Measuring abortion morbidity

Hospital record abstraction

Introduction

- Every encounter between a patient with abortion and a provider of a health care generates a record
- Almost <u>all</u> health facilities <u>routinely</u> collect data on their patients
- Most frequently collected information on records include:
 - Clinical data (e.g. clinical history, presenting signs and symptoms, clinical findings, diagnosis, procedures)
 - Socioeconomic (e.g. occupation, family composition, region of residence)
 - Administrative (e.g. site of care, type of service)
 - Behavioral (e.g. whether patient complied or not)

Introduction (cont...)

- Some of the records are:
 - Casualty/OPD logbooks
 - Patient charts
 - Ward registers
 - Theatre logbooks
 - Procedure room logbooks
 - Periodic statistical returns

- Routinely collected data are often used to provide a rough indication of the frequency of occurrence of an abortion with the intent of applying the results to the community as a whole
- However, before taking this for granted, we need to ask a few other general questions:
 - What is the measurement objective?
 i.e., its scope and purpose
 - Appropriateness of the disease
 - i.e., the condition should be conventionally treated in health facility
 - for example, compare cancer, mental illness and abortion
 - the condition should be adequately defined
 - abortion would meet this criterion
 - no selection for hospitalization should occur
 - for example, adolescents vs adults; single vs married; rural vs urban, poor vs rich
 - Appropriateness of the health facility and catchment area
 - i.e., a defined pop'n with available census data should exist
 - the health facility should serve most people from the geographic area

- Other factors that need consideration include:
 - » is routinely collected data standardized?
 - » are all points of the SDPs where data is collected known?
 - » are we confident on the completeness of data collected?

After exploring our responses to the above questions –

»Then – "What?"

 Are we still holding the view that routinely collected data measures abortion morbidity?

 I suggest, for your consideration, that routinely collected data in most, if not all, of our facilities are far from ideal.

 Therefore, as it stands now, I DON'T find routinely collected data useful to reliably measuring abortion morbidity.

- What are some of the problems?
 - Lack of accurate documentation of cases
 - practical problems to abstracting the relevant information from
 - » many places
 - » many medical charts
 - » Records written by numerous health workers
 - Cases seen at different level of health facilities differ
 - Cases seen at health facilities differ from those not visiting one
 - Records themselves are often incomplete
 - Information is unstandardized from facility to facility
 - Diagnostic variability exists among different facilities and health workers

- Presenting signs sometimes leading to misclassification to other disease categories.
 - » For example bleeding, shock, sepsis, peritonitis etc.,
- Compared to women who present to health facilities many more women are not admitted due to several reasons:
 - » Poor access (geographic and/or economic)
 - » Reluctance to seek care
 - » Self limiting clinical severity

Conclusion

- Although hospital records should in theory be able to identify all cases seen with abortion over a certain time period, for a variety of reasons cases are missed
- However, we can still make some use of routinely collected data to reflect abortion morbidity, such as:
 - Abstracting relevant information related to monitoring and evaluating services renders
 - » number of services provided
 - » Cases of abortion complications treated in the facilities
 - » Proportion of Gyn/Obs cases due to abortion complications
- Unless we administer special surveys, the information we abstract from hospital records, therefore, is of limited use for measuring abortion morbidity