

6.1. RECOMMENDATION:

Should LAY HEALTH WORKERS manage puerperal sepsis using intramuscular antibiotics, delivered by a standard syringe, before referral?

Problem: Poor access to treatment for puerperal sepsis Option: LHWs using intramuscular antibiotics before referral Comparison: Care delivered by other cadres or no care

Setting: Community/primary health care settings in LMICs with poor access to health professionals

Recommendation	We recommend against the option	We suggest considering the option only in the context of rigorous research	We recommend the option			
		☑				
	We suggest considering this option only in the context of rigorous research. We suggest evaluating this intervention where a well-functioning LHW programme already exists, where LHWs are already familiar with injection techniques and materials, and where referral to more specialised care is available or can be put in place.					
Justification	There is insufficient evidence of the effectiveness, acceptability and feasibility of this intervention. However, it may reduce inequalities by extending care to underserved populations.					
Implementation considerations	Not applicable					
Monitoring and evaluation						
Research priorities	Studies are needed to assess the effects and the acceptability of using lay health workers to deliver intravenous antibiotics for puerperal sepsis.					



6.1. EVIDENCE BASE:

Should LAY HEALTH WORKERS manage puerperal sepsis using intramuscular antibiotics, delivered by a standard syringe, before referral?

Problem: Poor access to treatment for puerperal sepsis Option: LHWs using intramuscular antibiotics before referral **Comparison**: Care delivered by other cadres or no care Setting: Community/primary health care settings in LMICs with poor access to health professionals

Are the anticipated desirable effects large? Are the anticipated by the processing of the anticipated effects is alrege? No. Probably Vice Varies Probably Vice Varies Varies Vice Varies Vice Varies Vice Varies Vice Varies Vice Varies Vice Vice Varies Vice Vice	CRITERIA		JUDGEMENT	EVIDENCE	COMMENTS AND QUERIES
Are the anticipated undesirable effects small? What is the certainty of the anticipated effects? Are the desirable effects of LHWs. In one trial, the package included LHWs injecting procaine to treat sick neonates, apparently using a standard syringe. The trial did not report any adverse effects of LHWs using injectable antibiotics. Overall, the trials suggest that these packages of care may lead to a reduction in neonatal (moderate certainty evidence). Annex: page 10 (Lewin 2012 – Table 2)	BENEFITS & HARMS OF THE OPTIONS	anticipated desirable	no yes		
What is the certainty of the anticipated effects? What is the certainty of the anticipated effects? What is the certainty of the anticipated effects? Are the desirable effects large relative to the undesirable effects? What is the certainty of the anticipated effects? What is the certainty endered by LHWs. In one trial, the package included LHWs injecting procaine trial did not report any adverse effects of LHWs using injectable antibiotics. Overall, the trials suggest that these packages of care may lead to a reduction in neonatal (moderate certainty evidence). Annex: page 10 (Lewin 2012 – Table 2) Main resource requirements Resource Settings in which LHW programmes already exist		anticipated undesirable	no yes	are therefore unable to draw any conclusions about the desirable or undesirable effects of this intervention. Indirect evidence:	
desirable effects large relative to the undesirable effects? Annex: page 10 (Lewin 2012 – Table 2) Main resource requirements Resource Settings in which LHW programmes already exist		certainty of the anticipated	low evidence	of care were delivered by LHWs. In one trial, the package included LHWs injecting procaine penicillin and gentamicin to treat sick neonates, apparently using a standard syringe. The trial did not report any adverse effects of LHWs using injectable antibiotics. Overall, the trials	
Resource Settings in which LHW programmes already exist		desirable effects large relative to the undesirable	no yes	evidence) and child mortality (low certainty evidence).	
				Main resource requirements	
Are the resources required small?	RESOURCE USE			Resource Settings in which LHW programmes already exist	
required Supervision and monitoring Regular supervision by midwife or nurse					
			·	Supervision and monitoring Regular supervision by midwife or nurse	
Supplies IV antibiotics, IV kit, sterile solution, robust supply chain		Jillall i		Supplies IV antibiotics, IV kit, sterile solution, robust supply chain	
Referral Transportation to a centre where comprehensive emergency obstetric care (CeMOC) is available					



	CRITERIA	JUDGEMENT	EVIDENCE	COMMENTS AND QUERIES
URCE	Is the incremental cost small relative to the benefits?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	Uncertain as there is no direct evidence on effectiveness.	
ACCEPTABILITY	Is the option acceptable to most stakeholders?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies yes	A systematic review of LHW programmes (Glenton, Colvin 2012) did not identify any studies that evaluated the acceptability of antibiotics for puerperal sepsis when delivered by LHWs. We are therefore uncertain about the acceptability of this intervention to key stakeholders. Indirect evidence: • A systematic review (Glenton, Khanna 2012) of drug delivery by LHWs using a CPAD device suggests that recipients, LHWs and other health workers find the delivery of drugs and vaccines by LHWs through this device to be acceptable, although the importance of training and supervision is emphasised (low certainty evidence). However, some LHWs voiced concerns about possible social or legal consequences if something went wrong. These concerns were at least partly addressed through support and supervision (low certainty evidence). • Activities that demand that the LHW is present at specific times, for instance during labour and birth, lead to irregular and unpredictable working conditions. At least one study shows that this may have direct implications for LHWs' expectations regarding incentives (low certainty evidence). LHWs may also be concerned about personal safety when working in the community and some LHWs were reluctant to visit clients at night because of safety issues (moderate certainty evidence) (Glenton, Colvin 2012). • While LHW involvement in deliveries requires an effective referral system, a systematic review has pointed to a number of challenges with referral of women in labour, including logistics and poor treatment of trained TBAs and women at facilities (moderate certainty evidence) (Glenton, Colvin 2012).	
FEASIBILITY	Is the option feasible to implement?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies no yes	Significant additional work may be needed to add this intervention to an existing LHW programme. It is likely to require changes in regulations; significant changes to drug supplies and training; and development of appropriate treatment algorithms. Also, access to a referral system with trained and equipped healthcare professionals and facilities. Implementation may additionally require consideration of factors affecting referral by LHWs (see under 'Acceptability'). Significant training and supervision provided by skilled health cadres would likely be needed. However, a systematic review (Glenton, Colvin 2012) suggests that ongoing support, training and supervision were often insufficient in LHW programmes (moderate certainty evidence). Annex: page 26 (Glenton, Colvin 2012)	