Preventing malaria during pregnancy: factors determining the use of insecticide-treated bednets and intermittent preventive therapy in Juba

Robert P. Napoleon^a, Amwayi S. Anyangu^b, Jared Omolocan^c and Juliet R. Ongus^d

Abstract

The study was carried out among 334 pregnant and newly delivered women seen at Juba Teaching Hospital in 2009. The objective was to assess the coverage of insecticide-treated bed-nets (ITN) and Intermittent Preventive Therapy (IPT) among these women and the factors associated with their use. Overall 87% of the women used ITN and 61% used IPT. ITN use was positively associated with buying nets, indoor spraying of insecticide and higher household income. IPT use was positively associated with more frequent antenatal clinic visits, indoor spraying and buying ITN.

Introduction

Studies show that malaria infections are higher in first and second pregnancies than subsequent ones (1). In South Sudan, as in other places, malaria is a cause of:

- maternal anaemia
- intra-uterine growth retardation
- low birth weight
- stillbirths and abortions, and
- maternal mortality (2, 3)

The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends IPT in pregnancy after studies showed that it reduced the prevalence of maternal anaemia and low birth weight (4, 5). The drug acts by clearing malaria parasites from the placenta during the period of rapid foetal growth (6).

To date there is no documentation on the coverage and determinants of the use of ITN or IPT in pregnancy in South Sudan. So the objective of this study was to fill this information gap.

Methods

A cross-sectional study was carried out between September and November 2009 at Juba Teaching Hospital (JTH). The Cochran formula (z2x p (1-p)/d2) was used to estimate the minimum sample size assuming the proportion of pregnant women using ITN (or IPT) was 33% (8, 1), a 95% confidence interval and a precision of 5%.

a MBBS, MSc. Directorate of Preventive Medicine, Ministry of
Health, Government of Southern Sudan,
<u>patmokili@yahoo.com, patmokili@gmail.com</u>
b MBChB, MSc. Field Epidemiology and Laboratory Training
Programme (FELTP), Kenya amwayi2004@yahoo.com
c MBBS, MSc. Field Epidemiology and Laboratory Training
Programme (FELTP), Kenya. jaredom2000@yahoo.com,
d MSc, PhD. Institute of Tropical Medicine and Infectious Diseases
(ITROMID), Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and
Technology, Kenya. julietteongus@yahoo.co.uk

The participants were pregnant women attending the ante-natal clinic (ANC) in their second and third trimesters and women in the maternity ward in the immediate period after delivery. Every sixth woman meeting the inclusion criteria and giving her consent was selected. A total of 334 women were recruited – 167 from ANC and 167 from the ward. Data were collected on:

- use of ITN and IPT during pregnancy
- attitudes towards IPT
- how bed-nets were acquired
- ANC attendance
- indoor spraying of insecticide

• general knowledge and attitudes about the cause and prevention of malaria

• age, employment, education, monthly household income and parity.

Statistical Analysis

Epi Info version 3.4.3 statistical software was used for data entry and analysis. A descriptive statistical analysis was carried out on the use of ITN. Differences in proportions were analyzed using Chi square tests or Fisher exact test where appropriate. During bivariate analysis for factors associated with ITN and IPT use the measure of association was Odds Ratio (OR). A P-value ≤ 0.05 was considered a statistically significant association.

Factors that were significant during bivariate analysis ($P \le 0.05$) were used as independent variables in the unconditional multiple logistic regression where a backward stepwise elimination method was used to obtain the final model. During the backward stepwise methods all the significant factors were entered in the model and the regression run until only factors that were significant (at $P \le 0.05$) were retained in the model which was the final "best" model. This allowed for the assessment of

MAIN ARTICLES

Ministry of Health guidelines for reducing malaria during pregnancy.

In accordance with WHO recommendations, the guidelines for reducing malaria during pregnancy in South Sudan are:

- treat clinical malaria
- promote the use of insecticide-treated bed-nets and
- prescribe Intermittent Preventive Therapy. Give at least two doses of sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine (SP) tablets at one month intervals, beginning after quickening in the second trimester. Give at least three doses to HIV infected women (7).

SSMJ plans to have an article on malaria in pregnancy in a future issue.

measures of association among nested levels of the factors retained in the model.

Results

Socio-demographic characteristics of participants (for full details see Table 1 in the Annex in the version of this article published on the SSMJ website)

The majority of women were in the 18-31 year age group (the mean age was 24 (\pm 5.4) years); most were unemployed or housewives (74%) and Christian (79%). Two thirds had attained primary or secondary education while 27% had not gone to school. The monthly income of the husbands of more than half of the women was between 500-1000 Sudanese pounds (approximately US\$185-370).

The overall use of ITN was 87% (n = 296; 95% CI = 85% - 92%) and of IPT was 61% (n = 204; 95% CI = 56% - 63%). The use of ITN and IPT was highest among women who:

- were aged 32 years and above
- were formally employed
- had attained secondary school education

• had a monthly household income above 1,000 Sudanese Pounds.

There was no significant difference in use of ITN and IPT among Christians and Muslims.

Factors associated with ITN use (for full details see Table 2 in the Annex in the version of this article published on the SSMJ website)

Bivariate analyses for factors associated with ITN use showed that the following factors were statistically significant at P \leq 0.05: buying ITN; being on the third or more ANC visit; household monthly income of \leq US\$ 100; use of indoor spraying to prevent mosquito bites; no education; doing nothing to prevent mosquito bites; Christianity; awareness that mosquitoes cause malaria and use of IPT.

These factors were used to obtain the final "best

fit model" and only three of these were independently associated with ITN use in pregnancy in the study. Those who had bought ITNs and those who used residual indoor spraying were more likely to sleep under insecticide treated nets. However women with low incomes were found to be less likely to use bed-nets.

Factors associated with IPT use (for full details see Table 3 in the Annex in the version of this article published on the SSMJ website)

Bivariate analyses for factors associated with IPT use showed that the following factors were statistically significant at P \leq 0.05: buying ITN; being on the third or more ANC visit; a household monthly income of \leq US \$100; use of indoor spraying for preventing mosquito bites, no education and starting ANC at above six months gestation.

Again, from the final best fit model only three factors were found to be independently associated with IPT use, namely, the buying of ITN, use of indoor spraying, and having attended three or more ANC visits.

Discussion

Eighty seven percent of women reported using ITN. This is almost twice that reported in Tanzania (9) and surpassed the target for the Abuja Declaration which set a target of 60% ITN coverage. Although this indicates that the target has been reached only one facility was covered in this study and more studies need to be done. Sixty one percent of women used IPT.

The highest proportion of both ITN and IPT users were in the 32-38 year-old group. Women who were formally employed and who were better educated had higher IPT and ITN use than women in the informal sector or with poorer education. This might be because the formally employed women have regular incomes and were more able to buy IPT. Those with a higher household income also had high IPT use. Formally employed women are likely to be better educated and hence know more about preventing malaria. Women with secondary education, or whose husbands had a university education, were also higher users of IPT. The factors independently associated with both IPT and ITN use were:

1. Buying ITN.

These findings are in line with those from Kenya (10) and Congo Brazzaville (11) where it was shown that the poorest households had poorer access to the tools for preventing malaria than richer ones. A low income was negatively associated with ITN use.

2. Use of indoor spraying.

Visiting ANC three or more times was associated with increased IPT use. This indicated that the more the women go for ANC, the more knowledge they acquire and the more likely they are to receive IPT.

Recommendations

• The Ministry of Health should undertake further studies to find out whether the Abuja targets have been achieved in other health facilities.

• There should be rigorous public health education on the use of ITNs in addition to subsidizing ITNs or giving them out for free.

• The Ministry of Health should undertake rigorous awareness campaigns to educate mothers on the importance of regular ANC visits and IPT use targeting especially those with lower incomes or less education.

• There should also be further studies on the use of IPT in pregnancy to assess their impact since their introduction into the government's health policy.

Acknowledgements

We thank the following people for their support: Donna Jones, Dr Joe Oundo, Ahmed Abade, Dr Atem Nathan Riak, Dr Majok Yak Majok, Dr John Rumunu, Dr Munir Christo, Dr Olivia Lomoro, Dr Merghani Abdallah, Jemelia Sake and Remo James. Our sincere gratitude goes to the Juba Teaching Hospital staff and study participants.

The study was approved by the Ethical Board of the Directorate of Research, Planning and Health Systems Development in the Ministry of Health in the Government of Southern Sudan.

References

- 1. Brabin B. An Assessment of Low-Birth-Weight Risk in Primiparae as an Indicator of Malaria Control in Pregnancy. *Int J Epidemiol*; 1991. 20:276-283.
- 2. Adam I., Khamis A.H. and Elbashir M.I. Prevalence and risk factors for anaemia in pregnant women of Eastern

Sudan. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2005; 90:739-43

- 3. Dafallah S.E., EL-Agib F.H. and Bushra G.O. Maternal mortality in a teaching hospital in Sudan. *Saudi Med J* 2003; 24:369–73.
- 4. Shulman C.E., Dorman E.K., Cutts F., Kawuondo K., Bulmer J.N., Peshu N. and Marsh K. Intermittent sulphadoxine–pyrimethamine to prevent severe anaemia secondary to malaria in pregnancy: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 1999; 353: 632–636.
- Newman R.D., Moran A.C., Kayentao K., Kayentao K., Benga-De E., Yameogo M., Gaye O., Faye O., Lo Y., Moreira P.M., Doumbo O., Parise M.E. and Steketee R.W. Prevention of malaria during pregnancy in West Africa: policy change and the power of sub- regional action. *Trop Med Int Health* 2006; 11: 462–469.
- 6. WHO/AFRO. A strategic framework for malaria prevention and control during pregnancy in the African region. AFR/MAL/04/01 2004
- Malaria Control Strategic Plan, Draft Proposal, Ministry of Health Government of Southern Sudan, April 2006
- Pettifor A., Taylor E., Nku D., Duvall S., Tabala M., Meshnick S. and Behets F. Bed net ownership, use and perceptions among women seeking antenatal care in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC): Opportunities for improved maternal and child health. BMC Public Health, 2008; 8:331
- Marchant T., Schellenberg J.A., Edgar T., Nathan R., Abdulla S., Mukasa O., Mponda H. and Lengeler, C. Socially marketed insecticide-treated nets improve malaria and anaemia in pregnancy in southern Tanzania. *Trop Med Int Health.* 2002; 7 no 2 pp 149±158
- Guyatt, H.L., Corlett, S.K., Robinson, T.P., Ochola S.A. and Snow R.W. (2002). Malaria prevention in highland Kenya: indoor residual house-spraying vs. insecticidetreated bednets. *Trop Med Int Health* 2002; 7: 298–303.
- Carme B., Plassart H., Senga P. and Nzingoula S. Cerebral malaria in African children: Socioeconomic risk factors in Brazzaville, Congo. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 1994; 50: 131–6

Further reading

- Gutman J. & Slutsker L. Malaria control in pregnancy: still a long way to go *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* March 2011 11 (3):157 - 159 (doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70311-X).
- van Eijk A-M. etal Coverage of malaria protection in pregnant women in sub-Saharan Africa: a synthesis and analysis of national survey data *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* March 2011 11 (3) 190 - 207 (doi:10.1016/ S1473-3099(10)70295-4).

MAIN ARTICLES

Socio demographic characteristics	Total enrolled	IPT users		ITN users	
		n	%	n	%
Total	334	204	61	296	87
Age in years					
<18	49	32	65	41	84
18-24	147	87	59	131	89
25-31	101	58	57	89	88
32-38	29	21	72	27	93
>39	4	4	100	4	100
Occupation					
Formal Employment	37	28	76	34	92
Housewife/unemployed	247	152	61	219	88
Informal employment	24	09	38	21	88
Student	24	14	58	21	88
Others	1	1	100	1	100
Education level of participant					
None	90	47	52	74	82
Primary	106	60	57	95	90
Secondary	115	83	72	106	92
College/University	23	14	61	21	91
Participant's husband education level					
None	57	30	53	47	83
Primary	48	26	54	44	92
Secondary	169	106	63	151	89
College/University	60	42	70	54	90
Husband monthly income					
250 SDG and below	139	74	53	113	81
500-1,000 SDG	186	123	66	174	94
>1,000 SDG	9	7	78	9	100
Religion					
Christianity	264	163	62	228	86
Muslim	65	40	62	64	99
Traditional	5	1	20	4	80

Table 1. Distribution of participants' use of IPT and ITN according to their socio-demographic characteristics

	Characteristics	ITN USE Yes N	0	Bivaria	ite analysis			Multiv	uriate analysis	
		n (%) n (%)	COR	95%CI	P-Vah	ue	AOR	95%CI	P-Value	
Yes 284(96) 2(5) No 12(4) 36(95) 14.4 2.08-114.0 0.001 16.6 1.33-206.22 0.029 Yes 87(29) 1(3) 0.3 0.14-0.59 0.001 16.6 1.33-206.22 0.029 No 209(70) 37(97) 0.3 0.14-0.59 0.001 0.17 0.04-0.71 0.015 Yes 113(85) 26(68) 0.4 0.17-0.79 0.016 Not Significant 0.015 0.299(7) 0.015 0.17 0.04-0.71 0.015 Yes 138(62) 12(32) 0.4 0.17-0.79 0.016 Not Significant 0.299(7) 0.015 Not Significant 14.8 0.292(9) 34(90) 0.5 0.23-0.92 0.041 Not Significant 14.9 14.0	Bought	ITN		426	91.6-1980.39	0.001		504.1	91.50-2777.93	<0.00
No 12.4 $36(95)$ 14.4 $2.08-114.0$ 0.001 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 Yes $87(29)$ $1(3)$ 0.3 $0.14-0.59$ 0.001 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.021 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.021 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.021 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.021 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.021 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.021 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.015 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.015 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.022 0.015 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.021 16.6 $1.33-206.22$ 0.015 16.6 $13-206.22$ 0.015 16.6 $13-206.22$ 0.015 16.6 $13-206.22$ 0.015 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 16.6 <td< td=""><td>Yes</td><td>284(96) 2(5)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Yes	284(96) 2(5)								
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	No	12(4) $36(95)$								
Yes $87(29)$ $1(3)$ No $209(70)$ $37(97)$ 0.3 $0.14-0.59$ 0.001 0.17 $0.04-0.71$ 0.015 Yes $113(88)$ $26(8)$ 0.4 $0.17-0.79$ 0.016 Not Significant 0.015 0.17 $0.04-0.71$ 0.015 Yes $113(88)$ $26(8)$ 0.4 $0.17-0.79$ 0.016 Not Significant Yes $38(13)$ $11(29)$ 0.4 $0.17-0.79$ 0.0035 Not Significant Yes $38(15)$ $11(29)$ 0.4 $0.17-0.79$ 0.0035 Not Significant Yes $38(15)$ $11(29)$ 0.5 $0.23-0.92$ 0.041 Not Significant Yes $74(25)$ $16(42)$ 0.7 $0.21-0.99$ 0.075 Not Significant Yes $74(16)$ $11(29)$ 0.7 $0.21-0.99$ 0.075 Not Significant Yes $228(77)$ $36(95)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Yes $190(64)$ $14(37)$ 3.1 $1.52-6.19$ $0.$. Indoor	spraying		14.4	2.08 - 114.0	0.001		16.6	1.33 - 206.22	0.029
No $209(70)$ $37(97)$ 0.3 $0.14 \cdot 0.59$ 0.001 0.17 $0.04 \cdot 0.71$ 0.015 Yes $113(88)$ $26(68)$ 0.4 $0.17 \cdot 0.79$ 0.016 Not Significant 0.17 $0.04 \cdot 0.71$ 0.015 Ves $38(12)$ $11(29)$ 0.016 Not Significant Ves $38(15)$ $11(29)$ 0.016 Not Significant Ves $38(15)$ $11(29)$ 0.035 Not Significant Ves $22(99)$ $34(90)$ No $41(10)$ No $41(10)$ No $41(10)$ Not $Significant$ Ves $74(25)$ $16(42)$ Not $Significant$ Ves $74(25)$ $16(42)$ Not $Significant$ Ves $74(16)$ $11(29)$ Not $Significant$ Ves $47(16)$ $11(29)$ Not $Significant$ Ves Ves $47(16)$ $11(29)$ Not $Significant$ Ves Ves Not $Significant$ Ves Ves Ves <t< td=""><td>Yes</td><td>87(29) 1(3)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Yes	87(29) 1(3)								
	No	209(70) 37(97)								
Yes 113(88) 26(68) No 183(62) 12(32) First ANC visit 0.4 0.17-0.79 0.016 Not Significant Yes 38(13) 11(29) 0.016 Not Significant No 258(87) 27(71) 0.016 Not Significant Yes 292(99) 34(00) 0.5 0.23-0.92 0.041 Not Significant Yes 74(25) 16(42) 0.5 0.23-0.92 0.041 Not Significant Yes 74(25) 16(42) 0.5 0.21-0.99 0.075 Not Significant Yes 74(10) 11(29) 0.02 0.075 Not Significant Yes 249(84) 27(71) 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.075 Not Significant Yes 190(64) 24(37) 3(05) 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.02 Not Significant Yes 190(64) 14(37) 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant	. House	hold income < \$90		0.3	0.14 - 0.59	0.001		0.17	0.04 - 0.71	0.015
No $183(62)$ $12(32)$ First ANC visit 0.4 0.17-0.79 0.016 Not Significant Yes $38(13)$ $11(29)$ No $258(87)$ $27(71)$ Not Significant Awareness that mosquitoes cause malaria 8.6 $2.05-35.91$ 0.0035 Not Significant Yes $292(99)$ $34(90)$ 0.5 $0.23-0.92$ 0.041 Not Significant Yes $74(25)$ $16(42)$ 0.5 $0.23-0.92$ 0.041 Not Significant Ves $74(25)$ $16(42)$ 0.5 $0.23-0.92$ 0.041 Not Significant Ves $74(25)$ $16(42)$ 0.5 $0.21-0.99$ 0.075 Not Significant Ves $74(16)$ $11(29)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Ves $228(77)$ $36(95)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Ves $190(64)$ $14(37)$ 3.1 $1.52-6.19$ 0.002 Not Significant </td <td>Yes</td> <td>113(88) 26(68)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Yes	113(88) 26(68)								
$. \mbox{First ANC visit} & 0.4 & 0.17-0.79 & 0.016 & \mbox{Not Significant} \\ \mbox{Yes} & 38(13) & 11(29) \\ \mbox{No} & 258(87) & 27(71) \\ \mbox{Avareness that mosquitoes cause malaria} & 8.6 & 2.05-35.91 & 0.0035 & \mbox{Not Significant} \\ \mbox{Yes} & 292(99) & 34(90) \\ \mbox{No} & 4(1) & 4(10) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	No	183(62) 12(32)								
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$. First Al	NC visit		0.4	0.17-0.79	0.016		Not Sig	pnificant	
No $258(87)$ $27(71)$ Awareness that mosquitoes cause malaria 8.6 $2.05-35.91$ 0.0035 Not Significant Yes $292(99)$ $34(90)$ 0.5 $2.05-35.91$ 0.0035 Not Significant No $4(1)$ $4(10)$ 0.5 $0.23-0.92$ 0.041 Not Significant Yes $74(25)$ $16(42)$ 0.5 $0.23-0.92$ 0.041 Not Significant No $222(75)$ $22(58)$ 0.7 $0.21-0.99$ 0.075 Not Significant Ves $47(16)$ $11(29)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.075 Not Significant Ves $249(84)$ $27(71)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Ves $228(77)$ $36(95)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Ves $190(64)$ $14(37)$ 3.1 $1.52-6.19$ 0.002 Not Significant	Yes	38(13) 11(29)								
. Awareness that mosquitoes cause malaria 8.6 2.05-35.91 0.0035 Not Significant Yes $292(99)$ $34(90)$ 0.101 0.0035 Not Significant No $4(1)$ $4(10)$ 0.5 0.23-0.92 0.041 Not Significant Yes $74(25)$ $16(42)$ 0.5 0.23-0.92 0.041 Not Significant Ves $74(25)$ $16(42)$ 0.7 0.21-0.99 0.075 Not Significant Use of protection against insect bite 0.7 $0.21-0.99$ 0.075 Not Significant Ves $47(16)$ $11(29)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Ves $228(77)$ $36(95)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Use of IPT 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Ves $190(64)$ $14(37)$ 3.1 $1.52-6.19$ 0.002 Not Significant	No	258(87) 27(71)								
	. Awaren	less that mosquitoes ca	use malari	a 8.6	2.05-35.91	0.0035		Not Sig	pnificant	
	Yes	292(99) 34(90)								
Not attended school 0.5 0.23-0.92 0.041 Not Significant Yes $74(25)$ $16(42)$ 0.7 0.23-0.92 0.041 Not Significant No $222(75)$ $22(68)$ 0.7 0.21-0.99 0.075 Not Significant Ves $47(16)$ $11(29)$ 0.7 0.21-0.99 0.075 Not Significant No $249(84)$ $27(71)$ 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.02 Not Significant Christian religion 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.02 Not Significant Yes $28(77)$ $36(95)$ 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.02 Not Significant Use of IPT 3.1 $1.52-6.19$ 0.002 Not Significant Yes $190(64)$ $14(37)$ 3.1 $1.52-6.19$ 0.002 Not Significant	No	4(1) 4(10)								
	. Not att	ended school		0.5	0.23 - 0.92	0.041		Not Sig	pnificant	
	Yes	74(25) 16(42)								
Use of protection against insect bite 0.7 0.21-0.99 0.075 Not Significant Yes $47(16)$ $11(29)$ No $249(84)$ $27(71)$ No $249(84)$ $27(71)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Yes $228(77)$ $36(95)$ 0.2 $0.04-0.79$ 0.02 Not Significant Use of IPT Use of IPT 3.1 $1.52-6.19$ 0.002 Not Significant Yes $190(64)$ $14(37)$ 3.1 $1.52-6.19$ 0.002 Not Significant	No	222(75) 22(58)								
Yes 47(16) 11(29) No 249(84) 27(71) Christian religion 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.02 Not Significant Yes 228(77) 36(95) 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.02 Not Significant Use of IPT 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant	. Use of	protection against inse	ct bite	0.7	0.21 - 0.99	0.075		Not Sig	pnificant	
No 249(84) 27(71) Christian religion 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.02 Not Significant Yes 228(77) 36(95) 36(95) 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant Ves 190(64) 14(37) 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant	Yes	47(16) 11(29)								
Christian religion 0.2 0.04-0.79 0.02 Not Significant Yes 228(77) 36(95) 36(95) No 68(23) 2(5) Use of IPT 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant Yes 190(64) 14(37) 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant	No	249(84) 27(71)								
Yes 228(77) 36(95) No 68(23) 2(5) Use of IPT 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant Yes 190(64) 14(37) 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant	Christia	an religion		0.2	0.04-0.79	0.02		Not Sig	pnificant	
No 68(23) 2(5) Use of IPT 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant Yes 190(64) 14(37) 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant	Yes	228(77) 36(95)							,	
Use of IPT 3.1 1.52-6.19 0.002 Not Significant Yes 190(64) 14(37) 14	No	68(23) 2(5)								
Yes 190(64) 14(37)	. Use of	IPT		3.1	1.52-6.19	0.002		Not Sig	mificant	
									TTTT COLL	

MAIN ARTICLES

	IPT Use				
Characteristics	Yes NO	Bivaria	ate analysis	Multiv	ariate analysis
	n (%) n (%)	COR	95%CI P-Value	AOR	95%CI P-Value
1. ≥3 ANC Visits		4.2	2.65-6.75 <0.001	4.0	2.49-6.47 <0.001
Yes	141 (69) 45 (35)				
No	63 (31) 85 (65)				
2. Indoor spraying		2.5	1.45-4.40 0.001	2.2	1.21-3.91 0.009
Yes	67 (33) 21 (16)				
No	137 (67) 109 (84)				
3. Bought ITN		2.5	1.35-4.70 0.005	2.0	1.02-3.91 0.045
Yes	184(90) 102 (79)				
No	20 (10) 28 (22)				
4. House hold incom	ne < 90USD	0.6	0.36-0.89 0.017		Not significant
Yes	74 (36) 65 (50)				Ū.
No	130 (64) 65 (50)				
5. No education of participant		0.6	0.37-0.99 0.059		Not significant
Yes	47(23) 43 (33)				Ū.
No	157 (77) 87 (67)				
6. ANC > 6 months		0.6	0.34-0.97 0.049		Not significant
Yes	38 (19) 37 (28)				U
No	166 (81) 93 (72)				

Table 3: Factors significantly associated with IPT	use in pregnancy during bivariate and subsequent
multivariate analysis among participants	