### SWINBURNE BUR \* NE \*

## Acknowledgement

### Acknowledgement of the country

I respectfully acknowledge the Wurundjeri People of the Kulin Nation, and their Elders past and present, who are the Traditional Owners of lands across Australia, their Elders, Ancestors, cultures and heritage.







## Utilization of Maternal Healthcare Services Among Women in 33 Low-and Middle-Income Countries: A Pooled Analysis of 2015-2022 Demographic and Health Survey Data

Abdul Baten<sup>1</sup>, Raaj Kishore Biswas<sup>2</sup>, Evie Kendal<sup>1</sup>, Jahar Bhowmik<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Health Sciences and Biostatistics, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

<sup>2</sup>School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia





# Outline

- Background
- ≻Objectives
- ≻Methods
- ≻Results and findings
  - -Prevalence of MHS (Mapping)
  - -Distribution of sociodemographic factors with respect to MHS
  - -Complex survey adjusted logistic regression model fittings
- >Conclusion and recommendations
- ≻References



# Background

- Maternal mortality is a significant global public health challenge, especially in low- and middleincome countries (LMICs)
- Maternal death declined by 34 percent between 2000 and 2020
- Worldwide, in 2020, nearly one maternal death occurred in every two minutes.
- Almost 95% of all maternal deaths occurred in LMICs especially in SSA and SA.
- \*75% of maternal deaths are related to direct obstetric causes and occur during or shortly after birth
- MHS has been demonstrated to lower maternal mortality and morbidity rates
- The prioritization of maternal healthcare is given to the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG)



*Figure:* Global distributions of maternal mortality ratio (MMR), **Source:** World Health Organization, UNICEF, United Nations Population Fund and The World Bank, *Trends in Maternal Mortality:* 2000 to 2020 WHO, Geneva, 2023

# Background (Conti....)





- The pace of MHS coverage and trend of utilization are different for different LMICs
- A comprehensive analysis across multiple MHS indicators on LMICs from multiple regions is lacking.





# Objectives

- ➢ To determine the prevalence of women's access to MHS in the selected LMICs and assess the magnitude of the differences among countries in the utilization of MHS.
- ➢ To investigate the associated sociodemographic factors on the utilization of MHS in LMICs.

# Methods



## • Data Source and study design

Latest standardized cross-sectional Demographic and Health Surveys (DHSs) between 2015 and 2022 from 33 LMICs.

## ≻Study variables:

≻Outcome variables: ANC, SBA, ID and PNC

Explanatory variables: Sociodemographic variables such as the age of mothers, education, wealth index of household, respondent's decision-making power etc.

## • Statistical Analysis:

- Estimate the percentage of MHS utilization and map them to visualize country-wise differences.
- Unweighted distribution between sociodemographic factors and the utilization of MHS was assessed.
- ≻Adjusted logistic regression models were fitted for each outcome variable separately.
- ≻ The results were reported based on odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI).



- The average prevalence of ANC was 58.9% (SD=16.5%) for the selected 33 LMICs.
- The lowest prevalence of ANC (16.6%) was observed in Afghanistan
- Indonesia exhibited the highest prevalence of ANC (88.8%).

#### 1 (a) Prevalence of the ANC for the selected 33 LMICs



Figure: Prevalence of ANC in the selected 33 LMICs (countries are displayed by the lowest to highest coverage of ANC).



- The average prevalence of SBA was 70.0% (SD=17.8%) for the selected 33 LMICs.
- The lowest prevalence of SBA (32.4%) was observed in Ethiopia
- Cambodia exhibited the highest prevalence of SBA (97.6%)



*Figure: Prevalence of SBA in the selected 33 LMICs (countries are displayed by the lowest to highest coverage of SBA).* 



- The average prevalence of ID was 66.9% (SD=19.7%) for the selected 33 LMICs.
- The lowest prevalence of ID (30.1%) was observed in Ethiopia
- Cambodia exhibited the highest prevalence of ID (95.2%)



Figure: Prevalence of ID in the selected 33 LMICs (countries are displayed by the lowest to highest coverage of ID).



- The average prevalence of PNC was 53.8% (SD=18.1%) for the selected 33 LMICs.
- The lowest prevalence of PNC (18.3%) was observed in Angola
- Indonesia exhibited the highest prevalence of PNC (83.0%)



*Figure: Prevalence of PNC in the selected 33 LMICs, (countries are displayed by the lowest to highest coverage of PNC)* 



LMICs Desired MHS coverage standard to meet the SDG target's 80% health service coverage by 2030.





### **Distribution (unweighted) of sociodemographic characteristics of women across MHS:**

- Pooled samples comprised 231,101 women for ANC, 324,361 for SBA, 324,336 for ID, and 139,064 for PNC.
- Of the women who utilize MHS (including ANC, SBA, ID, and PNC), an average of 64.9% (SD = 3.3%) were aged over 25 years.
- On average 81.1% (SD = 3.6%) of women who did not utilize MHS resided in rural areas.



#### Adjusted logistic regression model fittings

Considering Bangladesh as a reference country,

- Women of 30 LMICs, apart from Afghanistan and Ethiopia, were more likely to receive at least four ANC visits by medically trained providers compared to Bangladesh.
- For instance, the women of Liberia were about 14.0 times more likely to utilize ANC (AOR=13.8; 95% CI: 11.4, 17.2) than Bangladesh.
- Conversely, compared to Bangladesh, women in Afghanistan were 50.0% less likely to utilize ANC (AOR= 0.5; 95% CI: 0.5, 0.6).





#### Adjusted logistic regression model fittings

- Women in 29 LMICs, apart from Ethiopia, Haiti, and Nigeria, were more likely to utilize SBA compared to women in Bangladesh.
- For instance, the women of India were 11.8 (AOR=11.83; 95% CI;10.5, 13.3) times more likely to utilize SBA than in Bangladesh.
- Conversely, women in Haiti were 30.0% (AOR=0.7; 95% CI; 0.6, 0.8) less likely to utilize SBA than in Bangladesh.



Odds Ratio (95% CI) Values by Country for SBA Model

Adjusted logistic regression model fittings

- ➢Women of 30 LMICs apart from Haiti and Myanmar were more likely to utilize ID during childbirth compared to Bangladesh.
- For example, the Philippines exhibited 8.5 times higher odds (AOR=8.5; 95% CI; 7.0, 10.4) of utilizing ID compared to Bangladesh.
- Conversely, women in Haiti were 20.0% (AOR=0.8; 95% CI; 0.7, 1.0) less likely to utilize ID compared to women in Bangladesh.

#### Odds Ratio (95% CI) Values by Country for ID Model 74.2 (58.3-94.3) 75 54.4 (42.8-69.2) 33.7 (28.6-39.7) Legend 50 32.5 (27.1-39.0) OR\_ID Less likely and significant More likely and non-significant More likely and significant Reference country 20.1 (16.9-24.0) 18.5 (15.7-21.7) 5.6 (13.6-17.9) 15.0 (12.3-18.3) (12.7-15.9) (11.8-16.8) 12.6 (10.7-15.0) 11.5 (9.2-14.5) 25 7.0-10.4) (6.9-10.1) (7.2-9.9) (6.9-9.3) 6.6-8.7) 14.2 14.0 (5.4-7.0) (4.9-6.9) .3-6.0) (1.00-1.00) (3.9-5.3) 0-1.340 3.5-4.8) (3.2-4.1) 2.8-3.9) 2.5-3.5) (0.7-1.0) (0.7-1.0) -1.6) 1.0-1.2) 5 1.3) 8.5 2 7.6 8.3 8.0 ÷. 6.2 5.8 9 S. 0.8 1.0 Burkina Faso Cambodia Benin Burundi Senegal India Tanzania Mauritania Uganda Cameroon Indonesia Papua New Guinea Afghanistan Haiti Malawi Rwanda Gambia Zambia Liberia Kenya Nepal Pakistan Guinea Angola Ethiopia Nigeria Bangladesh Sierra Leone Mali Myanmar Philippines **IImor-Leste** Madagascar Country



### SWINBURNE BUR \* NE \*

## Results and findings

#### Adjusted logistic regression model fittings

- The odds of utilising PNC within two days after delivery were lower in 9 LMICs out of 32 LMICs compared to Bangladesh, others exhibited higher odds compared to Bangladesh.
- For instance, the women in Gambia were 6.5 (AOR=6.5; 95% CI; 5.4, 7.7) times more likely to utilize PNC than in Bangladesh.
- Whereas women in Angola were 70.0% (AOR=0.3; 95% CI; 0.2, 0.3) less likely to utilize PNC than in Bangladesh.



#### Odds Ratio (95% CI) Values by Country for PNC model

#### **Predictors of MHS**





## **Conclusion and recommendation**



- Given the limited time remaining until the 2030 SDG deadline, many LMICs are grappling to meet the desired standards of MHS coverage.
- To address this urgency, targeted interventions should focus on women in the lowest wealth quintile, uneducated or less educated, and women living in rural areas.
- Moreover, emphasis should be given to women's employment and autonomy in household decision-making.
- Given the heterogeneity in MHS uptakes, nations with lower maternal healthcare utilization can adopt the effective interventions proven successful in countries with higher maternal healthcare utilization to expedite progress toward achieving relevant SDG targets by 2030.

## References



1. Yadav AK, Sahni B, Jena PK, Kumar D, Bala K: Trends, differentials, and social determinants of maternal health care services utilization in rural India: an analysis from pooled data. *Women's Health Reports* 2020, 1(1):179-189.

- 2. Maternal Mortality [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/maternal-mortality]
- 3. Maternal Mortality [https://data.unicef.org/topic/maternal-health/maternal-mortality/]
- 4. Paul P, Chouhan P: Socio-demographic factors influencing utilization of maternal health care services in India. Clin Epidemiol Glob Health 2020, 8(3):666-670.
- 5. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations: New York, NY, USA 2015.
- 6. United Nations (UN).Sustainable Development Goals-SDG Indicators. [https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/]
- 7. Andriani H, Natasha V, Rachmadani SD, Saptari A: FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FOUR-VISIT ANC IN INDONESIA: A POPULATION-BASED STUDY. Asia Pac J Health Manag 2022, 17(1):11.
- Thomsen S, Hoa DTP, Målqvist M, Sanneving L, Saxena D, Tana S, Yuan B, Byass P: Promoting equity to achieve maternal and child health. *Reproductive health matters* 2011, 19(38):176-182.
- 9. Houweling TA, Ronsmans C, Campbell OM, Kunst AE: Huge poor-rich inequalities in maternity care: an international comparative study of maternity and child care in developing countries. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 2007, **85**(10):745-754.
- 10. Bain LE, Aboagye RG, Dowou RK, Kongnyuy EJ, Memiah P, Amu H: Prevalence and determinants of maternal healthcare utilisation among young women in sub-Saharan Africa: cross-sectional analyses of demographic and health survey data. *Bmc Public Health* 2022, **22**(1):20.
- 11. Bhowmik J, Biswas RK, Ananna N: Women's education and coverage of skilled birth attendance: An assessment of Sustainable Development Goal 3.1 in the South and Southeast Asian Region. *PLoS One* 2020, 15(4):18.
- 12. Abebo TA, Tesfaye DJ: Postnatal care utilization and associated factors among women of reproductive age Group in Halaba Kulito Town, Southern Ethiopia. Archives of Public Health 2018, 76:10.
- 13. Woldegiorgis MA, Hiller J, Mekonnen W, Meyer D, Bhowmik J: Determinants of antenatal care and skilled birth attendance in sub-Saharan Africa: A multilevel analysis. *Health* services research 2019, **54**(5):1110-1118.

# **Thanks & Acknowledgement**



## All audiences

### Supervisors/Co-authors

A/P Dr. Jahar Bhowmik (Principal supervisor)

Dr. Evie Kendal (Co-Supervisor)

Dr. Raaj Kishore Biswas (Co-supervisor, University of Sydney)





## Acknowledgement

Scholarship Sponsor Swinburne University of Technology





Ministry of Science and Technology, Government of The People's Republic of Bangladesh Bangladesh Secretariat, Dhaka. www.most.gov.bd



SWINBURNE UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

## **Appendix A: Goodness of models fitting**





Figure: ROC curves for the models of MHS (ANC, SBA, ID and PNC)

# Appendix B: Multicollinearity check



Terms (Covariates)	Model: ANC	Model: SBA	Model: ID	Model: PNC
	VIF (95% CI)	VIF (95% CI)	VIF (95% CI)	VIF (95% CI)
Respondent Age	1.91 (1.90, 1.92)	1.85 (1.84, 1.86)	1.73 (1.72, 1.73)	1.97 (1.96, 1.99)
Place of residence	1.78 (1.77, 1.79)	1.49 (1.49, 1.50)	1.58 (1.57, 1.59)	1.57 (1.56, 1.58)
Respondent education level	2.41 (2.39, 2.42)	1.76 (1.75, 1.76)	1.85 (1.84, 1.86)	2.34 (2.32, 2.35)
Wealth index	2.09 (2.08, 2.10)	1.79 (1.78, 1.80)	1.80 (1.79, 1.81)	1.94 (1.93, 1.96)
Sex of Household head	1.07 (1.06, 1.07)	1.06 (1.06, 1.07)	1.07 (1.06, 1.07)	1.07 (1.06, 1.07)
Distance to the health facility	1.18 (1.17, 1.18)	1.08 (1.08, 1.09)	1.09 (1.09, 1.10)	1.12 (1.11, 1.13)
Age of household head	1.41 (1.40, 1.42)	1.39 (1.39, 1.40)	1.42 (1.41, 1.43)	1.39 (1.38, 1.40)
Media exposure	1.23 (1.23, 1.24)	1.23 (1.23, 1.24)	1.27 (1.26, 1.27)	1.36 (1.35, 1.37)
Respondent's age at first birth	1.36 (1.35, 1.36)	1.36 (1.35, 1.36)	1.35 (1.34, 1.35)	1.46 (1.45, 1.47)
Birth order of the child	1.93 (1.92, 1.94)	1.76 (1.75, 1.77)	1.67 (1.66, 1.68)	1.83 (1.81, 1.84)
Husband/partner education level	1.98 (1.97, 1.99)	1.80 (1.79, 1.81)	1.93 (1.92, 1.94)	2.26 (2.25, 2.28)
Respondent working status	1.25 (1.24, 1.26)	1.30 (1.30, 1.31)	1.36 (1.35, 1.37)	1.31 (1.30, 1.32)
Respondent decision-making power	1.19 (1.18, 1.19)	1.18 (1.17, 1.18)	1.15 (1.14, 1.15)	1.22 (1.21, 1.23)
Attitude towards IPV	1.18 (1.17, 1.19)	1.15 (1.15, 1.15)	1.14 (1.14, 1.15)	1.21 (1.20, 1.22)
Country	6.48 (6.43, 6.53)	5.63 (5.59, 5.66)	6.17 (6.14, 6.21)	7.46 (7.39, 7.53)

Table: Multicollinearity check for covariates from all models of MHS (ANS, SBA, ID and PNC)