

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Relationship between midwifery density and midwifery regulatory environments
in International Confederation of Midwives member countries

Emma Virginia Clark^{1*}, Marianna LaNoue¹, Kate Clouse¹, Alexandra Zuber², Jeremy Neal¹

¹ School of Nursing, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, United States of America

² Ata Health Strategies LLC, Washington, District of Columbia, United States of America

***Corresponding Author:**

E-mail: emma.v.clark@vanderbilt.edu (EVC)

18

19 **Abstract**

20 **Background**

21 Midwives are a cost-effective solution for reducing preventable maternal death, but barriers to
22 their recruitment, training, deployment, and retention exist. Improved midwifery regulation is
23 proposed to address these challenges through activities related to education and qualification,
24 licensure, registration/re-licensure, and scope and conduct of practice. However, no
25 quantitative analysis of the associations between midwifery regulation and workforce density in
26 low- and middle-income countries has been conducted, limiting actionable insights for
27 policymakers. The objective of this study was to evaluate the relationship between midwifery
28 regulatory environments and midwifery workforce densities (midwives per 10,000 population)
29 in International Confederation of Midwives member countries.

30

31 **Methods**

32 The study used secondary data from the 2019 Global Midwives' Associations Map Survey to
33 perform a cross-sectional analysis of 103 International Confederation of Midwives member
34 countries. To operationalize the strength of a country's midwifery regulatory environment, we
35 used a previously developed Midwifery Regulatory Environment Index. We conducted
36 multivariable linear regression analysis to evaluate the relationship between this index and
37 country-level midwifery density, available from the National Health Workforce Accounts.

38 **Results**

39 Midwifery regulatory environments are significantly associated with midwifery workforce
40 densities across countries. For every 1-point increase in the Midwifery Regulatory Environment
41 Index (indicating activities in at least one additional regulatory domain), midwifery density
42 increased by 0.66 midwives per 10,000 population ($p = 0.011$). This effect decreased to 0.41
43 midwives per 10,000 population yet remained significant even after controlling for country level
44 income, per capita health spending, income inequality, and human development index ($p =$
45 0.04).

46 **Conclusion**

47 Stronger regulatory environments are associated with higher densities of midwives, even when
48 controlling for potential confounding factors such as country-level income and health spending.
49 This relationship suggests that policymakers should invest in midwifery regulation to improve
50 maternal health outcomes.

51 Introduction

52
53 The current global sexual, reproductive, maternal, newborn, and adolescent health
54 (SRMNAH) workforce is insufficient, meeting only 75% of the global need for essential services
55 [1]. This workforce provides care across the reproductive lifespan, including preconception
56 (e.g., offering modern contraceptive methods), early pregnancy (e.g., post-abortion care,
57 ectopic pregnancy management), antenatal (e.g., screening and managing hypertensive
58 disorders, diabetes, and malaria), intrapartum (e.g., parenteral administration of
59 anticonvulsants, uterotonics, and antibiotics, manual removal of placenta), and postpartum
60 (e.g., promoting breastfeeding) periods [2]. In low-income countries, only up to 41% of the
61 need for these essential services is met [1].

62 Midwives are increasingly recognized as a cost-effective means for delivering SRMNAH
63 services that improve outcomes and reduce preventable maternal and newborn mortality [3-5],
64 yet an estimated 900,000 more midwives are needed to meet global service delivery needs [1].
65 The availability of a country's health workforce to provide essential SRMNAH services in any
66 given geographical area can be estimated using national workforce density reports, with low-
67 and middle-income countries (LMICs) having the greatest workforce shortfall [6]. Numerous
68 regulatory barriers at the country level can contribute to this shortfall, hindering the
69 recruitment, training, deployment, and retention of midwives. These health professional
70 regulation barriers include unclear and non-standardized role definitions, limited scopes of
71 practice misaligned with international standards, varying educational and clinical standards for
72 entry to practice, and weak licensure and registration authorities and systems [7,8].

73 Health professional regulation establishes mechanisms and standards that recognize
74 and delineate the roles of health professionals, providing flexibility to adapt to complex and
75 evolving health system contexts [9]. According to the World Health Organization (WHO),
76 regulation is a priority component of advancing the health workforce, and policymakers should
77 consider it a strategic tool for addressing workforce imbalances and other challenges to ensure
78 adequate training and availability of health professionals [10]. Specifically, midwifery regulation
79 defines criteria and processes outlined in legislation to identify what a midwife is and to
80 describe their scope of practice [11]. The aim of regulation is to promote regulatory
81 mechanisms that protect the public (women and families) by ensuring that safe and competent
82 midwives provide high standards of midwifery care to every woman and baby through such
83 actions as producing autonomous, high-quality practice [11].

84 The presence of distinct regulatory structures and processes for midwifery is crucial to
85 enable autonomous midwifery practice and maintain midwifery standards, both of which are
86 essential for providing high-quality care to mothers and infants [11]. Midwifery regulation can
87 be categorized into the following regulatory domains, which are derived from the International
88 Confederation of Midwives (ICM) Global Standards for Midwives [11] and adapted through
89 additional research [12-14].

- 90 ● **Overarching Regulatory Policy and Legislation:** Enacting legislation that recognizes
91 midwifery as a profession distinct from nursing and establishing a dedicated regulatory
92 body with specifically for midwives or with separate and distinct policies and processes
93 for midwives.

- 94 ● **Education and Qualification:** Establishing standards for midwifery education, curricula,
95 and, occasionally, accreditation of educational institutions to develop necessary
96 competence for practice.
- 97 ● **Licensure:** Developing and enforcing criteria, standards, and processes for initial entry
98 into practice.
- 99 ● **Registration/Re-Licensure:** Establishing continuing medical education or other
100 requirements for demonstrating continued competence and maintaining a current
101 database of midwives, including their registration/licensure status, to support workforce
102 planning, and consumer transparency.
- 103 ● **Scope and Conduct of Practice:** Clearly defining the scope of practice of a midwife
104 consistent with ICM’s definition of a midwife and establishing mechanisms for handling
105 complaints and disciplinary action.

106 A strong midwifery regulatory environment is one in which midwifery is recognized as a distinct
107 profession, and a specific regulatory body, led by midwives, exists. Alternatively, a distinct track
108 for midwifery regulation within a nursing board or council may suffice. This empowered body,
109 established through regulatory policies, has statutory authority and effectively implements and
110 oversees activities across the domains noted above. Conversely, a weak regulatory
111 environment is characterized by the absence, inadequacy, or non-functionality of regulatory
112 activities and mechanisms.

113 Midwifery density is the number of midwives per 10,000 population in a specified
114 geographic area. Density data are critical for assessing workforce availability, recruitment,
115 deployment, and retention. The WHO and global professional associations have emphasized

116 the significance of regulation in advancing the midwifery workforce, resulting in a growing body
117 of research aiming to formally establish linkages between regulation and midwifery workforce
118 densities. Predominantly conducted in high-income countries, these studies have explored how
119 regulations constraining midwifery practice can lead to a reduction in the midwifery workforce
120 [15-17].

121 Research in the United States has underscored that strong regulatory environments are
122 related to higher midwifery workforce densities [18,19]. However, limited evidence exists on
123 this relationship in LMICs, where research mostly focuses on documenting midwifery workforce
124 challenges and suggesting that improved regulation might alleviate these challenges, without
125 exploration of the underlying mechanisms. For example, a scoping review in Kenya [20] and a
126 descriptive review in Nigeria [21] effectively highlight how poor job satisfaction and low
127 retention rates contribute to midwifery shortages, with the suggestion that weak regulatory
128 environments may be a driving factor. However, similar to other LMIC-focused research, these
129 studies lacked a quantitative analysis of associations between regulation and workforce,
130 limiting actionable insights for policymakers.

131 This study aims to evaluate the relationship between midwifery regulatory
132 environments and midwifery workforce densities in ICM member countries, addressing a
133 critical gap in the literature. We hypothesize that countries with stronger midwifery regulatory
134 environments will have higher densities of midwives.

135 **Methods**

136 This study was conducted using a cross-sectional design and secondary data analysis of
137 multiple publicly available databases. Approval for this study was obtained from the Vanderbilt
138 University Medical Center Institutional Review Board.

139 **Data and Variables**

140 The independent variable for this study was the Midwifery Regulatory Environment
141 (MRE) Index, a composite score our team developed to operationalize the strength of a
142 country's midwifery regulatory environment. Data used in developing this index were drawn
143 from the ICM Global Midwives' Association Map Survey. For this survey, ICM collected data
144 from country midwifery associations with support from the United Nations Population Fund
145 (UNFPA) Country Office and relevant government organizations between October and
146 December 2019 [22]. The survey included four subsections on midwifery: association,
147 education, leadership, and regulation. To ensure data quality, ICM used a multi-step process
148 including an initial review with country follow-up for clarifications and completeness, internal
149 logic, and validity; review of the revised and validated data by country midwifery associations;
150 and a letter of validation from an official for each survey section or confirmation that data were
151 publicly available from reputable sources [22].

152 To develop the MRE Index, we began by identifying relevant data from the Map Survey
153 for inclusion in the composite score. The regulatory sub-section contained 38 questions
154 assessing a country's regulatory environment [23]. We eliminated sixteen questions for free-
155 text answers and/or not directly relating to at least one regulatory domain. The remaining 22
156 questions were consolidated and organized into 12 items, each associating with one of the five
157 essential domains noted above [overarching regulatory policy and legislation (4 items);

158 education and qualification (0 items); licensure (4 items); registration/re-licensure (2 items);
159 and scope and conduct of practice (2 items)]. Because the education and qualification domain
160 was not reflected in the regulatory sub-section questions, one question from the education
161 subsection of the Map Survey about the national curriculum for midwifery education was
162 included as a final item for MRE Index development purposes. This resulted in a total of 13
163 items for inclusion in calculation of the final composite MRE Index.

164 Five different potential scoring methodologies for aggregating the 13 items into a single
165 MRE Index were developed, and the characterization that best fit the data and had the highest
166 predictive ability for each of three outcomes (low birthweight prevalence, stillbirth rate, MMR)
167 was selected. While all characterizations performed well, the “Aggregated Domain Scoring”
168 characterization proved to be the best. In this approach, the 13 items are grouped into five
169 categories, each representing a regulatory domain: overarching regulatory policy and
170 legislation, education and qualification, licensure, registration/re-licensure, or scope and
171 conduct of practice. One point is assigned to each domain with at least one “yes” response to
172 the item(s) within that domain, allowing for a total score between zero (no regulatory activities
173 in any domain) and five (regulatory activities in all five domains). Detailed methodology
174 regarding development of the MRE Index is published in a forthcoming manuscript.

175 The dependent variable for this study was the density of midwives at the country level,
176 defined as the number of midwives per 10,000 population. These data were obtained from
177 WHO’s National Health Workforce Accounts (NHWA), which facilitates data reporting on key
178 workforce indicators to improve the availability, quality, and use of health workforce data with
179 the goal of achieving universal health coverage [24]. WHO’s 194 member states submit health

180 workforce data annually to the NHTSA. These data sources include health workforce registries
181 or databases, aggregated data from health facilities such as routine administrative records and
182 District Health Information System census or surveys, professional council, chamber, and/or
183 association registers, and labor force surveys [25]. The NHTSA uses population estimates
184 provided by the United Nations (UN) Statistics Division, drawn from civil registration and vital
185 statistics systems, population censuses or registers, population registers, and household
186 surveys. If other methodologies are used, WHO recalculates densities using the UN Statistics
187 Division population estimates described above to harmonize densities [25].

188 Covariate data were obtained from publicly available databases including the United
189 Nations Development Program's (UNDP) Human Development Index (HDI) [26] and WHO's
190 Global Health Expenditure database [27], and the World Bank's Gini index [28] and income
191 group databases [29]. Four control variables were selected to reduce potential bias related to
192 overall allocation and distribution of resources within countries. These included two continuous
193 variables: per capita health spending in United States dollars and the Gini index, which
194 measures the extent to which the distribution of income or consumption among individuals or
195 households within an economy deviates from a perfectly equal distribution [28]. We also used
196 two categorical variables. A country's income group is assigned annually by the World Bank
197 based on the gross national income (GNI) per capita of the previous year, expressed in United
198 States dollars. In 2022, countries were classified as low income (GNI per capita less than
199 \$1,085), lower-middle income (GNI per capita \$1,086-4,255), upper-middle income (GNI per
200 capita \$4,256-13,205), and high income (GNI per capita greater than \$13,205) [29]. The HDI, the
201 final control variable, is a composite measure of average achievement in three key dimensions

202 of human life: a long and healthy life measured by life expectancy at birth; education, measured
203 by mean years of schooling and expected years of schooling; and a decent standard of living,
204 measured by gross national income per capita in Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) international
205 dollars. It is reported on a scale from 0 to 1.00, with ≥ 0.800 classified as “very high” human
206 development, 0.700-0.799 as high, 0.550-0.699 as medium, and < 0.550 as low [26].

207 **Data Screening and Analysis**

208 One hundred fifteen countries submitted complete responses to the regulatory
209 subsection of the ICM Global Midwives’ Association Map Survey, which was used for calculating
210 the MRE Index. Three countries were missing density information, and nine others were missing
211 data for one or more covariates, leaving a total of 103 countries for analyses. We transformed
212 two highly-skewed variables, midwifery workforce density and per capita health spending, by
213 selecting the positive square root transformation which had the best effect on skewness and
214 kurtosis. We used multivariable linear regression to test for associations between the MRE
215 Index and midwifery density, adjusting for the covariates. Statistical significance was set *a priori*
216 at 0.05. SPSS Statistics 27 was used to conduct the analysis.

217 **Results**

218 MRE Indices across countries ranged from 2 to 5, with an average score of 4.36 (SD =
219 0.88). Midwifery workforce density ranged from 0.11 midwives per 10,000 population in
220 Burundi to 20.46 midwives per 10,000 population in Ireland. The median density was 2.41
221 midwives per 10,000 population (interquartile range [IQR] 1.43, 5.10). Table 1 presents
222 descriptive summaries of MRE Index, midwifery workforce density, and control variables used
223 in the regression analysis (i.e., per capita health spending, Gini index, income group, and HDI).

224 **Table 1. Descriptive statistical summaries of country characteristics (N = 103)**

	Mean	SD
MRE Index	4.36	0.88
Gini Index (1-100)	37.39	7.48
	Median	IQR
Health Spending (USD)	201.06	58.5, 1278.18
Density of Midwives (per 10,000 population)	2.41	1.43, 5.10
	%	
Human Development Index		
Low	22.0	
Medium	28.0	
High	17.0	
Very High	33.0	
Income Level		
Low	25.0	
Low-Middle	29.0	
Upper-Middle	17.0	
High	29.0	

225

226 Correlations among the explanatory variables indicate that all control variables were

227 significantly associated with each other, with health spending, Gini index, and income group

228 demonstrating very strong associations (Table 2). However, MRE Index was not significantly

229 associated with any of the covariates.

230 **Table 2: Correlations among MRE Index and control variables (N= 103)**

231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245

	MRE Index	Health Spending ^a	Income Group	Human Development Index
Health Spending ^a	-0.097	-		
Income Group	1.19	155.037***	-	
Human Development Index	1.42	101.55***	181.055***	-
Gini Index	0.003	0.304*	9.35***	8.10***

246
247
248
249
250

Chi square for categorical variables, Person r for continuous variables, one-way ANOVA for mixed categorical (>2 categories) & continuous variables.

* = $p < 0.05$, ** = $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

^a transformed variable

251
252

Results of univariate and multivariate regression analyses are shown in Table 3. The

253
254
255
256
257

multiple regression of all explanatory variables with midwifery workforce density was significant (Multiple $R = 0.405$, $p = 0.010$), explaining approximately 12% of the variance. While all explanatory variables showed significant univariate correlations with midwifery workforce density, only health spending and the MRE Index remained significant after adjusting for health spending, HDI, Gini index, and income level.

258
259
260
261
262

Since transformed variables were used for midwifery workforce density and per capita health spending, *beta* values were calculated from non-transformed variables to aid interpretation. These values demonstrate that for every 1-point increase in the MRE Index (indicating activities in at least one additional regulatory domain), midwifery density increased by 0.66 midwives per 10,000 population ($p = 0.011$). This effect decreased to 0.41 midwives per

263 10,000 population when accounting for health spending, income group, inequality, and HDI, yet
 264 the MRE Index remained significantly associated with midwifery workforce density ($p = 0.04$).

265 **Table 3: Summary of univariate and multivariate associations with midwifery density (N =**
 266 **103)**

Characteristic	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i> -value	<i>beta</i> ^c	SE	95% Wald Confidence Interval		<i>p</i> -value
					Lower	Upper	
MRE Index	-0.24	0.011	0.41	.013	-0.37	1.19	0.04
Health Spending (USD)	0.31	<0.001	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03
Income Group ^a	5.00	0.003					
2-1			-1.51	1.39	-4.24	1.23	0.28
3-1			-0.93	1.89	-4.63	2.77	0.28
4-1			0.39	2.15	-3.82	4.61	0.39
Human Development Index ^b	6.24	<0.001					
2-1			3.89	1.43	1.09	6.68	0.05
3-1			2.16	1.92	-1.61	5.92	0.59
4-1			1.46	1.97	-2.39	5.31	0.97
Gini Index	0.29	0.002	-0.02	0.05	-0.12	0.09	0.12

267 Multiple R = 0.405, $p = 0.010$; $R^2 = 0.164$ (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.120$)

268 ^aIncome Group: 1 = Low; 2 = Lower Middle; 3 = Upper Middle; 4 = High; all income group values
 269 are relative to low-income group.

270 ^bHuman Development Group: 1 = Low; 2 = Middle; 3 = High; 4 = Very High.

271 ^cBeta obtained from model with untransformed variables for interpretation purposes.

272

273 Discussion

274 This study aimed to determine if there is a relationship between midwifery regulatory
275 environments and density of midwives in ICM member countries. The findings support our
276 hypothesis that there is a positive association between the midwifery regulatory environments
277 and midwife density; stronger regulatory environments are associated with higher densities.
278 This relationship remains significant even when controlling for potential confounding health
279 system and country factors. The sample included a relatively balanced representation of low-,
280 lower-middle, upper-middle, and high-income countries, as well as countries with varying levels
281 of human development, although there were slightly more high-income and high human
282 development countries.

283 Research such as the WHO's "Midwives' Voices, Midwives' Realities" consultation
284 highlights numerous issues that affect density. These issues include inadequate education,
285 uncertainty about midwifery's role in the health system, restrictions on practice that are
286 inconsistent with the legal scope of practice, and overwork leading to burnout and attrition
287 [30]. Each regulatory domain -- overarching regulatory policy and legislation, education and
288 qualification, licensing, registration/re-licensure, and scope and conduct of practice – contains
289 aspects that can influence midwifery density, with significant cross-over and reinforcement
290 between domains. For example, in the overarching regulatory policy and legislation domain,
291 Mattison et al. found when health system decision-makers did not recognize midwifery as an
292 autonomous profession, such as through distinct regulatory bodies, midwifery was excluded
293 from maternal health-related political agendas [31]. This omission led to downstream impacts
294 such as lack of clarity about midwives' specific roles in the health system and inappropriate

295 deployment and remuneration. These factors significantly affect the desirability of midwifery as
296 a profession and influence how many people choose to enter and remain in the profession.

297 Regulation in the education and qualification domain helps standardize education
298 requirements for midwives, ensuring they meet at least minimum education standards and are
299 prepared for their defined scope of practice. Aligning these standards with international norms
300 further strengthens credibility, making the profession more attractive and drawing in more and
301 stronger candidates. Administrative aspects of regulation, such as licensure and registration,
302 can improve density by providing data on the number of midwives working in the country,
303 distinguishing between active, inactive, and retired midwives, and identifying their locations.
304 This information is crucial for forecasting supply and analyzing it alongside demand data to
305 understand labor market dynamics and gaps. Such insights support appropriate investments in
306 midwifery training institutions and efforts to expand midwifery scope of practice, ensuring an
307 adequate number of midwives are available to provide needed services. Lastly, activities within
308 the scope and conduct of practice domain are fundamental aspects of regulatory environments
309 [12] and major drivers of midwifery workforce density. Well-defined scopes of practice that
310 promote strong interprofessional collaboration have been shown to attract and retain
311 healthcare workers by clarifying task division, enhancing support, and managing overall
312 workload [32,33]. A qualitative systematic review including studies from 23 LMICs found that
313 workplace relationships between healthcare professionals that are built on trust contribute to
314 social interactions and cooperation among healthcare workers, impacting their intrinsic
315 motivation, retention, performance, and quality of care [34]. There is also evidence suggesting
316 that midwives who practice autonomously – defined as the authority to make decisions and act

317 freely based on their knowledge base— experience increased occupational satisfaction,
318 improved professional identity, and reduced burnout [4,35,36]. Qualitative research on
319 policymakers’ and regulators’ perspectives from both strong and weak regulatory environments
320 could identify additional domains or domain activities not considered in this research. Research
321 tracking health systems that are in the process of enhancing regulatory mechanisms for
322 midwives, such as Lao People’s Democratic Republic [37], could also be evaluated using
323 approaches that account for the complexity of health systems, such as difference-in-
324 differences. It is also critical to ascertain if the relationship between midwifery workforce
325 density and regulation holds at a sub-national level, as remote and rural areas often have much
326 lower densities than urban areas and national averages, leading to poorer maternal, newborn,
327 and child health outcomes [38]. While the NHWA has the capacity to report sub-national
328 densities, only two countries in the study sample reported this information. As sub-national
329 density data becomes more available, or in countries where it is currently available, this
330 analysis could influence overall and specific domain investment in midwifery regulation.

331 **Limitations**

332 This study had several limitations. As a secondary data analysis, it is limited by the
333 quality of the datasets used. The data quality and validation processes for the main data
334 sources are discussed, with quality variation being a generally accepted limitation of secondary
335 data sources. Our regression analyses only included countries that are ICM members and
336 participated in the ICM mapping survey, potentially introducing bias toward countries with
337 more midwives and more sophisticated regulatory systems. However, many countries which
338 are not ICM members do not have a midwifery cadre, mitigating some of this bias. Additional

339 research is also needed to demonstrate a causal relationship between regulatory environments
340 and midwifery workforce density to maximize policymaker interest in regulatory investments.
341 Our findings only state an association, not causation, and these associations may be influenced
342 by other factors in the health system or country governance, such as other investments in
343 maternal and newborn health (e.g., abolition of user fees for MNH services).

344 **Conclusion**

345 Stronger midwifery regulatory environments, characterized by regulatory policies and
346 legislation, education and qualification standards, licensure, registration/re-licensure processes,
347 and well-defined scopes and conduct of practice, are associated with higher densities of
348 midwives globally. This likely results from the positive impact of regulation on the profession's
349 ability to attract, develop, and retain midwives due to enhanced professional identity,
350 autonomy, and credibility. These findings underscore the importance of investing in midwifery
351 regulation as a critical component for ensuring sufficient midwifery workforce and,
352 consequently, improved maternal, newborn, and child health outcomes. However, additional
353 research is needed to better understand how specific regulatory factors influence the pipeline
354 of midwifery students, as well as the recruitment and retention of midwives, to establish
355 causality and identify the role individual domains play in driving density.

356 **References:**

- 357 1. United Nations Population Fund, World Health Organization, International
358 Confederation of Midwives. The state of the world's midwifery 2021. 2021 [cited 6
359 March 24]. Available from: <https://www.unfpa.org/sowmy-webappendices>.
360
- 361 2. World Health Organization. The global strategy for women's, children's, and
362 adolescents' health (2016-2030). 2018.
363 https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/276423/A71_19Rev1-en.pdf?sequence=1
364
- 365 3. Nove A, Friberg IK, de Bernis L, McConville, F, Moran, A Najjemba M, et al. Potential
366 impact of midwives in preventing and reducing maternal and neonatal mortality and
367 stillbirths: a Lives Saved Tool modeling study. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021;9(1):e24-e32.
368
- 369 4. Homer, CS. Models of maternity care: evidence for midwifery continuity of care. *Med J*
370 *Aust*. 2016;205(8):370-374.
371
- 372 5. Sandall J, Soltani H, Gates S, Shennan A, Devane D. Midwife-led continuity models
373 versus other models of care for childbearing women. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*.
374 2016(4): CD004667.
375
- 376 6. World Health Organization Global Health Observatory. IA2030 SP 1.2: density of
377 physicians, nurses and midwives per 10,000 population. 2024 [cited 20 March 24].
378 Available from: [https://www.who.int/data/gho/indicator-metadata-registry/imr-
379 details/7766](https://www.who.int/data/gho/indicator-metadata-registry/imr-details/7766).
380
- 381 7. Renfrew MJ, McFadden A, Bastos MH, Campbell, J, Channon AA, Cheung NF et al.
382 Midwifery and quality care: findings from a new evidence-informed framework for
383 maternal and newborn care. *Lancet*, 2014; 384(9948), 1129–1145.
384
- 385 8. Filby A, McConville F, Portela A. What prevents quality midwifery care? A systematic
386 mapping of barriers in low and middle income countries from the provider
387 perspective. *PloS one*, 2016; 11(5), e0153391.
388
- 389 9. Nkowane AM, Wheeler E. Partnerships and collaboration: A means to effective
390 regulation and practice for nursing and midwifery professions in the African region.
391 *Africa J Midwifery*. 2014;8(2):3-3.
392
- 393 10. WHO. Transforming and scaling up health professionals' education and training: World
394 Health Organization guidelines 2013. 2013 [cited 31 May 24]. Available from:
395 [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/transforming-and-scaling-up-health-
396 professionals%E2%80%99-education-and-training](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/transforming-and-scaling-up-health-professionals%E2%80%99-education-and-training).
397

- 398 11. International Confederation of Midwives. Global standards for midwifery regulation.
399 2011 [cited 31 May 24]. Available from:
400 [https://internationalmidwives.org/resources/global-standards-for-midwifery-](https://internationalmidwives.org/resources/global-standards-for-midwifery-regulation/)
401 [regulation/](https://internationalmidwives.org/resources/global-standards-for-midwifery-regulation/).
402
- 403 12. Kennedy HP, Myers-Ciecko JA, Carr KC, Breedlove G, Bailey T, Farrell MV, et al. United
404 States model midwifery legislation and regulation: development of a consensus
405 document. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2018;63(6):652-659.
406
- 407 13. Jefferson K, Bouchard ME, Summers L. The regulation of professional midwifery in the
408 United States. *J Nurs Regul*. 2021;11(4):26-38.
409
- 410 14. Kreutzberg A, Reichebner, C, Maier, CB, Destrebecq, F & Panteli, D. Regulating the input:
411 health professions. In: Busse R, Klazinga N, Panteli D, et al., editors. *Improving*
412 *healthcare quality in Europe: characteristics, effectiveness and implementation of*
413 *different strategies (Health Policy Series, No. 53.)*. Copenhagen (Denmark): European
414 Observatory on Health Systems and Policies; 2019 [cited 31 May 24]. Available from:
415 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK549267/>
416
- 417 15. Ranchoff BL, Declercq ER. The scope of midwifery practice regulations and the
418 availability of the certified nurse-midwifery and certified midwifery workforce, 2012-
419 2016. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2020;65(1):119-130.
420
- 421 16. Hoehn-Velasco L, Jolles D, Silverio-Murillo A, Plemmons A. Health outcomes and
422 provider choice under independent practice for certified nurse-midwives. *SSRN*
423 *Electronic Journal*. 2022:3878127.
424
- 425 17. Markowitz S, Adams EK, Lewitt MJ, Dunlop AL. Competitive effects of scope of practice
426 restrictions: public health or public harm? *J Health Econ*. 2017;55:201-218.
427
- 428 18. Vanderlaan J. Midwifery workforce density moderates the association between
429 independent practice and pregnancy outcomes. *J Midwifery Womens Health*.
430 2023;68(5):588-595.
431
- 432 19. Vedam S, Stoll K, MacDorman M, Declercq E, Cramer R, Cheyney M, Fisher T, Butt E,
433 Yang YT, & Powell Kennedy H (2018). Mapping integration of midwives across the
434 United States: Impact on access, equity, and outcomes. *PloS one*. 2018;13(2),
435 e0192523–e0192523.
436
- 437 20. Kimani RW, Gatimu SM. Nursing and midwifery education, regulation and workforce in
438 Kenya: A scoping review. *Int Nurs Rev*. 2023;70(3):444-455. doi:10.1111/inr.12840
439
- 440 21. Adegoke AA, Atiyaye FB, Abubakar AS, Auta A & Aboda A. Job satisfaction and retention
441 of midwives in rural Nigeria. *Midwifery*. 2015;31(10), 946–956.

- 442
443 22. United Nations Population Fund, World Health Organization, International
444 Confederation of Midwives. The state of the world's midwifery 2021: webappendices.
445 2021 [Cited 6 March 24]. Available from: [https://www.unfpa.org/sowmy-](https://www.unfpa.org/sowmy-webappendices)
446 [webappendices](https://www.unfpa.org/sowmy-webappendices).
447
448 23. International Confederation of Midwives. Global midwives' associations mapping
449 survey. 2019 [cited 5 March 24]. Available from:
450 <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/c60a4fcb935a47fabcac76cdf025583b>.
451
452 24. World Health Organization. National Health Workforce Account Data Platform; 2024
453 [cited 5 June 2024]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/nhwaportal/>.
454
455 25. World Health Organization. National health workforce accounts: a handbook. 2017.
456 Geneva: World Health Organization.
457
458 26. United Nations Development Program. Human Development Index. 2022 [cited 8 March
459 24]. Available from: [https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/human-development-](https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/human-development-index#/indicies/HDI)
460 [index#/indicies/HDI](https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/human-development-index#/indicies/HDI).
461
462 27. World Health Organization. Global health expenditure database. 2024 [cited 7 March
463 24]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/nha/database>.
464
465 28. The World Bank. Gini Index Data. 2024 [cited 8 March 24]. Available from:
466 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI>.
467
468 29. The World Bank. Country Income Group. 2024 [cited 8 March 24]. Available from:
469 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/topics/19280-country-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/topics/19280-country-classification)
470 [classification](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/topics/19280-country-classification).
471
472 30. World Health Organization. Midwives' voices, midwives' realities: find-ings from a global
473 consultation on providing quality midwifery care. October 2016 [cited 20 March 24].
474 [http://www.who.int/maternal-child-adolescent/documents/midwives-voices-](http://www.who.int/maternal-child-adolescent/documents/midwives-voices-realities/en/)
475 [realities/en/](http://www.who.int/maternal-child-adolescent/documents/midwives-voices-realities/en/).
476
477 31. Mattison C, Bourret K, Hebert E, Leshabari S, Kabeya A, Achiga P, Robinson J, Darling E.
478 Health systems factors impacting the integration of midwifery: an evidence-informed
479 framework on strengthening midwifery associations. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021; 6(6),
480 e004850.
481
482 32. Soewondo P, Pujisubekti R, Prastyani AW, Rahmayanti NM. Interprofessional
483 collaborative practice and health workers retention at remote primary health care: case
484 study from nusantara sehat team-based program. *Kesmas (Depok)*, 2022;17(2).
485

- 486 33. Belaid L, Dagenais C, Moha M, Ridde V. Understanding the factors affecting the
487 attraction and retention of health professionals in rural and remote areas: a mixed-
488 method study in Niger. *Hum Resour Health*. 2017;*15*(1), 60–60.
489
- 490 34. Okello DRO, Gilson L. Exploring the influence of trust relationships on motivation in the
491 health sector: a systematic review. *Hum Resour Health*, 2015;*13*(1), 16–16.
492
- 493 35. West M, Bailey S, Williams E. The courage of compassion: supporting nurses and
494 midwives to deliver high quality care. The King’s Fund. Sep. 2020 [cited 8 Mar 24].
495 Available at: [https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/courage-compassion-](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/courage-compassion-supporting-nursesmidwives)
496 [supporting-nursesmidwives](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/courage-compassion-supporting-nursesmidwives)
497
- 498 36. Fenwick J, Sidebotham M, Gamble J, Creedy DK. The emotional and professional
499 wellbeing of Australian midwives: A comparison between those providing continuity of
500 midwifery care and those not providing continuity. *Women Birth*. 2018;*31*(1):38-43.
501
- 502 37. Kubota S, Ando M, Murray J, et al. A regulatory gap analysis of midwifery to deliver
503 essential reproductive, maternal, newborn, child and adolescent health services in Lao
504 People's Democratic Republic. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac*. 2023;*43*:100960. Published
505 2023 Dec 5.
506
- 507 38. Saralegui-Gainza A, Soto-Ruiz N, Escalada-Hernández P, Arregui-Azagra A, García-Vivar C,
508 San Martín-Rodríguez L. Density of nurses and midwives in sub-Saharan Africa: Trends
509 analysis over the period 2004–2016. *J Nurs Manag*. 2022;*30*(8), 3922–3932.
510