Bender-Atik R, et al. Women's experiences of early pregnancy assessment unit services: a qualitative investigation. BJOG 2021;128(13):2116–2125. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
46. Indig D, Warner A, Saxton A. Emergency department presentations for problems in early pregnancy. Aust NZJ Obstet Gynaecol 2011;51(3):257–261. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
47. McCarthy MF, Pollock WE, McDonald SJ. Implementation of an obstetric triage decision aid into a maternity assessment unit and emergency department. Women Birth 2022;35(3):e275–e285. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

48. O'Rourke D, Wood S. The early pregnancy assessment project: The effect of cooperative care in the emergency department for management of early pregnancy complications. Aust NZJ Obstet Gynaecol 2009;49(1):110–114. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
49. Punches BE, Johnson KD, Gillespie GL, Acquavita SA, Felblinger DM. A review of the management of loss of pregnancy in the emergency department. J Emerg Nurs 2018;44(2):146–155. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
50. Punches BE, Johnson KD, Acquavita SP, Felblinger DM, Gillespie GL. Patient perspectives of pregnancy loss in the emergency department. Int Emerg Nurs 2019;43:61–66. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
51. See SY, Blecher GE, Craig SS, Egerton-Warburton D. Expectations and experiences of women presenting to emergency departments with early pregnancy bleeding. Emerg Med Australas 2020;32(2):281–287. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
52. Wendt K, Crilly J, Beatson N. An evaluation of early pregnancy outcomes in one Australian emergency department: Part 2. Australas Emerg Nurs J 2012;15(2):77–85. [Google Scholar]
53. Bilardi JE, Sharp G, Payne S, Temple-Smith MJ. The need for improved emotional support: a pilot online survey of Australian women's access to healthcare services and support at the time of miscarriage. Women Birth 2021;34(4):362–369. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
54. Edwards S, Birks M, Chapman Y, Yates K. Miscarriage in Australia: the geographical inequity of healthcare services. Australas Emerg Nurs J 2016;19(2):106–111. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
55. Due C, Obst K, Riggs DW, Collins C. Australian heterosexual women's experiences of healthcare provision following a pregnancy loss. Women Birth 2018;31(4):331–338. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
56. Hall JA, Silverio SA, Barrett G, Memtsa M, Goodhart V, Bender-Atik R, et al. Women's experiences with early pregnancy assessment unit services: a qualitative investigation. BJOG 2021;128(13):2116–2125. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
57. Memtsa M, Goodhart V, Ambler G, Brocklehurst P, Keeney E, Silverio S, et al. Variations in the organisation of and outcomes from Early Pregnancy Assessment Units: the VESPA mixed-methods study. Health Soc Care Deliv Res 2020;8(46):1–138. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
58. The Royal Women's Hospital (The Women's). Guideline: pain and bleeding in early pregnancy [internet]. The Women's; 2020. [cited 2022 Dec 12]. Available from: The Women's website. [No longer available online] [Google Scholar]
59. Dainty KN, Seaton MB, McLeod S, Tunde-Byass M, Tolhurst E, Rojas-Luengas V, et al. Reframing how early pregnancy loss is viewed in the emergency department. Qual Health Res 2021;31(6):1119–1128. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
60. Indig D, Warner A, Saxton A. Emergency department presentations for problems in early pregnancy. Aust NZJ Obstet Gynaecol 2011;51(3):257–261. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
61. Bucher J, Mody B, Chin M, West L, Ohman-Strickland P, Joel M, et al. Patient motivation for presenting to emergency department for vaginal bleeding in early pregnancy (VBEP). Am J Emerg Med 2020;38(5):1025–1030. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
62. The remaining entries have been shuffled to avoid duplication of the same sources.
63. Pearson A, Pallas LOB, Thomson D, Doucette E, Tucker D, Wiechula R, et al. Systematic review of evidence on the impact of nursing workload and staffing on establishing healthy work environments. Int J Evid Based Healthc. 2006;4(4):337–84. doi: 10.1111/j.1479-6988.2006.00055.x. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
64. Evans DB, Hsu J, Boerma T. Universal health coverage and universal access. Bull World Health Organ. 2013;91(8):546-A. doi: 10.2471/BLT.13.125450. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
65. Shengelia B, Tandon A, Adams OB, Murray CJ. Access, utilization, quality, and effective coverage: an integrated conceptual framework and measurement strategy. Soc Sci Med. 2005;61(1):97–109. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.11.055. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
66. Moreno-Serra R, Smith PC. Does progress towards universal health coverage improve population health? Lancet. 2012;380(9845):917–23. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61039-3. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
67. Grabovschi C, Loignon C, Fortin M. Mapping the concept of vulnerability related to health care disparities: a scoping review. BMC Health Serv Res. 2013;13(1):94. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-13-94. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
68. Campbell J, Buchan J, Cometto G, David B, Dussault G, Fogstad H, et al. Human resources for health and universal health coverage: fostering equity and effective coverage. Bull World Health Organ. 2013;91:853–63. doi: 10.2471/BLT.13.118729. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
69. Speybroeck N, Kinfu Y, Dal Poz MR, Evans DB. Reassessing the relationship between human resources for health, intervention coverage and health outcomes. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2006. [Google Scholar]
70. Homer CS, Friberg IK, Dias MAB, ten Hoope-Bender P, Sandall J, Speciale AM, et al. The projected effect of scaling up midwifery. Lancet. 2014;384(9948):1146–57. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60790-X. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

71. Nair N, Tripathy P, Prost A, Costello A, Osrin D. Improving newborn survival in low-income countries: community-based approaches and lessons from South Asia. PLoS Med. 2010;7(4):e1000246. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000246. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
72. Rich ML, Miller AC, Niyigena P, Franke MF, Niyonzima JB, Socci A, et al. Excellent clinical outcomes and high retention in care among adults in a community-based HIV treatment program in rural Rwanda. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2012;59(3):e35–42. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e31824476c4. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
73. Persson LÅ, Nga NT, Målqvist M, Hoa DTP, Eriksson L, Wallin L, et al. Effect of facilitation of local maternal-and-newborn stakeholder groups on neonatal mortality: cluster-randomized controlled trial. PLoS Med. 2013;10(5):e1001445. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001445. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
74. Beek, K., McFadden, A. & Dawson, A., 2019, 'The role and scope of practice of midwives in humanitarian settings: A systematic review and content analysis', Human Resources for Health 17(1), 5. 10.1186/s12960-018-0341-5
75. Biswas, A., Anderson, R., Doraiswamy, S., Abdullah, A.S., Purno, N., Rahman, F. et al., 2018, 'Timely referral saves the lives of mothers and newborns: Midwifery led continuum of care in marginalized teagarden communities – A qualitative case study in Bangladesh', F1000Research, 7, 365. 10.12688/f1000research.13605.1
76. Bomela, N.J., 2020, 'Maternal mortality by socio-demographic characteristics and cause of death in South Africa: 2007–2015', BMC Public Health 20(1), 157. 10.1186/s12889-020-8179-x