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#### Abstract

Objectives-This report examines trends and characteristics of out-of-hospital and home births in the United States.

Methods-Descriptive tabulations of data are presented and interpreted.

Results-In 2006, there were 38,568 out-of-hospital births in the United States, including 24,970 home births and 10,781 births occurring in a freestanding birthing center. After a gradual decline from 1990 to 2004, the percentage of out-of-hospital births increased by $3 \%$ from $0.87 \%$ in 2004 to $0.90 \%$ in 2005 and 2006. A similar pattern was found for home births. After a gradual decline from 1990 to 2004, the percentage of home births increased by $5 \%$ to $0.59 \%$ in 2005 and remained steady in 2006. Compared with the U.S. average, home birth rates were higher for non-Hispanic white women, married women, women aged 25 and over, and women with several previous children. Home births were less likely than hospital births to be preterm, low birthweight, or multiple deliveries. The percentage of home births was $74 \%$ higher in rural counties of less than 100,000 population than in counties with a population size of 100,000 or more. The percentage of home births also varied widely by state; in Vermont and Montana more than 2\% of births in 2005-2006 were home births, compared with less than $0.2 \%$ in Louisiana and Nebraska. About $61 \%$ of home births were delivered by midwives. Among midwife-delivered home births, one-fourth ( $27 \%$ ) were delivered by certified nurse midwives, and nearly three-fourths (73\%) were delivered by other midwives.

Discussion-Women may choose home birth for a variety of reasons, including a desire for a low-intervention birth in a familiar environment surrounded by family and friends and cultural or religious concerns. Lack of transportation in rural areas and cost factors may also play a role.
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## Introduction

In the last several decades, there have been considerable changes in childbearing patterns in the United States. Historically, the percentage of out-of-hospital births declined from $44 \%$ in 1940 to $1 \%$ in 1969, and has remained about $1 \%$ for several decades (1-3). Out-of-hospital births include those born in a residence (i.e., home births), in a freestanding birthing center (i.e., one that is not part of a hospital), clinic or doctor's office, or other location. Some out-ofhospital births are intentional, whereas others are unintentional due to an emergency situation (i.e., precipitous labor or labor complications, could not get to the hospital in time). This report examines trends and characteristics of home and other out-of-hospital births in the United States from 1990 to 2006.

## Methods

Data shown in this report are based on birth certificates for the approximately 4.3 million live births registered in the United States in 2006, and equivalent data from previous years. Descriptive tabulations are presented and analyzed. Records where place of birth was not stated were excluded before percentages were computed. This report includes data on items that are collected on both the 1989 Revision of the U.S. Standard Certificate of Live Birth (unrevised) and the 2003 Revision of the U.S. Standard Certificate of Live Birth (revised); see "Technical Notes." Data on place of delivery were comparable between the two revisions, although the 2003 revision added a new data item on whether a home birth was planned or unplanned. Information from the new item is presented for the 19 states that had adopted the revised birth certificate by January 1, 2006 (California, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York (excluding New York City), North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming), to provide
some insight into this important characteristic of home births. However, while the 19 states represent $49 \%$ of U.S. births, the results cannot be generalized to all births and could change significantly when data from all states are available; see "Technical Notes."

## Results

## Trends in home and out-of-hospital births

In 2006, there were 38,568 out-of-hospital births in the United States, including 24,970 home births and 10,781 births occurring in a freestanding birthing center (Table 1). A small number of births occurred either in a clinic or doctor's office (414), in another specified location $(2,403)$, or with place of birth not stated (363). In 2006, out-of-hospital births represented $0.90 \%$ of the $4,265,555$ births in the United States. After a gradual decline from 1990 to 2004, the percentage of out-of-hospital births increased by $3 \%$ from $0.87 \%$ in 2004 to $0.90 \%$ in 2005 and 2006 (Table 1 and Figure 1). Patterns for home and birthing center births, the majority of out-of-hospital births, mirrored those for all out-of-hospital births, with a gradual decline from 1990 to 2004, followed by an increase in 2005 that was sustained in 2006. Thus, the percentage of home births declined from $0.67 \%$ in 1990 to $0.56 \%$ in 2004, and then increased by $5 \%$ to $0.59 \%$ in 2005 and 2006. The percentage of births in a birthing center decreased from $0.36 \%$ in 1990 to $0.23 \%$ in 2004, and then increased to $0.25 \%$ in 2005 and 2006.

Among out-of-hospital births in 2006, nearly two-thirds (64.7\%) occurred at home, $28.0 \%$ in a freestanding birthing center, $1.1 \%$ in a clinic or doctor's office, and 6.2\% elsewhere (Figure 2). From 1990 to 2006, the proportion of out-of-hospital births that were home births increased from $59.0 \%$ to $64.7 \%$, while the proportion of birthing center births declined slightly from $31.4 \%$ to $28.0 \%$. The proportion that occurred in a clinic or doctor's office declined from $2.4 \%$ in 1990 to $1.1 \%$ in 2006. Most of the rest of this report will focus on home births because they are the largest type of out-of-hospital births, representing nearly two-thirds (65\%) of all out-of-hospital births.


SOURCE: CDC/NCHS, National Vital Statistics System.
Figure 1. Percentage of all births that were born out of a hospital, at home, or in a birthing center: United States, 1990-2006


SOURCE: CDC/NCHS, National Vital Statistics System.
Figure 2. Percentage of out-of-hospital births, by place of delivery: United States, 1990 and 2006

## Variations in home births by maternal and infant characteristics

Table 2 shows data on place of birth by a variety of maternal and infant characteristics.

Race and ethnicity—Non-Hispanic white women were more likely to have a home birth than women of other race and ethnic groups. The percentage of home births for non-Hispanic white women (0.86\%) was about three times that for non-Hispanic black, American Indian, and Asian or Pacific Islander women (0.25-0.31\%), and about four times that for Hispanic women (0.19\%) (Table 2).

Overall, $81 \%$ of home births were to non-Hispanic white women, compared with $54 \%$ of hospital births (Figure 3). Only $8 \%$ of home births were to non-Hispanic black women, compared with $15 \%$ of hospital births. Hispanic women comprised $8 \%$ of home births and $25 \%$ of hospital births.

Maternal age-The percentage of home births was lowest for women aged $15-19$ years ( $0.19 \%$ ), and increased with increasing maternal age to a high of $1.41 \%$ for mothers aged 45 years and over (Table 2).

Marital status-The percentage of home births was 2.7 times higher for married women $(0.77 \%)$ than for unmarried women (0.29\%).

Live birth order-The percentage of home births increased rapidly with increasing birth order. Although only $0.3 \%$ of first births were home births, this percentage increased rapidly until $7.70 \%$ of births with a live birth order of 8 or higher were home births.

Birthplace of mother-Women born in the 50 states and the District of Columbia (D.C.) were 2.6 times more likely to have a home birth than women born outside the 50 states and D.C. However, for women born outside the 50 states and D.C., there was considerable variation by country of origin. Among places of origin with more than 10,000 births to U.S. mothers in 2006, the percentage of home births was low (less than one-half the U.S. average) for women born in Mexico and Puerto Rico. However, 2.4\% of births to Canadian-born women were home births-four times the U.S. average.

Plurality, birthweight, and gestational age-The percentage of high-risk births (i.e., multiple pregnancy, low birthweight, and preterm)


Figure 3. Percent distribution of home and hospital births, by race and Hispanic origin of mother: United States, 2006
was lower for home births than for hospital births. In 2006, 1.0\% of home births were multiple births, compared with $3.4 \%$ of hospital births (Figure 4). Only $5.2 \%$ of home births were low birthweight (less than 2,500 grams), compared with $8.3 \%$ of hospital births. Preterm (less than 37 weeks of gestation) births comprised $7.2 \%$ of home births, and $12.9 \%$ of hospital births.

## Geographic differences

The percentage of home births was higher in counties of less than 100,000 population than in counties with a population size of


Figure 4. Percentage of home and hospital births with selected characteristics: United States, 2006

100,000 or greater (Table 2). For counties of less than 100,000 population, $0.87 \%$ of births were home births compared with $0.50 \%$ for counties of 100,000 population or more.

There were also large differences in the percentage of home births by state. For the state analysis, 2 years of birth data were combined to produce more stable estimates (Tables 3 and 4 and Figures 5 and 6). In 13 states (Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin) more than $1 \%$ of births were home births; for Montana and Vermont more than $2 \%$ were home births. In contrast, in eight states (Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and West Virginia) less than $0.3 \%$ of births were home births.

Eleven states (Alabama, California, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia, and Wisconsin) had statistically significant increases in the percentage of home births from 2003-2004 to 2005-2006; for nine of these states the increase was $15 \%$ or more (Table 4 and Figure 6). In contrast, five states (Arkansas, Florida, Indiana, Nevada, and Wyoming) had statistically significant decreases in the percentage of home births from 2003-2004 to 2005-2006; for two of these states the decrease was $15 \%$ or more.

The percentage of births occurring in a freestanding birthing center was strongly influenced by the availability of such facilities in particular states. Several states did not have a freestanding birthing center (4), and thus reported no births within a birthing center. The states with the highest percentage of births in a birthing center were Alaska (3.2\%), Idaho (1.2\%), D.C. (0.9\%), Washington (0.8\%), and Pennsylvania (0.7\%) (Tables 3 and 4).


Figure 5. Percentage of home births, by state: United States, 2005-2006

## Attendant at birth

In 2006, 61\% of home births were delivered by midwives-16\% by certified nurse midwives (CNMs), and $45 \%$ by other midwives (Figure 7). Other midwives refer to midwives who are not CNMs or certified midwives, and, for example, may include certified professional midwives, or lay midwives (5). In 1990, $43 \%$ of home births were delivered by midwives, $13 \%$ by CNMs, and $30 \%$ by other midwives.

In 2006, only $7.6 \%$ of home births were delivered by physicians, a sharp decline from 1990, when $21.6 \%$ of home births were delivered by physicians (Figure 7). In both 1990 and 2006, a large proportion of home births were delivered by "other" birth attendants ( $31 \%$ and $36 \%$, respectively). "Other" refers to any other person who delivered the baby-such as a family member, emergency medical technician, or taxi driver.

In 2006, $99.9 \%$ of physician deliveries occurred in a hospital, $0.02 \%$ in a birthing center, and $0.05 \%$ in a home (Table 5). For CNMs, $96.7 \%$ of deliveries occurred in a hospital, $2.0 \%$ in a birthing center, and $1.2 \%$ in a home. In contrast, for other midwives, only $24.7 \%$ were hospital births, while $17.7 \%$ were birthing center births and $56.5 \%$ were home births. For births with an "other" birth attendant, $57.8 \%$ were born in hospital (they may have been born en-route to the hospital; see "Technical Notes"), and $35.3 \%$ were born at home.

## Planned and unplanned home births

The 2003 Revision of the U.S. Standard Certificate of Live Birth added an item which asks, for home births, whether the home birth was planned or unplanned. For 2006, these data are available for 19 states, comprising 2.1 million births or $49 \%$ of all U.S. births. This area is not representative of the overall U.S. population so these results are not generalizable to the total population; see "Technical Notes." Table 6 shows the number of births by birth attendant and place of birth for the 19-state area; 0.61 percent of births in the 19-state area were home births, compared with 0.59 percent of births for the United States as a whole (Table 5), and the percentage of home and out-of-hospital births by birth attendant were similar between the two areas.

In 2006, $83 \%$ of home births in the 19-state area were planned home births; however, this percentage varied greatly by attendant at birth (Table 6). Of home births delivered by medical doctors, only $31 \%$ were planned to deliver at home. In contrast, for home births delivered by doctors of osteopathy, $79 \%$ were planned home births. For certified nurse midwives and other midwives, nearly all, $98 \%$ and $99 \%$, respectively, of home births were planned home births, whereas almost two-thirds (65\%) of home births attended by "other" attendants were reported as planned.


Figure 6. Change in the percentage of home births by state, 2003-2004 to 2005-2006

About $17 \%$ of home births in the 19-state reporting area were unplanned in 2006 (Table 6). Unplanned home births are likely emergencies perhaps involving precipitous labor or other complications that might result in poorer-than-average outcomes when occurring in a setting unprepared for this type of delivery.


Figure 7. Percentage of home births, by birth attendant: United States, 1990 and 2006

## Discussion

In 2006, there were 38,568 out-of-hospital births in the United States; of these, 24,970 were home births. After a gradual decline from 1990 to 2004, the percentage of out-of-hospital births increased by $3 \%$ from $0.87 \%$ in 2004 to $0.90 \%$ in 2005 and 2006. A similar pattern was found for home births, which comprised nearly two-thirds (65\%) of all out-of-hospital births in 2006. After a gradual decline from 1990 to 2004, the percentage of home births increased by $5 \%$ to $0.59 \%$ in 2005 and remained steady in 2006. Home births differ from hospital births with respect to many characteristics. Home births are more prevalent for non-Hispanic white women, married women, and women aged 25 years and over. Women with several previous children are also more likely to have a home birth, and home birth may be favored by some select populations within the United States that tend to have larger families (6). Women born outside the 50 states and D.C. were less likely to have a home birth than women born in the 50 states and D.C. with the exception of Canadian-born women, who were more likely to have a home birth. It is interesting to note that the increase in home and out-of-hospital births in the United States was paralleled by an increase in out-of-hospital births in Canada (from 0.8\% of births in 2003 and $0.4 \% 2004$ to $1.1 \%$ in 2005 and 2006) (7).

The lower percentages of multiple, low-birthweight, and preterm deliveries for home births, compared with hospital births, suggest that
prenatal risk assessments are being done to identify low-risk women as candidates for home birth. Because the home birth category contains both planned home births and unplanned home births due to an emergency situation (i.e., precipitous labor, could not get to the hospital in time) it is unlikely that higher-risk low-birthweight, preterm, and multiple births can be completely eliminated from the home birth category.

There was also a large variation in the percentage of home births by state. Differences in the percentage of home births by state may be influenced by variations in state laws regarding midwifery practice (as midwives deliver the majority of home births) or home births $(8,9)$. Factors related to the availability of birthing facilities may also play a role in the choice of birth place. For example, Alaska had the highest percentage of out-of-hospital ( $5.3 \%$ ), and freestanding birthing center (3.2\%) births, and the third highest percentage of home births (1.9\%). The long distances and severe weather in Alaska may mean that women living in rural areas may not always have easy access to a hospital birth. Cultural factors and personal preferences may also influence women's choice of birth place (6, 9-11).

The 2003 revised birth certificate has an item on whether a home birth was planned or unplanned. While these data were only available for 19 states in 2006, and were not generalizable to the total U.S. population, about $17 \%$ of home births were unplanned. Unplanned home births may represent a previously unidentified high-risk population.

Home and out-of-hospital birth is the subject of ongoing controversy in the United States. In 2007, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, citing concerns about the safety of home birth for mothers and infants, issued a policy statement opposing home birth (12), a statement supported by a resolution passed at the 2008 American Medical Association annual meeting (13). In contrast, the World Health Organization, the American College of Nurse Midwives, and the American Public Health Association all support home and out-of-hospital birth options for low-risk women (14-16).

The percentage of home births in the United States is comparable to that in most other industrialized countries (17). However, in the Netherlands, about $30 \%$ of births occur at home (17). In addition, England has experienced an increase in its home birth rate from 1.0\% in 1983 to $2.9 \%$ in 2007 (18), while home births in New Zealand have increased to $2.5 \%$ of births in 2004 (19). The increase in home births in England has been linked to support for home birth by Britain's Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and Royal College of Midwives (20).

Women may prefer home over hospital birth for a variety of reasons, including a desire for a low-intervention birth in a familiar environment surrounded by family and friends, and cultural or religious concerns (6, 9-11). Lack of transportation in rural areas and cost factors may also play a role in the decision to have a home birth (6, 9-11).
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Table 1. Number and percent distribution of births, by place of birth: United States, 1990-2006

|  | Year | Total | In hospital | Out of hospital |  |  |  |  | Not stated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Home | Birthing center | Clinic or doctor's office | Other |  |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 |  | 4,265,555 | 4,226,624 | 38,568 | 24,970 | 10,781 | 414 | 2,403 | 363 |
| 2005 |  | 4,138,349 | 4,100,608 | 37,402 | 24,468 | 10,217 | 350 | 2,367 | 339 |
| 2004 |  | 4,112,052 | 4,075,709 | 35,578 | 23,150 | 9,620 | 469 | 2,339 | 765 |
| 2003 |  | 4,089,950 | 4,053,987 | 35,723 | 23,221 | 9,779 | 397 | 2,326 | 240 |
| 2002 |  | 4,021,726 | 3,986,190 | 35,416 | 22,980 | 9,683 | 385 | 2,368 | 120 |
| 2001 |  | 4,025,933 | 3,989,662 | 35,944 | 23,245 | 9,978 | 494 | 2,227 | 327 |
| 2000 |  | 4,058,814 | 4,020,877 | 37,635 | 23,843 | 10,738 | 466 | 2,588 | 302 |
| 1999 |  | 3,959,417 | 3,923,059 | 35,977 | 23,518 | 9,642 | 464 | 2,353 | 381 |
| 1998 |  | 3,941,553 | 3,903,770 | 37,049 | 23,232 | 10,693 | 857 | 2,267 | 734 |
| 1997 |  | 3,880,894 | 3,843,506 | 36,521 | 23,236 | 10,264 | 705 | 2,316 | 867 |
| 1996 |  | 3,891,494 | 3,853,728 | 37,085 | 23,784 | 10,278 | 778 | 2,245 | 681 |
| 1995 |  | 3,899,589 | 3,860,555 | 38,314 | 24,276 | 10,524 | 876 | 2,638 | 720 |
| 1994 |  | 3,952,767 | 3,912,195 | 40,119 | 24,694 | 11,787 | 923 | 2,715 | 453 |
| 1993 |  | 4,000,240 | 3,959,266 | 40,030 | 25,084 | 11,238 | 977 | 2,731 | 944 |
| 1992 |  | 4,065,014 | 4,021,608 | 43,017 | 25,923 | 13,255 | 900 | 2,939 | 389 |
| 1991 |  | 4,110,907 | 4,064,153 | 45,835 | 27,480 | 14,228 | 1,010 | 3,117 | 919 |
| 1990 |  | 4,158,212 | 4,109,634 | 46,946 | 27,678 | 14,759 | 1,128 | 3,381 | 1,632 |
|  |  | Percent distribution ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 |  | 100.00 | 99.10 | 0.90 | 0.59 | 0.25 | 0.01 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 2005 |  | 100.00 | 99.10 | 0.90 | 0.59 | 0.25 | 0.01 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 2004 |  | 100.00 | 99.13 | 0.87 | 0.56 | 0.23 | 0.01 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 2003 |  | 100.00 | 99.13 | 0.87 | 0.57 | 0.24 | 0.01 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 2002 |  | 100.00 | 99.12 | 0.88 | 0.57 | 0.24 | 0.01 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 2001 |  | 100.00 | 99.11 | 0.89 | 0.58 | 0.25 | 0.01 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 2000 |  | 100.00 | 99.07 | 0.93 | 0.59 | 0.26 | 0.01 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 1999 |  | 100.00 | 99.09 | 0.91 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.01 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 1998 |  | 100.00 | 99.06 | 0.94 | 0.59 | 0.27 | 0.02 | 0.06 | ... |
| 1997 |  | 100.00 | 99.06 | 0.94 | 0.60 | 0.26 | 0.02 | 0.06 | $\ldots$ |
| 1996 |  | 100.00 | 99.05 | 0.95 | 0.61 | 0.26 | 0.02 | 0.06 | . |
| 1995 |  | 100.00 | 99.02 | 0.98 | 0.62 | 0.27 | 0.02 | 0.07 | $\ldots$ |
| 1994 |  | 100.00 | 98.98 | 1.02 | 0.62 | 0.30 | 0.02 | 0.07 |  |
| 1993 |  | 100.00 | 99.00 | 1.00 | 0.63 | 0.28 | 0.02 | 0.07 | . |
| 1992 |  | 100.00 | 98.94 | 1.06 | 0.64 | 0.33 | 0.02 | 0.07 | ... |
| 1991 |  | 100.00 | 98.88 | 1.12 | 0.67 | 0.35 | 0.02 | 0.08 | $\ldots$ |
| 1990 |  | 100.00 | 98.87 | 1.13 | 0.67 | 0.36 | 0.03 | 0.08 |  |

[^0]Table 2. Number and percentage of births, by place of birth and selected characteristics: United States, 2006
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Table 2. Number and percentage of births, by place of birth and selected characteristics: United States, 2006-Con.

|  | Out of hospital |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total ${ }^{1}$ | In hospital | Total ${ }^{2}$ | Home | Freestanding birthing center | Percent home births ${ }^{3}$ | Percent birthing center births |
| Gestational age (in weeks) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 37. | 542,893 | 540,314 | 2,519 | 1,738 | 312 | 0.32 | 0.06 |
| 37 and over. | 3,697,010 | 3,661,568 | 35,181 | 22,506 | 10,439 | 0.61 | 0.28 |
| Not stated | 25,652 | 24,742 | 868 | 726 | 30 | - - - | -- - |
| County size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County of 100,000 or more population | 3,307,490 | 3,280,856 | 26,431 | 16,654 | 8,023 | 0.50 | 0.24 |
| County of less than 100,000 population. | 958,065 | 945,768 | 12,137 | 8,316 | 2,758 | 0.87 | 0.29 |

-     -         - Category not applicable.
${ }^{1}$ Includes place of birth not stated not shown separately.
${ }^{2}$ Includes births in a clinic or doctor's office, other, or unknown place of birth not shown separately.
${ }^{3}$ Percentages of total births that occurred at home for each category. Not stated place of delivery was excluded before percentages were computed.

Table 3. Number of births, by place of birth: United States and each state, 2005-2006

| State of residence | Total | In hospital | Out of hospital |  |  |  |  | Not stated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Home | Freestanding birthing center | Clinic or doctor's office | Other |  |
| Total | 8,403,904 | 8,327,232 | 75,970 | 49,438 | 20,998 | 764 | 4,770 | 702 |
| Alabama | 123,685 | 123,263 | 419 | 318 | 19 | 7 | 75 | 3 |
| Alaska | 21,455 | 20,298 | 1,147 | 401 | 680 | 51 | 15 | 10 |
| Arizona. | 198,628 | 196,443 | 2,169 | 888 | 1,192 | 41 | 48 | 16 |
| Arkansas. | 80,169 | 79,567 | 600 | 471 | 87 | 1 | 41 | 2 |
| California. | 1,111,322 | 1,105,153 | 6,146 | 4,445 | 741 | 7 | 953 | 23 |
| Colorado. | 139,695 | 138,175 | 1,519 | 1,465 | 9 | 16 | 29 | 1 |
| Connecticut | 83,538 | 83,105 | 432 | 292 | 119 | 11 | 10 | 1 |
| Delaware. | 23,632 | 23,308 | 324 | 72 | 165 | 2 | 85 | 0 |
| District of Columbia | 16,494 | 16,231 | 263 | 74 | 149 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| Florida | 463,042 | 458,083 | 4,944 | 2,196 | 2,354 | 22 | 372 | 15 |
| Georgia | 290,833 | 289,726 | 1,075 | 859 | 187 | 11 | 18 | 32 |
| Hawaii . | 36,906 | 36,445 | 461 | 401 | 0 | 14 | 46 | 0 |
| Idaho. | 47,246 | 45,932 | 1,301 | 708 | 589 | 1 | 3 | 13 |
| Illinois | 359,592 | 358,088 | 1,480 | 1,393 | 3 | 6 | 78 | 24 |
| Indiana. | 175,824 | 172,983 | 2,822 | 1,185 | 941 | 6 | 690 | 19 |
| lowa | 79,918 | 79,196 | 721 | 674 | 22 | 3 | 22 | 1 |
| Kansas. | 80,856 | 79,968 | 887 | 406 | 426 | 41 | 14 | 1 |
| Kentucky. | 114,694 | 113,464 | 956 | 872 | 5 | 19 | 60 | 274 |
| Louisiana. | 124,313 | 123,999 | 310 | 227 | 6 | 2 | 75 | 4 |
| Maine. | 28,263 | 27,882 | 378 | 286 | 88 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Maryland. | 152,474 | 151,036 | 1,437 | 646 | 766 | 6 | 19 | 1 |
| Massachusetts | 154,541 | 153,507 | 1,031 | 564 | 463 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Michigan . | 255,189 | 253,320 | 1,855 | 1,515 | 209 | 26 | 105 | 14 |
| Minnesota | 144,444 | 143,504 | 937 | 858 | 3 | 4 | 72 | 3 |
| Mississippi | 88,451 | 88,220 | 230 | 206 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 1 |
| Missouri . | 160,003 | 158,460 | 1,541 | 1,301 | 110 | 73 | 57 | 2 |
| Montana | 24,091 | 23,404 | 686 | 549 | 121 | 8 | 8 | 1 |
| Nebraska. | 52,872 | 52,749 | 122 | 103 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 1 |
| Nevada. | 77,295 | 76,346 | 949 | 866 | 20 | 1 | 62 | 0 |
| New Hampshire. | 28,798 | 28,480 | 317 | 255 | 57 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| New Jersey | 228,796 | 227,938 | 781 | 576 | 32 | 4 | 169 | 77 |
| New Mexico. | 58,771 | 58,089 | 682 | 464 | 192 | 8 | 18 | 0 |
| New York | 496,455 | 492,835 | 3,601 | 2,586 | 464 | 57 | 494 | 19 |
| North Carolina. | 250,955 | 249,345 | 1,609 | 840 | 485 | 16 | 268 | 1 |
| North Dakota | 17,011 | 16,909 | 100 | 93 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 |
| Ohio | 298,981 | 295,449 | 3,506 | 1,888 | 1,483 | 13 | 122 | 26 |
| Oklahoma | 105,817 | 104,990 | 820 | 582 | 203 | 1 | 34 | 7 |
| Oregon. . | 94,611 | 92,430 | 2,180 | 1,599 | 482 | 9 | 90 | 1 |
| Pennsylvania | 294,473 | 287,339 | 7,114 | 4,750 | 2,167 | 64 | 133 | 20 |
| Rhode Island | 25,069 | 24,992 | 75 | 64 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| South Carolina | 119,882 | 119,263 | 619 | 429 | 141 | 2 | 47 | 0 |
| South Dakota | 23,381 | 23,312 | 68 | 53 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 1 |
| Tennessee. | 166,102 | 164,522 | 1,575 | 914 | 580 | 26 | 55 | 5 |
| Texas. | 785,518 | 779,546 | 5,964 | 2,932 | 2,959 | 4 | 69 | 8 |
| Utah | 105,060 | 103,234 | 1,822 | 1,314 | 479 | 3 | 26 | 4 |
| Vermont | 12,806 | 12,492 | 307 | 303 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| Virginia . | 212,372 | 211,059 | 1,313 | 1,008 | 219 | 0 | 86 | 0 |
| Washington | 169,579 | 165,813 | 3,763 | 2,284 | 1,406 | 4 | 69 | 3 |
| West Virginia | 41,767 | 41,569 | 150 | 114 | 30 | 3 | 3 | 48 |
| Wisconsin | 143,324 | 140,975 | 2,349 | 2,050 | 136 | 145 | 18 | 0 |
| Wyoming. . . . . . . . | 14,911 | 14,796 | 113 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 2 |

Table 4. Percentage of births, by place of birth 2005-2006, and percent change in home births 2003-2004 to 2005-2006: United States and each state

| State of residence | In hospital | Out of hospital |  |  | Percentage change in home births 2003-2004 to 2005-2006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total ${ }^{1}$ | Home | Freestanding birthing center |  |
| Total | 99.10 | 0.90 | 0.59 | 0.25 | $\dagger 3.5$ |
| Alabama | 99.66 | 0.34 | 0.26 | 0.02 | $\dagger 18.2$ |
| Alaska | 94.65 | 5.35 | 1.87 | 3.17 | 0.5 |
| Arizona. | 98.91 | 1.09 | 0.45 | 0.60 | -2.2 |
| Arkansas. | 99.25 | 0.75 | 0.59 | 0.11 | $\dagger-14.5$ |
| California. | 99.45 | 0.55 | 0.40 | 0.07 | $\dagger 5.3$ |
| Colorado. | 98.91 | 1.09 | 1.05 | 0.01 | 2.9 |
| Connecticut | 99.48 | 0.52 | 0.35 | 0.14 | 12.9 |
| Delaware. | 98.63 | 1.37 | 0.30 | 0.70 | -21.1 |
| District of Columbia | 98.41 | 1.59 | 0.45 | 0.90 | 2.3 |
| Florida | 98.93 | 1.07 | 0.47 | 0.51 | †-6.0 |
| Georgia | 99.63 | 0.37 | 0.30 | 0.06 | -6.3 |
| Hawaii | 98.75 | 1.25 | 1.09 | 0.00 | 1.9 |
| Idaho. | 97.25 | 2.75 | 1.50 | 1.25 | -2.6 |
| Illinois | 99.59 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.00 | -4.9 |
| Indiana | 98.39 | 1.61 | 0.67 | 0.54 | $\dagger-21.2$ |
| lowa | 99.10 | 0.90 | 0.84 | 0.03 | 6.3 |
| Kansas. | 98.90 | 1.10 | 0.50 | 0.53 | $\dagger 16.3$ |
| Kentucky. | 99.16 | 0.84 | 0.76 | 0.00 | $\dagger 26.7$ |
| Louisiana. | 99.75 | 0.25 | 0.18 | 0.00 | -10.0 |
| Maine. | 98.66 | 1.34 | 1.01 | 0.31 | -5.6 |
| Maryland. | 99.06 | 0.94 | 0.42 | 0.50 | $\dagger 35.5$ |
| Massachusetts | 99.33 | 0.67 | 0.36 | 0.30 | 9.1 |
| Michigan . | 99.27 | 0.73 | 0.59 | 0.08 | -1.7 |
| Minnesota | 99.35 | 0.65 | 0.59 | 0.00 | $\dagger 25.5$ |
| Mississippi | 99.74 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| Missouri | 99.04 | 0.96 | 0.81 | 0.07 | 2.5 |
| Montana | 97.15 | 2.85 | 2.28 | 0.50 | 10.1 |
| Nebraska. | 99.77 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.00 | -17.4 |
| Nevada. | 98.77 | 1.23 | 1.12 | 0.03 | t-10.4 |
| New Hampshire. | 98.90 | 1.10 | 0.89 | 0.20 | $\dagger 21.9$ |
| New Jersey | 99.66 | 0.34 | 0.25 | 0.01 | -3.8 |
| New Mexico . | 98.84 | 1.16 | 0.79 | 0.33 | 0.0 |
| New York | 99.27 | 0.73 | 0.52 | 0.09 | 2.0 |
| North Carolina. | 99.36 | 0.64 | 0.33 | 0.19 | $\dagger 32.0$ |
| North Dakota | 99.41 | 0.59 | 0.55 | 0.00 | 27.9 |
| Ohio | 98.83 | 1.17 | 0.63 | 0.50 | $\dagger 37.0$ |
| Oklahoma | 99.23 | 0.77 | 0.55 | 0.19 | -5.2 |
| Oregon. | 97.70 | 2.30 | 1.69 | 0.51 | 6.3 |
| Pennsylvania | 97.58 | 2.42 | 1.61 | 0.74 | 2.5 |
| Rhode Island | 99.70 | 0.30 | 0.26 | 0.01 | 36.8 |
| South Carolina | 99.48 | 0.52 | 0.36 | 0.12 | -7.7 |
| South Dakota | 99.71 | 0.29 | 0.23 | 0.00 | -23.3 |
| Tennessee. | 99.05 | 0.95 | 0.55 | 0.35 | 5.8 |
| Texas. | 99.24 | 0.76 | 0.37 | 0.38 | 2.8 |
| Utah | 98.27 | 1.73 | 1.25 | 0.46 | 3.3 |
| Vermont | 97.60 | 2.40 | 2.37 | 0.01 | -7.8 |
| Virginia . | 99.38 | 0.62 | 0.47 | 0.10 | $\dagger 20.5$ |
| Washington | 97.78 | 2.22 | 1.35 | 0.83 | 4.7 |
| West Virginia | 99.64 | 0.36 | 0.27 | 0.07 | 17.4 |
| Wisconsin | 98.36 | 1.64 | 1.43 | 0.09 | $\dagger 7.5$ |
| Wyoming. | 99.24 | 0.76 | 0.66 | 0.03 | †-25.8 |

$\dagger$ Indicates statistically significant change at the $p<0.05$ level.
${ }^{1}$ Includes births in a freestanding birthing center, clinic or doctor's office, home, and other places.
NOTE: Not stateds are excluded before percentages are computed.

Table 5. Number and percent distribution of births, by place of birth and birth attendant: United States, 2006

|  |  | Birth attendant |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Physician |  |  |  |  |
| Place of birth | Total ${ }^{1}$ | Total | Medical doctor | Doctor of osteopathy | Certified nurse midwife | Other Midwife | Other |
|  |  |  |  | Number |  |  |  |
| Total ${ }^{2}$. | 4,265,555 | 3,905,146 | 3,698,641 | 206,505 | 317,168 | 19,179 | 21,798 |
| Hospital | 4,226,624 | 3,901,518 | 3,695,492 | 206,026 | 306,629 | 4,735 | 12,469 |
| Out of hospital | 38,568 | 3,565 | 3,090 | 475 | 10,502 | 14,435 | 9,112 |
| Home | 24,970 | 1,849 | 1,682 | 167 | 3,951 | 10,823 | 7,623 |
| Freestanding birthing center | 10,781 | 882 | 620 | 262 | 6,244 | 3,397 | 218 |
| Clinic or doctor's office | 414 | 273 | 252 | 21 | 58 | 31 | 50 |
| Other . . . . . . . . | 2,403 | 561 | 536 | 25 | 249 | 184 | 1,221 |
|  |  |  |  | distribution ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Hospital | 99.10 | 99.91 | 99.92 | 99.77 | 96.69 | 24.70 | 57.78 |
| Out of hospital | 0.90 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.23 | 3.31 | 75.30 | 42.22 |
| Home. | 0.59 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 1.25 | 56.46 | 35.32 |
| Freestanding birthing center | 0.25 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 1.97 | 17.72 | 1.01 |
| Clinic or doctor's office . . . | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.23 |
| Other | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.96 | 5.66 |

${ }^{1}$ Not stated birth attendant included in totals but not shown separately.
${ }^{2}$ Not stated place of delivery included in totals but not shown separately.
${ }^{3}$ Not stated place of delivery was subtracted from totals before percentages were computed.

Table 6. Number and percent distribution of home births by birth attendant, and percent distribution of home births by planning status and birth attendant: 19 states, 2006

${ }^{1}$ Not stated birth attendant included in totals but not shown separately.
${ }^{2}$ Not stated planning status was subtracted from totals before percents were computed.
NOTE: Data from the 2003 Revision of the U.S. Standard Certificate of Birth. Includes data from California, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York (excluding New York City), North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming.

## Technical Notes

## Sources of data

This report contains 2006 data on items that are collected on both the 1989 Revision of U.S. Standard Certificate of Live Birth (unrevised) and the 2003 Revision of U.S. Standard Certificate of Live Birth (revised). The 2003 revision is described in detail elsewhere (21, 22). The 2003 revision was seen as an important opportunity to improve data quality, primarily through the development of detailed, standardized data collection techniques (23).

## Place of birth

The place of birth variable is comparable between the 1989 and 2003 revisions of the U.S. Standard Certificate of Birth. This variable includes separate categories for hospital, freestanding birthing center, home, clinic or doctor's office, other, and unknown. Hospital births may include births occurring en-route or upon arrival at a hospital (24). Place of birth, a legal item on the birth certificate, is very well reported. In 2006, this information was not reported for only 363 out $4,265,555$ births ( $0.01 \%$ of births) (2).

The 2003 revision of the birth certificate added an item for home births: "Planned to deliver at home? (yes, no)." Data on whether a home birth was planned or unplanned are available for the 19 states that implemented the 2003 Revision of the U.S. Standard Certificate of Birth on or before January 1, 2006: California, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York (excluding New York City), North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming. The 2,073,368 births to residents of the 19 states comprise 49 percent of all U.S. births in 2006. Results for this limited reporting area are not generalizable to the United States as a whole because they are not a random sample of births. Because California and Texas are included in the 19-state area, this area has a higher percentage of Mexican (and overall Hispanic) births than the United States as a whole and this Hispanic population may not be representative of all Hispanics in the United States; see "Expanded Health Data from the New Birth Certificate, 2006" for further information (23).

Planning status of home birth is a relatively new variable on the birth certificate, so less is known about the quality of these data when compared with most other birth certificate variables. For home births in the 19 revised states, the planning status was unknown for $5.5 \%$ of births. However, 424 of a total of 688 births with unknown planning status were from a single state (Pennsylvania); when data from this state were excluded, the percentage of births with unknown planning status dropped to $2.6 \%$. Several states (Idaho, New Hampshire, Ohio, Vermont, and Wyoming) had no home births with unknown planning status. In contrast, 17.4\% of home births in Pennsylvania, and 20.4\% of home births in North Dakota had unknown planning status, although the latter figure was based on only 10 births with unknown planning status. Patterns of home births by planning status were similar when data from Pennsylvania and North Dakota were excluded, with $81 \%$ of home births being planned, compared with $83 \%$ when data from Pennsylvania and North Dakota were included in the estimates (see Table 6). Although 2006 marks the first year of implementation of the new certificate for seven of the states included in this report, the use of the new certificate is relatively new for all states (23) and data quality
may improve over time as home birth attendants become more familiar with the new data items. More assessment is needed of the accuracy of reporting of planning status for home births, as the percentage of unknowns is just one measure of data quality.

## Attendant at birth

For both the revised and unrevised certificates, birth attendants are classified to one of the following categories: medical doctor (MD), doctor of osteopathy (DO), certified nurse midwife/certified midwife (CNM/CM), other midwife, other, and unknown. There is evidence that the number of births by CNMs is understated (24), largely due to difficulty in correctly identifying the birth attendant when more than one provider is present at the birth. Anecdotal evidence suggests that some hospitals require that a physician be reported as the birth attendant even when no physician is physically present at a midwifeattended birth (24).

## Random variation in natality data

The number of births reported for an area is essentially a complete count because more than 99 percent of all births are registered. Although this number is not subject to sampling error, it may be affected by nonsampling errors such as mistakes in recording the mother's residence or age during the registration process. When the number of births is used for analytic purposes (that is, the comparison of numbers, rates, and percentages over time, for different areas, or between different groups), the number of events that actually occurred can be thought of as one outcome in a large series of possible results that could have occurred under the same (or similar) circumstances. When considered in this way, the number of births is subject to random variation according to certain statistical assumptions. For further information see the "Technical Notes" of "Births: Final Data for 2006" (2). Statements in the text that a given number or percentage is higher or lower than another indicate that the difference is statistically significant.
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[^0]:    . Category not applicable.
    ${ }^{1}$ Not stateds were subtracted from totals before percentages were computed.

