

International Conference on Applied Science and Health 2017

Improving health and well-being for better society

ICASH-A62

MODE OF DELIVERY, HOSPITAL OWNERSHIP AND PREDICTORS MATERNITY LENGTH OF STAY IN TWO HOSPITALS IN JAKARTA

Cicih Opitasari^{1,*}

¹Magister Administrasi Rumah Sakit, University of Indonesia

*Corresponding author's email: vitasari2010@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Length of stay (LOS) is one of the most common indicator used for hospital performance assessment. The longer LOS for mothers giving birth can increase the risk of nosocomial infections and cause some psychological problems.

Aims: This study aims to analyze the determinants of maternal length of stay which can be used to evaluate the hospital efficiency and quality care improvement.

Methods: The cross-sectional study was conducted in two hospitals in Jakarta. We used the medical records of women who underwent delivery during the period of January 1 to December 31, 2011. Multivariate linear regression analysis with stepwise method was used to predict length of stay.

Results: The study found 2727 patients met the inclusion criteria and were included in the analysis. The overall mean length of hospital stay was 3 days and the mean of mother's age was 29,9 years old. Among all of the covariates, mode of delivery had largest impact on LOS, with cesarean section increasing LOS by 1.2 days on average (Coef=1,21; P=0,000), followed by hospital ownership with private hospital reducing LOS 0,79 days on average (Coef = 0,79; P=0,000).

Conclusion: Mode of delivery and hospital ownership were the strong predictors for maternal length of stay in two hospitals in Jakarta.

Keywords: mode of delivery, hospital ownership, length of stay

INTRODUCTION

Length of stay (LOS) is one of the most common indicator used for hospital performance assessment [1,2]. It is considered as the effective measure for efficiency of the hospital delivery process and quality of care indicator [3,4]. The excess length of stay has an economic consequences which would increase the costs per patient and make beds unavailable for other patients [5]. The longer LOS for mothers giving birth can increase the risk of nosocomial infections and cause some psychological problems such as sleep disturbance, breastfeeding problem, maternal dissatisfaction, paternal involvement and family bonding problems [6].

There is a wide variation in the length of stay after giving birth between countries. The mean length of stay ranged from 0.5 to 6.2 days for vaginal deliveries and 2.5 to 9.3 days for cesarean-section deliveries [6]. According to WHO recommendation the cut off LOS for uncomplicated vaginal deliveries was 24 hours, but for cesarean section there was less evidence for choosing cut off, yet the united states consider 48 - 72 hours for complicated cesarean section and allowed to stay until 96 hours [6]. In Indonesia, the length of stay for cesarean section



deliveries was reported ranging from 4 to 13 days in 2010 [7]. Meanwhile in 2015 most women with cesarean deliveries have less than 5 days of hospital stay [8].

Several studies showed various factors that contribute to the maternal length of stay after delivery including cesarean section, birthweight, multiple birth, infant survival status, advanced maternal age, birth attendants, gained excess weight during pregnancy and the presence of obstetric complications [6,9,10]. Indonesia still has limited data on how much is actually the mean of maternal LOS after delivery and its determinants. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the determinants for maternal length of stay in two hospitals in Jakarta which can be used to evaluate hospital efficiency and quality care improvement. It was hypothesized that mode of delivery and hospital ownership are more influential than demographic characteristics in predicting maternal length of stay.

METHODS

The cross-sectional study was conducted in two hospitals in Jakarta. We used the medical records of women who underwent delivery during the period of January 1 to December 31, 2011. The data that were collected including patient's demographic characteristics (mother's age, mother's education level, mother's occupations, funding source), hospital ownership, mode of delivery, clinical risk factors (gemelli, haemorhagia antepartum/HAP, malpresentation, history of hypertension, (pre-)eclampsia, anemia), and delivery by social indications.

LOS as dependent variable was defined as the time from patient admission to the hospital until discharge (in days). This study excluded the patients less than 15 years of age and greater than 45 years of age, the patients with a length of stay of longer than 7 days (were considered to represent unusual cases) and the patients with incomplete data. The predictors for LOS as independent variables were mothers age (years), hospital ownership which was recorded as public and private hospital, mode of delivery was categorized as vaginal and cesarean delivery. Education level was categorized into three groups: low (uneducated until complete primary school), middle (complete junior high school) and high (complete senior high school or more). Mother's occupations were divided into 5 categories (unemployed/housewife, military/police/civil servants/state, private employees, entrepreneurs/traders and laborer). Payment sources were grouped into five categories: out of pocket, civil servants insurance (provided by *Askes*), company (*Jamsostek* or other company insurances), private insurance and social insurance (*Jamkesmas, Jamkesda, or Jampersal*).

Clinical risk factors were categorized as yes and no (diagnose was established by professional health workers in the hospital as gemelli, haemorhagia antepartum/HAP, malpresentation, history of hypertension, (pre-) eclampsia, anemia). Delivery by social indications was operationalized as delivery based on patient's demand. Multivariat linear regression analysis with stepwise method was used to predict length of stay by using STATA version 9. The null hypothesis was accepted if mode of delivery and hospital ownership did not significantly influence maternal length of hospital stay. Ethical approval was obtained from National Institute for Health Research and Development Ethics Committee, Ministry of Health, Republic of Indonesia on July 25, 2012.

RESULTS

The study found 2727 patients met the inclusion criteria and were included in the analysis. The overall mean length of hospital stay was 3 days and the mean of mother's age was 29,9 years old. Table 1 shows the geometric length of stay means was almost distributed similarly in respect with mother's education level and occupation. Meanwhile those with company and civil servant



insurance, cesarean delivery, mothers with clinical risk factors and perform delivery in government hospital had higher geometric mean length of stay.

Table 2. presents patient's demographic characteristics, including age, education, and payment source had effect on LOS except occupation. Every addition of 1year mother's age seems to elevate length of hospital stay. Compared to the respective reference group, patients with insurance payment appears to stay longer meanwhile low and middle educated mothers were more likely to stay shorter. However such effects were very small, these variables contributed less than 15% of the difference on LOS. Otherwise mode of delivery, hospital ownership and clinical risk factors except anemia were more likely to have much contribution on LOS.

Variable n % Metan length of stay (days) (2772) Wother's education (days) High ^R 730 26.8 2.87 Middle 1339 49.1 2.72 Low 658 24.1 2.51 Mother's occupation 147 5.4 2.97 Private employeed/housewife ^R 1902 69.7 2.69 Military/police/civil servants/state 147 5.4 2.97 Private employees 551 20.2 2.75 Entrepreneur/raders 86 3.2 2.69 Laborer 41 1.5 2.20 Payment source 0ut of pocket ^R 1403 51.4 2.53 Company insurance 160 5.9 3.25 2.69 Vaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership		Frequency		- Mean length of stay	
Mother's education 730 26.8 2.87 Middle 1339 49.1 2.72 Low 658 24.1 2.51 Mother's occupation 1002 69.7 2.69 Military/police/civil servants/state 147 5.4 2.97 Private employees 551 20.2 2.75 Entrepreneur/traders 86 3.2 2.69 Laborer 41 1.5 2.20 Payment source 000 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery Vaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation No ^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 97 3.6 3.33	Variable	n (2772)	%	(days)	
High73026.82.87Middle133949.12.72Low65824.12.51Mother's occupationUnemployed/housewife ^R 190269.72.69Military/police/civil servants/state1475.42.97Private employees55120.22.75Entrepreneur/traders863.22.69Laborer411.52.20Payment source51.42.53Company insurance1605.93.25Private insurance2549.33.09Social insurance2549.33.09Mode of deliveryVaginal delivery ^R 89332.71.86Casearean section183467.33.26Hospital ownershipGovernment ^R 129247.43.21Private143552.62.32MalpresentationNo ^R 238587.52.66Yes34212.53.11Haemorhagia antepartumNo ^R 245189.92.63Yes25993.82.66Yes10.13.47(Pre-jeclampsiaNo ^R 255993.82.66Yes1602.23.59GenelliNo ^R 255993.82.66Yes160 <td< td=""><td>Mother's education</td><td>· /</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Mother's education	· /			
Middle133949.12.72Low 658 24.12.51Mother's occupation $Unemployed/housewife^R$ 1902 69.7 2.69 Military/police/civil servants/state147 5.4 2.97 Private employees 551 20.2 2.75 Entrepreneur/traders 86 3.2 2.69 Laborer 41 1.5 2.20 Payment source $0u$ of pocket ^R 1403 51.4 2.53 Out of pocket ^R 1403 51.4 2.53 Company insurance 160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery V $Vaginal delivery^R$ 893 32.7 Vaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership $Government^R$ 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation No^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 49.7 Haemorhagia antepartum No^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 276 0.1 3.47 76 No ^R 2559 93.8 2.66 $7e_8$ Yes 1667 97.8 2.69 $7e_8$ No ^R 2667	High ^R	730	26.8	2.87	
Low65824.12.51Mother's occupation $=$ Unemployed/housewife ^R 190269.72.69Military/police/civil servants/state1475.42.97Private employees55120.22.75Entrepreneur/traders863.22.69Laborer411.52.00Payment source $=$ $=$ Out of pocket ^R 140351.42.53Company insurance632.32.68Civil servant insurance2549.33.09Social insurance84731.12.81Mode of delivery $=$ $=$ Vaginal delivery ^R 89332.71.86Caesarean section183467.33.26Hospital ownership $=$ $=$ $=$ Government ^R 129247.43.21Private13552.62.32Malpresentation $=$ $=$ No ^R 238587.52.66Yes973.63.33History of hypertension $=$ $=$ No ^R 245189.92.63Yes27610.13.47(Pre-)eclampsia $=$ $=$ No ^R 255993.82.66Yes1686.23.58Gemelli $=$ $=$ No ^R 266797.82.69Yes266797.82.69Yes266797.82.69Yes <t< td=""><td>Middle</td><td>1339</td><td>49.1</td><td>2.72</td></t<>	Middle	1339	49.1	2.72	
Mother's occupation Unemployed/housewife ^R 1902 69.7 2.69 Military/police/civil servants/state 147 5.4 2.97 Private employees 551 20.2 2.75 Entrepreneur/traders 86 3.2 2.69 Laborer 41 1.5 2.20 Payment source 100 51.4 2.53 Company insurance 160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery V V V 3.26 Hospital ownership U V 3.26 3.26 Hospital ownership U V 3.21 P Private 1435 52.6 2.32 3.26 Hapresentation V V S 3.26 No ^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Y Y S	Low	658	24.1	2.51	
Unemployed/housewife1902 69.7 2.69 Military/police/civil servants/state147 5.4 2.97 Private employees 551 20.2 2.75 Entrepreneur/traders 86 3.2 2.69 Laborer 41 1.5 2.20 Payment source 41 1.5 2.20 Payment source 63 2.3 2.68 Company insurance 160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery V V Vaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership U V V Government ^R 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation W V V No ^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension W V No ^R 255 93.8 2.66 Yes 2567 97.8 2.69 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli W W V No ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 6677 97.8 2.69 Yes 6677 97.8 2.69 Ye	Mother's occupation				
Military/police/civil servants/state1475.42.97Private employees55120.22.75Entrepreneur/traders863.22.69Laborer411.52.20Payment source0ut of pocket ^R 140351.42.53Company insurance1605.93.25Private insurance632.32.68Civil servant insurance2549.33.09Social insurance84731.12.81Mode of deliveryVVVaginal delivery ^R 89332.71.86Caesarean section183467.33.26Hospital ownershipGovernment ^R 129247.43.21Private143552.62.32MalpresentationNo ^R 238587.52.66Yes9363.63.33History of hypertensionNo ^R 245189.92.63Yes27610.13.47(Pre-)eclampsiaNo ^R 255993.82.66Yes602.23.59AnemiaNo ^R 266797.82.69Yes602.23.593.59AnemiaNo ^R 266797.82.69Yes602.23.593.59AnemiaNo ^R 266797.82.69Yes602.23.593.6Yes602.23.593.59AnemiaNo2	Unemployed/housewife ^R	1902	69.7	2.69	
Private employees 551 20.2 2.75 Entrepreneur/traders 86 3.2 2.69 Laborer 41 1.5 2.20 Payment source 0 100 50.44 2.53 Out of pocket ^R 1403 51.4 2.53 Company insurance 160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of deliveryVVVVaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownershipGovernment ^R 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 MalpresentationNo ^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum No^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 276 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia No^R 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli No^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia No^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia No^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 <td< td=""><td>Military/police/civil servants/state</td><td>147</td><td>5.4</td><td>2.97</td></td<>	Military/police/civil servants/state	147	5.4	2.97	
Entrepreneur/raders86 3.2 2.69 Laborer41 1.5 2.20 Payment source 115 2.20 Out of pocket ^R 1403 51.4 2.53 Company insurance 160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of deliveryVVVaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership 0 0 322 Government ^R 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 11435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 100^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum 100^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 276 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia 101 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli No^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia 1791 65.7 2.68 Yes 936 34.3 2.76	Private employees	551	20.2	2.75	
Laborer411.52.20Payment source 1403 51.4 2.53 Out of pocket ^R 160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery V V Vaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Casarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership V V Government ^R 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation V V V No ^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension V V No ^R 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli V V V No ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 667 97.8	Entrepreneur/traders	86	3.2	2.69	
Payment source 1403 51.4 2.53 Out of pocket ^R 160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery V V V Vaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership V V $S2.6$ 2.32 Malpresentation 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation V V V V No ^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Y Yes 3.42 12.5 3.11 V Haemorhagia antepartum V V V V No ^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Y Yes 97 3.6 3.33 V Haemorhagia antepartum V V V	Laborer	41	1.5	2.20	
Out of pocket ^R 1403 51.4 2.53 Company insurance160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of deliveryVaginal delivery ^R 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownershipGovernment ^R 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 MalpresentationNo ^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartumNo ^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertensionNo ^R 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 GemelliNo ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 27.8 3.59 AnemiaNo ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 27.8 3.59 AnemiaNo ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 65.7 2.68 Yes 936 34.3 2.76	Payment source				
Company insurance160 5.9 3.25 Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery $Vaginal delivery^R$ 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership $Government^R$ 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation No^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum No^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension No^R 2559 93.8 2.63 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli No^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia No^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59	Out of pocket ^R	1403	51.4	2.53	
Private insurance 63 2.3 2.68 Civil servant insurance 254 9.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery $Vaginal delivery^R$ 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership $Government^R$ 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation $Vaginal delivery^R$ 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum $Vaginal antepartum$ $Vaginal antepartum$ $Vaginal antepartum$ No ^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension $Vaginal antepartum$ $Vaginal antepartum$ No ^R 2451 89.9 2.63 Yes 276 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia $Vaginal antepartum$ $Vaginal antepartum$ No ^R 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli $Vaginal antepartum$ $Vaginal antepartup and Vaginal ante$	Company insurance	160	5.9	3.25	
Civil servant insurance2549.3 3.09 Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery $Vaginal delivery^R$ 893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership $Vaginal delivery^R$ 1292 47.4 3.21 Government ^R 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation $Vaginal delivery$ $Vaginal delivery$ $Vaginal delivery^R$ No ^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum $Vaginal delivery$ $Vaginal delivery$ No ^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension $Vaginal delivery$ $Vaginal delivery$ No ^R 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli $Vaginal delivery$ $Vaginal delivery$ No ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia $Vaginal delivery$ $Vaginal delivery$ No ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia $Vaginal delivery$ $Vaginal delivery$ No ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia $Vaginal delivery$ $Vaginal delivery$ No ^R 2.66 <	Private insurance	63	2.3	2.68	
Social insurance 847 31.1 2.81 Mode of delivery893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership 1292 47.4 3.21 Government ^R 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 1292 47.4 3.21 No ^R 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum 12.5 3.61 No ^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension 176 2559 93.8 No ^R 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli 1791 65.7 2.68 Yes 36 34.3 2.76	Civil servant insurance	254	9.3	3.09	
Mode of delivery893 32.7 1.86 Vaginal delivery893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section 1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership 1292 47.4 3.21 Government 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum 06.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension 06.4 2.69 Yes 2451 89.9 2.63 Yes 2451 89.9 2.63 Yes 2630 93.8 2.66 Yes 2657 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli 006 2.2 3.59 Anemia 006 2.2 3.59 Anemia 006 2.2 3.59	Social insurance	847	31.1	2.81	
Vaginal delivery893 32.7 1.86 Caesarean section1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership 67.3 3.26 Government1292 47.4 3.21 Private1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 1435 52.6 2.66 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension 168 6.2 3.58 (Pre-)eclampsia 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli 1791 65.7 2.68 Yes 936 34.3 2.76	Mode of delivery				
Caesarean section1834 67.3 3.26 Hospital ownership 1292 47.4 3.21 Government ^R 1292 47.4 3.21 Private 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum No^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension Ves 276 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia No^R 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli Ves 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia No^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia No^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59	Vaginal delivery ^R	893	32.7	1.86	
Hospital ownership Government ^R 129247.4 3.21 Private1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum 12.5 3.6 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli 168 6.2 3.59 Anemia 1791 65.7 2.68 Yes 936 34.3 2.76	Caesarean section	1834	67.3	3.26	
Government129247.4 3.21 Private1435 52.6 2.32 Malpresentation 2385 87.5 2.66 Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 276 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia 276 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia 86.2 3.58 Gemelli 86.2 3.58 Gemelli 86.2 3.59 Anemia 86.7 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia 86.7 34.3 2.76	Hospital ownership				
Private143552.62.32Malpresentation No^R 238587.52.66Yes34212.53.11Haemorhagia antepartum No^R 263096.42.69Yes973.63.33History of hypertension 2451 89.92.63Yes245189.92.63Yes255993.82.66Yes1686.23.58Gemelli No^R 266797.82.69Yes602.23.59Anemia No^R 179165.72.68Yes93634.32.76	Government ^R	1292	47.4	3.21	
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} Malpresentation & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Private	1435	52.6	2.32	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Malpresentation				
Yes 342 12.5 3.11 Haemorhagia antepartum 2630 96.4 2.69 No ^R 2630 96.4 2.69 Yes 97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension 2451 89.9 2.63 Yes 276 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia V V V No ^R 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes 168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli V V V No ^R 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia V V V No ^R 1791 65.7 2.68 Yes 936 34.3 2.76	No ^R	2385	87.5	2.66	
Haemorhagia antepartumNoR263096.42.69Yes973.63.33History of hypertension 2451 89.92.63Yes27610.13.47(Pre-)eclampsia 2559 93.82.66Yes1686.23.58Gemelli No^R 266797.82.69Yes602.23.59Anemia 1791 65.72.68Yes93634.32.76	Yes	342	12.5	3.11	
No^R 263096.42.69Yes973.63.33History of hypertension245189.92.63No^R245189.92.63Yes27610.13.47(Pre-)eclampsia $Varticle in the state in the stat$	Haemorhagia antepartum				
Yes97 3.6 3.33 History of hypertension2451 89.9 2.63 No ^R 276 10.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia 2559 93.8 2.66 Yes168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli 2667 97.8 2.69 Yes 60 2.2 3.59 Anemia 1791 65.7 2.68 Yes 936 34.3 2.76	No ^R	2630	96.4	2.69	
History of hypertension No^R 245189.92.63Yes27610.13.47(Pre-)eclampsia	Yes	97	3.6	3.33	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	History of hypertension				
Yes27610.1 3.47 (Pre-)eclampsia2559 93.8 2.66 NoR2559 93.8 2.66 Yes168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli $Vertical StructureVertical StructureNoR266797.82.69Yes602.23.59AnemiaVertical StructureVertical StructureNoR179165.72.68Yes93634.32.76$	No ^R	2451	89.9	2.63	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c } (Pre-)eclampsia & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Yes	276	10.1	3.47	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(Pre-)eclampsia				
Yes168 6.2 3.58 Gemelli	No ^R	2559	93.8	2.66	
Gemelli 2667 97.82.69Yes602.23.59Anemia 1791 65.72.68Yes93634.32.76	Yes	168	6.2	3.58	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Gemelli				
Yes602.23.59Anemia	No ^R	2667	97.8	2.69	
AnemiaNoR179165.72.68Yes93634.32.76	Yes	60	2.2	3.59	
NoR179165.72.68Yes93634.32.76	Anemia				
Yes 936 34.3 2.76	No ^R	1791	65.7	2.68	
	Yes	936	34.3	2.76	

Table 1. Patients' demographic and clinical characteristics on the length of stay



Improving health and well-being for better society

Social indication				
No ^R	2484	91.1	2.63	
Yes	243	8.9	3.71	
^R used as reference category for dummy variables				

Variable	Estimate	Difference (%)	95% CI	p value
Mother's age	0.03	3.0	0.02 - 0.04	0.000
Mother's education	-0.14	-14.0	-0.21 - 0.08	0.000
Mother's occupation	-0.02	-2.0	-0.07 - 0.03	0.422
Payment source	0.07	7.0	0.05 - 0.10	0.000
Mode of delivery	1.37	137.0	1.28 - 1.46	0.000
Hospital ownership	-0.87	-87.0	-0.960.77	0.000
Clinical risk factors				
Malpresentation	0.34	34.0	0.19 - 0.48	0.000
HAP	0.59	59.0	0.33 - 0.85	0.000
History of hypertension	0.73	73.0	0.57 - 0.88	0.000
(Pre-)eclampsia	0.84	84.0	0.65 - 1.04	0.000
Gemelli	0.84	84.0	0.51-1.17	0.000
Anemia	0.09	9.0	-0.01- 0.19	0.066
Social indication	0.89	89.0	0.73 - 1.06	0.000

|--|

Table 3 demonstrates among all of the covariates, mode of delivery had largest impact on LOS (with cesarean section increasing LOS by 1.2 days on average), followed by hospital ownership (with private hospital reducing LOS by 0,79 days on average), clinical risk factors (HAP, pre- eclampsia, gemelli, anemia) and payment source. Patients with cesarean section delivery and clinical risk factors except malpresentation had longer hospital stay compared to the reference group. In term of hospital effect, patients who perform delivery in private hospital stay shorter than in government hospital.

Table 3. Final fitted model to predict LOS				
Variable	Estimate	95% CI	Р	
Mode of delivery	1.21	1.12 - 1.31	0.000	
Hospital ownership	-0.79	-0.880.72	0.000	
Clinical risk factors				
Malpresentation	-0.13	-0.25 - 0.01	0.042	
HAP	0.26	0.05 - 0.47	0.015	
(Pre-)eclampsia	0.42	0.24 - 0.61	0.000	
Gemelli	0.29	0.02 - 0.55	0.034	
Anemia	0.10	0.02 - 0.18	0.015	
Payment source	0.07	0.04 - 0.09	0.000	
Intercept	2.39	2.28 - 2.49	0.000	
R-squared		36.0%		

DISCUSSION

Some limitations for this study were the absence of severity for clinical risk factors and neonatal condition information which made the prediction on LOS for more than 4 days was less accurate. This study only conducted in one private and government hospital, the prediction



hospital ownership on LOS may not represent large hospital. This study demonstrated that mode of delivery was the strongest predictor on maternal LOS. This finding was consistence with a review by Cseh who revealed the type of delivery has the largest effect on length of stay, with cesarean section increasing length of stay by 1.4 days on average [11]. The study done by Campbell reported that cesarean section delivery was one of the important factor associated with longer stay [6]. Ahlen stated Length of stay was longer for cesarean section (emergency and elective) compared to vaginal delivery [12]. Cesarean section was indicated when vaginal delivery put the mother or baby's health or life at risk [13]. The impact of anesthetic and adverse event following caesarean section also was related with extended hospital length of stay [14].

Another finding in this study is patients who perform delivery in private hospital stay shorter than in government or public hospital. Lin also found that women who underwent vaginal delivery in public hospital had longer LOS than in private hospital [15]. Meanwhile a review by Cseh stated that hospital ownership had very little effect on LOS [11]. The difference in the hospital ownership finding may due to the private hospitals in this study was a teaching hospital for midwives where the number of vaginal delivery was higher than the government hospital. However, this result enables an interaction effect between covariates.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, mode of delivery and hospital ownership were the strong predictors for length of stay in two hospitals in Jakarta. It is recommended that clinicians both in public or private hospitals always plan for a vaginal delivery, cesarean section should not be the delivery of choice unless it is medically required, moreover the hospitals should provide cesarean service as family-friendly as possible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wish to express gratitude to the Director of the Center for Applied Health Technology for the funding support, drg. Lelly Andayasari for the approval to use the datasets, and prof. Wiku Adisasmito for technical assistance in writing this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Gholamzadeh Nikjoo R, Jabbari Beyrami H, Jannati A, Asghari Jaafarabadi M. Selecting hospital's key performance indicators, using analytic hierarchy process technique. Journals of Community Health Research. 2013;2(1):30-8.
- [2] Rahimi H, Khammar-nia M, Kavosi Z, Eslahi M. Indicators of hospital performance evaluation: a systematic review. International Journal of Hospital Research. 2014;3(4):199-208.
- [3] Miani C, Ball S, Pitchforth E, Exley J, King S, Roland M, et al. Organizational interventions to reduce length of stay in hospital: a rapid evidence assessment. 2014.
- [4] Hoogervorst-Schilp J, Langelaan M, Spreeuwenberg P, de Bruijne MC, Wagner C. Excess length of stay and economic consequences of adverse events in Dutch hospital patients. BMC health services research. 2015;15(1):1.
- [5] Victorian Auditor-General's Office. Report of hospital performance length of stay. Melbourne: Victorian Auditor-General's Office; 2016
- [6] Campbell OM, Cegolon L, Macleod D, Benova L. Length of stay after childbirth in 92 countries and associated factors in 30 lowand middle-income countries: Compilation of reported data and a cross-sectional analysis from nationally representative surveys. PLoS Med. 2016;13(3):e1001972.
- [7] Nofitasari ST. Analisis lama perawatan (Los) partus seksio caesarea pada pasien jamkesmas rawat inap berdasarkan Ina-Cbg's di rumah sakit Islam Sultan Agung Semarang tahun 2010. FIKI 2013. 2013;1(1).
- [8] Nugraheni TH, Rosyidi MI, Siswanto Y. Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi lama perawatan pada ibu post sectio caesarean di RSUD Ambarawa. 2015- [cited 2016 october 27]; Available from http://perpusnwu.web.id/karyailmiah/documents/4465.pdf.
- [9] Mamun AA, Callaway LK, O'Callaghan MJ, Williams GM, Najman JM, Alati R, et al. Associations of maternal pre-pregnancy obesity and excess pregnancy weight gains with adverse pregnancy outcomes and length of hospital stay. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2011;11(1):1.
- [10] Elattar A, Selamat E, Robson A, Loughney A. Factors influencing maternal length of stay after giving birth in a UK hospital and the impact of those factors on bed occupancy. Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. 2008;28(1):73-6.
- [11] Cseh Å, Koford BC. The impact of maternity minimum stay mandates on hospitalizations: an extension. International advances in economic research. 2010;16(4):395-409.



Improving health and well-being for better society

- [12] Ahlén KM, Örtqvist AK, Gong T, Wallas A, Ye W, Lundholm C, et al. Antibiotic treatment and length of hospital stay in relation to delivery mode and prematurity. PloS one. 2016;11(10): e0164126.
- [13] Stokke SJ, Becher LMW. Indications for cesarean section at St. Joseph Medical Hospital, Moshi Tanzania. 2013.
- [14] Oh TT, Martel CG, Clark AG, Russo MB, Nossaman BD. Impact of anesthetic predictors on postpartum hospital length of stay and adverse events following cesarean delivery: A retrospective study in 840 consecutive parturient. The Ochsner Journal. 2015;15(3):228-36.
- [15] Lin H-C, Tung Y-C, Chen C-C, Tang C-H. Relationships between length of stay and hospital characteristics under the casepayment system in Taiwan: using data for vaginal delivery patients. Chang Gung medical journal. 2003;26(4):259-68.