#### Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Tracy Reibel, Murdoch University, Australia

REVIEWED BY Lawrence Ulu Ogbonnaya, Ebonyi State University, Nigeria Paola Vasquez, Murdoch University, Australia

\*CORRESPONDENCE Addisu Alemayehu Gube ⊠ addis166@gmail.com

RECEIVED 09 April 2024 ACCEPTED 14 June 2024 PUBLISHED 26 June 2024

#### CITATION

Gube AA, Murányi E, Vitrai J and Lohner S (2024) Inequity in uptake of maternal health care services in developing countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Public Health* 12:1415092. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2024.1415092

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Gube, Murányi, Vitrai and Lohner. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Inequity in uptake of maternal health care services in developing countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Addisu Alemayehu Gube<sup>1\*</sup>, Edit Murányi<sup>2</sup>, Jozsef Vitrai<sup>1</sup> and Szimonetta Lohner<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary, <sup>2</sup>Department of Public Health Medicine, Medical School, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary, <sup>3</sup>Cochrane Hungary, Medical School, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

**Background:** Maternal health service uptake remains an important predictor of maternal outcomes including maternal mortality. This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to summarize the available evidence on the uptake of maternal health care services in developing countries and to assess the impact of place of residence, education status, and wealth index on the uptake of these services.

**Methods:** We examined the databases MEDLINE, Web of Science, Global Index Medicus, and Scopus until June 14, 2022. Cross-sectional studies done between 2015 and 2022 were considered. Mothers of reproductive age and all states of health were included in the study. Independently, two authors determined the eligibility of studies, extracted data, evaluated the risk of bias, and ranked the evidence's degree of certainty. To combine the data, we performed a random-effects meta-analysis. The PROSPERO registration ID is CRD42022304094.

**Results:** We included 51 studies. Mothers living in urban areas were three times more likely to receive antenatal care (OR 2.95; 95% CI 2.23 to 3.89; 15 studies; 340,390 participants) than rural mothers. Compared with no education, those with primary education were twice as likely to utilize antenatal care (OR 2.36; 95% CI 1.80 to 3.09; 9 studies; 154,398 participants) and those with secondary and higher education were six and fourteen times more likely to utilize antenatal care, respectively. Mothers in the second wealth index were twice as likely as mothers in the lowest wealth index to utilize antenatal care (OR 1.62; 95% CI 1.36 to 1.91; 10 studies; 224,530 participants) and antenatal care utilization increased further among mothers in the higher wealth index. We observed similar relative inequalities in skilled delivery care and postnatal care utilization based on the pace of residence, education, and wealth index.

**Conclusion:** In developing countries, the problem of inequity in utilizing maternal health care services persists and needs considerable attention.

#### KEYWORDS

inequity, maternal health care services, developing countries, systematic review, meta-analysis, low-or middle-income countries

# Introduction

Health inequality refers to a measurable aspect of difference in health that can be observed across individuals or social groups (1). These differences might exist in health conditions or might be related to access to health prevention, therapy, or rehabilitation (2). The term 'health inequity' involves the moral social perception of existing health inequalities and refers to inequalities that are considered unjust by society or that stem from some kind of injustice, mainly affecting groups with less wealth, prestige, and power (3, 4).

Maternal mortality, defined as death during pregnancy or within 42 days after childbirth, is an important indicator of socioeconomic inequalities, as it is influenced by the availability of health care and obstetric care (5). Antenatal care contacts and births attended by skilled health professionals, early routine postnatal care, and timely management and treatment of complications are important aspects of reducing preventable maternal mortality (6, 7).

As part of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the member states of the United Nations expressed their commitment to reducing maternal mortality to less than 70 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births by 2030 (8). Based on recent data, we are far from reaching these goals, as since 2016 maternal mortality has been reported to decrease in only a part of the world, including Central and South Asia, Australia, and New Zealand, while in Sub-Saharan Africa, Oceania, East and Southeast Asia, and north Africa stagnation in maternal mortality is observed (9). In the same period, maternal mortality increased in Europe, North America, Latin America, and the Caribbean (9). Infectious diseases, adolescent pregnancies, cesarean section, availability of health workforce, coverage of births by health facilities and hospitals, and inequalities in service coverage might play the most important role in maternal mortality (10). Underutilization of maternal and child health care services can put women and their offspring at risk of dying (11).

Worldwide, governments have started to place increasing emphasis on addressing inequities in maternal and child health services and these efforts improved relative equity of the coverage of reproductive and maternal health services across countries over the last decades (12). However, among low and middle-income countries there are still differences in the extent to which equity is reached, and inequity in coverage of health services persists in some of the countries more than in others (13). For the current 2024 fiscal year, low-income economies are defined as those with a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita, calculated using the World Bank Atlas method, of \$1,135 or less in 2022; lower middle-income economies are those with a GNI per capita between \$1,136 and \$4,465; upper middle-income economies are those with a GNI per capita between \$4,466 and \$13,845; high-income economies are those with a GNI per capita of \$13,846 or more. And low-or middle-income countries are referred to as developing countries (14, 15).

Even across different regions of a country, significant differences might be present in the utilization of maternal health services (16). The most important factors indicated in studies to have an important impact on the utilization of maternal health services were education, region of residence, maternal age, and distance to health facilities (17). For example, if a woman lives in an impoverished rural area, like Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, where the number of available skilled health professionals is limited, the probability of not receiving sufficient healthcare is extremely high. In high- and upper-middle-income countries more than 90% of all births are attended by a trained midwife, doctor, or nurse. In contrast, in low-income and lower-middle-income countries less than half of all births are assisted by such skilled health personnel (18). According to World Health Organization (WHO), childbearing or reproductive age for women is from 15 to 49 years (19).

A previous systematic review carried out on equity in maternal health care service utilization in developing countries identified 36 studies published between 2005 and 2015, out of which 33 reported severe inequities in maternal health care utilization (20). This systematic review included only studies published in English, and maternal health care services were limited to antenatal care. Data were summarized narratively but not quantitatively. Besides, new studies have been published since then, which might show a more up-todate picture.

For the present systematic review and meta-analysis, maternal health care services considered based on the literature (21) are antenatal care, skilled delivery care, and postnatal care, while inequity for the services is assessed based on three variables including residence, wealth index, and educational status.

This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to summarize available evidence related to the uptake of maternal healthcare services in developing countries in the period of 2015 to 2022 and to assess differences across groups with different places of residence, education status, and wealth index.

# **Methods**

The methodology and the results are reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and MetaAnalyses (PRISMA) reporting guideline (22). This study is registered on PROSPERO with the registration ID: CRD42022304094.

#### Searches

For this systematic review and meta-analysis, we searched the following electronic databases until 14th June 2022 without restrictions to the language of publications: Ovid MEDLINE (09/06/2022), Web of Science (comprising Science Citation Index and Emerging Citation Index) (14/06/2022), Global Index Medicus comprising African Index Medicus (AIM), Index Medicus for the Eastern Mediterranean Region (IMEMR), Index Medicus for the South-east Asia Region (IMSEAR), Latin America and the Caribbean Literature on Health Science (LILACS) and Western Pacific Region Index Medicus (WPRO) (16/06/2022) and Scopus (14/06/2022). Details of our search strategies are available in the Supplementary material.

We used a snowball search method to identify other potentially eligible studies or supplementary publications by searching the reference lists of included studies. All 51 studies included were published in English.

### Study inclusion and exclusion criteria

We included cross-sectional (observational) studies investigating maternal health care services (including antenatal care, skilled

delivery care, and postnatal care) utilization either separately or all services together from 2015 to 2022 in developing countries. The participants of the studies were mothers of reproductive age (15–49 years) (19) with all health statuses, residing in and having utilized maternal health care services in developing (low and middle-income) countries. Health status refers to medical conditions (both physical and mental health), claims experience, receipt of health care, medical history, genetic information, evidence of insurability, and disability (23).

A country's development status was determined using the World Bank Classifications of countries (14).

Using Covidence<sup>TM</sup> software, two review authors (GA and EM) separately screened the titles and abstracts of each retrieved record. In a subsequent step, all possibly relevant full texts were evaluated for eligibility. Any differences of opinion were settled by consensus or by consulting a third author (SL).

### Potential effect modifiers and reasons for heterogeneity

We assessed methodological heterogeneity through the assessment of risk of bias, and clinical heterogeneity through the assessment of similarities and differences between studies in terms of types of participants and outcomes. We considered the size and direction of the effect and used a standard  $\chi^2$  test with a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.1$  and the  $I^2$  statistic, which quantifies inconsistency across studies, to assess the effect of heterogeneity on the metaanalysis. In almost all socioeconomic sub-groups we observed high heterogeneity among studies.

We used funnel plots to assess reporting bias and investigate small-study effects when at least ten studies were included in a metaanalysis.

#### Study quality assessment

Each included study's risk of bias was evaluated separately by two review authors (GA and EM), and any discrepancies were settled by consensus. The risk of bias was evaluated with the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist for analytical cross-sectional studies (24). Based on the checklist, studies were rated on an 8-point scale (Table 1). Those studies achieving a score exceeding half of the total points were eligible for inclusion in the systematic review and meta-analysis.

### Data extraction strategy

We retrieved information on study methods, participants, maternal health care services, outcomes, funding sources, and potential conflict of interest statements from full-text publications. One reviewer (GA or EM) extracted the data, while a second reviewer (GA or EM) verified its accuracy, consistency, and completeness.

The outcome of interest for this systematic review was inequity in utilization or uptake of maternal health care services (antenatal care, skilled delivery care, and postnatal care), reported as frequency or percentage by mothers' residence, educational status, and wealth index.

### Data synthesis and presentation

We conducted a metaanalysis for every outcome for which we judged the participants and outcomes to be similar enough to provide meaningful results. We conducted meta-analyses for the following three comparisons: Antenatal care utilization versus non-utilization, skilled delivery care utilization versus non-utilization, and post-natal care utilization versus non-utilization. To assess inequity, we investigated the following three factors in association with maternal health care utilization: place of residence (urban and rural), educational status (no education, primary, secondary, and higher), and wealth index (lowest, second, middle, fourth and highest).

We presented the results as odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals because our data were dichotomous. We did statistical analyses using RevMan (version 5.4.1). As we expected differences between studies like differences in sample size, we decided to combine the data using a randomeffects model. We used Mantel–Haenszel weighting because the outcomes are dichotomous.

Results of eligible studies that do not provide data in an appropriate format for meta-analysis are summarized in a narrative format. The result is presented using PRISMA 2020 checklist (Supplementary material).

# Results

We retrieved 2,109 studies through database searching. We removed duplicates and screened 2,045 studies based on their titles and abstracts. After removing irrelevant studies, we assessed 221 full-text studies for eligibility to be included in this systematic review. Finally, 51 studies met our inclusion criteria. Of these, we were able to include 34 studies in the quantitative syntheses (meta-analysis) (Figure 1).

All studies were conducted in low-income and lower-middleincome countries. The age of the participants in the included studies ranged from 15–49 years. The types of maternal health care services were antenatal care in 14 studies, skilled delivery care in 14 studies, postnatal care in 3 studies, and in another 20 studies, the services were at least two of maternal health care services mentioned above (Table 2).

The number of women investigated in the included studies ranged from 200 (45) to 699,686 (61). Funnel plots were used to assess reporting bias and investigate small-study effects. The findings from funnel plots indicated symmetrical funnel plots which in turn shows the absences of publication bias (Supplementary material).

# Results of the meta-analyses

### Antenatal care utilization

#### Utilization of antenatal care by place of residence

For the place of residence, utilization of antenatal care favors mothers living in urban places than those living in rural places. So, when compared to mothers living in rural areas, mothers living in urban areas utilize antenatal care three times more likely (OR 2.95; 95% CI 2.23, to 3.89; 15 studies; 340,390 participants; p<0.00001) (Figure 2).

Studies				(J	BI) critical	appraisa	l questior	IS		
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Score	Overall appraisal
El-Khatib 2020	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Fagbamigbe 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν	U	Y	Y	6	Include
Dankwah 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Ν	Y	Y	6	Include
Aziz 2022	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Ameyaw 2020	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Ahinkorah 2020	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Bintabara 2021	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Fagbamigbe 2022	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Ν	Y	Y	Y	6	Include
Ekholuenetale 2021	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Ν	Y	Y	Y	6	Include
Bobo 2017	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	6	Include
Daka 2020	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Ν	Y	Y	Y	6	Include
Fan 2021	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Ν	Y	Y	6	Include
Woldeamanuel 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	U	Y	Y	6	Include
Tesfaye 2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Farraga 2018	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Khatri 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Kien 2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Krishnamoorthy 2020	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Ν	Y	Y	6	Include
Mumtaz 2019	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Dinke 2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Kim 2016	Y	Y	Ν	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Include
Karanja 2018	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Kumar 2019	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Kpodotsi 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Ν	Y	Y	6	Include
Ozumba 2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Rahman 2021	Y	Ν	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Include
Pervin 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Zegeye 2022	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	U	Y	Y	6	Include
Mwase 2018	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Include
Rahman 2017	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Negeri 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Rosário 2019	Y	Y	Ν	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Include
Shibre 2020	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	U	Y	Y	6	Include
Yaya 2021	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Lukwa 2022	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Anarwat 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Ν	Y	Y	6	Include
Nonyane 2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	7	Include
Ghosh 2020	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Gudu 2017	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Y	U	Y	Y	6	Include
Hodge 2016	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	6	Include
Mehata 2017	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Huda 2018	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	6	Include
Keats 2018	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	6	Include

#### TABLE 1 Study quality assessment using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist for analytical cross-sectional studies.

(Continued)

#### TABLE 1 (Continued)

Studies				(J	BI) critica	l appraisa	l questior	าร		
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Score	Overall appraisal
Laksono 2020	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	Include
Målqvist 2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	7	Include
Perera 2021	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	Include
Nwosu 2019	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	6	Include
Okoli 2020	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7	Include
Myint 2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν	U	Y	Y	6	Include
Wang 2021	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	6	Include
Dimbuene 2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7	Include

\*Y, yes; N, no; U, unclear; Q, question. The score is calculated by summing up Y in each row.



# Utilization of antenatal care by the educational status of mothers

For the utilization of antenatal care in relation to the educational status of the mothers, we found that compared to no education, those with primary education utilize antenatal care two times more likely (OR 2.36; 95% CI 1.80 to 3.09; 9 studies; 154,398 participants p < 0.00001). Similarly, compared to mothers with no education, those with secondary and higher education utilized antenatal care six times (OR 6.00; 95% CI

4.13 to 8.73; 9 studies, 154,398 participants, p < 0.00001) and fourteen times (OR 14.27; 95% CI 7.93, 25.67; 9 studies, 154,398 participants, p < 0.00001) more likely, respectively, p < 0.00001 (Figure 3).

#### Utilization of antenatal care by wealth index

When we investigated the utilization of antenatal care by wealth index of mothers, we found that compared to mothers with the lowest wealth index, those with the second wealth index utilize antenatal care

#### TABLE 2 Key characteristics of included studies.

Study ID	Reference	Country	Economic level of the country* (14)	Sample size	Age group in years	Type of maternal health care service
El-Khatib 2020	(25)	Nigeria	Lower-middle income	52,654	15-49	Antenatal care
Fagbamigbe 2021	(26)	Nigeria	Lower-middle income	21,785	15-49	Antenatal care
Dankwah 2021	(27)	Ghana	Lower-middle income	4,292	15-49	Postnatal care
Aziz 2022	(28)	Bangladesh	Lower-middle income	4,948	15-49	Postnatal care
Ameyaw 2020	(29)	Mali	Low income	6,502	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Ameyaw 2020	(29)	Niger	Low income	7,432	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Ameyaw 2020	(29)	Sierra Leone	Low income	6,461	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Ahinkorah 2020	(30)	Guinea	Low income	5,046	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Bintabara 2021	(31)	Tanzania	Lower-middle-income	7,079	15-49	Antenatal care
Fagbamigbe 2022	(32)	Nigeria	Lower-middle income	68,679	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Ekholuenetale 2021	(33)	Ghana	Lower-middle income	1,404	15-49	Antenatal care
Bobo 2017 Daka 2020 Fan 2021 Woldeamanuel 2021 Tesfaye 2017	(16, 34–37)	Ethiopia	Low income	3,129	15-49	Antenatal care, Skilled delivery care, and postnatal care
Farraga 2018	(38)	Egypt	Lower-middle income	755	15-49	Antenatal care
Khatri 2021	(39)	Nepal	Lower-middle-income	1978	15-49	Antenatal care, Skilled delivery care, and postnatal care
Kien 2019	(40)	Vietnam	Lower-middle-income	1,475	15-49	Antenatal Care
Krishnamoorthy 2020	(41)	India	Lower-middle-income	190,797	15-49	Antenatal care, Skilled delivery care, and postnatal care
Mumtaz 2019	(42)	Afghanistan	Low income	19,642	15-49	Antenatal care and Skilled delivery care
Dinke 2017	(43)	Ethiopia	Low income	588	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Kim 2016	(44)	Afghanistan	Low income	18,255	15-49	Antenatal care and Skilled delivery care
Karanja 2018	(45)	Kenya	Lower-middle-income	200	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Kumar 2019	(46)	India	Lower-middle-income	190,898	15-49	Antenatal care
Kpodotsi 2021	(47)	Ghana	Lower-middle income	1,305	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Ozumba 2019	(48)	Nigeria	Lower-middle income	1,600	15-49	Antenatal care
Rahman 2021	(49)	Nepal	Lower-middle-income	3,962	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Rahman 2021	(49)	Pakistan	Lower-middle income	8,189	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Rahman 2021	(49)	Bangladesh	Lower-middle income	4,278	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Pervin 2021	(50)	Bangladesh	Lower-middle income	3,293	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Zegeye 2022	(51)	Guinea	Low income	2,779	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Mwase 2018	(52)	Burkina Faso	Low income	6,601 for ANC, 6535 for SDC, and 6,526 for PNC1	15-49	Antenatal care, Skilled delivery care, and postnatal care 1
Rahman 2017	(53)	Bangladesh	Lower-middle income	1,435	15-49	Antenatal care
Negeri 2021	(54)	Ethiopia	Low income	1,200	15-49	Antenatal care
Rosário 2019	(55)	Angola	Lower-middle income	10,084	15-49	Antenatal care
Shibre 2020	(56)	Angola	Lower-middle income	8,492	15-49	Antenatal care
Yaya 2021	(57)	Cameroon	Lower-middle-income	7,881	15-49	Skilled delivery care
Lukwa 2022	(58)	Zimbabwe	Low income		15-49	Antenatal care, Skilled delivery care, and postnatal care

(Continued)

#### TABLE 2 (Continued)

Study ID	Reference	Country	Economic level of the country* (14)	Sample size	Age group in years	Type of maternal health care service
Anarwat 2021	(59)	Ghana	Lower-middle income	10,627	15-49	Prenatal care and skilled delivery care
Nonyane 2015	(60)	Nepal	Lower-middle income	630	15-49	Antenatal and skilled delivery care
Ghosh 2020	(61)	India	Lower-middle income	699,686	15-49	Antenatal and skilled delivery care
Gudu 2017	(62)	Ghana	Lower-middle income	422	15-49	Skilled service delivery
Hodge 2016	(63)	Philippines	Lower-middle income	7,121	15-49	Skilled service delivery
Mehata 2017	(64)	Nepal	Lower-middle income	For ANC (13,211) and institutional delivery (14,969)	15-49	Antenatal care and skilled delivery care
Huda 2018	(65)	Nepal, Pakistan, and Bangladesh	Lower-middle income		15-49	Skilled delivery care
Keats 2018	(66)	Kenya	Lower-middle-income	31, 380	15-49	Antenatal care and skilled delivery care
Laksono 2020	(67)	Indonesia	Lower-middle-income	15,351	15-49	Antenatal care
Målqvist 2017	(68)	Nepal	Lower-middle income	4,745, 4,066, 4,079 and 2086	15-49	Antenatal care and skilled delivery care
Perera 2021	(69)	Sri Lanka	Lower-middle income	8,313	15-49	Postnatal care
Nwosu 2019	(70)	Nigeria	Lower-middle income	18,559	15-49	Antenatal care
Okoli 2020	(71)	Nigeria	Lower-middle income		15-49	Antenatal care and skill delivery care
Myint 2018	(72)	Myanmar	Lower-middle income	762	15-49	Antenatal care and skill delivery care
Wang 2021	(73)	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Low income	8,560	15–49	Antenatal care and skill delivery care
Dimbuene 2018	(74)	Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria and Zimbabwe	Low income and lower- middle income		15-49	Antenatal care and skill delivery care

\*Economic classification of countries according to World Bank Classification 2022.

two times more likely (OR 1.62; 95% CI 1.36 to 1.91; 10 studies; 224,530 participants; p < 0.00001). Those in middle, fourth and highest wealth index utilize antenatal care two times (OR 2.41; 95% CI 1.86 to 3.12; 10 studies 211,910 participants; p < 0.00001), four times (OR 3.73; 95% CI 2.63, 5.29; 10 studies 201,060 participants; p < 0.00001) and seven times (OR 6.72; 95% CI 4.26, 10.59; 10 studies 191,207 participants; p < 0.00001) more likely as compared to mothers in lowest wealth index, respectively (Figure 4).

# Skilled delivery care utilization

# Utilization of skilled delivery care by place of residence

When we investigated the uptake of skilled delivery care by place of residence, the results indicated that mothers living in urban areas

utilize skilled delivery care six times more likely than those mothers living in rural areas (OR 6.33; 95% CI 4.95 to 8.09; 16 studies, 166,085 participants; p < 0.00001) (Figure 5).

# Utilization of skilled delivery care by the educational status of mothers

As to the utilization of skilled delivery care by the educational status of mothers, we found that compared to those with no education, those with primary education utilized skilled delivery care three times more likely (OR 2.49; 95% CI 1.89 to 3.29; 9 studies; 53,182 participants, p < 0.00001). Those with secondary and higher education utilized skilled delivery care seven times (OR 6.59; 95% CI 4.24 to 10.26; 9 studies, 53,726 participants, p < 0.00001) and twenty-seven times (OR = 26.53; 95% CI = 16.44, 42.83; 9 studies; 45,880 participants, p < 0.00001) more likely than mothers with no education, respectively (Figure 6).

	_	Urban	_	Rural	Odds Ratio	_		
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Random effects model	OR	95%-Cl	Weight
Bintabara 2021	1351	2123	2238	4956	-	2.13	[1.91; 2.36]	7.0%
Daka 2020	182	213	1426	2916		6.13	[4.16; 9.04]	6.2%
<b>Ekholuenetale 2021</b>	239	551	312	853		1.33	[1.07; 1.65]	6.8%
El-Khatib 2020	14492	18350	13586	34304	+	5.73	[5.49; 5.97]	7.1%
Fagbamigbe 2021	6590	8659	6051	13126	+	3.72	[3.51; 3.95]	7.0%
Farraga 2018	282	307	358	448		2.84	[1.77; 4.54]	5.9%
Khatri 2021	802	1062	599	916	-	1.63	[1.34; 1.98]	6.8%
Kim 2016	2946	3450	8439	14805	+	4.41	[3.99; 4.87]	7.0%
Kumar 2019	13074	47833	21792	143065	+	2.09	[2.04; 2.15]	7.1%
Mumtaz 2019	1444	4566	2050	15076	+	2.94	[2.72; 3.18]	7.0%
Negeri 2021	173	193	741	1007	<u> </u>	3.11	[1.91; 5.04]	5.8%
Ozumba 2019	779	800	716	800	<u>+</u>	4.35	[2.67; 7.10]	5.8%
Rahman 2017	306	663	415	772		0.74	[0.60; 0.91]	6.8%
Rosario 2019	8347	8509	1411	1575		5.99	[4.79; 7.49]	6.8%
Shibre 2020	4017	5446	1200	3046	+	4.32	[3.93; 4.75]	7.0%
Antenatal care		102725		237665	-	2.95	[2.23; 3.89]	100.0%
Prediction interval							[0.89; 9.70]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99$	$.4\%, \tau^2 = 0$	).284, p =	0			1		
5,				0	.1 1 1	0		
				<	Non-utilization Utilization >			
FIGURE 2								
Forest plot showing antenat	tal care utiliz	zation by p	lace of resi	dence in de	eveloping countries, 2015 to 2022.			

#### Utilization of skilled delivery care by wealth index

Concerning utilization of skilled delivery care by wealth index of mothers, we found that compared to mothers with the lowest wealth index, those with the second wealth index utilize skilled delivery care two times more likely (OR 1.89; 95% CI 1.66 to 2.15; 14 studies; 151,578 participants; p < 0.00001). Those mothers in the middle, fourth, and highest wealth index utilized skilled delivery care three times.

(OR 2.96; 95% CI 2.25 to 3.89; 14 studies; 144,116 participants; p < 0.00001), seven times (OR 6.51; 95% CI 4.59 to 9.24; 14 studies; 137,236; p < 0.00001) and eighteen times (OR 17.80; 95% CI 11.36 to 27.89; 14 studies; 129,419; p < 0.00001) are more likely as compared to mothers in lowest wealth index, respectively (Figure 7).

### Postnatal care utilization

#### Utilization of postnatal care by place of residence

As to utilization of postnatal care by place of residence, we found that urban mothers are three times more likely to utilize postnatal care than rural mothers (OR 2.74; 95% CI 1.98 to 3.78; 4 studies; 14,347; p < 0.00001) (Figure 8).

# Utilization of postnatal care by educational status of mothers

Concerning the utilization of postnatal care by the educational status of mothers, we found that compared to no education, those with primary education utilize postnatal care two times more likely (OR 1.99; 95% CI 0.78 to 5.04; 2 studies; 4,642 participants;

p = 0.15). Those with secondary education utilize postnatal care five times (OR 5.27; 95% CI 1.78 to 15.60; 2 studies; 4,828 participants; p = 0.003) and those with higher education ten times (OR 9.66; 95% CI 7.39 to 12.63, 2 studies; 3,289 participants; p < 0.00001) more likely than mothers with no education (Figure 9).

#### Utilization of postnatal care by wealth index

For the utilization of postnatal care by wealth index of mothers, we found that compared to mothers with the lowest wealth index, those with second wealth index utilize postnatal care two times more likely (OR 1.46; 95% CI 1.10, 1.96; 4 studies; 96,432 participants; p = 0.01). In the same way, compared to mothers in lowest wealth index, those in middle, fourth and highest wealth index utilize postnatal care two times (OR 2.01; 95% CI 1.39, 2.91; 4 studies; 90,962 participants; p = 0.0002), three times (OR 2.62; 95% CI 1.55, 4.44; 4 studies; 85,894 participants; p = 0.0003) and five times (OR 5.06; 95% CI 2.45, 10.45; 4 studies; 81,335 participants; p < 0.0001) more likely, respectively (Figure 10).

# Additional results from studies not included in meta-analyses

A total of 17 studies were not included in the meta-analysis, but their findings were summarized for the qualitative synthesis only. In these studies, the outcomes were not reported as frequencies or percentages. However, the result agrees with the result from a meta-analysis.

Pr	rimary edu	ucation	No ed	ucation	Odds Ratio			
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Random effects model	OR	95%-CI	Weight
Bintabara 2021	439	879	552	1350	+	1.44	[1.22: 1.71]	12.3%
Daka 2020	577	924	875	2034	<b></b>	2.20	[1.88: 2.58]	12.4%
El-Khatib 2020	5816	9576	7682	25328	+	3.55	[3 38 3 73]	12.9%
Fagbamigbe 2021	2101	3272	3350	9684		3.39	[3.12: 3.69]	12.8%
Farraga 2018	109	166	25	55		2.29	[1.23; 4.27]	7.7%
Kumar 2019	3401	26712	4103	55165	+	1.82	[1.73: 1.91]	12.9%
Mumtaz 2019	434	1596	2390	16288	+	2.17	[1.93; 2.45]	12.7%
Negeri 2021	406	499	344	523		2.27	[1.70: 3.03]	11.3%
Rahman 2017	47	260	5	87		3.62	[1.39; 9.42]	4.9%
							. , ,	
Antenatal care		43884		110514		2.36	[1.80; 3.09]	100.0%
Prediction interv	al						[0.90; 6.17]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 9$	$98.3\%, \tau^2 =$	0.146, p	< 0.0001	[				
				0.0	01 0.1 1 10	100		
				<	Non-utilization Utilization	>		
Secon	adami adu	action	No od	instian	Odde Datia			
Secor	ndary edu	cation	No edu	ucation	Odds Ratio		<b>05%</b>	Weight
Secor Study	ndary edu Events	cation Total	No edu Events	ucation Total	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR	<mark>95%-</mark> C	l Weight
Secon Study Bintabara 2021	ndary edu Events 2371	cation Total 3701	No edu Events	ucation Total 1350	Odds Ratio Random effects model	<b>OR</b> 2.58	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93	<b>Weight</b>
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020	ndary edu Events 2371 103	Cation Total 3701 119	No edu Events 552 875	<b>Ication</b> Total 1350 2034	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54	<b>Weight</b> ] 12.7% ] 10.2%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153	<b>cation</b> <b>Total</b> 3701 119 14053	No edu Events 552 875 7682	<b>Ication</b> <b>Total</b> 1350 2034 25328	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28	I Weight ] 12.7% ] 10.2% ] 12.9%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440	cation Total 3701 119 14053 6921	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350	<b>Ication</b> <b>Total</b> 1350 2034 25328 9684	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278	<b>Cation</b> <b>Total</b> 3701 119 14053 6921 300	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25	1350 2034 25328 9684 55	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117	<b>Cation</b> <b>Total</b> 3701 119 14053 6921 300 88871	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103	<b>Total</b> 1350 2034 25328 9684 55 55165	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500	<b>Cation</b> <b>Total</b> 3701 119 14053 6921 300 88871 1432	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390	Justication           Total           1350           2034           25328           9684           55           55165           16288	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51]	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108	3701           119           14053           6921           300           88871           1432           119	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344	Justication           Total           1350           2034           25328           9684           55           55165           16288           523	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51 [2.68; 9.75	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.3%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021 Rahman 2017	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108 406	Cation           Total           3701           119           14053           6921           300           88871           1432           119           763	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344 5	Justical           Total           1350           2034           25328           9684           55           55165           16288           523           87	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11 18.65	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51 [2.68; 9.75 [7.48; 46.52	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.8%         9.3%         7.3%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021 Rahman 2017	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108 406	<b>Cation</b> <b>Total</b> 3701 119 14053 6921 300 88871 1432 119 763	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344 5	Justical           Total           1350           2034           25328           9684           55           55165           16288           523           87           110514	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11 18.65	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93] [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51 [2.68; 9.75] [7.48; 46.52]	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         10.0%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021 Rahman 2017 Antenatal care Prediction interval	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108 406	Cation           Total           3701           119           14053           6921           300           88871           1432           119           763           116279	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344 5	Justical           Total           1350           2034           25328           9684           55           55165           16288           523           87           110514	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11 18.65 <b>6.00</b>	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51 [2.68; 9.75 [7.48; 46.52 <b>[4.13; 8.73</b>	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         10.0%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021 Rahman 2017 Antenatal care Prediction interval	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108 406 1 2% 2 <sup>2</sup> = 0	cation Total 3701 119 14053 6921 300 88871 1432 119 763 116279	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344 5	ucation Total 1350 2034 25328 9684 55 55165 16288 523 87 110514	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11 18.65 <b>6.00</b>	<b>95%-C</b> [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51 [2.68; 9.75 [7.48; 46.52 <b>[4.13; 8.73</b> <b>[1.58; 22.83</b>	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.3%         7.3%         100.0%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021 Rahman 2017 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108 406 1 .3%, $\tau^2 = 0$ .	cation           Total           3701           119           14053           6921           300           88871           1432           119           763           116279           283, p <	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344 5	Lication Total 1350 2034 25328 9684 55 55165 16288 523 87 110514	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11 18.65 6.00	95%-C [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51 [2.68; 9.75 [7.48; 46.52 [4.13; 8.73 [1.58; 22.83	I Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.8%         9.3%         7.3%         100.0%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021 Rahman 2017 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108 406 1 .3%, $\tau^2 = 0$ .	Cation           Total           3701           119           14053           6921           300           88871           1432           119           763           116279           283, p <	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344 5 0.0001	ucation Total 1350 2034 25328 9684 55 55165 16288 523 87 110514	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11 18.65 6.00	95%-C [2.27; 2.93 [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28 [6.47; 7.46 [7.64; 30.10 [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51 [2.68; 9.75 [7.48; 46.52 [4.13; 8.73 [1.58; 22.83	I       Weight         12.7%         10.2%         12.9%         12.9%         9.0%         12.9%         9.3%         7.3%         100.0%
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021 Rahman 2017 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108 406 1 .3%, $\tau^2 = 0$ .	cation Total 3701 119 14053 6921 300 88871 1432 119 763 116279 283, p <	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344 5 0.0001	ucation Total 1350 2034 25328 9684 55 55165 16288 523 87 110514 □ 0.0 < N	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11 18.65 6.00	95%-C [2.27; 2.93] [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28] [6.47; 7.46] [7.64; 30.10] [3.51; 3.77] [2.78; 3.51] [2.68; 9.75] [7.48; 46.52] [4.13; 8.73] [1.58; 22.83]	<ul> <li>I Weight</li> <li>12.7%</li> <li>10.2%</li> <li>12.9%</li> <li>12.9%</li> <li>9.0%</li> <li>12.9%</li> <li>12.8%</li> <li>9.3%</li> <li>7.3%</li> <li>100.0%</li> </ul>
Secon Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Fagbamigbe 2021 Farraga 2018 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Negeri 2021 Rahman 2017 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99	ndary edu Events 2371 103 11153 5440 278 20117 500 108 406 1 .3%, $\tau^2 = 0$ .	Cation           Total           3701           119           14053           6921           300           88871           1432           119           763           116279           283, p <	No edu Events 552 875 7682 3350 25 4103 2390 344 5 0.0001	ucation Total 1350 2034 25328 9684 55 55165 16288 523 87 110514 □ 0.0 < N	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 2.58 8.53 8.83 6.95 15.16 3.64 3.12 5.11 18.65 6.00	95%-C [2.27; 2.93] [5.00; 14.54 [8.41; 9.28] [6.47; 7.46] [7.64; 30.10] [3.51; 3.77 [2.78; 3.51] [2.68; 9.75] [7.48; 46.52] [4.13; 8.73] [1.58; 22.83]	<ul> <li>I Weight</li> <li>12.7%</li> <li>10.2%</li> <li>12.9%</li> <li>12.9%</li> <li>9.0%</li> <li>12.9%</li> <li>12.8%</li> <li>9.3%</li> <li>7.3%</li> <li>100.0%</li> </ul>

	Higner eau	ication	No eau	Ication	Odds Ratio			
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Random effects model	OR	95%-CI	Weight
Bintabara 2021	977	1149	552	1350	+	8.21	[6.76: 9.98]	12.5%
Daka 2020	228	234	875	2034		50.33	[22.27; 113.75]	10.2%
El-Khatib 2020	3451	3697	7682	25328	+	32.22	[28.24; 36.77]	12.5%
Fagbamigbe 202	1 1759	1908	3350	9684	+	22.32	[18.79; 26.52]	12.5%
Farraga 2018	228	234	25	55		45.60	[17.30; 120.16]	9.4%
Kumar 2019	7245	20150	4103	55165	•	6.99	[6.69; 7.29]	12.6%
Mumtaz 2019	171	326	2390	16288		6.42	[5.14; 8.01]	12.4%
Negeri 2021	56	59	344	523		9.71	[ 3.00; 31.47]	8.4%
Rahman 2017	73	325	5	87		4.75	[ 1.86; 12.16]	9.5%
Antenatal care		28082		110514		14.27	[ 7.93; 25.67]	100.0%
Prediction inter	val					•	[ 1.72; 118.46]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 =$	98.8%, $\tau^2 =$	0.711, p	< 0.0001					
				0.	01 0.1 1 10 10	0		
				<	Non-utilization Utilization >			

Forest plot showing antenatal care utilization by educational status of mothers in developing countries, 2015 to 2022.

Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Random effects model	OR	95%-CI V	Veight
Bintabara 2021	614	1422	599	1525	+	1.17	[1.01; 1.36]	10.8%
Daka 2020	317	736	252	627		1.13	[0.91: 1.40]	9.9%
El-Khatib 2020	4487	11860	2522	12475		2.40	[2.27: 2.54]	11.6%
Kien 2019	149	295	74	295		3.05	[2.15: 4.32]	7.9%
Krishnamoorthy 2020	19713	43710	11969	46753		2.39	[2.32: 2.46]	11.7%
Kumar 2019	5531	43739	3126	46782		2.02	[1.93; 2.12]	11.6%
Mumtaz 2019	453	3966	409	3914		1.11	[0.96; 1.27]	10.9%
Mwase 2018	545	1250	543	1306	jeni (	1.09	[0.93; 1.27]	10.7%
Rahman 2017	23	181	16	151		1.23	[0.62; 2.42]	4.1%
Shibre 2020	838	1869	570	1674	+	1.57	[1.37; 1.80]	10.9%
Antenatal care Prediction interval		109028		115502		1.62	[1.36; 1.91] 10 [0.87; 2.99]	00.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97.5^{\circ}$	$\%, \tau^2 = 0.$	064, <i>p</i> < (	0.0001	0		100		
				<	Non-utilization Vtilization >	>		
		Middle		Lowest	Odds Ratio			
Study	Events	s Total	Events	Total	Random effects model	OR	95%-CI W	/eight
Bintabara 2021	628	3 1349	599	1525		1.35	[1.16; 1.56] 1	10.5%
Daka 2020	371	1 697	252	627		1.69	[1.36; 2.11] 1	10.1%
EI-Khatib 2020	5812	2 9965	2522	12475		5.52	[5.21; 5.86] 1	0.8%
Kien 2019	167	295	74	295		3.90	[2.75; 5.53]	9.1%
Krisnnamoorthy 2020	22254	+ 38369	11969	46/53		4.01	[3.90; 4.13] 1	0.8%
Kumar 2019	/56/	38393	3126	40/82		3.43	[3.28; 3.58] 1	10.8%
Mwasa 2019	5/9	9 4020 1 1070	409	3914		1.44	[1.20, 1.05] 1	0.3%
WW058 2010 Dahman 2017	201	1 12/8	043 16	1500		1.00	[0.91, 1.24] 1 [0.81· 2.00]	6.6%
Shibro 2020	116	+ ZZZ	570	1674		1.00	[0.01, 2.00]	0.0%
Shible 2020	110.	5 1020	570	1074		3.44	[3.00, 3.90]	10.370
Antenatal care		96408		115502	-	2.41		0.0%
Hotorogonoity: $l^2 = 00.0$	$a^2 = 0$	162 0 4	0.0001	1			[0.01, 0.00]	
	-	- a untila		0.0 <	Non-utilization Vtilization >	100		
Study	F Events	<sup>F</sup> ourth Total E	L. Events	0.0 < ∣ owest Total	Non-utilization Vtilization > Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 OR	95%-CI	Weight
Study Bintabara 2021	F Events 798	Fourth Total E	L svents	0.0 <   owest Total	Odds Ratio Random effects model	0R 1.97	<b>95%-CI</b>	Weight 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020	F Events 798 362	Fourth Total E 1424 647	L svents 599 252	0.0 <   owest Total 1525 627	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89	<b>95%-Cl</b> [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36]	Weight 10.3% 10.0%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020	F Events 798 362 7019	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305	599 252 2522	0.0 <   owest Total 1525 627 12475	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12	<b>95%-Cl</b> [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36] [11.36; 12.92]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019	F Events 798 362 7019 202	<b>Total E</b> 1424 647 9305 295	599 252 2522 74	0.0 <1 owest Total 1525 627 12475 295	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49	<b>95%-Cl</b> [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36] [11.36; 12.92] [ 4.53; 9.30]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 9.4%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176	<b>Fourth</b> <b>Total E</b> 1424 647 9305 295 33198	599 252 2522 74 11969	0.0 <1 owest Total 1525 627 12475 295 46753 46753	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85	<b>95%-Cl</b> [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36] [ 1.36; 12.92] [ 4.53; 9.30] [ 5.67; 6.03]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 9.4% 10.4%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 702	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212	Li svents 599 252 2522 74 11969 3126	0.( <1 owest Total 1525 627 12475 295 46753 46753 46782	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.12	<b>95%-Cl</b> [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36] [ 1.36; 12.92] [ 4.53; 9.30] [ 5.67; 6.03] [ 4.73; 5.16]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 9.4% 10.4% 10.4%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797	<b>Fourth</b> <b>Total E</b> 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409	0.0 <ul> <li>owest</li> <li>Total</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>4020</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10	<b>95%-Cl</b> [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 9.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Debrase 2012	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 297	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543	0.0 <1 owest Total 1525 627 12475 295 46753 46782 3914 1306	Non-utilization Utilization > Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.21	<b>95%-Cl</b> [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 9.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibra 2020	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1202	Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570	0.0 <ul> <li>owest</li> <li>Total</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	00 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 .55	<b>95%-Cl</b> [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [1.65; 5.13]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 9.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 8.2%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392	Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707	599 2522 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570	0.0 <10000000000000000000000000000000000	Odds Ratio Random effects model	00 0R 1.97 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56	<b>95%-Cl</b> [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36] [ 1.36; 12.92] [ 4.53; 9.30] [ 5.67; 6.03] [ 4.73; 5.16] [ 1.84; 2.38] [ 0.97; 1.31] [ 1.65; 5.13] [ 7.30; 10.03]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 9.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 8.2% 10.2%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval	F Events 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392	Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 85558	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570	0.0 <ul> <li>000000000000000000000000000000000000</li></ul>	Non-utilization Vilization > Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b>	<b>95%-Cl</b> [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] <b>[2.63; 5.29]</b> <b>[0.98; 14.19]</b>	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 8.2% 10.2%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99.4%	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392	<b>Fourth</b> <b>Total E</b> 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 <b>85558</b> 04, <i>p</i> = 0	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1	0.0 <ul> <li>owest</li> <li>Total</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> </ul> 15502	Non-utilization Utilization > Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 3.73	95%-CI [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19]	Weight 10.3% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 99.4%	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 $, \tau^2 = 0.3$	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 85558 04, p = 0	599 252 2522 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>0.01</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	00 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 3.73	<b>95%-Cl</b> [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.3% 10.2% 8.2% 10.2%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 99.4%	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 $0, \tau^2 = 0.3$	<b>Fourth</b> <b>Total E</b> 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 <b>85558</b> 04, p = 0	L 599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1	0.0 <ul> <li>000000000000000000000000000000000000</li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 3.73 00	95%-Cl [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 8.2% 10.2%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: J <sup>2</sup> = 99.4%	Fevents 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 $, \tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events	Fourth         Total         E           1424         647         9305         295           33198         33212         4057         1346           1307         85558         04, p = 0         04, p = 0	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 1	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> <li>3</li> <li>3</li> <li>3</li> <li>4</li> <li>1</li> <li>5</li> <li>1</li> <li>6</li> <li>1</li> <li>4</li> <li>1</li> <li>5</li> <li>0</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> OR	95%-Cl [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [11.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] 4 [0.98; 14.19]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 100.0%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99.4% Study Bintabara 2021	Fevents 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949	Fourth         Total         E           1424         647         9305         295           33198         33212         4057         1346           367         1707         85558         04, ρ = 0           04, ρ = 0         0         5000000000000000000000000000000000000	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 1	0.0 <ul> <li>&lt;1</li> <li>owest</li> <li>Total</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>124753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> <li>15502</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>&lt; No</li> <li>owest</li> <li>Total</li> <li>1525</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> OR 3.58	95%-CI [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] 95%-CI [3.06; 4.18]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kisn 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: J <sup>2</sup> = 99.4% Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 $, \tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305	Fourth         Total         E           1424         647         9305         295           33198         33212         4057         1346           1340         367         1707         85558           04, ρ = 0         0         1455         1455           1346         1707         1707         1707         1707           1707         1707         1707         1707         1707         1707           1707	Syents       599       252       2522       74       11969       3126       409       543       570       1       Syents       599       252	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	00 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0	95%-Cl [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06]	Weight 10.3% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 10.2% 100.0% Weight 10.2% 9.9%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99.4% Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 $, \tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 85558 04, p = 0 ighest Total E 1359 422 9048	Events 599 252 2522 2522 3126 409 543 16 570 1 Events 599 252 2522 2522 2522	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> <li>15502</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>0.0</li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48	95%-Cl [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17]	Weight 10.3% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99.4% Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 242	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 <b>85558</b> 04, $\rho = 0$ ighest Total E 1359 422 9048 2955	599 252 2522 2522 74 11969 543 16 570 1 1 570 1	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>295</li> <li>1074</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48 13.64	95%-Cl 1 [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [9.17; 20.28]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 8.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.1% 10.2% 10.0% 10.1% 10.2% 10.2% 10.1% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 10.3% 10
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99.4% Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 El-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020	$F$ Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 242 21345	Fourth         Total         E           1424         647         9305         295           23198         33212         4057         1346           367         1707         85558         04, p = 0           04, p = 0         0         1359         422           9048         295         28767         295	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b></b>	0.0 <ul> <li>&lt;1</li> <li>owest</li> <li>Total</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> <li>15502</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>&lt; No</li> <li>owest</li> <li>Total</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48 13.64 8.36	95%-CI [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [9.17; 20.28] [8.08; 8.64]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 9.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 100.0% Weight 10.2% 9.9% 9.6% 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Muraz 2019 Muraz 2019 Muraz 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 99.4\%$ Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 $, \tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 2422 21345 9967	<b>Fourth</b> <b>Total E</b> 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 <b>85558</b> 04, <i>ρ</i> = 0 <b>ighest</b> <b>Total E</b> 1359 422 9048 295 28767 28772	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b></b>	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> <li>2</li> <li>2</li> <li>2</li> <li>2</li> <li>4</li> <li>6</li> <li>2</li> <li>3</li> <li>3</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>6</li> <li>2</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>5</li> <li>0</li> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR           1.97           1.89           12.12           6.49           5.85           4.94           2.10           1.13           2.91           8.56           3.73           00           OR           3.58           3.88           41.48           13.64           8.36           7.40	95%-Cl [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [0.98; 14.19] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [9.17; 20.28] [8.08; 8.64] [7.09; 7.73]	Weight 10.3% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 100.0% Weight 10.2% 9.9% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99.4\%$ Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 242 2136 8262 242 2125	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 85558 04, p = 0 04, p	599 252 2522 2522 2522 3126 409 543 16 570 1 <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b></b>	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> <li>15502</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>0.01<!--</td--><td>Odds Ratio Random effects model</td><td>OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48 13.64 8.366 7.40 4.43</td><td>95%-Cl [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [9.17; 20.28] [8.08; 8.64] [7.09; 7.73] [3.91; 5.01]</td><td>Weight 10.3% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 100.0% Weight 10.2% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3%</td></li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48 13.64 8.366 7.40 4.43	95%-Cl [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [9.17; 20.28] [8.08; 8.64] [7.09; 7.73] [3.91; 5.01]	Weight 10.3% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 100.0% Weight 10.2% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kuisn 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99.4% Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8875 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 242 21345 9967 1255 669	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 <b>85558</b> $04, \rho = 0$ <b>1359</b> 422 9048 295 28767 28772 3685 1421	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 195 2522 74 11969 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>1511</li> <li>1674</li> <li>15502</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>No</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>No</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>No</li> <li>0.01</li> <li></li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48 13.64 8.366 7.40 4.43 1.25	95%-CI [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36] [ 4.53; 9.30] [ 5.67; 6.03] [ 4.73; 5.16] [ 1.84; 2.38] [ 0.97; 1.31] [ 1.65; 5.13] [ 7.30; 10.03] [ 2.63; 5.29] [ 3.06; 4.18] [ 2.97; 5.06] [ 38.09; 45.17] [ 9.17; 20.28] [ 8.88; 8.64] [ 7.09; 7.73] [ 3.91; 5.01] [ 1.07; 1.45]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 9.6% 10.3% 10.2%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kuisn 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99.4% Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017	Fevents 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 2422 21345 9967 1255 669 184	Fourth         Total         E           1424         647         9305         295           33198         33212         4057         1346           367         1346         367         1707           85558         04, p = 0         0         1359           422         9048         295         28767           28767         28772         3685         1421           5142         514         514         514	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 599 2522 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 126	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> <li>15502</li> <li>0</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>&lt; No</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>&lt; No</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>&lt; No</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>&lt; No</li> <li>&lt; No<td>Odds Ratio Random effects model</td><td>OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48 13.64 8.36 7.40 4.25 4.70</td><td>95%-CI [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [38.09; 45.17] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [3.91; 5.01] [1.07; 1.45] [2.72; 8.14]</td><td>Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 100.0% 100.0% Weight 10.2% 9.9% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.2% 9.6% 10.3% 10.4% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3%</td></li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48 13.64 8.36 7.40 4.25 4.70	95%-CI [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [38.09; 45.17] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [3.06; 4.18] [2.97; 5.06] [38.09; 45.17] [3.91; 5.01] [1.07; 1.45] [2.72; 8.14]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 100.0% 100.0% Weight 10.2% 9.9% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.2% 9.6% 10.3% 10.4% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.2% 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kuisn 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 99.4% Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mwase 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8875 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 242 21345 9967 1255 8269 184 1254	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 <b>85558</b> $04, \rho = 0$ <b>85558</b> $04, \rho = 0$ <b>1359</b> 422 9048 295 28767 28772 3685 1421 514 1422	599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b></b>	0.0 <ul> <li>&lt;1</li> <li>owest</li> <li>Total</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 1.97 1.89 12.12 6.49 5.85 4.94 2.10 1.13 2.91 8.56 <b>3.73</b> 00 OR 3.58 3.88 41.48 13.64 8.368 7.40 4.43 1.25 4.70 14.46	95%-CI [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36] [ 4.53; 9.30] [ 5.67; 6.03] [ 4.73; 5.16] [ 1.84; 2.38] [ 0.97; 1.31] [ 1.65; 5.13] [ 7.30; 10.03] [ 2.63; 5.29] [ 0.98; 14.19] 95%-CI [ 3.06; 4.18] [ 2.97; 5.06] [ 38.09; 45.17] [ 9.17; 20.28] [ 8.08; 8.64] [ 7.09; 7.73] [ 3.91; 5.01] [ 1.07; 1.45] [ 2.72; 8.14] [ 1.95; 17.48]	Weight 10.3% 10.0% 10.4% 9.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 100.0% 10.2% 10.3% 9.6% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.3% 10.2% 10
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kisnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 99.4\%$ Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 242 21345 8262 242 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 21345 8262 8262 8262 8262 8262 8262 8262 826	Fourth         Total         E           1424         647         9305         295           33198         33212         4057         1346           1340         367         1707         85558           04, ρ = 0         0         9422         9048           295         28767         28772         3685           1422         9544         514         1422           75705         1421         514         1422	Syents 599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 Syents 599 252 2522 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 Syents 599 252 2522 74 10 543 16 570 1 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> <li>15502</li> <li>0</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>0.0</li></ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR           1.97           1.89           12.12           6.49           5.85           4.94           2.10           1.13           2.91           8.56           3.73           00           OR           3.58           3.88           41.48           13.64           8.36           7.40           4.43           1.25           4.70           14.46           6.72	95%-Cl [ 1.70; 2.28] [ 1.51; 2.36] [ 1.36; 12.92] [ 4.53; 9.30] [ 5.67; 6.03] [ 4.73; 5.16] [ 1.84; 2.38] [ 0.97; 1.31] [ 1.65; 5.13] [ 7.30; 10.03] [ 2.63; 5.29] [ 0.98; 14.19] 95%-Cl [ 3.06; 4.18] [ 2.97; 5.06] [ 3.06; 4.18] [ 2.97; 5.06] [ 3.06; 4.18] [ 2.97; 5.06] [ 3.06; 4.18] [ 2.97; 5.06] [ 3.09; 45.17] [ 9.17; 20.28] [ 8.08; 8.64] [ 7.09; 7.73] [ 3.91; 5.01] [ 1.07; 1.45] [ 2.72; 8.14] [ 1.95; 17.48] [ 4.26; 10.59] [ 1.16; 38.821	Weight 10.3% 10.4% 10.4% 10.4% 10.2% 10.2% 100.0% Weight 10.2% 9.9% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.4% 10.2% 10.3%
Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99.4\%$ Study Bintabara 2021 Daka 2020 EI-Khatib 2020 Kien 2019 Krishnamoorthy 2020 Kumar 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2019 Mumtaz 2018 Rahman 2017 Shibre 2020 Antenatal care Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99.6\%$	F Events 798 362 7019 202 22176 8675 797 599 94 1392 0, $\tau^2 = 0.3$ Hi Events 949 305 8262 242 21345 8262 242 21345 8967 1255 669 184 1254	Fourth Total E 1424 647 9305 295 33198 33212 4057 1346 367 1707 <b>85558</b> 04, $p = 0$ <b>ighest</b> <b>Total E</b> 1359 422 9048 295 28767 28772 3685 1421 514 1422 <b>75705</b> 25, $p = 0$	Syents 599 252 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 Syents 599 252 2522 2522 74 11969 3126 409 543 16 570 1 570 1 599 252 252 16 570 1 570 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 1 570 570 570 570 570 570 570 570	0.0 <ul> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>0.0</li> <li>1525</li> <li>627</li> <li>12475</li> <li>295</li> <li>46753</li> <li>46782</li> <li>3914</li> <li>1306</li> <li>151</li> <li>1674</li> <li>15502</li> <li>0.01</li> <li>15502</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio Random effects model	100         0R         1.97         1.89         12.12         6.49         5.85         4.94         2.10         1.13         2.91         8.56         3.73         00         OR         3.58         3.88         41.48         13.64         8.36         7.40         4.43         1.25         4.70         14.46         6.72	95%-CI [1.70; 2.28] [1.51; 2.36] [1.36; 12.92] [4.53; 9.30] [5.67; 6.03] [4.73; 5.16] [1.84; 2.38] [0.97; 1.31] [1.65; 5.13] [7.30; 10.03] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [2.63; 5.29] [0.98; 14.19] [2.72; 8.14] [1.07; 1.45] [3.06; 4.18] [2.72; 8.14] [1.07; 1.45] [2.72; 8.14] [1.07; 1.48] [4.26; 10.59]	Weight 10.3% 10.4% 10.4% 10.3% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 100.0% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.3%

Forest plot showing antenatal care utilization by wealth index of mothers in developing countries, 2015 to 2022.



# Utilization of antenatal care and skilled delivery care by the educational status of mothers

Among the 17 studies examined, 6 studies have indicated that education has a direct effect on antenatal care and skilled delivery care utilization. Notably, in Ghana, women with secondary school education or higher were more inclined to receive prenatal and skilled delivery care compared to those without formal education (59). Similarly, in Northern Ghana, the educational attainment of mothers significantly correlated with the utilization of skilled delivery services (62).

In Indonesia, evidence indicates that education plays a crucial role in influencing women to undergo more than four antenatal care visits (67). Moreover, in Congo, a higher level of education was associated with increased utilization of antenatal care (73).

A comprehensive study across five African countries demonstrated a positive link between women's education and various aspects of maternal health care, including the type of antenatal care provider, timing and frequency of antenatal care visits, delivery location, and presence of a skilled birth attendant (74). In Nigeria, the research suggested a consistently higher concentration of maternal healthcare usage among well-educated and wealthier mothers throughout the study period (71).

# Utilization of antenatal care and skilled delivery care by wealth index

Out of 17 studies, 10 studies have highlighted the correlation between the wealth index and the utilization of antenatal care and skilled delivery care. Research conducted in Nepal revealed an escalating trend in the utilization of skilled delivery care and antenatal care as the wealth index of mothers transitions from the poorest to the least poor (60). The ratio of utilization for four ANC visits and institutional delivery between the richest and the poorest quintile mothers were 5.08 and 9.00, respectively, (64). Additionally, women from low socioeconomic backgrounds were six times more likely to deliver without skilled assistance compared to those from high socioeconomic backgrounds (68).

In India, the probability of having at least four ANC visits is nearly four times higher for women in the richest households than for those in the poorest households (61). In the Philippines, facility-based delivery coverage was higher for non-poor households compared to poor households (63). A study across three different Asian countries revealed a pro-rich inequality in the use of facility delivery services (65).

For skilled birth attendance and four or more antenatal care visits in Kenya, the absolute difference in coverage between the wealthiest quintile (quintile 5) and poorest quintile (quintile 1) was 61.6 and 31.0%, respectively (66).

In Zimbabwe, women from middle-income and richest households were more likely to utilize antenatal care services than women from the poorest households. Maternal service utilization in Zimbabwe exhibited a pro-rich pattern, indicating a preference for maternal health care utilization among women from wealthy households (58). In Nigeria, the concentration of at least four ANC visits and a higher number of ANC visits were disproportionately higher among the rich (70). Similarly, in Myanmar, the utilization of skilled birth attendants (SBAs) among women was disproportionately concentrated among the affluent, irrespective of maternal characteristics (72).



Forest plot showing skilled delivery care utilization by educational status of mothers in developing countries, 2015 to 2022.

12

Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR	95%-CI	Weight
Abinkorah 2020	400	1120	000	1012		2.02	[1 60: 2 44]	7 00/-
Ameyaw 2020 M	403	1360	203	1330		2.02	[1.16: 1.71]	7.6%
Ameyaw 2020 N	315	1477	198	1465		1 73	[1.43: 2 11]	7.6%
Ameyaw 2020 S	503	1394	505	1534	=	1.15	[0.99; 1.34]	8.2%
Daka 2020	127	735	37	627		3.33	[2.27; 4.89]	5.1%
Fagbamigbe 2022	3001	15548	1411	16030	+	2.48	[2.32; 2.65]	9.0%
Karanja 2018	9	40	8	40		1.16	[0.40; 3.40]	1.3%
Kpodotsi 2021	172	274	240	434		1.36	[1.00; 1.86]	6.0%
Krishnamoorthy 2020	33700	43710	28753	46753		2.11	[2.05; 2.17]	9.1%
Mumtaz 2019	1604	3966	1026	3914		1.91	[1.74; 2.10]	8.7%
Mwase 2018	1101	1239	1094	1298		1.49	[1.18; 1.88]	7.1%
Yava 2021	1075	18/0	422	1671		3.26	[1.09, 1.71]	8 3%
Zegeye 2022	305	622	153	567		2.60	[2.04; 3.32]	7.0%
Skilled delivery		74022		77556	•	1.89	[1.66; 2.15] [1.15: 3.11]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 93.0\%$	6, $\tau^2 = 0.0$	)48, p <	0.0001	0		100	[	
				<	Non-utilization Utilization	>		
Study	Events	Middle Total	l Events	owest Total	Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR	95%-CI	Weight
Ahinkorah 2020	493	997	283	1213	+	3.21	[2.68; 3.86]	7.5%
Ameyaw 2020 M	328	1326	220	1339	<b>H</b>	1.67	[1.38, 2.02]	7.5%
Ameyaw 2020 N	384	1537	198	1465	+	2.13	[1.76; 2.57]	7.5%
Ameyaw 2020 S	546	1397	505	1534	+	1.31	[1.12; 1.52]	7.6%
Daka 2020	150	697	37	627	1 💻	4.37	[3.00; 6.38]	6.7%
Fagbamigbe 2022	5310	13581	1411	16030		6.65	[6.24; 7.10]	7.7%
Knodotsi 2021	18	40	8	40		3.27	[1.21; 8.84]	3.8%
Krishnamoorthy 2020	33342	245	240	434		Z.49 A 15	[4 01 / 30]	7 7%
Mumtaz 2019	1910	4020	1026	3914		2 55	[2 32 2 80]	7 7%
Mwase 2018	1123	1265	1094	1298	<b>E</b> :	1.47	[1.17: 1.86]	7.3%
Pervin 2021	585	746	422	671		2.14	[1.70; 2.71]	7.3%
Yaya 2021	1378	1770	499	1671	+	8.26	[7.08; 9.63]	7.6%
Zegeye 2022	345	570	153	567		4.15	[3.23; 5.33]	7.3%
Skilled delivery		66560		77556		2.96	[2.25: 3.89]	100.0%
Prediction interval		20000				2.00	[0.95; 9.18]	
$11$ stars are it $1^2 = 0.0$ EV	2-01	051 n c	0.0001					
Heterogeneity. 7 – 98.5%	$0, \tau = 0.2$	501, p ~	0.0001					
Heterogeneity. 7 – 98.5%	ο, τ - 0.2	201, <i>μ</i> <	0.0001	0. <	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization 3	100 >		
Study E	ο, τ = 0.2 Fc vents	ourth Total E	Lc	0. < west Total	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization : Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 > OR	95%-C	:l Weight
Study E	•, τ = 0.2 Fc vents 707	ourth Total E	Lc Events	0. < west Total	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization : Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 > OR 9 33	<b>95%-C</b> [ 7 67: 11 36	I Weight
Study E thinkorah 2020 meyaw 2020 M	Fc vents 707 738	ourth Total E 956 1321	Lc Events 283 220	0.  cowest Total 1213 1339	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization : Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 > OR 9.33 6.44	<b>95%-C</b> [ 7.67; 11.36 [ 5.37: 7 71	il Weight i] 7.5% ] 7.5%
Study E Ahinkorah 2020 Ameyaw 2020 M Ameyaw 2020 N	, τ = 0.2 Fc vents 707 738 517	ourth Total E 956 1321 1566	Lc Events 283 220 198	0. west Total 1213 1339 1465	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 OR 9.33 6.44 3.15	<b>95%-C</b> [ 7.67; 11.36 [ 5.37; 7.71 [ 2.63; 3.79	il Weight i] 7.5% ] 7.5% i] 7.5%
Study E hinkorah 2020 kmeyaw 2020 N kmeyaw 2020 S	Fc vents 707 738 517 669	956 1321 1566 1226	Lc Events 283 220 198 505	0. <b>owest</b> <b>Total</b> 1213 1339 1465 1534	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45	<b>95%-C</b> [ 7.67; 11.36 [ 5.37; 7.71 [ 2.63; 3.79 [ 2.10; 2.86	i Weight 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5%
Study E hinkorah 2020 meyaw 2020 M meyaw 2020 N meyaw 2020 S baka 2020	Fc vents 707 738 517 669 181	956 1321 1566 1226 648	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 37	0. <b>vwest</b> Total 1213 1339 1465 1534 627	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18	<b>95%-C</b> [ 7.67; 11.36 [ 5.37; 7.71 [ 2.63; 3.79 [ 2.10; 2.86 [ 4.25; 8.98	I Weight           j         7.5%           j         7.5%           j         7.5%           j         7.6%           j         7.1%
Study E Ninkorah 2020 Vineyaw 2020 M Vineyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 'agbamigbe 2022	Fo vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1	ourth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517	Lo Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 1	0. <b>west</b> Total 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 16030	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10	<b>95%-C</b> [ 7.67; 11.36 [ 5.37; 7.71 [ 2.63; 3.79 [ 2.10; 2.86 [ 4.25; 8.98 [ 4.25; 8.98	I Weight           j         7.5%           j         7.5%           j         7.5%           j         7.6%           j         7.6%           j         7.6%
Study E Ahinkorah 2020 Ameyaw 2020 M Ameyaw 2020 N Ameyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 Caranja 2018	Fo vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1 19	956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517 40	Lo Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 1	0. <b>west</b> Total 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 16030 40	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 2 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62	<b>95%-C</b> [ 7.67; 11.36 [ 5.37; 7.71 [ 2.63; 3.79 [ 2.10; 2.86 [ 4.25; 8.98 [ 4.14; 16.12 [ 1.34; 9.77	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           4.7%
Study E Ahinkorah 2020 Ameyaw 2020 M Ameyaw 2020 N Ameyaw 2020 S Daka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 (aranja 2018 (podotsi 2021	Fc vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1 19 192	956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517 40 200	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 1 8 240	0. west Total 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 16030 40 434 435	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 1 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 0R 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40	<b>95%-C</b> [ 7.67; 11.36 [ 5.37; 7.71] [ 2.63; 3.79 [ 2.10; 2.86 [ 4.25; 8.98 [ 14.14; 16.12 [ 1.34; 9.77 [ 9.33; 40.34	H Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.7%           7.6%           4.7%           5.7%
Study E thinkorah 2020 meyaw 2020 M meyaw 2020 N meyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 'agbamigbe 2022 (aranja 2018 joddsi 2021 (rishnamoorthy 2020)	Fc vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1 19 192 30542 3 2705	ourth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517 40 200 33198	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 1 8 240 28753 4	0. west Total 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 16030 40 434 16753 2014	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 0R 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40 7.20	<b>95%-C</b> [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52	I Weight           ]         7.5%           ]         7.5%           ]         7.5%           ]         7.6%           ]         7.6%           ]         7.6%           ]         7.7%           ]         5.7%           ]         7.7%
itudy E winkorah 2020 wineyaw 2020 M wineyaw 2020 N wineyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 jagbamigbe 2022 jaranja 2018 joodotsi 2021 rishnamoorthy 2020 itumtaz 2019	For vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1 19 192 30542 3 2785 1204	ourth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517 40 200 33198 4057	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 1 8 240 28753 4 1024	0. <b>vwest</b> <b>Total</b> 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 16030 40 434 16753 3914 1209	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 0R 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40 7.20 6.16 1.74	<b>95%-C</b> [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79]	I Weight           ]         7.5%           ]         7.5%           ]         7.5%           ]         7.6%           ]         7.6%           ]         7.6%           ]         4.7%           ]         5.7%           ]         7.6%           ]         7.7%
study E Ahinkorah 2020 umeyaw 2020 M umeyaw 2020 N umeyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 (aranja 2018 (podotsi 2021 (rishnamoorthy 2020) Umfaz 2019 Iwase 2018 Panja 2019 Iwase 2018 Panja 2019	For vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1 19 192 30542 3 2785 1204 428	ourth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517 40 200 i3198 4057 1335 552	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 1 8 240 28753 4 1026 1094 422	0. <b>vest</b> <b>Total</b> 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 16030 40 434 16753 3914 1298 671	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 1 Odds Ratio Random effects model	000 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40 7.20 6.16 1.71 2.04	<b>95%-C</b> [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17] [1.58; 2.22]	I Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.1%           1.7.6%           2.7.7%           3.7.7%           3.7.7%           3.7.7%           3.7.7%           3.7.7%           3.7.7%           3.7.7%           3.7.7%           3.7.7%
itudy E hinkorah 2020 meyaw 2020 M meyaw 2020 N meyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 aranja 2018 cpodotsi 2021 frishnamoorthy 2020 lumtaz 2019 lwase 2018 fervin 2021	For vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1 199 192 30542 3 2785 1204 428 1390	956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517 40 200 13198 4057 1335 552 1500	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 1 8 240 28753 4 1026 1094 422 499	0. <b>covest</b> <b>Total</b> 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 16030 40 434 16753 3914 1298 671 1671	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 1 Odds Ratio Random effects model	000 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40 7.20 6.16 1.71 2.04 29.68	<b>95%-C</b> [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17 [1.58; 2.63 [23,80; 37,00]	I Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.6%           7.7%
Study E Study E Study E Study E Study 2020 M starbar 2020 N starbar 2020 N starbar 2020 S starbar 2020 S starbar 2020 S starbar 2020 S starbar 2020 S starbar 2021 S starbar 2018 Starbar 2018 Starbar 2018 Starbar 2018 Starbar 2018 Starbar 2018 Starbar 2018 Starbar 2021 Starbar 2021 Starbar 2022 Starbar 2022 Starbar 2022 Starbar 2022 Starbar 2022 Starbar 2022 Starbar 2020 Starbar 2021 Starbar 2021 Starbar 2021 Starbar 2021 Starbar 2021 Starbar 2022 Starbar 2022 Starba	For vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1 192 30542 3 2785 1204 428 1390 492	ourth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517 40 200 33198 4057 1335 552 1500 564	Lo Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 1 8 240 28753 4 1026 1094 422 499 153	0. <b>vwest</b> Total 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 16030 40 434 16753 3914 1298 671 1671 567	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40 7.20 6.16 1.71 2.04 29.68 18.49	<b>95%-C</b> [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19]	I Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.5%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.4%           7.4%           7.2%
Study E Ahinkorah 2020 Ameyaw 2020 M Ameyaw 2020 N Ameyaw 2020 S Daka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 (aranja 2018 (spodotsi 2021 (rishnamoorthy 2020) Awase 2018 Parvin 2021 (agba 2021 (agba 2021 (agba 2022 Skilled delivery	For vents 707 738 517 669 181 7423 1 192 30542 3 2785 1204 428 1390 492 5	ourth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 2517 40 200 33198 4057 552 1500 564 39680	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 8 240 28753 4 1026 1094 422 499 153	0./ < west Total 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 6030 40 434 16753 3914 1298 671 1671 567 77556	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 1 Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40 7.20 6.16 1.71 2.04 2.968 18.49 6.51	<b>95%-C</b> [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.88; 7.52 [5.59; 6.24] [1.36; 2.17 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19] <b>[4.59; 9.24</b>	H Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.2%           100.0%
Study E Ahinkorah 2020 Ameyaw 2020 M Ameyaw 2020 N Ameyaw 2020 N Ameyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 Garanja 2020 Garanja 2020 Garanja 2018 (podotsi 2021 Grishnamoorthy 2020 Javia 2021 'aya 2022 'aya 2021 'aya 2022 'aya 2022 '	For the second	Surth           Total E           956           1321           1566           1226           648           200           201           201           3138           4057           1335           552           1500           564           9680           55, p < 0	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 8 240 28753 240 28753 240 28753 240 28753 240 28753 240 28753 2 1094 422 499 153 7 0001	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40 7.20 6.16 1.71 2.04 29.68 18.49 6.51	<b>95%-C</b> [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 <b>[4.59; 9.24</b> <b>[1.52; 27.93</b> ]	I         Weight           j         7.5%           j         7.5%           j         7.6%           j         7.6%           j         7.6%           j         7.7%           j         7.6%           j         7.7%           j         7.7%           j         7.4%           j         100.0%
Study E Vhinkorah 2020 Vmeyaw 2020 M Vmeyaw 2020 N Vmeyaw 2020 N Vmeyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 'agbarnigbe 2022 (aranja 2018 (podotsi 2021 (aranja 2018 Vpodotsi 2021 Vinishamoorthy 2020 Vamitaz 2019 Awase 2018 Vervin 2021 'egeye 2022 :killed delivery 'rediction interval leterogeneity. / <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Fc}\\ \text{Fc}\\ \text{vents}\\ 707\\ 738\\ 517\\ 669\\ 181\\ 7423\\ 119\\ 30542\\ 32785\\ 1204\\ 492\\ 1390\\ 492\\ 5\\ 5\\ 7^2 = 0.41 \end{array}$	<b>Durth</b> <b>Total E</b> 956 1321 1566 1226 648 22517 40 200 33198 4057 1335 552 1500 564 <b>4057</b> 1335 552 552 564	Lcc Events 283 220 198 505 37 1411 240 28753 4 240 28753 4 1026 2499 153 7 0094 422 499 153 7 0001	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 2 Odds Ratio Random effects model	000 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 3.62 19.40 6.16 1.71 2.04 29.68 18.49 6.51	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.03; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93	I Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.2%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%           17.4%
Study E Ahinkorah 2020 Ameyaw 2020 M Ameyaw 2020 N Ameyaw 2020 N Ameyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 Garanja 2018 (rishnamoorthy 2020 Awase 2018 Jervin 2021 (aga 2021 (aga 2021 (ageye 2022 Skilled delivery Prediction interval teterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,	Free vents 707 738 517 669 181 192 2765 181 192 192 2765 272 1204 492 5 $\tau^2 = 0.41$	Surth         Formation           956         956           1321         1321           1326         648           22617         200           33198         4057           4007         1335           552         1500           564         552           9680         5, p < 0	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 505 37 14111 8 240 205 24 99 153 7 00001	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 1 Odds Ratio Random effects model	100 OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.64 19.40 7.20 6.16 19.40 7.20 6.16 1.71 2.04 29.68 6.51	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71] [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16.82 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17] [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19] [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93]	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.7%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.4%           7.2%           100.0%
Study E thinkorah 2020 timeyaw 2020 M timeyaw 2020 M timeyaw 2020 N timeyaw 2020 S baka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 agranja 2018 (podolsi 2021 trishnamoorthy 2020 timeta 2018 Pervin 2021 Pervin 2021 Pervin 2021 Skilled delivery Prediction interval leterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%, tudy Ev	Fcc vents 707 738 517 669 181 192 30542 3 2785 30542 3 1204 492 5 $\tau^2 = 0.41$ Higl vents 1	surth         Total E           956         1321           1566         200           1318         2517           40         200           3198         4057           1335         552           554         9680           55, ρ < 0	Lc Events 283 220 198 505 505 505 37 14111 8 220 2499 153 7 00001 Lo vents	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model 1 0.1 1 10 1 on-utilization 1 10 1 Odds Ratio Random effects model	OR 933 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.64 15.10 3.62 19.40 7.20 6.16 6.16 1.71 2.04 29.68 6.51	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71] [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16; 2.63 [4.14; 16; 2.63 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17] [1.56; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19] [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93]	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.75%           7.6%           7.7%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.2%           100.0%           Cl Weight
Study E Ahinkorah 2020 Ameyaw 2020 M Ameyaw 2020 N Ameyaw 2020 S Jaka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 Karanja 2018 kpodotsi 2021 Aumtaz 2019 Aumtaz 2019 Amataz 20	For vents 707 738 517 669 181 19 192 2765 1204 492 5 722 = 0.41 Hig vents 1 644	ourth         Total E           956         1321           1566         1321           1566         40           2001         3198           3135         552           552         564           9680         5, p < 0	Lc Events 283 220 198 200 1098 200 1098 200 1098 200 1098 200 2005 1006 1006 2005 1006 100	0. < vwest Total 1213 1339 1465 1534 627 40 434 40 434 1298 671 1671 567 77556 west Total 1213 1367 1554 1257 1675 1677 17556 1755	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [1.414; 16.82; [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17 [1.56; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.75%           7.75%           7.76%
Study     E       Study     E       Ahinkorah 2020     Mumeyaw 2020 M       ymeyaw 2020 N     Mumeyaw 2020 N       ymeyaw 2020 N     Mumeyaw 2020 S       Jaka 2020     Saranja 2018       (podotsi 2021)     Grishnamoorthy 2020 S       Frishnamoorthy 2020 S     Pervin 2021       /aya 2021     Jervin 2021       /aya 2021     Jervin 2021       /egeye 2022     Skilled delivery       Prediction interval     Jeterogeneity: J <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020     Muse 2020	For vents $707$ 738 $517$ 669 181 19 192 1204 492 $52785$ 1390 492 $572$ 428 1390 $492$ $572428$ 1390 $492$ $5721204 492 5721204 492 572 100 1$	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 648 2007 40 200 200 552 1500 564 9680 55, $p < 0$ hest Fotal E 741 1156	Lo Events 283 220 198 240 198 240 28753 1026 1094 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 283 220 0001	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Codds Ratio Random effects model	OR 9.33 6.44 3.15 2.45 6.18 15.10 7.20 6.16 1.71 2.04 29.68 18.49 6.51 7.00 00 00 00 00	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17] [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19] [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93] 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11]	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.7%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.2%           1.7.2%           1.7.2%           1.7.2%           1.7.2%           1.7.5%
Study     E       Athinkorah 2020     M       Ameyaw 2020 M     M       Ameyaw 2020 N     M       Ameyaw 2020 N     M       Ameyaw 2020 S     Jaka 2020       Jaka 2020     Jaka 2020       (aranja 2018     G       (podotsi 2021)     G       Ammaz 2018     G       (podotsi 2021)     Mase 2018       Pervin 2021     G       (aya 2021)     G       (egeye 2022)     Skilled delivery       Prediction interval     Ieterogeneity. I <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020     M       meyaw 2020 M     M       meyaw 2020 N     M	Free vents 707 738 517 19 192 20542 3 2785 1204 428 2785 1204 428 5 772 = 0.41 Higg vents 1 644 644 1010	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 648 2517 40 200 200 552 1550 552 1550 552 552 552 552 552 552 552	Lco zvents 283 220 198 240 198 240 198 240 1026 1	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Codds Ratio Random effects model 1 0.1 1 0 1 on-utilization 1 Utilization > Codds Ratio Random effects model	OR 9,33 6,44 3,15 2,45 6,18 15,10 3,62 19,40 7,20 6,16 1,71 2,04 8,61 8,49 9,68 18,49 9,651 7,20 00 00 00 00 00	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.03; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11 [14.22; 20.8]	I Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.6%           7.7%           100.0%           100.0%           100.0%           100.0%
Study     E       Study     E       Whinkorah 2020     Mmeyaw 2020 M       xmeyaw 2020 N     Mmeyaw 2020 N       xmeyaw 2020 S     Jaka 2020       Caranja 2018     Garanja 2018       Kpodotsi 2021     Krishnamoorthy 2020       Kindumtaz 2019     Awmase 2018       Varina 2021     Yaya 2021       Yegeye 2022     Skilled delivery       Prediction interval     Ieterogeneity: 1 <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020 M     meyaw 2020 M       meyaw 2020 N     Jaka 2020       waya 2020 S     Saka 2020	Fcc vents 707 738 517 669 181 192 30542 30542 30542 30542 30542 30542 30542 30542 30542 30542 30542 30542 428 428 492 $\xi^2 = 0.41$ <b>Higi</b> 1390 492 <b>5</b> 1390 492 <b>5</b> 1390 492 <b>5</b> 104 402 402 402 402 402 402 402 402 402 4	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 4057 1335 552 2577 400 564 4057 1335 552 1500 564 552 552 1500 564 1506 552 1500 564 1506 1512 1500 564 1550 15	Lo Events 283 220 198 298 298 298 298 298 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Cidds Ratio Random effects model 1 0.1 1 10 1 on-utilization 1 Utilization > Cidds Ratio Random effects model	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71] [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16.28; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17] [1.56; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19] [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93] 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11] [4.22; 20.83 [5.34; 7.7; 41.22]	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.75%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.4%           7.2%           100.0%           1           6]           7.5%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.7%
Study     E       Study     E       Whinkorah 2020     Wimeyaw 2020 M       ymeyaw 2020 N     Wimeyaw 2020 N       ymeyaw 2020 S     Jaka 2020       agbamigbe 2022     Saranja 2018       (podotsi 2021     Sinshamoorthy 2020 C       Aumtaz 2019     Awase 2018       Pervin 2021     Pervin 2021       'aya 2021     Silled delivery       Prediction interval     Ieterogeneity: 1 <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020     Mimeyaw 2020 N       meyaw 2020 N     Mimeyaw 2020 S       aka 2020     Saka 2020       akabamigbe 2022     Saka 2020	For events $707$ 738 $517$ 669 181 7423 1 19 192 2 2785 1204 492 5 $c^2 = 0.41$ Higi vents 1 644 1010 7 641 1011 7 644	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 648 22517 40 200 562 1500 564 9680 55, $\rho < 0$ hest Fotal E 741 1156 1387 9910 422	Loc Events 283 220 198 240 198 240 1094 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 283 220 0001 Lo 283 220 198 422 422 422 422 422 422 422 42	0. <	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 COdds Ratio Random effects model	OR 9,33 6,44 3,15 2,45 6,18 15,10 7,20 6,16 1,71 2,04 29,68 18,49 6,51 7,20 6,16 1,71 2,04 29,68 18,49 6,51 7,00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [1.38; 2.63 [2.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11 [14.22; 20.83; 7.7 [19.23; 41.7; [5.23; 41.7]	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.2%           100.0%           1           6]           7.5%           1           7.2%           1           1           7.7%           1           7.7%           1           7.7%           1           7.7%
Study     E       Whinkorah 2020     M       Ameyaw 2020 M     M       Imeyaw 2020 N     M       Imeyaw 2020 N     M       Jaka 2020     S       Jaka 2020     S       Jaka 2020     Jaka 2020       Garanja 2018     S       Kodolsi 2021     Grevin 2021       Grevin 2021     Grevin 2021       Gaya 2021     Gervin 2021       Jegegve 2022     Skilled delivery       Prediction interval     Ieterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020     M       meyaw 2020 N     M       meyaw 2020 N     M       meyaw 2020 S     Jaka 2020       Jaka 2020     S	Free vents 707 738 517 19 192 20542 3 20542 3 20542 3 20542 3 1204 492 5 7 $^2^2 = 0.41$ Higg vents 1 644 1010 1011 691 9270 270 24	burth         Total E           956         1321           1566         3221           1526         648           22517         40           200         552           1500         564           9980         552           1500         564           9980         5, $p < 0$ hest         741           1156         1387           9103         402	Lo 283 220 198 240 198 240 198 240 1026	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Codds Ratio Random effects model 1 0.1 1 10 1 on-utilization 1 Utilization > Codds Ratio Random effects model	OR 9,33 6,44 3,15 2,45 6,18 15,10 3,62 19,40 7,20 6,16 1,71 2,04 8,62 19,40 7,20 6,16 1,71 2,04 8,62 19,40 6,51 7,00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [1.38; 2.63 [2.5.9; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17, [2.380; 37.00 [3.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11 [14.22; 20.8 [5.34; 7.7 [9.23; 41.7] [42.71; 49.4	I Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           1.7.7%           1.7.7%
Study     E       whinkorah 2020     Mineyaw 2020 M       wineyaw 2020 N     Mineyaw 2020 N       wineyaw 2020 S     Jaka 2020       Jaka 2020     Jaka 2020       Jaka 2020     Jaka 2020       Jaka 2020     Jaka 2020       Jaka 2020     Jaka 2021       (podotsi 2021     Jaka 2020       Jawase 2018     Jaka 2021       Jegeye 2022     Jakilled delivery       Prediction interval     Jeterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020     Mineyaw 2020 N       meyaw 2020 N     Mineyaw 2020 S       Jaka 2020     Jaka 2020       Jagbamigbe 2022     Jaka 2020       Jagbamigbe 2022     Jaka 2020	Free vents 707 738 517 19 192 30542 3 2785 1204 492 $\xi^2 = 0.41$ Higg vents 1 644 1010 1 1011 - 644 691 1010 270 8978 1 270 150	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 4057 1335 552 1500 564 552 1500 564 552 1500 564 1552 1500 564 1552 1500 564 1555 1500 564 1555 1500 564 1555 1500 10	Lo Events 283 220 198 240 298 200 298 207 207 207 207 207 207 207 207	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71] [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16.82; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17] [1.36; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 (28.07; 44.11 [14.22; 20.83 [5.34; 7.7; [19.23; 41.77] [42.71; 49.4] [2.21; 16.3; 247 7	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.7%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%           7.6%
Study     E       Study     E       Whinkorah 2020     Mumeyaw 2020 M       ymeyaw 2020 N     Mumeyaw 2020 S       jaka 2020     Sumeyaw 2020 S       jaka 2021     Strishnamoorthy 2020 C       //wase 2018     Pervin 2021       /aya 2021     Skilled delivery       Prediction interval     Jeterogeneity: 1 <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020     Mumeyaw 2020 S       aka 2020     Saka 2020 S       agbamigbe 2022     Saranja 2018       podotsi 2021     Saranja 2018       podotsi 2021     Saranja 2018	Frequencies $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{2$	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 648 22517 40 200 200 562 1506 552 1500 564 9680 55, $p < 0$ hest Fotal E 741 1156 1387 9910 422 1387 9910 422 1387 910 422 1387 910 422 1387 910 422 1387 910 423 1387 910 423 1387 910 423 1387 910 423 1387 910 423 1387 910 1387 1387 910 1387 1387 910 1387 1	Loc Events 283 220 198 240 198 240 1094 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 7 0001 Lo 283 220 198 505 505 505 7 10411 8 240 0001 1046 422 499 153 7 1046 422 499 153 7 1046 422 499 153 7 1046 422 499 153 7 1046 422 429 1053 7 1046 422 429 1053 7 1046 422 429 1053 7 1046 422 429 1053 7 1046 422 429 1053 7 1046 422 429 1053 7 1047 422 429 1053 7 1047 422 429 1053 7 1047 422 429 153 7 1046 422 429 153 7 1047 422 429 153 7 1047 422 429 153 7 1047 422 429 1053 7 1047 422 422 429 1053 7 1047 422 1058 1056 1057 422 1058 1056 1057 422 1058	0. <	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 COdds Ratio Random effects model	OR 9,33 6,44 3,15 2,45 6,18 15,10 7,20 6,16 1,71 2,04 29,68 18,49 6,51 7,20 6,16 1,71 2,04 29,68 18,49 6,51 7,00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17] [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11 [14.22; 20.83; 7.7 [19.23; 41.7; [2.21; 16.3] [4.83; 247.7; 49.41 [2.21; 16.3]	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           100.0%           1.7.5%           1.7.6%           1.7.6%           1.7.6%           1.7.6%           1.7.6%           1.7.6%           1.7.7%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%           1.7.5%
Study     E       Whinkorah 2020     M       ymeyaw 2020 M     M       ymeyaw 2020 N     M       ymeyaw 2020 N     M       yaka 2020     Salaka 2020       agbamigbe 2022     Garanja 2018       ypodolsi 2021     Grevin 2021       raya 2021     Gervin 2021       'aya 2021     Gervin 2021       'aya 2021     Gervin 2021       'servin 2021     Gervin 2021       'aya 2021     Gervin 2021       'servin 2021     Gervin 2021       'ervin 2021     Gervin 2020       'ervin 2021     Gervin 2020       'ervin 2020     Salaka 2020       meyaw 2020 N     M       meyaw 2020 Salaka 2020     Gervin 208       podotsi 2021     rishnamoorthy 2020     2       umtaz 2019     Corolination 2019     Corolination 2019	Free vents 707 738 517 7423 1 19 192 20542 3 2785 1204 492 5 $t^2 = 0.41$ Higg vents 1 644 1010 101 101 492 5 7 24 1300 492 5 7 1204 1300 101 102 1205 10	burth         Total E           956         1321           1566         3221           1526         648           2017         40           200         552           1500         564           9980         552           554         9980           55, $p < 0$ 9422           11156         13910           422         1003           400         152           8767         7385	Lc Events 283 220 198 240 198 240 28753 1026 1094 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 283 220 108 505 505 505 505 505 505 505 5	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Codds Ratio Random effects model 1 0.1 1 10 1 on-utilization 1 Utilization > Codds Ratio Random effects model	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17, [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [3.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [2.17]; 49.4 [2.21; 16.3] [2.21; 16.34; 21.7]	I Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.6%           7.6%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.5%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           1.7.7%           1.7.7%           1.7.7%           1.5.6%           1.7.7%           1.5.7%           1.7.7% </td
Study     E       Ahinkorah 2020       Ameyaw 2020 M       Ameyaw 2020 N       Ameyaw 2020 S       Jaka 2020       'agbamigbe 2022       'agamigbe 2020 S       Jaka 2020       'agbamigbe 2021       (rishnamoorthy 2020 S       Jawase 2018       'Pervin 2021       'aya 2021       'egeye 2022       Skilled delivery       'Prediction interval       Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020       agaamigbe 2022 S       aka 2020       agbamigbe 2022       aranja 2018       podotsi 2021       rishnamoorthy 2020 S       aka 2020       agbamigbe 2022       aranja 2018       Wase 2018	Free vents 707 738 517 19 192 30542 3 2785 1204 492 $\xi^2 = 0.41$ Higg vents 1 644 1010 1011 691 1010 1011 1010 1011 1010 1011 1010 1000 1000 100 100 100 1000 1000 100 100	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 1226 648 4057 1335 552 1500 564 4057 1335 552 1500 564 99880 55, p < 0 hest for al E 741 1156 155 5, p < 0 hest for al E 152 152 152 152 153 155 155 155 155 155 155 155 155 155	Lo Events 283 220 198 240 1024 499 153 7 00001 Lo vents 220 198 505 37 7 1024 422 499 153 7 00001 Lo vents 7 1041 105 1094 422 409 153 7 1094 422 409 153 7 1094 422 409 153 7 1094 422 409 153 7 1094 422 409 153 7 1094 422 409 153 7 1094 422 409 153 7 7 1004 422 409 153 7 7 1004 422 409 153 7 7 1004 422 420 1094 422 4000 1094 422 409 153 7 7 1005 1094 422 200 1094 422 200 1094 422 200 1098 1098 1094 422 200 1094 422 200 1098 1098 1094 422 200 1098 1094 422 200 1098 1094 422 200 1098 1098 1094 1094 1098 1098 1094 1098 1098 1098 1094 1098 1098 1098 1098 1094 1098	0. <pre></pre>	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Codds Ratio Random effects model 1 0.1 1 10 1 01 0.1 1 0 1 01 0.1 1 0 1 01 0.1 1 0 1 01 0.1 1 0 1 01 0 1	OR 9 33 6 44 3 15 2 45 6 618 15 10 3 62 19 40 7 200 6 .16 1.71 2.04 6 .16 1.71 2.04 6 .16 1.71 2.968 18.49 6 .51 7 00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71] [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [4.14; 16.28; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17] [1.36; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 ] [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 ] [4.52; 27.93 ] [4.22; 20.83 [5.34; 7.7; [19.23; 41.7] [42.71; 49.4] [2.21; 16.3; [1.48]; 247.73 [16.64; 21.1]; [1.90; 3.12]	Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.75%           7.6%           7.7%
Study     E       Ahinkorah 2020     Ameyaw 2020 M       Ameyaw 2020 N     Ameyaw 2020 N       Ameyaw 2020 S     Jaka 2020       'agbamigbe 2022     Caranja 2018       (xishnamoorthy 2020 1     Aumtaz 2019       Awata 2018     Pervin 2021       /aya 2021     Stidde delivery       Prediction interval     Heterogenetity: I <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020 N     meyaw 2020 S       aka 2020 agbamigbe 2022     Salade 2020 A       meyaw 2020 N     meyaw 2020 N       meyaw 2020 S     aka 2020 agbamigbe 2022 aranja 2018       podotsi 2021     rishnamoorthy 2020 2       aybamigbe 2022     Byodotsi 2021       meyaw 2020 N     Production 2018       meyaw 2020 N     Production 2018       meyaw 2020 N     Production 2018       podotsi 2021     Production 2018       podotsi 2021     Production 2018       wase 2018     Privin 2021	Frequencies $r_{12}$ (red) $r_{12}$	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 648 200 200 200 200 200 552 1500 564 9680 5, $p < 0$ hest Total E 741 1156 741 1156 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 752 752 752 752 754 752 754 752 754 7552 754 7552 7552 7564 7552 757 757 757 757 757 757 75	Lo Events 283 220 198 240 1094 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 7 0001 Lo 283 220 198 505 37 7 14111 18 422 499 153 7 0001 18 422 422 499 153 7 1004 422 428 37 7 1004 422 108 422 108 422 1094 422 108 108 1094 422 1094 422 1094 1098 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1094 1098 1099 1094 1005	0. <				
Study     E       Ahinkorah 2020       Ameyaw 2020 N       Ameyaw 2020 N       Ameyaw 2020 N       Jaka 2020       Sagbamigbe 2022       Garanja 2018       Çodolsi 2021       Krishnamoorthy 2020 S       Jaka 2020       Parvin 2021       Yaya 2021       Jervin 2020       Skilled delivery       Yerediction interval       leterogeneity: J <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020       meyaw 2020 N       meyaw 2020 S       aka 2020       agbamigbe 2022       aranja 2018       podotsi 2021       rishnamoorthy 2020 2       umtaz 2019       wase 2018       ervin 2021       aya 2021	Frequencies $r_{12}$ (red) $r_{12}$	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 648 22517 40 200 562 1500 564 9680 55, $p < 0$ hest E 741 1156 1387 9910 402 1387 9910 402 1387 9910 402 1387 9910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 910 402 1387 1387 910 402 1387 1500 1522 1500 1522 1500 1522 1500 1522 1500 1522 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1500 152 1552 1500 152 1552 1500 152 155 155	Loc Events 283 220 198 240 198 240 28753 1026 1026 1029 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 283 220 198 422 429 153 7 0001 Lo 283 220 198 422 422 422 423 1026	0. <	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Codds Ratio Random effects model	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11 [1.22; 20.83; [5.34; 7.7; [9.23; 41.7; [2.21; 16.3] [14.83; 247.7; [15.29; 17.3] [16.64; 21.1; [1.90; 3.11] [2.24; 3.7; [50.00; 131.6 [2.97]	I Weight           i]         7.5%           i]         7.5%           i]         7.6%           i]         7.6%           i]         7.7%           i]         7.7%           i]         7.7%           i]         7.2%           i]         7.4%           i]         7.6%           i]         7.6%           ii]         7.5%           ii]         7.5%           ii]         7.5%           ii]         7.5%           ii]         7.5%           iiiiiiiiiiiiii
Study     E       Study     E       Whinkorah 2020     Mumeyaw 2020 M       ymeyaw 2020 N     Mumeyaw 2020 S       jaka 2020     Saranja 2018       içodotsi 2021     Sirishnamoorthy 2020 C       Aumtaz 2019     Awase 2018       ipodotsi 2021     Pervin 2021       'aya 2021     Silded delivery       'Prediction interval     Ieterogeneity: 1 <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020     Maeyaw 2020 M       meyaw 2020 N     Meyaw 2020 S       aka 2020     agabamigbe 2022       aranja 2018     podotsi 2021       prishnamoorthy 2020 2     2       aranja 2018     podotsi 2021       ervin 2021     aya 2021       aya 2021     aya 2021       ageye 2022     Sales	Frequencies $r_{12}$ (respectively) $r_{12}$ (respect	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 648 22517 40 200 200 562 1500 564 9680 5, $p < 0$ hest Total E 741 1156 741 1156 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 741 1157 752 752 741 1157 752 757 757 757 757 757 757 7	Loc Events 283 220 198 240 1094 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 7 0001 Lo 283 220 198 8 240 198 8 240 198 220 198 223 198 220 198 223 198 220 198 223 198 223 198 223 198 223 198 223 198 223 198 223 198 224 198 225 23 225 198 245 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 225 23 245 245 245 255 255 255 255 255	0. <	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 Odds Ratio Random effects model 1 0.1 1 10 1 on-utilization 1 Utilization > Odds Ratio Random effects model	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.17 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [13.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93][1.52; 27.	<ul> <li>Weight</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>7.6%</li> <li>7.6%</li> <li>4.7%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.4%</li> <li>7.6%</li> <li>4.4%</li> <li>7.6%</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.1%</li> </ul>
Study     E       Ahinkorah 2020     Ameyaw 2020 M       Ameyaw 2020 N     Ameyaw 2020 N       Jaka 2020     Sagbamigbe 2022       Garanja 2018     Godosi 2021       Krishnamoorthy 2020 1     Aumtaz 2019       Awase 2018     Auritaz 2019       Avarage 2018     Auritaz 2019       Avarage 2018     Auritaz 2019       Avarage 2018     Airvin 2021       'aya 2021     Sagbamigbe 2022       Skilled delivery     Yrediction interval       leterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,     Maya 2020 N       meyaw 2020 N     Meyaw 2020 S       aka 2020     agbamigbe 2022       aranja 2018     podotsi 2021       rishnamoorthy 2020 2     2       wase 2018     ervin 2021       aya 2021     aya 2021       age 2022     Killed delivery       rediction interval     Second	Frequencies $r_{1}^{0}$ (red) $r_{2}^{0}$ (red)	burth         Formula           956         1321           1566         200           200         200           201         200           552         552           1506         564           9680         5, $p < 0$ 648         9680           5, $p < 0$ 1126           741         1156           11387         910           402         1387           1398         655           1091         422           1398         655           1091         456           1863         1863	Lo Events 283 220 198 240 1094 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 7 283 220 188 240 198 505 37 7 1411 18 422 499 153 7 1411 18 422 499 153 7 1411 18 422 499 153 7 1411 18 422 499 153 7 1411 18 422 499 153 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0. <	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 COdds Ratio Random effects model	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [1.414; 16.12 [1.34; 9.77 [1.36; 2.77 [1.58; 2.63 [23.80; 37.00 [1.36; 2.75 [23.80; 37.00 [1.357; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 [4.59; 9.24 [2.21; 16.3; [2.34; 7.7, [9.23; 41.7, [1.52; 21.13] [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [1.52; 27.93 [2.75; 15.04 [2.75; 15.04 [2.	<ul> <li>Weight</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>7.6%</li> <li>4.7%</li> <li>5.7%</li> <li>7.6%</li> <li>4.7%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.4%</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>4.4%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>5.6%</li> <li>4.4%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>5.6%</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>4.4%</li> <li>7.7%</li> <li>7.5%</li> <li>4.75%</li> <li>7.1%</li> <li>7.3%</li> <li>7.1%</li> <li>100.0%</li> <li>100.0%</li> </ul>
Study     E       Study     E       Whinkorah 2020     Wimeyaw 2020 M       ymeyaw 2020 N     Wimeyaw 2020 N       ymeyaw 2020 S     Jaka 2020       'agbamigbe 2022     Jaranja 2018       'podotsi 2021     Irishnamoorthy 2020 S       'irishnamoorthy 2020 I     Wase 2018       'ervin 2021     'aya 2021       'ervin 2021     'aya 2021       'ervin 2021     'aya 2021       'erdiction interval     leterogeneity: 1 <sup>2</sup> = 98.9%,       tudy     Ev       hinkorah 2020     meyaw 2020 N       meyaw 2020 N     meyaw 2020 S       aka 2020     agbamigbe 2022       aranja 2018     podotsi 2021       'ishnamoorthy 2020 2     umtar 2019       wase 2018     arvin 2021       aya 2021     'aya 2021       'aye 2022     killed delivery       'rediction interval     sterogenetic, 1 <sup>2</sup> = 99.0%, t	Frequencies $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{1}^{0}$ $r_{2}^{0}$ $r_{2$	burth Total E 956 1321 1566 648 22517 40 200 562 1500 564 9680 55, $p < 0$ hest Fotal E 741 1156 1387 9910 402 1303 402 552 1500 564 1312 1318 1319 1319 1326 1327 1319 1326 1327 1328 1328 1329 1328 1329	Loc Events 283 220 198 240 198 240 28753 1026 1026 1029 422 499 153 7 0001 Lo vents 283 220 198 422 429 153 7 0001 Lo vents 7 7 0001 283 200 198 422 422 422 429 153 7 7 0001 283 200 198 422 422 422 429 153 7 7 7 0001 283 7 7 7 14111 8 422 429 153 7 7 7 1026	0. <	01 0.1 1 10 Non-utilization 1 Utilization 3 COdds Ratio Random effects model	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	95%-C [7.67; 11.36 [5.37; 7.71 [2.63; 3.79 [2.10; 2.86 [4.25; 8.98 [14.14; 16, 12 [1.34; 9.77 [9.33; 40.34 [6.89; 7.52 [5.59; 6.79 [1.36; 2.75 [3.80; 37.00 [3.57; 25.19 [4.59; 9.24 [1.52; 27.93 95%-C [16.97; 28.00 [28.07; 44.11 [1.422; 20.83; [5.34; 7.7 [9.23; 41.7, [2.21; 16.3 [1.4.83; 247.7] [5.29; 17.33 [16.64; 21.1] [1.52; 3.7 [16.64; 21.1] [1.90; 3.11] [2.24; 3.7 [60.40; 131.6 [36.32; 95.8 [1.36; 27.84 [2.75; 115.04]	I Weight           7.5%           7.5%           7.5%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.7%           7.5%           7.7%           7.7%           7.5%           7.7%

Forest plot showing skilled delivery care utilization by wealth index of mothers in developing countries, 2015 to 2022.





#### Utilization of postnatal care by residence

Out of 17 studies, 1 study has highlighted the correlation between the place of residence and the utilization of postnatal care. In Sri Lanka, mothers residing in rural areas are less inclined to receive Full Postnatal care (FPNC) in comparison to their counterparts in urban areas (69).

#### Discussion

In the present systematic review, we summarized up-to-date evidence about the utilization of maternal health care services, including antenatal care, skilled delivery care, and postnatal care in developing countries. In all three areas of maternal health care



services, we have seen that place of residence, education, and wealth index are still important determinants, that is those living in urban areas, having a higher education level, or a higher wealth index utilize maternal health services more often. The greater the difference in education or wealth between the two groups, the greater the difference in the use of maternal health care services between them. The results of this systematic review and meta-analysis clearly indicate that there is a relative inequity in the utilization of antenatal care, skilled delivery care, and postnatal care for mothers in developing countries.

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review summarizing available evidence on inequity in the uptake of maternal health care services in developing countries not only in a narrative way but also quantitatively, by including meta-analyses. As compared to previous systematic reviews the present systematic review does not only focus on a specific maternal health care service but includes antenatal care, skilled delivery care, as well as postnatal care. Other strengths include a comprehensive search strategy, conducted in electronic databases without imposing language restrictions. This way we think, the likelihood of overlooking published studies was minimal, although there was a potential for missing unpublished ones. We aimed to reduce bias wherever possible by having at least two review authors work independently on study selection, data extraction, and risk of bias assessments.

A previous systematic review carried out on equity in maternal healthcare service utilization in developing countries investigated studies published between 2005 and 2015 (20). The present systematic review summarizes evidence for the period 2015 to 2022. Although the results of these two systematic reviews are only partially comparable due to the more limited questioning and lack of quantitative analysis in the previous review, it can be concluded that inequity in the uptake of maternal health care services described earlier persists in developing countries.

Several interventions might be potentially effective in reducing inequalities in maternal and child health in low- and middle-income settings. Besides immunization campaigns, nutrition supplement programs, and demand-side interventions, healthcare provision improvement interventions are tested in different countries, including different health programs, which aim to improve the uptake of maternal and child healthcare services (75). In Tanzania, simple guidelines, and messages for use in primary health facilities and communities were developed (76). In Brazil, the family health program was introduced, where multi-professional teams were working under the principles of comprehensive care and provided permanent and systematic follow-up of high-risk families residing in a pre-specified area with high infant mortality rates (77). In Bangladesh, voluntary community health workers provide intensive home-based maternal and newborn care. This program aimed to increase the utilization of antenatal care and to train attendants for home delivery (78). Another program addressing both the demand side (education about the benefits of ANC and PNC visits, pathologic signs related to pregnancy and delivery) and supply side interventions (strengthening health facilities, providing trained personnel and equipment) was able to successfully improve the utilization of maternal health services and reduce inequalities (79). In Indonesia, midwives were trained and posted in every village with specific responsibility for pregnancy, delivery, and postpartum care. This way this program focused on inequities in antenatal care check-ups and birth attendance by trained professionals (80). Although the evidence level is generally low, all these programs seemed to be effective in achieving results in the field of equity of maternal and child health care services.

When designing and implementing interventions to reduce inequalities in access to maternal and newborn care, the 5As

framework of access developed by Penchansky and Thomas should be borne in mind. They argue that access to care is simultaneously dependent on affordability, availability, accessibility, accommodation, and acceptability (81). These five aspects of access form a chain that is no stronger than its weakest link, so interventions that target only one or two of them may not reduce inequality at all (82, 83). In general, Changes in social determinants of health at the societal level can only be brought about by systemic, complex interventions. The obstacles to decisions leading to such measures are a lack of recognition of the problems, short-term political interests, and limited resources (84, 85).

Further research should be conducted to delve deeper into the effectiveness of the above-mentioned and additional interventions to improve the uptake of maternal health care services. The effectiveness of these interventions should be investigated separately for the different sociodemographic groups. These studies and sub-group analyses might facilitate targeted interventions in the most vulnerable groups. Governments should use the results of research activities to plan the implementation of programs. Progress in equity should be monitored, and recommendations should be forwarded to concerned bodies periodically. In most developing countries, there are demographic and health surveillance sites where demographic and health data are collected, analyzed, and reported regularly. Therefore, monitoring health inequity should be incorporated in these sites as one theme. In summary, this systematic review and meta-analysis synthesized data from 51 cross-sectional studies analyzing the uptake of maternal health care services in developing countries. The findings revealed a consistent and statistically significant effect of place of residence, education, and wealth index of mothers on the uptake of maternal health care services indicating persistence of relative inequity in utilization in developing countries. Currently, the services are mostly utilized by mothers who reside in urban areas, are more educated, and have the highest wealth index. Based on the conclusions of the literature synthesis, recommendations can be formulated for health policy that could increase the uptake of maternity services and reduce inequalities. The article may draw the attention of health policy makers to the fact that the low uptake and inequalities in maternal health care cannot be improved by interventions in the health sector alone, i.e., intersectoral action is needed.

### Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

### Author contributions

AG: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. EM: Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Visualization, Writing – review & editing. JV: Resources, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – review & editing. SL: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – review & editing.

# Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Acknowledgments

Our sincere thanks go to the University of Pécs, Doctoral School of Health Sciences for the provision of easy access to the databases.

# **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

# References

1. Arcaya MC, Arcaya AL, Subramanian SV. Inequalities in health: definitions, concepts, and theories. *Glob Health Action.* (2015) 8:27106. doi: 10.3402/gha.v8.27106

2. Barreto ML. Health inequalities: a global perspective. Ciênc Saúde Colet. (2017) 22:2097-108. doi: 10.1590/1413-81232017227.02742017

3. Whitehead M. The concepts and principles of equity and health. *Int J Health Serv.* (1992) 22:429–45. doi: 10.2190/986L-LHQ6-2VTE-YRRN

4. Marmot M, Allen J, Bell R, Bloomer E, Goldblatt PConsortium for the European Review of Social Determinants of Health and the Health Divide. WHO European review of social determinants of health and the health divide. *Lancet*. (2012) 380:1011–29. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61228-8

5. Lima Figueiredo ER, do Socorro Carvalho Miranda C, Viana Campos AC, de Campos Gomes F, Câmara Rodrigues CN, de Melo-Neto JS. Influence of sociodemographic and obstetric factors on maternal mortality in Brazil from 2011 to 2021. *BMC Womens Health.* (2024) 24:84. doi: 10.1186/s12905-024-02925-3

6. Tey N-P, Lai S-L. Correlates of and barriers to the utilization of health Services for Delivery in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. *Sci World J.* (2013) 2013:423403. doi: 10.1155/2013/423403

7. WHO, Ending preventable maternal mortality (EPMM): a renewed focus for improving maternal and newborn health and well-being, WHO, Editor. (2021), WHO.

8. WHO, Trends in maternal mortality, (2000), To 2020: Estimates by WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA. Geneve, Switzerland: World Bank Group and UNDESA/Population Division. (2023).

9. Souza JP, Day LT, Rezende-Gomes AC, Zhang J, Mori R, Baguiya A, et al. A global analysis of the determinants of maternal health and transitions in maternal mortality. *Lancet Glob Health.* (2024) 12:e306–16. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00468-0

10. Boerma T, Campbell OMR, Amouzou A, Blumenberg C, Blencowe H, Moran A, et al. Maternal mortality, stillbirths, and neonatal mortality: a transition model based on analyses of 151 countries. *Lancet Glob Health*. (2023) 11:e1024–31. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00195-X

11. Tsawe M, Moto A, Netshivhera T, Ralesego L, Nyathi C, Susuman AS. Factors influencing the use of maternal healthcare services and childhood immunization in Swaziland. *Int J Equity Health*. (2015) 14:32. doi: 10.1186/s12939-015-0162-2

12. Alkenbrack S, Chaitkin M, Zeng W, Couture T, Sharma S. Did equity of reproductive and maternal health service coverage increase during the MDG era? An analysis of trends and determinants across 74 low- and middle-income countries. *PLoS One.* (2015) 10:e0134905. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0134905

13. UNICEF, Analysis of reproductive, maternal, newborn, child and adolescent health inequities in Latin America and the Caribbean to inform policymaking summary report, Health Equity Report 2016, (2016). UNICEF Panama, Republic of Panama.

14. WBG. Data: World Bank Country and Lending Groups, (2024), Available at: https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups

15. Mahler DG, Serajuddin AH Umar. Time to stop referring to the "developing world." 2024 (cited 2024 24/05/2024).

16. Daka DW, Woldie M, Ergiba MS, Sori BK, Bayisa DA, Amente AB, et al. Inequities in the uptake of reproductive and maternal health Services in the Biggest Regional State of Ethiopia: too far from "leaving no one behind". *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res.* (2020) 12:595–607. doi: 10.2147/CEOR.S269955

17. Ahmed S, Creanga AA, Gillespie DG, Tsui AO. Economic status, education and empowerment: implications for maternal health service utilization in developing countries. *PLoS One.* (2010) 5:e11190. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0011190

18. WHO/UNICEF, Global indicator framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030, (2018), Agenda for Sustainable Development.

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

# Supplementary material

The Supplementary material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1415092/ full#supplementary-material

19. WHO. The Global Health Observatory: women of reproductive age 2024 [cited 2024 24/05/2024].

20. Çalışkan Z, Kılıç D, Öztürk S, Atılgan E. Equity in maternal health care service utilization: a systematic review for developing countries. *Int J Public Health*. (2015) 60:815–25. doi: 10.1007/s00038-015-0711-x

21. Shanto HH, al-Zubayer MA, Ahammed B, Sarder MA, Keramat SA, Hashmi R, et al. Maternal healthcare services utilisation and its associated risk factors: a pooled study of 37 low- and middle-income countries. *Int J Public Health*. (2023) 68:1606288. doi: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606288

22. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DGThe PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and Meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* (2009) 6:e1000097. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

23. HealthCare.gov. Glossary 2024 [cited 2024 24/05/2024].

24. Moola S., Munn Z., Tufanaru C., Aromataris E., Sears K., Sfetic R., et al, Chapter 7: Systematic reviews of etiology and risk: JBI manual for evidence synthesis JBI, editor. (2020).

25. el-Khatib Z, Kolawole Odusina E, Ghose B, Yaya S. Patterns and predictors of insufficient antenatal care utilization in Nigeria over a decade: a pooled data analysis using demographic and health surveys. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (2020) 17:8261. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17218261

26. Fagbamigbe AF, Olaseinde O, Setlhare V. Sub-national analysis and determinants of numbers of antenatal care contacts in Nigeria: assessing the compliance with the WHO recommended standard guidelines. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2021) 21:402. doi: 10.1186/s12884-021-03837-y

27. Dankwah E, Feng C, Kirychuck S, Zeng W, Lepnurm R, Farag M. Assessing the contextual effect of community in the utilization of postnatal care services in Ghana. *BMC Health Serv Res.* (2021) 21:40. doi: 10.1186/s12913-020-06028-1

28. Aziz S, Basit A, Sultana S, Homer CSE, Vogel JP. Inequalities in women's utilization of postnatal care services in Bangladesh from 2004 to 2017. *Sci Rep.* (2022) 12:2747. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-06672-z

29. Ameyaw EK, Dickson KS. Skilled birth attendance in Sierra Leone, Niger, and Mali: analysis of demographic and health surveys. *BMC Public Health*. (2020) 20:164. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-8258-z

30. Ahinkorah BO. Non-utilization of health facility delivery and its correlates among childbearing women: a cross-sectional analysis of the 2018 Guinea demographic and health survey data. *BMC Health Serv Res.* (2020) 20:1016. doi: 10.1186/s12913-020-05893-0

31. Bintabara D, Basinda N. Twelve-year persistence of inequalities in antenatal care utilisation among women in Tanzania: a decomposition analysis of population-based cross-sectional surveys. *BMJ Open.* (2021) 11:e040450. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040450

32. Fagbamigbe AF, Oyedele OK. Multivariate decomposition of trends, inequalities and predictors of skilled birth attendants utilisation in Nigeria (1990–2018): a cross-sectional analysis of change drivers. *BMJ Open.* (2022) 12:e051791. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-051791

33. Ekholuenetale M, Nzoputam CI, Barrow A. Prevalence and socioeconomic inequalities in eight or more antenatal care contacts in Ghana: findings from 2019 population-based data. *Int J Women's Health.* (2021) 13:349–60. doi: 10.2147/IJWH. S306302

34. Fan Q, Roque M, Nuzhath T, Hossain MM, Jin X, Aggad R, et al. Changes in levels and determinants of maternal health service utilization in Ethiopia: comparative analysis of two rounds Ethiopian demographic and health surveys. *Matern Child Health J*. (2021) 25:1595–606. doi: 10.1007/s10995-021-03182-8 35. Bobo FT, Yesuf EA, Woldie M. Inequities in utilization of reproductive and maternal health services in Ethiopia. *Int J Equity Health*. (2017) 16:105. doi: 10.1186/s12939-017-0602-2

36. Woldeamanuel BT, Aga MA. Trends, regional inequalities and determinants in the utilization of prenatal care and skilled birth attendant in Ethiopia: a multilevel analysis. *Clin Epidemiol Global Health*. (2021) 11:100771. doi: 10.1016/j.cegh.2021.100771

37. Tesfaye B, Mathewos T, Kebede M. Skilled delivery inequality in Ethiopia: to what extent are the poorest and uneducated mothers benefiting? *Int J Equity Health*. (2017) 16:82. doi: 10.1186/s12939-017-0579-x

38. Farrag NS, Abdelwahab F, Ismail GR. Patterns and factors affecting antenatal care utilization in Damietta governorate, Egypt: a retrospective cross-sectional study. *Fam Pract.* (2018) 36:479–85. doi: 10.1093/fampra/cmy105

39. Khatri RB, Alemu Y, Protani MM, Karkee R, Durham J. Intersectional (in) equities in contact coverage of maternal and newborn health services in Nepal: insights from a nationwide cross-sectional household survey. *BMC Public Health*. (2021) 21:1098. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-11142-8

40. Kien VD, Jat TR, Phu TV, Cuong LM, Anh VTM, Chu NV, et al. Trends in socioeconomic inequalities in the use of antenatal care services by women aged 15 to 49 years in Vietnam. *Asia Pacific J Publ Health*. (2019) 31:413–21. doi: 10.1177/1010539519857305

41. Krishnamoorthy Y, Majella MG, Rajaa S. Equity in coverage of maternal and newborn care in India: evidence from a nationally representative survey. *Health Policy Plan.* (2020) 35:616–23. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czaa020

42. Mumtaz S, Bahk J, Khang Y-H. Current status and determinants of maternal healthcare utilization in Afghanistan: analysis from Afghanistan demographic and health survey 2015. *PLoS One*. (2019) 14:e0217827. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0217827

43. Dinke K, Hunduma J. Urban-rural disparity and determinants of delivery care utilization in Oromia region, Ethiopia: community-based cross-sectional study. *Int J Nurs Pract.* (2017) 23:23. doi: 10.1111/ijn.12510

44. Kim C, Saeed KMA, Salehi AS, Zeng W. An equity analysis of utilization of health services in Afghanistan using a national household survey. *BMC Public Health*. (2016) 16:1226. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-3894-z

45. Karanja S, Gichuki R, Igunza P, Muhula S, Ofware P, Lesiamon J, et al. Factors influencing deliveries at health facilities in a rural Maasai Community in Magadi subcounty, Kenya. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2018) 18:5. doi: 10.1186/s12884-017-1632-x

46. Kumar G, Choudhary TS, Srivastava A, Upadhyay RP, Taneja S, Bahl R, et al. Utilisation, equity and determinants of full antenatal care in India: analysis from the National Family Health Survey 4. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* (2019) 19:327. doi: 10.1186/s12884-019-2473-6

47. Kpodotsi A, Baku EA, Adams JH, Alaba O. Socioeconomic inequalities in access and use of skilled birth attendants during childbirth in Ghana: a decomposition analysis. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2021) 21:850. doi: 10.1186/s12884-021-04290-7

48. Ozumba BC, Onyeneho NG, Chalupowski M, Subramanian SV. Inequities in access to maternal health Care in Enugu State: implications for universal health coverage to meet vision 2030 in Nigeria. *Int Q Community Health Educ.* (2019) 39:163–73. doi: 10.1177/0272684X18819977

49. Rahman MA, Rahman MA, Rawal LB, Paudel M, Howlader MH, Khan B, et al. Factors influencing place of delivery: evidence from three south-Asian countries. *PLoS One.* (2021) 16:e0250012. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0250012

50. Pervin J, Venkateswaran M, Nu UT, Rahman M, O'Donnell BF, Friberg IK, et al. Determinants of utilization of antenatal and delivery care at the community level in rural Bangladesh. *PLoS One*. (2021) 16:e0257782. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0257782

51. Zegeye B, Ahinkorah BO, Ameyaw EK, Budu E, Seidu AA, Olorunsaiye CZ, et al. Disparities in use of skilled birth attendants and neonatal mortality rate in Guinea over two decades. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2022) 22:56. doi: 10.1186/s12884-021-04370-8

52. Mwase T, Brenner S, Mazalale J, Lohmann J, Hamadou S, Somda SMA, et al. Inequities and their determinants in coverage of maternal health services in Burkina Faso. *Int J Equity Health*. (2018) 17:58. doi: 10.1186/s12939-018-0770-8

53. Rahman A, Nisha MK, Begum T, Ahmed S, Alam N, Anwar I. Trends, determinants and inequities of 4+ ANC utilisation in Bangladesh. *J Health Popul Nutr.* (2017) 36:2. doi: 10.1186/s41043-016-0078-5

54. Negeri MA. Magnitude and associated factors of antenatal care utilization in Western regions of Ethiopia: a study based on demographic and health survey data. *J Pharmaceut Res Int.* (2021) 33:23–9. doi: 10.9734/jpri/2021/v33i49A33297

55. Rosário EVN, Gomes MC, Brito M, Costa D. Determinants of maternal health care and birth outcome in the Dande health and demographic surveillance system area, Angola. *PLoS One*. (2019) 14:e0221280. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0221280

56. Shibre G, Zegeye B, Idriss-Wheeler D, Ahinkorah BO, Oladimeji O, Yaya S. Socioeconomic and geographic variations in antenatal care coverage in Angola: further analysis of the 2015 demographic and health survey. *BMC Public Health.* (2020) 20:1243. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09320-1

57. Yaya S, Zegeye B, Ahinkorah BO, Seidu AA, Ameyaw EK, Adjei NK, et al. Predictors of skilled birth attendance among married women in Cameroon: further analysis of 2018 Cameroon demographic and health survey. *Reprod Health*. (2021) 18:70. doi: 10.1186/s12978-021-01124-9

58. Lukwa AT, Siya A, Odunitan-Wayas FA, Alaba O. Decomposing maternal socioeconomic inequalities in Zimbabwe; leaving no woman behind. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2022) 22:239. doi: 10.1186/s12884-022-04571-9

59. Anarwat SG, Salifu M, Akuriba MA. Equity and access to maternal and child health services in Ghana a cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Serv Res.* (2021) 21:864. doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06872-9

60. Nonyane BA, Ashish KC, Callaghan-Koru JA, Guenther T, Sitrin D, Syed U, et al. Equity improvements in maternal and newborn care indicators: results from the Bardiya district of Nepal. *Health Policy Plan.* (2015) 31:405–14. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czv077

61. Ghosh A, Ghosh R. Maternal health care in India: a reflection of 10 years of National Health Mission on the Indian maternal health scenario. *Sex Reprod Healthc.* (2020) 25:100530. doi: 10.1016/j.srhc.2020.100530

62. Gudu W, Addo B. Factors associated with utilization of skilled service delivery among women in rural northern Ghana: a cross sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2017) 17:159. doi: 10.1186/s12884-017-1344-2

63. Hodge A, Firth S, Bermejo R, Zeck W, Jimenez-Soto E. Utilisation of health services and the poor: deconstructing wealth-based differences in facility-based delivery in the Philippines. *BMC Public Health.* (2016) 16:523. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-3148-0

64. Mehata S, Paudel YR, Dariang M, Aryal KK, Lal BK, Khanal MN, et al. Trends and inequalities in use of maternal health Care Services in Nepal: strategy in the search for improvements. *Biomed Res Int*. (2017) 2017:5079234. doi: 10.1155/2017/5079234

65. Huda TM, Hayes A, Dibley MJ. Examining horizontal inequity and social determinants of inequality in facility delivery services in three south Asian countries. *J Glob Health.* (2018) 8:010416. doi: 10.7189/jogh.08.010416

66. Keats EC, Akseer N, Bhatti Z, Macharia W, Ngugi A, Rizvi A, et al. Assessment of inequalities in coverage of essential reproductive, maternal, newborn, child, and adolescent health interventions in Kenya. *JAMA Netw Open.* (2018) 1:e185152–2. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.5152

67. Laksono AD, Rukmini R, Wulandari RD. Regional disparities in antenatal care utilization in Indonesia. *PLoS One.* (2020) 15:e0224006. doi: 10.1371/journal. pone.0224006

68. Målqvist M, Pun A, Raaijmakers H, KC A. Persistent inequity in maternal health care utilization in Nepal despite impressive overall gains. *Glob Health Action.* (2017) 10:1356083. doi: 10.1080/16549716.2017.1356083

69. Perera UAP, Assefa Y, Amilani U. Postnatal care coverage and its determinants in Sri Lanka: analysis of the 2016 demographic and health survey. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2021) 21:299. doi: 10.1186/s12884-021-03770-0

70. Nwosu CO, Ataguba JE. Socioeconomic inequalities in maternal health service utilisation: a case of antenatal care in Nigeria using a decomposition approach. *BMC Public Health.* (2019) 19:1493. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-7840-8

71. Okoli C, Hajizadeh M, Rahman MM, Khanam R. Geographical and socioeconomic inequalities in the utilization of maternal healthcare services in Nigeria: 2003–2017. *BMC Health Serv Res.* (2020) 20:849. doi: 10.1186/s12913-020-05700-w

72. Myint ANM, Liabsuetrakul T, Htay TT, Wai MM, Sundby J, Bjertness E. Inequity in the utilization of antenatal and delivery care in Yangon region, Myanmar: a cross-sectional study. *Int J Equity Health*. (2018) 17:63. doi: 10.1186/s12939-018-0778-0

73. Wang H, Frasco E, Takesue R, Tang K. Maternal education level and maternal healthcare utilization in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: an analysis of the multiple indicator cluster survey 2017/18. *BMC Health Serv Res.* (2021) 21:850. doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06854-x

74. Tsala Dimbuene Z, Amo-Adjei J, Amugsi D, Mumah J, Izugbara CO, Beguy D. WOMEN'S education and utilization of maternal health services in Africa: a multicountry and socioeconomic status analysis. *J Biosoc Sci.* (2018) 50:725–48. doi: 10.1017/ S0021932017000505

75. Yuan B, Målqvist M, Trygg N, Qian X, Ng N, Thomsen S. What interventions are effective on reducing inequalities in maternal and child health in low- and middleincome settings? A systematic review. *BMC Public Health.* (2014) 14:634. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-634

76. Masanja H, Schellenberg JA, de Savigny D, Mshinda H, Victora CG. Impact of integrated Management of Childhood Illness on inequalities in child health in rural Tanzania. *Health Policy Plan.* (2005) 20:i77–84. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czi054

77. Aquino R, de Oliveira NF, Barreto ML. Impact of the family health program on infant mortality in Brazilian municipalities. *Am J Public Health*. (2009) 99:87–93. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2007.127480

78. Quayyum Z, Khan MNU, Quayyum T, Nasreen HE, Chowdhury M, Ensor T. "Can community level interventions have an impact on equity and utilization of maternal health care"—evidence from rural Bangladesh. *Int J Equity Health.* (2013) 12:22. doi: 10.1186/1475-9276-12-22

79. Haider MR, Rahman MM, Moinuddin M, Rahman AE, Ahmed S, Khan MM. Impact of maternal and neonatal health initiatives on inequity in maternal health care utilization in Bangladesh. *PLoS One*. (2017) 12:e0181408. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0181408

80. Hatt L, Stanton C, Makowiecka K, Adisasmita A, Achadi E, Ronsmans C. Did the strategy of skilled attendance at birth reach the poor in Indonesia? *Bull World Health Organ.* (2007) 85:774–82. doi: 10.2471/BLT.06.033472

81. Penchansky R, Thomas JW. The concept of access: definition and relationship to consumer satisfaction. *Med Care*. (1981) 19:127–40. doi: 10.1097/00005650-198102000-00001

82. Kriel Y, Milford C, Cordero JP, Suleman F, Steyn PS, Smit JA. Access to public sector family planning services and modern contraceptive methods in South Africa: a qualitative evaluation from community and health care provider perspectives. *PLoS One.* (2023) 18:e0282996. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0282996

83. Dotse-Gborgbortsi W, Nilsen K, Ofosu A, Matthews Z, Tejedor-Garavito N, Wright J, et al. Distance is "a big problem": a geographic analysis of reported and

modelled proximity to maternal health services in Ghana. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* (2022) 22:672. doi: 10.1186/s12884-022-04998-0

84. Farrer L, Marinetti C, Cavaco YK, Costongs C. Advocacy for health equity: a synthesis review. *Milbank Q.* (2015) 93:392–437. doi: 10.1111/1468-0009.12112

85. Abouzahr C. Improving access to quality maternal health services. *Plan Parent Chall.* (1998) 1:6–9.