CODEN [USA]: IAJPBB ISSN: 2349-7750

INDO AMERICAN JOURNAL OF
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES
http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3610739

Available online at: http://www.iajps.com Research Article

THE CHARACTER OF THE HOSPITALIST AND MATERNAL-FETAL MEDICINE IN INPATIENT OBSTETRICAL CARE

[1]Dr. Jamshaid Ali, [2]Dr. Neelam Ameer, [3]Dr. Madiha Tariq
[1]BHU Jharanwala, Sialkot
[2]BHU Dullah, Chakwal
[3]Imran Idrees Teaching Hospital, Sialkot

Article Received: November 2019 **Accepted:** December 2019 **Published:** January 2020

Abstract:
Objective: *Our goal was to evaluate the work of hospitalists and maternal-fetal medicine (MFM) subspecialists in inpatient obstetrical care.*
Study Design: *Our existing research was led at Sir Ganga Ram Hospital, Lahore from October 2018 to August 2019. This electronic study was offered to individuals from the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology (ACOG; n=1,038) and the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM; n=1814).*
Results and Conclusion: *609 (22%) respondents completed the review. Thirty-five percent reported that hospitalists provided care in at least one of their emergency clinics. In contrast, CCOG and MEMS respondents indicated that they were more comfortable with the fact that hospitalists consider all women in labour and birth (75.3 vs. 44.6%, p=.006) and women with complex problems (57.5 vs. 44.6%, p=.005). Most CCOG respondents, to some degree, strongly agreed that hospitalists were associated with fewer unfriendly opportunities (70%) and improved social safety and well-being (71%). Seventy-two percent of COCA respondents had access to the MFM interview, and 54% had access to the inpatient inclusion. Of these, 81% were satisfied with the accessibility of the MFM. More than 34% of respondents work in units set up with hospitalists and most of them have an MFM accessible to inpatients. It is essential to assess whether and how hospitalists can improve maternal and perinatal outcomes, and which types of clinics are best served by them.*
Keywords: *Hospitalist; inpatient obstetrical care; laborism; Maternal Fetal Medicine*

Corresponding author:
Dr. Jamshaid Ali,
BHU Jharanwala, Sialkot

QR code

Please cite this article in press Jamshaid Ali et al., ***The Character Of The Hospitalist And Maternal-Fetal Medicine In Inpatient Obstetrical Care.,*** *Indo Am. J. P. Sci, 2020; 07(01).*

INTRODUCTION:

Over the past decade, obstetrics "hospitalists" (obs.), also known as "laboratory technicians", have gradually been used to provide care in labour and delivery units. First depicted in 2003, the hospital obstetrics model was introduced with the desire to reduce the number of outstanding tasks within reach of the physician and to improve patient consideration and fulfillment [1]. This model was first conceptualized to incorporate physicians who were constantly observing patients in the delivery and development unit. Simultaneously with the rise in hospitalist care, there has been an expanded focus on the treatment of complex maternal conditions by maternal fetal medicine (MFM) subspecialists [2]. In an inspirational paper for 2013, D'Alton highlighted the fundamental work that MMF physicians have been doing in caring for complex women, and demonstrated that MMF physicians should be readily available to provide care to the convoluted obstetric inpatient in a restorative manner [3]. With the increasing predominance of obstetrical hospitalists and the emphasis on caring for complex obstetrical patients to reduce maternal morbidity and mortality, we have attempted to review the current work with the minds of the inpatient obstetrical patient in mind [4]. This synthesis study was planned to evaluate the work of obstetrical hospitalists and MMF subspecialists in hospital obstetrical care, to assess the comfort level of general obstetrics and gynecology professionals and MFM sub-specialists with respect to hospital obstetrical care for explicit inpatient gatherings, and to establish the level of achievement of master's degrees in obstetrics and gynecology with respect to MFM administrations accessible to their patients [5].

METHODOLOGY:

Our existing research was led at Sir Ganga Ram Hospital, Lahore from October 2018 to August 2019. This electronic study was offered to individuals from the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology (ACOG; n=1,038) and the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM; n=1814). Separate studies were offered to individuals from the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) and the Society for Maternal Fetal Medicine (SMFM) during the periods indicated below. The review was evaluated by the University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board and found to meet the exclusion criteria.

Survey design

Reviews include both face approval and substance approval by an expert board of ACOG and SMFM prior to organization. This board included professionals in obstetrics and gynaecology, obstetrical hospitalists and subspecialists in MFM. The overviews included various decision questions regarding segment, clinic, and inpatient qualities (Appendix). The MFM review included questions regarding the "core" medical clinic of the MFM physician's work, as well as satellite emergency clinics, where the same number of MFM physicians provide care in more than one clinic.

Analysis of information:

Information was entered into Stata's 12.0 restitution (College Station, TX) for investigation. Chi-square tests were used to examine absolute factors, t-tests to analyze parametric information, and range tests to reflect rates and ranges. An estimate $p < 0.06$ was considered a fact worthy of note.

RESULTS:

A total of 2,985 physicians were reached, Figure 1. 120 individuals who responded to COGPA were not eligible because they were MFP physicians or did not provide inpatient obstetrical care. Of the remainder (MFMS, 1,034 ACOG), 219 ACOG and 396 MFMS completed the examination. The overall reaction rate was 3.5% (n=615). Non-responders to the MMSS included both those physicians in the MMSS who chose not to respond and those who were ineligible because they were not providing inpatient care. In this way, the specific number of MMFs who were ineligible is unclear. The segment and practice qualities of the respondents from both associations are presented in Table 1. The ACOG individuals were necessarily female and were somewhat younger than the MMFS respondents. More than 77% of the ACOG respondents rehearsed in a medical clinic with a level II or III neonatal emergency unit and more than 71% were in an urban setting. Eighty-four percent of the MMFS respondents have rehearsed in a medical clinic with a Level III neonatal intensive care unit, with the majority (61%) being college-based. Approximately 36% of respondents reported that obstetrical hospitalists provided care in at least one of their medical clinics, with no contrast between COAG and MMPS respondents (40.5 vs. 33.8%, p=0.2). Overall, most hospital physicians have been used in the past 5 years, with a wide range of business plans (Table 1). Table 2 presents data on the work of the

Obstetrics Hospitalist. Respondents revealed comparative frequencies in terms of the type of patients that hospitalists care for at their foundation. Fewer than 11% of respondents reported that Hospitalists care for patients with perplexity or high risk. In order to better understand what an obstetrical hospitalist is, MSMWs were asked what they meant by a hospitalist. These definitions have changed significantly and are presented in Table 3. Table 4 presents the feedback from the ACOG review with respect to the MMF jurisdictions available to them. Seventy-two percent of CCOG respondents had access to MMF subspecialists, and 53.6% had access to MMF subspecialty administrations for patients hospitalized in their clinic. Nearly 80% of repeat obstetrician-gynecologists have MFM subspecialty administrations available within 31 miles. Over 91% of COAG respondents with accessible subspecialty administrations were satisfied with the accessibility of telephone questions and meetings for women with complex health problems.

DISCUSSION:

Approximately 87% of respondents were satisfied with the accessibility of MMF subspecialists for questions and face-to-face discussions for women with complex conditions and for transportation of these women. 82% of respondents were pleased that the MMF administration was responsive to the needs of fundamentally ill obstetrical patients [6]. Of those who were dissatisfied with the administration of the MTM, the majority (69%) showed a trend towards 24-hour, daily accessibility of the MTM. We surveyed general Ob/Gyn specialists and MFM subspecialists to evaluate the roles of hospitalists and MFM subspecialists in the care of the obstetrical inpatient [7]. Consistent with published data, approximately 36% of respondents had Ob hospitalists working at their hospital. In terms of the MFM subspecialty, 84% of MFM subspecialists practiced in a hospital with a Level III NICU with the majority (61%) at university centers [8]. More than three quarters of Ob/Gyn specialists' practice in hospitals with a Level II or Level III NICU and 73% have MFM availability for patient care, with 54% having inpatient MFM availability. It is not surprising that 29% of ACOG respondents did not have MFM subspecialists available for patient care as 24% of respondents practice in a hospital with a Level I NICU [9].

Table 1: Demographic and rehearsal structures of accused:

Demographic Features	ACOG (n=216)	SMFM (n=297)	P Value
Female gender	128 (49)	117 (45)	<0.001
Age	51.5 (10.4)	52.6 (9.5)	0.006
Years in practice	28.9 (14.10)	18.7 (10.7)	0.9
Level of hospital/NICU			
Level I	50 (24)	23 (6)	<0.001
Level II	71 (34)	42 (11)	
Level III	97 (45)	335 (84)	
Type of hospital			
Urban university or university affiliate	61 (29)	238 (61)	<0.002
Urban community	95 (44)	128 (34)	
Rural community	44 (21)	13 (4)	
Other	18 (9)	19 (6)	
Type of ObGyn			
MFM	0	398 (100)	---
Generalist	185 (89)	0	
Hospitalist	11 (5)	0	
Combination of generalist/hospitalist	21 (10)	0	
Hospitalists are present in at least one of the hospitals	85 (40)	131 (34)	0.2
Number of years hospitalists have been employed			

0–5	148 (69)	249 (63)	<0.001
6–10	40 (19)	91 (23)	
>10	25 (12)	54 (14)	
Who employs hospitalists?			0.09
The hospital/university	89 (42)	193 (48)	
Independent set	38 (18)	49 (13)	
A hospitalist company	22 (11)	20 (6)	
The MFM division	6 (4)	41 (11)	
Part of the private practice or multispecialty group	29 (14)	71 (19)	
Other	22 (11)	25 (7)	
Unknown	15 (7)	0	

Table 2: Role of obstetrical hospitalists:

Percentage of respondents who report that hospitalists care for following types of patients: *			
	ACOG (n=213)	SMFM (n=394)	p-value
Females through complex medical situations	18 (9)	31 (9)	2.1
Females through complex obstetrical situations	21 (11)	39 (11)	2.1
Females through complex fetal situations	16 (8)	23 (7)	1.7
Completely females on L&D	37 (18)	53 (13)	0.3
Entirely females on L&D excluding private cases	42 (20)	41 (11)	0.003
Cases of MFM exercise	19 (9)	30 (8)	0.7
Females in intensive care unit	17 (9)	7 (3)	0.002
Percentage of cases who were somewhat or very relaxed through hospitalists providing care to following sets of cases:*			
	ACOG (n=213)	SMFM (n=394)	p-value
All women on L&D	93 (44)	293 (74)	0.005
Women with complex medical conditions	80 (38)	174 (44)	0.1
Women with complex obstetrical conditions	93 (44)	222 (56)	0.004
Women with complex fetal conditions	72 (34)	115 (29)	0.3
What is the impact of the hospitalist on various outcomes			
	ACOG (n=215)		
	Somewhat/completely agree		
Lessened adversative actions	149 (69)		
Reduced malpractice claims	78 (39)		
Reduced cesarean deliveries	64 (31)		
Better neonatal results	99 (48)		
Enhanced case approval	96 (46)		
Enhanced provider approval	157 (75)		
Enhanced safety and safety culture	149 (72)		
Enhanced house staff training	123 (62)		

Table 3: What is the definition of an obstetrical hospitalist? *

Definition	n (%) n=395
Part of a meeting giving every minute of every day inclusion on L&D	128 (3)
The practice is full, but is also used for unassigned patients in L&D and the crisis room	42 (11)
Helps the different providers for a specific move, (Doc of the day).	68 (19)
Dispatches unassigned patients to the L&D and also to the crisis room.	42 (11)
Helps the different providers for all their working days, not having a practice.	57 (15)
Other	62 (15)

*This survey enquiry only managed to SMFM members L&D: labor & delivery:

CONCLUSION:

Although only the marginal of ACOG respondents indicated that they were comfortable with the fact that Ottawa College of Physicians Hospitalists pay special attention to women in loss and development, most agreed that Ottawa College of Physicians Hospitalists improve the safety and well-being of society, reduce adverse opportunities and improve the preparedness of domestic staff. It is imperative to evaluate whether and how hospital physicians can improve maternal and perinatal outcomes, and the types of medical clinics that are best served by them.

REFERENCES:

1. Wenstrom K, Erickson K, Schulkin J. Are Obstetrician-Gynecologists Satisfied with Their Maternal-Fetal Medicine Consultants? A Survey Am J Perinatol. 2012; 29:599–608. [PubMed: 22639353]
2. Funk C, Anderson BL, Schulkin J, Weinstein L. Survey of obstetric and gynecologic hospitalists and laborists. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2010; 203(2):177, e1–4. [PubMed: 20579954]
3. Olson R, Garite TJ, Fishman A, Andress IF. Obstetrician/gynecologist hospitalists: can we improve safety outcomes for patients and hospitalists and improve lifestyle for physicians? Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2010; 207(2):81–6. [PubMed: 22840717]
4. D'Alton ME, Bonanno CA, Berkowitz RL, et al. Putting the "M" back in maternal-fetal medicine. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2013; 208(6):442–8. [PubMed: 23211544]
5. D'Alton ME. Where Is the "M" in Maternal-Fetal Medicine? Obstet Gynecol. 2010; 116(6):1401–4. [PubMed: 21099610]
6. [Accessed last on April 20, 2014] https://www.realmagnet.com/solutions/survey-management/
7. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap) - A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform. 2009 Apr; 42(2):377–81. [PubMed: 18929686]
8. Srinivas SK, Lorch SA. The laborist model of obstetric care: we need more evidence. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2012; 207(1):30–5. [PubMed: 22138138]
9. Weinstein L. The laborist: a new focus of practice for the obstetrician. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2003; 188:310–2. [PubMed: 12592231]