

Citation: Belay JK, Abebe SM, Baffa LD, Mengistu B (2024) Food consumption score and predictors among pregnant women attending antenatal care services in health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Using ordinal logistic regression model. PLoS ONE 19(6): e0306169. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0306169

Editor: Girma Beressa, Madda Walabu University, ETHIOPIA

Received: February 8, 2023

Accepted: June 12, 2024

Published: June 26, 2024

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.0306169

Copyright: © 2024 Belay 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: all relevant data are within the manuscript and its <u>Supporting</u> Information files.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Food consumption score and predictors among pregnant women attending antenatal care services in health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Using ordinal logistic regression model

Jerusalem Ketema Belay, Solomon Mekonnen Abebe, Lemlem Daniel Baffa, Berhanu Mengistu 10 *

Department of Human Nutrition, Institute of Public Health, University of Gondar, Gondar, Ethiopia

* berhanu5@yahoo.com

Abstract

Background

Poor maternal nutrition during pregnancy creates a stressful environment that can lead to long-term effects on tissue development. Understanding the food consumption score can be used to prevent problems associated with poor dietary intake of pregnant mothers. In Ethiopia, the food consumption score ranges from 54% to 81.5%, which is far below the World Food Program (WFP) recommendation. Thus, this study aimed to assess food consumption score and associated factors among pregnant women attending antenatal care services in health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Methods

This study has used institution based cross sectional study. Overall, 999 pregnant women were selected for this study. A multistage sampling technique followed by systematic random sampling was used to include pregnant women coming for antenatal care services in the selected health centers of Addis Ababa from June 07 to July 08, 2022. We used interviewer administered questionnaire using the Kobo toolbox. Food consumption score (FCS) was assessed after collecting data on frequency of eight food groups consumed over the previous seven days, which were weighted according to their relative nutritional value. STATA 14 was used to analyse the data. Ordinal logistic regression was used to identify independent predictors of food consumption score. Those variables having p value < 0.25 in the bivariable ordinal logistic regression were considered for the final model. Crude and Adjusted Odds Ratio were used to assess the strength of the association. In the final model, p value < 0.05 at 95% confidence interval was used to declare statistical significance.

Result

From the total of 949 pregnant women a little over half (51.20% (95%CI: 48.00%-54.40%) had acceptable food consumption score, while just over two fifth (42.60% (95% CI: 39.40%-

Funding: The authors received no specific funding for this work.

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

Abbreviations: FCS, Food Consumption Score; WFP, World Food Program; ANC, Antenatal Care; COR, Crude Odds Ratio; SD, Standard Deviation; AOR, Adjusted Odds Ratio; VIF, Variance Inflation Factor. 45.70%)) and a small proportion (6.2% (95%CI: 4.84%-7.94%)) of the study participants had borderline and poor food consumption score, respectively. No meal skip (AOR = 1.37, 95% CI:1.03–1.81), able to read and write (AOR = 3.99, 95% CI: 1.33–11.96), poorest wealth status (AOR = 0.52, 95% CI: 0.34–0.78), positive attitude towards consumption of a diversified diet (AOR = 1.52,95% CI: 1.17–1.98) were independent predictors of acceptable food consumption score.

Conclusion

In this study, considerably low level of acceptable food consumption score among the study participants was observed. Besides, not skipping meal, having better educational status, wealth status and attitude towards consumption of a diversified diet were associated with acceptable food consumption score. Therefore, nutritional education considering important dietary modifications should be intensified targeting vulnerable groups.

Background

A woman's nutritional requirements vary during pregnancy as she is now feeding both her unborn child and herself. Although prenatal nutrition has an impact on how a pregnancy develops, there is never a wrong moment to start eating healthily. Therefore, it is imperative to have a sound nutrition during the period of gestation for both the mother and her growing foetus [1–3].

However, poor maternal nutrition during pregnancy that is either due to decreased intake or quality results a range of problems [4]. It affects the general growth and development of the off-spring. These changes can have a significant impact on the overall health and production performance of the offspring [5, 6]. Along with its negative impacts on the offspring's nutritional quality, it also produces a stressful environment that may have long-term or permanent repercussions on tissue development, as seen by the emergence of chronic non-communicable diseases later in life [7–9]. Understanding the food consumption score (FCS) of a pregnant woman will help to prevent the issues linked to poor dietary intake during the period of gestation [10].

Nutritional needs during pregnancy can be satisfied by eating foods from a variety of food groups including fruits, vegetables, dairy products, carbohydrates, fats, and vitamins [11]. However, poor dietary diversity and FCS have been reported during pregnancy. For example, in Bangladesh acceptable FCS among pregnant women was found to be 58%, different studies in Ethiopia have also revealed a similar figure of FCS among pregnant women:81.5% in East Gojam Zone [12], and 54% in rural Eastern Ethiopia [13], which were far below the World Food Program (WFP) recommendations (90%) [1].

A number of studies have shown the following as independent predictors of having an acceptable FCS during pregnancy: religion [12], residence [12], maternal educational status [14], educational status of the father [10], wealth status [13, 14], attitude [13], antenatal care (ANC) visit [13], skipping meal [15] and consumption of animal source food [13].

In recent years, introduction of western lifestyles in the big cities of Ethiopia like Addis Ababa has brought a drastic change in food consumption pattern of pregnant women [16], which runs counter to unrelenting efforts that is outlined in different policies and programmes enacted by the government [17, 18]. Socio-cultural factors such as women's education and employment, food preference, recent epidemics like COVID-19 and cultural practices have also been reported as driving forces for this change [19, 20]. In cognizant of this, findings from this study can be used to provide an evidence-based decision to determine factors that influence FCS of pregnant women [21].

Even though there are a handful of researches that focused on FCS among pregnant women, our study employed a different method-ordinal logistic regression to better understand predictors of FCS among pregnant women [22]. Thus, this study aimed to assess the food consumption pattern and associated factors among pregnant women attending ANC services in health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The goal of this study is to improve the dietary practice of pregnant women, thereby preventing long term ramifications of malnutrition.

Methods

Study area, design and period

The study was conducted in the capital city of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa, it is among the fastest growing cities in Africa. It was estimated that 5,228,000 people reside in the ten sub-cities of Addis Ababa in the study period [23]. The city has a sub-tropical highland climate, and is populated by people from the different regions of Ethiopia. The magnitude of food insecurity among productive safety net program beneficiaries of the city was 77.10% [24]. There were six publicly owned general hospitals and one hundred two (102) health centers, and eleven privately owned hospitals and 882 clinics in the city. By using cross-sectional study, pregnant mothers who came for ANC follow up from June 07 to July 08, 2022 at the selected health centers were approached to participate in this study. In these health centers, there were 2478 mothers who came for ANC services.

Sample size determination and sampling technique

Sample size was estimated for each specific objective, and the highest was taken for this study. For the first specific objective, by assuming 54.46% proportion of FCS from previous study [13], 5% margin of error, 1.96 Z value at 95% confidence interval (CI) and by adding 10% non-response rate at 1.5 design effect and it was estimated to be 629. However, the highest sample size was obtained using the second specific objective. Accordingly, epi-info version 7.2.2 was used to estimate the sample size by considering the following assumptions: crude odds ratio of having acceptable FCS among pregnant women who had positive attitude towards consumption a diversified diet, which was 1.6 from a previous study [13], 80% power and 95% CI, 1.5 designs effect. Therefore, 999 was the final sample size after adding 10% non-response rate.

Pregnant women coming for antenatal care services at the selected health centers were included. However, pregnant women who were seriously ill during the data collection period were excluded in the study. Multistage sampling technique followed by systematic random sampling technique was employed to select the study participants. Out of the ten sub-cities in Addis Ababa, four sub-cities were selected randomly (30%): Nifas silk lafto sub-city, Kolfe keraniyo sub-city, Lideta sub-city and Akaki kality sub-city. In the selected sub-cities, there were 28 health centers. First, nine health centers (one from Nifas silk lafto sub-city, two from Kolfe keraniyo sub-city, three from Lideta sub-city and three Akaki kality sub-city) were selected randomly using a lottery method. Then, the required sample size was proportionated to the selected health centers, and every three ($k \approx 2478/999$) pregnant woman who was coming for ANC follow up was selected.

Data collection tools and measurement

Data was collected using pretested interviewer administered questionnaire that comprises socio-demographic data, dietary habits, attitude towards consumption of a diversified diet,

obstetric history, and food consumption score (FCS). The questionnaire was first prepared in English and then translated into Amharic (Local language). We used kobo toolbox to collect the data. Nine B.Sc. nurses and four public health officers were the data collectors and supervisors, respectively. The questionnaire was pretested at 5% of the final estimated sample size at Arada sub-city. After the pre-test, the question that assessed participants' residence was excluded as all the study participants were urban residents. On the food frequency questionnaire, necessary modification was made by including foods that were not previously included.

The outcome variable of this study was food consumption score (FCS), information on foods which were consumed in the last seven days prior to the data collection time was gathered. Food consumption score (FCS) is a composite variable that is constructed based on the following criteria: food frequency, diet diversity and relative nutritional value of each food item [1]. Food consumption score (FCS) was computed after asking the study participants about the frequency and consumption of eight food groups over the period of seven days prior to the data collection period. In the questionnaire, there were 70 food items which were commonly consumed in the study area. The Cronbach's alpha value (internal consistency) was observed to be 0.82.

Then, the consumption frequencies were summed and multiplied by the standardized food group weight. Finally, it was categorized into three categories; poor food consumption score (FCS)(0–21), borderline food consumption score(FCS) (21.5–35), and acceptable food consumption score(FCS) (>35) [1, 25]. The wealth status was determined using principal component analysis which contained 15 items, and it was later categorized into five categories (Poorest to the richest) [23]. The attitude of the study participants towards the consumption diversified diet was measured using 4 item Likert-scale questions, the response ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree. It was considered positive attitude when respondents score above the median. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was checked using Cronbach's alpha (0.78). The trimesters were defined as first trimester (less than 14 weeks), second trimester (14–27 complete weeks) and third trimester (28 complete weeks until delivery). Finally, birth interval was categorized as recommended birth interval when interpregnancy interval was more 24 months otherwise it was categorized as not recommended birth interval [26].

Data analysis

The collected data using Kobo toolbox was exported to STATA 14 for analysis. A descriptive data was reported as frequencies, percentage, mean(\pm SD) and presented in tables. Ordinal logistic regression was used to identify predictors of FCS. Multicollinearity was checked using Variance inflation factor (VIF<10). Brant test of parallel regression assumption (p value = 0.66) conferred proportion of odds assumption. After checking the assumptions of ordinal logistic regression, COR and AOR at 95% was used to ascertain predictors of the outcome variable in both bivariable (p value <0.25) and multivariable ordinal logistic regression respectively. Finally, P value < 0.05 was used to determine level of significance in the final model. The final model reached after checking adequacy of the data using the Hosmer and Lemeshow test.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and following amendments. Ethical clearance was obtained from University of Gondar Institutional Review Board of Institute of Public Health (Ref. No IPH/2119/2014). Permission letter was obtained from Addis Ababa Health Office. Written informed consent was obtained from all study participants. Study participants who were unable to read and write signed by fingerprints, while doing so there were two literate witnesses. Data collectors have strictly followed COVID-19 prevention protocols. Confidentiality of the study participants was ensured; no person identifiers were used and the kobo account was password protected-only authorized user was able to access the data.

Result

Sociodemographic characteristics of the study participants

In this study, 949 pregnant women consented to participate in the study period, yielding 95% response rate. The vast majority of the study participants (96.80%) were married. The mean (\pm Standard deviation (SD)) age of the study participants in years was 27.16(\pm 4.46SD), about two fifth (39.10%) of the study participants were in the age range 25–29 years. Regarding educational status, half of (50.10%) the study participants had accomplished primary education. More than two fifth (43.90%) of the study participants were housewives. Almost a quarter (24.50%) of the participants were from poor households. More than half (57.60%) of pregnant women have positive attitude towards consumption of variety of food (Table 1).

Maternal characteristics

As to the maternal characteristics the study participants, more than half (57.6%) were multigravida, almost two third (61.5%) were in the second trimester pregnancy, more than two third (67.02%) had at least one ANC visit, and 69.6% had received nutritional counselling when they came for ANC visit (Table 2).

Dietary habits of the study participants

Of the study participants, less than half (45.3%) ate three times a day, whereas over half (56.5%) regularly ate snacks. Nearly two thirds (59.2%) skipped meals, with the most common reasons being fatigued or preoccupied with work (19.6%), not wanting to gain weight (19.6%), and other (31.3%) causes such as loss of appetite, vomiting, and discomfort. Likewise, nearly one-third (31.1%) reported a history of food taboos. Lastly, more than a quarter (26.7%) of study participants reported having a history of food cravings (Table 3).

Food consumption pattern

In this study, practically all of the study participants had consumed common staples, and nearly three quarters (73.2%) of the participants had consumed animal-source food, such as meat (Table 4).

Food consumption score

This study has revealed that a little over half [51.20% (95%CI: 48.00%-54.40)] had acceptable food consumption score. More than two fifth [42.60% (95% CI: 39.45%-45.74%)] had border-line food consumption, and the small proportion [6.2% (95%CI: 4.84%-7.94%) (Table 5).

Factors associated with food consumption score

Ordinal logistic regression was used to identify factors associated with food consumption score. The following variables which were significant in the bivariable analysis (p value<0.25): age, husband educational status, husband occupation, maternal education, attitude, wealth status, family size, meal skip, food avoid, food craving, taking supplements, still birth, ANC visit,

Variables	Frequency (%)	
Age (vears)		
18-24	294(31%)	
25-29	371(39.1%)	
30-34	219(23.1%)	
>35	65(6.5%)	
Marital status		
Currently married	919(96.8%)	
Currently unmarried	30(3.2%)	
Mother Educational status		
Unable to read and write	30 (3.1%)	
Read and write	33 (3.5%)	
Primary	475(50.1%)	
Secondary	294(31%)	
Higher (college and above)	117(12.3%)	
Occupation	·	
Housewife	417(43.9%)	
Employed(private/public)	161(17%)	
Merchant	254(26.8%)	
Daily labourer	98(10.3%)	
Student	19(2%)	
Husband educational status		
Unable to read to write	24(2.5%)	
Can read and write	23(2.4%)	
Primary	298(31.4%)	
Secondary	385(40.6%)	
Higher (college and above)	219(23.1%)	
Husband occupation		
Employed	247(26%)	
Merchant	435(45.8%)	
Daily labourer	219(23.1%)	
Driver	48(5.1%)	
Family size		
≤ 4	82(8.6%)	
>4	867(91.4%)	
Wealth status		
Poorest	197(20.8%)	
Poor	233(24.6%)	
Middle	100(10.5%)	
Rich	221(23.3%)	
Richest	198(20.8%)	
Attitude, diversified diet		
Positive	547(57.6%)	
Negative	402(42.4%)	

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the study participants(n = 949) in the selected health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2022.

1 '	
Variables	Frequency (%)
Gravidity	
Primigravida	402(42.2%)
Multigravida	547(57.6%)
Birth interval	
Recommended	55(10.1%)
Not recommended	492(89.9%)
Trimester	
1 st trimester	9(1.0%)
2 nd trimester	584(61.5%)
3 rd trimester	355(37.5%)
History of early ANC visit for the current pregnancy	
Had ANC	636(67.02%)
No ANC	313(32.98%)
Got nutrition counselling	
Yes	660(69.6%)
No	289(30.4%)
History of still-birth/abortion	
Yes	59(6.3%)
No	890(93.7%)

Table 2. Maternal characteristics of the study participants (n = 949) in the selected health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2022.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0306169.t002

Variables	Frequency (%)	
Meal per day		
Once	3(0.3%)	
Twice	36(3.8%)	
Three times	430(45.3%)	
Four times	396(41.7%)	
Five and above	84(8.9%)	
Habit of eating snack		
Yes	536(56.5%)	
No	413(43.5%)	
Meal skip		
Yes	562(59.2%)	
No	387(40.8%)	
Fasting while pregnant		
Yes	302(31.8%)	
No	647(68.2%)	
Avoid certain foods		
Yes	286(30.1%)	
No	663(69.9%)	
History of craving		
Yes	253(26.6%)	
No	696(73.4%)	

Table 3. Dietary habits of the study participants (n = 949) in the selected health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2022.

Type of Food	Frequency (%)
Main staples	940(99%)
Pulse	921(97%)
Fruits	848(89.3%)
Vegetable	906(95.4%)
Meat	695(73.2%)
Milk	746(78.6%)
Oil	672(70.8%)
Sweets	929(97.9%)

Table 4. Types of foods consumed by the study participants (n = 949) in the selected health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2022.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0306169.t004

and nutrition counselling during ANC follow-up were fitted in the final model. However, only meal skip, maternal education, attitude and wealth status were found to be the independent predictors of food consumption score.

The odds of having acceptable food consumption score among study participants who can read and write was 3.99 (Relative to borderline and poor food consumption score) times higher than study participants who were unable to read and write [AOR = 3.99,95%CI: 1.33-11.96]. The odds of having acceptable food consumption score were 49% (Relative to borderline and poor food consumption score) lower among study participants who came from the poorest households when compared to participants who came from the richest households [AOR = 0.52, 95%CI: 0.24-0.78]. The odds of having acceptable food consumption score were 1.36 times higher among study participants who did not skip meal (Versus borderline and poor food consumption score) compared to participants who skipped meal [AOR = 1.36, 95% CI: 1.03-1.81]. Finally, among study participants with positive attitude towards consumption score (Relative to borderline and poor food consumption score) [AOR = 1.52,95%CI: 1.17-1.98] (Table 6).

	Food consumption score			
	Poor	Borderline	Acceptable	
Yes	57	402	481	
No	2	2	5	
Yes	57	388	476	
No	2	16	10	
Yes	28	346	474	
No	31	58	12	
Yes	47	380	479	
No	12	24	1	
Yes	8	236	451	
No	51	168	35	
Yes	11	270	465	
No	48	134	21	
Yes	24	245	403	
No	35	159	83	
Yes	54	393	482	
No	5	11	4	
	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	Food consumption scorePoorYes57No2Yes57No2Yes28No31Yes47No12Yes8No51Yes11No48Yes24No35Yes54	PoorBorderlineYes57402No22Yes57388No216Yes28346No3158Yes47380No1224No51168Yes11270No4834Yes24No55159Yes54393No5111	

Table 5. Food consumption score of the study participants(n = 949) in the selected health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2022.

Age(years) Age(years)18-24249(30,00)0.70,0-1.1)0.80(0.8-1.3)0.80(0.	Variables	Categories	Number (%)	COR (95% CI)	AOR (95%CI)
	Age(years)	18-24	294(31.00%)	0.67(0.40-1.14)	0.82(0.44-1.55)
<table-row></table-row>		25–29	371(39.10%)	0.89(0.54-1.49)	0.871(0.47-1.59)
> > Pashad education> > > Pashad education> > Pashad education> Pashad education> Pashad educationPashad educationP		30-34	219(23.10%)	0.94(0.55-1.61)	0.878(0.48-1.59)
<table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container>		≥35	65(6.50%)	1.00	
Realand write 242.0%) 0.40(4-0.87) 0.63(0.34-1.02) Yeinary 296(1.40%) 0.43(0.10-0.99) 0.64(0.34-1.12) Geondary 385(0.60%) 0.43(0.10-0.99) 0.64(0.34-1.12) Husband occupation Daily bauer 219(2.10%) 1.68(1.18-2.40) 0.73(0.41-1.28) Husband occupation Daily bauer 247(2.60%) 1.68(1.18-2.40) 0.73(0.41-1.28) Husband occupation Hardinand 247(2.60%) 1.68(1.18-2.40) 0.73(0.41-1.28) Husband occupation 1.68(1.18-2.40) 0.73(0.41-1.28) 0.73(0.41-1.28) Husband occupation 1.68(1.18-2.40) 1.64(0.85-3.18) 1.64(0.85-3.18) Husband occupation 1.68(1.18-2.40) 1.64(0.85-3.18) 1.64(0.85-3.18) Husband occupation 1.64(1.08-1.80) 1.64(0.85-3.18) 1.64(0.85-3.18) 1.64(0.85-3.18) Husband occupation 1.010 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(0.85-1.12) 1.64(Husband education	Unable to read and write	24(2.50%)	1.00	
Primary298(31,40%)0.602(40-87)0.6(0.03-1.12)Secondary385(0.60%)0.43(0.1-0.97)0.5(0.02-1.41)College and above219(23.10%)0.35(0.15-0.82)0.7(0.17-1.29)Husband occupationEmployed219(23.0%)1.60(1.0-82)0.7(3.0.43-1.26)Merchant455(5.60%)1.64(0.85-0.18)1.23(0.87-1.75)1.23(0.87-1.75)Family2428(3.0%)1.64(0.85-0.18)1.64(0.85-0.18)Family2482(6.0%)0.80(0.58-1.10)1.64(0.85-0.18)Maternal Education10able to real and write30(3.0%)0.80(0.58-1.10)1.64(0.85-0.18)Maternal EducationUnable to real and write30(3.0%)1.001.001.00Maternal EducationEducation1.75(5.0.16%)1.84(0.78-4.32)1.84(0.78-4.32)Maternal EducationUnable to real and write30(3.0%)3.68(0.59-8.51)1.84(0.78-4.32)Maternal EducationSecondary265(25.0%)1.001.011.01Mariny525(25.0%)1.001.01(0.71-1.90)1.011.01Food to avoidYes366(30.9%)1.001.011.011.01Mating supplementYes666(30.9%)1.001.011.011.01Maring SupplementYes66(67.0%)1.86(1.4-1.8%)1.27(0.92-1.96)1.01Mating SupplementYes66(67.0%)1.86(1.4-1.8%)1.27(0.92-1.76)1.66(0.74.9%)1.01Matring SupplementYes66(67.0%)1.86(1.4-1.8%) </td <td rowspan="2"></td> <td>Read and write</td> <td>23(2.40%)</td> <td>0.64(0.46-0.89)</td> <td>0.63(0.38-1.07)</td>		Read and write	23(2.40%)	0.64(0.46-0.89)	0.63(0.38-1.07)
श्वल्वा 383(40,0%) 0,35(19-9,0%) 0,46(20-1,4) Raband ocupation Daily laboren 219(23,0%) 100 0 Hashand ocupation Daily laboren 219(23,0%) 1,68(1,18-2,40) 0,30(3,1-1,26) Hamboren 43(25,0%) 1,68(1,18-2,40) 1,23(0,87-1,75) 1,23(0,87-1,75) Hamboren 43(45,0%) 1,64(0,89-3,03) 1,64(0,85-3,18) 1,64(0,85-3,18) Family size 2 4 87(9,10%) 1,64(0,89-3,03) 1,64(0,85-3,18) Maternal Education Unable to read and write 3(3(5%) 1,00 1,00 1,00 Maternal Education Unable to read and write 3(3(5%) 1,38(1,5-1,25) 3,99(1,33-1,15),6* 1,00 Maternal Education Unable to read and write 3(3(5,0%) 1,00 </td <td>Primary</td> <td>298(31.40%)</td> <td>0.62(0.44-0.87)</td> <td>0.64(0.38-1.12)</td>		Primary	298(31.40%)	0.62(0.44-0.87)	0.64(0.38-1.12)
Image sharp in the standard state stat		Secondary	385(40.60%)	0.43(0.19-0.99)	0.54(0.20-1.44)
Hashand occupationIndiplayme219(23.0%)1.001.00Imployd247(26.0%)1.6(1.0.3-1.0%)0.2(3.07.1.7%)Imployd247(26.0%)1.4(1.0.3-1.0%)1.2(3.07.1.7%)Imployd245(3.0%)1.6(0.0%-3.0%)1.2(3.0%)Imploydia267(1.0%)0.000.00Imploydia267(1.0%)0.000.00Imploydia30(3.0%)1.000.00Imploydia30(3.0%)1.000.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.000.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.000.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.001.00Imploydia26(1.0%)1.00 <td< td=""><td></td><td>College and above</td><td>219(23.10%)</td><td>0.35(0.15-0.82)</td><td>0.47(0.17-1.29)</td></td<>		College and above	219(23.10%)	0.35(0.15-0.82)	0.47(0.17-1.29)
İmployed 247(26.00%) 168(118-24.00) 0.70(3.0.3-1.26) Marchart 435(45.80%) 1.4(10.3-1.94) 1.23(0.87-1.75) Family size 54 65(0.9%) 1.64(0.83-0.00) 1.64(0.85-0.18) Maternal Faducation 24 867(9.1.40%) 1.00 6.03(0.56-1.03) Maternal Faducation 1.04 83(3.0%) 4.38(1.53-12.55) 3.99(1.3.3-11.05)* Maternal Faducation 1.04 1.84(0.87-2.07) 3.94(0.8-3.18) 1.18(0.52-2.71) Maternal Faducation 2.93(3.0%) 4.38(1.53-12.55) 3.99(1.3.3-11.05)* 3.99(1.3.3-11.05)* Maternal Faducation 2.94(3.0%) 4.38(1.53-12.55) 3.99(1.3.2-1.05)* 3.99(1.3.2-1.0	Husband occupation	Daily labourer	219(23.10%)	1.00	
Merchant43(54.80%)14(1.03-1.94)1.23(0.87-1.75)Familysize5448(510%)1.64(08-3.03)1.64(08-5.18)Familysize54867(140%)1.0083(0.56-1.23)Maternal EducationYandbe toread and write30(3.0%)1.0083(0.56-1.23)Maternal EducationTable toread and write30(3.0%)1.0030(1.03-1.01)Maternal EducationTable toread and write30(3.0%)1.0130(1.03-1.01)Maternal EducationTable toread and write30(3.0%)1.011.18(0.52-2.71)Maternal EducationTable toread and write26(3.0%)1.011.81(0.52-2.71)Maternal EducationTable toread and write36(3.0%)3.68(1.59-8.51)3.18(0.52-2.71)Maternal EducationTable toread and write36(3.0%)1.013.61(0.51-8.51)3.18(0.52-2.71)Maternal EducationTable toread and write36(3.0%)1.013.61(0.51-8.51)3.61(0.51-8.51		Employed	247(26.00%)	1.68(1.18-2.40)	0.73(0.43-1.26)
IndexInterpretableInterpretableInterpretableInterpretableFamily size> 480(30%)1.00Adarmal EducationUable to read and write80(3.0%)1.00Adarmatic30(3.0%)1.00Read and write30(3.0%)4.38(1.53-1.25)3.99(1.33-1.16)*Firmary475(5.0%)4.38(1.53-1.25)3.99(1.33-1.16)*Firmary475(5.0%)1.47(0.68-3.18)1.18(0.52-2.71)Firmary475(5.0%)1.27(0.58-3.18)1.81(0.52-2.71)Firmary62(59.0%)1.002.31(0.89-6.5)MaleskipYes56(59.2%)1.002.31(0.89-6.5)MaryYes368(1.69.0%)1.57(1.22-0.4)3.61(1.3-1.81)*Food to avoidYes286(30.0%)1.57(1.22-0.4)1.01(0.7-1.39)Taking supplementYes636(69.0%)0.71(0.54-0.94)1.01(0.7-1.39)Alfong1.66(36.90%)0.71(0.54-0.94)1.01(0.7-1.39)1.01Alfong1.30(3.28.9%)1.00Alfong31(3.29.8%)1.00Alfong1.33(3.28.9%)1.00Alfong1.33(3.28.9%)1.00Alfong1.33(3.28.9%)1.00Alfong1.33(3.28.9%)1.00Alfong1.33(3.28.9%)1.00Alfong1.33(3.28.9%)1.01Alfong		Merchant	435(45.80%)	1.41(1.03-1.94)	1.23(0.87-1.75)
Family size>4867(91.40%)100100G5482(8.0%)0.80(0.58-1.10)0.80(0.58-1.10)Maternal Education10080(0.58-1.10)0.80(0.58-1.10)39(1.33-11.96)*Maternal Education745(0.10%)4.38(1.53-12.55)39(1.33-11.96)*Marcine294(1.00%)2.52(1.5-5.1)1.84(0.78-4.32)Marcine294(0.10%)3.68(1.59-6.51)1.84(0.78-4.32)Marcine265(2.90%)1.001.00Marcine85(2.90%)1.001.00Marcine1.86(0.80%)1.01(2.2-2.4)1.36(1.03-1.81)*Foot avoidYes265(0.90%)1.001.01(7.4-1.39)Taking supplementYes263(6.90%)1.001.01(7.4-1.39)Affing supplementYes636(6.70%)1.86(1.43-2.48)1.24(0.79-1.96)Marcine263(2.60%)1.001.01(7.4-1.39)1.01Affing supplementYes636(6.90%)1.001.01Marcine1.03(2.8%)1.001.011.01Affing supplementYes63(6.90%)1.011.01Marcine1.0223(2.66%)1.001.011.01Affing supplementYes63(6.90%)1.011.011.01Marcine1.0223(2.66%)1.001.011.01Marcine1.0223(2.66%)1.011.011.01Marcine1.021.021.011.011.01Marcine1.021.021.011.01 <td< td=""><td></td><td>Driver</td><td>48(5.10%)</td><td>1.64(0.89-3.03)</td><td>1.64(0.85-3.18)</td></td<>		Driver	48(5.10%)	1.64(0.89-3.03)	1.64(0.85-3.18)
<th< td=""><td>Family size</td><td>>4</td><td>867(91.40%)</td><td>1.00</td><td></td></th<>	Family size	>4	867(91.40%)	1.00	
<table-row> Maternal Education Unable to read and write 9(3.10%) 1.00 Memory Read and write 3(3.50%) 4.3(1.51.2.5) 3.9(1.3.3.1.9.6) * 1.40 Primary 245(1.0.0%) 1.47(0.68-3.1.8) 1.8(0.52-2.1) Scondary 294(31.00%) 2.5(2.1.5-5.5.1) 1.8(0.78-4.3.2) Mail Address 2.6(1.59-8.5.1) 2.8(0.78-8.5.1) 2.8(0.78-8.5.1) Mass Address 2.8(2.0.0%) 1.6(1.72-8.5.1) 2.8(0.78-8.5.1)</table-row>		≤ 4	82(8.60%)	0.80(0.58-1.10)	0.83(0.56-1.23)
	Maternal Education	Unable to read and write	30(3.10%)	1.00	
Primary475(50.10%)1.47(0.683.18)1.18(0.522.7)Secondary294(31.00%)2.52(1.155.1)1.84(0.784.32)College and above)117(12.30%)3.68(1.598.51)2.31(0.896.05)Meal skipYes562(59.20%)1.00Poor387(40.80%)1.57(1.2204)1.36(1.03-1.81)*Food ta avoidYes286(30.10%)1.00Taking supplementYes663(69.90%)0.71(0.540.94)1.01(0.741.39)Taking supplementYes649(68.40%)1.89(1.452.48)1.24(0.791.96)Taking supplementYes636(67.02%)1.86(1.432.44)0.98(0.511.92)ANC follow-upYes636(67.02%)1.60Yes030(31.60%)1.00CravingYes636(67.02%)1.89(1.452.48)1.2(0.92-1.76)No313(32.98%)1.00CravingYes630(67.02%)1.93(1.472.54)1.56(0.822.97)Nutrition counsellingYes660(69.60%)1.93(1.472.54)1.56(0.822.97)No289(3.04%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.01No289(3.04%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.54(0.932.57)1.36(0.792.33)Weath StatusPoorest197(2.08%)0.46(0.310.68)0.50(0.431.40)Middle100(1.50%)0.55(0.340.88)0.69(0.431.40)Kill birth196(2.0.3		Read and write	33(3.50%)	4.38(1.53-12.55)	3.99(1.33-11.96) *
Secondary294(31.00%)2.52(1.15-5.1)1.84(0.78-4.32)College and above)117(12.30%)3.68(1.59-8.51)2.31(0.89-6.05)Meal skipYes562(59.20%)1.00No387(40.80%)1.57(1.22-2.40)1.63(0.3-1.81)*Food to avoidYes286(30.0%)0.01Main supplementYes286(30.0%)0.011.01(0.74-1.39)Taking supplementYes649(68.40%)1.89(1.45-2.48)1.24(0.79-1.96)Mo300(31.60%)1.00ANCYes636(67.02%)1.86(1.43-2.44)0.80(5-1.192)Mo313(32.98%)1.00CarvingYes253(26.60%)1.41(1.06-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)No313(32.98%)1.00Nutrition counsellingYes660(69.60%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.56(0.82-2.97)Nutrition counsellingYes560(30%)1.00Yes59(0.30%)1.00Still birthYes59(0.30%)1.00No809(37.0%)1.54(0.93-2.57)1.56(0.82-2.97)Wealth StatusPoorest197(0.80%)0.46(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78)*Maide100(10.50%)0.54(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78)*Maide100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.69(0.43-1.14)Maide100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.69(0.43-1.14)Maide100(10.50%)0.50(0.54-0.17)0.52(0.17-0.58)Maide109(0		Primary	475(50.10%)	1.47(0.68-3.18)	1.18(0.52-2.71)
Index setCollege and above)117(12.30%)3.68(1.59-8.51)2.31(0.89-6.05)Meal skipYes562(59.20%)1.00International Set (1.57)Food to avoidYes286(30.10%)1.57(1.22-2.04)1.36(1.03-1.81) *Food to avoidYes286(30.10%)0.71(0.54-0.94)1.01(0.74-1.39)Taking supplementYes649(68.40%)1.89(1.45-2.48)1.24(0.79-1.96)No300(31.60%)1.00International Set (1.57)1.24(0.79-1.96)ANC follow-upYes636(67.02%)1.86(1.43-2.44)0.98(0.51-1.92)No313(32.98%)1.00International Set (1.57)1.27(0.92-1.76)No313(32.98%)1.00International Set (1.57)I.56(0.82-2.97)CravingYes650(67.340%)1.00International Set (1.57)Nutrition counsellingYes59(3.04%)1.00International Set (1.57)Nutrition counsellingYes59(6.30%)1.00International Set (1.57)Still birthYes59(3.04%)1.00International Set (1.57)Still birthYes59(3.04%)1.00International Set (1.57)No233(24.60%)1.28(0.88-1.88)1.19(0.80-1.76)Weath StatusPoorest1.29(2.33)0.80(0.51-1.17)0.86(0.17-0.58)No212(3.30%)0.80(0.51-1.17)0.86(0.17-0.58)International Set (1.57)No212(3.30%)1.00International Set (1.57)0.52(1.17-1.98) *No212(3.30%)1.00Inte		Secondary	294(31.00%)	2.52(1.15-5.51)	1.84(0.78-4.32)
Meal skipYes562(59.2%)1.00Medmedmedmedmedmedmedmedmedmedmedmedmedme		College and above)	117(12.30%)	3.68(1.59-8.51)	2.31(0.89-6.05)
No387(40.80%)1.57(1.22-2.04)1.36(1.03-1.81)*Food to avoidYes286(30.10%)1.00No653(69.90%)0.71(0.54-0.94)1.01(0.74-1.39)Taking supplementYes649(88.40%)1.89(1.45-2.48)1.24(0.79-1.96)No300(31.60%)1.00ANC follow-upYes636(67.02%)1.86(1.43-2.44)0.98(0.51-1.92)No313(32.98%)1.00CravingYes636(66.02%)1.41(1.06-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)No532(66.60%)1.41(1.06-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)Nutrition counsellingYes660(69.60%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.56(0.82-2.97)Nutrition counsellingYes59(6.30%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.00Weath StatusPoorest197(20.80%)1.00Weath StatusPoorest197(20.80%)1.64(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78)*Weath StatusPoorest100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.69(0.43-1.14)Miche100(10.50%)0.80(0.55-1.17)0.69(0.43-1.14)Michest198(20.80%)1.00AttitudePositive547(57.60%)1.72(1.34-2.22)1.52(1.17-1.98)*	Meal skip	Yes	562(59.20%)	1.00	
Food to avoidYes286(30.10%)1.00MedicalNo63(69.90%)0.71(0.54-0.94)1.01(0.74-1.39)Taking supplementYes649(68.40%)1.89(1.45-2.48)1.24(0.79-1.96)No300(31.60%)1.00MedicalMedicalANC follow-upYes636(67.02%)1.86(1.43-2.44)0.98(0.51-1.92)Mo313(32.98%)1.00MedicalMedicalCravingYes253(26.60%)1.41(1.66-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)No696(73.40%)1.00MedicalMedicalNutrition counsellingYes660(6.00%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.66(0.82-2.97)No289(30.00%)1.00MedicalMedicalStill birthYes59(6.30%)1.00MedicalNo280(93.70%)1.54(0.93-2.57)1.36(0.79-2.33)Wealth StatusPoorest97(20.80%)0.46(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78)*Middle100(10.50%)0.52(0.44-0.88)1.19(0.80-1.76)Middle100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.69(0.43-1.14)Kichest198(20.80%)1.00Medical-1.14)Kitude198(20.80%)1.000.55(0.14-0.88)0.55(0.14-0.88)Kitude198(20.80%)1.001.52(1.17-1.98)*		No	387(40.80%)	1.57(1.22-2.04)	1.36(1.03–1.81) *
No663(69.0%)0.71(0.54-0.94)1.01(0.74-1.39)Taking supplementYes649(68.40%)1.89(1.45-2.48)1.24(0.79-1.96)No300(31.60%)1.00ANC follow-upYes636(67.02%)1.86(1.43-2.44)0.98(0.51-1.92)No313(32.98%)1.00CravingYes253(26.60%)1.41(1.06-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)No696(73.40%)1.00Nutrition counsellingYes660(69.60%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.56(0.82-2.97)No289(30.40%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.00No289(30.40%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.00No289(30.40%)1.00Wealth StatusPoorest59(6.30%)1.00No33(34.20%)1.54(0.93-2.57)1.36(0.79-2.33)No33(34.60%)1.54(0.93-2.57)1.36(0.79-2.33)No33(34.60%)1.28(0.88-1.88)1.19(0.80-1.76)Maddle100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.59(0.43-1.14)No212(3.30%)0.80(0.55-1.17)0.85(0.17-0.58)AttitudePostive198(20.80%)1.00AttitudePostive54(5.60%)1.00AttitudePostive54(5.60%)1.001.52(1.17-1.98)*	Food to avoid	Yes	286(30.10%)	1.00	
Taking supplementYes649(68.40%)1.89(1.45-2.48)1.24(0.79-1.96)No300(31.60%)1.00ANC follow-upYes636(67.02%)1.86(1.43-2.44)0.98(0.51-1.92)No313(32.98%)1.00CravingYes253(26.60%)1.41(1.06-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)No696(73.40%)1.00Nutrition counsellingYes660(69.60%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.56(0.82-2.97)No289(30.40%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.00No289(30.40%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.00No289(30.40%)1.00Mo289(30.40%)1.00Midle109(10.50%)0.46(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78)*Model100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)1.19(0.80-1.76)Midle100(10.50%)0.80(0.55-1.17)0.85(0.17-0.58)AttitudePositive198(20.80%)1.00AttitudePositive547(57.60%)1.021.52(1.17-1.98)*		No	663(69.90%)	0.71(0.54-0.94)	1.01(0.74–1.39)
IndextNo300(31.60%)1.00IndextANC follow-upYes636(67.02%)1.86(1.43–2.44)0.98(0.51–1.92)No313(32.98%)1.00IndextCravingYes253(2.60%)1.41(1.06–1.88)1.27(0.92–1.76)No696(7.340%)1.00IndextIndextNutrition counsellingYes660(6.60%)1.93(1.47–2.54)1.56(0.82–2.97)Nutrition counsellingYes59(6.30%)1.00IndextStill birthYes59(6.30%)1.00IndextNo890(9.370%)1.54(0.93–2.57)1.36(0.79–2.33)Wealth StatusPoorest1.97(2.80%)0.46(0.31–0.68)0.52(0.24–0.78)*Midel100(1.50%)0.55(0.34–0.88)1.19(0.80–1.76)Midel21(2.330%)0.80(0.55–1.17)0.85(0.17–0.58)AttitudePositive198(2.80%)1.00IndextAttitudePositive547(57.60%)1.72(1.34–2.22)1.52(1.17–1.98)*	Taking supplement	Yes	649(68.40%)	1.89(1.45-2.48)	1.24(0.79–1.96)
ANC follow-upYes636(67.2%)1.86(1.43-2.44)0.98(0.51-1.92)No313(32.98%)1.00CravingYes253(26.60%)1.41(1.06-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)No696(73.40%)1.00Nutrition counsellingYes660(96.00%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.56(0.82-2.97)No289(30.40%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.00No890(93.70%)1.00Wealth StatusPoorest197(20.80%)0.46(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78) *Middle100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.69(0.43-1.14)Middle100(10.50%)0.80(0.55-1.17)0.85(0.17-0.58)AttitudePositive198(20.80%)1.00AttitudePositive547(57.60%)1.72(1.34-2.22)1.52(1.17-1.98) *		No	300(31.60%)	1.00	
No313(32.98%)1.00CenterCravingYes253(26.0%)1.41(1.06-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)No696(73.40%)1.00CenterNutrition counsellingYes660(96.0%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.56(0.82-2.97)No289(30.40%)1.00CenterStill birthYes59(6.30%)1.00CenterNo890(93.70%)1.54(0.93-2.57)1.36(0.79-2.33)Wealth StatusPoorest197(20.80%)0.46(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78) *Poor233(24.60%)1.28(0.88-1.88)1.19(0.80-1.76)Middle100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.69(0.43-1.14)Rich221(23.30%)0.80(0.55-1.17)0.85(0.17-0.58)AttitudePositive198(20.80%)1.00CenterAttitudePositive547(57.60%)1.72(1.34-2.22)1.52(1.17-1.98) *	ANC follow-up	Yes	636(67.02%)	1.86(1.43-2.44)	0.98(0.51-1.92)
CravingYes253(26.6%)1.41(1.06-1.88)1.27(0.92-1.76)No696(73.4%)1.00Nutrition counsellingYes660(69.60%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.56(0.82-2.97)No289(30.40%)1.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.00No890(93.70%)1.54(0.93-2.57)1.36(0.79-2.33)Wealth StatusPoorest197(20.80%)0.46(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78) *Poor233(24.60%)1.28(0.88-1.88)1.19(0.80-1.76)Middle100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.69(0.43-1.14)Rich221(23.30%)0.80(0.55-1.17)0.85(0.17-0.58)AttitudePositive198(20.80%)1.00Meader547(57.60%)1.72(1.34-2.22)1.52(1.17-1.98) *		No	313(32.98%)	1.00	
No696(73.40%)1.00IndextNutrition counsellingYes660(69.60%)1.93(1.47-2.54)1.56(0.82-2.97)No289(30.40%)1.001.00Still birthYes59(6.30%)1.001.00No890(93.70%)1.54(0.93-2.57)1.36(0.79-2.33)Wealth StatusPoorest197(20.80%)0.46(0.31-0.68)0.52(0.24-0.78) *Poor233(24.60%)1.28(0.88-1.88)1.19(0.80-1.76)Middle100(10.50%)0.55(0.34-0.88)0.69(0.43-1.14)Rich221(23.30%)0.80(0.55-1.17)0.85(0.17-0.58)AttitudePositive547(57.60%)1.72(1.34-2.22)1.52(1.17-1.98) *	Craving	Yes	253(26.60%)	1.41(1.06-1.88)	1.27(0.92–1.76)
Nutrition counselling Yes 660(69.60%) 1.93(1.47-2.54) 1.56(0.82-2.97) No 289(30.40%) 1.00 Still birth Yes 59(6.30%) 1.00 No 890(93.70%) 1.54(0.93-2.57) 1.36(0.79-2.33) Wealth Status Poorest 197(20.80%) 0.46(0.31-0.68) 0.52(0.24-0.78) * Middle 100(10.50%) 0.55(0.34-0.88) 1.19(0.80-1.76) Kich 221(23.30%) 0.80(0.55-1.17) 0.85(0.17-0.58) Richest 198(20.80%) 1.00 Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.72(1.34-2.22) 1.52(1.17-1.98) *		No	696(73.40%)	1.00	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline No & 289(30.40\%) & 1.00 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 $	Nutrition counselling	Yes	660(69.60%)	1.93(1.47-2.54)	1.56(0.82–2.97)
Still birth Yes 59(6.30%) 1.00 No 890(93.70%) 1.54(0.93-2.57) 1.36(0.79-2.33) Wealth Status Poorest 197(20.80%) 0.46(0.31-0.68) 0.52(0.24-0.78) * Poor 233(24.60%) 1.28(0.88-1.88) 1.19(0.80-1.76) Middle 100(10.50%) 0.55(0.34-0.88) 0.69(0.43-1.14) Rich 221(23.30%) 0.80(0.55-1.17) 0.85(0.17-0.58) Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.00 1.52(1.17-1.98) *		No	289(30.40%)	1.00	
No 890(93.70%) 1.54(0.93-2.57) 1.36(0.79-2.33) Wealth Status Poorest 197(20.80%) 0.46(0.31-0.68) 0.52(0.24-0.78)* Poor 233(24.60%) 1.28(0.88-1.88) 1.19(0.80-1.76) Middle 100(10.50%) 0.55(0.34-0.88) 0.69(0.43-1.14) Rich 221(23.30%) 0.80(0.55-1.17) 0.85(0.17-0.58) Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.00 1.52(1.17-1.98)*	Still birth	Yes	59(6.30%)	1.00	
Wealth Status Poorest 197(20.80%) 0.46(0.31-0.68) 0.52(0.24-0.78) * Poor 233(24.60%) 1.28(0.88-1.88) 1.19(0.80-1.76) Middle 100(10.50%) 0.55(0.34-0.88) 0.69(0.43-1.14) Rich 221(23.30%) 0.80(0.55-1.17) 0.85(0.17-0.58) Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.00 1.52(1.17-1.98) * Negative 402(42.40%) 1.00 1.52(1.17-1.98) * 1.52(1.17-1.98) *		No	890(93.70%)	1.54(0.93-2.57)	1.36(0.79–2.33)
Poor 233(24.60%) 1.28(0.88-1.88) 1.19(0.80-1.76) Middle 100(10.50%) 0.55(0.34-0.88) 0.69(0.43-1.14) Rich 221(23.30%) 0.80(0.55-1.17) 0.85(0.17-0.58) Richest 198(20.80%) 1.00 Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.72(1.34-2.22) 1.52(1.17-1.98)*	Wealth Status	Poorest	197(20.80%)	0.46(0.31-0.68)	0.52(0.24-0.78) *
Middle 100(10.50%) 0.55(0.34-0.88) 0.69(0.43-1.14) Rich 221(23.30%) 0.80(0.55-1.17) 0.85(0.17-0.58) Richest 198(20.80%) 1.00 Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.72(1.34-2.22) 1.52(1.17-1.98)* Negative 402(42.40%) 1.00		Poor	233(24.60%)	1.28(0.88-1.88)	1.19(0.80–1.76)
Rich 221(23.30%) 0.80(0.55-1.17) 0.85(0.17-0.58) Richest 198(20.80%) 1.00 Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.72(1.34-2.22) 1.52(1.17-1.98)* Negative 402(42.40%) 1.00		Middle	100(10.50%)	0.55(0.34-0.88)	0.69(0.43-1.14)
Richest 198(20.80%) 1.00 Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.72(1.34-2.22) 1.52(1.17-1.98)* Negative 402(42.40%) 1.00 1.00		Rich	221(23.30%)	0.80(0.55-1.17)	0.85(0.17–0.58)
Attitude Positive 547(57.60%) 1.72(1.34-2.22) 1.52(1.17-1.98)* Negative 402(42.40%) 1.00		Richest	198(20.80%)	1.00	
Negative 402(42.40%) 1.00	Attitude	Positive	547(57.60%)	1.72(1.34-2.22)	1.52(1.17–1.98) *
		Negative	402(42.40%)	1.00	

Table 6. Factors associated food consumption score among pregnant women having ANC follow up at health centers of Addis Ababa (n = 949), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2022.

* Indicates p value<0.05

Discussion

This study sought to examine FCS and associated factors among pregnant women who were having ANC follow up in health centers of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The results of this study have showed a little over half (51.20%, 95% CI: 48.00%-54.30%) of the study participants had acceptable FCS, and the small proportion of the study participants had poor FCS (6.20%).

Our report was far below the WFP recommendation [1]. Furthermore, the finding has showed that the percentage of acceptable FCS was comparatively lower than studies from Bangladesh(58%) [27], Nigeria (80.3%) [28] and pocket studies from Ethiopia (81.5% and 54.6% at Shegaw Motta and Eastern Ethiopia, respectively) [12, 13]. The study period could explain the decreased rate FCS, for example, the study at Shegaw Motta was conducted in the main harvest season while our study was conducted in fasting season when there is a decreased consumption animal source food [29]. Methodologically, the use of larger sample size in the current study and difference in outcome ascertainment might explain decreased rate of acceptable FCS in this study. In Ethiopia, pregnant women avoid foods due to cultural and religious reasons, and this might explain the discrepancy between the current the study and study from Nigeria where religion and culture has lesser influence over their food choice [30].

As to the associated factors of FCS, our study has showed maternal educational status-able to read and write, not being in the poorest wealth status, positive attitude towards dietary diversity, and skipping meal were independent predictors of FCS. Those mothers who were able to read and write had higher odds of having acceptable FCS compared to mothers who were unable to read and write, emphasizing the importance of nutritional educational during pregnancy. This was supported by other similar studies conducted in Nigeria [30], Ghana [31], and other studies in Ethiopia [32]. It is evident that increasing level of literacy is crucial to mitigate the problem even in the poorest households [33]. Besides, mothers who are able to read and write will have a better access to nutritional information from internet, brochures, newspapers and magazines [34–36]. In the affluents, where the toll of non-communicable disease is spiralling- enhancing level of literacy will play a pivotal role for an appropriate food selection and consumption too [37].

Being in the poorest wealth status decreases the odds of having acceptable FCS by 49% when compared mothers from the richest wealth status. This was also observed in previous studies conducted in Bishoftu, Oromia [10]. Pregnant mothers from the poorest households have limited economical accesses to procure and buy a diversified diet. On top of this, different studies have pinpointed that being in the lowest wealth status is associated with decreased consumption of animal source food [38], which in turn results lower FCS. Mothers who did not skip meal had also higher odds of having acceptable FCS when compared to their counterparts. A similar finding was observed from a study in Eastern Ethiopia [15]. During the period of gestation, meal patterning is highly important since pregnant women who sustain prolonged periods of time without food by skipping meals or snacks may be inducing a physiologic stress in their pregnancy [39]. Even though accidentally skipping a meal is not going to be harmful, skipping meals regularly for different reasons is not advisable to have a better pregnancy outcome [40, 41]. Moreover, from different studies, it has been seen that skipping meals during this period is associated decreased dietary quality [15].

The study has also revealed, study participants who had positive attitude towards consumption diversified diet had an increased odds of having acceptable FCS than their counter parts. A similar finding was observed from a study conducted in Eastern Ethiopia [13]. Different researches have supported that pregnant women with increased level of attitude have a better practice of consuming a diversified diet [42]. Women with positive feeling towards a diversified diet are also motivated to consume foods from different food groups [43, 44]. It should be mentioned that the present study has provided greater evidence on the dietary quality and predictors among pregnant women using ordinal logistic regression [22]. However, methodological limitation of the study cannot go unnoticed. Despite the use of probes like photographs-to recite memory of the study participants-problem of recall bias cannot be ignored which in turn might overestimate or underestimate the result. On top of that, cross-sectional nature of the study limits detection of causal association between the outcome and predicator variables. Even though FCS is a validated tool to asses calorie intake, the tool has not been validated to measure adequacy of macronutrients and micronutrients. The use of a 4 item Likert questionnaire is another limitation of the current study, while recommending the use of a questionnaire with sufficient numbers questions.

Implication of the study

The findings of this study can be used to implement public health policies and programmes that strive to bring a better pregnancy outcome by promoting a balanced diet to vulnerable groups of the population. Therefore, to meet the WFP recommendation of having 90% acceptable FCS, interventions need to give a due attention to mothers with lower educational status who are from a lower socio-economic status. The implications of this study can be linked to the importance nutritional educations that target to bring a positive attitude towards consumption of a diversified diet. Moreover, findings of the study imply the importance of provision of a diversified diet in deterring the sequala of malnutrition.

Conclusion

The findings of this study have showed that only half of the study participants had acceptable FCS which is far below the WFP recommendation. Besides, able to read and write, not skipping meal, positive attitude towards the consumption variety of foods, not being from the poorest household were significantly associated with having acceptable FCS relative to border-line and poor FCS. Therefore, it is important to give a special attention to pregnant mothers with low socioeconomic status, and mothers who skip meals in order to enhance their food variety score and improve their nutritional intake.

Future researches are encouraged to investigate nutrient adequacy among pregnant women. Finally, future studies triangulated with qualitative research that investigate behavioural factors such as food taboos and norms that influence FCS among pregnant women are also encouraged.

Supporting information

S1 File. FCS Plos one. (XLSX)

Acknowledgments

The authors of this article are grateful for the study participants without whom this would not be possible.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Jerusalem Ketema Belay, Solomon Mekonnen Abebe, Berhanu Mengistu.

Data curation: Jerusalem Ketema Belay, Berhanu Mengistu.

Formal analysis: Jerusalem Ketema Belay, Solomon Mekonnen Abebe, Lemlem Daniel Baffa, Berhanu Mengistu.

Investigation: Jerusalem Ketema Belay.

- Methodology: Jerusalem Ketema Belay, Solomon Mekonnen Abebe, Berhanu Mengistu.
- Project administration: Jerusalem Ketema Belay.
- Resources: Jerusalem Ketema Belay.
- **Software:** Jerusalem Ketema Belay, Solomon Mekonnen Abebe, Lemlem Daniel Baffa, Berhanu Mengistu.
- Supervision: Jerusalem Ketema Belay.
- Writing original draft: Jerusalem Ketema Belay, Solomon Mekonnen Abebe, Berhanu Mengistu.
- Writing review & editing: Solomon Mekonnen Abebe, Lemlem Daniel Baffa, Berhanu Mengistu.

References

- 1. Wfp V., Food consumption analysis: calculation and use of the food consumption score in food security analysis. WFP: Rome, Italy, 2008.
- Soma-Pillay P., et al., Physiological changes in pregnancy: review articles. Cardiovascular journal of Africa, 2016. 27(2): p. 89–94.
- Forbes L.E., et al., Dietary change during pregnancy and women's reasons for change. Nutrients, 2018. 10(8): p. 1032. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10081032 PMID: 30096771
- Lindsay K., Gibney E., and McAuliffe F., Maternal nutrition among women from Sub-Saharan Africa, with a focus on Nigeria, and potential implications for pregnancy outcomes among immigrant populations in developed countries. Journal of human nutrition and dietetics, 2012. 25(6): p. 534–546. https:// doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-277X.2012.01253.x PMID: 22594552
- Du M., et al., Fetal muscle development, mesenchymal multipotent cell differentiation, and associated signaling pathways. Journal of animal science, 2011. 89(2): p. 583–590. https://doi.org/10.2527/jas. 2010-3386 PMID: 20852073
- Devlin M. and Bouxsein M., Influence of pre-and peri-natal nutrition on skeletal acquisition and maintenance. Bone, 2012. 50(2): p. 444–451. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2011.06.019 PMID: 21723972
- Calkins K. and Devaskar S.U., Fetal origins of adult disease. Curr Probl Pediatr Adolesc Health Care, 2011. 41(6): p. 158–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cppeds.2011.01.001 PMID: 21684471
- Barker D.J., The origins of the developmental origins theory. Journal of internal medicine, 2007. 261(5): p. 412–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2796.2007.01809.x PMID: 17444880
- 9. Marshall N.E., et al., iThe Importance of Nutrition in Pregnancy and Lactation: Lifelong Consequences. American journal of obstetrics and gynecology, 2021.
- 10. WONDW T., ADDIS ABA COLLEGE OF H SCHOOL OF. 2016, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH FOR T LLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR MASTERS DEGREE
- 11. Geurts M., et al., Food consumption in the Netherlands and its determinants: Background report to'What is on our plate? Safe, healthy and sustainable diets in the Netherlands.'. 2017.
- 12. Ambaw M.B., et al., Level of food consumption score and associated factors among pregnant women at SHEGAW MOTTA hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. BMC public health, 2021. 21(1): p. 1–9.
- 13. Fite M.B., et al., Factors associated with food consumption score among pregnant women in Eastern Ethiopia: a community-based study. Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition, 2022. 41(1): p. 1–9.
- Jardí C., et al., Food Consumption during Pregnancy and Post-Partum. ECLIPSES Study. Nutrients, 2019. 11(10).
- **15.** Oumer A., Abraham M., and Nuri A., Predictors of Major Dietary Patterns Among Pregnant Women Attending Public Health Facilities in Eastern Ethiopia: A New Epidemiological Approach. Frontiers in nutrition, 2022. 9: p. 855149.

- Wolle A., et al., Household food consumption patterns in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Vol. 139. 2020: Intl Food Policy Res Inst.
- 17. Ethiopia F.D.R.o., Food and Nutrition Policy. November- 2018: Fedral Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- Yadene N. What's next for Ethiopia's nutrition programs? 2019; Available from: <u>https://www.ifpri.org/blog/whats-next-ethiopias-nutrition-programs</u>.
- Chenarides L., et al., Food consumption behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic. Agribusiness, 2021. 37(1): p. 44–81. https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.21679 PMID: 33362340
- Hirvonen K., De Brauw A., and Abate G.T., Food consumption and food security during the COVID-19 pandemic in Addis Ababa. American journal of agricultural economics, 2021. 103(3): p. 772–789. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajae.12206 PMID: 33821007
- Isaura E.R., Chen Y.-C., and Yang S.-H., The association of food consumption scores, body shape index, and hypertension in a seven-year follow-up among Indonesian adults: A longitudinal study. International journal of environmental research and public health, 2018. 15(1): p. 175. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15010175</u> PMID: 29361793
- Das S. and Rahman R.M., Application of ordinal logistic regression analysis in determining risk factors of child malnutrition in Bangladesh. Nutrition Journal, 2011. 10(1): p. 124. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-10-124 PMID</u>: 22082256
- Ababa A. and Calverton E., Central statistical agency (Ethiopia) and ICF international. Ethiopia and Calverton: Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey, 2011. 14.
- 24. Derso A., et al., Food insecurity status and determinants among Urban Productive Safety Net Program beneficiary households in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. PLOS ONE, 2021. 16(9): p. e0256634. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256634</u> PMID: 34570794
- 25. Wiesmann D., et al., Validation of the world food programme s food consumption score and alternative indicators of household food security. 2009: Intl Food Policy Res Inst.
- Organization W.H., Report of a WHO technical consultation on birth spacing: Geneva, Switzerland 13– 15 June 2005. 2007, World Health Organization.
- Ahmed, E., I. Jahan, and M.A. Islam, FOOD SECURITY STATUS AND FOOD CONSUMPTION AMONG URBAN AND RURAL PREGNANT WOMEN OF JASHORE DISTRICT IN BANGLADESH.
- Folahan O., Odunuga B., and Dele-Olawumi B., Food Consumption Score, Dietary Habits and Anthropometric Indices of Market Traders in Owo Township, Ondo State, Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Nutritional Sciences, 2020. 41(2): p. 109–119.
- 29. Abegaz G.A., Hassen I.W., and Minten B., Consumption of animal-source foods in Ethiopia: Patterns, changes, and determinants. Vol. 113. 2018: Intl Food Policy Res Inst.
- Olatona F.A., et al., Dietary habits, diversity, and predictors among pregnant women attending primary health care centers for antenatal care in Lagos, Nigeria. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 2021. 10(8): p. 3076–3083.
- Bukari M., et al., Household factors and gestational age predict diet quality of pregnant women. Maternal & child nutrition, 2021. 17(3): p. e13145. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13145 PMID: 33528101
- **32.** Aliwo S., et al., Dietary diversity practice and associated factors among pregnant women in North East Ethiopia. BMC research notes, 2019. 12(1): p. 1–6.
- Yadegari L., et al., The relationship between socioeconomic factors and food security in pregnant women. Shiraz E-Medical Journal, 2017. 18(1).
- Abuya B.A., Ciera J., and Kimani-Murage E., Effect of mother's education on child's nutritional status in the slums of Nairobi. BMC pediatrics, 2012. 12(1): p. 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2431-12-80 PMID: 22721431
- 35. Daba G., et al., Assessment of knowledge of pregnant mothers on maternal nutrition and associated factors in Guto Gida Woreda, East Wollega Zone, Ethiopia. Journal of Nutrition & Food Sciences, 2013. 3(6): p. 1.
- Vikram K. and Vanneman R., Maternal education and the multidimensionality of child health outcomes in India. Journal of biosocial science, 2020. 52(1): p. 57–77. <u>https://doi.org/10.1017/</u> S0021932019000245 PMID: 31112112
- Yin H., et al., Socioeconomic status and prevalence of chronic non-communicable diseases in Chinese women: a structural equation modelling approach. BMJ open, 2017. 7(8): p. e014402. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014402 PMID: 28827232</u>
- Workicho A., et al., Household dietary diversity and animal source food consumption in Ethiopia: evidence from the 2011 welfare monitoring survey. BMC public health, 2016. 16(1): p. 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3861-8 PMID: 27884138

- **39.** Cleland J.G. and Van Ginneken J.K., Maternal education and child survival in developing countries: the search for pathways of influence. Social science & medicine, 1988. 27(12): p. 1357–1368. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(88)90201-8 PMID: 3070762</u>
- 40. Maria Siega-Riz A., et al., Frequency of eating during pregnancy and its effect on preterm delivery. American journal of epidemiology, 2001. 153(7): p. 647–652. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/153.7.647</u> PMID: 11282791
- Aizawa M., et al., Skipping breakfast during pregnancy and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy in Japanese women: the Tohoku medical megabank project birth and three-generation cohort study. Nutrition Journal, 2022. 21(1): p. 1–10.
- Zerfu T.A. and Biadgilign S., Pregnant mothers have limited knowledge and poor dietary diversity practices, but favorable attitude towards nutritional recommendations in rural Ethiopia: evidence from community-based study. BMC nutrition, 2018. 4(1): p. 1–9. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s40795-018-0251-x</u> PMID: 32153904
- 43. Kowalkowska J., et al., Health-and taste-related attitudes associated with dietary patterns in a representative sample of Polish girls and young women: A cross-sectional study (GEBaHealth Project). Nutrients, 2018. 10(2): p. 254. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10020254 PMID: 29473894
- **44.** Rah J.H., et al., Applying the theory of planned behavior to women's behavioral attitudes on and *consumption of soy products*. Journal of nutrition education and behavior, 2004. 36(5): p. 238–244.