

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

Full title: Factors influencing referral to maternity models of care in Australian general practice

Short title: Referral to maternity models of care

J Thomas<sup>1\*</sup>, L Kuliukas<sup>1</sup>, J Frayne<sup>2</sup>, Z Bradfield<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Nursing, Curtin University, Western Australia, Australia,

<sup>2</sup>Medical School, University of Western Australia, Western Australia, Australia

\*Corresponding author

Email: [19175638@postgrad.curtin.edu.au](mailto:19175638@postgrad.curtin.edu.au) (JT)

## 24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** In the Australian maternity system, general practitioners play a vital role in  
26 advising and directing prospective parents to maternity models of care. Optimising model of  
27 care discussions and the decision-making process avoids misaligning women with over or  
28 under specialised care, reduces the potential for disruptive care transitions and unnecessary  
29 healthcare costs, and is critical in ensuring consumer satisfaction. Current literature  
30 overwhelmingly focusses on women's decision-making around model of care discussions and  
31 neglects the gatekeeping role of the General Practitioner (GP). This study aimed to explore  
32 and describe the factors influencing Australian GPs decision-making when referring pregnant  
33 women to maternity models of care.

34 **Methods:** This study used a qualitative descriptive approach. General practitioners (N=12)  
35 with experience referring women to maternity models of care in Australia participated in a  
36 semi-structured interview. Interviews occurred between October and November 2021 by  
37 telephone or videoconference. Reflexive thematic analysis was facilitated by NVivo-12 data  
38 management software to codify and interpret themes from the data.

39 **Findings:** Two broad themes were interpreted from the data. The first theme entitled 'GP  
40 Factors', incorporated three associated sub-themes including 'GPs Previous Model of Care  
41 Experience', 'Gaps in GP Knowledge' and 'GP Perception of Models of Care'. The second  
42 theme, entitled 'Woman's Factors', encapsulated two associated sub-themes including the  
43 'Woman's Preferences' and 'Access to Models'.

44 **Conclusions:** This study provides novel evidence regarding general practitioner perspectives  
45 of the factors influencing model of care decision-making and referral. The exploration and  
46 description of factors influencing model of care decisions provide unique insight into the  
47 ways that all stakeholders can experience access to a broader range of models of care

- 48 including midwifery-led continuity of care models aligned with consumer-demand. In
- 49 addition, the role of national primary health networks is outlined as a means to achieving this.

## 50 **Introduction**

51 The Australian healthcare system and its maternity services operate through a two-tier system  
52 of both public and private providers [1, 2]. The national publicly funded universal healthcare  
53 program, Medicare, provides hospital and community-based care to Australian and New  
54 Zealand citizens with predominantly no out-of-pocket costs [2, 3]. Conversely, private  
55 hospitals and services are accessible with private health insurance and a co-payment or  
56 alternatively, incur a full fee for service [2, 3].

57 Within this system, almost all pregnant women will make initial contact with a general  
58 practitioner (GP) when commencing their maternity care journey [4, 5]. GPs provide  
59 healthcare across the lifespan and play a key role in advising and directing prospective  
60 parents to a maternity model of care [2]. They have a gatekeeping function in the way that  
61 access to certain models of care is only granted through the GP referral. Although other  
62 referral pathways exist such as through other clinicians or via self-referral, the GP referral  
63 pathway is the most common way women access models of care [2, 6].

64 In Australia, there are 11 models of maternity care according to the Maternity Care  
65 Classification System (MaCCs), each has their own specific features, personnel, and fee  
66 structure [2, 7]. These can be grouped into five major model of care categories which include  
67 standard public care, shared care, public midwifery continuity care, private obstetric care and  
68 private midwifery care [2, 7]. Standard public care is provided by hospital doctors and  
69 midwives and is government funded [2, 7]. Shared care involves antenatal care delivered by a  
70 community doctor and or midwife, with several key antenatal visits and intrapartum care  
71 occurring in the public hospital [2, 7]. Hospital-based care within a shared care model is  
72 government funded though women may incur out of pocket costs for GP-led visits [2, 7].  
73 Public midwifery continuity of care models are government funded and provided by a  
74 hospital midwife or small team of midwives with birth largely occurring in a birth centre or  
75 public hospital [2, 7]. Within the public midwifery continuity of care category is midwifery  
76 group practice caseload care. Midwifery group practice caseload care involves antenatal care  
77 provided by a known midwife or group of midwives in the hospital, community, home, or  
78 birth centre setting with intrapartum care taking place in the hospital, birth centre or home [2,  
79 7]. Private obstetric care is provided by an obstetrician with birth occurring in a private  
80 hospital and is largely accessible via women's private health insurance though some  
81 Medicare rebates may be available [2, 7]. Subsumed within the private obstetric care major  
82 model category is general practitioner obstetrician care which involves community or  
83 hospital clinic antenatal care and public or private hospital intrapartum care provided by a GP  
84 obstetrician [2, 7]. Finally, private midwifery care involves care by a privately practising  
85 midwife who supports birth in the home or hospital settings and can be partly government  
86 funded and partly consumer funded [2, 7].

87 It is known that 97% of Australian women intend to and will give birth in a hospital setting  
88 but it is not known how women distribute across the models of care at a national level as this  
89 is not yet reported [2, 8]. The first national model of maternity care report was published in  
90 November 2021, has been re-released annually and focusses on the maternity model of care  
91 characteristics [1, 8, 9]. As such, there remains limited data comparing and evaluating the  
92 models of care in Australia [2, 10-12]. Despite this, model of care report data and birthplace  
93 data can be used to infer how women distribute across the models of care. In 2023,  
94 approximately 1000 model of care services were active in Australia and most of these  
95 identified as public hospital maternity care (41%), 14% were midwifery group caseload care  
96 models, 15% identified as shared care models and 11% were private obstetrician specialist  
97 care models [8]. In 2019, Australian birthplace data revealed that 75% of women gave birth  
98 in a public hospital, 22% in a private hospital, 2.3% in a birth centre, 0.6% of women  
99 constituted births before the arrival to a health service and 0.3% of births occurred in the  
100 home setting [13].

## 101 **Significance**

102 In 2009, the Australian Department of Health and Ageing published a maternity service  
103 review and recommended that there be improved model of care choice for women, a greater  
104 range of models of care be made available, an expanded role for midwives, improved access  
105 for Indigenous and rural women and further development of collaborative models of care  
106 [14]. This was strengthened by the most recent national maternity strategy built on four  
107 pillars of choice, safety, access and respect orientated by woman-centred care [15].

108

109 Model of care information, when comprehensive, allows parents to make trade-offs between  
110 the perceived advantages and disadvantages and select a framework that most aligns with  
111 their preferences [12, 16]. In addition, model of care decision making when optimised,

112 enhances consumer satisfaction, prevents over or under specialised care, prevents excessive  
113 healthcare costs and the potential for disruptive care transitions [2, 17].

114

115 The Fourth National Atlas in Healthcare Variation which identifies potentially unwarranted  
116 variation in healthcare has highlighted early planned birth by caesarean section and induction  
117 of labour before 39 weeks without medical indication as an area of concern [18]. Early  
118 planned birth has been identified as a key contributor to neonatal respiratory problems,  
119 admission to neonatal intensive care units and longer-term cognitive deficits in children [18].

120 It is well accepted that midwifery- led continuity of care confers a range of benefits to  
121 mothers and infants including a higher chance of a normal labour and birth and less chance of  
122 intrapartum caesarean section [19, 20]. Specifically, women planning a homebirth have a six  
123 times greater chance of a vaginal birth compared to women planning a hospital birth and  
124 women planning a birth centre birth have a nearly double chance of vaginal birth compared to  
125 women planning a hospital birth without a continuity of care model [19, 20]. Moreover,  
126 midwifery continuity of care is the only health system intervention shown to reduce preterm  
127 birth and improve perinatal survival [19, 20]. Despite the range of consumer and health  
128 system benefits evident among midwifery-led continuity of care models, most Australian  
129 women are accessing public hospital care and it is the GP referral that often determines  
130 model of care and birthplace.

131

132 Models of care are also vital for the provision of culturally sensitive care for Aboriginal and  
133 Torres Strait Islander women and those from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD)  
134 backgrounds. Midwifery-led continuity of care models that are tailored to the needs of  
135 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, particularly those that offer ‘birthing on  
136 country’, have been shown to improve health outcomes and confer a range of benefits to its

137 consumers [21-25]. These models are unique in that they provide antenatal care alongside  
138 access to a range of multidisciplinary providers and are supported by Aboriginal Health  
139 Workers [22-24]. Improvements associated with these models include high levels of  
140 consumer satisfaction [22-24], improved antenatal attendance rates [25], improved  
141 breastfeeding rates [25], and a reduction in preterm birth rates [22, 26]. For CALD women,  
142 there are a range of service elements such as continuity of care, effective communication,  
143 culturally responsive care, support navigating systems and flexibility within services that  
144 align with maternal preferences, reduce barriers to access and have the potential to improve  
145 outcomes for CALD mothers and infants [27].

146

147 It is recognised that challenges navigating the referral system can act as a barrier to initiating  
148 antenatal care which is vital for the health and wellbeing of women and babies [28]. Finally,  
149 the literature overwhelmingly focusses on women's decision-making and neglects the  
150 gatekeeping role of the GP [29-31]. Given the established importance of GP referral to model  
151 of care and dearth of evidence regarding factors that influence referral, this study aimed to  
152 explore and describe the factors influencing Australian GPs' decision-making when referring  
153 pregnant women to maternity models of care.



## 154 **Methods**

155 A qualitative description design was used given the recognised utility to derive rich  
156 descriptions from participants and its suitability for understanding novel phenomena/on [32,  
157 33]. The research aim prompted the use of a critical realist lens which is ontologically realist  
158 asserting that an authentic reality exists separately to human knowing while also being  
159 epistemologically subjectivist asserting that multiple versions of reality can be produced [34].  
160 A purposive, snowball and convenience sampling approach was taken utilising social media  
161 and email to recruit general practitioners from around the nation experienced in referring  
162 pregnant women to maternity models of care. Recruitment occurred from the 23<sup>rd</sup> of August  
163 2021 to the 20<sup>th</sup> of October 2021. Prospective participants were provided with information on  
164 the study, the researchers involved, and its purpose; written consent was provided. GPs  
165 participated in a semi-structured interview conducted by researcher JT between October and  
166 November of 2021. Sampling was driven by data saturation, defined as the point at which  
167 limited new concepts or descriptions directly relevant to the research aim could be  
168 interpreted. Twelve general practitioners comprised the final sample size. Interviews were  
169 conducted via Microsoft Teams or via telephone and lasted approximately 30 minutes each.  
170 Demographic data were collected at the beginning of the interview. GP participants were  
171 asked “*Please describe how you decide where and to whom you refer your maternity*  
172 *clients?*”. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim by researcher JT.  
173 Interview transcripts then underwent Braun and Clarke’s reflexive thematic analysis  
174 facilitated by NVivo-12 data management software including 1) familiarisation with the data,  
175 2) coding the data, 3) identifying themes, 4) reviewing themes, 5) defining and naming  
176 themes, and 6) producing the report [35]. To enhance the rigor of the study, the researcher  
177 maintained an audit trail and engaged in peer-review at relevant intervals with the research  
178 team to expose bias or inappropriate subjectivity.

179 The data were managed utilising an encrypted, password protected cloud storage platform  
180 (OneDrive) and university research drive. Following the interviews, data copies were deleted  
181 from OneDrive and will remain on the university research drive for a period of seven years.  
182 This study obtained ethical clearance from the Curtin University Human Research Ethics  
183 Committee in alignment with the National Health and Medical Research Council guidelines  
184 (HREC 2021-0500).

## 185 Findings

186 The demographic profile of the participants is outlined in Table 1. Of the twelve participants,  
187 eleven identified as female. Participants were between 30 and 59 years of age with most  
188 participants aged between 40 and 49 years. Most participants were GP Fellows of the Royal  
189 Australian and New Zealand College of General Practitioners. Five participants had less than  
190 10 years of experience working in general practice, five participants had between 11 and 20  
191 years of experience and two participants had more than 20 years of experience working in  
192 general practice. Most participants were currently living and working in Western Australia.  
193 Most of the participating GPs were working in metropolitan areas however five participants  
194 were currently working in a rural or regional area.

195

196 **Table 1. Demographic Profile of Participants.**

<b>Demographic variables</b>	<b>Participant numbers n=12</b>
<b>Gender</b>	
Female	11
Male	1
<b>Age</b>	
30 to 39	4

40 to 49	6
50 to 59	2
<b>Level of vocation</b>	
GP Registrar	1
Fellow	11
<b>Years of experience as a GP</b>	
0 to 10	5
11 to 20	5
21 to 30	2
<b>Additional obstetric qualification</b>	
Nil	5
Basic Diploma	6
Advanced Diploma	1
<b>Maternity model work experience</b>	
Nil	2
Birth Centre	3
GP Obstetric	7
Private hybrid model	1
Hospital	10
<b>Years of experience in maternity model</b>	
Nil	2
< 1 year	4
1 to 5 years	3
6 to 10 years	1
Over 10 years	2
<b>Geographical classification</b>	
Metropolitan	7
Rural	4
Regional	1
<b>State</b>	
WA	8
NSW	3
QLD	1

197

198 Two main themes were generated from the data analysis process. The first theme, entitled  
199 “GP factors” incorporates three subthemes including “Gaps in GP knowledge”, “GPs  
200 previous model of care experience” and “GPs perception of the models of care”. The second  
201 theme or the “Woman’s factors” encapsulates two subthemes including “Woman’s  
202 preferences” and “Access to models” (Fig 1).

203

204 **Fig 1. Final thematic map of the factors that influence GP referral to maternity models**  
205 **of care demonstrating two themes and five subthemes**

## 206 **GP factors**

### 207 **Gaps in GP knowledge**

208 The participant GPs were asked about the models of care they had previously referred to and  
209 those they considered themselves to be familiar with. Overall participants had incomplete  
210 knowledge of the Australian maternity models of care and limited insight into the gaps in  
211 their knowledge base. One participant stated:

212 *Well, I either go public or private because that's all the options we have..." (P5)*

213 Most GPs described gaining their model of care knowledge from their work experience  
214 which predominantly occurred in a hospital setting. One GP participant said:

215 *It [was] just seeing women come through the birth suite and where they've come from and  
216 what their journey has been and figuring out from there if it was a model or what the model  
217 was... (P7)*

218 The GPs were most familiar with the medical models and were less knowledgeable about  
219 midwifery-led models of care:

220 *I feel like I know enough about the medical model[s] because they're the ones that I've  
221 worked most in, but I feel like midwifery group practice, community midwifery programs,  
222 family birth centres we don't get a lot of information about..." (P7)*

223

224 Of those interviewed, two GP participants mentioned their Public Health Network (PHN)  
225 when describing their model of care education and resources. Participant 3 stated that they  
226 use the PHN developed *HealthPathways* web-based portal that supports clinicians' referrals:

227 *...looking at the HealthPathways and seeing what's actually available in my area when and I*  
228 *sort of do that at point of care so when a woman who comes in and requesting a referral for*  
229 *pregnancy I kind of open that up... (P3)*

230

### 231 **GP's previous model of care experience**

232 Previous model of care experience both personally and professionally was described as  
233 influential to the GP's referral practice. In terms of personal birthing experience most GPs  
234 accessed private obstetric-led care. One GP said:

235

236 *I had my first baby in the private sector, I didn't think things went particularly well. I had my*  
237 *second baby as a private patient in the public sector and things went exceptionally well so I*  
238 *was quite impressed with the public system so that of course has influenced me (P5)*

239

240 All GPs in the cohort had professional exposure to hospital-based models of care with fewer  
241 participants describing GP obstetrics and birth centre experience. One participant said:

242

243 *[Other GPs] might not be aware of other models of care like caseload midwifery if they*  
244 *haven't had that sort of exposure (P10)*

245

246 Communication from a service was also seen as influential to the GP referral:

247

248 *...if a service is good at communicating with me I'm more likely to refer to it as well...if that*  
249 *service sends me a letter with good information or lets me know if something significant has*  
250 *happened, then I'm more likely to want to continue to use that service (P6)*

## 251 **GP's perception of the models of care**

252 When asked about their rationale for making previous referrals to the maternity models of  
253 care, GPs described referring to models that they perceive positively one participant said:

254 *Well, I'm happy with all of them (P4)*

255 GPs described referring to providers that they had confidence, faith, and trust in for example  
256 one GP stated:

257 *...the most common model of care that I refer to would be delivering with general  
258 practitioners in a [regional centre] and I think that's because I have confidence in the service  
259 (P12)*

260 Positive word of mouth from women was described by most GPs as a factor that increased  
261 their referrals to a service or provider stating *...you get good reports about somebody you  
262 tend to refer to them more (P12)*

263 On the other hand GPs said that negative feedback from women about their model of care  
264 made them less likely to make future referrals to that service.

265 Most interviewed GPs had an unfavourable perception of private midwifery models of care  
266 offering homebirth, one participant stated:

267 *I generally don't refer [to] that model of care 'cause I guess ...I'm more worried about  
268 their backup systems when things go wrong (P12)*

## 269 **Woman's factors**

### 270 **Woman's preferences**



271 When GPs were asked about how they make their referral decisions, they overwhelmingly  
272 indicated, *...so the predominant way is through patient choice... (P10)*. This included  
273 considering the woman's desired mode of birth or birth location.

274 One GP said:

275 *... just talking through the pros and cons of each model, they may lean strongly towards one*  
276 *so they may have a preference for more midwife-led care or a preference for avoiding*  
277 *intervention if possible or ...they're just very keen on caesar or induction early on in the*  
278 *pregnancy that may influence how we make a decision... (P6)*

279 A patient or woman-centred philosophy was emphasised by the GP's explaining:

280 *...if you follow what they want, they tend to end up with a better outcome, sort of more happy*  
281 *patients and... [if] a patient is contented with their pregnancy and delivery, is more likely to*  
282 *be a contented mother... (P5)*

283 Even when questioned about their feelings towards a woman declining a referral, GPs  
284 maintained:

285 *...I'd feel fine I'd respect that...she has complete capacity to make that decision about her*  
286 *and her baby so that would be fine...her birth her pregnancy, her choice really yeah (P11)*

## 287 **Access to models**

288 Access around the models of care was described by GPs as a major consideration during  
289 referral discussions.

290 Rural and regional GPs highlighted how women living in these areas are limited to a few  
291 models of care explaining:

292 *...there's ...limited options 'cause we live in the country...- the options are what they are...*

293 *(P12)*

294 The maternal and fetal risk profile was described as a directing force during referral  
295 discussions. It was often referenced as a contraindication to the woman's choice. One GP  
296 said:

297 *...you know it's their pregnancy and sometimes that doesn't work out you know they might*  
298 *actually have a high-risk pregnancy and they don't get to do what they would like to do...*

299 *(P2)*

300 Financial and health insurance status of the woman was also highly relevant to referral  
301 discussions. GPs described discussions around out of pocket costs for women with one GP  
302 saying:

303 *.. if they see me for GP shared care 'cause I'm in a private billing practice, so there will be*  
304 *out of pocket costs associated with every appointment that they come in to see me ... when it*  
305 *comes to the midwifery-led models of care I sort of yeah explain what that means in terms of*  
306 *cost which are minimal (P1)*

307 **Discussion**

308 To our knowledge, this is the first study anywhere in the world to explore factors that  
309 influence GP referral to maternity models of care. Gaps in knowledge may impact GP's  
310 ability to offer a comprehensive range of models to women and in particular, their reduced  
311 knowledge of midwifery-led continuity of care models may mean that the benefits associated  
312 with these models such as reduced intervention and increased spontaneous vaginal birth [36],  
313 go unrealized. Given the important referring function of the GP it is likely that these referral  
314 practices may be impacting maternal and neonatal outcomes at a population health level.

315

316 Resources supplied by Primary Health Networks (PHNs) as the *HealthPathways* portal were  
317 used by two GP participants during their model of care discussions. PHNs are important to  
318 enhancing GP knowledge of the maternity models of care. PHNs assist with health service  
319 planning so as to ensure that primary care meets the community's needs. Furthermore, PHNs  
320 address gaps in health care, acquire new services and analyse the efficacy of current services  
321 [37]. This occurs by collaboration with both health service providers and stakeholders [37].  
322 PHN developed resources, such as the *HealthPathways* portal is used to provide local clinical  
323 management pathways and referral advice [38]. However, the portal is limited by its  
324 completeness and relevance of information. For example, the Western Australian  
325 *HealthPathways* portal does not include locally relevant model of care referral information  
326 and instead has adapted its 'Antenatal Consult – First' pathway from New Zealand [39].  
327 Embedding a decision tool into the *HealthPathways* portal with the up to date and locally  
328 relevant model of care service information could provide GPs with support during model of  
329 care discussions and provide women with a broader range of model of care options.

330

331 Of the interviewed GPs, most participants described personal and work experience in the  
332 medical-led models of care and reported a heightened familiarity with those models. With

333 most medical education and GP obstetric training occurring around medical -led- models, this  
334 medical focus appeared to impact the exposure and familiarity of GPs with non-medical led  
335 models. Moreover, GPs described referring to providers they had previously worked with,  
336 and if this predominantly occurs in the hospital setting then this reinforces referral to medical  
337 providers. Whilst there are no studies that have previously explored medical referring within  
338 the maternity context, a cross-sectional study of American primary care physicians (n=1252)  
339 demonstrated that together with other factors, past experience with a specialist was highly  
340 important to their referral practice [40]. Further, a prospective cohort study also conducted in  
341 the United States found that personal knowledge of a specialist was the most important  
342 consideration for primary care doctors when referring patients [41]. Given that most of the  
343 interviewed participants had hospital-based model of care experience, GPs may preferentially  
344 choose obstetricians working in those models of care as opposed to community-based GP  
345 obstetricians or midwives.

346

347 GPs disclosed referring to providers they perceive positively. This sentiment was echoed by  
348 Choudhry et al. stating that referral recommendations made by physicians have little or no  
349 objective basis and rather that the physicians perception of the specialist's reputation,  
350 knowledge base and feedback from previously referred patients instead are highly valued  
351 [42]. Addressing this practice is made difficult as one needs exposure to a model to develop a  
352 positive perception of that model. However, this finding provides insights for maternity  
353 providers into aspects that are important such as communication, respectful practice and  
354 convenience for patients which impact their perception by GPs. Similar factors regarding  
355 model of care convenience for the woman and effective communication have been identified  
356 in the literature as influential to the primary care physician's decision-making [40, 42, 43].

357

358 The woman's choice and preferences were reported by GPs as central to the referral decision,  
359 giving insight into what they consider women view as important including birth location,  
360 mode of birth and continuity of carer. At face value, these findings may indicate GP  
361 alignment with the key intents of the national maternity strategy [15]. The reluctance  
362 demonstrated by some participants to refer to privately practising midwives in this research  
363 has been explored in previous studies [12, 44, 45]. In a national survey of n=1657  
364 participants, narratives from women describing challenges of having to 'fight' with their GP  
365 to obtain a referral to a private midwife or to receive midwife only care [45]. GP reluctance  
366 or refusal to refer to midwifery models of care requires further exploration. Changes in the  
367 National Law requiring private midwives to have a collaborative arrangement with a GP are  
368 underway, it is anticipated that this will improve women's access to private midwifery and  
369 remove the requirement for referral from a GP [46].

370

371 Finally, GPs described access around the models of care as a key consideration during model  
372 of care discussions. GPs described how rural and remote women have limited options for  
373 maternity care which is congruent with current literature that outlines how women residing in  
374 remote geographical areas experience the least antenatal care access [47]. Improving  
375 maternity care access for rural and remote women is a key objective within the national  
376 maternity strategy. Strategies such as optimising all health workforce scope, service  
377 innovations such as telehealth and outreach care as well as national pathways are critical to  
378 achieving improved access for rural and remote women [15]. The interviewed GPs also  
379 described how characteristics like maternal fetal risk profile, the financial status of the  
380 woman, and convenience, may mean that current model of care options do not meet the needs  
381 of women. Despite current risk stratification practices, there is compelling evidence regarding  
382 the benefits of continuity of midwifery care for women of all risk profiles alongside a

383 multidisciplinary team [20, 48]. Although publicly funded models of care represent those  
384 most commonly accessed by Australian women, rising out-of-pocket costs serve as a barrier  
385 to accessing care [49]. Strategies such as funding models that support continuity of care for  
386 all women, shifting GP practice funding to support patients in need and expanding access to  
387 expert primary care through clinically activated PHNs have been discussed [15, 50, 51].  
388 Factors of convenience such as proximity to the model of care expressed by the interviewed  
389 GPs have been highlighted as important to other doctors when undertaking a referral [40, 42,  
390 43]. The benefit of convenient maternity models of care include reduced work and family  
391 disruption, reduced travel related safety issues, and the ability to facilitate birthing on  
392 Country, a priority for many Aboriginal women [15].  
393  
394 Maintaining currency of knowledge of the maternity models available within a local referring  
395 area presents a challenge for GP's that could be met by providing online resources to support  
396 broader conversations with women and referral practices. Both national and individual  
397 jurisdictions have begun to address the gap in knowledge, examples include the Pregnancy,  
398 Birth and Baby website and the MyBaby WA App which targets new or expectant mothers  
399 but may also be used by health professionals to support a range of conversations including  
400 model of care choice [52, 53]. Education, beginning early on in medical schools, and in GPs  
401 training programs on the breadth of model of care options available is important to increase  
402 awareness and enable GPs to refer from a more empowered position. In their public health  
403 education role, GPs could further enhance women's understanding of their options so all  
404 stakeholders can experience the benefits of consumer-demand and led access to a wider  
405 variety of models.  
406

407 Within these education structures exposure to non-hospital-based models of care may provide  
408 the opportunity for GPs and training doctors to gain a sense of familiarity and enhance their  
409 knowledge of those models. This and expanding the role of midwives in the primary health  
410 sector including in primary health network (PHN) stakeholder groups may foster networks  
411 between GPs and other providers improving health service integration. Despite no current  
412 evidence evaluating the benefit of midwifery integration into primary care clinics or PHN  
413 stakeholder groups in Australia, a predominantly European study that surveyed GPs and  
414 patients across 34 countries evaluated GP outcomes and patient experiences of GPs co-  
415 located with other health professionals including midwives [54]. Of the 7183 GPs surveyed,  
416 most were co-located with nursing staff while only one in three described themselves as co-  
417 located with midwives, specialists, physiotherapists, dentists or pharmacists [54]. The  
418 analysis demonstrated that co-location with the aforementioned allied health staff or  
419 midwives resulted in improved coordination with secondary care [54]. As such, the  
420 integration of midwives into GP practices or other primary settings may confer improved  
421 coordination with secondary care however more research into the benefits of midwifery  
422 integration into the primary health sector and in PHN stakeholder groups is needed.  
423  
424 Finally, insights gained around women's ability to access models of care is helpful for health  
425 system planning with a view to improve choice for women and the range of models of care  
426 available to them. Strengthening the rural workforce by training GP obstetricians, enabling  
427 scope fulfilment for midwives who have recognized expertise in primary maternity care,  
428 using telehealth and outreach services and national pathway development have been  
429 highlighted as vital to improving healthcare delivery to rural women [15, 55]. Moreover, the  
430 development of all-risk caseload midwifery models of care [20, 48], funding that supports  
431 continuity of care options [15, 50, 51] and model of care design that improves the

432 convenience elements of maternity models [15] have the potential to better meet the needs of  
433 new and expectant parents in Australia.

## 434 **Acknowledgments**

435 We would like to acknowledge the general practitioners who dedicated their time to this  
436 research while still working among a global pandemic to share their experiences providing us  
437 with a deeper understanding of the factors influencing referral to maternity models of care.

## 438 **Inclusivity statement**

439 This research uses gendered terminology. It is recognised that individuals have diverse  
440 gender identities. In this paper, pregnant persons are described with the nomenclature  
441 “woman/women”. The use of these terms is not intended to exclude those who do not identify  
442 in this way.

## 443 **References**


- 444 1. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Maternity models of care in Australia,  
445 2022. Canberra: 2022. Cat. no: PER 118.
- 446 2. Talukdar S, Dingle K, Miller YD. A scoping review of evidence comparing models of  
447 maternity care in Australia. *Midwifery*. 2021;99:1-13. doi:  
448 10.1016/j.midw.2021.102973.
- 449 3. Commonwealth of Australia. The Australian health system 2022. Available from:  
450 <https://www.health.gov.au/about-us/the-australian-health-system>.
- 451 4. Department of Health. Clinical practice guidelines: Pregnancy care. Canberra:  
452 Australian Government 2019.
- 453 5. Wong C, Gordon J, Pan Y, Henderson J, Britt H. Antenatal care in Australian general  
454 practice. *Aust Fam Physician* 2016;45(8):538. doi:  
455 10.3316/informit.243289149943914.
- 456 6. Soltani H, Fair F, Duxbury AM. Exploring health professionals’ and women's  
457 awareness of models of maternity care evidence. *Br J Midwifery*. 2015;23(1):22-31.  
458 doi: 10.12968/bjom.2015.23.1.22.
- 459 7. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. MaCCS- major model category. Canberra:  
460 AIHW, 2015.
- 461 8. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Maternity models of care in Australia,  
462 2023. Canberra: 2023 Cat. no: PER 118.



- 463 9. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Maternity care in Australia: First national  
464 report on models of care, 2021. Canberra: 2021 Cat. no: PER 118.
- 465 10. Li Z, McNally L, Hilder L, Sullivan E. Australia's mothers and babies 2009. Sydney:  
466 2011. Cat. no. PER 52.
- 467 11. Prosser S, Miller Y, Armanasco A, Hennegan J, Porter J, Thompson R. Findings from  
468 the having a baby in Queensland survey, 2012. Brisbane, QLD: 2013.
- 469 12. Stevens G, Thompson R, Kruske S, Watson B, Miller YD. What are pregnant women  
470 told about models of maternity care in Australia? A retrospective study of women's  
471 reports. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2014;97(1):114-21. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2014.07.010.
- 472 13. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Australia's mothers and babies 2017—In  
473 brief. Canberra: 2019 Cat. no. PER 100.
- 474 14. Department of Health and Ageing [DoHA]. Improving maternity services in  
475 Australia: the report of the Maternity Services Review. Canberra: Department of  
476 Health; 2009.
- 477 15. Department of Health. Woman-centred care: Strategic directions for Australian  
478 maternity services. Canberra: COAG Health Council; 2019.
- 479 16. Pavlova M, Hendrix M, Nouwens E, Nijhuis J, van Merode G. The choice of obstetric  
480 care by low-risk pregnant women in the Netherlands: Implications for policy and  
481 management. *Health Policy*. 2009;93(1):27-34. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.05.008.
- 482 17. McIntyre MJ, Chapman Y, Francis K. Hidden costs associated with the universal  
483 application of risk management in maternity care. *Aust Health Rev*. 2011;35(2):211-  
484 5. doi: 10.1071/AH10919.
- 485 18. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care and Australian Institute  
486 of Health and Welfare. The Fourth Australian Atlas of Healthcare Variation. Sydney:  
487 2021.
- 488 19. Homer CS, Cheah SL, Rossiter C, Dahlen HG, Ellwood D, Foureur MJ, et al.  
489 Maternal and perinatal outcomes by planned place of birth in Australia 2000–2012: a  
490 linked population data study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(10):e029192. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-  
491 2019-029192.
- 492 20. Sandall J, Soltani H, Gates S, Shennan A, Devane D. Midwife-led continuity models  
493 of care compared with other models of care for women during pregnancy, birth and  
494 early parenting. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;4:CD004667. doi:  
495 10.1002/14651858.CD004667.pub5.
- 496 21. Kildea S, Van Wagner V. 'Birthing on Country' maternity service delivery models:  
497 an Evidence Check rapid review brokered by the Sax Institute on behalf of the  
498 Maternity Services InterJurisdictional Committee for the Australian Health Ministers'  
499 Advisory Council. Sydney, Australia 2013.
- 500 22. Kildea S, Stapleton H, Murphy R, Low NB, Gibbons K. The Murri clinic: a  
501 comparative retrospective study of an antenatal clinic developed for Aboriginal and  
502 Torres Strait Islander women. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2012;12(1):1-11.
- 503 23. Josif CM, Barclay L, Kruske S, Kildea S. 'No more strangers': investigating the  
504 experiences of women, midwives and others during the establishment of a new model  
505 of maternity care for remote dwelling Aboriginal women in northern Australia.  
506 *Midwifery*. 2014;30(3):317-23. doi: 10.1016/j.midw.2013.03.012.
- 507 24. Corcoran PM, Catling C, Homer CS. Models of midwifery care for Indigenous  
508 women and babies: a meta-synthesis. *Women and Birth*. 2017;30(1):77-86. doi:  
509 10.1016/j.wombi.2016.08.003.
- 510 25. Murphy E, Best E. The Aboriginal Maternal and Infant Health Service: a decade of  
511 achievement in the health of women and babies in NSW. *NSW Public Health*  
512 *Bulletin*. 2012;23(4):68-72. doi: 10.1071/NB11051.

- 513 26. Kildea S, Hickey S, Nelson C, Currie J, Carson A, Reynolds M, et al. Birthing on  
514 Country (in Our Community): a case study of engaging stakeholders and developing a  
515 best-practice Indigenous maternity service in an urban setting. *Aust Health Rev.*  
516 2017;42(2):230-8. doi: 10.1071/AH16218.
- 517 27. Rogers HJ, Hogan L, Coates D, Homer CS, Henry A. Responding to the health needs  
518 of women from migrant and refugee backgrounds—Models of maternity and  
519 postpartum care in high-income countries: a systematic scoping review. *Health Soc*  
520 *Care Community.* 2020;28(5):1343-65. doi: 10.1111/hsc.12950.
- 521 28. Hatherall B, Morris J, Jamal F, Sweeney L, Wiggins M, Kaur I, et al. Timing of the  
522 initiation of antenatal care: An exploratory qualitative study of women and service  
523 providers in East London. *Midwifery.* 2016;36:1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.midw.2016.02.017.
- 524 29. Grigg C, Tracy SK, Schmied V, Daellenbach R, Kensington M. Women' s birthplace  
525 decision-making, the role of confidence: Part of the evaluating maternity units study,  
526 New Zealand. *Midwifery.* 2015;31(6):597-605. doi: 10.1016/j.midw.2015.02.006.
- 527 30. Wiggins D, Hundley VA, Wilkins C, Walton G, Bond C. The effect of a birth place  
528 decision support tool on women's decision making and information gathering  
529 behaviours during pregnancy: Mybirthplace study protocol. *J Innov Health Inform.*  
530 2018;25(1):1-6. doi: 10.14236/jhi.v25i1.945.
- 531 31. Grigg C, Tracy SK, Daellenbach R, Kensington M, Schmied V. An exploration of  
532 influences on women's birthplace decision-making in New Zealand: A mixed  
533 methods prospective cohort within the evaluating maternity units study. *BMC*  
534 *Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2014;14(1):1-14.
- 535 32. Bradshaw C, Atkinson S, Doody O. Employing a qualitative description approach in  
536 health care research. *Glob Qual Nurs Res.* 2017;4:2333393617742282. doi:  
537 10.1177/2333393617742282.
- 538 33. Sandelowski M. What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Res Nurs Health.*  
539 2010;33(1):77-84. doi: 10.1002/nur.20362.
- 540 34. Williams S. A critical realist informed thematic analysis: Families' experience of the  
541 process of adjustment when a family member is in a forensic mental health hospital:  
542 University of East London School of Psychology; 2018.
- 543 35. Braun V, Clarke V. Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA?  
544 Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic  
545 approaches. *Couns Psychother Res.* 2020;21(1):37-47. doi: 10.1002/capr.12360.
- 546 36. Sandall J, Soltani H, Gates S, Shennan A, Devane D. Midwife-led continuity models  
547 versus other models of care for childbearing women. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.*  
548 2016;(4). doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004667.pub5.
- 549 37. Department of Health and Aged Care [DoHAC]. What primary health networks are.  
550 Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia 2021. Available from:  
551 <https://www.health.gov.au/our-work/phn/what-PHNs-are>.
- 552 38. WA Primary Health Alliance [WAPHA]. HealthPathways: WAPHA; 2023. Available  
553 from: <https://www.wapha.org.au/health-professionals/healthpathways/>.
- 554 39. HealthPathways. Antenatal - first consult: HealthPathways; 2022. Available from:  
555 <https://wa.communityhealthpathways.org/37932.htm>.
- 556 40. Kinchen KS, Cooper LA, Levine D, Wang NY, Powe NR. Referral of patients to  
557 specialists: Factors affecting choice of specialist by primary care physicians. *Ann*  
558 *Fam Med.* 2004;2(3):245-52. doi: 10.1370/afm.68.
- 559 41. Forrest CB, Nutting PA, Starfield B, von Schrader S. Family physicians' referral  
560 decisions: Results from the ASPN referral study. *J Fam Pract.* 2002;51(3):215-22.

- 561 42. Choudhry NK, Liao JM, Detsky AS. Selecting a specialist: Adding evidence to the  
562 clinical practice of making referrals. *JAMA*. 2014;312(18):1861-2. doi:  
563 10.1001/jama.2014.12963.
- 564 43. Ludke RL. An examination of the factors that influence patient referral decisions.  
565 *Med Care*. 1982;20(8):782-96. doi: 10.1097/00005650-198208000-00003.
- 566 44. Vedam S, Stoll K, Schummers L, Fairbrother N, Klein MC, Thordarson D, et al. The  
567 Canadian birth place study: Examining maternity care provider attitudes and  
568 interprofessional conflict around planned home birth. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*.  
569 2014;14(1):353. doi: 10.1186/1471-2393-14-353.
- 570 45. McKellar L, Brown A, Adelson P. A public e-survey to explore community  
571 understanding of the role of the midwife in Australia. *Eur J Midwifery*. 2019;3:20.  
572 doi: 10.18332/ejm/114226.
- 573 46. Department of Health and Aged Care. Collaborative Arrangements 2023 Project  
574 2023. Available from: [https://www.health.gov.au/our-work/collaborative-  
575 arrangements-2023-  
576 project#:~:text=This%20project%20aims%20to%20remove,Benefits%20Scheme%20  
577 \(PBS\)%20medications](https://www.health.gov.au/our-work/collaborative-arrangements-2023-project#:~:text=This%20project%20aims%20to%20remove,Benefits%20Scheme%20(PBS)%20medications).
- 578 47. Medway P, Hutchinson A, Sweet L. In what ways does maternity care in Australia  
579 align with the values and principles of the national maternity strategy? A scoping  
580 review. *Sex Reprod Healthc*. 2023;37:100900. doi:  
581 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.srhc.2023.100900>.
- 582 48. Styles C, Kearney L, George K. Implementation and upscaling of midwifery  
583 continuity of care: The experience of midwives and obstetricians. *Women and Birth*.  
584 2020;33(4):343-51. doi: 10.1016/j.wombi.2019.08.008.
- 585 49. Adams J, Steel A, Frawley J, Broom A, Sibbritt D. Substantial out-of-pocket  
586 expenditure on maternity care practitioner consultations and treatments during  
587 pregnancy: estimates from a nationally-representative sample of pregnant women in  
588 Australia. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2017;17(1):114. doi: 10.1186/s12884-017-  
589 1297-5.
- 590 50. Breadon P, Romanes D, Fox L, Bolton J, Richardson L. A new Medicare:  
591 Strengthening general practice. Grattan Institute, 2022.
- 592 51. Australian Government. Strengthening medicare taskforce report. Australia 2023.
- 593 52. Government of Western Australia. Pregnancy, birth and early parenting information  
594 now available across WA with new app 2021. Available from:  
595 [https://wacountry.health.wa.gov.au/News/2021/06/04/Pregnancy-birth-and-early-  
596 parenting-information-now-available--across-WA-with-new-app](https://wacountry.health.wa.gov.au/News/2021/06/04/Pregnancy-birth-and-early-parenting-information-now-available--across-WA-with-new-app).
- 597 53. Department of Health and Aged Care. Pregnancy, birth and baby: planning for  
598 pregnancy.n.d. Available from: [https://www.pregnancybirthbaby.org.au/planning-for-  
599 pregnancy](https://www.pregnancybirthbaby.org.au/planning-for-pregnancy).
- 600 54. Bonciani M, Schäfer W, Barsanti S, Heinemann S, Groenewegen PP. The benefits of  
601 co-location in primary care practices: the perspectives of general practitioners and  
602 patients in 34 countries. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18(1):132. doi: 10.1186/s12913-  
603 018-2913-4.
- 604 55. Worley PS, O'Sullivan B, Ellis R. From locum-led outposts to locally led continuous  
605 rural training networks: The national rural generalist pathway. *Med J Aust*.  
606 2019;211(2):57-9. e1. doi: 10.5694/mja2.50225.
- 607



Figure