

# 

**Citation:** Mare KU, Aychiluhm SB, Sabo KG, Tadesse AW, Kase BF, Ebrahim OA, et al. (2023) Determinants of anemia level among reproductiveage women in 29 Sub-Saharan African countries: A multilevel mixed-effects modelling with ordered logistic regression analysis. PLoS ONE 18(11): e0294992. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0294992

**Editor:** Fekede Asefa Kumsa, University of Tennessee Health Science Center, UNITED STATES

Received: February 21, 2023

Accepted: November 13, 2023

Published: November 29, 2023

**Peer Review History:** PLOS recognizes the benefits of transparency in the peer review process; therefore, we enable the publication of all of the content of peer review and author responses alongside final, published articles. The editorial history of this article is available here: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294992

**Copyright:** © 2023 Mare et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Data Availability Statement:** The raw dataset used and analyzed in this study can be accessed from

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Determinants of anemia level among reproductive-age women in 29 Sub-Saharan African countries: A multilevel mixed-effects modelling with ordered logistic regression analysis

Kusse Urmale Mare<sup>1\*</sup>, Setognal Birara Aychiluhm<sup>2</sup>, Kebede Gemeda Sabo<sup>1</sup>, Abay Woday Tadesse<sup>3</sup>, Bizunesh Fentahun Kase<sup>3</sup>, Oumer Abdulkadir Ebrahim<sup>3</sup>, Tsion Mulat Tebeje<sup>4</sup>, Getahun Fentaw Mulaw<sup>5</sup>, Beminate Lemma Seifu<sup>3</sup>

Department of Nursing, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Samara University, Samara, Ethiopia,
Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, Institute of Public Health, College of Medicine & Health
Sciences, University of Gondar, Gondar, Ethiopia, 3 Department of Public Health, College of Medicine and
Health Sciences, Samara University, Samara, Ethiopia, 4 School of Public Health, College of Health
Sciences and Medicine, Dilla University, Dilla, Ethiopia, 5 School of Public Health, College of Medicine and
Health Sciences, Woldia University, Woldia, Ethiopia

\* kussesinbo@gmail.com

# Abstract

# Background

Despite the implementation of different nutritional and non-nutritional interventions, 43% of reproductive-age women in Africa suffer from anemia. Recent evidence also shows that none of the Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries are on the track to achieve the nutrition target of 50% anemia reduction by 2030. To date, information on the level of anemia and its determinants among reproductive-age women at the SSA level is limited. Thus, this study aimed to estimate the pooled prevalence of anemia level and its determinants in SSA countries.

# Methods

We used a pooled data of 205,627 reproductive-age women from the recent demographic and health surveys of 29 SSA countries that were conducted between 2010–2021. A multi-level mixed-effects analysis with an ordered logistic regression model was fitted to identify determinants of anemia level and the deviance value was used to select the best-fitted model. First, bivariable ordinal logistic regression analysis was done and the proportional odds assumption was checked for each explanatory variable using a Brant test. Finally, in a multivariable multilevel ordinal logistic regression model, a p-value<0.05 and AOR with the corresponding 95% CI were used to identify determinants of anemia level. All analyses were done using Stata version 17 software.

the DHS website (https://dhsprogram.com/data/ dataset\_admin/index.cfm).

**Funding:** The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.

**Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Abbreviations: AOR, Adjusted Odds Ratio; CI, Confidence Interval; DHS, Demographic and Health Survey; ICC, Intra Class Correlation Coefficient; LMICs, Low and Middle-Income Countries; LL, Log-Likelihood; MOR, Median Odds Ratio; PCV, Proportional Change in Variance; SSA, Sub-Saharan Africa.

#### Results

The pooled prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age in SSA was 40.5% [95% CI = 40.2%-40.7%], where 24.8% [95% CI: 24.6%-25.0%], 11.1% [95% CI = 10.9%-11.2%], and 0.8% [95% CI = 0.7%-0.8%] had mild, moderate, and severe anemia, respectively. The prevalence significantly varied from the lowest of 13% in Rwanda to the highest of 62% in Mali, and anemia was found as a severe public health problem (prevalence of  $\geq$  40%) in 18 countries. The regression result revealed that polygamous marriage, women and husband illiteracy, poor household wealth, shorter birth interval, non-attendance of antenatal care, underweight, unimproved toilet and water facilities, and low community-level women literacy were positively linked with high anemia level. Additionally, the likelihood of anemia was lower in women who were overweight and used modern contraception.

#### Conclusions

Overall results showed that anemia among women of reproductive age is a severe public health problem in SSA countries, affecting more than four in ten women. Thus, enhancing access to maternal health services (antenatal care and contraception) and improved sanitation facilities would supplement the existing interventions targeted to reduce anemia. Moreover, strengthening women's education and policies regulating the prohibition of polygamous marriage are important to address the operational constraints.

# Background

Anemia is the most common nutritional problem disproportionately affecting women of reproductive age in all settings due to women's physiologic state of menstruation, pregnancy, and lactation [1]. Although the risk of exposure to anemia differs across preconception, pregnancy, and lactation periods, its occurrence throughout women's reproductive life is associated with poor maternal, newborn, and child health outcomes [2–10]. Evidence has shown that maternal pre-conceptional anemia leads to spontaneous abortion [11], low birth weight and fetal growth restriction [9, 10], and long-term childhood neurodevelopmental disorders like autism, attention deficit hyperactive disorders, and intellectual disability [2].

Moreover, gestational anemia results in an increased risk of antepartum, intrapartum, and postpartum maternal hemorrhage [12–14] and subsequent blood transfusions [5, 6, 13–15], pregnancy-induced hypertension [5, 13], prolonged and induced labor [13], cesarean birth [3–6, 13], puerperal infections [15], maternal shock, longer hospitalization and critical care admission [5], and mortality [7, 8, 12, 16, 17]. Likewise, the risk of poor neonatal outcomes such as low birth weight [3, 4, 13, 16], small-for-gestational-age [3, 5, 13], preterm birth [3, 4, 6, 12, 13], low Apgar score [3, 5, 6], stillbirth [12, 13], and neonatal and perinatal mortality [5, 13, 16] is higher among neonates and children born to anemic mothers. In addition, low maternal hemoglobin level during pregnancy was also found to increase the risk of placenta previa [5] and abruption, fetal malformation, growth restriction [12], and neonatal admission [6, 14].

Globally, 30% of non-pregnant and 36% of pregnant women suffer from anemia [18]. In low and middle-income countries (LMICs), anemia affects about 32% of childbearing women and more than 50% of the countries in this region had a national anemia level of 20% to 39.9% among this age group [19]. Most importantly, its prevalence in SSA countries is 43%, with the highest prevalence in the Western African region (51%) [20]. Previous studies at national and subnational levels across African countries have identified the influence of different sociodemographic, reproductive, nutritional, and sanitation-related factors on anemia among childbearing women [21–26].

Different nutrition-specific interventions like supplementation of iron-folic acid and vitamin A, fortification of food, and improving dietary diversity and food security through agricultural initiatives have resulted in the reduction of anemia among pregnant and non-pregnant reproductive-age women [27, 28]. Additionally, the implementation of programs like deworming, malaria control, water, sanitation, and hygiene were the strategies targeted to address non-nutritional causes of anemia among reproductive-age women [28]. Despite these efforts, during the last two decades, anemia declined by only 1% in non-pregnant and 5% in pregnant women between 2000 and 2019 [18]. Moreover, the existing evidence shows that none of the LMICs including SSA countries are on the track to achieve the nutrition target of anemia reduction by 50% in 2030, indicating that the average annual rate of decline was below the level needed to achieve the target [29]. Thus, generating up-to-date national, sub-regional, and regional estimates of anemia and identification of context-specific factors at all possible levels are important for further reduction.

To date, evidence on the level of anemia and its determinants at the SSA level is limited and most of the previous studies across this region were restricted to a single country [24, 30–33] and some African countries [20, 26, 34, 35]. However, methodologically these studies did not employ multilevel modelling to account for the hierarchical nature of the demographic and health survey (DHS) data, and data were not weighted to compensate for the non-proportional allocation of the sample size and appropriate estimation of the standard error. Additionally, they did not use the proportional odds model that accounts for the ordered nature of the anemia level. Furthermore, they did not assess the influence of some reproductive health-related factors like antenatal care, place of delivery, birth spacing, parity, and contraceptive use on anemia. Thus, taking into account the methodological gaps of the previous studies, the current study aimed to estimate the pooled prevalence of anemia level and its determinants in SSA countries using data from the DHS conducted between 2010 and 2021.

## Methods

#### Data source

Pooled demographic and health survey data from 29 SSA African countries were used in this study. We took into account the survey year (surveys conducted during 2010–2021), data restrictions, and the presence of outcome variables (i.e. anemia level) in the dataset for the country inclusion. Based on this, we found that, of 43 SSA countries that have a routine DHS, four have data that was collected earlier than 2010 (Central African Republic, Sudan, Eswatini, and Sao Tome and Principe), four have data restriction (Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Botswana, and Eritrea), and datasets of six countries have no observation on the outcome variable (Angola, Chad, Comoros, Kenya, Senegal, and Zambia). Finally, 29 countries were considered in the analysis (Burkina Faso, Benin, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Congo, Cote D'Ivoire, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Niger, Namibia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Togo, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa, and Zimbabwe).

#### Data extraction and management of missing observations

The surveys across all countries employed standardized procedures to gather data on basic socio-demographic characteristics and different health indicators. In this analysis, since the

study population was reproductive-age women (15–49 years old), we extracted women's records (IR) of each country and then appended them after managing missing observations (i.e. women with missing observations on the outcome variable were dropped/excluded from the analysis). Finally, a weighted sample of 205,627 reproductive-age women (unweighted sample = 206,026) was considered in the analysis. Details about the survey's methodology can be accessed online [36].

#### Study variables

**Dependent variable.** The outcome variable for the current study was "anemia level" which was categorized into "no anemia", "mild anemia (hemoglobin level of 10.0–10.9 g/dl for pregnant women and 10.0–11.9 g/dl for nonpregnant women)", "moderate anemia (hemoglobin level 7.0–9.9 g/dl)", and "severe anemia (hemoglobin level less than 7.0 g/dl)". In DHS, anemia level was assessed using hemoglobin level adjusted for altitude and pregnancy status. In this regard, a hemoglobin level of 12 g/dL, and 11 g/dL was considered as the cut-off point to determine anemia among non-pregnant and pregnant women, respectively [37].

**Independent variables.** For analysis purposes, explanatory variables were grouped into individual and community-level variables. Individual-level variables included age, marital status, age at marriage, nature of marriage, women and partner's education, women's employment, family size, possession of bed net, sex of household head, wealth index, parity, birth interval, pregnancy status, current contraceptive use, antenatal care visit, place of delivery, delivery by cesarean section, intake of iron supplementation, body mass index, and history of pregnancy loss. While, residence, region, toilet facility, source of drinking water, distance to a health facility, community-level women's employment, and community-level women's literacy were community-level variables.

Toilet facility was grouped as "improved" and "unimproved" based on DHS guidelines. Improved toilet facilities include (a flush-to-piped sewer system, flush-to-septic tank, flush-topit latrine, pit latrine—ventilated improved pit, pit latrine with slab, and composting toilet). Unimproved toilet facilities include (flush-to-somewhere else, pit latrine—without a slab or open pit, bucket toilet, hanging toilet/latrine, and other DHS categories) [38].

Source of drinking water was grouped as "improved" and "unimproved" based on DHS guidelines. Water sources including household connections, public standpipes, boreholes, protected dug wells, protected springs, and rainwater collection were grouped as improved water sources. While unimproved water sources include unprotected wells, unprotected springs, surface water (from river, dam, or lake), vendor-provided water, bottled water (unless water for other uses is available from an improved source), and tanker truck-provided water [38].

Community-level variables (i.e. community-level women's employment and communitylevel women's literacy) were generated by aggregating the individual-level observations at the cluster level and median values were used to categorize the generated variables as "low" and "high".

**Data management and statistical analysis.** The datasets of all SSA countries were accessed from the DHS program's official database after securing the authorization letter. Then the dataset of each country was cleaned for missing and inconsistent observations. Finally, the cleaned datasets of 29 countries were appended into a single dataset and variable extraction was done based on the literature. Stata software version 17 was used for data analysis and data were weighted to compensate for the non-representativeness of the sample and obtain reliable estimates. Frequency and percentages were used to present descriptive results. To account for the hierarchal nature of DHS data and the ordinal nature of the outcome variable (i.e. anemia level), a multilevel mixed-effect ordered logistic regression model was fitted

Predictor variables	VIF	Tolerance (1/VIF)	GVIF
Woman's education	1.76	0.57	1.02
Partner's education	1.65	0.61	1.01
Nature of marriage	1.22	0.82	1.00
Household wealth	1.45	0.69	1.01
Family size	1.05	0.95	1.00
Birth interval	1.01	0.99	1.00
Currently pregnant	1.08	0.93	1.00
Contraceptive use	1.21	0.83	1.01
Antenatal care visit	1.41	0.71	1.01
Place of delivery	1.34	0.74	1.01
Body mass index	1.09	0.92	1.01
Pregnancy loss	1.01	0.99	1.00
SSA regions	1.11	0.90	1.00
Toilet facility	1.28	0.78	1.01
Water source	1.16	0.86	1.00
Community-level women employment	1.00	0.99	1.00
Community-level women literacy	1.03	0.97	1.00

Table 1. Generalized variance inflation factor values for the predictors of anemia level among reproductive-age women in 29 SSA countries.

GVIF = Generalized variance inflation factor; VIF = Varaiance inflation factor.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294992.t001

to identify determinants of anemia level. First, unadjusted ordinal logistic regression was done and likelihood ratio and Brant tests was conducted for each predictor variable as post-estimation [39, 40]. Therefore, in the unadjusted analysis, explanatory variables that satisfied the proportional odds assumption and had a p-value less than 0.25 were selected for inclusion in the final multivariable regression model [41, 42]. A collinearity diagnostic was carried out using a generalized variance inflation factor (GVIF) due to the categorical nature of the outcome variable, the complexity of the sampling design used, and the hierarchical structure of the fitted model. Thus, to get GVIF for the explanatory variables, the variance inflation factor (VIF) was first obtained as a post-estimation result and then GVIF was computed using a formula,  $GVIF = VIF^{[1/(2^*df)]}$ , where df (degree of freedom) = 16). As presented in Table 1, GVIF values for all predictor variables included in the final model were less than five indicating that there was no multicollinearity (Table 1).

## Model building and selection

Four hierarchal models were fitted to select the model that best fits the data: a model without explanatory variables to test random variability in the intercept (model I), a model with only individual-level explanatory variables (model II), a model with only community-level variables (model III), and a model with both individual and community-level variables (model IV). Deviance (i.e. -2\*LL) was used for model selection and the model with the lowest deviance value was considered as a best-fitted model [43]. Finally, in the multivariable multilevel ordinal logistic regression model, a p-value less than 0.05 and an adjusted odds ratio with the corresponding 95% confidence interval were used to declare the statistical significance of the independent variables. In addition, the random variability in the prevalence of anemia across clusters was estimated by intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC), proportion change in variance (PCV), and median odds ratio (MOR).

# **Ethical approval**

Permission to access the data (AuthLetter\_179743) used in the present study was granted from a measure demographic and health survey via an online request at <u>http://www.dhsprogram.</u> com. The accessed data were only used for this registered study and are publicly available from the program's official database.

# Results

## Sociodemographic characteristics

Of 205,627 reproductive-age women included in the study, 80,499 (39%) were between the ages of 15 and 24 years. The majority (63.9%) of women were married and more than three-fourths (76.9%) were in a monogamous relationship. Less than one-third (30%) of women had no formal education, while 75,234 (36.7%) attended higher education. Moreover, 127,284 (62%) women resided in rural areas and 41,978 (20%) were from the Eastern African region. It was also found that 107,413 (52%) and 61,088 (29.7%) women lived in households with unim-proved toilet and water facilities, respectively (Table 2).

# Obstetrics and reproductive characteristics

Less than half (46.7%) of women included in the analysis were married before the age of 18 years and 121,267 (59.0%) were multiparous. In addition, 185,891 (90.4%) women had a birth interval of 24 months or more, and 52,652 (25.6%) were using contraceptives. The majority (77.8%)of women consumed iron-folic acid supplementation, 53,050 (25.8%) were overweight, and 28,709 (14.0) had a history of pregnancy loss (Table 3).

# Prevalence of anemia among reproductive-age women in SSA countries

The pooled prevalence of anemia among reproductive-age women in SSA countries was 40.5% (95% CI = 40.2%-40.7%), with mild, moderate, and severe anemia accounting for 24.8% (95% CI = 24.6%-25.0%), 11.08% (95% CI = 10.9%-11.2%), 0.8% (95% CI = 0.75%-08%), respectively. The prevalence greatly varied across the countries, with Mali having the highest prevalence (63%) and Rwanda having the lowest (13%). Our result also showed that anemia was a severe public health problem (prevalence of  $\geq$  40) in 18 of the countries included in the analysis and was a moderate problem in the remaining countries except for Rwanda. Furthermore, sub-group analysis revealed that Western (51%) and Southern (37%) African regions had a higher anemia prevalence compared to other regions (Fig 1).

# Random effect analysis

The value of ICC in the null model indicates that there was a 17.9% variation in the level of anemia among reproductive-age women across the clusters and the variability was reduced to about 11% after considering both individual and community-level variables in the full model. The PCV value of the final model showed that the combined effect of individual and community-level variables accounted for 44.9% of the variation in the prevalence of anemia at the community level. Additionally, the presence of heterogeneity in the anemia level between clusters was indicated by the MOR with a value of 2.19 in the null model. This shows that the likelihood of anemia among women in the clusters with higher anemia prevalence was more than two-fold compared to those in the clusters with a lower anemia level. Model IV had the lowest deviance value (i.e. 182,250) and was hence selected as the best-fitted model (Table 4).

Table 2.	Socio-demographic characteristic	s of reproductive-age wo	omen in 29 SSA countries (n = 205,627).
			, , ,

NameNoteNoteNetNetNet54AcadeAc	Characteristics		Total			
AgeImageImageImageImageImageImage15-2434.41 (23.0)16.858 (03.0)9.24 (13.0)74.2 (13.0)6.352 (13.1)35-4934.44 (28.9)16.050 (29.3)8.59 (29.1)74.2 (13.0)39.80 (29.1)Matrial status14.44 (28.9)16.050 (29.3)8.59 (29.1)74.0 (29.1)39.80 (29.1)Neurmirel34.45 (28.0)14.352 (26.0)1.985 (67.0)1.900 (67.0)13.416 (63.9)Formely married10.821 (07.1)5.558 (02.0)1.985 (67.0)1.900 (67.0)13.416 (63.9)Formely married10.821 (07.1)6.559 (52.0)1.452 (67.1)1.010 (69.1)1.1080 (75.0)Rotomarrig9.352 (73.0)6.559 (75.2)1.425 (71.1)1.010 (69.1)1.1080 (75.0)Rotomarrig9.352 (75.2)6.559 (75.2)1.425 (71.1)1.088 (63.0)6.138 (73.0)Rotomarrig9.352 (75.2)6.559 (75.2)1.772 (40.1)1.088 (63.0)6.138 (73.0)Rotomarrig40.797 (42.0)1.780 (23.2)8.551 (24.1)6.752 (24.1)7.524 (63.7)Rotomarrig40.797 (42.0)1.278 (13.0)9.552 (12.5)9.652 (13.1)6.752 (14.1)Rotomarrig40.797 (42.1)1.298 (13.0)1.256 (23.0)9.652 (13.1)6.752 (14.1)Rotomarrig6.962 (53.5)1.818 (53.0)1.529 (12.0)1.661 (13.0)7.752 (13.0)9.752 (13.0)9.752 (13.0)Rotomarrig6.962 (53.5)1.498 (13.0)1.556 (54.0)9.521 (45.1)9.521 (45.1)9.752 (13.0) <td< th=""><th></th><th>No anemia</th><th>Mild</th><th>Moderate</th><th>Severe</th><th></th></td<>		No anemia	Mild	Moderate	Severe	
15-246.439 (184)1.438 (197)1.438 (197)8.439 (137)8.439 (137)25-343.431 (123)1.636 (230)8.540 (230)7.631 (231)5.336 (131)Sa-543.430 (230)1.536 (231)3.630 (231)3.630 (231)7.631 (231)3.630 (231)Nerwaraid3.430 (230)1.536 (231)7.630 (231)7.631 (231)7.631 (231)7.631 (231)Nerwaraid3.630 (231)3.530 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.631 (231)7.631 (231)Nerwaraid3.630 (231)3.530 (231)3.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)Nerwaraid3.632 (231)3.630 (231)3.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)Nerwaraid3.632 (231)3.630 (231)3.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)Nama duanton3.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)7.630 (231)Nama duanton4.067 (231)7.610 (231)7.610 (231)7.610 (231)7.610 (231)7.610 (231)Nama d	Age					
32-4484.81 (2.3.0)86.81 (2.8.0)96.81 (2.9.0)96.00 (2.9.0)BArainatan14.46 (2.8.0)16.00 (2.9.0)56.00 (2.9.0)56.00 (2.9.0)Nermatrici34.05 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)57.05 (2.9.0)Correntpurariato13.02 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)Nomagan0.202 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)Nomagan0.302 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)16.00 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)15.05 (2.9.0)Nomagandandandan15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)Nomagandandandan15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)Nomagandandandan15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)Nomagandandandan15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)Nomagandandan15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00 (2.9.0)15.00	15–24	46,269 (38.8)	21,825 (39.9)	11,483 (39.1)	922 (38.9)	80,499 (39.1)
35-9Jext (30)Jext (30)Jext (30)Jext (30)Jext (30)Jext (30)NariantaJado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)CorrentymariadJado (30)Jaso (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Narear (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Jado (30)Narear (30)Jado (30)J	25-34	38,431 (32.3)	16,858 (30.8)	9,294 (31.6)	742 (31.3)	65,326 (31.8)
ManiationincincincincNormarind3,060,0001,550,66,001,507,67,00057,61,00013,116,63,000Normarind10,200,0001,550,60,0001,567,67,0001,500,67,00013,116,63,000Normarind10,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind15,110,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,5110,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Normarind1,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,0001,200,000Nor	35-49	34,445 (28.9)	16,050 (29.3)	8,598 (29.3)	709 (29.9)	59,802 (29.1)
New marrief34.496 (28.0)14.932 (55.7)17.90 (24.0)55.893 (27.0)Carnenly married74.916 (62.9)35.050 (64.0)18.95 (76.5)19.90 (70.1)11.416 (63.9)Formerly married10.521 (0.1)5.18 (0.2)2.467 (45.0)20.6 (87.0)18.456 (71.0)Nature of marriage59.322 (79.3)6.359 (57.2)14.236 (71.7)1.103 (69.4)10.900 (70.1)Polyagny15.511 (20.7)8.682 (24.8)5.20 (28.3)487 (30.6)3.03 (12.1)No formal education25.98 (27.3)17.708 (25.2)11.772 (40.1)1.088 (45.8)6.314 (0.7)Primary education40.579 (43.2)17.761 (23.2)8.901 (73.4)9.912 (13.2)7.524 (45.7)No form education40.579 (43.2)17.761 (23.2)8.901 (73.4)9.052 (23.6)7.524 (45.7)No form education40.579 (43.2)12.819 (41.7)1.568 (42.8)1.721 (13.1)8.567 (41.9)Norking49.475 (41.5)2.819 (41.7)1.568 (42.8)1.721 (13.1)8.567 (41.9)Parter Education24.940 (53.1)1.818 (43.3)1.578 (73.2)1.618 (19.1)4.945 (63.1)Noring education24.940 (53.1)1.538 (23.3)6.390 (23.1)3.912 (23.1)4.945 (63.1)Primary education24.967 (31.4)1.538 (23.3)6.390 (23.1)3.912 (23.1)4.945 (10.2)No formal education24.967 (31.4)1.521 (23.1)8.96 (71.4)1.946 (73.2)1.960 (73.1)1.960 (73.1)No formal education24.967 (31.4)1.521 (23.1)8.963 (2	Marital status					
Carrendy married74,919 (62.9)85,050 (6.0)19,827 (7.6)15,067,07)13,146 (6.5)9.1Formery married10,821 (9.1)1,150 (9.2)2,467 (8.4)20 (6.7)1,163 (8.5) (9.1)Monogamy53,827 (9.3)8,580 (7.8)1,250 (7.7)1,103 (8.9,1)10,800 (7.6) (9.7)Polygamy15,110 (2.7)8,682 (2.4)5,620 (2.8.3)6,87 (3.0.4)30,301 (2.1)Moma's education15,110 (2.7)1,772 (4.1)1,988 (4.5.8)6,3148 (0.7)Pinary education45,959 (3.6.1)1,715 (3.2.1)8,521 (2.7)6,561 (2.7)6,563 (2.7)Higher education49,475 (1.5.1)2,819 (1.7)1,2568 (2.8.1)1,212 (1.1)8,667 (1.1)Not working69,475 (1.5.1)2,819 (1.7)1,2568 (2.8.1)1,121 (1.8)1,1949 (5.8.1)Working69,475 (1.5.1)2,819 (1.7)1,2568 (2.8.1)1,121 (1.9)1,1499 (5.8.1)Not working69,475 (1.5.1)2,819 (1.7)1,2568 (2.8.1)1,121 (1.9)1,1499 (5.8.1)Partine Education4,475 (1.5.1)2,819 (1.7)1,2568 (2.8.1)1,124 (3.9.1)1,1499 (5.8.1)No formal education2,499 (2.9.1)1,521 (2.9.1)8,617 (2.9.1)8,617 (1.9.1)1,245 (3.9.1)1,456 (7.9.1)Pinary education2,499 (2.9.1)1,521 (2.9.1)3,617 (2.9.1)1,456 (7.9.1)1,456 (7.9.1)1,456 (7.9.1)Pinary education2,499 (2.9.1)1,521 (2.9.1)1,521 (2.9.1)1,521 (2.9.1)1,521 (2.9.1)1,521 (2.9.1)Pinary education2,499 (	Never married	33,405 (28.0)	14,525 (26.5)	7,050 (24.0)	577 (24.3)	55,558 (27.0)
Formery married10821 (9.1)5.188 (9.2)2.647 (8.4)206 (8.7)1.632 (9.1)Nature of marriage9.932 (7.3)6.539 (7.5.)1.730 (7.17.)1.010 (9.01.)1.0100 (7.6.9.)Polygamy15.51 (2.0.7.)8.62 (2.4.8)5.20 (2.3.3.)47.30.0.3.031 (2.3.1.0.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1	Currently married	74,919 (62.9)	35,050 (64.0)	19,857 (67.6)	1,590 (67.0)	131,416 (63.9)
Nature of marriageindexindexindexindexMonogumy59,382 (79.3)6,352 (67.3)1,510 (30.4)101,08 (79.9)Polygumy15,11 (20.7)8,682 (24.8)5,620 (27.1)1,080 (69.1)Woma's cducation2,268 (7.3)17,780 (32.5)8,071 (77.2 (4.1)1,086 (4.5)No formal education40,679 (43.2)1,756 (32.2)8,071 (7.7)6,071 (7.7)Pinary education40,679 (43.2)1,758 (32.3)9,521 (32.5)596 (25.1)7,234 (36.7)Woma's employment40,475 (41.5)2,281 9(4.7)1,266 (42.8)1,212 (51.1)8,607 (41.9)Working0,90,26 (58.3)1,821 (58.3)4,673 (57.2)1,161 (48.9)119,469 (81.1)Parter Education24,047 (1.5)1,258 (42.3)592 (23.1)8,912 (4.1)49,455 (36.0)Pinary education24,047 (3.2)1,258 (32.3)6,392 (39.3)391 (23.4)4,312 (37.1)Pinary education24,067 (1.6)1,258 (32.3)6,392 (39.3)391 (23.4)4,312 (37.1)Higher education24,067 (1.6)1,258 (32.3)6,392 (39.3)391 (23.4)4,312 (37.1)Pinary education24,067 (1.6)1,258 (32.3)6,392 (39.6)371 (23.7)1,482 (37.2)Higher education24,067 (1.6)1,521 (27.1)7,622 (37.6)6,812 (37.6)7,412 (37.1)Pinary education34,093 (28.6)1,521 (27.6)7,622 (37.6)6,812 (37.6)9,867 (42.7)Higher education34,093 (28.6)1,521 (27.6)7,622 (37.6)6,812 (3	Formerly married	10,821 (9.1)	5,158 (9.2)	2,467 (8.4)	206 (8.7)	18,652 (9.1)
Monagamy93.82 (79.3)93.82 (79.3)94.36 (77.7)1,103 (69.4)10,108 (76.9)Polygamy15,511 (20.7)8,62 (24.8)5,02 (23.3)477 (0.6)3,031 (21.1)Nomar's calculation2,208 (27.3)17.780 (32.5)11,772 (40.1)1088 (45.8)6,3148 (0.7)Primary education40,679 (3.2)17.80 (32.5)8,051 (21.4)600 (21.1)6,752 (3.6)Migher education40,679 (3.1)19.373 (3.5)8,051 (21.5)8,052 (3.5)7,523 (45.7)Monas enployment69.26 (3.6)13.83 (3.6)12.568 (4.8)12.12 (3.1.0)8,067 (4.1.0)Vorking69.62 (6.5)3,188 (3.6)12.568 (4.8)12.12 (3.1.0)11.496 (58.1)Partine Education69.62 (6.5)3,188 (3.6)15.12 (4.3.0)80 (24.1)11.496 (58.1)Primary education24.676 (31.6)10.538 (3.8.0)6.349 (30.20)30 (23.1)4.051 (21.1)Primary education24.676 (31.6)15.251 (27.4)6.349 (3.0.1)318 (23.4)4.051 (21.1)Reide education24.696 (31.6)15.251 (27.4)6.349 (3.0.1)318 (23.4)4.741 (21.1)Finalge education8.806 (71.4)15.251 (27.4)1.649 (71.2)1.649 (71.4)1.649 (71.4)Rouse education5.206 (46.3)12.612 (72.4)1.640 (71.4)1.620 (72.4)1.640 (71.4)Rouse education6.806 (71.4)10.864 (19.4)1.620 (11.4)1.660 (11.4)1.660 (11.4)Rouse education6.806 (71.4)10.861 (71.4)1.800 (71.4)1.800 (71.4) <t< td=""><td>Nature of marriage</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Nature of marriage					
Polygamy15,511 (20.7)8,682 (24.8)5,620 (28.3)4,87 (30.6)9,030 (23.1)Woma's education32,508 (27.3)17,708 (32.5)11,772 (0.1)1.688 (45.8)63,148 (30.7)Primary education40,679 (34.2)17,61 (32.2)8,051 (27.4)690 (29.1)67,055 (32.6)Woma's enployment45,030 (33.6)12,523 (32.5)55,23 (32.5)15,234 (35.7)75,234 (35.7)Not working69,625 (55.3)3,183 (53.8)1,579 (57.2)1,161 (48.9)11,946 (58.1)Partner Education24,949 (32.0)14,901 (37.8)9,512 (45.3)902 (54.3)49,553 (6.6)No formal education24,949 (32.0)14,901 (37.8)4,579 (22.9)389 (33.4)40,50 (33.9)Primary education24,949 (32.0)15,324 (33.9)6,349 (30.8)371 (22.3)49,553 (6.6)Primary education24,676 (13.6)15,212 (7.4)6,349 (30.8)371 (22.3)48,212 (12.1)Hagher education85,086 (71.4)9,121 (27.6)1,824 (37.8)1,824 (37.9)1,824 (12.1)Hade for education85,086 (71.4)9,121 (27.6)1,829 (12.3)48,212 (12.1)Female35,086 (34.3)1,621 (27.4)1,424 (38.9)6,037 (39.1)1,848 (38.9)6,037 (39.1)Made Gabas Barder52,06 (64.3)1,212 (27.4)1,414 (38.9)1,023 (39.6)1,424 (12.1)Female10010.20 (13.9)1,262 (27.4)1,444 (38.9)0,363 (39.1)1,444 (38.9)6,363 (39.1)1,414 (38.9)0,363 (39.1)Made Gabas Barder	Monogamy	59,382 (79.3)	26,359 (75.2)	14,236 (71.7)	1,103 (69.4)	101,080 (76.9)
Wonan's educationIndexIndexIndexIndexIndexIndexNo formary education40,679 (A3.2)17,616 (A3.4)17,616 (A3.4)10,868 (A3.4)6,7045 (A3.2)Higher education45,90 (A3.4)19,307 (A3.4)9,552 (A2.5)562 (A3.4)7,324 (A3.7)Wonan's employment40,470 (A3.5)2,219 (A1.7)12,256 (A2.8)12,12 (S1.1)8,670 (A1.9)Working69,626 (K5.4)3,188 (A3.4)16,768 (C3.2)11,61 (A8.9)11,490 (S8.1)Partine Education69,626 (K5.4)14,813 (K3.2)16,768 (C3.2)12,12 (S1.1)4,453 (G3.0)No formal education24,676 (A1.6)16,380 (A3.2)3,12 (A3.1)3,12 (A3.1)4,454 (A3.1)Primary education24,676 (A1.6)15,313 (A3.2)6,340 (A3.2)3,12 (A3.1)4,454 (A3.1)Higher education24,676 (A1.6)15,213 (A3.2)6,460 (A3.2)14,213 (A3.2)4,214 (A3.1)Higher education24,676 (A1.6)15,213 (A3.2)1,423 (A3.2)14,213 (A3.2)4,214 (A3.2)Higher education34,050 (A3.2)1,212 (A3.2)1,423 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)Higher education4,050 (A3.2)1,212 (A3.2)1,423 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)Higher education4,050 (A3.2)1,212 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)Higher education4,050 (A3.2)1,212 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2)Higher education4,050 (A3.2)1,212 (A3.2)1,424 (A3.2) <td>Polygamy</td> <td>15,511 (20.7)</td> <td>8,682 (24.8)</td> <td>5,620 (28.3)</td> <td>487 (30.6)</td> <td>30,301 (23.1)</td>	Polygamy	15,511 (20.7)	8,682 (24.8)	5,620 (28.3)	487 (30.6)	30,301 (23.1)
No formal education32,508 (27.3)17,780 (32.5)11,772 (40.1)1.088 (45.8)63,148 (30.7)Primary education40,679 (34.2)17,616 (32.2)8,051 (27.4)690 (23.1)67,553 (3.6,7)Higher education40,679 (34.6)19,337 (35.3)9,552 (32.5)590 (23.1)75,234 (36.7)Woman's employment49,475 (15.1)2,819 (41.7)12,568 (42.8)1,212 (51.1)8,677 (41.9)Working69,626 (55.5)31,883 (58.3)16,798 (57.2)1,161 (48.9)19,469 (58.1)Partner Education24,949 (20.0)14,091 (37.8)9,512 (46.3)902 (54.3)4,639 (23.0)Pirmary education24,949 (20.0)10,538 (28.3)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)4,302 (23.1)Higher education28,390 (36.9)12,534 (33.9)6,740 (30.8)371 (22.3)4,747 (43.7)Head of household28,390 (36.9)12,512 (37.0)1,723 (73.9)1,689 (71.2)47,744 (37.7)Head of household28,309 (36.9)15,212 (7.4)7,522 (6.1)648 (28.8)57,416 (27.9)Household weath20,305 (14.9)10,212 (7.4)7,522 (6.1)648 (28.8)57,416 (27.9)Roor52,626 (63.2)24,217 (4.8)11,443 (38.9)802 (33.8)66,674.9Robe differed20,305 (14.9)10,442 (37.3)12,800 (41.1)1,448 (43.9)7,4555 (26.2)Robe differed20,305 (14.9)16,616 (14.9)9,6164 (5.8)5,556 (4.6)16.60 (5.8)5,566 (4.9)5,616 (4.9)5,616 (4.9)5,616 (4.9)5,616 (4.9)<	Woman's education					
Primary ducation40,679 (34.2)17,616 (32.2)8,051 (27.4)690 (29.1)67,055 (32.6)Higher ducation45,959 (36.6)1,937 (33.3)9,552 (32.6)596 (25.1)75,243 (36.7)Womar's employment49,475 (41.5)22,819 (41.7)12,68 (42.8)1,121 (51.1)86,074 (41.9)Working69,626 (58.5)31,833 (58.3)16,798 (57.2)1,161 (48.9)19,496 (58.1)Partner Education24,949 (32.0)14,091 (37.8)9,512 (46.3)902 (54.3)49,455 (36.0)No formal education24,949 (32.0)12,534 (33.9)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)4,030 (29.3)Higher education24,676 (31.6)12,534 (33.9)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)4,321 (72.1)Head of household24,676 (31.6)12,534 (33.9)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)4,321 (72.1)Head of household24,076 (31.6)13,971 (27.6)317 (23.7)1,689 (71.2)148,211 (72.1)Made5,056 (67.1)3,971 (27.6)1,473 (43.9)1,689 (71.2)148,211 (72.1)Femaly40,490 (32.6)1,521 (27.4)7,522 (21.1)618 (28.8)57.16 (27.9)Bord1,520 (46.3)3,971 (27.6)1,414 (38.9)80 (33.8)9,867 (42.2)Guodehold1,303 (19.4)1,521 (27.4)1,541 (43.9)1,521 (27.9)3,561 (27.9)Hidde2,303 (19.4)1,524 (47.3)1,414 (38.9)80 (33.8)6,452 (39.8)Guodehold1,303 (19.6)1,424 (33.9)1,414 (38.9)80 (35.1)1,456 (39.2)Gub	No formal education	32,508 (27.3)	17,780 (32.5)	11,772 (40.1)	1,088 (45.8)	63,148 (30.7)
Higher education45,939 (38.6)9,337 (35.3)9,552 (32.5)556 (25.1)75,234 (36.7)Womar's enployment9,475 (11.5)2,2419 (4.17)1,2568 (42.8)1,212 (51.1)8,057 (41.9)Not working69,626 (58.5)31,883 (58.3)16,798 (57.2)1,161 (48.9)119,469 (58.1)Partner Education24,949 (32.0)1,409 (137.8)9,512 (43.3)92 (54.3)4,630 (29.3)No formal education24,076 (31.6)10,538 (28.3)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)40,30 (29.3)Higher education24,076 (31.6)10,538 (28.3)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)44,744 (34.7)Head obrowehold24,076 (31.6)12,534 (33.9)6,349 (30.8)371 (22.3)47,744 (34.7)Female85,086 (71.4)39,712 (72.6)1,639 (71.2)148,211 (72.1)Formale54,006 (23.8)1,521 (27.4)7,652 (26.1)648 (28.8)5,7416 (27.9)Fourbelod weath55,006 (63.7)1,521 (27.4)1,434 (38.9)80,613.209,867 (42.2)Midel52,006 (63.1)1,434 (18.9)80 (33.8)0,464 (19.9)1,444 (18.9)42.617.9)Ford52,006 (63.1)1,464 (18.9)1,444 (18.9)14.64.8)9,867 (42.2)Family size52,006 (63.1)1,454 (19.9)1,444 (19.9)1,444 (19.9)1,444 (19.9)Ford1,454 (59.9)1,454 (19.9)1,454 (19.1)1,444 (19.9)1,464 (19.9)Ford1,454 (19.9)1,454 (19.9)1,454 (19.9)1,454 (19.9)1,454 (19.9)Ford1	Primary education	40,679 (34.2)	17,616 (32.2)	8,051 (27.4)	690 (29.1)	67,055 (32.6)
Wonan's employmentIncIncIncIncIncNot working49,475 (1.5)22,819 (41.7)12,568 (2.8)1,212 (1.1)86,074 (41.9)Working69,626 (58.5)31,883 (58.3)16,798 (57.2)116 (14.8.9)119,469 (58.1)Partner Education24,696 (2.0)14,991 (37.8)9.121 (4.5.3)92 (54.3)43,455 (56.0)Primary education24,696 (1.6)10,538 (28.3)4.679 (2.7)380 (2.3)43,453 (3.6)Higher education28,309 (30.9)12,534 (3.3)6.494 (30.8)371 (2.3.3)47,414 (3.7.1)Higher education85,086 (71.4)3,971 (2.7.6)1,923 (73.9)1689 (71.2)148,211 (7.1.1)Made85,086 (71.4)3,971 (2.7.6)1,923 (73.9)1689 (71.2)148,211 (7.1.1)Female85,086 (71.4)3,971 (2.7.6)1,723 (73.9)1689 (71.2)148,211 (7.1.1)Made85,086 (71.4)3,971 (2.7.6)1,723 (73.9)1689 (71.2)148,211 (7.1.1)Female85,086 (71.4)3,971 (2.7.6)1,723 (73.9)1689 (71.2)162 (71.2)Made85,086 (71.4)3,912 (72.4)1,414 (38.9)80 (38.109,867 (41.2)Female10.21,224 (73.2)1,414 (38.9)80 (38.109,867 (41.2)Made2,505 (19.4)1,814 (13.9)1,414 (38.9)14,813 (39.1)14,813 (39.1)14,813 (39.1)Made2,505 (19.4)1,814 (13.9)1,241 (13.1)1,414 (38.9)1,614 (45.8)1,614 (45.8)Share3,506 (19.4)1,3	Higher education	45,939 (38.6)	19,337 (35.3)	9,552 (32.5)	596 (25.1)	75,234 (36.7)
Not working94,975 (41.5)22,819 (41.7)12,568 (42.8)1,212 (51.1)86,074 (41.9)Working69,622 (85.5)31,883 (83.0)16,798 (57.2)1,161 (48.9)119,469 (58.1)Partner Education24,949 (32.0)14,091 (37.8)9,512 (46.3)902 (54.3)49,455 (66.0)No formal education24,949 (32.0)14,091 (37.8)9,512 (46.3)902 (54.3)49,455 (66.0)Primary education24,676 (31.6)16,538 (28.3)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)40,30 (29.3)Higher education28,390 (36.9)12,534 (33.9)6,349 (03.8)31/12.2.3)47,744 (34.7)Head of household85,086 (71.4)39,712 (72.6)21,723 (73.9)1,689 (71.2)148.211 (72.1)Female85,086 (71.4)39,712 (72.6)21,723 (73.9)1,689 (71.2)148.211 (72.1)Formale34,059 (28.6)13,021 (27.4)7,652 (26.1)648 (28.8)5,7416 (27.9)Fourde52,06 (64.3)23,427 (42.8)11,434 (38.9)802 (33.8)90,867 (44.2)Node52,06 (64.3)23,427 (42.8)14,343 (38.9)802 (33.8)90,867 (44.2)Rich40,868 (34.3)24,427 (42.8)14,48 (30.9)42,417.9)40,203 (19.6)Rich40,868 (34.3)24,427 (42.8)14,84 (38.3)74,555 (26.2)13.305 (19.9)Rich40,868 (34.3)0,946 (37.2)14,943 (39.9)14,94 (39.9)14,945 (35.2)Formaly fize61,400 (51.5)30,109 (55.2)15,656 (56.4)1,308 (55.1)16,903 (19.9) <t< td=""><td>Woman's employment</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Woman's employment					
Working69,626 (58.5)31,883 (58.3)16,798 (57.2)1,161 (48.9)19,469 (58.1)Partner EducationCCCCCNo formal education24,949 (32.0)14,091 (37.8)9,512 (46.3)902 (54.3)49,455 (36.0)Primary education24,676 (31.6)10,538 (28.3)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)40,30 (29.3)Higher education24,676 (31.6)10,538 (28.3)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)40,30 (29.3)Head of householdCCCCCCMale85,086 (71.4)39,712 (72.6)1,689 (71.2)1,689 (71.2)1,482 (172.1)Female34,059 (28.6)15,212 (27.4)7,652 (26.1)648 (28.0)9,741 (27.9)Household wealthCCCCCPoor55,06 (64.3)23,427 (42.6)11,484 (38.9)802 (33.8)9,867 (41.2)Middle20,305 (19.4)10,864 (19.9)5,861 (19.9)424 (17.9)40,203 (19.6)Rich40,488 (33.2)23,427 (42.8)11,404 (38.9)802 (33.8)9,867 (42.2)Middle30,305 (19.4)10,864 (19.9)5,861 (19.9)424 (17.9)40,203 (19.6)RichCCCCCCPoor50.60 (63.1)10,464 (19.9)5,861 (19.9)11,46 (43.9)10,664 (45.2)Si10,490 (15.7)30,100 (52.1)15,656 (53.6)1,308 (55.1)10,664 (35.2)Post10,490 (37.7)30,100 (52.1)15,656 (53.6)1,308 (55.1)	Not working	49,475 (41.5)	22,819 (41.7)	12,568 (42.8)	1,212 (51.1)	86,074 (41.9)
Partner EducationInterpretationInt	Working	69,626 (58.5)	31,883 (58.3)	16,798 (57.2)	1,161 (48.9)	119,469 (58.1)
No formal education24,949 (32.0)14,091 (37.8)9,512 (46.3)902 (54.3)49,455 (36.0)Primary education24,676 (31.6)10,538 (28.3)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)40,30 (29.3)Higher education28,309 (36.9)12,534 (33.9)6,394 (30.8)371 (22.3)47,744 (47.7)Head of household </td <td>Partner Education</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Partner Education					
Primary education24,676 (31.6)10,538 (28.3)4,679 (22.9)389 (23.4)40,30 (29.3)Higher education28,390 (36.9)12,534 (33.9)6,349 (30.8)371 (22.3)47,744 (34.7)Head of household </td <td>No formal education</td> <td>24,949 (32.0)</td> <td>14,091 (37.8)</td> <td>9,512 (46.3)</td> <td>902 (54.3)</td> <td>49.455 (36.0)</td>	No formal education	24,949 (32.0)	14,091 (37.8)	9,512 (46.3)	902 (54.3)	49.455 (36.0)
Higher education28,390 (36.9)12,534 (33.9)6,349 (30.8)371 (22.3)47,744 (34.7)Head of householdImage (19,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00	Primary education	24,676 (31.6)	10,538 (28.3)	4,679 (22.9)	389 (23.4)	40,30 (29.3)
Head of householdIndexIndexIndexIndexIndexIndexMale $85,086$ (71.4) $39,712$ (72.6) $21,723$ (73.9) $1,689$ (71.2) $148,211$ (72.1)Female $34,059$ (28.6) $15,021$ (27.4) $7,652$ (26.1) $648$ (28.8) $57,416$ (27.9)Household wealth $52,026$ (46.3) $23,427$ (42.8) $11,434$ (38.9) $802$ (33.8) $90,867$ (44.2)Middle $23,053$ (19.4) $10,864$ (19.9) $5,861$ (19.9) $424$ (17.9) $40,203$ (19.6)Rich $40,886$ (34.3) $20,442$ (37.3) $12,080$ (41.1) $1,148$ (88.3) $74,555$ (26.2)Family size $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1-5$ $57,745$ (48.5) $24,543$ (44.8) $12,810$ (43.6) $1,066$ (44.9) $96,164$ (46.8) $> 5$ $5$ $51,000$ (51.5) $30,190$ (55.2) $1,656$ (56.6) $1,300$ (55.1) $109,463$ (53.2) $Poses616 (45.1)30,100 (55.2)1,656 (56.6)1,300 (55.1)109,463 (53.2)No1111111No111.926 (37.1)30,907 (70.7)36,907 (71.0)20,339 (72.1)1,566 (70.5)13,90,907 (70.7)No1112,241 (62.3)33,315 (60.9)11,246 (38.3)74 (32.6)78,343 (38.1)Rural74,241 (62.3)33,315 (60.9)11,246 (38.3)112 (47.7)29,751 (14.5)SA regions119,33 (16.2)$	Higher education	28,390 (36.9)	12,534 (33.9)	6,349 (30.8)	371 (22.3)	47,744 (34.7)
Male     85,086 (71.4)     39,712 (72.6)     21,723 (73.9)     1,689 (71.2)     148,211 (72.1)       Female     34,059 (28.6)     15,021 (27.4)     7,652 (26.1)     648 (28.8)     57,416 (27.9)       Household wealth             Poor     55,206 (46.3)     23,427 (42.8)     11,434 (38.9)     802 (33.8)     90,867 (44.2)       Middle     23,053 (19.4)     10,864 (19.9)     5,861 (19.9)     424 (17.9)     40,203 (19.6)       Rich     40,886 (34.3)     20,442 (37.3)     12,080 (41.1)     1,148 (48.3)     7,4555 (26.2)       Family size             1-5     57,745 (48.5)     24,543 (44.8)     12,810 (43.6)     1,066 (44.9)     96,164 (46.8)       > 5     61,400 (51.5)     30,190 (55.2)     16,565 (56.4)     1,308 (55.1)     109,463 (53.2)       Posession of bed net             No     31,048 (29.9)     1,47.33 (29.0)     7,869 (27.9)     654 (29.5)     54,304 (29.3)	Head of household					
Female     34,059 (28.6)     15,021 (27.4)     7,652 (26.1)     648 (28.8)     57,416 (27.9)       Household wealth             Poor     55,206 (46.3)     23,427 (42.8)     11,434 (38.9)     802 (33.8)     90,867 (44.2)       Middle     23,053 (19.4)     10,864 (19.9)     5.861 (19.9)     424 (17.9)     40,203 (19.6)       Rich     40,886 (34.3)     20,442 (37.3)     12,080 (41.1)     1,148 (48.3)     7,455 (26.2)       Family size              1-5     57,745 (48.5)     24,543 (44.8)     12,810 (43.6)     1,066 (44.9)     96,164 (46.8)       > 5     Possession of bed net             No     31,048 (29.9)     14,733 (29.0)     7,869 (27.9)     654 (29.5)     54,304 (29.3)       Yes     72,905 (70.1)     36,097 (71.0)     20,339 (72.1)     1,566 (70.5)     130,907 (70.7)       Residence	Male	85,086 (71.4)	39,712 (72.6)	21,723 (73.9)	1,689 (71.2)	148,211 (72.1)
Household wealthImage: Constraint of the state of the sta	Female	34,059 (28.6)	15,021 (27.4)	7,652 (26.1)	648 (28.8)	57,416 (27.9)
Poor     55,206 (46.3)     23,427 (42.8)     11,434 (38.9)     802 (33.8)     90,867 (44.2)       Middle     23,053 (19.4)     10,864 (19.9)     5,861 (19.9)     424 (17.9)     40,203 (19.6)       Rich     40,886 (34.3)     20,442 (37.3)     12,080 (41.1)     1,148 (48.3)     74,555 (26.2)       Family size     Image: Constraint of the c	Household wealth					
Middle     23,053 (19.4)     10,864 (19.9)     5,861 (19.9)     424 (17.9)     40,203 (19.6)       Rich     40,886 (34.3)     20,442 (37.3)     12,080 (41.1)     1,148 (48.3)     74,555 (26.2)       Family size     image: transmit size     image: tr	Poor	55,206 (46.3)	23,427 (42.8)	11,434 (38.9)	802 (33.8)	90,867 (44.2)
Rich     40,886 (34.3)     20,442 (37.3)     12,080 (41.1)     1,148 (48.3)     74,555 (26.2)       Family size             1-5     57,745 (48.5)     24,543 (44.8)     12,810 (43.6)     1,066 (44.9)     96,164 (46.8)       > 5     61,400 (51.5)     30,190 (55.2)     16,565 (56.4)     1,308 (55.1)     109,463 (53.2)       Possession of bed net             No     31,048 (29.9)     14,733 (29.0)     7,869 (27.9)     654 (29.5)     54,304 (29.3)       Yes     72,905 (70.1)     36,097 (71.0)     20,339 (72.1)     1,566 (70.5)     130,907 (70.7)       Residence             Urban     44,904 (37.7)     21,418 (39.1)     11,246 (38.3)     774 (32.6)     78,343 (38.1)       Rural     74,241 (62.3)     33,315 (60.9)     18,128 (61,7)     1,600 (67.4)     127,284 (61.9)       SSA regions             Central Africa <td< td=""><td>Middle</td><td>23,053 (19.4)</td><td>10,864 (19.9)</td><td>5,861 (19.9)</td><td>424 (17.9)</td><td>40,203 (19.6)</td></td<>	Middle	23,053 (19.4)	10,864 (19.9)	5,861 (19.9)	424 (17.9)	40,203 (19.6)
Family sizeImage: si	Rich	40,886 (34.3)	20,442 (37.3)	12,080 (41.1)	1,148 (48.3)	74,555 (26.2)
1-5     57,745 (48.5)     24,543 (44.8)     12,810 (43.6)     1,066 (44.9)     96,164 (46.8)       > 5     61,400 (51.5)     30,190 (55.2)     16,565 (56.4)     1,308 (55.1)     109,463 (53.2)       Possession of bed net             No     31,048 (29.9)     14,733 (29.0)     7,869 (27.9)     654 (29.5)     54,304 (29.3)       Yes     72,905 (70.1)     36,097 (71.0)     20,339 (72.1)     1,566 (70.5)     130,907 (70.7)       Residence             Urban     44,904 (37.7)     21,418 (39.1)     11,246 (38.3)     774 (32.6)     78,343 (38.1)       Sural     74,241 (62.3)     33,315 (60.9)     18,128 (61.7)     1,600 (67.4)     12,7284 (61.9)       Sural     74,921 (62.3)     7,904 (14.4)     2,432 (8.3)     112 (4.7)     29,751 (14.5)       Eastern Africa     19,303 (16.2)     7,904 (14.4)     2,432 (8.3)     112 (4.7)     29,751 (14.5)       Suthern Africa     28,751 (24.1)     9,418 (17.2)     3,493 (11.9)     316 (13.3) <t< td=""><td>Family size</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Family size					
> 5     61,400 (51.5)     30,190 (55.2)     16,565 (56.4)     1,308 (55.1)     109,463 (53.2)       Possesion of bed net     Image: Constraint of the state of t	1–5	57,745 (48.5)	24,543 (44.8)	12,810 (43.6)	1,066 (44.9)	96,164 (46.8)
Possession of bed net     Image: Constraint of the constraint of t	> 5	61,400 (51.5)	30,190 (55.2)	16,565 (56.4)	1,308 (55.1)	109,463 (53.2)
No31,048 (29.9)14,733 (29.0)7,869 (27.9)654 (29.5)54,304 (29.3)Yes72,905 (70.1)36,097 (71.0)20,339 (72.1)1,566 (70.5)130,907 (70.7)Residence </td <td>Possession of bed net</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Possession of bed net					
Yes72,905 (70.1)36,097 (71.0)20,339 (72.1)1,566 (70.5)130,907 (70.7)Residence </td <td>No</td> <td>31,048 (29.9)</td> <td>14,733 (29.0)</td> <td>7,869 (27.9)</td> <td>654 (29.5)</td> <td>54,304 (29.3)</td>	No	31,048 (29.9)	14,733 (29.0)	7,869 (27.9)	654 (29.5)	54,304 (29.3)
ResidenceImage: Constraint of the second	Yes	72,905 (70.1)	36,097 (71.0)	20,339 (72.1)	1,566 (70.5)	130,907 (70.7)
Urban44,904 (37.7)21,418 (39.1)11,246 (38.3)774 (32.6)78,343 (38.1)Rural74,241 (62.3)33,315 (60.9)18,128 (61,7)1,600 (67.4)127,284 (61.9)SSA regions </td <td>Residence</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Residence					
Rural74,241 (62.3)33,315 (60.9)18,128 (61,7)1,600 (67.4)127,284 (61.9)SSA regionsImage: Central Africa19,303 (16.2)7,904 (14.4)2,432 (8.3)112 (4.7)29,751 (14.5)Eastern Africa28,751 (24.1)9,418 (17.2)3,493 (11.9)316 (13.3)41,978 (20.4)Southern Africa25,075 (21.1)10,775 (19.7)3,476 (11.8)339 (14.3)39,665 (19.3)Western Africa46,015 (38.6)26,636 (48.7)19,974 (68.0)1,607 (67.7)94,233 (45.8)Distance to health facilityImage: Central Africa21,604 (39.5)11,608 (39.5)1,032 (43.5)78,359 (38.1)	Urban	44,904 (37.7)	21,418 (39.1)	11,246 (38.3)	774 (32.6)	78,343 (38.1)
SSA regions     Image: Central Africa     19,303 (16.2)     7,904 (14.4)     2,432 (8.3)     112 (4.7)     29,751 (14.5)       Eastern Africa     28,751 (24.1)     9,418 (17.2)     3,493 (11.9)     316 (13.3)     41,978 (20.4)       Southern Africa     25,075 (21.1)     10,775 (19.7)     3,476 (11.8)     339 (14.3)     39,665 (19.3)       Western Africa     46,015 (38.6)     26,636 (48.7)     19,974 (68.0)     1,607 (67.7)     94,233 (45.8)       Distance to health facility     Image: Control of the addition	Rural	74,241 (62.3)	33,315 (60.9)	18,128 (61,7)	1,600 (67.4)	127,284 (61.9)
Central Africa19,303 (16.2)7,904 (14.4)2,432 (8.3)112 (4.7)29,751 (14.5)Eastern Africa28,751 (24.1)9,418 (17.2)3,493 (11.9)316 (13.3)41,978 (20.4)Southern Africa25,075 (21.1)10,775 (19.7)3,476 (11.8)339 (14.3)39,665 (19.3)Western Africa46,015 (38.6)26,636 (48.7)19,974 (68.0)1,607 (67.7)94,233 (45.8)Distance to health facilityImage: Constant of the state of the st	SSA regions					
Eastern Africa28,751 (24.1)9,418 (17.2)3,493 (11.9)316 (13.3)41,978 (20.4)Southern Africa25,075 (21.1)10,775 (19.7)3,476 (11.8)339 (14.3)39,665 (19.3)Western Africa46,015 (38.6)26,636 (48.7)19,974 (68.0)1,607 (67.7)94,233 (45.8)Distance to health facility </td <td>Central Africa</td> <td>19,303 (16.2)</td> <td>7,904 (14.4)</td> <td>2,432 (8.3)</td> <td>112 (4.7)</td> <td>29,751 (14.5)</td>	Central Africa	19,303 (16.2)	7,904 (14.4)	2,432 (8.3)	112 (4.7)	29,751 (14.5)
Southern Africa     25,075 (21.1)     10,775 (19.7)     3,476 (11.8)     339 (14.3)     39,665 (19.3)       Western Africa     46,015 (38.6)     26,636 (48.7)     19,974 (68.0)     1,607 (67.7)     94,233 (45.8)       Distance to health facility             Big problem     44,114 (37.0)     21,604 (39.5)     11,608 (39.5)     1,032 (43.5)     78,359 (38.1)	Eastern Africa	28,751 (24.1)	9,418 (17.2)	3,493 (11.9)	316 (13.3)	41,978 (20.4)
Western Africa     46,015 (38.6)     26,636 (48.7)     19,974 (68.0)     1,607 (67.7)     94,233 (45.8)       Distance to health facility     Image: Constraint of the state	Southern Africa	25,075 (21.1)	10,775 (19.7)	3,476 (11.8)	339 (14.3)	39,665 (19.3)
Distance to health facility     Image: Constraint of the second	Western Africa	46,015 (38.6)	26,636 (48.7)	19,974 (68.0)	1,607 (67.7)	94,233 (45.8)
Big problem     44,114 (37.0)     21,604 (39.5)     11,608 (39.5)     1,032 (43.5)     78,359 (38.1)	Distance to health facility					
	Big problem	44,114 (37.0)	21,604 (39.5)	11,608 (39.5)	1,032 (43.5)	78,359 (38.1)
Not a big problem     75,022 (63.0)     33,124 (60.5)     17,761 (60.5)     1,342 (56.5)     127,249 (61.9)	Not a big problem	75,022 (63.0)	33,124 (60.5)	17,761 (60.5)	1,342 (56.5)	127,249 (61.9)

(Continued)

Characteristics		Level of anemia [n (%)]				
	No anemia	Mild	Moderate	Severe		
Toilet facility						
Improved	58,996 (49.5)	25,355 (46.3)	12,894 (43.9)	952 (40.1)	98,198 (47.8)	
Unimproved	60,142 (50.5)	29,372 (53.7)	16,477 (56.1)	1,412 (59.9)	107,413 (52.2)	
Water source						
Improved	84,945 (71.3)	38,116 (69.6)	19,941 (67.9)	1,523 (64.2)	144,525 (70.3)	
Unimproved	34,191 (28.7)	16,614 (30.4)	9,433 (32.1)	851 (35.8)	61,088 (29.7)	
Community-level women employment						
Low	56,697 (47.6)	26,460 (48.3)	14,130 (48.1)	1,105 (46.6)	98.393 (47.9)	
High	62,447 (52.4)	28,273 (51.7)	15,244 (51.9)	1,269 (53.4)	107,234 (52.1)	
Community-level women literacy						
High	24,919 (20.9)	11,690 (21.4)	6,745 (23.0)	525 (22.1)	43,880 (21.3)	
Low	94,226 (79.1)	43,043 (78.6)	22,629 (77.0)	1,848 (77.9)	161,747 (78.7)	

Table 2. (Continued)

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294992.t002

# Determinants of anemia level among reproductive-age women in SSA countries

Only explanatory variables that satisfied the proportional odds assumptions were included in the final multilevel ordinal logistic regression model. It was revealed that women in a polygamous union [AOR (95% CI) = 1.16(1.12, 1.21)] had a 16% greater chance of having a higher anemia versus the combination of no anemia, mild anemia, and moderate anemia levels when compared with those in a monogamous union. For women with no formal education [AOR (95% CI) = 1.36(1.30, 1.42)] and those whose husbands did not attend formal school [AOR (95% CI) = 1.11(1.06, 1.17)], the likelihood of having a high anemia level was 1.36 and 1.11 times higher, respectively. Furthermore, compared to women from wealthy families, women from the middle [AOR (95% CI) = 1.10(1.02, 1.12)] and low-income [AOR (95% CI) = 1.12 (1.07, 1.17)] households had a greater risk of experiencing higher levels of anemia.

In addition, our analysis revealed that the odds of higher anemia level were greater for women with a shorter birth interval [AOR (95% CI) = 1.27(1.22, 1.32)], those who did not receive antenatal care [AOR (95% CI) = 1.30(1.23, 1.38)] and currently pregnant [AOR (95% CI) = 1.36(1.29, 1.43)]. Likewise, holding the effect of other covariates constant, women who were underweight [AOR (95% CI) = 1.21(1.10, 1.27)], had unimproved toilet [AOR (95% CI) = 1.20(1.16, 1.24)], unimproved water source [AOR (95% CI) = 1.34(1.30, 1.38)], and lived in the community with low-level women literacy [AOR (95% CI) = 1.21(1.14, 1.29)] were more likely to suffer from higher anemia level compared to their counter groups. On the contrary, overweight [AOR (95% CI) = 0.85(0.81, 0.89)] and contraceptive use [AOR (95% CI) = 0.57 (0.55, 0.59)] were associated with decreased odds of anemia (Table 5).

# Discussion

Due to the physiologic nature of menstruation, pregnancy, and lactation, women of reproductive age are at greater risk of anemia. This study aimed to identify determinants of anemia levels among women of reproductive age in SSA countries. For instance, it was found that the pooled prevalence of anemia among reproductive-age women in SSA countries was 40.5% (95% CI = 40.2%-40.7%), which was almost consistent with the previous study in East Africa that reported the prevalence ranging from 40.7% to 42.9% [23]. However, our finding was

Characteristics		Level of anemia [n (%)]					
	No anemia	Mild	Moderate	Severe			
Age at marriage							
$\geq$ 18 year	46,780 (54.6)	20,946 (52.1)	11,309 (50.7)	881 (49.1)	79,917 (53.3)		
< 18 year	38,960 (45.4)	19,262 (47.9)	11,015 (49.3)	915 (50.9)	70,151 (46.7)		
Parity							
Nulliparous	32,250 (27.1)	14,393 (26.3)	7,489 (22.5)	697 (29.4)	54,829 (26.7)		
Primiparous	17,241 (14.3)	7,829 (14.3)	4,152 (14.1)	308 (13.0)	29,531 (14.3)		
Multiparous	69,654 (58.4)	32,511 (59.4)	17,734 (60.4)	1,368 (57.6)	121,267 (59.0)		
Birth interval							
$\geq$ 24 months	108,134 (90.8)	49,484 (90.4)	26,158 (89.1)	2,115 (89.1)	185,891 (90.4)		
< 24 months	11,011 (9.2)	5,249 (9.6)	3,217 (10.9)	259 (10.9)	19,735 (9.6)		
Currently pregnant							
No	110,132 (92.4)	50.621 (92.5)	24,755 (84.3)	2,076 (87.5)	187,585 (91.2)		
Yes	9,012 (7.6)	4,112 (7.5)	4,620 (15.7)	297 (12.5)	18,042 (8.8)		
Contraceptive use							
Not using	83,734 (70.3)	42,436 (77.5)	24,714 (84.1)	2,091 (88.1)	152,975 (74.4)		
Using	35,411 (29.7)	12,297 (22.5)	4,661 (15.9)	283 (11.9)	52,652 (25.6)		
Antenatal care visit							
Yes	56,432 (91.1)	26,818 (90.4)	14,052 (86.2)	930 (78.9)	98.232 (90.1)		
No	5,510 (8.9)	2,836.6 (9.6)	2,252 (13.8)	249 (21.3)	10,847 (9.9)		
Place of delivery							
Health facility	44,333 (71.6)	20,483 (69.1)	10,384 (63.7)	614 (52.1)	75,815 (69.5)		
Home	17,598 (28.4)	9,165 (30.9)	5,923 (36.3)	565 (47.9)	33,250 (30.5)		
Delivery by CS							
No	58,133 (94.0)	28,062 (94.7)	15,539 (95.5)	1,132 (96.1)	102,866 (94.5)		
Yes	3,709 (6.0)	1,560 (5.3)	730 (4.5)	45 (3.8)	6,044 (5.5)		
Took iron-folic acid							
Yes	48,364 (78.1)	23,178 (78.2)	12,469 (76.5)	824 (69.9)	84,835 (77.8)		
No	13,567 (21.9)	6,473 (21.8)	3,832 (23,5)	355 (30.1)	24,227 (22.2)		
Body mass index							
Normal weight	74,526 (62.5)	35672 (65.2)	19,203 (65.4)	1,535 (64.7)	130.937 (63.7)		
Underweight	11,879 (10.0)	5,980 (10.9)	3,372 (11.5)	407 (17.1)	21,640 (10.5)		
Overweight	32,739 (27.5)	11,081 (23.9)	6,799 (23.1)	431 (18.2)	53,050 (25.8)		
Pregnancy loss							
No	103,029 (86.5)	46.662 (85.3)	25,183 (85.7)	2,034 (85.6)	176,908 (86.0)		
Yes	16,109 (13.5)	8,068 (14.7)	4,192 (14.3)	340 (14.3)	28,709 (14.0)		

Tuble 5. Obstetile und reproductive endracteristics of reproductive uge women in 25 obti countries (n = 203,02	Table 3.	Obstetric and reproductive charac	teristics of reproductive-age women in	n 29 SSA countries (n = 205,627
--	----------	-----------------------------------	--	---------------------------------

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294992.t003

higher than the studies in 21 SSA countries (36.9%) [34], Ethiopia (37.5%) [21], Uganda (32%) [32], Rwanda (19%) [31], and Pakistan (18%) [22]. This discrepancy could be partly explained by differences in the scope of the study and population. For instance, previous studies were carried out at a single-country level [21, 31] and limited to some African countries [34]. Furthermore, these studies were either conducted only on pregnant women [21] or non-pregnant women [22, 31] which differ from the population of the present study (i.e. reproductive-age women regardless of their pregnancy status).

On the contrary, the prevalence of anemia found in this study was greatly lower than the studies in Tanzania (83.5%) [33], Burkina Faso (55%) [44], Asia (53%) [45], Afghanistan (52%) [46], Gambia (44%) [24], and 27 SSA countries (43%) [20]. Likewise, our finding was

Country	Sample size	Anemic		ES (95% CI)	Weight (%)
Burkina Faso	8142	3912		48.05 (46.96, 49.13)	3.53
Benin	7820	4508	۲	57.65 (56.55, 58.74)	3.47
Burundi	8464	3141	۲	37.11 (36.08, 38.14)	3.92
DR Congo	9151	3701	٠	40.44 (39.44, 41.45)	4.11
Congo .	5137	2720	۲	52.95 (51.58, 54.31)	2.23
Cote Divoire	4542	2393	۲	52.69 (51.23, 54.14)	1.97
Cameroon	6347	2491	۲	39.25 (38.05, 40.45)	2.88
Ethiopia	14143	3858	•	27.28 (26.54, 28.01)	7.71
Gabon	5125	2981	۲	58.17 (56.82, 59.52)	2.28
Ghana	4582	1934	۲	42.21 (40.78, 43.64)	2.03
Gambia	5699	2782	۲	48.82 (47.52, 50.11)	2.47
Guinea	5157	2314		44.87 (43.51, 46.23)	2.26
Liberia	3971	1880		47.34 (45.79, 48.90)	1.72
Lesotho	3155	820	۲	25.99 (24.46, 27.52)	1.77
Madagascar	9350	2626	•	28.09 (27.17, 29.00)	5.01
Mali	5036	3165	۲	62.85 (61.51, 64.18)	2.33
Mauritania	7060	3857	۲	54.63 (53.47, 55.79)	3.08
Malawi	7876	2652	٠	33.67 (32.63, 34.72)	3.82
Mozambique	13003	6810	•	52.37 (51.51, 53.23)	5.64
Nigeria	14503	8412	•	58.00 (57.20, 58.81)	6.44
Niger	4817	2144	۲	44.51 (43.11, 45.91)	2.11
Namibia	4177	868	۲	20.78 (19.55, 22.01)	2.75
Rwanda	7167	932	٠	13.00 (12.23, 13.78)	6.86
Sierra Leone	7096	3338	۲	47.04 (45.88, 48.20)	3.08
Togo	4676	2156		46.11 (44.68, 47.54)	2.04
Tanzania	12361	5709	٠	46.19 (45.31, 47.06)	5.38
Uganda	5789	1861	۲	32.15 (30.94, 33.35)	2.87
South Africa	2865	907	۲	31.66 (29.95, 33.36)	1.43
Zimbabwe	8815	2415	•	27.40 (26.47, 28.33)	4.80
Pooled prevalence	e of anemia			40.45 (40.24, 40.65)	100.00
		-64.2	0 64	2	

Fig 1. Country-level and pooled prevalence of anemia among married reproductive-age women in 29 SSA countries.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294992.g001

also lower than other previous studies [26, 30, 35, 47]. Variations in the study settings and period, sample size, and population characteristics might have resulted in these discrepancies.

The result of the multilevel ordinal logistic regression model revealed that women whose husbands had another wife were at a greater odds of being affected by a higher anemia level

Table 4.	The result of random	-effect logit models in	predicting	the level of anemia among	reproductive-as	ge women in 29 SSA countries.
		0				

Null Model	Model-II	Mode-III	Model-IV			
0.717	0.510	0.482	0.395			
0.179	0.134	0.128	0.107			
Reference	0.289	0.328	0.449			
2.193	1.849	1.798	1.628			
408,568	183,320	400,272	181,320			
408,609	183,518	400,385	181,584			
-204,684	-92,010	-200,699	-91,125			
409,368	184,020	401,398	182,250			
	Null Model       0.717       0.179       Reference       2.193       408,568       408,609       -204,684       409,368	Null Model     Model-II       0.717     0.510       0.179     0.134       Reference     0.289       2.193     1.849       408,568     183,320       408,609     183,518       -204,684     -92,010       409,368     184,020	Null Model     Model-II     Mode-III       0.717     0.510     0.482       0.179     0.134     0.128       Reference     0.289     0.328       2.193     1.849     1.798       408,568     183,320     400,272       408,609     183,518     400,385       -204,684     -92,010     -200,699       409,368     184,020     401,398	Null Model     Model-II     Mode-III     Model-IV       0.717     0.510     0.482     0.395       0.179     0.134     0.128     0.107       Reference     0.289     0.328     0.449       2.193     1.849     1.798     1.628       408,568     183,320     400,272     181,320       408,609     183,518     400,385     181,584       -204,684     -92,010     -200,699     -91,125       409,368     184,020     401,398     182,250		

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294992.t004

Covariates		Adjusted analysis (AOR)				
	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4			
Individual-level determinants						
Nature of marriage				< 0.001		
Monogamy	1.00	-	1.00			
Polygamy	1.37 (1.33. 1.42)		1.16 (1.12, 1.21)*			
Woman's education						
Higher education	1.00		1.00			
Primary education	1.03 (0.99, 1.06)	-	0.96 (1.10, 1.22)	0.124		
No formal education	1.56 (1.52, 1.62)		1.36 (1.30, 1.42)*	< 0.001		
Partner's education						
Higher education	1.00		1.00			
Primary education	0.99 (0.93, 1.05)	-	0. 94(0.89, 1.00)	0.071		
No formal education	1.51 (1.46, 1.57)		1.11 (1.06, 1.17)*	< 0.001		
Household wealth						
Rich	1.00		1.00			
Middle	1.18 (1.14, 1.22)	-	1.10 (1.02, 1.12)*	0.032		
Poor	1.33 (1.28, 1.38)		1.12 (1.07, 1.17)*	< 0.001		
Family size						
1–5	1.00	-	1.00			
> 5	1.17 (1.14, 1.20)		1.00 (0.96, 1.04)	0.206		
Birth interval						
$\geq$ 24 months	1.00	-	1.00			
< 24 months	1.32 (1.28, 1.36)		1.27 (1.22, 1.32)*	0.008		
Currently pregnant						
No	1.00	-	1.00			
Yes	1.65 (1.58, 1.72)		1.36 (1.29, 1.43)*	< 0.001		
Contraceptive use						
Not using	1.00	-	1.00			
Using	0.57 (0.56, 0.61)		0.57 (0.55, 0.59)*	< 0.001		
Antenatal care visit						
Yes	1.00	-	1.00			
No	1.42 (1.33, 1.51)		1.30 (1.23, 1.38)*	0.004		
Place of delivery						
Health facility	1.00	-	1.00			
Home	1.31 (1.26, 1.36)		1.10 (0.96, 1.05)	0.948		
Body mass index						
Normal weight	1.00	-	1.00			
Underweight	1.20 (1.07, 1.15)		1.21 (1.10, 1.27)*	0.001		
Overweight	0.80 (0.78, 0.82)		0.85 (0.81, 0.89)*	< 0.001		
Pregnancy loss						
No	1.00	-	1.00			
Yes	1.18 (1.15, 1.22)		1.17 (1.13, 1.23)*	0.001		
Community-level determinants						
SSA regions						
Central Africa		1.00	1.00			
Eastern Africa		0.88 (0.83, 0.93)	0.83 (0.78, 0.90)*	< 0.001		

Table 5. A multivariable multilevel ordered logistic regression model describing factors associated with anemia level among reproductive-age women in 29 SSA countries.

(Continued)

Table 5. (Continued)

Covariates		P-value		
	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	
Individual-level determinants				
Southern Africa		1.07 (1.02, 1.14)	1.05 (0.98, 1.13)	0.081
Western Africa		2.14 (2.04, 2.24)	2.12 (2.02, 2.22)*	< 0.001
Toilet facility				
Improved	-	1.00	1.00	
Unimproved		1.21 (1.18, 1.25)	1.20 (1.16, 1.24)*	< 0.001
Water source				
Improved	-	1.00	1.00	
Unimproved		1.43 (1.39, 1.47)	1.34 (1.30, 1.38)*	< 0.001
Community-level women employment				
Low		1.00	1.00	
High		1.06 (1.04, 1.12)	1.00 (0.96, 1.04)	0.072
Community-level women literacy	-			
High		1.00	1.00	
Low		1.33 (1.26, 1.42)	1.21 (1.14, 1.29)*	< 0.001

\*Statistically significant variables at P-value less than 0.05.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294992.t005

than those in a monogamous marital structure. The possible justification for this finding is that women in a polygamous marriage have a higher risk of experiencing mental health (anxiety and depression) and psychological problems [48, 49] which have a dose-response relationship with the occurrence of anemia related to poor dietary habits [50]. Access to food and decision-making power might have also resulted in this finding.

This study found that women who did not attend formal education and those from the areas with low community-level women literacy had increased odds of high anemia level than their counter groups. This finding was consistent with the result of the previous studies [20, 45]. Likewise, it was supported by the reciprocal association between anemia and higher educational attainment reported in the other previous studies [30, 35, 51–53]. This might be because educated women have good nutritional knowledge and dietary habits and therefore less likely to suffer from nutritional deficiencies compared to uneducated women [54]. In addition, the effect of education on women's empowerment [55] which positively affects their reproductive health patterns might also explain this finding [56].

Our analysis also revealed that women whose husbands did not have formal education were more likely to have high anemia levels than those with educated husbands. This was in line with the finding of the study in Africa that reported lower odds of anemia in women of husbands with primary education [26]. The possible reason for this finding is that educated husbands have a better understanding and attitude toward maternal healthcare services and get more involved in their spousal utilization of these services [57].

According to this study, the likelihood of suffering from anemia was higher among women in households with middle and poor wealth indexes compared to those from rich households. Consistent with this finding, previous studies reported decreased odds of anemia with an improving household wealth index [20, 26, 31, 32, 45, 51–53, 58, 59]. This might be because women in households with high socioeconomic status are economically empowered and tend to have better dietary practices [60] and access to health services [61]. The effect of household wealth on food insecurity which directly affects nutritional status [62] might also be attributable to this finding. Suboptimal birth spacing was also found to have a significant influence on maternal anemia. In this regard, women with a duration of birth interval less than 24 months had 27% increased odds of being affected by higher level anemia compared to those with optimal birth interval. This finding was in agreement with the result of the previous studies [22, 34, 46, 53, 63].

Consistent with the findings of the previous studies [21, 47, 53], the present study showed that women who did not receive antenatal care were more likely to suffer from anemia compared to those who had antenatal care attendance during the pregnancy of their index child. This is because women who did not attend antenatal clinics miss the opportunity to get preventive health services like iron supplementation, nutritional education, malaria prophylaxis, and other related interventions that have a significant effect on anemia.

Moreover, this study found that women who were pregnant during the survey had 36% higher odds of being affected by high anemia levels compared to non-pregnant women. Similarly, previous studies in Ethiopia [25, 30] and Gambia [24] reported a higher risk of anemia among pregnant women. This might be related to an increased nutritional demand and physiologic changes during pregnancy.

It was also found that women with undernutrition had a 21% higher likelihood of being affected by anemia than those with normal body mass index. This finding aligns with the previous studies that showed a positive association between anemia and lower body mass index [20, 31, 45]. Additionally, lower anemia risk among women with normal body mass index reported in the other study also supported our finding [30, 53].

Furthermore, this study highlighted the effect of sanitation status on anemia occurrence among women. Accordingly, women from households with unimproved toilets and water facilities were found to have a higher anemia risk compared to their counterparts. Our result was in agreement with the studies in which water source [20, 31, 32, 45, 52, 64] and toilet facility [23, 26, 45, 53] were reported to have a significant influence on anemia.

In this study, maternal contraceptive use was found as a protective factor against anemia. For instance, women who were using contraceptives had about 43% reduced odds of having anemia than non-users. Similarly, previous studies in African settings consistently reported a decreased likelihood of anemia among contraceptive users [24-26, 31, 51-53]. This association might be partly explained by the effect of iron-containing contraceptive pills on increasing hemoglobin concentration [65, 66] and decreasing menstrual blood loss [67].

#### Strengths and limitations

A multi-country analysis of data from DHS data of 29 SSA countries, consistent use of Hemo-Cue blood hemoglobin testing system for measuring hemoglobin level in all surveys, use of a larger sample size, and an advanced statistical method (i.e. multilevel ordinal logistic regression model), which takes into account the hierarchical structure of the data and ordered nature of the outcome variable are the main strengths of this study. However, it is impossible to show the cause-and-effect relationship between the explanatory and outcome variables due to the cross-sectional nature of the data. The only tests employed to assess the proportional odds assumption were the Brant and likelihood ratio tests. Furthermore, since the study participants were asked about the events that took place five years or more preceding the survey, there might be a recall bias.

## Conclusions

The overall result showed that anemia among women of reproductive age is a severe public health problem in SSA countries, affecting more than four in ten women. Nature of marriage,

women and husband education, household wealth, birth interval, contraceptive use, antenatal care, nutritional status, and sanitation (toilet and water) facilities were significantly associated with anemia. Thus, enhancing access to maternal health services (antenatal care and contraception) and improved sanitation facilities would supplement the existing nutritional interventions targeted to reduce anemia. Moreover, strengthening women's education and policies regulating the prohibition of polygamous marriage is important to address the operational constraints. Our finding also suggests the need for further studies on the effectiveness of context-specific anemia interventions for this age group.

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank ICF International for granting access to the dataset used in this study.

## **Author Contributions**

- **Conceptualization:** Kusse Urmale Mare, Setognal Birara Aychiluhm, Kebede Gemeda Sabo, Abay Woday Tadesse, Bizunesh Fentahun Kase, Oumer Abdulkadir Ebrahim, Tsion Mulat Tebeje, Getahun Fentaw Mulaw, Beminate Lemma Seifu.
- Data curation: Kusse Urmale Mare, Getahun Fentaw Mulaw, Beminate Lemma Seifu.
- Formal analysis: Kusse Urmale Mare, Tsion Mulat Tebeje, Beminate Lemma Seifu.
- **Methodology:** Kusse Urmale Mare, Setognal Birara Aychiluhm, Kebede Gemeda Sabo, Abay Woday Tadesse, Bizunesh Fentahun Kase, Oumer Abdulkadir Ebrahim, Tsion Mulat Tebeje, Getahun Fentaw Mulaw.

Software: Kusse Urmale Mare, Beminate Lemma Seifu.

- Validation: Kusse Urmale Mare, Beminate Lemma Seifu.
- Visualization: Kusse Urmale Mare.
- Writing original draft: Kusse Urmale Mare, Setognal Birara Aychiluhm, Kebede Gemeda Sabo, Abay Woday Tadesse, Bizunesh Fentahun Kase, Oumer Abdulkadir Ebrahim, Tsion Mulat Tebeje, Getahun Fentaw Mulaw, Beminate Lemma Seifu.
- Writing review & editing: Kusse Urmale Mare, Setognal Birara Aychiluhm, Kebede Gemeda Sabo, Abay Woday Tadesse, Bizunesh Fentahun Kase, Oumer Abdulkadir Ebrahim, Tsion Mulat Tebeje, Getahun Fentaw Mulaw, Beminate Lemma Seifu.

#### References

- 1. Raut AK, Hiwale KM, Hiwale KM. Iron deficiency anemia in pregnancy. Cureus. 2022 Sep 8; 14(9). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.28918 PMID: 36225459
- Wiegersma AM, Dalman C, Lee BK, Karlsson H, Gardner RM. Association of prenatal maternal anemia with neurodevelopmental disorders. JAMA psychiatry. 2019 Dec 1; 76(12):1294–304. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.2309</u> PMID: 31532497
- Shah T, Khaskheli MS, Ansari S, Lakhan H, Shaikh F, Zardari AA, et al. Gestational Anemia and its effects on neonatal outcome, in the population of Hyderabad, Sindh, Pakistan. Saudi journal of biological sciences. 2022 Jan 1; 29(1):83–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2021.08.053 PMID: 35002396
- Uzunov AV, Cîrstoiu MM, Secară DC, Crîngu-Ionescu A, Matei A, Mehedinţu C, et al Mode of Delivery and Neonatal Outcome in Adolescent Pregnancy (13–16 Years Old) Associated with Anemia. Medicina. 2022 Dec 6; 58(12):1796. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina58121796 PMID: 36556997
- Smith C, Teng F, Branch E, Chu S, Joseph KS. Maternal and perinatal morbidity and mortality associated with anemia in pregnancy. Obstetrics and gynecology. 2019 Dec; 134(6):1234. https://doi.org/10. 1097/AOG.000000000003557 PMID: 31764734

- Drukker L, Hants Y, Farkash R, Ruchlemer R, Samueloff A, Grisaru-Granovsky S. Iron deficiency anemia at admission for labor and delivery is associated with an increased risk for Cesarean section and adverse maternal and neonatal outcomes. Transfusion. 2015 Dec; 55(12):2799–806. https://doi.org/10. 1111/trf.13252 PMID: 26246160
- Brabin BJ, Hakimi M, Pelletier D. An analysis of anemia and pregnancy-related maternal mortality. The Journal of nutrition. 2001 Feb 1; 131(2):S604–15. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/131.2.604S</u> PMID: 11160593
- 8. Helmy ME, Elkhouly NI, Ghalab RA. Maternal anemia with pregnancy and its adverse effects. Menoufia Medical Journal. 2018 Jan 1; 31(1):7.
- Ronnenberg AG, Wood RJ, Wang X, Xing H, Chen C, Chen D, et al. Preconception hemoglobin and ferritin concentrations are associated with pregnancy outcome in a prospective cohort of Chinese women. The Journal of nutrition. 2004 Oct 1; 134(10):2586–91. https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/134.10.2586 PMID: 15465752
- Liu X, An H, Li N, Li Z, Zhang Y, Zhang L, et al. Preconception hemoglobin concentration and risk of low birth weight and small-for-gestational-age: A Large prospective cohort study in China. Nutrients. 2022 Jan 9; 14(2):271. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu14020271 PMID: 35057452
- Xu Q, Yang Y, Liu F, Wang L, Wang Q, Shen H, et al. Preconception Hb concentration with risk of spontaneous abortion: A population-based cohort study in over 3.9 million women across rural China. Public Health Nutrition. 2020 Nov; 23(16):2963–72.
- Shi H, Chen L, Wang Y, Sun M, Guo Y, Ma S, et al. Severity of anemia during pregnancy and adverse maternal and fetal outcomes. JAMA Network Open. 2022 Feb 1; 5(2):e2147046- <u>https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.47046</u> PMID: 35113162
- Mahmood T, Rehman AU, Tserenpil G, Siddiqui F, Ahmed M, Siraj F, et al. The association between iron-deficiency anemia and adverse pregnancy outcomes: a retrospective report from Pakistan. Cureus. 2019 Oct 7; 11(10). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.5854 PMID: 31754588
- Yilmaz E, Işitan OY, Soysal Ç, Yilmaz ZV, Kara OF, Küçüközkan T. The influence of anemia on maternal and neonatal outcomes in adolescent pregnant. Journal of Surgery and Medicine. 2018 Mar 10; 2 (2):69–73.
- Ajepe AA, Okunade KS, Sekumade AI, Daramola ES, Beke MO, Ijasan O, et al. Prevalence and foetomaternal effects of iron deficiency anaemia among pregnant women in Lagos, Nigeria. PLoS One. 2020 Jan 23; 15(1):e0227965. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0227965 PMID: 31971986
- Geelhoed D, Agadzi F, Visser L, Ablordeppey E, Asare K, O'Rourke P, et al. Severe anemia in pregnancy in rural Ghana: a case–control study of causes and management. Acta obstetricia et gynecologica Scandinavica. 2006 Jan 1; 85(10):1165–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/00016340600672812 PMID: 17068674
- Daru J, Zamora J, Fernández-Félix BM, Vogel J, Oladapo OT, Morisaki N, et al. Risk of maternal mortality in women with severe anaemia during pregnancy and post partum: a multilevel analysis. The Lancet Global Health. 2018 May 1; 6(5):e548–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30078-0 PMID: 29571592
- Stevens GA, Paciorek CJ, Flores-Urrutia MC, Borghi E, Namaste S, Wirth JP, et al. National, regional, and global estimates of anaemia by severity in women and children for 2000–19: a pooled analysis of population-representative data. The Lancet Global Health. 2022 May 1; 10(5):e627–39. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.1016/S2214-109X(22)00084-5 PMID: 35427520</u>
- Kinyoki D, Osgood-Zimmerman AE, Bhattacharjee NV, Kassebaum NJ, Hay SI. Anemia prevalence in women of reproductive age in low-and middle-income countries between 2000 and 2018. Nature medicine. 2021 Oct; 27(10):1761–82. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01498-0 PMID: 34642490
- Correa-Agudelo E, Kim HY, Musuka GN, Mukandavire Z, Miller FD, Tanser F, et al. The epidemiological landscape of anemia in women of reproductive age in sub-Saharan Africa. Scientific reports. 2021 Jun 7; 11(1):1–0.
- Animut K, Berhanu G. Determinants of anemia status among pregnant women in ethiopia: using 2016 ethiopian demographic and health survey data; application of ordinal logistic regression models. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2022 Aug 26; 22(1):663. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-022-04990-8 PMID: 36028797
- 22. Habib MA, Raynes-Greenow C, Soofi SB, Ali N, Nausheen S, Ahmed I, et al. Prevalence and determinants of iron deficiency anemia among non-pregnant women of reproductive age in Pakistan. Asia Pacific journal of clinical nutrition. 2018 Jan; 27(1):195–203. <u>https://doi.org/10.6133/apjcn.042017.14</u> PMID: 29222899
- 23. Liyew AM, Tesema GA, Alamneh TS, Worku MG, Teshale AB, Alem AZ, et al. Prevalence and determinants of anemia among pregnant women in East Africa; A multi-level analysis of recent Demographic

and Health Surveys. PloS one. 2021 Apr 27; 16(4):e0250560. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone. 0250560 PMID: 33905448

- 24. Shitu K, Terefe B. Anaemia and its determinants among reproductive age women (15–49 years) in the Gambia: a multi-level analysis of 2019–20 Gambian Demographic and Health Survey Data. Archives of Public Health. 2022 Dec; 80(1):1–0.
- Tirore LL, Mulugeta A, Belachew AB, Gebrehaweria M, Sahilemichael A, Erkalo D, et al. Factors associated with anaemia among women of reproductive age in Ethiopia: Multilevel ordinal logistic regression analysis. Maternal & Child Nutrition. 2021 Jan; 17(1):e13063. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13063 PMID: 32761751
- Zegeye B, Anyiam FE, Ahinkorah BO, Ameyaw EK, Budu E, Seidu AA, et al. Prevalence of anemia and its associated factors among married women in 19 sub-Saharan African countries. Archives of Public Health. 2021 Dec; 79(1):1–2.
- Panchal PD, Ravalia A, Rana R, Puthussery S, Vaze G, Mavlankar D, et al. Impact of Nutrition Interventions for Reduction of Anemia in Women of Reproductive Age in Low-and Middle-Income Countries: A Meta-Review. Current Developments in Nutrition. 2022 Dec; 6(12):nzac134. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/cdn/nzac134">https://doi.org/10.1093/cdn/nzac134</a> PMID: 36601436
- 28. World Health Organization. Global anaemia reduction efforts among women of reproductive age: impact, achievement of targets and the way forward for optimizing efforts. 2020.
- Hasan MM, Magalhaes RJ, Garnett SP, Fatima Y, Tariqujjaman M, Pervin S, et al. Anaemia in women of reproductive age in low-and middle-income countries: progress towards the 2025 global nutrition target. Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 2022 Mar 3; 100(3):196. <u>https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.20.</u> 280180 PMID: 35261408
- Assefa E. Multilevel analysis of anemia levels among reproductive age groups of women in Ethiopia. SAGE Open Medicine. 2021 Jan; 9:2050312120987375. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/2050312120987375</u> PMID: 33552512
- Habyarimana F, Zewotir T, Ramroop S. Spatial distribution and analysis of risk factors associated with Anemia among women of reproductive age: case of 2014 Rwanda demographic and health survey data. The Open Public Health Journal. 2018 Oct 26; 11(1).
- **32.** Nankinga O, Aguta D. Determinants of Anemia among women in Uganda: further analysis of the Uganda demographic and health surveys. BMC Public Health. 2019 Dec; 19(1):1–9.
- Ngimbudzi EB, Massawe SN, Sunguya BF. The burden of anemia in pregnancy among women attending the antenatal clinics in Mkuranga District, Tanzania. Frontiers in Public Health. 2021: 1600. <u>https://</u> doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.724562 PMID: 34926366
- Mruts KB, Gebremedhin AT, Tessema GA, Scott JA, Pereira G. Interbirth interval and maternal anaemia in 21 sub-Saharan African countries: A fractional-polynomial analysis. Plos one. 2022 Sep 23; 17 (9):e0275155. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275155 PMID: 36149878
- Worku MG, Alamneh TS, Teshale AB, Yeshaw Y, Alem AZ, Ayalew HG, et al. Multilevel analysis of determinants of anemia among young women (15–24) in sub-Sahara Africa. Plos one. 2022 May 9; 17 (5):e0268129. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268129 PMID: 35533194
- Demographic and Health Survey. DHS Methodology. Available from https://dhsprogram.com/ methodology/Survey-Types/DHS-Methodology.cfm.
- **37.** WHO, Haemoglobin concentrations for the diagnosis of anaemia and assessment of severity.. (World Health Organization, Geneva, 2011). 2011.
- World Health Organization. Guidelines on sanitation and health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. 2018.
- Brant R. Assessing proportionality in the proportional odds model for ordinal logistic regression. Biometrics. 1990 Dec 1:1171–8. PMID: 2085632
- Steele F. Module 9: Single-level and multilevel models for ordinal responses concepts. Centre for Multilevel Modelling, University of Bristol. 2011.
- Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, Hosmer DW. Purposeful selection of variables in logistic regression. Source code for biology and medicine. 2008 Dec; 3(1):1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/1751-0473-3-17 PMID: 19087314
- 42. Hosmer DW Jr, Lemeshow S, Sturdivant RX. Applied logistic regression. John Wiley & Sons; 2013 Apr 1.
- Whittaker TA, Furlow CF. The comparison of model selection criteria when selecting among competing hierarchical linear models. Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods. 2009; 8(1):15.
- 44. Ouedraogo I, Zamané H, Sawadogo AY, Kiemtoré S, Kain DP, Ouattara A, et al. Anaemia in Pregnancy in an African Setting after Preventive Measures. Open Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2019 Jan 4; 9(01):10.

- 45. Sunuwar DR, Singh DR, Chaudhary NK, Pradhan PM, Rai P, Tiwari K. Prevalence and factors associated with anemia among women of reproductive age in seven South and Southeast Asian countries: Evidence from nationally representative surveys. PloS one. 2020 Aug 13; 15(8):e0236449. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236449 PMID: 32790764
- Zewar M, Chakraborty S. Perspectives of Health Care Professionals and Patients on Anemia in Afghanistan's Women of Reproductive Age. International Journal of Clinical Skills. 2022; 16(3):230.
- **47.** Ahmed RH, Yussuf AA, Ali AA, Iyow SN, Abdulahi M, Mohamed LM, et al Anemia among pregnant women in internally displaced camps in Mogadishu, Somalia: a cross-sectional study on prevalence, severity and associated risk factors. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2021 Dec; 21(1):1–9.
- Shepard LD. The impact of polygamy on women's mental health: a systematic review. Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences. 2013 Mar; 22(1):47–62. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796012000121 PMID: 22794315
- 49. Shepard L.D., The impact of polygamy on women's mental health: a systematic review. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci, 2013. 22(1): p. 47–62. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796012000121 PMID: 22794315
- Vulser H, Wiernik E, Hoertel N, Thomas F, Pannier B, Czernichow S, et al. Association between depression and anemia in otherwise healthy adults. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. 2016 Aug; 134(2):150–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/acps.12595 PMID: 27238642
- Nti J, Afagbedzi S, da-Costa Vroom FB, Ibrahim NA, Guure C. Variations and determinants of anemia among reproductive age women in five Sub-Saharan Africa Countries. BioMed research international. 2021 Aug 5; 2021:1–4.
- Talukder A, Paul N, Khan ZI, Ahammed B, Haq I, Ali M. Risk factors associated with anemia among women of reproductive age (15–49) in Albania: A quantile regression analysis. Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health. 2022 Jan 1; 13:100948.
- Owais A, Merritt C, Lee C, Bhutta ZA. Anemia among women of reproductive age: an overview of global burden, trends, determinants, and drivers of progress in low-and middle-income countries. Nutrients. 2021 Aug 10; 13(8):2745. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13082745 PMID: 34444903
- Appiah PK, Naa Korklu AR, Bonchel DA, Fenu GA, Wadga-Mieza Yankey F. Nutritional knowledge and dietary intake habits among pregnant adolescents attending antenatal care clinics in urban community in Ghana. Journal of Nutrition and Metabolism. 2021 Feb 13; 2021. <u>https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/</u> 8835704 PMID: 33628495
- Habib K, Shafiq M, Afshan G, Qamar F. Impact of education and employment on women empowerment. European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings. 2019; 8(3 (s)):pp-62.
- Moonzwe Davis L, Schensul SL, Schensul JJ, Verma RK, Nastasi BK, Singh R. Women's empowerment and its differential impact on health in low-income communities in Mumbai, India. Global public health. 2014 May 28; 9(5):481–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2014.904919 PMID: 24766149
- 57. Tsegaye B, Shudura E, Yoseph A, Tamiso A. Predictors of skilled maternal health services utilizations: a case of rural women in Ethiopia. PLoS One. 2021 Feb 19; 16(2):e0246237. https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pone.0246237 PMID: 33606676
- Fite MB, Assefa N, Mengiste B. Prevalence and determinants of Anemia among pregnant women in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and Meta-analysis. Archives of Public Health. 2021 Dec; 79:1–1.
- 59. Adamu AL, Crampin A, Kayuni N, Amberbir A, Koole O, Phiri A, et al. Prevalence and risk factors for anemia severity and type in Malawian men and women: urban and rural differences. Population health metrics. 2017 Dec; 15(1):1–5.
- Harris-Fry H, Azad K, Kuddus A, Shaha S, Nahar B, Hossen M, et al. Socio-economic determinants of household food security and women's dietary diversity in rural Bangladesh: a cross-sectional study. Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition. 2015 Dec; 33(1):1–2.
- Mehari K, Wencheko E. Factors affecting maternal health care services utilization in rural Ethiopia: a study based on the 2011 EDHS data. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2013; 27(1):16–24.
- **62.** Saaka M. How is household food insecurity and maternal nutritional status associated in a resourcepoor setting in Ghana?. Agriculture & Food Security. 2016 Dec; 5(1):1–8.
- Onwuka CC, Ugwu EO, Obi SN, Onwuka CI, Dim CC, Eleje GU, et al. Effects of Short Inter-Pregnancy Interval on Maternal and Perinatal Outcomes: A Cohort Study of Pregnant Women in a Low-Income Country. Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice. 2020 Jul 20; 23(7):928–33. <u>https://doi.org/10.4103/njcp.njcp\_423\_19 PMID: 32620721</u>
- Weze K, Abioye AI, Obiajunwa C, Omotayo M. Spatio-temporal trends in anaemia among pregnant women, adolescents and preschool children in sub-Saharan Africa. Public health nutrition. 2021 Aug; 24(12):3648–61. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980020004620 PMID: 33190664

- 65. Fischer JA, Sasai CS, Karakochuk CD. Iron-containing oral contraceptives and their effect on hemoglobin and biomarkers of iron status: a narrative review. Nutrients. 2021 Jul 9; 13(7):2340. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.3390/nu13072340</u> PMID: 34371850
- 66. Tekle E, Gelaw Y, Asrie F. Hematological Profile Changes Among Oral Contraceptive Users: A Narrative Review. Journal of Blood Medicine. 2022 Jan 1:525–36. https://doi.org/10.2147/JBM.S379841 PMID: 36199529
- Karakochuk C. Iron-Containing Oral Contraceptives. Encyclopedia. Available at <a href="https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/12081">https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/12081</a>. Accessed on 14 February 2023.