

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Prevalence and predictors of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-073799
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Mar-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Kumsa, Henok; Woldia University Mislu, Esuyawkal; Woldia University, Midwifery Aragie, Mulugeta; Woldia University, Midwifery Kidie, Atitegeb; Woldia University Hailu, Tilahun; Woldia University tenaw, lebeza; Woldia University
Keywords:	Adolescent, Public health < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Sexual and Gender Minorities
	·





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Prevalence and predictors of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Henok Kumsa¹, Esuyawkal Kasahun Mislu¹, Mulugeta Wedaje Aragie¹, Atitegeb Kidie Abera², Tilahun Hailu², and Lebeza Alemu Tenaw²

Affiliations

¹School of Midwifery, College of Health Science, Woldia University, Ethiopia

² School of Public health, College of Health Science, Woldia University, Ethiopia

Email Address

- HK: henokkumsa@gmail.com
- EKM: esuyawkalmislu@gmail.com

EKM: esuyawkalmislu@gmail.com MWA: mulewodaje@gmail.com AKA: atitegebabera@gmail.com TH: lemaryam01@gmail.com LAT: lebezaa@gmail.com *Corresponding author: Lebeza Alemu Tenaw Email: lebezaa@gmail.com

BMJ Open

Abstract

Objectives: this systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to assess the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its predictors in Ethiopia.

Participants: A systematic review and meta-analysis of studies published from January 2004 to January 2023. PubMed, EMBASE, Medline, and other search engines were used to retrieve relevant articles. Thirty-three full articles were included in this review.

Primary and Secondary Measures: The p-value for I² statistics of 0.05 was used to determine the presence of heterogeneity. Publication bias was assessed using the Egger regression asymmetry test and the Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis.

Results: The overall pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy among women in Ethiopia was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01, 28.03). The meta-analysis included studies with significant heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99.8\%$, p 0.000. The Egger's regression asymmetry test also showed significant publication bias, a p-value 0.001. Sub-group analysis showed that the pooled prevalence of abortion was highest in the Oromia region (35.60%; 95% CI: 28.86, 42.34) and among gynecological admitted patients (60.60%; 95% CI: 59.47, 61.73). Women who were students who had their first sexual initiation before the age of 18, had irregular menstrual bleeding, and had multiple sexual partners were significantly associated with pregnancy termination, according to the pooled meta-analysis.

Conclusions: One in five women terminated their pregnancies, which is higher than in other sub-Saharan African countries. Being a student, irregular menstrual bleeding, early initiation of sexual intercourse, and multiple sexual partners were predictors of pregnancy termination.

Strength

- Both published and unpublished literature are included in this study.

- The authors extracted the whole literature separately to ensure data quality
- JBI implemented to ensure the quality of each literature to include in this review

Keywords: Pregnancy termination, Predictors, Systematic review and meta analysis, Ethiopia

Introduction

Pregnancy termination is a delicate and divisive topic having political, cultural, moral, and religious implications. Also, it is a problem for public health in many regions of the world(1). More than 60% of unintended pregnancies result in induced abortion, with the majority of those being unsafe, resulting in approximately 73 million induced abortions performed globally each year(2). Developing countries bear the burden of 97% of all unsafe abortions and contribute to 220 deaths per 100,000 live births(3).

Moreover, abortion imposes an additional burden on health institutions and individuals; 7 million women per year were treated in hospital facilities for complications of unsafe abortion in developing countries alone(4). It is estimated that health-care systems will spend \$553 million per year on post-abortion complications and will lose \$922 million in income due to long-term disability caused by unsafe termination(5). Additionally, a woman with a history of pregnancy termination has an increased risk of subsequent preterm birth, especially when performed by mechanical dilation and curettage or performed repeatedly (6).

Though the burden of pregnancy termination has significant causes of maternal mortality and morbidity in Ethiopia(7). Previous studies conducted in Ethiopia have shown that the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its negative consequences are increasing over time(8, 9), and repeated induced abortion also account significant amount (10-12). Several variables, including early age marriage, low level of education, early sexual intercourse initiation, violence/rape, emotional well-being, educational status, employment status, and resources, and sexual intercourse relationship, have been implicated as predictors of pregnancy termination in studies conducted across Ethiopia(13-16).

However, at the national level, illustrative evidence is lacking in Ethiopia regarding the level and underlying factors of pregnancy termination. Thus, this systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to assess the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its associated factors in Ethiopia. The findings of this study provide evidence for intervention to reduce the burden of pregnancy termination, its complications, and its economic impact in the country. Additionally, this study will help to design strategies and monitor the progress of programs aimed at achieving the maternal mortality reduction targets of the sustainable development gaols.

Methods

Study design and search strategy

A search in PubMed, EMBASE, Medline, and reference lists was performed for relevant articles to assess the pooled prevalence and predictors of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia. Well-known PRISMA guidelines were strictly followed in doing this review. Similarly, the quality of our systematic review and meta-analysis was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist(17). The data extraction tool contains information on the author, title, year of publication, study area and region, study design and type, study population, sample size, the outcome measured, and the prevalence rate of pregnancy termination.

We used the search terms "(((((((Abortion) OR (termination of pregnancy)) OR (miscarriage)) AND (determinant factors)) OR (predictors)) OR (associated factors)) OR (influencing factors)) AND (Ethiopia)".

Study selection and eligibility criteria

The study period for the review ranged from January 2004 to January 2023. MESH terms were pregnancy termination, abortion, and miscarriage. We included cross-sectional and case-control studies that showed the prevalence of or predictors of pregnancy termination or miscarriage. Case reports, case series, reviews, editorials, and studies published as abstracts only were excluded. The references of the selected articles were also screened to retrieve any additional articles that could be incorporated into this review.

Quality assessment and data extraction

Articles were screened using their titles, abstracts, and full paper reviews before being included in the meta-analysis. The quality of included studies was evaluated using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist(17). The quality scores of included studies were assessed and presented using the mean scores to designate them as high- or low-quality. The JBI tool for prevalence and predictor studies was used as a guideline for data extraction from the final selected articles. The data extraction tool contains information on the author and year of the study, the title, the year the study was conducted and the year of publication, the study area and

region, the study design and type, the study population, the sample size, the response rate, the outcome measured, and the prevalence and predictors of pregnancy termination. Moreover, all authors independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of studies to be included in this systematic review and meta-analysis. Agreements on the inclusion and exclusion of the articles were reached with the participation of all authors.

Heterogeneity and publication Bias

The I² statistics were used to assess the heterogeneity of the studies that were included. The p-value for I² statistics less than 0.05 was used to determine the presence of heterogeneity. Based on the I² test statistics results, the heterogeneity is categorized as low (25%), moderate (50%), and high (75%) (18). Moreover, the publication bias was assessed using the Egger regression asymmetry test (19, 20). The presence of publication bias is declared when the Egger test result's P-value is less than 0.05. The Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis using the random effect analysis was conducted to see the presence of publication bias(21).

Measurement of the outcome variable

In this study, pregnancy termination is the removal of pregnancy tissue, the products of conception, or the fetus, and the placenta from the uterus. In general, the terms "fetus" and "placenta" are used after eight weeks of pregnancy. Pregnancy tissue and products of conception refer to tissue produced by the union of an egg and sperm before eight weeks. It is a deliberate intervention to terminate a pregnancy, either by a health professional or the woman herself(22).

Patient and Public Involvement: N/A

Statistical methods and analysis

Data were entered into Microsoft Excel, and the meta-analysis was conducted using Stata 16 software. The prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia was shown by forest plots. Due to its help in minimizing the heterogeneity of included studies, the random effect model of analysis was used as a method of meta-analysis(18). Sub-group analysis was conducted by study setting, population, and study period. Predictors of pregnancy termination were presented using odds ratios (ORs) at a 95% confidence interval (CI).

Result

Study selection

This systematic review and meta-analysis included published studies on the termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia. A total of 12,242 records were retrieved through electronic database searching, and only 33 articles were included in the final analysis (Figure 1).

Characteristics of included studies

Thirty-three studies conducted in different regions of Ethiopia were represented in this review. Of all the studies, 8 (24.24%) were from the Amhara Region(11, 12, 15, 16, 23-26), South Nations and Nationalities accounted for 9 (27.27%) of the total(13, 27-34), 1 was from Oromia (35), 5 (15.15%) from Addis Ababa city administration(10, 14, 36-38), 3 (9.09%) were from Harari region(39-41), 3 (9.09%) were from Tigray region(42-44), 1 (3.03%) was from Afar region(45), 3 (9.09) were from National data(46-48). Twenty-eight (84.85%) of the included studies were cross-sectional studies(10-13, 15, 23-31, 33-35, 37-42, 44-48), and remains five (15.15%) were case-control studies(14, 16, 32, 36, 43).

As well, twenty-seven of the studies were institution-based(10-16, 24, 27-33, 35-46), while six were community-based studies(23, 25, 26, 34, 47, 48). The sample size of the included studies ranged from a minimum of 124 in a study conducted in southwest Ethiopia(34) and to a maximum of 12,378 in a study conducted using DHS data(48). Lastly, this review included a total of 40,116 study participants.

Prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia

Based on the random effect model, the overall pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy among women in Ethiopia was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01-28.03). The meta-analysis included studies with significant heterogeneity: I2 = 99.8%, p 0.000. Publication biases among the included studies were examined using funnel plots and Egger's regression test. The results of funnel plots showed an asymmetric shape, which indicates the presence of publication biase among those included studies. Additionally, the Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis was applied to correct publication bias among the studies, but no trimming was performed since the data is unchanged (Figures 3 and 4).

BMJ Open

Objective assessments of publication bias by Egger's regression test also showed the presence of publication bias across studies (*p*-value 0.001). After adjustment, the final pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia after the trim and fill analysis was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03) (Figure 2).

Subgroup analysis

We performed subgroup analysis based on the region, study population, and study setting of the included studies. Table 1 shows the pooled prevalence was highest, 35.60% (95% CI: 28.86, 42.34) in the Oromia region, followed by 34.17% (95% CI: 17.67, 86.01) in the Tigray region, 24.63% (95% CI: 10.52, 37.75) in the South Nation and Nationalities People Region, and the lowest was seen in three studies conducted using demographic health data, 12.10% (95% CI: 5.66, 18.50) (Figure 5).

Furthermore, subgroup analysis reveals that the highest pooled prevalence of abortion was seen among gynecological admitted patients, at 60.60% (95% CI: 59.47, 61.73), followed by 25.38% (95% CI: 9.39, 41.32) among university/college students, and 27.90% (95% CI: 20.01, 35.79) among insecurely housed women, with the lowest pooled prevalence being seen among pregnant women and youth women,Additionally, subgroup analysis was conducted based on the year before and after the Millennium Development Goals' implementation. The pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination before and after MDGs was 20.55% (95% CI: 16.10–24.99) and 21.61% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03), respectively (Figure 7).

3	
4	
5	
6	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
2-T 2E	
20	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
21	
21	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
27	
57	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
42	
7-J // /	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
55	
50	
57	
58	
59	
60	

Table 1. Subgroup analysis for the prevalence of pregnancy termination in Europia, 2004-20	Table 1	1: Subgroup	analysis for t	he prevalence	of pregnancy	termination in	n Ethiopia,	2004-202
--	---------	-------------	----------------	---------------	--------------	----------------	-------------	----------

Subgroup	Number Total		Prevalence (95%CI)	Heterogeneity	
	of studies	Sample		I ²	p-value
By region			÷		
Addis Ababa	2	855	25.49(10.39, 40.09)	92.4	0.000
Amhara	6	2371	18.06(6.27, 29.85)	99.0	0.000
SNNP	8	3678	24.63(95% CI: 10.52, 37.75)	99.4	0.000
National Data	3	19854	12.10(5.70, 18.50)	99.7	0.000
Tigray	2	7463	34.17(17.6, 86.01)	99.9	0.000
Harari	2	1835	16.13(12.21, 20.05)	81.2	0.021
Oromia	1	194	35.60(28.86, 42.34)		
Afar	1	509	8.80(6.34, 11.26)		
By publication year		-			
2016 to 2022 (post	15	24234	20.55(16.10, 24.99)	99.3	0.000
MDG)					
Before MDG	10	12525	22.61(4.55, 40.66)	99.9	0.000
Study population					
Reproductive age	8	4426	17.03(8.55, 25.52)	99.0	0.000
Pregnant women	1	12378	8.90(8.40, 9.40)		
Abortion care seeker	7	2990	21.19(14.65, 27.72)	95.3	0.000
University or college student	6	3237	25.36(9.39, 41.32)	99.5	0.000
Gynecological patient	1	7203	60.60(59.47, 61.73)	•	•
Youth women	1	6401	2.50(2.12, 2.88)		
Insecurely household women	1	124	27.90(20.01, 35.79)		
Total	25	36759	21.52(15.01, 28.03)	99.8	0.000

Predictors of pregnancy termination

Socio-demographic characteristics

The sociodemographic factors included in this analysis were the place of residence, age, marital, occupational, and educational status of the women. A separate analysis was conducted for each variable. Finally, a meta-analysis of (16, 39) two studies showed that being a student was significantly associated with pregnancy termination (OR: 4.85; 95% CI: 1.98, 11.91). There was moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 39\%$) (Figures 8 and 9).

Reproductive characteristics

A total of 5 articles (15, 24, 28, 43, 47) were included to assess the association between first sexual initiation before the age of 18 and pregnancy termination. The pooled meta-analysis found that women who had their first sexual experience before the age of 18 were twice as likely as those who had their first sexual experience after the age of 18 to have their pregnancy terminated (OR = 1.78; 95% CI = 1.13, 2.82). There was moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 41.6\%$). Moreover, two articles (11, 43) were also included to determine the association between irregular menstrual bleeding and pregnancy termination. The final pooled meta-analysis using data from the two articles found that pregnancy termination was nearly two times more likely to occur in women with irregular menstrual bleeding than in those who had regular menstrual bleeding, (OR = 1.86; 95% CI = 1.25, 2.77). Similarly, a meta-analysis of six studies(14, 15, 24, 32, 34, 43) showed that women who had multiple sexual partners were significantly associated with pregnancy termination (OR: 4.88; 95% CI: 3.43, 6.93). There was low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 13.4\%$) (Figure 10).

Discussion

Pregnancy termination is a major public health concern in Ethiopia (49). In this systematic review and meta-analysis, the overall magnitude of pregnancy termination was pooled from 25 published articles in Ethiopia, and significant predictors of pregnancy termination were identified using different articles. Being a student increased the rate of termination of pregnancy nearly five times. In addition, first sexual initiation before the age of 18, women with irregular menstrual bleeding, and multiple sexual partners were predictors of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia. The findings of this review revealed evidence to help reduce the impact of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia in Ethiopia by aiming at the main predictors for pregnancy termination.

There are different studies conducted on this issue at community, health, and higher education institutions with different figures. This study found a higher prevalence of termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia compared to other low- and middle-income countries.

The pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia was 21.52%. This finding is lower compared to a study conducted in Ghana at 25% (50), higher than in Mozambique at 9 % (× 2.33) (50), and in India at 1.7% (× 12) (51). The difference might be due to the difference in the study population, study design, study area, socio-demographic characteristics, and the differences in health policies of the countries. That is, the current study was conducted using meta-analysis at the national level, which includes community or institutional studies, while the study in Ghana and Mozambique was conducted using demographic health data with a small sample size compared to the current study(50). Additionally, in our study, huge variations were seen across the regions. Moreover, a spatial analysis study conducted in Ethiopia using national DHS data also showed variation even within the regions of the country(48). Thus, acting according to the needs of the region and age-specific policy is important in national policy or guideline development.

Our study observed that being a student was significantly associated with the termination of pregnancy. One of the possible explanations could be that students are likely to be adolescents, belonging to the younger age category. In addition, adolescent girls are remaining in school longer, which may factor into their decisions to postpone childbearing and terminate unintended

BMJ Open

pregnancies(52). Likewise, a study conducted in India shows the tendency for pregnancy termination is high in this age category since the rate of unintended pregnancies and unmet needs for family planning are high in this age group(53). The higher rate of pregnancy termination could also be attributed to a failure to provide education about the risks of pregnancy termination and the mechanisms in place to prevent unintended pregnancy. Contraception use aids in the prevention of unintended pregnancy and unsafe abortions(54).

Additionally, the idea supported by Van Rensburg that societal poverty, unemployment, and other socio-demographic factors affect youth pregnancies and might lead to pregnancy termination is also supported(55). In addition, a review from the late 1990s found that young women often cited a desire to stay in school as a major reason for abortion(56). Moreover, many adolescents continue to have difficulty accessing contraception, often as a result of stigma and/or a lack of resources(57).

The study from Nigeria indicated that 15–24-year old women are still being left behind on reproductive health matters despite increasing global attention to prioritizing their health(58). Studies found that educational programs aimed at reducing sexual risk behaviors and preventing pregnancy among young people can effectively reduce pregnancy rates among teenagers(59). Also, programs aimed at abstinence-centered sexuality education are effective in preventing adolescent pregnancy (60). Thus, this implies a future focus on reproductive health issues specific to students to address their needs. Additionally, future researchers should better focus on possible interventions to reduce the risk of pregnancy and pregnancy termination among students.

This review also assessed the association of selected variables with pregnancy termination. Women under the age of 18 at first sex were significantly more likely to terminate their pregnancy. This finding is consistent with studies conducted in Nigeria and Peru that reported a higher rate of pregnancy termination among women who had their age at first sex before 18 years old (61-63). Studies also revealed that early sexual debuts are significantly associated with adolescent pregnancies, which are usually unwanted (64, 65). In addition, a study conducted in Ethiopia shown engaging in sex before the age of 18 years was found to have a higher odds of experiencing repeat induced abortion (66).

In many low income countries, rising ages at first marriage combined with increasing levels of premarital sex continue to result in unintended pregnancies among adolescents(67). Thus, improving the knowledge of adolescents about sexual and reproductive health issues, and increasing contraceptive access and use among young people, are important to prevent unsafe abortion or pregnancy termination(68). This necessitates the development of reproductive health education specifically for adolescent girls.Future researchers should also address the gap in studies on the needs of adolescent girls and possible interventions needed to reduce sexual initiation before the age of 18 years.

Furthermore, at the individual level, we found that pregnancy termination was significantly associated with women who had multiple sexual partners. Likewise, a study conducted in Peru indicated that as the number of sexual partners increased, the odds of getting a pregnancy termination increased(69). Furthermore, studies in Cambodia, China, and the United Kingdom have found that having multiple sexual partners is associated with a higher rate of repeated pregnancy termination(54, 70, 71). The government shall be emphasized reproductive health education, particularly for women regarding the risks of multiple sexual partners, the access where, and how to get counseling on how to prevent pregnancy.

This study also found that pregnancy termination was two times higher among women who had menstrual irregularities compared to their counterparts. Lastly, this systematic review and metaanalysis indicated that there was no statistically significant association between the termination of pregnancy and rural residents, marital status, women's age, educational status, primiparous, history of abortion, and wanted pregnancy.

As a limitation, this finding might be prone to the risk of bias due to the significant heterogeneity of articles included from a different region of Ethiopia. In addition, differences in the study population, setting, and design within the included studies might influence the results of this review. Moreover, studies conducted in health institutions, Colleges, or higher education might affect the pooled estimates. Additionally, in this review, only published articles were included. On the other hand, the fact that self-performed pregnancy termination is becoming common, especially when performed early, makes it difficult to determine the true prevalence of pregnancy termination. Abortifacients like misoprostol tablets are poorly restricted in many African countries(72). Future research must explain the relationship between pregnancy

BMJ Open

termination and other predictors such as social, economic, substance use, peer pressure, alcohol use, sexual or physical violence, and knowledge of sexual and reproductive health issues such as family planning and fertility. Also, this review didn't include qualitative studies on the explanations for pregnancy termination.

Conclusions

One in every five women had their pregnancies terminated, which is a high rate when compared to other students in Sub-Saharan Africa. Being a student was significantly associated with the termination of a pregnancy. In addition, irregular menstrual bleeding, early initiation of sexual intercourse, and multiple sexual partners were important predictors of pregnancy termination

Abbreviations

OR: odds ratios; CI: confidence interval; .JBI: Joanna Briggs Institute; MDG: Millennium Development Goals'

Declarations

Ethical approval: Not required. This article is based on published articles.

Funding: None declared.

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request(lebezaa@gmail.com).

Competing interests: None declared.

Author contributions: HK, MWA, AKA, EKM, TH, and LAT conducted the search and data extraction. HK, LAT, EKM, and MWA. wrote the first draft of the manuscript. LAT, EKM, MWA and HK conducted the statistical analyses and data interpretation. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Reference

1. Mesce D, Clifto D. Abortion facts and figures; population reference bureau. Geneva: WHO. 2011.

2. Bearak J, Popinchalk A, Ganatra B, Moller A-B, Tunçalp Ö, Beavin C, et al. Unintended pregnancy and abortion by income, region, and the legal status of abortion: estimates from a comprehensive model for 1990–2019. The Lancet Global Health. 2020;8(9):e1152-e61.

3. Ganatra B, Gerdts C, Rossier C, Johnson Jr BR, Tunçalp Ö, Assifi A, et al. Global, regional, and subregional classification of abortions by safety, 2010–14: estimates from a Bayesian hierarchical model. The Lancet. 2017;390(10110):2372-81.

4. Singh S, Maddow - Zimet I. Facility - based treatment for medical complications resulting from unsafe pregnancy termination in the developing world, 2012: a review of evidence from 26 countries. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2016;123(9):1489-98.

 Vlassoff M, Shearer J, Walker D, Lucas H. Economic impact of unsafe abortion-related morbidity and mortality: evidence and estimation challenges: Institute of Development Studies Brighton, UK; 2008.
 DeCherney AH NL, Laufer N, Roman AS. Contraception and family, gynecology. pcdatioa, 2007. teUSTM-HC.

Ababa A. Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia ministry of health. Ethiopia: Postnatal Care.
 2003.

8. Gebrehiwot Y, Fetters T, Gebreselassie H, Moore A, Hailemariam M, Dibaba Y, et al. Changes in Morbidity and Abortion Care in Ethiopia After Legal Reform: National Results from 2008 and 2014. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2016;42(3):121-30. PubMed PMID: 28825903. eng.

9. Singh S, Fetters T, Gebreselassie H, Abdella A, Gebrehiwot Y, Kumbi S, et al. The estimated incidence of induced abortion in Ethiopia, 2008. International perspectives on sexual and reproductive health. 2010:16-25.

10. Alemayehu B, Addissie A, Ayele W, Tiroro S, Woldeyohannes D. Magnitude and associated factors of repeat induced abortion among reproductive age group women who seeks abortion Care Services at Marie Stopes International Ethiopia Clinics in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Reproductive health. 2019;16(1):1-10.

11. Mulat A, Bayu H, Mellie H, Alemu A. Induced second trimester abortion and associated factors in Amhara region referral hospitals. BioMed research international. 2015;2015:256534. PubMed PMID: 25918704. Pubmed Central PMCID: Pmc4396136. Epub 2015/04/29. eng.

12. Tesfaye B, Tewabe M, Ferede A, Dawson A. Induced second trimester abortion and associated factors at debre Markos referral hospital: cross-sectional study. Women's Health. 2020;16:1745506520929546.

13. Tesfaye G, Hambisa MT, Semahegn A. Induced abortion and associated factors in health facilities of Guraghe zone, southern Ethiopia. Journal of pregnancy. 2014;2014.

14. Denberu B, Alemseged F, Segni H. Determinants of abortion among youth seeking reproductive health Care in Selected Health Facilities, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Global Journal of Reproductive Medicine. 2017;1(2):27-38.

15. Behulu GK, Fenta EA, Aynalem GL. Repeat induced abortion and associated factors among reproductive age women who seek abortion services in Debre Berhan town health institutions, Central Ethiopia, 2019. BMC research notes. 2019;12(1):1-5.

16. Tilahun F, Dadi AF, Shiferaw G. Determinants of abortion among clients coming for abortion service at felegehiwot referral hospital, northwest Ethiopia: a case control study. Contraception and reproductive medicine. 2017;2(1):1-6.

17. Aromataris E, Munn Z. Joanna Briggs Institute reviewer's manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute. 2017;2018.

BMJ Open

2	
3	18 Higgins IP Thompson SG Deeks II Altman DG Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses Bmi
4	2003-327(7/1/1)-557-60
5	10 Regg CR Mazumdar M Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias
6	Piemetrics 1004:1098 101
7	Biometrics, 1994,1088-101.
8	20. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical
9	test. Bmj. 1997;315(7109):629-34.
10	21. Duval S, Tweedie R. A nonparametric "trim and fill" method of accounting for publication bias in
11	meta-analysis. Journal of the american statistical association. 2000;95(449):89-98.
12	22. 2014 KAAOBAftooARA.
13	23. Ayenew G, Gedefaw M, Berhe R, Nigusie A. Current Status, and Correlates of Abortion among
14	Rural Women of Gonji Kollela District, Northwest Ethiopia. Open Journal of Epidemiology. 2015
15	04/01;5:136-46.
10	24. Waktola MI, Mekonen DG, Nigussie TS, Cherkose EA, Abate AT, Repeat induced abortion and
17	associated factors among women seeking abortion care services at Debre Markos town health
10	institutions Ambara regional state Ethionia 2017 BMC Res Notes 2020:13(1):44- PubMed PMID:
20	21007254 ong
20	25 Mariam T. Malkamu S. Vaturala F. Abdala M. Catnet M. Drovalance and Associated Factors of
27	25. Wahami I, Weikamu S, Yetwale F, Abdela W, Gethet W. Prevalence and Associated Factors of
23	Unsate Abortion among women of Reproductive Age Group in Gondar Town, Northwest Ethiopia, 2017:
24	A Community-based Cross-sectional Study. Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research. 2018
25	11/30;28:1-7.
26	26. Getahun H, Berhane Y. Abortion among rural women in north Ethiopia. International Journal of
27	Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2000;71(3):265-6.
28	27. Animaw W, Bogale B. Abortion in university and college female students of Arba Minch town,
29	Ethiopia, 2011. Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare. 2014;5(1):17-22.
30	28. Beyene BB, Meshesha B. Magnitude And Associated Factors Of Induced Abortion Among Regular
31	Undergraduate Students Of Dilla University. International journal of scientific and research publications.
32	2020:10:10032
33	29 Sabile A Shiferaw M Magnitude of Induced Abortion and Associated Factors among Female
34	Students of Hawassa University Southern Persion Ethionia, 2010 Journal of programsy, 2020
35	Students of Hawassa Oniversity, Southern Region, Ethopia, 2019. Journal of pregnancy. 2020
36	09/22/2020:1-0.
37	30. Gelaye AA, Taye KN, Mekonen T. Magnitude and risk factors of abortion among regular female
38	students in Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia. BMC Women's Health. 2014 2014/03/26;14(1):50.
39	31. Nigussie T, Feyisa M, Yosef T, Berhanu M, Asefa A. Prevalence of induced abortion and its
40	associated factors among female students of health science in South West Ethiopia. The Open Nursing
41	Journal. 2020;14(1).
42	32. Abebe M, Mersha A, Degefa N, Gebremeskel F, Kefelew E, Molla W. Determinants of induced
45	abortion among women received maternal health care services in public hospitals of Arba Minch and
44	Wolayita Sodo town, southern Ethiopia: unmatched case-control study. BMC women's health.
45	2022:22(1):1-12.
40	33 Lentiro K. Gebru T. Worku A. Asfaw A. Gebremariam T. Tesfave A. Risk factors of induced
48	abortion among preparatory school student in Guraghe zone. Southern region. Ethionia: a cross-
49	soctional study PMC Woman's Health 2010/10/11/1 7
50	Alamu K. Dirkanu S. Fokadu L. Endala F. Tamana A. Hahta A. Safa abartian comiss utilization and
51	34. Alemu K, Birnanu S, Fekadu L, Endale F, Tamene A, Hable A. Sale abortion service utilization and
52	associated factors among insecurely noused women who experienced abortion in southwest Ethiopia,
53	2021: A community-based cross-sectional study. Plos one. 2022;17(8):e0272939.
54	35. Gebeyehu D, Admassu B, Sinega M, Haile M. Assessment of Prevalence and Reasons for
55	Termination of Pregnancy at Jimma University Teaching Hospital, Ethiopia. Universal Journal of Public
56	Health. 2015 11/01;3:251-5.
57	
58	16
59	
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

36. Megersa BS, Ojengbede OA, Deckert A, Fawole OI. Factors associated with induced abortion among women of reproductive age attending selected health facilities in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a case control study. BMC Women's Health. 2020;20(1):1-11.

37. Wassie AY, Lemlem SB, Boka A. Knowledge, Practice and Associated Factors Towards Medication Abortion Among Reproductive-Age Women in Sexual and Reproductive Health Clinics of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2018: Cross-Sectional Study. International Journal of Women's Health. 2021;13:489.

38. Bulti F, Gela D, Dinagde N. Knowledge of Safe Abortion Care Services and Associated Factors Among Women of Reproductive Age Working at Non-Health Sector Public Institutions in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. 2021.

39. Jamie AH, Abdosh MZ. Prevalence of induced abortion and associated factors among women of reproductive age in Harari region, Ethiopia. Public Health of Indonesia. 2020;6(2):35-40.

40. Mohammed M, Wesenu M. Prevalence and determinants associated with second trimester termination of pregnancy in Harari city, Ethiopia; Cross sectional study. 2021.

41. Worku S, Fantahun M. Unintended pregnancy and induced abortion in a town with accessible family planning services: the case of Harar in eastern Ethiopia. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2006;20(2):79-83.

42. Abera GB, Berhanu B, Kahsay AB, Gebru HB, Aregay A. Assessment of determinants of induced abortion among child bearing age women attending maternal and child health clinic in Mekelle town, Tigray, Ethiopia: a cross sectional study. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research. 2012;3(12):4745.

43. Alemayehu M, Yebyo H, Medhanyie AA, Bayray A, Fantahun M, Goba GK. Determinants of repeated abortion among women of reproductive age attending health facilities in Northern Ethiopia: a case–control study. BMC Public Health. 2017;17(1):1-8.

44. Gessessew A. Abortion and unwanted pregnancy in Adigrat zonal hospital, Tigray, north Ethiopia. African journal of reproductive health. 2010;14(3):183-8.

45. Biza N, Habib Y, Bayray A, Reddy PS. MAGNITUDE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS OF ABORTION AMONG REGULAR FEMALE STUDENTS OF SAMARA UNIVERSITY, AFAR, ETHIOPIA, 2016. Medico Research Chronicles. 2018;5(3):191-201.

46. Mekbib T-A, Hiwot YG, Fantahun M. SURVEY OF UNSAFE ABORTION IN SELECTED HEALTH FACILITIES IN ETHIOPIA. Ethiopian Journal of Reproductive Health. 2007;1(1):11-.

47. Gilano G, Hailegebreal S. Determinants of abortion among youth 15–24 in Ethiopia: A multilevel analysis based on EDHS 2016. PloS one. 2021;16(3):e0248228.

48. Tesema GA, Mekonnen TH, Teshale AB. Spatial distribution and determinants of abortion among reproductive age women in Ethiopia, evidence from Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey 2016 data: Spatial and mixed-effect analysis. PloS one. 2020;15(6):e0235382.

49. Abdella A. Maternal mortality trend in Ethiopia. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2010;24(1).

50. Dickson KS, Adde KS, Ahinkorah BO. Socio–economic determinants of abortion among women in Mozambique and Ghana: evidence from demographic and health survey. Archives of Public Health. 2018;76(1):1-10.

51. Pallikadavath S, Stones RW. Maternal and social factors associated with abortion in India: a population-based study. International Family Planning Perspectives. 2006:120-5.

52. Grant MJ, Behrman JR. Gender gaps in educational attainment in less developed countries. Population and development review. 2010;36(1):71-89.

53. Jiang L, Hardee K. Women's education, family planning, or both? Application of multistate demographic projections in India. International journal of population research. 2014;2014.

54. Demographic E. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and Rockville. Maryland, MA, USA: CSA and ICF. 2016.

1	
2	
2	
2	
4	
5	
6	
0	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
10	
12	
13	
14	
15	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
21	
22	
23	
24	
24	
25	
26	
27	
27	
28	
29	
20	
30	
31	
32	
22	
22	
34	
35	
26	
50	
37	
38	
20	
27	
40	
41	
12	
-72	
43	
44	
15	
46	
47	
<u>4</u> 8	
+0	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
51	
55	
56	
57	
57	
58	
59	

60

55. van Rensburg HC. South Africa's protracted struggle for equal distribution and equitable access– still not there. Human resources for health. 2014;12(1):1-16.

56. Bankole A, Singh S, Haas T. Reasons why women have induced abortions: evidence from 27 countries. International family planning perspectives. 1998:117-52.

57. Woog V, Susheela S, Alyssa B, Jesse P. Adolescent womens need for and use of sexual and reproductive health services in developing countries: Citeseer; 2015.

58. Onukwugha FI, Magadi MA, Sarki AM, Smith L. Trends in and predictors of pregnancy termination among 15–24 year-old women in Nigeria: a multi-level analysis of demographic and health surveys 2003–2018. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2020 2020/09/22;20(1):550.

59. Coyle K, Basen-Enquis K, Kirby D, Parcel G, Banspach S. Collins JL, Baumler ER, Caravajal S, Harrist, RB. Safer Choices: Long-term impact of a multicomponent school-based HIV, STD, and pregnancy prevention program. Public Health Reports. 2001;116(Suppl 1):82-93.

60. Cabezón C, Vigil P, Rojas I, Leiva ME, Riquelme R, Aranda W, et al. Adolescent pregnancy prevention: An abstinence-centered randomized controlled intervention in a Chilean public high school. Journal of Adolescent Health. 2005;36(1):64-9.

61. Onukwugha FI, Magadi MA, Sarki AM, Smith L. Trends in and predictors of pregnancy termination among 15–24 year-old women in Nigeria: a multi-level analysis of demographic and health surveys 2003–2018. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2020;20(1):1-13.

62. Cadmus E, Owoaje E. Knowledge about complications and practice of abortion among female undergraduates in the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Annals of Ibadan postgraduate medicine. 2011;9(1):19-23.

63. Ahmed S, Ray R. Determinants of pregnancy and induced and spontaneous abortion in a jointly determined framework: evidence from a country-wide, district-level household survey in India. Journal of biosocial science. 2014;46(4):480-517.

64. Morhe ES, Tagbor HK, Ankobea FK, Danso KA. Reproductive experiences of teenagers in the Ejisu-Juabeng district of Ghana. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2012;118(2):137-40.

65. Mulugeta Y, Berhane Y. Factors associated with pre-marital sexual debut among unmarried high school female students in bahir Dar town, Ethiopia: cross-sectional study. Reproductive health. 2014;11(1):1-6.

66. Mekie M, Addisu D, Dagnew E, Necho W. The level and deriving factors of repeat-induced abortion in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Heliyon. 2021;7(1):e05984.

67. Wellings K, Collumbien M, Slaymaker E, Singh S, Hodges Z, Patel D, et al. Sexual behaviour in context: a global perspective. The Lancet. 2006;368(9548):1706-28.

68. WHO. Adolescent pregnancy fact sheet: World Health Organization; 2022 [updated 15 September 2022; cited 2023 01/02/2023]. Available from: https://www.who.int/en/news-room/factsheets/detail/adolescent-pregnancy.

69. Bernabé-Ortiz A, White PJ, Carcamo CP, Hughes JP, Gonzales MA, Garcia PJ, et al. Clandestine induced abortion: prevalence, incidence and risk factors among women in a Latin American country. Cmaj. 2009;180(3):298-304.

70. Cheng Y, Wang X, Lv Y, Cai Y, Li Y, Guo X, et al. Study on the risk factors of repeated abortion among unmarried adolescents. Zhonghua liu xing bing xue za zhi= Zhonghua liuxingbingxue zazhi. 2006;27(8):669-72.

71. Yi S, Tuot S, Chhoun P, Pal K, Tith K, Brody C. Factors associated with induced abortion among female entertainment workers: a cross-sectional study in Cambodia. BMJ open. 2015;5(7):e007947.

72. Sherris J, Bingham A, Burns M, Girvin S, Westley E, Gomez P. Misoprostol use in developing countries: results from a multicountry study. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2005;88(1):76-81.



Figure 1. Flow chart of describing the selection of studies for the systematic review and metaanalysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination and associated factors in Ethiopia, 2023

ID		ES (95% CI)	We
Addisu W. et al (2018)		33.00 (28.52, 37	.48) 3.9
Mahlet. etal (2017)	-	34.90 (30.98, 38	.82) 3.9
Gezahegn T. et al (2010)		12.30 (9.17, 15.4	43) 4.0
Bekele T. et al (2017)		29.60 (24.07, 35	.13) 3.9
Getayeneh A. et AL (2016)		8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.0
Addisu T. et al (2019)			.12) 3.9
Amlaku M. et al (2014)		19.20 (15.44, 22	.96) 4.0
Amanuel G. (2004)		• 60.60 (59.47, 61	.73) 4.0
Endalew S. (2021)	-	18.10 (14.47, 21	.73) 4.0
Worku A. (2011)		43.40 (40.06, 46	.74) 4.0
Geremew K. et al (2019)	-	20.30 (16.12, 24	.48) 3.9
Amha A. et al (2011)	*	6.49 (4.32, 8.66)	4.0
Girma G. et al (2016)		2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.0
Kifle Lentiro (2017)	+	13.60 (10.26, 16	.94) 4.0
Biniyam Bayou (2020)	•	6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4.0
Diriba G (2015)		- 35.60 (28.86, 42	.34) 3.8
Girum M (2015)		1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.0
Murad M (2020)	.	18.20 (15.58, 20	.82) 4.0
Tekleab M (2007)	-	25.60 (22.99, 28	.21) 4.0
Tadesse N (2020)	- E	18.80 (15.06, 22	.54) 4.0
Tesfamichael G (2017)	*	3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.0
Kidist Alemu, (2022)		27.90 (20.01, 35	.79) 3.8
Solomon W (2006)	-	14.20 (12.04, 16	.36) 4.0
Biza N. et al (2018)		8.80 (6.34, 11.26	s) 4.C
Abera et al (2012)	-	7.70 (4.46, 10.94	4) 4.0
Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.000)		21.52 (15.01, 28	.03) 10
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analys	is		

Figure-2: Forest plot of the pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023





Figure-3: Funnel plot to test publication bias of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023



Figure-4: The Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis of abortion among women in Ethiopia, 2023

thors	Publication			% Waint
ane	year		ES (90% CI)	weight
ddis Ababa				
Addisu W. et al	2018		33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3.97
Endalew S.	2021		18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4.00
Subtotal (I-squared = 96.1%, p = 0.000)			25.49 (10.89, 40.09)	7.98
		-		
Amhara		I		
Mahlet. etal	2017		34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.99
Bekele T. et al	2017		29.60 (24.07, 35.13)	3.94
Amlaku M. et al	2014	*	19.20 (15.44, 22.96)	4.00
Geremew K. et al	2019	+	20.30 (16.12, 24.48)	3.98
Girum M	2015	• · ·	1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
Tesfamichael G	2017	★	3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.02
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.0%, p = 0.000)			18.06 (6.27, 29.85)	23.97
Sezaherin Tietal	2010	<u> </u>	12 30 (9 17 15 43)	4.01
Addieu Tatal	2010	I	68 70 (64 28 73 12)	3.08
Norku A	2013	· · · ·	43.40 (40.06.46.74)	3.30
monunt. Amba Allatal	2011		43.40 (40.00, 40.14)	4.01
nina A. Ulai	2017		0.43 (4.32, 8.00)	4.03
Nile Leftiro	2017		13.00 (10.26, 16.94)	4.01
Siniyam Bayou	2020		6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4.04
ladesse N	2020		18.80 (15.06, 22.54)	4.00
Kidist Alemu,	2022		27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.82
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.3%, p = 0.000)			24.63 (11.50, 37.75)	31.90
National Data		l I		
Getaveneh A. et Al.	2016		8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
Girma G. et al	2016		2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.05
Tekleah M	2007	r I <u>⇒</u>	25.60 (22.99, 28.21)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.7%, p = 0.000)	2007		12.10 (5.70, 18.50)	12.13
		-		
Figray				
Amanuel G.	2004	1	60.60 (59.47, 61.73)	4.05
Abera et al	2012		7.70 (4.46, 10.94)	4.01
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.9%, p = 0.000)			34.17 (-17.67, 86.01)	8.06
Harari				
Nurad M	2020		18 20 (15 58 20 82)	4 02
Solomon W	2006		14 20 (12 04 16 36)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 81.2%, p = 0.021)	2000		16.13 (12.21. 20.05)	8.06
((
Dromia				
Diriba G	2015		35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Afar				
Biza N. et al	2018	🍨 I	8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		♦ 1	8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.000)			21.52 (15.01, 28.03)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects and	alysis			

Figure-5: Subgroup analysis of the pregnancy termination based on regional distribution in Ethiopia, 2023





PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	3
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	4
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	4
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	4
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	4
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	4
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	5
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	5
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	5
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I ²) for each meta-analysis. For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	5

Page 27 of 31



3

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Page 1 of 2

4			
5 6 7 7	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
8 Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	5
10 Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	5
13 RESULTS			6-7
14 Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	6
17 Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	6
¹⁹ Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	6
20 21 Results of individual studies 22	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	6
²³ Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	6
24 25 Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	6
²⁶ Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	7
28 DISCUSSION		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10-12
29 30 31	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	10
32 Limitations 33	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	11
³⁴ Conclusions 35	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	13
34 Funding 39	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	13
40			

41 From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. 42 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.

Page 2 of 2 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

45 46

43

44

Authors name	Publication year		ES (95% CI)	% Weight
Reproductive age				
Addisu W. et al	2018		33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3.97
Mahlet. etal	2017	· · · · · ·	34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.99
Endalew S.	2021		18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4.00
Kifle Lentiro	2017		13.60 (10.26, 16.94)	4.01
Girum M	2015	•	1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
Murad M	2020	<u>₩</u>	18.20 (15.58, 20.82)	4.02
Fesfamichael G	2017	*	3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.02
Solomon W	2006	•	14.20 (12.04, 16.36)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.0%, p = 0.000)		\diamond	17.03 (8.55, 25.52)	32.10
Pregnant women				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
Abortion care seekers				
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		12.30 (9.17, 15.43)	4.01
Bekele T. et al	2017	I	29.60 (24.07, 35.13)	3.94
Amlaku M. et al	2014		19.20 (15.44, 22.96)	4.00
Geremew K. et al	2019		20.30 (16.12, 24.48)	3.98
Diriba G	2015		35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Tekleab M	2007	+	25.60 (22.99, 28.21)	4.03
Abera et al	2012	+	7.70 (4.46, 10.94)	4.01
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.3%, p = 0.000)		\diamond	21.19 (14.65, 27.72)	27.85
University/College students				
Addisu T. et al	2019		68.70 (64.28, 73.12)	3.98
Worku A.	2011		43.40 (40.06, 46.74)	4.01
Amha A. et al	2011	•	6.49 (4.32, 8.66)	4.03
Biniyam Bayou	2020	•	6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4.04
Tadesse N	2020	-	18.80 (15.06, 22.54)	4.00
Biza N. et al	2018		8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.5%, p = 0.000)			25.36 (9.39, 41.32)	24.08
Gynaecological patients				
Amanuel G.	2004		60.60 (59.47, 61.73)	4.05
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			60.60 (59.47, 61.73)	4.05
/outh women				
Girma G. et al	2016		2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.05
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		•	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.05
nsecurely housed women				
Kidist Alemu,	2022		27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.82
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.82
Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.000)			21.52 (15.01, 28.03)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects a	nalysis			

Figure-6: Subgroup analysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination based on study population in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors	Publication year		ES (95% CI)	% Weigl
After MDG				
Addisu W. et al	2018	-	33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3.97
Mahlet. etal	2017	-	34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.99
Bekele T. et al	2017		29.60 (24.07, 35.13)	3.94
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
Addisu T. et al	2019			3.98
Endalew S.	2021		18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4.00
Geremew K. et al	2019	<u>.</u>	20.30 (16.12, 24.48)	3.98
Girma G. et al	2016		2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.05
Kifle Lentiro	2017	-	13.60 (10.26, 16.94)	4.01
Biniyam Bayou	2020		6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4.04
Murad M	2020	<u>₩</u>	18.20 (15.58, 20.82)	4.02
Tadesse N	2020		18.80 (15.06, 22.54)	4.00
Tesfamichael G	2017	*	3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.02
Kidist Alemu.	2022	· · ·	27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.82
Biza N. et al	2018	-	8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 9	99.3%, p = 0.000)	\diamond	20.55 (16.10, 24.99)	59.90
Before MDG				
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	●	12.30 (9.17, 15.43)	4.01
Amlaku M. et al	2014		19.20 (15.44, 22.96)	4.00
Amanuel G.	2004		 60.60 (59.47, 61.73) 	4.05
Worku A.	2011	*	43.40 (40.06, 46.74)	4.01
Amha A. et al	2011	•	6.49 (4.32, 8.66)	4.03
Diriba G	2015	· · · ·	35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Girum M	2015	•	1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
Tekleab M	2007	1 	25.60 (22.99, 28.21)	4.03
Solomon W	2006		14.20 (12.04, 16.36)	4.03
Abera et al	2012	-	7.70 (4.46, 10.94)	4.01
Subtotal (I-squared = 9	99.9%, p = 0.000)		22.61 (4.55, 40.66)	40.10
Overall (I-squared = 99	9.8%, p = 0.000)	\diamond	21.52 (15.01, 28.03)	100.0
NOTE: Weights are fro	m random effects analysis			

Figure-7: Subgroup analysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination based on before and after MDG in Ethiopia, 2023

$\begin{matrix} 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 25 \\ 26 \\ 27 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 30 \\ 31 \\ 32 \\ 33 \\ 34 \\ 35 \\ 36 \\ 37 \\ 38 \\ 39 \\ 40 \\ 41 \\ 42 \\ 43 \\ 44 \\ 546 \\ 47 \\ 48 \\ 49 \\ 50 \\ 51 \\ 52 \\ 53 \\ 55 \\ 56 \\ 57 \\ 58 \\ 59 \end{matrix}$	2	
5 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 32 4 25 26 27 28 9 30 31 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 9 30 31 32 33 45 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 55 57 55 57 58 59	R	
$\begin{array}{c} 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 546\\ 47\\ 48\\ 9\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ 55\\ 56\\ 57\\ 58\\ 59\end{array}$	4	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 33 24 25 26 27 28 9 30 31 32 33 45 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 56 57 55 57 58 59	4	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 445 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 7	5	
$\begin{array}{c} 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 45\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ 54\\ 55\\ 56\\ 57\\ 58\\ 59\\ \end{array}$	6	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	7	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	, 0	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	ð	
$\begin{array}{c} 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 45\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ 54\\ 55\\ 56\\ 57\\ 58\\ 59\\ \end{array}$	9	
$\begin{array}{c} 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 45\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ 54\\ 55\\ 56\\ 57\\ 58\\ 59\\ \end{array}$	10	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58	11	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 90 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 90 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58	10	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	12	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	13	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	14	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 9 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58	15	
10 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58	16	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	10	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58	17	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	18	
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	19	
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	20	
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	20	
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	21	
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	22	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	23	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	24	
25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	24	
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	25	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	26	
28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	27	
29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	28	
29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	20	
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	29	
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	30	
32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	31	
32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	32	
33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	22	
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	33	
 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 	34	
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	35	
37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	36	
37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	27	
38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	3/	
 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 	38	
40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	39	
41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	40	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	лı	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	41	
43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	42	
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	43	
45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	44	
43 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	15	
46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	45	
47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	46	
48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	47	
49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	48	
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	10	
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	49	
51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	50	
52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	51	
53 54 55 56 57 58 59	52	
53 54 55 56 57 58 59	52	
54 55 56 57 58 59		
55 56 57 58 59	54	
56 57 58 59	55	
57 58 59	56	
57 58 59	57	
58 59	57	
59	58	
	59	
60	60	

lame	VOOR			70 Woight
	year		ES (95% CI)	weight
Rural Residence				
Mahlet. etal	2017 —	•	0.19 (0.09, 0.42)	6.42
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	-	1.27 (0.74, 2.18)	6.84
Amlaku M. et al	2014		1.86 (1.11, 3.13)	6.88
vlesfn A. et al	2021		0.43 (0.23, 0.80)	6.73
Kifle Lentiro	2017	<u>'</u>	2.30 (1.10, 4.80)	6.52
Fadesse N	2020		0.26 (0.12, 0.55)	6.50
Subtotal (I-squared =	89.1%, p = 0.000)		0.71 (0.32, 1.58)	39.88
Students				
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014		- 7.40 (2.93, 18.69)	6.16
Arif H. Jamie	2020		2.95 (1.02, 8.52)	5.88
Subtotal (I-squared =	39.0%, p = 0.201)		4.85 (1.98, 11.91)	12.04
Single		1		
-ikreselassie T. et al	2014		18.23 (8.04, 41.33)	6.37
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		1.35 (0.58, 3.14)	6.32
Bekele T. et al	2017		- 4.93 (1.41, 17.17)	5.48
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		1.22 (0.78, 1.90)	6.98
Arif H. Jamie	2020		5.50 (1.20, 25.14)	4.89
Solomon W	2006	+ -	1.72 (1.20, 2.47)	7.07
Denberu B	2017 ←	1	0.04 (0.01, 0.12)	5.84
Abera et al	2012		0.60 (0.15, 2.45)	5.13
Subtotal (I-squared =	92.0%, p = 0.000)	\Leftrightarrow	1.55 (0.60, 4.02)	48.08
Overall (I-squared = 9	0.8%, p = 0.000)	\Leftrightarrow	1.30 (0.72, 2.34)	100.00
	··· /	Ĩ		
NOTE: Weights are fro	om random effects analysis			

Figure-8: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected socio-demographic characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors - name	Publication year		ES (95% CI)	% Weig
Divorced				
Bekele T. et al	2017		2.38 (0.67, 8.44)	4.12
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		0.78 (0.49, 1.24)	5.68
Girma G. et al	2016		20.00 (7.14, 56.06)	4.61
Subtotal (I-squared = 93.8	%, p = 0.000)		3.24 (0.41, 25.83)	14.4
Married				
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	- <u>'</u>	2.40 (1.19, 4.85)	5.27
Girma G. et al	2016		38.00 (17.10, 84.47)	5.09
Abera et al	2012		1.26 (0.39, 4.07)	4.31
Subtotal (I-squared = 94.	%, p = 0.000)		4.97 (0.63, 38.95)	14.6
Drimon (achool				
Mobilet stol	2017		E 46 (2.06.14.47)	4 70
	2017		5.40 (2.00, 14.47)	4.73
Gezanegn I. et al	2010		0.26 (0.10, 0.68)	4.//
Getayenen A. et AL	2016	T	1.36 (1.13, 1.64)	5.97
Mesfn A. et al	2021		1.44 (0.53, 3.92)	4.67
Bethelihem A. et al	2015		0.20 (0.07, 0.59)	4.52
Solomon W	2006		1.65 (1.03, 2.65)	5.66
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.4	%, p = 0.000)		1.05 (0.55, 2.00)	30.3
Secondary school				
Addisu W. et al	2018		3.54 (1.02, 12.27)	4.16
Mahlet. etal	2017		12.96 (6.16, 27.28)	5.19
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	-	0.98 (0.68, 1.41)	5.80
Mesfn A. et al	2021		2.04 (0.79, 5.28)	4.78
Bethelihem A. et al	2015		0.40 (0.20, 0.80)	5.29
Subtotal (I-squared = 92.5	%, p = 0.000)		2.00 (0.63, 6.37)	25.2
College & above				
Addieu W at al	2018		3 /0 (1 02 11 02)	1 20
Gatavanah A at Al	2016		0.00 (0.61 1.60)	4.20 E CE
Detayenen A. et AL	2010		0.33 (0.01, 1.00)	5.00 5.00
Detrieiment A. et al	GIU2		0.40 (0.23, 0.09)	5.54
Subtotal (I-squared = 83.8	‰, p = 0.002)	\rightarrow	0.97 (0.37, 2.54)	15.3
Overall (I-squared = 91.0	%, p = 0.000)	\Diamond	1.78 (1.13, 2.82)	100.
NOTE: Weights are from	andom effects analysis			
	ļ			

Figure-9: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected socio-demographic characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors name	Publication year		ES (95% CI)	% Weight
Have 1 alive child		1		
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	÷	0.97 (0.72, 1.31)	5.60
Mesfn A. et al	2021	i	0.32 (0.10, 1.01)	3.80
Girma G. et al	2016	I	0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	5.46
Denberu B	2017	— •	0.74 (0.32, 1.71)	4.53
Subtotal (I-squared = 42.0%,	p = 0.160)	\diamond	0.74 (0.52, 1.05)	19.39
First sex before18 vrs				
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.70 (1.44, 5.06)	5.01
Geremew K. et al	2019		5.96 (2.54, 13.97)	4.49
Girma G. et al	2016		2.00 (1.32, 3.03)	5.42
Biniyam Bayou	2020	· ·	4.30 (1.16, 15.94)	3.44
Tadesse N	2020	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.64 (0.73, 3.69)	4.59
Subtotal (I-squared = 41.6%.	p = 0.144)		2.65 (1.74, 4.04)	22.95
	- 1			
Irregular menstruation				
Amlaku M. et al	2014	_	1.76 (1.03. 2.99)	5.21
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.00 (1.09, 3.67)	5.05
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p	= 0.756)	$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$	1.86 (1.25, 2.77)	10.26
	,			
Abortion history		i		
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014	<u>→</u> ! !	0.29 (0.11, 0.78)	4.17
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		1.17 (0.39, 3.49)	3.92
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.30 (1.28, 4.15)	5.09
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.0%,	p = 0.002)		0.96 (0.27, 3.40)	13.18
		T ¦		
Multiple sexual partner				
Mahlet. etal	2017	I	6.16 (3.25, 11.68)	4.98
Mesfn A. et al	2021		- 5.47 (2.98, 10.04)	5.05
Mussie A. et al	2014		4.40 (2.34, 8.27)	5.00
Geremew K. et al	2019	i — •	7.72 (2.90, 20.57)	4.19
Denberu B	2017		1.09 (0.22, 5.35)	2.88
Biza N. et al	2018		2.90 (0.91, 9.21)	3.78
Subtotal (I-squared = 13.4%,	p = 0.329)	\diamond	4.88 (3.43, 6.93)	25.88
Wanted pregnancy				
Addisu W. et al	2018		11.77 (3.51, 39.43)	3.66
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	—	0.44 (0.20, 0.95)	4.69
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.1%,	p = 0.000)		2.20 (0.09, 55.02)	8.35
Dverall (I-squared = 85.6%, p	= 0.000)	\mathbf{A}	1.92 (1.31, 2.80)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from rand	om effects analysis			

Figure-10: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected reproductive characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Prevalence and determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-073799.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Oct-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Kumsa, Henok; Woldia University Arage, Mulugeta; Woldia University, Midwifery Mislu, Esuyawkal; Woldia University, Midwifery Kidie, Atitegeb; Woldia University Hailu, Tilahun; Woldia University tenaw, lebeza; Woldia University
Primary Subject Heading :	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Sexual health, Reproductive medicine, Public health
Keywords:	Adolescent, Public health < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Sexual and Gender Minorities





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Prevalence and determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Henok Kumsa¹, Esuyawkal Mislu¹, Wodaje Mulugeta Arage¹, Atitegeb Abera², Tilahun Hailu², and Lebeza Alemu Tenaw²

Affiliations invaluable

¹School of Midwifery, College of Health Science, Woldia University, Ethiopia

² School of Public health, College of Health Science, Woldia University, Ethiopia

Email Address

- HK: henokkumsa@gmail.com
- EM: esuyawkalmislu@gmail.com
- MWA: mulewodaje@gmail.com

MWA: mulewodaje@gmail.com AA: atitegebabera@gmail.com TH: lemaryam01@gmail.com LAT: lebezaa@gmail.com *Corresponding author: Lebeza Alemu Tenaw Email: lebezaa@gmail.com

Abstract

Objective: This review aims to determine the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its determinant factors in Ethiopia.

Data sources: Relevant articles were retrieved from PubMed, EMBASE, Medline, and other search engines.

Eligibility criteria for selecting studies: The research design for this study had no restrictions, allowing for the inclusion of cross-sectional and case-control studies that examined the prevalence or determinants of pregnancy termination. However, case reports, case series, reviews, editorials, and studies published as abstracts only were excluded from the analysis.

Data extraction and synthesis: The review precisely in accordance with PRISMA criteria, and the quality of the review was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist. Heterogeneity was indicated by the p-value for I2 statistics less than 0.05. Data were entered into Microsoft Excel, and the analysis was conducted using Stata 16.

Results: The pooled prevalence pregnancy termination in Ethiopia was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01, 28.03). Women who had their first sexual initiation before the age of 18 (OR = 1.78; 95% CI = 1.13, 2.82, P=0.144), had irregular menstrual bleeding (OR = 1.86; 95% CI = 1.25, 2.77, P=0.756), being a student (OR: 4.85; 95% CI: 1.98, 11.91, P=0.201), and had multiple sexual partners (OR: 4.88; 95% CI: 3.43, 6.93, P=0.329) were significantly associated with pregnancy termination.

Conclusions: One in five women terminated their pregnancies, which is higher than in other sub-Saharan countries. Being a student, irregular menstrual bleeding, early initiation of sexual intercourse, and multiple sexual partners were determinants of pregnancy termination. Special attention is needed in avoiding early sexual initiation and in reducing sexual risk behaviors.

Strength and limitation of this review:

- Both published and unpublished literature are included in this study.

- The authors extracted the whole literature separately to ensure data quality

- The review includes only observational studies

Keywords: Pregnancy termination, Determinantss, Systematic review and meta analysis, Ethiopia

Introduction

Pregnancy termination is a delicate and divisived terminants topic having political, cultural, moral, and religious implications. Also, it presents a significant public health concern in developing coutries (1). Above 60% of unintended pregnancies result in pregnancy termination, with the majority of those being unsafe (2). Developing countries bear the burden of 97% of all unsafe abortions which contributes to 220 deaths per 100,000 live births (3).

Moreover, pregnancy termination imposes an additional burden on health institutions and individuals; in developing countries alone, each year an estimated 7 million women seek treatment in health facilities for the complication of pregnancy termination (4). It is estimated that health-care systems will spend \$553 million per year on post-abortion complications and will lose \$922 million in income due to long-term disability caused by unsafe termination (5). Additionally, a woman who undergo pregnancy termination, particularly through methods such as mechanical dilation and curettage, face an increased a risk of experiencing preterm birth and repeated pregnancy loss (6).

Though the burden of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia is a significant contributor to maternal mortality and morbidity (7). Previous studies conducted in Ethiopia have shown that the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its negative consequences are increasing over time (8, 9), and repeated pregnancy termination also accounts significant amount (10-12). Several variables, including early age marriage, low level of education, early sexual intercourse initiation, violence/rape, emotional well-being, educational status, employment status, and resources, and sexual intercourse relationship, have been implicated as factors of pregnancy termination in studies conducted across Ethiopia (13-16).

However, at the national level, illustrative evidence is lacking in Ethiopia regarding the level and underlying factors of pregnancy termination. Thus, this systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to assess the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its determinant factors in Ethiopia. The findings of this study provide evidence for intervention to reduce the burden of pregnancy termination, its complications, and its economic impact in the country. Additionally, this study will help to design strategies and monitor the progress of programs aimed at achieving the maternal mortality reduction targets of the sustainable development gaols.

Methods

Study design and setting

This systematic review and meta-analysis included cross sectional, and case control studies which has been conducted in Ethiopia. Systematic review and meta-analysis using computerized databases; searches were performed to estimate the prevalence and identify the determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia.

Search strategy

For this review, a comprehensive search was conducted using various searching strategies to identify relevant articles. Published articles were searched in well-known online databases including EMBBASE, Medline, Google, PubMed, Google Scholar, African Journal Online, and Science Direct databases. Additionally, the search was expanded by examining the reference lists of eligible articles to retrieve and extract potential articles. This systematic review was conducted using the preferred reporting items for systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses PRISMA guidelines. Similarly, the quality of our systematic review and meta-analysis was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist (17).

Searching was done by using Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) terms related with determinantss of pregnancy termination. MeSH terms enables us to select related research articles. We conducted the search for terms using Boolean operators "AND" and "OR," both separately and in combinations. We used the search terms "((((((Abortion) OR (termination of pregnancy)) OR (miscarriage)) AND (determinant factors)) OR (determinants)) OR (associated factors)) OR (influencing factors)) AND (Amhara) OR (Oromia) OR (Tigray) OR (Southern nation, nationalities and people's) OR (Afar) OR (Benshagul gumuz) OR (Gamabella) OR (Somali) OR (Dire dawa) OR (Addis Ababa) OR (Hareri) OR (Ethiopia)".

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria

There were no restrictions on research design. We included cross-sectional and case-control studies that showed the prevalence of or determinants of pregnancy termination. Additionally, Only articles reported in the English language and conducted studies until February 2023 were included.

Exclusion criteria

Case reports, case series, reviews, editorials, and studies published as abstracts only were excluded. Agreements on the inclusion and exclusion of the articles were held through the participation of all authors.

Quality assessment and data extraction

Articles were screened using their titles, abstracts, and full paper reviews before being included in the meta-analysis. The quality of included studies was evaluated using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist (17). The quality scores of included studies were assessed and presented using the mean scores to designate them as high- or low-quality. The JBI tool for prevalence and determinat studies was used as a guideline for data extraction from the final selected articles. The data extraction tool contains information on the author and year of the study, the title, the year the study was conducted and the year of publication, the study area and region, the study design and type, the study population, the sample size, the response rate, the outcome measured, and the prevalence and determinats of pregnancy termination. Moreover, all authors independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of studies to be included in this systematic review and meta-analysis. Agreements on the inclusion and exclusion of the articles were reached with the participation of all authors.

Measurement of the outcome variable

In this study, termination of pregnancy is the removal of pregnancy tissue, conception products, or fetus, and placenta from the uterus. The term 'fetus' and 'placenta' is commonly used after eight weeks of pregnancy. Pregnancy tissue and products of conception are the tissues that are produced by the union of an egg and sperm before eight weeks. Terminating a pregnancy is a deliberate action taken by a health professional or the woman herself (18).

Registration and protocol

This review has not previously registered or prepared a protocol. As a result, no adjustments have been made.

Patient and Public Involvement: not applicable

Statistical methods and analysis

The meta-analysis was conducted using Stata 16 software after entering data into Microsoft Excel. Forest plots were used to demonstrate the prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia. The random effect model of analysis was utilized as a method of meta-analysis to minimize the heterogeneity of included studies (19). The study setting, population, and study period were used to conduct sub-group analysis. The presentation of pregnancy termination determinants was based on odds ratios (ORs) with a 95% confidence interval(CI).

The heterogeneity of the studies included was assessed using the I2 statistics. The presence of heterogeneity was determined by using a p-value for I² statistics that was less than 0.05. Based on the I² test statistics results, the heterogeneity is categorized as low (25%), moderate (50%), and high (75%) (19). Furthermore, the Egger regression asymmetry test was used to evaluate the publication bias (20, 21). When the Egger test result's P-value is less than 0.05, there is a declaration of publication bias. The Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis using the random effect analysis was conducted to detect the presence of publication bias (22).

onducies.

Result

Study selection

This systematic review and meta-analysis included published studies on the termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia. A total of 12,242 records were retrieved through electronic database searching, and only 33 articles were included in the final analysis (Figure 1).

Characteristics of included studies

This review included Thirty-three studies conducted in various regions of Ethiopia. Of all the studies, 8 (24.24%) were from the Amhara Region (11, 12, 15, 16, 23-26), South Nations and Nationalities Peoples accounted for 9 (27.27%) of the total (13, 27-34), 1 was from Oromia (35), 5 (15.15%) from Addis Ababa city administration (10, 14, 36-38), 3 (9.09%) were from Harari region (39-41), 3 (9.09%) were from Tigray region (42-44), 1 (3.03%) was from Afar region (45), 3 (9.09) were from National data (46-48). Twenty-eight (84.85%) of the included articles were cross-sectional studies (10-13, 15, 23-31, 33-35, 37-42, 44-48), and remains five (15.15%) were case-control studies(14, 16, 32, 36, 43) (supplementary material 1).

As well, twenty-seven of the studies were institution-based (10-16, 24, 27-33, 35-46), while six were community-based studies(23, 25, 26, 34, 47, 48). The sample size of the included studies ranged from a minimum of 124 in a study conducted in southwest Ethiopia (34) and and to a maximum of 12,378 in a study conducted using DHS data (48). Overall, a total of 40,116 study participants were included in this review.

Prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia

Based on the random effect model, the overall pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy among women in Ethiopia was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03). The meta-analysis included studies with significant heterogeneity: I2 value of 99.8%, p < 0.000. Publication biases among the included studies were examined using funnel plots and Egger's regression test. The results of funnel plots showed an asymmetric shape, which indicates the presence of publication biase among those included studies. Additionally, the Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis was applied to correct publication bias among the studies, but no trimming was performed since the data is unchanged (supplementary material 2).

BMJ Open

Objective assessments of publication bias by Egger's regression test also showed the presence of publication bias across studies (*p*-value < 0.001). After conducting the trim and fill analysis to address publication bias, the final pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia was adjusted to 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03) (supplementary material 2).

Subgroup analysis

We performed subgroup analysis based on the region, study population, and study setting of the included studies. Table 1 shows the pooled prevalence was highest, 35.60% (95% CI: 28.86, 42.34) in the Oromia region, followed by 34.17% (95% CI: 17.67, 86.01) in the Tigray region, 24.63% (95% CI: 10.52, 37.75) in the South Nation and Nationalities People Region, and the lowest was seen in three studies conducted using demographic health data, 12.10% (95% CI: 5.66, 18.50) (supplementary material 2).

Furthermore, subgroup analysis reveals that the highest pooled prevalence of abortion was seen among gynecological admitted patients, at 60.60% (95% CI: 59.47, 61.73), followed by 25.38% (95% CI: 9.39, 41.32) among university/college students, and 27.90% (95% CI: 20.01, 35.79) among insecurely housed women, with the lowest pooled prevalence being seen among pregnant women and youth women. Additionally, subgroup analysis was conducted based on the year before and after the Millennium Development Goals' implementation. The pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination before and after MDGs was 20.55% (95% CI: 16.10–24.99) and 21.61% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03), respectively (supplementary material 2).

2
2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
10
11
12
13
14
14
15
16
17
10
١ð
19
20
21
21
22
23
24
25
25
26
27
28
20
29
30
31
27
52
33
34
35
20
36
37
38
20
29
40
41
42
42
45
44
45
46
47
47
48
49
50
50
51
52
53
E /
54
55
56
57
57
58

60

1

Table 1: S	Subgroup a	nalysis for th	ne prevalence	of pregnancy	termination in	Ethiopia, 2004-2022
	0 1	2	1	1 0 1		1 /

Subgroup	Number Total		Prevalence (95%CI)	Heterogeneity		
	of	Sample		I ²	p-value	
	studies				_	
By region	-		•			
Addis Ababa	2	855	25.49(10.39, 40.09)	92.4	< 0.001	
Amhara	6	2371	18.06(6.27, 29.85)	99.0	< 0.001	
SNNP	8	3678	24.63(95% CI: 10.52,	99.4	< 0.001	
			37.75)			
National Data	3	19854	12.10(5.70, 18.50)	99.7	< 0.001	
Tigray	2	7463	34.17(17.6, 86.01)	99.9	< 0.001	
Harari	2	1835	16.13(12.21, 20.05)	81.2	< 0.001	
Oromia	1	194	35.60(28.86, 42.34)			
Afar	1	509	8.80(6.34, 11.26)			
By publication year	r					
2016 to 2022 (post	15	24234	20.55(16.10, 24.99)	99.3	< 0.001	
MDG)						
Before MDG	10	12525	22.61(4.55, 40.66)	99.9	< 0.001	
Study population						
Reproductive age	8	4426	17.03(8.55, 25.52)	99.0	< 0.001	
Pregnant women	1	12378	8.90(8.40, 9.40)			
Abortion care	7	2990	21.19(14.65, 27.72)	95.3	< 0.001	
seeker						
University or	6	3237	25.36(9.39, 41.32)	99.5	< 0.001	
college student						
Gynecological	1	7203	60.60(59.47, 61.73)	•		
patient						
Youth women	1	6401	2.50(2.12, 2.88)	•		
Insecurely housed	1	124	27.90(20.01, 35.79)	5,	·	
Total	25	36759	21 52(15 01 28 03)	99.8	< 0.001	
IVIAI	23	50757	[21.52(15.01, 20.05)]	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	1 0.001	

*Insecurely household women: it means women who live or spend their time on the street.

Determinants of pregnancy termination

Socio-demographic characteristics

The sociodemographic factors included in this analysis were the place of residence, age, marital, occupational, and educational status of the women. A separate analysis was conducted for each variable. Finally, a meta-analysis of (16, 39) two studies showed that being a student was significantly associated with pregnancy termination (OR: 4.85; 95% CI: 1.98, 11.91). There was moderate heterogeneity (I2 = 39%) (supplementary material 2).

Reproductive characteristics

A total of 5 articles (15, 24, 28, 43, 47) were included to assess the association between first sexual initiation before the age of 18 and pregnancy termination. The pooled meta-analysis found that women who had their first sexual experience before the age of 18 were twice as likely as those who had their first sexual experience after the age of 18 to have their pregnancy terminated (OR = 1.78; 95% CI = 1.13, 2.82). There was moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 41.6\%$). Moreover, two articles (11, 43) were also included to determine the association between irregular menstrual bleeding and pregnancy termination. The final pooled meta-analysis using data from the two articles found that pregnancy termination was nearly two times more likely to occur in women with irregular menstrual bleeding than in those who had regular menstrual bleeding, (OR = 1.86; 95% CI = 1.25, 2.77). Similarly, a meta-analysis of six studies(14, 15, 24, 32, 34, 43) showed that women who had multiple sexual partners were significantly associated with pregnancy termination (OR: 4.88; 95% CI: 3.43, 6.93). There was low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 13.4\%$) (supplementary material 2).

Discussion

Pregnancy termination is a major public health concern in Ethiopia (49). In this systematic review and meta-analysis, the overall magnitude of pregnancy termination was pooled from 25 published articles in Ethiopia, and significant determinants of pregnancy termination were identified using different articles. Being a student increased the rate of termination of pregnancy nearly five times. In addition, first sexual initiation before the age of 18, women with irregular menstrual bleeding, and multiple sexual partners were determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia. The findings of this review revealed evidence to help reduce the impact of pregnancy termination.

In Ethiopia various studies have been conducted on the issue of pregnancy termination, involving different settings such as the community, healthcare institutions, and higher education institutions. These studies have yielded varying figures regarding the prevalence of pregnancy termination in the country. However, this particular study revealed Ethiopia has a higher prevalence of pregnancy termination compared to other low- and middle-income countries.

The study found that the pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia was 21.52%. This finding is lower compared to a study done in Ghana at 25% (50), higher than in Mozambique at 9 % (\times 2.33) (50), and in India at 1.7% (\times 12) (51). The difference could be attributed to various factors like; study population, study design, study area, socio-demographic characteristics, and the differences in health policies of the countries. Additionally, the current study utilized a meta-analysis approach at the national level, incorporating community or institutional studies, while the study in Ghana and Mozambique was conducted using demographic health data with a small sample size compared to the current study (50). Additionally, in our study, huge variations were seen across the regions. A spatial analysis study conducted in Ethiopia using national DHS data also also showed variation even within the regions of the country (48). Thus, acting according to the needs of the region and age-specific policy is important during national policy or guideline development.

Page 13 of 33

BMJ Open

Our study observed that being a student was significantly associated with the termination of pregnancy. One of the possible explanations could be that students are likely to be adolescents, belonging to the younger age category. In addition, adolescent girls are remaining in school longer, which may factor into their decisions to postpone childbearing and terminate unintended pregnancies (52). Likewise, a study conducted in India shows the tendency for pregnancy termination is high in this age category since the rate of unintended pregnancies and unmet needs for family planning are high in this age group (53). The higher rate of pregnancy termination could also be attributed to a failure to provide education about the risks of pregnancy termination and ways of prevention for unintended pregnancy (54).

Additionally, the idea supported by Van Rensburg that societal poverty, unemployment, and other socio-demographic factors affect youth pregnancies and it might prone to pregnancy termination (55). In addition, a review from the late 1990s found that young women often cited a desire to stay in school as a major reason for pregnancy termination (56). Moreover, many adolescents continue to have difficulty accessing contraception, often as a result of stigma and/or a lack of resources (57).

The study from Nigeria indicated that 15–24-year old women are still being left behind on reproductive health matters despite increasing global attention to prioritizing their health (58). Studies found that educational programs aimed at reducing sexual risk behaviors and preventing pregnancy among young people can effectively reduce pregnancy rates among teenagers (59). Also, programs aimed at abstinence-centered sexuality education are effective in preventing adolescent pregnancy (60). Thus, this implies a future focus on reproductive health issues specific to students to address their needs. Additionally, future researchers should better focus on possible interventions to reduce the risk of pregnancy and pregnancy termination among students.

This review also assessed the association of selected variables with pregnancy termination. Women under the age of 18 at first sex were significantly more likely to terminate their pregnancy. This finding is consistent with studies conducted in Nigeria and Peru that reported a higher rate of pregnancy termination among women who had their age at first sex before 18 years old (61-63). Studies also revealed that early sexual debuts are significantly associated with adolescent pregnancies, which are usually unwanted (64, 65). As well, a study conducted in

Ethiopia shown initiation of sexual intercourse before the age of 18 years was found significant association with repeated pregnancy termination (66).

In many low income countries, rising ages at first marriage combined with increasing levels of premarital sex continue to result in unintended pregnancies among adolescents (67). Thus, improving the knowledge of adolescents about sexual and reproductive health issues, and increasing contraceptive access and use among young people, are important to prevent unsafe abortion or pregnancy termination (68). This necessitates the development of reproductive health education specifically for adolescent girls. Future researchers should also address the gap in studies on the needs of adolescent girls and possible interventions needed to reduce sexual initiation before the age of 18 years.

Furthermore, at the individual level, we found that pregnancy termination was significantly associated with women who had multiple sexual partners. Likewise, a study conducted in Peru indicated that as the number of sexual partners increased, the odds of getting a pregnancy termination increased (69). Studies conducted in Cambodia, China, and the United Kingdom also have found that having multiple sexual partners is associated with a higher rate of repeated pregnancy termination. (54, 70, 71). The government shall be emphasized reproductive health education, particularly for women regarding the risks of multiple sexual partners, the access where, and how to get counseling on how to prevent pregnancy.

This study also found that pregnancy termination was two times higher among women who had menstrual irregularities compared to their counterparts. Lastly, this systematic review and metaanalysis indicated that there were no statistical association between the termination of pregnancy and rural residents, marital status, women's age, educational status, primiparous, history of abortion, and wanted pregnancy.

As a limitation, this finding might be prone to the risk of bias due to the significant heterogeneity of articles included from a different region of Ethiopia. In addition, differences in the study population, setting, and design within the included studies might influence the results of this review. Moreover, studies conducted in health institutions, Colleges, or higher education might affect the pooled estimates. Additionally, in this review, only published articles were included.

BMJ Open

Also, this review didn't include qualitative studies on the explanations for pregnancy termination.

Future research must explain the relationship between pregnancy termination and other determinats such as social, economic, substance use, peer pressure, alcohol use, sexual or physical violence, and knowledge of sexual and reproductive health issues such as family planning and fertility.

Conclusions

One in every five women had their pregnancies terminated, which is a high rate when compared to Sub-Saharan countries. Being a student was significantly associated with the termination of a pregnancy. In addition, irregular menstrual bleeding, early initiation of sexual intercourse, and multiple sexual partners were important determinants of pregnancy termination.

Abbreviations: OR: odds ratios; CI: confidence interval; .JBI: Joanna Briggs Institute; MDG: Millennium Development Goals'

Declarations

Ethical approval: This article was conducted using published articles. Therefore, it don't required ethical approval.

Funding: No funding was used in this study.

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and analyzed during the review are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Competing interests: None declared.

Author contributions: HK, MWA, AB, EM, TH, and LAT conducted the data curation and extraction. HK, LAT, EM, and MWA. wrote the orginal and final draft of the research. LAT, EM, MWA and HK were conducted formal analyses and data interpretation. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Supplementary file : The supplementary file contains the data extraction sheet for the study included in the review.

References

1. Mesce D, Clifto D. Abortion facts and figures; population reference bureau. Geneva: WHO. 2011.

2. Bearak J, Popinchalk A, Ganatra B, Moller A-B, Tunçalp Ö, Beavin C, et al. Unintended pregnancy and abortion by income, region, and the legal status of abortion: estimates from a comprehensive model for 1990–2019. The Lancet Global Health. 2020;8(9):e1152-e61.

3. Ganatra B, Gerdts C, Rossier C, Johnson Jr BR, Tunçalp Ö, Assifi A, et al. Global, regional, and subregional classification of abortions by safety, 2010–14: estimates from a Bayesian hierarchical model. The Lancet. 2017;390(10110):2372-81.

4. Singh S, Maddow - Zimet I. Facility - based treatment for medical complications resulting from unsafe pregnancy termination in the developing world, 2012: a review of evidence from 26 countries. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2016;123(9):1489-98.

 Vlassoff M, Shearer J, Walker D, Lucas H. Economic impact of unsafe abortion-related morbidity and mortality: evidence and estimation challenges: Institute of Development Studies Brighton, UK; 2008.
 DeCherney AH NL, Laufer N, Roman AS. Contraception and family, gynecology. pcdatioa, 2007. teUSTM-HC.

Ababa A. Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia ministry of health. Ethiopia: Postnatal Care.
 2003.

8. Gebrehiwot Y, Fetters T, Gebreselassie H, Moore A, Hailemariam M, Dibaba Y, et al. Changes in Morbidity and Abortion Care in Ethiopia After Legal Reform: National Results from 2008 and 2014. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2016;42(3):121-30.

9. Singh S, Fetters T, Gebreselassie H, Abdella A, Gebrehiwot Y, Kumbi S, et al. The estimated incidence of induced abortion in Ethiopia, 2008. International perspectives on sexual and reproductive health. 2010:16-25.

10. Alemayehu B, Addissie A, Ayele W, Tiroro S, Woldeyohannes D. Magnitude and associated factors of repeat induced abortion among reproductive age group women who seeks abortion Care Services at Marie Stopes International Ethiopia Clinics in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Reproductive health. 2019;16(1):1-10.

11. Mulat A, Bayu H, Mellie H, Alemu A. Induced second trimester abortion and associated factors in Amhara region referral hospitals. BioMed research international. 2015;2015:256534.

12. Tesfaye B, Tewabe M, Ferede A, Dawson A. Induced second trimester abortion and associated factors at debre Markos referral hospital: cross-sectional study. Women's Health. 2020;16:1745506520929546.

13. Tesfaye G, Hambisa MT, Semahegn A. Induced abortion and associated factors in health facilities of Guraghe zone, southern Ethiopia. Journal of pregnancy. 2014;2014.

14. Denberu B, Alemseged F, Segni H. Determinants of abortion among youth seeking reproductive health Care in Selected Health Facilities, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Global Journal of Reproductive Medicine. 2017;1(2):27-38.

15. Behulu GK, Fenta EA, Aynalem GL. Repeat induced abortion and associated factors among reproductive age women who seek abortion services in Debre Berhan town health institutions, Central Ethiopia, 2019. BMC research notes. 2019;12(1):1-5.

16. Tilahun F, Dadi AF, Shiferaw G. Determinants of abortion among clients coming for abortion service at felegehiwot referral hospital, northwest Ethiopia: a case control study. Contraception and reproductive medicine. 2017;2(1):1-6.

17. Aromataris E, Munn Z. Joanna Briggs Institute reviewer's manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute. 2017;2018.

18. 2014 KAAOBAftooARA.

Page 17 of 33

BMJ Open

Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. Bmj. 2003;327(7414):557-60.
 Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics. 1994:1088-101.

21. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. Bmj. 1997;315(7109):629-34.

22. Duval S, Tweedie R. A nonparametric "trim and fill" method of accounting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Journal of the american statistical association. 2000;95(449):89-98.

Ayenew G, Gedefaw M, Berhe R, Nigusie A. Current Status, and Correlates of Abortion among
Rural Women of Gonji Kollela District, Northwest Ethiopia. Open Journal of Epidemiology. 2015;5:136-46.
Waktola MI, Mekonen DG, Nigussie TS, Cherkose EA, Abate AT. Repeat induced abortion and

associated factors among women seeking abortion care services at Debre Markos town health institutions, Amhara regional state, Ethiopia, 2017. BMC Res Notes. 2020;13(1):44-.

25. Mariam T, Melkamu S, Yetwale F, Abdela M, Getnet M. Prevalence and Associated Factors of Unsafe Abortion among Women of Reproductive Age Group in Gondar Town, Northwest Ethiopia, 2017: A Community-based Cross-sectional Study. Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research. 2018;28:1-7.

26. Getahun H, Berhane Y. Abortion among rural women in north Ethiopia. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2000;71(3):265-6.

27. Animaw W, Bogale B. Abortion in university and college female students of Arba Minch town, Ethiopia, 2011. Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare. 2014;5(1):17-22.

28. Beyene BB, Meshesha B. Magnitude And Associated Factors Of Induced Abortion Among Regular Undergraduate Students Of Dilla University. International journal of scientific and research publications. 2020;10:10032.

Sahile A, Shiferaw M. Magnitude of Induced Abortion and Associated Factors among Female
 Students of Hawassa University, Southern Region, Ethiopia, 2019. Journal of pregnancy. 2020;2020:1-6.
 Gelaye AA, Taye KN, Mekonen T. Magnitude and risk factors of abortion among regular female

students in Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia. BMC Women's Health. 2014;14(1):50.
31. Nigussie T, Feyisa M, Yosef T, Berhanu M, Asefa A. Prevalence of induced abortion and its associated factors among female students of health science in South West Ethiopia. The Open Nursing Journal. 2020;14(1).

32. Abebe M, Mersha A, Degefa N, Gebremeskel F, Kefelew E, Molla W. Determinants of induced abortion among women received maternal health care services in public hospitals of Arba Minch and Wolayita Sodo town, southern Ethiopia: unmatched case–control study. BMC women's health. 2022;22(1):1-12.

33. Lentiro K, Gebru T, Worku A, Asfaw A, Gebremariam T, Tesfaye A. Risk factors of induced abortion among preparatory school student in Guraghe zone, Southern region, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. BMC Women's Health. 2019;19(1):1-7.

34. Alemu K, Birhanu S, Fekadu L, Endale F, Tamene A, Habte A. Safe abortion service utilization and associated factors among insecurely housed women who experienced abortion in southwest Ethiopia, 2021: A community-based cross-sectional study. Plos one. 2022;17(8):e0272939.

35. Gebeyehu D, Admassu B, Sinega M, Haile M. Assessment of Prevalence and Reasons for Termination of Pregnancy at Jimma University Teaching Hospital, Ethiopia. Universal Journal of Public Health. 2015;3:251-5.

36. Megersa BS, Ojengbede OA, Deckert A, Fawole OI. Factors associated with induced abortion among women of reproductive age attending selected health facilities in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a case control study. BMC Women's Health. 2020;20(1):1-11.

37. Wassie AY, Lemlem SB, Boka A. Knowledge, Practice and Associated Factors Towards Medication Abortion Among Reproductive-Age Women in Sexual and Reproductive Health Clinics of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2018: Cross-Sectional Study. International Journal of Women's Health. 2021;13:489.

38. Bulti F, Gela D, Dinagde N. Knowledge of Safe Abortion Care Services and Associated Factors Among Women of Reproductive Age Working at Non-Health Sector Public Institutions in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. 2021.

39. Jamie AH, Abdosh MZ. Prevalence of induced abortion and associated factors among women of reproductive age in Harari region, Ethiopia. Public Health of Indonesia. 2020;6(2):35-40.

40. Mohammed M, Wesenu M. Prevalence and determinants associated with second trimester termination of pregnancy in Harari city, Ethiopia; Cross sectional study. 2021.

41. Worku S, Fantahun M. Unintended pregnancy and induced abortion in a town with accessible family planning services: the case of Harar in eastern Ethiopia. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2006;20(2):79-83.

42. Abera GB, Berhanu B, Kahsay AB, Gebru HB, Aregay A. Assessment of determinants of induced abortion among child bearing age women attending maternal and child health clinic in Mekelle town, Tigray, Ethiopia: a cross sectional study. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research. 2012;3(12):4745.

43. Alemayehu M, Yebyo H, Medhanyie AA, Bayray A, Fantahun M, Goba GK. Determinants of repeated abortion among women of reproductive age attending health facilities in Northern Ethiopia: a case–control study. BMC Public Health. 2017;17(1):1-8.

44. Gessessew A. Abortion and unwanted pregnancy in Adigrat zonal hospital, Tigray, north Ethiopia. African journal of reproductive health. 2010;14(3):183-8.

45. Biza N, Habib Y, Bayray A, Reddy PS. MAGNITUDE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS OF ABORTION AMONG REGULAR FEMALE STUDENTS OF SAMARA UNIVERSITY, AFAR, ETHIOPIA, 2016. Medico Research Chronicles. 2018;5(3):191-201.

46. Mekbib T-A, Hiwot YG, Fantahun M. SURVEY OF UNSAFE ABORTION IN SELECTED HEALTH FACILITIES IN ETHIOPIA. Ethiopian Journal of Reproductive Health. 2007;1(1):11-.

47. Gilano G, Hailegebreal S. Determinants of abortion among youth 15–24 in Ethiopia: A multilevel analysis based on EDHS 2016. PloS one. 2021;16(3):e0248228.

48. Tesema GA, Mekonnen TH, Teshale AB. Spatial distribution and determinants of abortion among reproductive age women in Ethiopia, evidence from Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey 2016 data: Spatial and mixed-effect analysis. PloS one. 2020;15(6):e0235382.

49. Abdella A. Maternal mortality trend in Ethiopia. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2010;24(1).

50. Dickson KS, Adde KS, Ahinkorah BO. Socio–economic determinants of abortion among women in Mozambique and Ghana: evidence from demographic and health survey. Archives of Public Health. 2018;76(1):1-10.

51. Pallikadavath S, Stones RW. Maternal and social factors associated with abortion in India: a population-based study. International Family Planning Perspectives. 2006:120-5.

52. Grant MJ, Behrman JR. Gender gaps in educational attainment in less developed countries. Population and development review. 2010;36(1):71-89.

53. Jiang L, Hardee K. Women's education, family planning, or both? Application of multistate demographic projections in India. International journal of population research. 2014;2014.

54. Demographic E. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and Rockville. Maryland, MA, USA: CSA and ICF. 2016.

55. van Rensburg HC. South Africa's protracted struggle for equal distribution and equitable accessstill not there. Human resources for health. 2014;12(1):1-16.

56. Bankole A, Singh S, Haas T. Reasons why women have induced abortions: evidence from 27 countries. International family planning perspectives. 1998:117-52.

1	
2	
3	57. Woog V, Susheela S, Alyssa B, Jesse P. Adolescent womens need for and use of sexual and
4 5	reproductive health services in developing countries: Citeseer; 2015.
5	58. Onukwugha FI, Magadi MA, Sarki AM, Smith L. Trends in and predictors of pregnancy
7	termination among 15–24 year-old women in Nigeria: a multi-level analysis of demographic and health
8	surveys 2003–2018. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2020;20(1):550.
9	59. Coyle K, Basen-Enquis K, Kirby D, Parcel G, Banspach S. Collins JL, Baumler ER, Caravajal S,
10	Harrist, RB. Safer Choices: Long-term impact of a multicomponent school-based HIV, STD, and pregnancy
11	prevention program. Public Health Reports. 2001;116(Suppl 1):82-93.
12	60. Cabezón C, Vigil P, Rojas I, Leiva ME, Riquelme R, Aranda W, et al. Adolescent pregnancy
13	prevention: An abstinence-centered randomized controlled intervention in a Chilean public high school.
14	Journal of Adolescent Health. 2005;36(1):64-9.
15	61. Onukwugha FI, Magadi MA, Sarki AM, Smith L, Trends in and predictors of pregnancy
16 17	termination among 15–24 year-old women in Nigeria: a multi-level analysis of demographic and health
17	surveys 2003–2018. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2020:20(1):1-13.
19	62. Cadmus F. Owoaie F. Knowledge about complications and practice of abortion among female
20	undergraduates in the University of Ibadan. Nigeria. Annals of Ibadan postgraduate medicine
21	2011.9(1).19-23
22	63 Abmed S. Ray R. Determinants of pregnancy and induced and spontaneous abortion in a jointly
23	determined framework: evidence from a country-wide district-level household survey in India Journal
24	of biosocial science 2014:46(4):480-517
25	64 Morbe FS Taghor HK Ankohea FK Danso KA Reproductive experiences of teenagers in the
26	Eisu-Juaheng district of Ghana International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics 2012:118(2):137-40
27	65 Mulugeta V. Berbane V. Factors associated with pre-marital sexual debut among upmarried high
20	school female students in babir Dar town. Ethionia: cross-sectional study. Reproductive health
30	
31	2014,11(1).1-0.
32	abortion in Ethionia: A systematic review and meta analysis. Heliven, 2021;7(1):e05084
33	abortion in Ethopia. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Henyon, 2021,7(1),603964.
34	67. Weinings K, Conumbien W, Sidymaker E, Singh S, Houges Z, Pater D, et al. Sexual behaviour in
35	Context: a global perspective. The Lancet. 2006;368(9548):1706-28.
36	68. WHO. Addrescent pregnancy fact sheet. World Health Organization, 2022 [updated 15
3/	September 2022. Available from: <u>https://www.who.int/en/news-room/ract-sneets/detail/adolescent-</u>
38	pregnancy.
39 40	69. Bernabe-Ortiz A, White PJ, Carcamo CP, Hughes JP, Gonzales MA, Garcia PJ, et al. Clandestine
40	induced abortion: prevalence, incidence and risk factors among women in a Latin American country.
42	Cmaj. 2009;180(3):298-304.
43	70. Cheng Y, Wang X, Lv Y, Cai Y, Li Y, Guo X, et al. Study on the risk factors of repeated abortion
44	among unmarried adolescents. Zhonghua liu xing bing xue za zhi= Zhonghua liuxingbingxue zazhi.
45	2006;27(8):669-72.
46	71. Yi S, Tuot S, Chhoun P, Pal K, Tith K, Brody C. Factors associated with induced abortion among
47	female entertainment workers: a cross-sectional study in Cambodia. BMJ open. 2015;5(7):e007947.
48	
49	
50 51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	18
59	For near review only - http://bmionen.hmi.com/sito/about/quidelings.yhtml
60	Tor peer review only - http://binjopen.binj.com/site/about/guidelines.xitum





Figure 1. Flow chart of describing the selection of studies for the systematic review and metaanalysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination and associated factors in Ethiopia, 2023

 BMJ Open

Table 2: Characteristics of the studies for the prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2004-2022

Authors name	Publication year	Study area	Region	Study design	Study setting	Study population	Sample size
Addisu W. et al	2018	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	423
Mahlet T. et al.	2017	Debre Markos	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	567
Fikreselassie T. et al.	2014	Bahr Dar	Amhara	Case-control	Institutional	Pregnant women	175
Gezahegn T. et al.	2010	Guraghe Zone	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	422
Bekele T. et al.	2017	Debre Markos	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	262
Getayeneh A. et al.	2016	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Community	Pregnant women	12378
Addisu T. et al.	2019	Hawassa	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	422
Amlaku M. et al.	2014	Amhara region referral hospitals	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	422
Birye D. et al.	2019	Gondar	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	648
Amanuel G. et al.	2004	Adigrat	Tigray	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Women with Gynecologic problem	7203
Endalew S. et al.	2021	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age	432
Worku A. et al.	2011	Arba Minch	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	845
Mesfn A. et al.	2021	Arba minch & Wolayita Sodo town	SNNP	Case control	Institutional	Reproductive age group	413
Bethelihem A. et al.	2015	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	429
Mussie A. et al.	2014	Tigray region health hospitals	Tigray	Case control	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	309

Geremew K. et al.	2019	Debre Berhan town health institutions	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	355
Amha A. et al.	2011	Hawassa University	SNNP*	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	493
Girma G. et al.	2016	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Community	Youth women	6401
Kifle L. et al.	2017	Guraghe zone	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age	404
Arif H. et al.	2020	Harari	Harari	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	611
Biniyam B. et al.	2020	Dilla University	SNNPR	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	548
Denberu B. et al	2017	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Case control	Institutional	Youth women	330
Diriba G. et al.	2015	Jimma	Oromia	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	194
Girum M. et al.	2015	Gonji Kollela District	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age group	611
Murad M. et al.	2020	Harar	Harari	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	835
Tekleab M. et al.	2007	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	1075
Tadesse N. et al.	2020	Mizan Tepi University	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	420
Tesfamichael G. et al.	2017	Gondar	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age	154
Kidist A. et al	2022	Jimma, Bonga, and Mizan-Aman	SNNPR	Cross-sectional	Community	Insecurely housed women	124
Solomon W. et al	2006	Harer	Harari	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age	1000
Biza N. et al.	2018	Semera	Afar	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	509
Abera et al.	2012	Mekelle	Tigray	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care seekers	260

*SNNP: South Nations and Nationalities Peoples

2							
4							
5							
6		Study					%
7							Woight
8						LO (95 / 0 CI)	weight
9	-					00.00 (00.50.07	40\0.07
10						33.00 (28.52, 37	.48) 3.97
11		Mahlet. etal (2017)	_			34.90 (30.98, 38	.82) 3.99
12		Gezahegn T. et al (2010)	+	1		12.30 (9.17, 15.4	43) 4.01
13		Bekele T. et al (2017)		-		29.60 (24.07, 35	5.13) 3.94
15		Getayeneh A. et AL (2016)	۲	1		8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
16		Addisu T. et al (2019)		1	-	- 68.70 (64.28, 73	.12) 3.98
17		Amlaku M. et al (2014)	-			19.20 (15.44, 22	96) 4.00
18		Amanuel G. (2004)			۲	60.60 (59.47, 61	.73) 4.05
19		Endalew S. (2021)	-	, H		18.10 (14.47, 21	.73) 4.00
20		Worku A. (2011)			F	43.40 (40.06, 46	74) 4.01
21		Geremew K et al (2019)	-	-		20.30 (16.12.24	48) 3 98
22		Amba A $et al (2011)$	-	1		6 40 (4 32 8 66)	4.03
23		$\operatorname{Cirma}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{C} \text{ at al } (2016)$		l I		2 50 (2 12 2 00)	4.05
24 25				1		2.50 (2.12, 2.00)	4.05
26				1		13.60 (10.26, 16	.94) 4.01
27		Biniyam Bayou (2020)	*	·		6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4.04
28		Diriba G (2015)				35.60 (28.86, 42	2.34) 3.88
29		Girum M (2015)		1		1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
30		Murad M (2020)	-	H		18.20 (15.58, 20	.82) 4.02
31		Tekleab M (2007)		-		25.60 (22.99, 28	.21) 4.03
32		Tadesse N (2020)	-	● <mark>↓</mark>		18.80 (15.06, 22	54) 4.00
33		Tesfamichael G (2017)	-	1		3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.02
34 25		Kidist Alemu, (2022)				27.90 (20.01, 35	.79) 3.82
36		Solomon W (2006)	•	1		14.20 (12.04, 16	.36) 4.03
37		Biza N et al (2018)	+	1		8 80 (6 34 11 26	6) 4 03
38		Abera et al (2012)	-	i.		7 70 (1 16 10 9	1) 1.00
39		Overall (Lequared = 99.8% p = 0.000)				21 52 (15 01 28	+) +.01 (03) 100 00
40		OVerall (1-5quared = 35.0%, p = 0.000)				21.52 (15.01, 20	.03) 100.00
41		NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		1			
42			İ I				
43			. 01 10				
44							



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



Figure-2: Funnel plot to test publication bias of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

BMJ Open



Figure-3: The Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis of abortion among women in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors	Publication			%
name	year		ES (95% CI)	Weigh
Addis Ababa				
Addisu W. et al	2018		33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3.97
Endalew S.	2021	*	18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4.00
Subtotal (I-squared = 96.1%, p = 0.000)		\diamond	25.49 (10.89, 40.09)	7.98
Amhara				
Mahlet. etal	2017		34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.99
Bekele T. et al	2017	I - ● -	29.60 (24.07, 35.13)	3.94
Amlaku M. et al	2014		19.20 (15.44, 22.96)	4.00
Geremew K. et al	2019	+	20.30 (16.12, 24.48)	3.98
Girum M	2015	I	1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
Tesfamichael G	2017		3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.02
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.0%, p = 0.000)			18.06 (6.27, 29.85)	23.97
SNNPR				
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		12.30 (9.17, 15.43)	4.01
Addisu T. et al	2019		68.70 (64.28, 73.12)	3.98
Worku A.	2011		43.40 (40.06, 46.74)	4.01
Amha A. et al	2011		6.49 (4.32, 8.66)	4.03
Kifle Lentiro	2017		13.60 (10.26, 16.94)	4.01
Binivam Bavou	2020	•	6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4.04
Tadesse N	2020		18.80 (15.06, 22.54)	4.00
Kidist Alemu.	2022		27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.82
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.3%, p = 0.000)		\diamond	24.63 (11.50, 37.75)	31.90
National Data				
Getaveneh A. et AL	2016	■ 1	8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
Girma G. et al	2016	•	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.05
Tekleab M	2007	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	25.60 (22.99, 28.21)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.7%, p = 0.000)			12.10 (5.70, 18.50)	12.13
Tigray				
Amanuel G.	2004		60.60 (59.47. 61.73)	4.05
Abera et al	2012		7.70 (4.46, 10.94)	4.01
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.9%, p = 0.000)			34.17 (-17.67, 86.01)	8.06
Harari				
Murad M	2020		18.20 (15 58 20 82)	4 02
Solomon W	2006	a 1	14.20 (12.04, 16.36)	4.02
Subtotal (I-squared - 81 2% n - 0.021)			16 13 (12 21 20 05)	9.05 R NR
		×1	10.10 (12.21, 20.00)	0.00
Oromia				
Diriba G	2015		35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		\diamond	35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Afar				
Biza N. et al	2018		8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		Ö	8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.000)			21.52 (15.01, 28.03)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects	analysis	Ĭ		

Figure-4: Subgroup analysis of the pregnancy termination based on regional distribution in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors name	Publication year		ES (95% CI)	y N
Reproductive age				
Addisu W. et al	2018		33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3.
Mahlet. etal	2017		34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.
Endalew S.	2021		18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4
Kifle Lentiro	2017		13.60 (10.26, 16.94)	4
Girum M	2015	· · · ·	1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4
Murad M	2020	Г – Ч	18 20 (15 58 20 82)	4
Tesfamichael G	2017	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4
Solomon W	2006		14 20 (12 04 16 36)	4
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.0%, p = 0.0	2000		17.03 (8.55, 25.52)	3
Pregnant women	2016		8 00 /8 40 0 40)	4
Subtotal (I squared = % n =)	2010	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	8.00 (8.40, 9.40)	4.
			0.50 (0.40, 5.40)	-
Abortion care seekers				
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		12.30 (9.17, 15.43)	4.
Bekele T. et al	2017	I - 3 -	29.60 (24.07, 35.13)	3.
Amlaku M. et al	2014		19.20 (15.44, 22.96)	4.
Geremew K. et al	2019		20.30 (16.12, 24.48)	3
Diriba G	2015		35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3
Tekleab M	2007		25.60 (22.99, 28.21)	4
Abera et al	2012		7.70 (4.46, 10.94)	4
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.3%, p = 0.06	00)		21.19 (14.65, 27.72)	2
University/College students				
Addisu T et al	2019		68 70 (64 28 73 12)	3
Worku A	2013			4
Amha A et al	2011		6 49 (4 32 8 66)	4
Rinivam Bayou	2020		6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	-
Todosso N	2020		18 90 (15 06 22 54)	
Piza N. et al	2020		9 90 (6 24 11 26)	-
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.5%, p = 0.04	2010		25.36 (9.39, 41.32)	- 2
Gynaecological patients	2004		60 60 /50 47 61 72)	
Subtotal (Leguarad - % n -)	2004		60.60 (53.47, 61.73)	-
			V 00.00 (39.47, 01.73)	4.
Youth women		L i		
Girma G. et al	2016		2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.
Insecurely housed women				
Kidist Alemu,	2022	<u>+</u>	27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	-		27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.
Ovorall (Leavared 00.89/ p. 0.00	n .		21 50 /45 04 09 02)	
Overall (I-Squared = 99.8%, p = 0.00			21.32 (13.01, 28.03)	1
NOTE: Weights are from random effe	cts analysis			

Figure-5: Subgroup analysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination based on study population in Ethiopia, 2022

name	year		ES (95% CI)	Weight
Have 1 alive child				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	+	0.97 (0.72, 1.31)	5.60
Mesfn A. et al	2021	_ _	0.32 (0.10, 1.01)	3.80
Girma G. et al	2016	I	0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	5.46
Denberu B	2017		0.74 (0.32, 1.71)	4.53
Subtotal (I-squared = 42.0%,	p = 0.160)	\diamond	0.74 (0.52, 1.05)	19.39
First sex before18 yrs				
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.70 (1.44, 5.06)	5.01
Geremew K. et al	2019		5.96 (2.54, 13.97)	4.49
Girma G. et al	2016		2.00 (1.32, 3.03)	5.42
Biniyam Bayou	2020	T	4.30 (1.16, 15.94)	3.44
Tadesse N	2020		1.64 (0.73, 3.69)	4.59
Subtotal (I-squared = 41.6%,	p = 0.144)	\diamond	2.65 (1.74, 4.04)	22.95
Irregular monstruction				
Inegular mensulualion	2014		1 76 (1 02 2 00)	E 01
Mussio A ot al	2014		2 00 (1 00, 2.39)	5.21
viussie A. ei ai Subtotal (Leguarod – 0.0% p	2014		1 96 (1 25 2 77)	10.26
Subiolai (1-Squareu - 0.070, p	- 0.750)		1.00 (1.23, 2.17)	10.20
Abortion history				
Fikreselassie T. et al.	2014	I	0.29 (0.11, 0.78)	4 17
Gezaheon T. et al	2010		1 17 (0.39, 3.49)	3.92
Mussie Allet al	2014		2 30 (1 28, 4 15)	5.09
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.0%,	p = 0.002)		0.96 (0.27, 3.40)	13.18
Multiple sexual partner				
Vahlet, etal	2017		6.16 (3.25, 11.68)	4.98
Vesfn A. et al	2021	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• 5.47 (2.98. 10.04)	5.05
Mussie A. et al	2014		4.40 (2.34, 8.27)	5.00
Geremew K. et al	2019		7.72 (2.90, 20.57)	4.19
Denberu B	2017		1.09 (0.22, 5.35)	2.88
Biza N. et al	2018	<u> </u>	2.90 (0.91, 9.21)	3.78
Subtotal (I-squared = 13.4%,	p = 0.329)		4.88 (3.43, 6.93)	25.88
		1		
Wanted pregnancy				
Addisu W. et al	2018		11.77 (3.51, 39.43)	3.66
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	i	0.44 (0.20, 0.95)	4.69
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.1%,	p = 0.000)		2.20 (0.09, 55.02)	8.35
Overall (I-squared = 85.6%, p	= 0.000)		1.92 (1.31, 2.80)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from rand	om effects analysis			

Figure-6: Subgroup analysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination based on before and after MDG in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors	Publication year			ES (95% CI)	% Weigh
Rural Residence		1			
Mahlet. etal	2017 —	•		0.19 (0.09, 0.42)	6.42
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016			1.27 (0.74, 2.18)	6.84
Amlaku M. et al	2014			1.86 (1.11, 3.13)	6.88
Mesfn A. et al	2021			0.43 (0.23, 0.80)	6.73
Kifle Lentiro	2017			2.30 (1.10, 4.80)	6.52
Tadesse N	2020 -			0.26 (0.12, 0.55)	6.50
Subtotal (I-squared =	89.1%, p = 0.000)			0.71 (0.32, 1.58)	39.88
		1			
Students					
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014		•	7.40 (2.93, 18.69)	6.16
Arif H. Jamie	2020		_	2.95 (1.02, 8.52)	5.88
Subtotal (I-squared =	39.0%, p = 0.201)		>	4.85 (1.98, 11.91)	12.04
Singlo					
Siligie Fikrosolassio T. ot al	2014			18 23 (8 04 41 33)	6 37
Cozobogn T of al	2014			1 35 (0.59 3 14)	6.22
Bekele T et al	2010	· · · · ·		1.35 (0.36, 3.14)	0.3Z
	2017			4.93 (1.41, 17.17)	5.40 6.00
	2010			1.22(0.70, 1.90)	0.90
	2020	1		5.50 (1.20, 25.14) 1.72 (1.20, 2.47)	4.09
Donhoru P	2000			1.72(1.20, 2.47)	1.01 E 04
	2017			0.04 (0.01, 0.12)	5.04
Abera et al	2012			0.60 (0.15, 2.45)	5.13
Subtotal (I-squared =	92.0‰, p = 0.000)			1.55 (0.60, 4.02)	48.08
Overall (I-squared = 9	0.8%, p = 0.000)	\Leftrightarrow		1.30 (0.72, 2.34)	100.0
NOTE: Weights are fro	m random effects analysis				
	, T	1'			

Figure-7: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected socio-demographic characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

iame	year	ES (95% CI)	Weight
Divorced			
Bekele T. et al	2017 —	2.38 (0.67, 8.44)	4.12
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016 -	0.78 (0.49, 1.24)	5.68
Girma G. et al	2016	20.00 (7.14, 56.06)	4.61
Subtotal (I-squared = 93.8	%, p = 0.000)	3.24 (0.41, 25.83)	14.41
Married			
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	2.40 (1.19, 4.85)	5.27
Girma G. et al	2016	→ 38.00 (17.10, 84.47)	5.09
\bera et al	2012	1.26 (0.39, 4.07)	4.31
Subtotal (I-squared = 94.1	%, p = 0.000)	4.97 (0.63, 38.95)	14.67
Primery school			
Aahlet. etal	2017	5.46 (2.06, 14.47)	4.73
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	0.26 (0.10, 0.68)	4.77
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	€ 1.36 (1.13, 1.64)	5.97
Jesfn A. et al	2021	1.44 (0.53, 3.92)	4.67
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.20 (0.07, 0.59)	4.52
Solomon W	2006	1.65 (1.03, 2.65)	5.66
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.4	%, p = 0.000)	1.05 (0.55, 2.00)	30.31
Secondary school			
Addisu W. et al	2018	3.54 (1.02, 12.27)	4.16
Mahlet. etal	2017	12.96 (6.16, 27.28)	5.19
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016 -	0.98 (0.68, 1.41)	5.80
lesfn A. et al	2021 -	2.04 (0.79, 5.28)	4.78
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.40 (0.20, 0.80)	5.29
Subtotal (I-squared = 92.5	%, p = 0.000)	2.00 (0.63, 6.37)	25.23
College & above			
Addisu W. et al	2018	3.49 (1.02, 11.92)	4.20
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016 —	0.99 (0.61, 1.60)	5.65
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.40 (0.23, 0.69)	5.54
Subtotal (I-squared = 83.8	%, p = 0.002)	0.97 (0.37, 2.54)	15.39
Overall (I-squared = 91.0°	b, p = 0.000)	1.78 (1.13, 2.82)	100.00
VOTE: Weights are from r	indom effects analysis		

Figure-8: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected socio-demographic characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

. name	year		ES (95% CI)	% Weig
Have 1 alive child				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		0.97 (0.72, 1.31)	5.60
Mesfn A. et al	2021		0.32 (0.10, 1.01)	3.80
Girma G. et al	2016	I	0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	5.46
Denberu B	2017		0.74 (0.32, 1.71)	4.53
Subtotal (I-squared = 42.0%, p	o = 0.160)	$\overline{\diamond}$	0.74 (0.52, 1.05)	19.3
First sex before18 yrs				
Mussie A. et al	2014	_ i ∎	2.70 (1.44, 5.06)	5.01
Geremew K. et al	2019	i — •	5.96 (2.54, 13.97)	4.49
Girma G. et al	2016		2.00 (1.32, 3.03)	5.42
Biniyam Bayou	2020		4.30 (1.16, 15.94)	3.44
Tadesse N	2020		1.64 (0.73, 3.69)	4.59
Subtotal (I-squared = 41.6%, p	o = 0.144)		2.65 (1.74, 4.04)	22.9
Irregular menstruation				
Amlaku M. et al	2014		1 76 (1 03 2 99)	5 21
Mussia A at al	2014	-	2.00 (1.00, 2.00)	5.05
Subtotal (I-squared - 0.0% n	- 0.756)		1 86 (1 25 2 77)	0.00 10 0
	- 0.1007		1.00 (1.20, 2.17)	10.2
Abortion history				
Fikreselassie I. et al	2014		0.29 (0.11, 0.78)	4.17
Gezahegn I. et al	2010		1.17 (0.39, 3.49)	3.92
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.30 (1.28, 4.15)	5.09
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.0%, p	o = ().002)		0.96 (0.27, 3.40)	13.1
Multiple sexual partner				
Mahlet. etal	2017		6.16 (3.25, 11.68)	4.98
Mesfn A. et al	2021		5.47 (2.98, 10.04)	5.05
Mussie A. et al	2014	; •	4.40 (2.34, 8.27)	5.00
Geremew K. et al	2019		• 7.72 (2.90, 20.57)	4.19
Denberu B	2017	•	1.09 (0.22, 5.35)	2.88
Biza N. et al	2018		2.90 (0.91, 9.21)	3.78
Subtotal (I-squared = 13.4%, p	o = 0.329)		4.88 (3.43, 6.93)	25.8
Wanted pregnancy				
Addisu W. et al	2018		11.77 (3.51, 39.43)	3.66
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	<u> </u>	0.44 (0.20, 0.95)	4.69
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.1%, p	0 = 0.000)		2.20 (0.09, 55.02)	8.35
Overall (I-squared = 85.6%, p	= 0.000)	\diamond	1.92 (1.31, 2.80)	100.
NOTE: Weights are from rando	om effects analysis			

Figure-9: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected reproductive characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported	
6 TITLE				
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1	
ABSTRACT				
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	2	
2 Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	3	
3 Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	3	
4 METHODS			5	
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	4-5	
Information	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	4	
G Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	4	
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5	
2 Data collection 3 process 4	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5	
5 Data items 6	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	5	
7 8	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	5	
 Study risk of bias assessment 	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	6	
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	6	
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	6	
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	6	
¥ i	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	6	
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	6	
φ [13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	6	
1	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	6	
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	6	
5 Certainty	15	Describe any methods used topassess/centainty (ortconfidenice) in the body of evidence/ion in butsomem	6	

 Page 32 of 33

Page 33 of 33



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported		
assessment					
RESULTS					
Study selection 16		Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.			
1	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	7		
2 Study 3 characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.			
4 Risk of bias in 5 studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.			
6 Results of 7 individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	7-9		
8 Results of	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	7-9 &14		
9 syntheses 0 1	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	7-9 & 14		
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	7-9 & 14		
23	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	7-9 & 14		
24 Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	7-9		
²⁵ Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	7-9		
DISCUSSION	DISCUSSION				
²⁸ Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	11-13		
30	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	11-13		
31	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	13		
32	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	111-13		
Registration and	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	5		
6	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	5		
37	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	5		
38 Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	14		
27 Competing 10 interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	14		
⁺ Availability of ¹² data, code and ¹³ other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	14		
14 15 <i>From:</i> Page M.L. Mu	Konzia	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	21:372:n71 doi:		

BMJ Open



10.1136/bmj.n71

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

.umation, visit. <u>http://www.</u> For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Prevalence and determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-073799.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Dec-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Kumsa, Henok; Woldia University Mislu, Esuyawkal; Woldia University, Midwifery Arage, Mulugeta; Woldia University, Midwifery Kidie, Atitegeb; Woldia University Hailu, Tilahun; Woldia University tenaw, lebeza; Woldia University
Primary Subject Heading :	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Sexual health, Reproductive medicine, Public health
Keywords:	Adolescent, Public health < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Sexual and Gender Minorities





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Prevalence and determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Henok Kumsa¹, Esuyawkal Mislu¹, Mulugeta Wodaje Arage¹, Atitegeb Abera², Tilahun Hailu², and Lebeza Alemu Tenaw²

Affiliations invaluable

¹School of Midwifery, College of Health Science, Woldia University, Ethiopia

² School of Public health, College of Health Science, Woldia University, Ethiopia

Email Address

- HK: henokkumsa@gmail.com
- EM: esuyawkalmislu@gmail.com
- MWA: mulewodaje@gmail.com

MWA: mulewodaje@gmail.com AA: atitegebabera@gmail.com TH: lemaryam01@gmail.com LAT: lebezaa@gmail.com *Corresponding author: Lebeza Alemu Tenaw Email: lebezaa@gmail.com
Abstract

Objective: This review aims to determine the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its determinant factors in Ethiopia.

Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Data sources: Relevant articles were retrieved from databases such as PubMed, EMBASE, Medline, and other search engines.

Eligibility criteria for selecting studies: The research design for this study had no restrictions, allowing for the inclusion of cross-sectional and case-control studies that examined the prevalence or determinants of pregnancy termination. However, case reports, case series, reviews, editorials, and studies published as abstracts only were excluded from the analysis.

Data extraction and synthesis: The review precisely in accordance with PRISMA criteria, and the quality of the review was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist. Heterogeneity was indicated by the p-value for I² statistics less than 0.05. Data were entered into Microsoft Excel, and the analysis was conducted using Stata 16.

Results: The pooled prevalence pregnancy termination in Ethiopia was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01, 28.03). Women who had their first sexual initiation before the age of 18 (OR = 1.78; 95% CI = 1.13, 2.82, P=0.144), had irregular menstrual bleeding (OR = 1.86; 95% CI = 1.25, 2.77, P=0.756), being a student (OR: 4.85; 95% CI: 1.98, 11.91, P=0.201), and had multiple sexual partners (OR: 4.88; 95% CI: 3.43, 6.93, P=0.329) were significantly associated with pregnancy termination.

Conclusions: One in five women terminated their pregnancies, which is higher than in other sub-Saharan countries. Being a student, irregular menstrual bleeding, early initiation of sexual intercourse, and multiple sexual partners were determinants of pregnancy termination. Special attention is needed in avoiding early sexual initiation and in reducing sexual risk behaviors.

Keywords: Pregnancy termination, Determinantss, Systematic review and meta analysis, Ethiopia

Introduction

Pregnancy termination is a sensitive and contentious issue with religious, moral, cultural, and political dimensions. Also, it presents a significant public health concern in developing coutries (1). Above 60% of unintended pregnancies result in pregnancy termination, with the majority of those being unsafe (2). Developing countries bear the burden of 97% of all unsafe abortions which contributes to 220 deaths per 100,000 live births (3).

Moreover, pregnancy termination imposes an additional burden on health institutions and individuals; in developing countries alone, each year an estimated 7 million women seek treatment in health facilities for the complication of pregnancy termination (4). It is estimated that health-care systems will spend \$553 million per year on post-abortion complications and will lose \$922 million in income due to long-term disability caused by unsafe termination (5). Additionally, a woman who undergo pregnancy termination, particularly through methods such as mechanical dilation and curettage, face an increased a risk of experiencing preterm birth and repeated pregnancy loss (6).

Though the burden of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia is a significant contributor to maternal mortality and morbidity (7). Previous studies conducted in Ethiopia have shown that the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its negative consequences are increasing over time (8, 9), and repeated pregnancy termination also accounts significant amount (10-12). Several variables, including early age marriage, low level of education, early sexual intercourse initiation, violence/rape, emotional well-being, educational status, employment status, and resources, and sexual intercourse relationship, have been implicated as factors of pregnancy termination in studies conducted across Ethiopia (13-16).

However, at the national level, illustrative evidence is lacking in Ethiopia regarding the level and underlying factors of pregnancy termination. Thus, this systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to assess the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its determinant factors in Ethiopia. The findings of this study provide evidence for intervention to reduce the burden of pregnancy termination, its complications, and its economic impact in the country. Additionally, this study will help to design strategies and monitor the progress of programs aimed at achieving the maternal mortality reduction targets of the sustainable development gaols.

Methods

Study design and setting

This systematic review and meta-analysis included cross sectional, and case control studies which has been conducted in Ethiopia. Systematic review and meta-analysis using computerized databases; searches were performed to estimate the prevalence and identify the determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia.

Search strategy

For this review, a comprehensive search was conducted using various searching strategies to identify relevant articles. Published articles were searched in well-known online databases including EMBBASE, Medline, Google, PubMed, Google Scholar, African Journal Online, and Science Direct databases. Additionally, the search was expanded by examining the reference lists of eligible articles to retrieve and extract potential articles. This systematic review was conducted using the preferred reporting items for systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses PRISMA guidelines. Similarly, the quality of our systematic review and meta-analysis was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist (17).

Searching was done by using Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) terms related with determinantss of pregnancy termination. MeSH terms enables us to select related research articles. We conducted the search for terms using Boolean operators "AND" and "OR," both separately and in combinations. We used the search terms "((((((Abortion) OR (termination of pregnancy)) OR (miscarriage)) AND (determinant factors)) OR (determinants)) OR (associated factors)) OR (influencing factors)) AND (Amhara) OR (Oromia) OR (Tigray) OR (Southern nation, nationalities and people's) OR (Afar) OR (Benshagul gumuz) OR (Gamabella) OR (Somali) OR (Dire dawa) OR (Addis Ababa) OR (Hareri) OR (Ethiopia)".

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria

There were no restrictions on research design. We included cross-sectional and case-control studies that showed the prevalence of or determinants of pregnancy termination. Additionally,

Only articles reported in the English language and conducted studies until February 2023 were included.

Exclusion criteria

Case reports, case series, reviews, editorials, and studies published as abstracts only were excluded. Agreements on the inclusion and exclusion of the articles were held through the participation of all authors.

Quality assessment and data extraction

Articles were screened using their titles, abstracts, and full paper reviews before being included in the meta-analysis. The quality of included studies was evaluated using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist (17). The quality scores of included studies were assessed and presented using the mean scores to designate them as high- or low-quality. The JBI tool for prevalence and determinat studies was used as a guideline for data extraction from the final selected articles. The extraction sheet contains name of authors, study year, publication year, region of study, study design, sample size, prevalence in percentage or proportion, odd ratio of factors, confidence intervals both the upper and lower bound of each corresponding odds ratio. The odd ratio of each factors are transformed as log (OR). The lower and upper confidence intervals are log transformed as log (upper confidence interval), and log (lower confidence interval). The standard error for the proportion was also created as: Standard error = $\sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$. And then the standard error of the confidence intervals were also estimated using the log transformed upper and lower limits which is calculated as SE= (logUCL-logLCL)/3.92. Finally for pooled prevalence estimation, the proportion and its corresponding standard errors were used. For factors, the log transformed odd ratios and the standard error of their corresponding confidence intervals were used to estimate the effect sizes. Moreover, all authors independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of studies to be included in this systematic review and meta-analysis. Agreements on the inclusion and exclusion of the articles were reached with the participation of all authors.

Measurement of the outcome variable

In this study, termination of pregnancy is the removal of pregnancy tissue, conception products, or fetus, and placenta from the uterus. The term 'fetus' and 'placenta' is commonly used after eight weeks of pregnancy. Pregnancy tissue and products of conception are the tissues that are produced by the union of an egg and sperm before eight weeks. Terminating a pregnancy is a deliberate action taken by a health professional or the woman herself (18).

Registration and protocol

This review has not previously registered or prepared a protocol. As a result, no adjustments have been made.

Patient and Public Involvement: not applicable

Statistical methods and analysis

The meta-analysis was conducted using Stata 16 software after entering data into Microsoft Excel. Forest plots were used to demonstrate the prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia. The random effect model of analysis was utilized as a method of meta-analysis to minimize the heterogeneity of included studies (19). The study setting, population, and study period were used to conduct sub-group analysis. The presentation of pregnancy termination determinants was based on odds ratios (ORs) with a 95% confidence interval(CI).

The heterogeneity of the studies included was assessed using the I² statistics. The presence of heterogeneity was determined by using a p-value for I² statistics that was less than 0.05. Based on the I² test statistics results, the heterogeneity is categorized as low (25%), moderate (50%), and high (75%) (19). Furthermore, the Egger regression asymmetry test was used to evaluate the publication bias (20, 21). When the Egger test result's P-value is less than 0.05, there is a declaration of publication bias. The Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis using the random effect analysis was conducted to detect the presence of publication bias (22).

Result

Study selection

This systematic review and meta-analysis included published studies on the termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia. A total of 12,242 records were retrieved through electronic database searching, and only 33 articles were included in the final analysis (supplementary figure 1).

Characteristics of included studies

This review included Thirty-three studies conducted in various regions of Ethiopia. Of all the studies, 8 (24.24%) were from the Amhara Region (11, 12, 15, 16, 23-26), South Nations and Nationalities Peoples accounted for 9 (27.27%) of the total (13, 27-34), 1 was from Oromia (35), 5 (15.15%) from Addis Ababa city administration (10, 14, 36-38), 3 (9.09%) were from Harari region (39-41), 3 (9.09%) were from Tigray region (42-44), 1 (3.03%) was from Afar region (45), 3 (9.09) were from National data (46-48). Twenty-eight (84.85%) of the included articles were cross-sectional studies (10-13, 15, 23-31, 33-35, 37-42, 44-48), and remains five (15.15%) were case-control studies(14, 16, 32, 36, 43).

As well, twenty-seven of the studies were institution-based (10-16, 24, 27-33, 35-46), while six were community-based studies(23, 25, 26, 34, 47, 48). The sample size of the included studies ranged from a minimum of 124 in a study conducted in southwest Ethiopia (34) and to a maximum of 12,378 in a study conducted using DHS data (48). Overall, a total of 40,116 study participants were included in this review detail is available in suplmentary table 1.

Prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia

Based on the random effect model, the overall pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy among women in Ethiopia was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03) (supplementary figure 2). The meta-analysis included studies with significant heterogeneity: I² value of 99.8%, p < 0.000. Publication biases among the included studies were examined using funnel plots and Egger's regression test. The results of funnel plots showed an asymmetric shape, which indicates the presence of publication bias among those included studies. Additionally, the Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis was applied to correct publication bias among the studies, but no trimming was performed since the data is unchanged (supplementary figures 3 and 4).

BMJ Open

Objective assessments of publication bias by Egger's regression test also showed the presence of publication bias across studies (*p*-value < 0.001). After conducting the trim and fill analysis to address publication bias, the final pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia was adjusted to 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03).

Subgroup analysis

We performed subgroup analysis based on the region, study population, and study setting of the included studies. Table 1 shows the pooled prevalence was highest, 35.60% (95% CI: 28.86, 42.34) in the Oromia region, followed by 34.17% (95% CI: 17.67, 86.01) in the Tigray region, 24.63% (95% CI: 10.52, 37.75) in the South Nation and Nationalities People Region, and the lowest was seen in three studies conducted using demographic health data, 12.10% (95% CI: 5.66, 18.50) (supplementary figure 5).

Furthermore, subgroup analysis reveals that the highest pooled prevalence of abortion was seen among gynecological admitted patients, at 60.60% (95% CI: 59.47, 61.73), followed by 25.38% (95% CI: 9.39, 41.32) among university/college students, and 27.90% (95% CI: 20.01, 35.79) among insecurely housed women, with the lowest pooled prevalence being seen among pregnant women and youth women (supplementary figure 6). Additionally, subgroup analysis was conducted based on the year before and after the Millennium Development Goals' implementation. The pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination before and after MDGs was 20.55% (95% CI: 16.10–24.99) and 21.61% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03), respectively (supplementary figure 7).

3
4
5
6
7
, o
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
20
2/
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
16
40 47
4/
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
55
20
5/
58
59
60

Table 1:	Subgroup	analysis t	for the preval	ence of pregnanc	y termination in	Ethiopia, 2004-2022
----------	----------	------------	----------------	------------------	------------------	---------------------

Subgroup	Number	Total	Prevalence (95%CI)	Heteroge	neity
	of	Sample	, , ,	I ²	p-value
	studies				
By region					
Addis Ababa	2	855	25.49(10.39, 40.09)	92.4	< 0.001
Amhara	6	2371	18.06(6.27, 29.85)	99.0	< 0.001
SNNP	8	3678	24.63(95% CI: 10.52,	99.4	< 0.001
			37.75)		
National Data	3	19854	12.10(5.70, 18.50)	99.7	< 0.001
Tigray	2	7463	34.17(17.6, 86.01)	99.9	< 0.001
Harari	2	1835	16.13(12.21, 20.05)	81.2	< 0.001
Oromia	1	194	35.60(28.86, 42.34)		•
Afar	1	509	8.80(6.34, 11.26)		
By publication year	r				
2016 to 2022 (post	15	24234	20.55(16.10, 24.99)	99.3	< 0.001
MDG)					
Before MDG	10	12525	22.61(4.55, 40.66)	99.9	< 0.001
Study population	-				
Reproductive age	8	4426	17.03(8.55, 25.52)	99.0	< 0.001
Pregnant women	1	12378	8.90 (8.40, 9.40)		
Abortion care	7	2990	21.19(14.65, 27.72)	95.3	< 0.001
seeker					
University or	6	3237	25.36 (9.39, 41.32)	99.5	< 0.001
college student					
Gynecological	1	7203	60.60 (59.47, 61.73)		•
patient					
Youth women	1	6401	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	•	
Insecurely housed	1	124	27.90 (20.01, 35.79)		
women					
Total	25	36759	21.52(15.01, 28.03)	99.8	< 0.001

Insecurely household women: it means women who live or spend their time on the street.

Determinants of pregnancy termination

Socio-demographic characteristics

The sociodemographic factors included in this analysis were the place of residence, age, marital, occupational, and educational status of the women. A separate analysis was conducted for each variable. Finally, a meta-analysis of (16, 39) two studies showed that being a student was

BMJ Open

significantly associated with pregnancy termination (OR: 4.85; 95% CI: 1.98, 11.91). There was moderate heterogeneity (I2 = 39%) (supplementary figures 8 and 9).

Reproductive characteristics

A total of 5 articles (15, 24, 28, 43, 47) were included to assess the association between first sexual initiation before the age of 18 and pregnancy termination. The pooled meta-analysis found that women who had their first sexual experience before the age of 18 were twice as likely as those who had their first sexual experience after the age of 18 to have their pregnancy terminated (OR = 1.78; 95% CI = 1.13, 2.82). There was moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 41.6\%$). Moreover, two articles (11, 43) were also included to determine the association between irregular menstrual bleeding and pregnancy termination. The final pooled meta-analysis using data from the two articles found that pregnancy termination was nearly two times more likely to occur in women with irregular menstrual bleeding than in those who had regular menstrual bleeding, (OR = 1.86;95% CI = 1.25, 2.77). Similarly, a meta-analysis of six studies(14, 15, 24, 32, 34, 43) showed that women who had multiple sexual partners were significantly associated with pregnancy termination (OR: 4.88; 95% CI: 3.43, 6.93). There was low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 13.4\%$) 6.93). (supplementary figures 10).

> For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Discussion

Pregnancy termination is a major public health concern in Ethiopia (49). In this systematic review and meta-analysis, the overall magnitude of pregnancy termination was pooled from 25 published articles in Ethiopia, and significant determinants of pregnancy termination were identified using different articles. Being a student increased the rate of termination of pregnancy nearly five times. In addition, first sexual initiation before the age of 18, women with irregular menstrual bleeding, and multiple sexual partners were determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia. The findings of this review revealed evidence to help reduce the impact of pregnancy termination.

In Ethiopia various studies have been conducted on the issue of pregnancy termination, involving different settings such as the community, healthcare institutions, and higher education institutions. These studies have yielded varying figures regarding the prevalence of pregnancy termination in the country. However, this particular study revealed Ethiopia has a higher prevalence of pregnancy termination compared to other low- and middle-income countries.

The study found that the pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia was 21.52%. This finding is lower compared to a study done in Ghana at 25% (50), higher than in Mozambique at 9 % (\times 2.33) (50), and in India at 1.7% (\times 12) (51). The difference could be attributed to various factors like; study population, study design, study area, socio-demographic characteristics, and the differences in health policies of the countries. Additionally, the current study utilized a meta-analysis approach at the national level, incorporating community or institutional studies, while the study in Ghana and Mozambique was conducted using demographic health data with a small sample size compared to the current study (50). Additionally, in our study, huge variations were seen across the regions. A spatial analysis study conducted in Ethiopia using national DHS data also also showed variation even within the regions of the country (48). Thus, acting according to the needs of the region and age-specific policy is important during national policy or guideline development.

Our study observed that being a student was significantly associated with the termination of pregnancy. One of the possible explanations could be that students are likely to be adolescents, belonging to the younger age category. In addition, adolescent girls are remaining in school

BMJ Open

longer, which may factor into their decisions to postpone childbearing and terminate unintended pregnancies (52). Likewise, a study conducted in India shows the tendency for pregnancy termination is high in this age category since the rate of unintended pregnancies and unmet needs for family planning are high in this age group (53). The higher rate of pregnancy termination could also be attributed to a failure to provide education about the risks of pregnancy termination and ways of prevention for unintended pregnancy (54).

Additionally, the idea supported by Van Rensburg that societal poverty, unemployment, and other socio-demographic factors affect youth pregnancies and it might prone to pregnancy termination (55). In addition, a review from the late 1990s found that young women often cited a desire to stay in school as a major reason for pregnancy termination (56). Moreover, many adolescents continue to have difficulty accessing contraception, often as a result of stigma and/or a lack of resources (57).

The study from Nigeria indicated that 15–24-year old women are still being left behind on reproductive health matters despite increasing global attention to prioritizing their health (58). Studies found that educational programs aimed at reducing sexual risk behaviors and preventing pregnancy among young people can effectively reduce pregnancy rates among teenagers (59). Also, programs aimed at abstinence-centered sexuality education are effective in preventing adolescent pregnancy (60). Thus, this implies a future focus on reproductive health issues specific to students to address their needs. Additionally, future researchers should better focus on possible interventions to reduce the risk of pregnancy and pregnancy termination among students.

This review also assessed the association of selected variables with pregnancy termination. Women under the age of 18 at first sex were significantly more likely to terminate their pregnancy. This finding is consistent with studies conducted in Nigeria and Peru that reported a higher rate of pregnancy termination among women who had their age at first sex before 18 years old (61-63). Studies also revealed that early sexual debuts are significantly associated with adolescent pregnancies, which are usually unwanted (64, 65). As well, a study conducted in Ethiopia shown initiation of sexual intercourse before the age of 18 years was found significant association with repeated pregnancy termination (66).

BMJ Open

In many low income countries, rising ages at first marriage combined with increasing levels of premarital sex continue to result in unintended pregnancies among adolescents (67). Thus, improving the knowledge of adolescents about sexual and reproductive health issues, and increasing contraceptive access and use among young people, are important to prevent unsafe abortion or pregnancy termination (68). This necessitates the development of reproductive health education specifically for adolescent girls. Future researchers should also address the gap in studies on the needs of adolescent girls and possible interventions needed to reduce sexual initiation before the age of 18 years.

Furthermore, at the individual level, we found that pregnancy termination was significantly associated with women who had multiple sexual partners. Likewise, a study conducted in Peru indicated that as the number of sexual partners increased, the odds of getting a pregnancy termination increased (69). Studies conducted in Cambodia, China, and the United Kingdom also have found that having multiple sexual partners is associated with a higher rate of repeated pregnancy termination. (54, 70, 71). The government shall be emphasized reproductive health education, particularly for women regarding the risks of multiple sexual partners, the access where, and how to get counseling on how to prevent pregnancy.

This study also found that pregnancy termination was two times higher among women who had menstrual irregularities compared to their counterparts. Lastly, this systematic review and metaanalysis indicated that there were no statistical association between the termination of pregnancy and rural residents, marital status, women's age, educational status, primiparous, history of abortion, and wanted pregnancy.

As a limitation, this finding might be prone to the risk of bias due to the significant heterogeneity of articles included from a different region of Ethiopia. In addition, differences in the study population, setting, and design within the included studies might influence the results of this review. Moreover, studies conducted in health institutions, Colleges, or higher education might affect the pooled estimates. Additionally, in this review, only published articles were included. Also, this review didn't include qualitative studies on the explanations for pregnancy termination.

BMJ Open

Future research must explain the relationship between pregnancy termination and other determinats such as social, economic, substance use, peer pressure, alcohol use, sexual or physical violence, and knowledge of sexual and reproductive health issues such as family planning and fertility.

Conclusions

One in every five women had their pregnancies terminated, which is a high rate when compared to Sub-Saharan countries. Being a student was significantly associated with the termination of a pregnancy. In addition, irregular menstrual bleeding, early initiation of sexual intercourse, and multiple sexual partners were important determinants of pregnancy termination.

Abbreviations

OR: odds ratios; CI: confidence interval; .JBI: Joanna Briggs Institute; MDG: Millennium Development Goals'

Declarations

Ethical approval: This article was conducted using published articles. Therefore, it don't required ethical approval.

Funding: No funding was used in this study.

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and analyzed during the review are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Competing interests: None declared.

Author contributions: HK, MWA, AB, EM, TH, and LAT conducted the data curation and extraction. HK, LAT, EM, and MWA. wrote the orginal and final draft of the research. LAT, EM, MWA and HK were conducted formal analyses and data interpretation. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Supplementary file

The supplementary file contains the data extraction sheet for the study included in the review as suplmentary table 1 and supplementary figures 1-10.

References

1. Mesce D, Clifto D. Abortion facts and figures; population reference bureau. Geneva: WHO. 2011.

2. Bearak J, Popinchalk A, Ganatra B, Moller A-B, Tunçalp Ö, Beavin C, et al. Unintended pregnancy and abortion by income, region, and the legal status of abortion: estimates from a comprehensive model for 1990–2019. The Lancet Global Health. 2020;8(9):e1152-e61.

3. Ganatra B, Gerdts C, Rossier C, Johnson Jr BR, Tunçalp Ö, Assifi A, et al. Global, regional, and subregional classification of abortions by safety, 2010–14: estimates from a Bayesian hierarchical model. The Lancet. 2017;390(10110):2372-81.

4. Singh S, Maddow - Zimet I. Facility - based treatment for medical complications resulting from unsafe pregnancy termination in the developing world, 2012: a review of evidence from 26 countries. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2016;123(9):1489-98.

 Vlassoff M, Shearer J, Walker D, Lucas H. Economic impact of unsafe abortion-related morbidity and mortality: evidence and estimation challenges: Institute of Development Studies Brighton, UK; 2008.
 DeCherney AH NL, Laufer N, Roman AS. Contraception and family, gynecology. pcdatioa, 2007. teUSTM-HC.

Ababa A. Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia ministry of health. Ethiopia: Postnatal Care.
 2003.

8. Gebrehiwot Y, Fetters T, Gebreselassie H, Moore A, Hailemariam M, Dibaba Y, et al. Changes in Morbidity and Abortion Care in Ethiopia After Legal Reform: National Results from 2008 and 2014. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2016;42(3):121-30.

9. Singh S, Fetters T, Gebreselassie H, Abdella A, Gebrehiwot Y, Kumbi S, et al. The estimated incidence of induced abortion in Ethiopia, 2008. International perspectives on sexual and reproductive health. 2010:16-25.

10. Alemayehu B, Addissie A, Ayele W, Tiroro S, Woldeyohannes D. Magnitude and associated factors of repeat induced abortion among reproductive age group women who seeks abortion Care Services at Marie Stopes International Ethiopia Clinics in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Reproductive health. 2019;16(1):1-10.

11. Mulat A, Bayu H, Mellie H, Alemu A. Induced second trimester abortion and associated factors in Amhara region referral hospitals. BioMed research international. 2015;2015:256534.

12. Tesfaye B, Tewabe M, Ferede A, Dawson A. Induced second trimester abortion and associated factors at debre Markos referral hospital: cross-sectional study. Women's Health. 2020;16:1745506520929546.

13. Tesfaye G, Hambisa MT, Semahegn A. Induced abortion and associated factors in health facilities of Guraghe zone, southern Ethiopia. Journal of pregnancy. 2014;2014.

14. Denberu B, Alemseged F, Segni H. Determinants of abortion among youth seeking reproductive health Care in Selected Health Facilities, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Global Journal of Reproductive Medicine. 2017;1(2):27-38.

15. Behulu GK, Fenta EA, Aynalem GL. Repeat induced abortion and associated factors among reproductive age women who seek abortion services in Debre Berhan town health institutions, Central Ethiopia, 2019. BMC research notes. 2019;12(1):1-5.

16. Tilahun F, Dadi AF, Shiferaw G. Determinants of abortion among clients coming for abortion service at felegehiwot referral hospital, northwest Ethiopia: a case control study. Contraception and reproductive medicine. 2017;2(1):1-6.

17. Aromataris E, Munn Z. Joanna Briggs Institute reviewer's manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute. 2017;2018.

18. 2014 KAAOBAftooARA.

Page 17 of 35

BMJ Open

Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. Bmj.
 2003;327(7414):557-60.
 Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication hias

20. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics. 1994:1088-101.

21. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. Bmj. 1997;315(7109):629-34.

22. Duval S, Tweedie R. A nonparametric "trim and fill" method of accounting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Journal of the american statistical association. 2000;95(449):89-98.

Ayenew G, Gedefaw M, Berhe R, Nigusie A. Current Status, and Correlates of Abortion among
Rural Women of Gonji Kollela District, Northwest Ethiopia. Open Journal of Epidemiology. 2015;5:136-46.
Waktola MI, Mekonen DG, Nigussie TS, Cherkose EA, Abate AT. Repeat induced abortion and

associated factors among women seeking abortion care services at Debre Markos town health institutions, Amhara regional state, Ethiopia, 2017. BMC Res Notes. 2020;13(1):44-.

25. Mariam T, Melkamu S, Yetwale F, Abdela M, Getnet M. Prevalence and Associated Factors of Unsafe Abortion among Women of Reproductive Age Group in Gondar Town, Northwest Ethiopia, 2017: A Community-based Cross-sectional Study. Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research. 2018;28:1-7.

26. Getahun H, Berhane Y. Abortion among rural women in north Ethiopia. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2000;71(3):265-6.

27. Animaw W, Bogale B. Abortion in university and college female students of Arba Minch town, Ethiopia, 2011. Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare. 2014;5(1):17-22.

28. Beyene BB, Meshesha B. Magnitude And Associated Factors Of Induced Abortion Among Regular Undergraduate Students Of Dilla University. International journal of scientific and research publications. 2020;10:10032.

Sahile A, Shiferaw M. Magnitude of Induced Abortion and Associated Factors among Female
 Students of Hawassa University, Southern Region, Ethiopia, 2019. Journal of pregnancy. 2020;2020:1-6.
 Gelaye AA, Taye KN, Mekonen T. Magnitude and risk factors of abortion among regular female

students in Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia. BMC Women's Health. 2014;14(1):50.
31. Nigussie T, Feyisa M, Yosef T, Berhanu M, Asefa A. Prevalence of induced abortion and its associated factors among female students of health science in South West Ethiopia. The Open Nursing Journal. 2020;14(1).

32. Abebe M, Mersha A, Degefa N, Gebremeskel F, Kefelew E, Molla W. Determinants of induced abortion among women received maternal health care services in public hospitals of Arba Minch and Wolayita Sodo town, southern Ethiopia: unmatched case–control study. BMC women's health. 2022;22(1):1-12.

33. Lentiro K, Gebru T, Worku A, Asfaw A, Gebremariam T, Tesfaye A. Risk factors of induced abortion among preparatory school student in Guraghe zone, Southern region, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. BMC Women's Health. 2019;19(1):1-7.

34. Alemu K, Birhanu S, Fekadu L, Endale F, Tamene A, Habte A. Safe abortion service utilization and associated factors among insecurely housed women who experienced abortion in southwest Ethiopia, 2021: A community-based cross-sectional study. Plos one. 2022;17(8):e0272939.

35. Gebeyehu D, Admassu B, Sinega M, Haile M. Assessment of Prevalence and Reasons for Termination of Pregnancy at Jimma University Teaching Hospital, Ethiopia. Universal Journal of Public Health. 2015;3:251-5.

36. Megersa BS, Ojengbede OA, Deckert A, Fawole OI. Factors associated with induced abortion among women of reproductive age attending selected health facilities in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a case control study. BMC Women's Health. 2020;20(1):1-11.

BMJ Open

37. Wassie AY, Lemlem SB, Boka A. Knowledge, Practice and Associated Factors Towards Medication Abortion Among Reproductive-Age Women in Sexual and Reproductive Health Clinics of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2018: Cross-Sectional Study. International Journal of Women's Health. 2021;13:489.

38. Bulti F, Gela D, Dinagde N. Knowledge of Safe Abortion Care Services and Associated Factors Among Women of Reproductive Age Working at Non-Health Sector Public Institutions in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. 2021.

39. Jamie AH, Abdosh MZ. Prevalence of induced abortion and associated factors among women of reproductive age in Harari region, Ethiopia. Public Health of Indonesia. 2020;6(2):35-40.

40. Mohammed M, Wesenu M. Prevalence and determinants associated with second trimester termination of pregnancy in Harari city, Ethiopia; Cross sectional study. 2021.

41. Worku S, Fantahun M. Unintended pregnancy and induced abortion in a town with accessible family planning services: the case of Harar in eastern Ethiopia. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2006;20(2):79-83.

42. Abera GB, Berhanu B, Kahsay AB, Gebru HB, Aregay A. Assessment of determinants of induced abortion among child bearing age women attending maternal and child health clinic in Mekelle town, Tigray, Ethiopia: a cross sectional study. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research. 2012;3(12):4745.

43. Alemayehu M, Yebyo H, Medhanyie AA, Bayray A, Fantahun M, Goba GK. Determinants of repeated abortion among women of reproductive age attending health facilities in Northern Ethiopia: a case–control study. BMC Public Health. 2017;17(1):1-8.

44. Gessessew A. Abortion and unwanted pregnancy in Adigrat zonal hospital, Tigray, north Ethiopia. African journal of reproductive health. 2010;14(3):183-8.

45. Biza N, Habib Y, Bayray A, Reddy PS. MAGNITUDE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS OF ABORTION AMONG REGULAR FEMALE STUDENTS OF SAMARA UNIVERSITY, AFAR, ETHIOPIA, 2016. Medico Research Chronicles. 2018;5(3):191-201.

46. Mekbib T-A, Hiwot YG, Fantahun M. SURVEY OF UNSAFE ABORTION IN SELECTED HEALTH FACILITIES IN ETHIOPIA. Ethiopian Journal of Reproductive Health. 2007;1(1):11-.

47. Gilano G, Hailegebreal S. Determinants of abortion among youth 15–24 in Ethiopia: A multilevel analysis based on EDHS 2016. PloS one. 2021;16(3):e0248228.

48. Tesema GA, Mekonnen TH, Teshale AB. Spatial distribution and determinants of abortion among reproductive age women in Ethiopia, evidence from Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey 2016 data: Spatial and mixed-effect analysis. PloS one. 2020;15(6):e0235382.

49. Abdella A. Maternal mortality trend in Ethiopia. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2010;24(1).

50. Dickson KS, Adde KS, Ahinkorah BO. Socio–economic determinants of abortion among women in Mozambique and Ghana: evidence from demographic and health survey. Archives of Public Health. 2018;76(1):1-10.

51. Pallikadavath S, Stones RW. Maternal and social factors associated with abortion in India: a population-based study. International Family Planning Perspectives. 2006:120-5.

52. Grant MJ, Behrman JR. Gender gaps in educational attainment in less developed countries. Population and development review. 2010;36(1):71-89.

53. Jiang L, Hardee K. Women's education, family planning, or both? Application of multistate demographic projections in India. International journal of population research. 2014;2014.

54. Demographic E. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and Rockville. Maryland, MA, USA: CSA and ICF. 2016.

55. van Rensburg HC. South Africa's protracted struggle for equal distribution and equitable accessstill not there. Human resources for health. 2014;12(1):1-16.

56. Bankole A, Singh S, Haas T. Reasons why women have induced abortions: evidence from 27 countries. International family planning perspectives. 1998:117-52.

BMJ Open

1	
2	
3	57. Woog V, Susheela S, Alyssa B, Jesse P. Adolescent womens need for and use of sexual and
4	reproductive health services in developing countries: Citeseer; 2015.
5	58. Onukwugha FI, Magadi MA, Sarki AM, Smith L. Trends in and predictors of pregnancy
7	termination among 15–24 year-old women in Nigeria: a multi-level analysis of demographic and health
8	surveys 2003–2018. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2020;20(1):550.
9	59. Coyle K, Basen-Enquis K, Kirby D, Parcel G, Banspach S. Collins JL, Baumler ER, Caravajal S,
10	Harrist, RB. Safer Choices: Long-term impact of a multicomponent school-based HIV, STD, and pregnancy
11	prevention program. Public Health Reports. 2001;116(Suppl 1):82-93.
12	60. Cabezón C, Vigil P, Rojas I, Leiva ME, Riguelme R, Aranda W, et al. Adolescent pregnancy
13	prevention: An abstinence-centered randomized controlled intervention in a Chilean public high school.
14	Journal of Adolescent Health. 2005;36(1):64-9.
15	61. Onukwugha FI, Magadi MA, Sarki AM, Smith L, Trends in and predictors of pregnancy
10	termination among 15–24 year-old women in Nigeria: a multi-level analysis of demographic and health
17	surveys 2003–2018. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2020;20(1):1-13.
19	62. Cadmus E. Owoaie E. Knowledge about complications and practice of abortion among female
20	undergraduates in the University of Ibadan. Nigeria. Annals of Ibadan postgraduate medicine.
21	2011:9(1):19-23.
22	63. Ahmed S. Ray R. Determinants of pregnancy and induced and spontaneous abortion in a jointly
23	determined framework: evidence from a country-wide, district-level household survey in India. Journal
24	of biosocial science. 2014;46(4):480-517.
25	64. Morhe ES, Tagbor HK, Ankobea FK, Danso KA. Reproductive experiences of teenagers in the
20	Ejisu-Juabeng district of Ghana. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2012;118(2):137-40.
28	65. Mulugeta Y, Berhane Y. Factors associated with pre-marital sexual debut among unmarried high
29	school female students in bahir Dar town, Ethiopia: cross-sectional study. Reproductive health.
30	2014;11(1):1-6.
31	66. Mekie M, Addisu D, Dagnew E, Necho W. The level and deriving factors of repeat-induced
32	abortion in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Heliyon. 2021;7(1):e05984.
33	67. Wellings K, Collumbien M, Slaymaker E, Singh S, Hodges Z, Patel D, et al. Sexual behaviour in
34 25	context: a global perspective. The Lancet. 2006;368(9548):1706-28.
36	68. WHO. Adolescent pregnancy fact sheet: World Health Organization; 2022 [updated 15
37	September 2022. Available from: https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescent-
38	pregnancy.
39	69. Bernabé-Ortiz A, White PJ, Carcamo CP, Hughes JP, Gonzales MA, Garcia PJ, et al. Clandestine
40	induced abortion: prevalence, incidence and risk factors among women in a Latin American country.
41	Cmaj. 2009;180(3):298-304.
42	70. Cheng Y, Wang X, Lv Y, Cai Y, Li Y, Guo X, et al. Study on the risk factors of repeated abortion
43	among unmarried adolescents. Zhonghua liu xing bing xue za zhi= Zhonghua liuxingbingxue zazhi.
44	2006;27(8):669-72.
46	71. Yi S, Tuot S, Chhoun P, Pal K, Tith K, Brody C. Factors associated with induced abortion among
47	female entertainment workers: a cross-sectional study in Cambodia. BMJ open. 2015;5(7):e007947.
48	
49	
50	
51	
52 53	
55 54	
55	
56	
57	
58	18
59	For poor review only between the income have a set (site to be set (suid a live sector)
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



Figure 1. Flow chart of describing the selection of studies for the systematic review and metaanalysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination and associated factors in Ethiopia, 2023

3						
4						
5						
6	Study					%
7					ES (95% CI)	Weight
8						weight
9	(2018)				22 00 (20 52 27	49) 2.07
10					33.00 (20.52, 37	.40) 3.97
11					34.90 (30.98, 38	.82) 3.99
12	Gezahegn I. et al (2010)	-	 		12.30 (9.17, 15.4	43) 4.01
15	Bekele T. et al (2017)				29.60 (24.07, 35	.13) 3.94
15	Getayeneh A. et AL (2016)	۲			8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
16	Addisu T. et al (2019)				- 68.70 (64.28, 73	.12) 3.98
17	Amlaku M. et al (2014)	-	∎ <mark>.</mark>		19.20 (15.44, 22	.96) 4.00
18	Amanuel G. (2004)			۲	60.60 (59.47, 61	.73) 4.05
19	Endalew S. (2021)		•		18.10 (14.47, 21	.73) 4.00
20	Worku A. (2011)		÷ +	-	43.40 (40.06, 46	.74) 4.01
21	Geremew K. et al (2019)				20.30 (16.12, 24	.48) 3.98
22	Amba A et al (2011)	-			6 49 (4 32 8 66)	4 03
23	Girma G. et al (2016)		1		2 50 (2 12 2 88)	4.05
25	Kifle Lentire (2017)	-			12 60 (10 26 16	4.03
26	Rine Lenuro (2017)				6.40/4.25.9.45	.94) 4.01
27	Dirilyani Bayou (2020)				0.40 (4.35, 0.45)	4.04
28					35.60 (28.86, 42	.34) 3.88
29	Girum M (2015)	•			1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
30	Murad M (2020)		€ 1		18.20 (15.58, 20	.82) 4.02
31	Tekleab M (2007)		+		25.60 (22.99, 28	.21) 4.03
32	Tadesse N (2020)	-	€ <mark> </mark>		18.80 (15.06, 22	.54) 4.00
37	Tesfamichael G (2017)	-			3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.02
35	Kidist Alemu, (2022)				27.90 (20.01, 35	.79) 3.82
36	Solomon W (2006)	•			14.20 (12.04, 16	.36) 4.03
37	Biza N. et al (2018)				8.80 (6.34, 11.26	6) 4.03
38	Abera et al (2012)	-			7.70 (4.46, 10.94	4) 4.01
39	Overall (I-squared = 99.8% $p = 0.000$)		\diamond		21 52 (15 01 28	03) 100 00
40	(· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		¥		. (1010 1, 2 0	
41	NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis					
42						
45 AA		.01 10				
44						





Figure 3: Funnel plot to test publication bias of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

BMJ Open



Figure 4: The Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis of abortion among women in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors	Publication		ES (05% CI)	% Weinh
lidile	yeai		E3 (33 /8 G)	weign
Addis Ababa				
Addisu W. et al	2018		33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3.97
Endalew S.	2021		18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4.00
Subtotal (I-squared = 96.1%, p = 0.000)		$\langle \rangle$	25.49 (10.89, 40.09)	7.98
Amhara				
Mahlet. etal	2017	*	34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.99
Bekele T. et al	2017		29.60 (24.07, 35.13)	3.94
Amlaku M. et al	2014		19.20 (15.44, 22.96)	4.00
Geremew K. et al	2019	+	20.30 (16.12, 24.48)	3.98
Girum M	2015	I	1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
Tesfamichael G	2017		3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.02
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.0%, p = 0.000)		\diamond	18.06 (6.27, 29.85)	23.97
SNNPR				
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		12.30 (9.17, 15.43)	4.01
Addisu T. et al	2019		68.70 (64.28, 73.12)	3.98
Worku A.	2011	_	43.40 (40.06, 46.74)	4.01
Amha A. et al	2011	•	6.49 (4.32, 8.66)	4.03
Kifle Lentiro	2017		13.60 (10.26, 16.94)	4.01
Biniyam Bayou	2020	•	6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4.04
Tadesse N	2020		18.80 (15.06, 22.54)	4.00
Kidist Alemu,	2022		27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.82
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.3%, p = 0.000)		\Diamond	24.63 (11.50, 37.75)	31.90
National Data				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	•	8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
Girma G. et al	2016	•	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.05
Tekleab M	2007		25.60 (22.99, 28.21)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.7%, p = 0.000)			12.10 (5.70, 18.50)	12.13
Tigray				
Amanuel G.	2004		60.60 (59.47, 61.73)	4.05
Abera et al	2012		7.70 (4.46, 10.94)	4.01
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.9%, p = 0.000)			34.17 (-17.67, 86.01)	8.06
Harari				
Murad M	2020	₩ 1	18.20 (15.58, 20.82)	4.02
Solomon W	2006		14.20 (12.04, 16.36)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 81.2%, p = 0.021)			16.13 (12.21, 20.05)	8.06
Oromia		1		
Diriba G	2015		35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		↓ Õ	35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Afar				
Biza N. et al	2018		8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		♦	8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.000)			21.52 (15.01, 28.03)	100.0
NOTE: Weights are from random effects	analysis	Ĭ		

Figure 5: Subgroup analysis of the pregnancy termination based on regional distribution in Ethiopia, 2023

name	year		ES (95% CI)	9 V
Reproductive age				
Addisu W. et al	2018		33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3.
Mahlet. etal	2017		34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.
Endalew S.	2021		18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4.
Kifle Lentiro	2017		13.60 (10.26, 16.94)	4.
Girum M	2015	•	1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.
Murad M	2020	<u>₩</u> .	18.20 (15.58, 20.82)	4.
Tesfamichael G	2017		3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.
Solomon W	2006	•	14.20 (12.04, 16.36)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.0%, p = 0.00))	\diamond	17.03 (8.55, 25.52)	3
Pregnant women				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.
Abortion care seekers				
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	★ 1	12.30 (9.17, 15.43)	4.
Bekele T. et al	2017	I	29.60 (24.07, 35.13)	3.
Amlaku M. et al	2014		19.20 (15.44, 22.96)	4.
Geremew K. et al	2019		20.30 (16.12, 24.48)	3.
Diriba G	2015		35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.
Tekleab M	2007		25.60 (22.99, 28.21)	4.
Abera et al	2012		7.70 (4.46, 10.94)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.3%, p = 0.00))		21.19 (14.65, 27.72)	2
University/College students			_	
Addisu T. et al	2019		68.70 (64.28, 73.12)	3
Worku A.	2011		43.40 (40.06, 46.74)	4
Amha A. et al	2011	•	6.49 (4.32, 8.66)	4
Biniyam Bayou	2020	•	6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4
Tadesse N	2020	- • •	18.80 (15.06, 22.54)	4
Biza N. et al	2018		8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.5%, p = 0.00))		25.36 (9.39, 41.32)	24
Gynaecological patients				
Amanuel G.	2004	1	6 0.60 (59.47, 61.73)	4.
Subtotal (I-Square0 = .%, p = .)			V 0U.0U (59.47, b1.73)	4.
Youth women		1		
Girma G. et al	2016		2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		•	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.
Insecurely housed women				
Kidist Alemu,	2022		27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.
Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.000)		21.52 (15.01, 28.03)	1
NOTE: Waights are from random office	ts analysis			

Figure 6: Subgroup analysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination based on study population in Ethiopia, 2022

name	year		ES (95% CI)	Weight
Have 1 alive child				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	-	0.97 (0.72, 1.31)	5.60
Mesfn A. et al	2021	i	0.32 (0.10, 1.01)	3.80
Girma G. et al	2016	I	0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	5.46
Denberu B	2017		0.74 (0.32, 1.71)	4.53
Subtotal (I-squared = 42.0%,	p = 0.160)	$\overline{\diamond}$	0.74 (0.52, 1.05)	19.39
First sex before18 yrs				
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.70 (1.44, 5.06)	5.01
Geremew K. et al	2019	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5.96 (2.54, 13.97)	4.49
Girma G. et al	2016		2.00 (1.32, 3.03)	5.42
Biniyam Bayou	2020		4.30 (1.16, 15.94)	3.44
Tadesse N	2020	•	1.64 (0.73, 3.69)	4.59
Subtotal (I-squared = 41.6%,	p = 0.144)	\diamond	2.65 (1.74, 4.04)	22.95
Irregular menstruation				
Amlaku M. et al	2014		176 (103, 299)	5.21
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.00 (1.09, 3.67)	5.05
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p	e = 0.756)	\diamond	1.86 (1.25, 2.77)	10.26
Abortion history				
Fikreselassie 1. et al	2014		0.29 (0.11, 0.78)	4.17
Gezanegn I. et al	2010		1.17 (0.39, 3.49)	3.92
Mussie A. et al Subtotal (I-squared = 84.0%,	2014 p = 0.002)		2.30 (1.28, 4.15) 0.96 (0.27, 3.40)	5.09 13.18
Multiple sexual partner				
Mahlet. etal	2017		- 6.16 (3.25, 11.68)	4.98
Vlestn A. et al	2021		5.47 (2.98, 10.04)	5.05
Mussie A. et al	2014		4.40 (2.34, 8.27)	5.00
Geremew K. et al	2019		7.72 (2.90, 20.57)	4.19
Denberu B	2017		1.09 (0.22, 5.35)	2.88
Biza N. et al	2018		2.90 (0.91, 9.21)	3.78
Subtotal (I-squared = 13.4%,	p = 0.329)		4.88 (3.43, 6.93)	25.88
Wanted pregnancy		1		
Addisu W. et al	2018		11.77 (3.51, 39.43)	3.66
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	_	0.44 (0.20, 0.95)	4.69
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.1%,	p = 0.000)		2.20 (0.09, 55.02)	8.35
Overall (I-squared = 85.6%, p	e = 0.000)		1.92 (1.31, 2.80)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from rand	lom effects analysis			

Figure 7: Subgroup analysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination based on before and after MDG in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors	Publication year			ES (95% CI)	% Weigh
Rural Residence					
Mahlet. etal	2017 —	— i		0.19 (0.09, 0.42)	6.42
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	-		1.27 (0.74, 2.18)	6.84
Amlaku M. et al	2014	÷.		1.86 (1.11, 3.13)	6.88
Mesfn A. et al	2021	● ¦		0.43 (0.23, 0.80)	6.73
Kifle Lentiro	2017	<u> </u>		2.30 (1.10, 4.80)	6.52
Tadesse N	2020 —	•		0.26 (0.12, 0.55)	6.50
Subtotal (I-squared = 8	89.1%, p = 0.000)			0.71 (0.32, 1.58)	39.88
Students					
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014		•	7.40 (2.93, 18.69)	6.16
Arif H. Jamie	2020		_	2.95 (1.02, 8.52)	5.88
Subtotal (I-squared = 3	39.0%, p = 0.201)		>	4.85 (1.98, 11.91)	12.04
Single					
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014		—	18.23 (8.04, 41.33)	6.37
Gezahegn T. et al	2010			1.35 (0.58, 3.14)	6.32
Bekele T. et al	2017	¦•		4.93 (1.41, 17.17)	5.48
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016			1.22 (0.78, 1.90)	6.98
Arif H. Jamie	2020	•		5.50 (1.20, 25.14)	4.89
Solomon W	2006	-		1.72 (1.20, 2.47)	7.07
Denberu B	2017 🔶 🕨			0.04 (0.01, 0.12)	5.84
Abera et al	2012 —			0.60 (0.15, 2.45)	5.13
Subtotal (I-squared = 9	92.0%, p = 0.000)			1.55 (0.60, 4.02)	48.08
Overall (I-squared = 9	0.8%, p = 0.000)	\Leftrightarrow		1.30 (0.72, 2.34)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are fro	m random effects analysis				

Figure 8: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected socio-demographic characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

name	Publication year	ES (95% CI)	% Weight
Divorced			
Bekele T. et al	2017 —	2.38 (0.67, 8.44)	4.12
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016 -	- 0.78 (0.49, 1.24)	5.68
Girma G. et al	2016	20.00 (7.14, 56.06)	4.61
Subtotal (I-squared = 93.	%, p = 0.000)	3.24 (0.41, 25.83)	14.41
Married		1	
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	2.40 (1.19, 4.85)	5.27
Girma G. et al	2016	→ 38.00 (17.10, 84.47)	5.09
Abera et al	2012	1.26 (0.39, 4.07)	4.31
Subtotal (I-squared = 94.	%, p = 0.000)	4.97 (0.63, 38.95)	14.67
Primery school			
Mahlet. etal	2017	5.46 (2.06, 14.47)	4.73
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	0.26 (0.10, 0.68)	4.77
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	★ 1.36 (1.13, 1.64)	5.97
Mesfn A. et al	2021	1.44 (0.53, 3.92)	4.67
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.20 (0.07, 0.59)	4.52
Solomon W	2006	1.65 (1.03, 2.65)	5.66
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.	%, p = 0.000)	1.05 (0.55, 2.00)	30.31
Secondary school			
Addisu W. et al	2018	3.54 (1.02, 12.27)	4.16
Mahlet. etal	2017	12.96 (6.16, 27.28)	5.19
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016 -	0.98 (0.68, 1.41)	5.80
Mesfn A. et al	2021	2.04 (0.79, 5.28)	4.78
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.40 (0.20, 0.80)	5.29
Subtotal (I-squared = 92.	%, p = 0.000)	2.00 (0.63, 6.37)	25.23
College & above			
Addisu W. et al	2018	3.49 (1.02, 11.92)	4.20
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	0.99 (0.61, 1.60)	5.65
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.40 (0.23, 0.69)	5.54
Subtotal (I-squared = 83.	%, p = 0.002)	0.97 (0.37, 2.54)	15.39
Overall (I-squared = 91.0	%, p = 0.000)	1.78 (1.13, 2.82)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from	andom effects analysis	1	

Figure 9: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected socio-demographic characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors . name	Publication year		ES (95% CI)	% W
Have 1 alive child				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		0.97 (0.72, 1.31)	5.6
Mesfn A. et al	2021	i	0.32 (0.10, 1.01)	3.8
Girma G. et al	2016	I	0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	5.4
Denberu B	2017		0.74 (0.32, 1.71)	4.5
Subtotal (I-squared = 42.0%	, p = 0.160)	$\overline{\diamond}$	0.74 (0.52, 1.05)	19
First sex before18 yrs				
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.70 (1.44, 5.06)	5.0
Geremew K. et al	2019		5.96 (2.54, 13.97)	4.
Girma G. et al	2016		2.00 (1.32, 3.03)	5.
Biniyam Bayou	2020		4.30 (1.16, 15.94)	3.4
Tadesse N	2020		1.64 (0.73, 3.69)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = 41.6%	, p = 0.144)		2.65 (1.74, 4.04)	22
Irregular menstruation	2014			-
Amlaku M. et al	2014		1.76 (1.03, 2.99)	5.
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.00 (1.09, 3.67)	5.
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%,	p = 0.756)	\mathbf{Q}	1.86 (1.25, 2.77)	10
Abortion history		-		
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014		0.29 (0.11, 0.78)	4.
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		1.17 (0.39, 3.49)	3.
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.30 (1.28, 4.15)	5.
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.0%	, p = 0.002)		0.96 (0.27, 3.40)	1:
Multiple sexual partner			_	
Mahlet. etal	2017		6.16 (3.25, 11.68)	4.9
Mesfn A. et al	2021		5.47 (2.98, 10.04)	5.
Mussie A. et al	2014	i•	4.40 (2.34, 8.27)	5.
Geremew K. et al	2019	I I	• 7.72 (2.90, 20.57)	4.1
Denberu B	2017		1.09 (0.22, 5.35)	2.
Biza N. et al	2018		2.90 (0.91, 9.21)	3.7
Subtotal (I-squared = 13.4%	, p = 0.329)		4.88 (3.43, 6.93)	25
Wanted pregnancy				
Addisu W. et al	2018	— I I —	11.77 (3.51, 39.43)	3.0
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	i	0.44 (0.20, 0.95)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.1%	, p = 0.000)		2.20 (0.09, 55.02)	8.
Overall (I-squared = 85.6%,	p = 0.000)		1.92 (1.31, 2.80)	10
NOTE: Weights are from ran	dom effects analysis			

Figure 10: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected reproductive characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

Table 1. Data extraction sheet of the studies

Authors name	Publication year	Study area	Region	Study design	Study setting	Study population	Sample size
Addisu W. et al	2018	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	423
Mahlet T. et al.	2017	Debre Markos	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	567
Fikreselassie T. et al.	2014	Bahr Dar	Amhara	Case-control	Institutional	Pregnant women	175
Gezahegn T. et al.	2010	Guraghe Zone	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	422
Bekele T. et al.	2017	Debre Markos	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	262
Getayeneh A. et al.	2016	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Community	Pregnant women	12378
Addisu T. et al.	2019	Hawassa	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	422
Amlaku M. et al.	2014	Amhara region referral hospitals	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	422
Birye D. et al.	2019	Gondar	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	648
Amanuel G. et al.	2004	Adigrat	Tigray	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Women with Gynecologic problem	7203
Endalew S. et al.	2021	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age	432
Worku A. et al.	2011	Arba Minch	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	845
Mesfn A. et al.	2021	Arba minch & Wolayita Sodo town	SNNP	Case control	Institutional	Reproductive age group	413
Bethelihem A. et al.	2015	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	429
Mussie A. et al.	2014	Tigray region health hospitals	Tigray	Case control	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	309
Geremew K. et al.	2019	Debre Berhan town health institutions	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	355
Amha A. et al.	2011	Hawassa University	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	493

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

 BMJ Open

Girma G. et al.	2016	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Community	Youth women	6401
Kifle L. et al.	2017	Guraghe zone	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age	404
Arif H. et al.	2020	Harari	Harari	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	611
Biniyam B. et al.	2020	Dilla University	SNNPR	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	548
Denberu B. et al	2017	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Case control	Institutional	Youth women	330
Diriba G. et al.	2015	Jimma	Oromia	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	194
Girum M. et al.	2015	Gonji Kollela District	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age group	611
Murad M. et al.	2020	Harar	Harari	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	835
Tekleab M. et al.	2007	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	1075
Tadesse N. et al.	2020	Mizan Tepi University	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	420
Tesfamichael G. et al.	2017	Gondar	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age	154
Kidist A. et al	2022	Jimma, Bonga, and Mizan-Aman	SNNPR	Cross-sectional	Community	Insecurely housed women	124
Solomon W. et al	2006	Harer	Harari	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age	1000
Biza N. et al.	2018	Semera	Afar	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	509
	2012	Mekelle	Tioray	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care seekers	260

Table 2: Characteristics of the studies for the prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2004-2022

Authors name	Publication year	Study area	Region	Study design	Study setting	Study population	Sample size
Addisu W. et al	2018	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	423
Mahlet T. et al.	2017	Debre Markos	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	567
Fikreselassie T. et al.	2014	Bahr Dar	Amhara	Case-control	Institutional	Pregnant women	175
Gezahegn T. et al.	2010	Guraghe Zone	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	422
Bekele T. et al.	2017	Debre Markos	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	262
Getayeneh A. et al.	2016	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Community	Pregnant women	12378
Addisu T. et al.	2019	Hawassa	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	422
Amlaku M. et al.	2014	Amhara region referral hospitals	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	422
Birye D. et al.	2019	Gondar	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	648
Amanuel G. et al.	2004	Adigrat	Tigray	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Women with Gynecologic problem	7203
Endalew S. et al.	2021	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age	432
Worku A. et al.	2011	Arba Minch	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	845
Mesfn A. et al.	2021	Arba minch & Wolayita Sodo town	SNNP	Case control	Institutional	Reproductive age group	413
Bethelihem A. et al.	2015	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	429
Mussie A. et al.	2014	Tigray region health hospitals	Tigray	Case control	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	309

Geremew K. et al.	2019	Debre Berhan town health institutions	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	355
Amha A. et al.	2011	Hawassa University	SNNP*	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	493
Girma G. et al.	2016	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Community	Youth women	6401
Kifle L. et al.	2017	Guraghe zone	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age	404
Arif H. et al.	2020	Harari	Harari	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	611
Biniyam B. et al.	2020	Dilla University	SNNPR	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	548
Denberu B. et al	2017	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Case control	Institutional	Youth women	330
Diriba G. et al.	2015	Jimma	Oromia	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	194
Girum M. et al.	2015	Gonji Kollela District	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age group	611
Murad M. et al.	2020	Harar	Harari	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	835
Tekleab M. et al.	2007	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	1075
Tadesse N. et al.	2020	Mizan Tepi University	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	420
Tesfamichael G. et al.	2017	Gondar	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age	154
Kidist A. et al	2022	Jimma, Bonga, and Mizan-Aman	SNNPR	Cross-sectional	Community	Insecurely housed women	124
Solomon W. et al	2006	Harer	Harari	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age	1000
Biza N. et al.	2018	Semera	Afar	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	509
Abera et al.	2012	Mekelle	Tigray	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care seekers	260

*SNNP: South Nations and Nationalities Peoples

BMJ Open

Page 34 of 35



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE	1		
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
ABSTRACT	1		
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	2
INTRODUCTION	1		
2 Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	3
3 Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	3
4 METHODS	1		5
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	4-5
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	4
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	4
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5
22 Data collection 23 process 24	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5
25 Data items 26	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	5
27 28	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	5
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	6
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	6
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	6
35 86	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	6
37	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	6
38	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	6
ιφ	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	6
1	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	6
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	6
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used topassess/centainty (ortcon/fibenjce) in the body of evidence/for an butcontern	6

3 i

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

4 Section and 5 Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported		
assessment					
RESULTS					
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	7		
10 11	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	7		
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.			
4 Risk of bias in 5 studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.			
16 Results of 17 individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	7-9		
8 Results of	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	7-9 &14		
19 syntheses 20	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	7-9 & 14		
21 27	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	7-9 & 14		
23	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	7-9 & 14		
24 Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	7-9		
²⁵ Certainty of ²⁶ evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	7-9		
DISCUSSION					
²⁸ Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	11-13		
29 30	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	11-13		
31	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	13		
32	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	111-13		
	TION				
Registration and	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	5		
36	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	5		
37	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	5		
38 Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	14		
³⁹ Competing 10 interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	14		
Availability of data, code and dother materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	14		
++ 15 <i>From:</i> Page MJ, Mo	cKenzie	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 202	21;372:n71. doi:		

BMJ Open



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

.omation, visit. <u>http://www.</u> 10.1136/bmj.n71 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 36 of 35

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Prevalence and determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-073799.R3
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Dec-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Kumsa, Henok; Woldia University Mislu, Esuyawkal; Woldia University, Midwifery Arage, Mulugeta; Woldia University, Midwifery Kidie, Atitegeb; Woldia University Hailu, Tilahun; Woldia University tenaw, lebeza; Woldia University
Primary Subject Heading :	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Sexual health, Reproductive medicine, Public health
Keywords:	Adolescent, Public health < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Sexual and Gender Minorities





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
BMJ Open

Prevalence and determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Henok Kumsa¹, Esuyawkal Mislu¹, Mulugeta Wodaje Arage¹, Atitegeb Abera², Tilahun Hailu², and Lebeza Alemu Tenaw²

Affiliations invaluable

¹School of Midwifery, College of Health Science, Woldia University, Ethiopia

² School of Public health, College of Health Science, Woldia University, Ethiopia

Email Address

HK: henokkumsa@gmail.com

EM: esuyawkalmislu@gmail.com

MWA: mulewodaje@gmail.com

MWA: <u>mulewodaje@gmail.com</u> AA: <u>atitegebabera@gmail.com</u> TH: <u>lemaryam01@gmail.com</u> LAT: <u>lebezaa@gmail.com</u> *Corresponding author: Lebeza Alemu Tenaw Email: lebezaa@gmail.com

Abstract

Objective: This review aims to determine the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its determinant factors in Ethiopia.

Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Data sources: Relevant articles were retrieved from databases such as PubMed, EMBASE, Medline, and other search engines.

Eligibility criteria for selecting studies: The research design for this study had no restrictions, allowing for the inclusion of cross-sectional and case-control studies that examined the prevalence or determinants of pregnancy termination. However, case reports, case series, reviews, editorials, and studies published as abstracts only were excluded from the analysis.

Data extraction and synthesis: The review precisely in accordance with PRISMA criteria, and the quality of the review was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist. Heterogeneity was indicated by the p-value for I² statistics less than 0.05. Data were entered into Microsoft Excel, and the analysis was conducted using Stata 16.

Results: The pooled prevalence pregnancy termination in Ethiopia was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01, 28.03). Women who had their first sexual initiation before the age of 18 (OR = 1.78; 95% CI = 1.13, 2.82, P=0.144), had irregular menstrual bleeding (OR = 1.86; 95% CI = 1.25, 2.77, P=0.756), being a student (OR: 4.85; 95% CI: 1.98, 11.91, P=0.201), and had multiple sexual partners (OR: 4.88; 95% CI: 3.43, 6.93, P=0.329) were significantly associated with pregnancy termination.

Conclusions: One in five women terminated their pregnancies, which is higher than in other Sub-Saharan countries. Being a student, irregular menstrual bleeding, early initiation of sexual intercourse, and multiple sexual partners were determinants of pregnancy termination. Special attention is needed in avoiding early sexual initiation and in reducing sexual risk behaviors.

Strength and limitation

- Comprehensive inclusion of studies from various regions of provides a broader perspective.
- Variations in study population, setting, and design may impact the results.
- Exclusion of qualitative studies on pregnancy termination explanations limits the overall understanding.

Keywords: Pregnancy termination, Determinants, Systematic review and meta analysis, Ethiopia

Introduction

Pregnancy termination is a sensitive and contentious issue with religious, moral, cultural, and political dimensions. Also, it presents a significant public health concern in developing coutries (1). Above 60% of unintended pregnancies result in pregnancy termination, with the majority of those being unsafe (2). Developing countries bear the burden of 97% of all unsafe abortions which contributes to 220 deaths per 100,000 live births (3).

Pregnancy termination imposes an additional burden on health institutions and individuals; in developing countries alone, each year an estimated 7 million women seek treatment in health facilities for the complication of pregnancy termination (4). It is estimated that health-care systems will spend \$553 million per year on post-abortion complications and will lose \$922 million in income due to long-term disability caused by unsafe termination (5). Additionally, a woman who undergo pregnancy termination, particularly through methods such as mechanical dilation and curettage, face an increased a risk of experiencing preterm birth and repeated pregnancy loss (6).

Though the burden of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia is a significant contributor to maternal mortality and morbidity (7). Previous studies conducted in Ethiopia have shown that the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its negative consequences are increasing over time (8, 9), and repeated pregnancy termination also accounts significant amount (10-12). Several variables, including early age marriage, low level of education, early sexual intercourse initiation, violence/rape, emotional well-being, educational status, employment status, and resources, and sexual intercourse relationship, have been implicated as factors of pregnancy termination in studies conducted across Ethiopia (13-16).

However, at the national level, illustrative evidence is lacking in Ethiopia regarding the level and underlying factors of pregnancy termination. Thus, this systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to assess the prevalence of pregnancy termination and its determinant factors in Ethiopia. The findings of this study provide evidence for intervention to reduce the burden of pregnancy termination, its complications, and its economic impact in the country. Additionally, this study will help to design strategies and monitor the progress of programs aimed at achieving the maternal mortality reduction targets of the sustainable development gaols.

Methods

Study design and setting

This systematic review and meta-analysis included cross sectional, and case control studies which has been conducted in Ethiopia. Systematic review and meta-analysis using computerized databases; searches were performed to estimate the prevalence and identify the determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia.

Search strategy

For this review, a comprehensive search was conducted using various searching strategies to identify relevant articles. Published articles were searched in well-known online databases including EMBBASE, Medline, Google, PubMed, Google Scholar, African Journal Online, and Science Direct databases. Additionally, the search was expanded by examining the reference lists of eligible articles to retrieve and extract potential articles. This systematic review was conducted using the preferred reporting items for systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses PRISMA guidelines. Similarly, the quality of our systematic review and meta-analysis was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist (17).

Searching was done by using Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) terms related with determinantss of pregnancy termination. MeSH terms enables us to select related research articles. We conducted the search for terms using Boolean operators "AND" and "OR," both separately and in combinations. We used the search terms "((((((Abortion) OR (termination of pregnancy)) OR (miscarriage)) AND (determinant factors)) OR (determinants)) OR (associated factors)) OR (influencing factors)) AND (Amhara) OR (Oromia) OR (Tigray) OR (Southern nation, nationalities and people's) OR (Afar) OR (Benshagul gumuz) OR (Gamabella) OR (Somali) OR (Dire dawa) OR (Addis Ababa) OR (Hareri) OR (Ethiopia)".

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria

There were no restrictions on research design. We included cross-sectional and case-control studies that showed the prevalence of or determinants of pregnancy termination. Additionally, Only articles reported in the English language and conducted studies until February 2023 were included.

Exclusion criteria

Case reports, case series, reviews, editorials, and studies published as abstracts only were excluded. Agreements on the inclusion and exclusion of the articles were held through the participation of all authors.

Quality assessment and data extraction

Articles were screened using their titles, abstracts, and full paper reviews before being included in the meta-analysis. The quality of included studies was evaluated using the JBI critical appraisal checklist (17). The quality scores of included studies were assessed and presented using the mean scores to designate them as high or low quality. The JBI tool for prevalence and determinat studies was used as a guideline for data extraction from the final selected articles. Moreover, all authors independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of studies to be included in this systematic review and meta-analysis. Agreements on the inclusion and exclusion of the articles were reached with the participation of all authors. The extraction sheet contains name of authors, study year, publication year, region of study, study design, sample size, prevalence in percentage or proportion, odd ratio of factors, confidence intervals both the upper and lower bound of each corresponding odds ratio. The odd ratio of each factors are transformed as log (OR). The lower and upper confidence intervals are log transformed as log (upper confidence interval), and log (lower confidence interval). The standard error for the proportion was also created as: Standard error = $\sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$. Then the standard error of the confidence intervals were also estimated using the log transformed upper and lower limits which is calculated as SE= (logUCL-logLCL)/3.92. Finally for pooled prevalence estimation, the proportion and its corresponding standard errors were used. For factors, the log transformed odd ratios and the standard error of their corresponding confidence intervals were used to estimate the effect sizes.

Measurement of the outcome variable

In this study, termination of pregnancy is the removal of pregnancy tissue, conception products, or fetus, and placenta from the uterus. The term 'fetus' and 'placenta' is commonly used after eight weeks of pregnancy. Pregnancy tissue and products of conception are the tissues that are

produced by the union of an egg and sperm before eight weeks. Terminating a pregnancy is a deliberate action taken by a health professional or the woman herself (18).

Registration and protocol

This review has not previously registered or prepared a protocol. As a result, no adjustments have been made.

Patient and Public Involvement: not applicable

Statistical methods and analysis

The meta-analysis was conducted using Stata 16 software after entering data into Microsoft Excel. Forest plots were used to demonstrate the prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia. The random effect model of analysis was utilized as a method of meta-analysis to minimize the heterogeneity of included studies (19). The study setting, population, and study period were used to conduct sub-group analysis. The presentation of pregnancy termination determinants was based on odds ratios (ORs) with a 95% confidence interval(CI).

The heterogeneity of the studies included was assessed using the I^2 statistics. The presence of heterogeneity was determined by using p-value for I^2 statistics that was less than 0.05. Based on the I^2 test statistics results, the heterogeneity is categorized as low (25%), moderate (50%), and high (75%) (19). Furthermore,the Egger regression asymmetry test was used to evaluate the publication bias (20, 21). When the Egger test result's P-value is less than 0.05, there is a declaration of publication bias. As well, the Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis using the random effect analysis was conducted to detect the presence of publication bias (22).

Result

Study selection

This systematic review and meta-analysis included published studies on the termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia. A total of 12,242 records were retrieved through electronic database searching, and only 33 articles were included in the final analysis (supplementary figure 1).

Characteristics of included studies

This review included Thirty-three studies conducted in various regions of Ethiopia. Of all the studies, 8 (24.24%) were from the Amhara Region (11, 12, 15, 16, 23-26), South Nations and Nationalities Peoples accounted for 9 (27.27%) of the total (13, 27-34), 1 was from Oromia (35), 5 (15.15%) from Addis Ababa city administration (10, 14, 36-38), 3 (9.09%) were from Harari region (39-41), 3 (9.09%) were from Tigray region (42-44), 1 (3.03%) was from Afar region (45), 3 (9.09) were from National data (46-48). Twenty-eight (84.85%) of the included articles were cross-sectional studies (10-13, 15, 23-31, 33-35, 37-42, 44-48), and remains five (15.15%) were case-control studies(14, 16, 32, 36, 43).

As well, twenty-seven of the studies were institution-based (10-16, 24, 27-33, 35-46), while six were community-based studies(23, 25, 26, 34, 47, 48). The sample size of the included studies ranged from a minimum of 124 in a study conducted in southwest Ethiopia (34) and to a maximum of 12,378 in a study conducted using DHS data (48). Overall, a total of 40,116 study participants were included in this review detail is available in supplementary table 1.

Prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia

Based on the random effect model, the overall pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy among women in Ethiopia was 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03) (supplementary figure 2). The meta-analysis included studies with significant heterogeneity: I² value of 99.8%, p < 0.000. Publication biases among the included studies were examined using funnel plots and Egger's regression test. The results of funnel plots showed an asymmetric shape, which indicates the presence of publication bias among included studies. Additionally, the Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis was applied to correct publication bias among the studies, but no trimming was performed since the data is unchanged (supplementary figures 3 and 4).

BMJ Open

Objective assessments of publication bias by Egger's regression test also showed the presence of publication bias across studies (P-value < 0.001). After conducting the trim and fill analysis to address publication bias, the final pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia was adjusted to 21.52% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03).

Subgroup analysis

We performed subgroup analysis based on the region, study population, and study setting of the included studies. Table 1 shows the pooled prevalence was highest, 35.60% (95% CI: 28.86, 42.34) in the Oromia region, followed by 34.17% (95% CI: 17.67, 86.01) in the Tigray region, 24.63% (95% CI: 10.52, 37.75) in the South Nation and Nationalities People Region, and the lowest was seen in three studies conducted using demographic health data, 12.10% (95% CI: 5.66, 18.50) (supplementary figure 5).

Furthermore, subgroup analysis reveals that the highest pooled prevalence of abortion was seen among gynecological admitted patients, at 60.60% (95% CI: 59.47, 61.73), followed by 25.38% (95% CI: 9.39, 41.32) among university/college students, and 27.90% (95% CI: 20.01, 35.79) among insecurely housed women, with the lowest pooled prevalence being seen among pregnant and youth women (supplementary figure 6). Additionally, subgroup analysis was conducted based on the year before and after the Millennium Development Goals' implementation. The pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination before and after MDGs was 20.55% (95% CI: 16.10–24.99) and 21.61% (95% CI: 15.01–28.03), respectively (supplementary figure 7).

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	,
17	
18	
19)
20)
21	
22	
23	
20	
24	
25	
26)
27	
28	
29)
30)
31	
37	
22	
22	
34	
35	
36)
37	
38	;
39)
40)
11	
וד- ⊿ר	
42	
43	
44	•
45	
46	•
47	,
48	;
49	,
50)
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	,
57	,
58	
50	
57	

1 2

Table 1: Subgroup analysis for the prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2004-2022

Subgroup	Number	Total	Prevalence (95%CI)	Heteroge	neity
	of	Sample		I ²	p-value
	studies				_
By region					
Addis Ababa	2	855	25.49(10.39, 40.09)	92.4	< 0.001
Amhara	6	2371	18.06(6.27, 29.85)	99.0	< 0.001
SNNP	8	3678	24.63(95% CI: 10.52,	99.4	< 0.001
			37.75)		
National Data	3	19854	12.10(5.70, 18.50)	99.7	< 0.001
Tigray	2	7463	34.17(17.6, 86.01)	99.9	< 0.001
Harari	2	1835	16.13(12.21, 20.05)	81.2	< 0.001
Oromia	1	194	35.60(28.86, 42.34)		
Afar	1	509	8.80(6.34, 11.26)		
By publication yea	r				
2016 to 2022 (post	15	24234	20.55(16.10, 24.99)	99.3	< 0.001
MDG)					
Before MDG	10	12525	22.61(4.55, 40.66)	99.9	< 0.001
Study population					
Reproductive age	8	4426	17.03(8.55, 25.52)	99.0	< 0.001
Pregnant women	1	12378	8.90 (8.40, 9.40)		
Abortion care	7	2990	21.19(14.65, 27.72)	95.3	< 0.001
seeker					
University or	6	3237	25.36 (9.39, 41.32)	99.5	< 0.001
college student					
Gynecological	1	7203	60.60 (59.47, 61.73)		
patient					
Youth women	1	6401	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	•	
Insecurely housed	1	124	27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	5	
women					
Total	25	36759	21.52(15.01, 28.03)	99.8	< 0.001

Insecurely household women: it means women who live or spend their time on the street.

Determinants of pregnancy termination

Socio-demographic characteristics

The sociodemographic factors included in this analysis were the place of residence, age, marital, occupational, and educational status of the women. A separate analysis was conducted for each variable. Finally, a meta-analysis of (16, 39) two studies showed that being a student was significantly associated with pregnancy termination (OR: 4.85; 95% CI: 1.98, 11.91). There was moderate heterogeneity (I2 = 39%) (supplementary figures 8 and 9).

Reproductive characteristics

A total of 5 articles (15, 24, 28, 43, 47) were included to assess the association between first sexual initiation before the age of 18 and pregnancy termination. The pooled meta-analysis found that women who had their first sexual experience before the age of 18 were twice as likely as those who had their first sexual experience after the age of 18 to have their pregnancy terminated (OR = 1.78; 95% CI = 1.13, 2.82). There was moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 41.6\%$). Moreover, two articles (11, 43) were also included to determine the association between irregular menstrual bleeding and pregnancy termination. The final pooled meta-analysis using data from the two articles found that pregnancy termination was nearly two times more likely to occur in women with irregular menstrual bleeding than in those who had regular menstrual bleeding, (OR = 1.86; 95% CI = 1.25, 2.77). Similarly, a meta-analysis of six studies(14, 15, 24, 32, 34, 43) showed that women who had multiple sexual partners were significantly associated with pregnancy termination (OR: 4.88; 95% CI: 3.43, 6.93). There was low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 13.4\%$) (supplementary figures 10).

Discussion

Pregnancy termination is a major public health concern in Ethiopia (49). In this systematic review and meta-analysis, the overall magnitude of pregnancy termination was pooled from 25 published articles in Ethiopia, and significant determinants of pregnancy termination were identified using different articles. Being a student increased the rate of termination of pregnancy nearly five times. In addition, first sexual initiation before the age of 18, women with irregular menstrual bleeding, and multiple sexual partners were determinants of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia. The findings of this review revealed evidence to help reduce the impact of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia by aiming at the main determinants.

In Ethiopia various studies have been conducted on the issue of pregnancy termination, involving different settings such as the community, healthcare institutions, and higher education institutions. These studies have yielded varying figures regarding the prevalence of pregnancy termination. However, this particular study revealed Ethiopia has a higher prevalence of pregnancy termination compared to other low- and middle-income countries.

The study found that the pooled prevalence of termination of pregnancy in Ethiopia was 21.52%. This finding is lower compared to a study done in Ghana at 25% (50), higher than in Mozambique at 9 % (\times 2.33) (50), and in India at 1.7% (\times 12) (51). The difference could be attributed to various factors like; study population, study design, study area, socio-demographic characteristics, and the differences in health policies of the countries. Additionally, the current study utilized a meta-analysis approach at the national level, incorporating community or institutional studies, while the study in Ghana and Mozambique was conducted using demographic health data with a small sample size compared to the current study (50). Moreover, in our study, huge variations were seen across the regions. A spatial analysis study conducted in Ethiopia using national data also also showed variation within the regions (48). Thus, acting according to the needs of the region and age-specific policy is important during national policy or guideline development.

Our study observed that being a student was significantly associated with the termination of pregnancy. One of the possible explanations could be that students are likely to be adolescents,

Page 13 of 35

BMJ Open

belonging to the younger age category. In addition, adolescent girls are remaining in school longer, which may factor into their decisions to postpone childbearing and terminate unintended pregnancies (52). Likewise, a study conducted in India shows the tendency for pregnancy termination is high in this age category since the rate of unintended pregnancies and unmet needs for family planning are high in this age group (53). The higher rate of pregnancy termination could also be attributed to a failure to provide education on prevention for unintended pregnancy and complications of pregnancy termination (54).

Additionally, the idea supported by Van Rensburg that societal poverty, unemployment, and other socio-demographic factors affect youth pregnancies and it might prone to pregnancy termination (55). In addition, a review from the late 1990s found that young women often cited a desire to stay in school as a major reason for pregnancy termination (56). Moreover, many adolescents continue to have difficulty accessing contraception, often as a result of stigma and/or a lack of resources (57).

The study from Nigeria indicated that 15–24-year old women are still being left behind on reproductive health matters despite increasing global attention to prioritizing their health (58). Studies found that educational programs aimed at reducing sexual risk behaviors and preventing pregnancy among young people can effectively reduce pregnancy rate among teenagers (59). Also, programs aimed at abstinence-centered education are effective in preventing adolescent pregnancy (60). Thus, this implies a future focus on reproductive health issues specific to students to address their needs. Additionally, future researchers should better focus on possible interventions to reduce the risk of pregnancy and pregnancy termination among students.

Women under the age of 18 at first sexual initiation were significantly more likely to terminate their pregnancy. This finding is consistent with studies conducted in Nigeria and Peru that reported a higher rate of pregnancy termination among women who had their age at first sex before 18 years old (61-63). Studies also revealed that early sexual debuts are significantly associated with adolescent pregnancies, which are usually unwanted (64, 65). As well, a study conducted in Ethiopia shown initiation of sexual intercourse before the age of 18 years was found significant association with repeated pregnancy termination (66).

BMJ Open

In many low income countries, rising ages at first marriage combined with increasing levels of premarital sex continue to result in unintended pregnancies among adolescents (67). Therefore, improving the knowledge of adolescents about sexual and reproductive health issues, and increasing contraceptive access and use among young people, are important to prevent unsafe abortion or pregnancy termination (68). This necessitates the development of reproductive health education specifically for adolescent girls. Future researchers should also address the gap in studies on the needs of adolescent girls and possible interventions needed to reduce sexual initiation before the age of 18 years.

Furthermore, at the individual level, we found that pregnancy termination was significantly associated with women who had multiple sexual partners. Likewise, a study conducted in Peru indicated that as the number of sexual partners increased, the odds of getting a pregnancy termination increased (69). Studies conducted in Cambodia, China, and the United Kingdom also have found that having multiple sexual partners is associated with a higher rate of repeated pregnancy termination. (54, 70, 71). The government shall be emphasized reproductive health education, particularly for women regarding the risks of multiple sexual partners, the access where, and how to get counseling on how to prevent pregnancy.

This study also found that pregnancy termination was two times higher among women who had menstrual irregularities compared to their counterparts. Lastly, this systematic review and metaanalysis indicated that there were no statistical association between the termination of pregnancy and rural residents, marital status, women's age, educational status, primiparous, history of abortion, and wanted pregnancy.

Our study has several strengths. The comprehensive inclusion of studies from various regions in Ethiopia provides a broader perspective. The rigorous methodology employed in the selection and analysis of studies further strengthens the credibility of the results. As a limitation, this finding might be prone to the risk of bias due to the significant heterogeneity of articles included from a different region of Ethiopia. In addition, differences in the study population, setting, and design within the included studies might influence the results of this review. Studies conducted in health institutions, higher education might affect the pooled estimates. Furthermore, it is

BMJ Open

important to note that the review exclusively included published articles and did not incorporate qualitative studies that explore the explanations for pregnancy termination.

Future research must explain the relationship between pregnancy termination and other determinats such as social, economic, substance use, peer pressure, alcohol use, sexual or physical violence, and knowledge of sexual and reproductive health issues such as family planning and fertility.

Conclusions

One in every five women had their pregnancies terminated, which is a high rate when compared to Sub-Saharan countries. Being a student was significantly associated with the termination of a pregnancy. In addition, irregular menstrual bleeding, early initiation of sexual intercourse, and multiple sexual partners were important determinants of pregnancy termination.

Abbreviations

OR: odds ratios; CI: confidence interval; .JBI: Joanna Briggs Institute; MDG: Millennium Development Goals'

Declarations

Ethical approval: This article was conducted using published articles. Therefore, it don't required ethical approval.

Funding: No funding was used in this study.

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and analyzed during the review are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Competing interests: None declared.

Author contributions: HK, MWA, AB, EM, TH, and LAT conducted the data curation and extraction. HK, LAT, EM, and MWA. wrote the orginal and final draft of the research. LAT, EM,

MWA and HK were conducted formal analyses and data interpretation. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Supplementary file

The supplementary file contains the data extraction sheet for the study included in the review as supplmentary table 1 and supplementary figures 1-10.

to beet terien only

References

WHO. 2011.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

Care. 2003.

Brighton, UK; 2008.

pcdatioa, 2007. teUSTM-HC.

and reproductive health. 2010:16-25.

Reproductive health. 2019;16(1):1-10.

of Reproductive Medicine. 2017;1(2):27-38.

Contraception and reproductive medicine. 2017;2(1):1-6.

2020;16:1745506520929546.

BMJ Open

Mesce D, Clifto D. Abortion facts and figures; population reference bureau. Geneva:

Ganatra B, Gerdts C, Rossier C, Johnson Jr BR, Tunçalp Ö, Assifi A, et al. Global,

from unsafe pregnancy termination in the developing world, 2012: a review of evidence from 26

countries. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2016;123(9):1489-98.

morbidity and mortality: evidence and estimation challenges: Institute of Development Studies

DeCherney AH NL, Laufer N, Roman AS. Contraception and family, gynecology.

pregnancy and abortion by income, region, and the legal status of abortion: estimates from a

comprehensive model for 1990–2019. The Lancet Global Health. 2020;8(9):e1152-e61.

regional, and subregional classification of abortions by safety, 2010-14: estimates from a

Bayesian hierarchical model. The Lancet. 2017;390(10110):2372-81.

2008 and 2014. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2016;42(3):121-30.

Bearak J, Popinchalk A, Ganatra B, Moller A-B, Tuncalp Ö, Beavin C, et al. Unintended

Singh S, Maddow-Zimet I. Facility-based treatment for medical complications resulting

Vlassoff M, Shearer J, Walker D, Lucas H. Economic impact of unsafe abortion-related

Ababa A. Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia ministry of health. Ethiopia: Postnatal

Gebrehiwot Y, Fetters T, Gebreselassie H, Moore A, Hailemariam M, Dibaba Y, et al.

Changes in Morbidity and Abortion Care in Ethiopia After Legal Reform: National Results from

Singh S, Fetters T, Gebreselassie H, Abdella A, Gebrehiwot Y, Kumbi S, et al. The

Alemayehu B, Addissie A, Ayele W, Tiroro S, Woldeyohannes D. Magnitude and

estimated incidence of induced abortion in Ethiopia, 2008. International perspectives on sexual

associated factors of repeat induced abortion among reproductive age group women who seeks

abortion Care Services at Marie Stopes International Ethiopia Clinics in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

factors in Amhara region referral hospitals. BioMed research international. 2015;2015:256534.

associated factors at debre Markos referral hospital: cross-sectional study. Women's Health.

facilities of Guraghe zone, southern Ethiopia. Journal of pregnancy. 2014;2014.

institutions, Central Ethiopia, 2019. BMC research notes. 2019;12(1):1-5.

Tesfave B, Tewabe M, Ferede A, Dawson A. Induced second trimester abortion and

Denberu B, Alemseged F, Segni H. Determinants of abortion among youth seeking

Behulu GK, Fenta EA, Aynalem GL. Repeat induced abortion and associated factors

Tilahun F, Dadi AF, Shiferaw G. Determinants of abortion among clients coming for

reproductive health Care in Selected Health Facilities, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Global Journal

among reproductive age women who seek abortion services in Debre Berhan town health

abortion service at felegehiwot referral hospital, northwest Ethiopia: a case control study.

Mulat A, Bayu H, Mellie H, Alemu A. Induced second trimester abortion and associated

Tesfaye G, Hambisa MT, Semahegn A. Induced abortion and associated factors in health

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47

59 60

17. Aromataris E, Munn Z. Joanna Briggs Institute reviewer's manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute. 2017;2018.

18. 2014 KAAOBAftooARA.

19. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in metaanalyses. Bmj. 2003;327(7414):557-60.

20. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics. 1994:1088-101.

21. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. Bmj. 1997;315(7109):629-34.

22. Duval S, Tweedie R. A nonparametric "trim and fill" method of accounting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Journal of the american statistical association. 2000;95(449):89-98.

23. Ayenew G, Gedefaw M, Berhe R, Nigusie A. Current Status, and Correlates of Abortion among Rural Women of Gonji Kollela District, Northwest Ethiopia. Open Journal of Epidemiology. 2015;5:136-46.

24. Waktola MI, Mekonen DG, Nigussie TS, Cherkose EA, Abate AT. Repeat induced abortion and associated factors among women seeking abortion care services at Debre Markos town health institutions, Amhara regional state, Ethiopia, 2017. BMC Res Notes. 2020;13(1):44-.

25. Mariam T, Melkamu S, Yetwale F, Abdela M, Getnet M. Prevalence and Associated Factors of Unsafe Abortion among Women of Reproductive Age Group in Gondar Town, Northwest Ethiopia, 2017: A Community-based Cross-sectional Study. Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research. 2018;28:1-7.

26. Getahun H, Berhane Y. Abortion among rural women in north Ethiopia. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2000;71(3):265-6.

27. Animaw W, Bogale B. Abortion in university and college female students of Arba Minch town, Ethiopia, 2011. Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare. 2014;5(1):17-22.

28. Beyene BB, Meshesha B. Magnitude And Associated Factors Of Induced Abortion Among Regular Undergraduate Students Of Dilla University. International journal of scientific and research publications. 2020;10:10032.

29. Sahile A, Shiferaw M. Magnitude of Induced Abortion and Associated Factors among Female Students of Hawassa University, Southern Region, Ethiopia, 2019. Journal of pregnancy. 2020;2020:1-6.

30. Gelaye AA, Taye KN, Mekonen T. Magnitude and risk factors of abortion among regular female students in Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia. BMC Women's Health. 2014;14(1):50.

31. Nigussie T, Feyisa M, Yosef T, Berhanu M, Asefa A. Prevalence of induced abortion and its associated factors among female students of health science in South West Ethiopia. The Open Nursing Journal. 2020;14(1).

32. Abebe M, Mersha A, Degefa N, Gebremeskel F, Kefelew E, Molla W. Determinants of induced abortion among women received maternal health care services in public hospitals of Arba Minch and Wolayita Sodo town, southern Ethiopia: unmatched case–control study. BMC women's health. 2022;22(1):1-12.

33. Lentiro K, Gebru T, Worku A, Asfaw A, Gebremariam T, Tesfaye A. Risk factors of induced abortion among preparatory school student in Guraghe zone, Southern region, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. BMC Women's Health. 2019;19(1):1-7.

34. Alemu K, Birhanu S, Fekadu L, Endale F, Tamene A, Habte A. Safe abortion service utilization and associated factors among insecurely housed women who experienced abortion in

BMJ Open

1	
2	
3	southwest Ethionia 2021: A community based cross sectional study. Plos one
4	southwest Europia, 2021. A community-based cross-sectional study. Thos one.
5	2022;17(8):e0272939.
5	35. Gebeyehu D, Admassu B, Sinega M, Haile M. Assessment of Prevalence and Reasons for
7	Termination of Pregnancy at Jimma University Teaching Hospital Ethiopia Universal Journal
/	of Public Health 2015:2:251 5
0	$\begin{array}{c} \text{of function for a field of } \\ \\ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \\ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \\ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \\ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \\ \ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \\ \ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \\ \ \text{of function for a field of } \\ \\ $
9	36. Megersa BS, Ojengbede OA, Deckert A, Fawole OI. Factors associated with induced
10	abortion among women of reproductive age attending selected health facilities in Addis Ababa,
11	Ethiopia: a case control study. BMC Women's Health. 2020;20(1):1-11.
12	37 Wassie AY Lemlem SB Boka A Knowledge Practice and Associated Factors Towards
13	Mediantian Among Denreductive Age Women in Sevuel and Denreductive Health
14	Medication Abortion Among Reproductive-Age women in Sexual and Reproductive Health
15	Clinics of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2018: Cross-Sectional Study. International Journal of
16	Women's Health. 2021;13:489.
17	38. Bulti F, Gela D, Dinagde N. Knowledge of Safe Abortion Care Services and Associated
18	Factors Among Women of Reproductive Age Working at Non-Health Sector Public Institutions
19	in Addia Ababa Ethionia 2021
20	in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. 2021.
21	39. Jamie AH, Abdosh MZ. Prevalence of induced abortion and associated factors among
22	women of reproductive age in Harari region, Ethiopia. Public Health of Indonesia. 2020;6(2):35-
23	40.
23	40 Mohammed M. Wesenu M. Prevalence and determinants associated with second
25	trimester termination of anomanaxy in Herministry. Ethionic, Cross spectrum at the 2021
25	trimester termination of pregnancy in Harari city, Ethiopia, Cross sectional study. 2021.
20	41. Worku S, Fantahun M. Unintended pregnancy and induced abortion in a town with
27	accessible family planning services: the case of Harar in eastern Ethiopia. Ethiopian Journal of
28	Health Development, 2006;20(2):79-83.
29	12 Abera GB Berhanu B Kahsay AB Gebru HB Aregay A Assessment of determinants of
30	42. Aberd OD, Demand D, Ransay AD, Ocord HD, Aregay A. Assessment of determinants of
31	induced abortion among child bearing age women attending maternal and child health clinic in
32	Mekelle town, Tigray, Ethiopia: a cross sectional study. International Journal of Pharmaceutical
33	Sciences and Research. 2012;3(12):4745.
34	43. Alemavehu M. Yebyo H. Medhanyie AA, Bayray A, Fantahun M, Goba GK.
35	Determinants of repeated abortion among women of reproductive age attending health facilities
36	in Nexthern Ethics is a second souther of the DMC Deblie Health 2017;17(1):1.9
37	in Northern Ethlopia: a case-control study. BMC Public Health. 2017;17(1):1-8.
38	44. Gessessew A. Abortion and unwanted pregnancy in Adigrat zonal hospital, Tigray, north
39	Ethiopia. African journal of reproductive health. 2010;14(3):183-8.
40	45 Biza N Habib Y Bayray A Reddy PS MAGNITUDE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS
41	OF A BORTION AMONG REGULAR FEMALE STUDENTS OF SAMARA UNIVERSITY
42	AFAD FTHODIA 2016 M 1: D 1 CI : 1 2019 5(2) 101 201
43	AFAR, ETHIOPIA, 2016. Medico Research Chronicles. 2018;5(3):191-201.
44	46. Mekbib T-A, Hiwot YG, Fantahun M. SURVEY OF UNSAFE ABORTION IN
45	SELECTED HEALTH FACILITIES IN ETHIOPIA. Ethiopian Journal of Reproductive Health.
45	2007.1(1).11-
40	47 Gilano G. Hoilagahraal S. Determinents of abortion among youth 15, 24 in Ethionia: A
47	47. Onano G, Hanegeorear S. Determinants of abortion among youth 15–24 in Europia. A
40	multilevel analysis based on EDHS 2016. PloS one. 2021;16(3):e0248228.
49	48. Tesema GA, Mekonnen TH, Teshale AB. Spatial distribution and determinants of
50	abortion among reproductive age women in Ethiopia. evidence from Ethiopian Demographic and
51	Health Survey 2016 data: Snatial and mixed-effect analysis PloS one 2020:15(6):e0235382
52	Abdella A Maternal mortality trand in Ethicania, Ethicanian Journal of Health
53	47. Aduenta A. Iviatemai mortanty tienu in Euriopia. Euriopian Journal of Health
54	Development. 2010;24(1).
55	
56	
57	
58	18
59	

BMJ Open

50. Dickson KS, Adde KS, Ahinkorah BO. Socio–economic determinants of abortion among women in Mozambique and Ghana: evidence from demographic and health survey. Archives of Public Health. 2018;76(1):1-10.

51. Pallikadavath S, Stones RW. Maternal and social factors associated with abortion in India: a population-based study. International Family Planning Perspectives. 2006:120-5.

52. Grant MJ, Behrman JR. Gender gaps in educational attainment in less developed countries. Population and development review. 2010;36(1):71-89.

53. Jiang L, Hardee K. Women's education, family planning, or both? Application of multistate demographic projections in India. International journal of population research. 2014;2014.

54. Demographic E. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and Rockville. Maryland, MA, USA: CSA and ICF. 2016.

55. van Rensburg HC. South Africa's protracted struggle for equal distribution and equitable access–still not there. Human resources for health. 2014;12(1):1-16.

56. Bankole A, Singh S, Haas T. Reasons why women have induced abortions: evidence from 27 countries. International family planning perspectives. 1998:117-52.

57. Woog V, Susheela S, Alyssa B, Jesse P. Adolescent womens need for and use of sexual and reproductive health services in developing countries: Citeseer; 2015.

58. Onukwugha FI, Magadi MA, Sarki AM, Smith L. Trends in and predictors of pregnancy termination among 15–24 year-old women in Nigeria: a multi-level analysis of demographic and health surveys 2003–2018. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2020;20(1):550.

59. Coyle K, Basen-Enquis K, Kirby D, Parcel G, Banspach S. Collins JL, Baumler ER, Caravajal S, Harrist, RB. Safer Choices: Long-term impact of a multicomponent school-based HIV, STD, and pregnancy prevention program. Public Health Reports. 2001;116(Suppl 1):82-93.

60. Cabezón C, Vigil P, Rojas I, Leiva ME, Riquelme R, Aranda W, et al. Adolescent pregnancy prevention: An abstinence-centered randomized controlled intervention in a Chilean public high school. Journal of Adolescent Health. 2005;36(1):64-9.

61. Onukwugha FI, Magadi MA, Sarki AM, Smith L. Trends in and predictors of pregnancy termination among 15–24 year-old women in Nigeria: a multi-level analysis of demographic and health surveys 2003–2018. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2020;20(1):1-13.

62. Cadmus E, Owoaje E. Knowledge about complications and practice of abortion among female undergraduates in the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Annals of Ibadan postgraduate medicine. 2011;9(1):19-23.

63. Ahmed S, Ray R. Determinants of pregnancy and induced and spontaneous abortion in a jointly determined framework: evidence from a country-wide, district-level household survey in India. Journal of biosocial science. 2014;46(4):480-517.

64. Morhe ES, Tagbor HK, Ankobea FK, Danso KA. Reproductive experiences of teenagers in the Ejisu-Juabeng district of Ghana. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2012;118(2):137-40.

65. Mulugeta Y, Berhane Y. Factors associated with pre-marital sexual debut among unmarried high school female students in bahir Dar town, Ethiopia: cross-sectional study. Reproductive health. 2014;11(1):1-6.

66. Mekie M, Addisu D, Dagnew E, Necho W. The level and deriving factors of repeatinduced abortion in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Heliyon. 2021;7(1):e05984.
67. Wellings K, Collumbien M, Slaymaker E, Singh S, Hodges Z, Patel D, et al. Sexual behaviour in context: a global perspective. The Lancet. 2006;368(9548):1706-28.

2	
3	68 WHO Adolescent pregnancy fact sheet: World Health Organization: 2022 [updated 15
4	6. WITO. Adolescent pregnancy fact sheet. World freath Organization, 2022 [updated 15
5	September 2022. Available from: <u>https://www.wno.int/en/news-room/fact-</u>
6	sheets/detail/adolescent-pregnancy.
7	69. Bernabé-Ortiz A, White PJ, Carcamo CP, Hughes JP, Gonzales MA, Garcia PJ, et al.
8	Clandestine induced abortion: prevalence incidence and risk factors among women in a Latin
9	American country (mai 2000:180(3):208-304
10	American country. Cinaj. 2009,100(5).290-504.
10	70. Cheng Y, wang X, LV Y, Cal Y, Ll Y, Guo X, et al. Study on the risk factors of repeated
17	abortion among unmarried adolescents. Zhonghua liu xing bing xue za zhi= Zhonghua
12	liuxingbingxue zazhi. 2006;27(8):669-72.
13	71. Yi S. Tuot S. Chhoun P. Pal K. Tith K. Brody C. Factors associated with induced
14	abortion among female entertainment workers: a cross-sectional study in Cambodia BMI open
15	$2015.5(7)_{10}007047$
10	2015;5(7):0007947.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
30	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
40	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	• •
58	20
59	For noor raviou anly, http://hmianan.hmi.com/sita/ahayt/suidalinas.yhtml
60	Tor peer review only - mtp.//pmjopen.pmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



Figure 1. Flow chart of describing the selection of studies for the systematic review and metaanalysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination and associated factors in Ethiopia, 2023

3			
4			
5			
6	Study		%
7		ES (95% CI)	Weight
8			weight
9	Addieu IV. et el (2018)		40) 2.07
10			48) 3.97
11	Mahlet. etal (2017)	 34.90 (30.98, 38.	82) 3.99
12	Gezahegn T. et al (2010)	12.30 (9.17, 15.4)	3) 4.01
13	Bekele T. et al (2017)	29.60 (24.07, 35.	13) 3.94
15	Getayeneh A. et AL (2016)	8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
16	Addisu T. et al (2019)	→ 68.70 (64.28, 73.	12) 3.98
17	Amlaku M. et al (2014)	H 19.20 (15.44, 22.)	96) 4.00
18	Amanuel G. (2004)	 60.60 (59.47. 61.) 	73) 4.05
19	Endalew S. (2021)	H 18.10 (14.47.21.	73) 4.00
20	Worku A (2011)	43 40 (40 06 46	74) 4 01
21	Geremew K et al (2019)		18) 3.08
22			40/ 3.90
23		0.49 (4.32, 8.00)	4.03
24	Girma G. et al (2016)	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.05
25	Kifle Lentiro (2017)	13.60 (10.26, 16.	94) 4.01
20	Biniyam Bayou (2020)	6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4.04
28	Diriba G (2015)	35.60 (28.86, 42.	34) 3.88
29	Girum M (2015)	1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
30	Murad M (2020)	H 18.20 (15.58, 20.1	82) 4.02
31	Tekleab M (2007)	₹ 25.60 (22.99, 28.	21) 4.03
32	Tadesse N (2020)	18.80 (15.06, 22,	, 54) 4.00
33	Tesfamichael G (2017)	3 90 (0 84 6 96)	4 02
34	Kidist Alemu (2022)		79) 3 82
35	Solomon W (2006)		26) 4.02
30 27			> 4.03
27 38) 4.03
30	Abera et al (2012)	7.70 (4.46, 10.94) 4.01
40	Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.000)	21.52 (15.01, 28.	03) 100.00
41	NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
42		1	
43	.CI 10		
44			
45			

Figure 2: Forest plot of the pooled prevalence of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023



Figure 3: Funnel plot to test publication bias of pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

BMJ Open



Figure 4: The Duval and Tweedie nonparametric trim and fill analysis of abortion among women in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors	Publication			%
name	year		ES (95% CI)	Weig
Addis Ababa		I		
Addisu W. et al	2018		33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3.97
Endalew S.	2021		18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4.00
Subtotal (I-squared = 96.1%, p = 0.000)		\Leftrightarrow	25.49 (10.89, 40.09)	7.98
Amhara				
Mahlet. etal	2017	+	34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.99
Bekele T. et al	2017		29.60 (24.07, 35.13)	3.94
Amlaku M. et al	2014	-	19.20 (15.44, 22.96)	4.00
Geremew K. et al	2019	+	20.30 (16.12, 24.48)	3.98
Girum M	2015		1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.05
Tesfamichael G	2017	₩ 1	3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.02
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.0%, p = 0.000)			18.06 (6.27, 29.85)	23.97
SNNPR				
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		12.30 (9.17. 15.43)	4.01
Addisu T. et al	2019		68.70 (64.28.73.12)	3 98
Worku A.	2011	-	43.40 (40.06, 46.74)	4.01
Amha A. et al	2011		6.49 (4.32, 8.66)	4.03
Kifle Lentiro	2017	~ ₽	13.60 (10.26, 16.94)	4.03
Binivam Bayou	2020		6 40 (4 35 8 45)	4.04
Tadesse N	2020		18 80 (15 06 22 54)	4.00
Kidist Alemu	2022		27 90 (20 01 35 79)	3.82
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.3%, p = 0.000)			24.63 (11.50, 37.75)	31.9
National Data				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4.05
Girma G. et al	2016	•	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.05
Tekleab M	2007	•	25.60 (22.99, 28.21)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.7%, p = 0.000)			12.10 (5.70, 18.50)	12.1
Tigray				
Amanuel G.	2004		60.60 (59.47, 61.73)	4.05
Abera et al	2012	+ 1	7.70 (4.46, 10.94)	4.01
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.9%, p = 0.000)	-		34.17 (-17.67, 86.01)	8.06
Harari				
Murad M	2020	●	18.20 (15.58, 20.82)	4.02
Solomon W	2006		14.20 (12.04, 16.36)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 81.2%, p = 0.021)			16.13 (12.21, 20.05)	8.06
Oromia				
Diriba G	2015		35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	3.88
Afar				
Biza N. et al	2018	•	8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		Q	8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4.03
Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.000)			21.52 (15.01, 28.03)	100.0
NOTE: Weights are from random effects an	rsis			

Figure 5: Subgroup analysis of the pregnancy termination based on regional distribution in Ethiopia, 2023

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Authors	Publication year		ES (95% CI)	9 V
·				
Reproductive age	2010	· · · ·		
Addisu W. et al	2018		33.00 (28.52, 37.48)	3
Mahlet. etal	2017		34.90 (30.98, 38.82)	3.
Endalew S.	2021		18.10 (14.47, 21.73)	4.
Kifle Lentiro	2017		13.60 (10.26, 16.94)	4.
Girum M	2015		1.10 (0.27, 1.93)	4.
Murad M	2020	`	18.20 (15.58, 20.82)	4.
Tesfamichael G	2017	*	3.90 (0.84, 6.96)	4.
Solomon W	2006		14.20 (12.04, 16.36)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.0%, p = 0.00	10)		17.03 (8.55, 25.52)	3
Pregnant women				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$)			8.90 (8.40, 9.40)	4
Abortion care seekers				
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		12.30 (9.17. 15.43)	4
Bekele T. et al	2017		29 60 (24 07 35 13)	3
Amlaku M. et al	2014	-	19 20 (15 44, 22 96)	4
Geremew K et al	2019		20 30 (16 12 24 48)	3
Diriha G	2015	Ĩ <u>-</u>	35.60 (28.86, 42.34)	0. 3
Teklesh M	2007	<u> </u>	25.60 (22.00, 42.04)	4
Abora at al	2007	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7 70 /4 /6 10 04)	-
Subtatel (Laguarad 05.20/ p. 0.0	2012		7.70 (4.40, 10.54)	-
Subtotal (I-squaled = 95.5%, p = 0.00	0)		21.19 (14.05, 27.72)	2
University/College students				
Addisu T. et al	2019		68.70 (64.28, 73.12)	3
Worku A.	2011		43.40 (40.06, 46.74)	4.
Amha A. et al	2011		6.49 (4.32, 8.66)	4
Biniyam Bayou	2020	•	6.40 (4.35, 8.45)	4
Tadesse N	2020	- • 1	18.80 (15.06, 22.54)	4
Biza N. et al	2018	★ 1	8.80 (6.34, 11.26)	4
Subtotal (I-squared = 99.5%, p = 0.00	10)		25.36 (9.39, 41.32)	24
Gynaecological patients				
Amanuel G.	2004		60.60 (59.47, 61.73)	4
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			60.60 (59.47, 61.73)	4.
Youth women				
Girma G. et al	2016	• 1	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$)		•	2.50 (2.12, 2.88)	4.
Insecurely housed women				
Kidist Alemu,	2022		27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)			27.90 (20.01, 35.79)	3.
Overall (I-squared = 99.8%, p = 0.00))		21.52 (15.01, 28.03)	1
NOTE: Weights are from random effe	rts analysis			

Figure 6: Subgroup analysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination based on study population in Ethiopia, 2022

name	year		ES (95% CI)	Weight
Have 1 alive child				
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		0.97 (0.72, 1.31)	5.60
Mesfn A. et al	2021	—	0.32 (0.10, 1.01)	3.80
Girma G. et al	2016	I	0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	5.46
Denberu B	2017	!	0.74 (0.32, 1.71)	4.53
Subtotal (I-squared = 42.0%,	p = 0.160)	$\overline{\diamond}$	0.74 (0.52, 1.05)	19.39
First sex before18 yrs				
Mussie A. et al	2014	 •	2.70 (1.44, 5.06)	5.01
Geremew K. et al	2019	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5.96 (2.54, 13.97)	4.49
Girma G. et al	2016		2.00 (1.32, 3.03)	5.42
Biniyam Bayou	2020	T	4.30 (1.16, 15.94)	3.44
Tadesse N	2020		1.64 (0.73, 3.69)	4.59
Subtotal (I-squared = 41.6%,	p = 0.144)	\diamond	2.65 (1.74, 4.04)	22.95
Irregular menstruation				
Amlaku M. et al	2014		1 76 (1 03 2 99)	5.21
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.00 (1.09, 3.67)	5.05
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p	= 0.756)	\diamond	1.86 (1.25, 2.77)	10.26
	,			
Abortion history		i i		
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014	I	0.29 (0.11, 0.78)	4.17
Gezahegn T. et al	2010		1.17 (0.39, 3.49)	3.92
Mussie A. et al	2014		2.30 (1.28, 4.15)	5.09
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.0%,	p = 0.002)		0.96 (0.27, 3.40)	13.18
Multiple sexual partner				
Vahlet. etal	2017	i	- 6.16 (3.25, 11.68)	4.98
Mesfn A. et al	2021		5.47 (2.98, 10.04)	5.05
Mussie A. et al	2014		4.40 (2.34, 8.27)	5.00
Geremew K. et al	2019		7.72 (2.90, 20.57)	4.19
Denberu B	2017		1.09 (0.22, 5.35)	2.88
Biza N. et al	2018		2.90 (0.91, 9.21)	3.78
Subtotal (I-squared = 13.4%,	p = 0.329)		4.88 (3.43, 6.93)	25.88
Nonted programmy				
Manieu pregnancy	2010		11 77 /0 54 - 20 49)	0.00
Addisu W. et al	2018		11.77 (3.51, 39.43)	3.00
Jezanegn n. et al	2010 n = 0.000)		0.44 (0.20, 0.90)	4.09
Subiotal (I-squared = 95.1%,	μ = 0.000)		2.20 (0.09, 55.02)	0.30
Overall (I-squared = 85.6%, p	= 0.000)	\diamond	1.92 (1.31, 2.80)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from rand	om effects analysis			

Figure 7: Subgroup analysis of the prevalence of pregnancy termination based on before and after MDG in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors	Publication year			ES (95% CI)	% Weigh
Rural Residence					
Mahlet. etal	2017 —	⊢		0.19 (0.09, 0.42)	6.42
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	- <u>.</u>		1.27 (0.74, 2.18)	6.84
Amlaku M. et al	2014	÷.		1.86 (1.11, 3.13)	6.88
Mesfn A. et al	2021	_ ●		0.43 (0.23, 0.80)	6.73
Kifle Lentiro	2017	<u>'</u>		2.30 (1.10, 4.80)	6.52
Tadesse N	2020 —	•		0.26 (0.12, 0.55)	6.50
Subtotal (I-squared =	89.1%, p = 0.000)			0.71 (0.32, 1.58)	39.88
				(, , ,	
Students					
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014		<u> </u>	7.40 (2.93, 18.69)	6.16
Arif H. Jamie	2020	÷		2.95 (1.02, 8.52)	5.88
Subtotal (I-squared =	39.0%, p = 0.201)		>	4.85 (1.98, 11.91)	12.04
Single					
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014			18.23 (8.04, 41.33)	6.37
Gezahegn T. et al	2010			1.35 (0.58, 3.14)	6.32
Bekele T. et al	2017			4.93 (1.41, 17.17)	5.48
Getaveneh A. et AL	2016	<u> </u>		1.22 (0.78, 1.90)	6.98
Arif H. Jamie	2020			5.50 (1.20, 25.14)	4.89
Solomon W	2006	÷		1.72 (1.20, 2.47)	7.07
Denberu B	2017 ←			0.04 (0.01, 0.12)	5.84
Abera et al	2012 -			0.60 (0.15, 2.45)	5.13
Subtotal (I-squared =	92.0%, p = 0.000)			1.55 (0.60, 4.02)	48.08
	· i /				
Overall (I-squared = 9	0.8%, p = 0.000)	\Leftrightarrow		1.30 (0.72, 2.34)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are fro	m random effects analysis				
			T		

Figure 8: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected socio-demographic characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

name	Publication year	ES (95% CI)	% Weight
Divorced			
Bekele T. et al	2017 —	2.38 (0.67, 8.44)	4.12
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	- 0.78 (0.49, 1.24)	5.68
Girma G. et al	2016	20.00 (7.14, 56.06)	4.61
Subtotal (I-squared = 93.	%, p = 0.000)	3.24 (0.41, 25.83)	14.41
Married			
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	2.40 (1.19, 4.85)	5.27
Girma G. et al	2016	→ 38.00 (17.10, 84.47)	5.09
Abera et al	2012	1.26 (0.39, 4.07)	4.31
Subtotal (I-squared = 94.	%, p = 0.000)	4.97 (0.63, 38.95)	14.67
Primery school			
Mahlet. etal	2017	5.46 (2.06, 14.47)	4.73
Gezahegn T. et al	2010	0.26 (0.10, 0.68)	4.77
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	★ 1.36 (1.13, 1.64)	5.97
Mesfn A. et al	2021	1.44 (0.53, 3.92)	4.67
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.20 (0.07, 0.59)	4.52
Solomon W	2006	1.65 (1.03, 2.65)	5.66
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.	%, p = 0.000)	1.05 (0.55, 2.00)	30.31
Secondary school			
Addisu W. et al	2018	3.54 (1.02, 12.27)	4.16
Mahlet. etal	2017	12.96 (6.16, 27.28)	5.19
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	0.98 (0.68, 1.41)	5.80
Mesfn A. et al	2021 -	2.04 (0.79, 5.28)	4.78
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.40 (0.20, 0.80)	5.29
Subtotal (I-squared = 92.	%, p = 0.000)	2.00 (0.63, 6.37)	25.23
College & above			
Addisu W. et al	2018	3.49 (1.02, 11.92)	4.20
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016	0.99 (0.61, 1.60)	5.65
Bethelihem A. et al	2015	0.40 (0.23, 0.69)	5.54
Subtotal (I-squared = 83.	%, p = 0.002)	0.97 (0.37, 2.54)	15.39
Overall (I-squared = 91.0	%, р = 0.000)	1.78 (1.13, 2.82)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from	andom effects analysis	1	

Figure 9: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected socio-demographic characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

Authors . name	Publication year			ES (95% CI)	% We
Have 1 alive child			1		
Getayeneh A. et AL	2016		⊨ ¦	0.97 (0.72, 1.31)	5.60
Mesfn A. et al	2021		f i	0.32 (0.10, 1.01)	3.8
Girma G. et al	2016		I.	0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	5.4
Denberu B	2017		<u> </u>	0.74 (0.32, 1.71)	4.5
Subtotal (I-squared = 42.0%, p	= 0.160)	Ō		0.74 (0.52, 1.05)	19.
First sex before18 yrs					
Mussie A. et al	2014		♦	2.70 (1.44, 5.06)	5.0
Geremew K. et al	2019		i — •	5.96 (2.54, 13.97)	4.4
Girma G. et al	2016			2.00 (1.32, 3.03)	5.4
Biniyam Bayou	2020			4.30 (1.16, 15.94)	3.4
Tadesse N	2020	_		1.64 (0.73, 3.69)	4.5
Subtotal (I-squared = 41.6%, p	= 0.144)		\diamond	2.65 (1.74, 4.04)	22.
Irregular menstruation					
Amlaku M. et al	2014			1.76 (1.03, 2.99)	5.2
Mussie A. et al	2014			2.00 (1.09, 3.67)	5.0
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p =	= 0.756)		\diamond	1.86 (1.25, 2.77)	10.
Abortion history					
Fikreselassie T. et al	2014	—	l.	0.29 (0.11, 0.78)	4.1
Gezahegn T. et al	2010			1.17 (0.39, 3.49)	3.9
Mussie A. et al	2014			2.30 (1.28, 4.15)	5.0
Subtotal (I-squared = 84.0%, p	= 0.002)	\sim		0.96 (0.27, 3.40)	13
Multiple sexual partner					
Mahlet. etal	2017		I —	6.16 (3.25, 11.68)	4.9
Mesfn A. et al	2021		! →	5.47 (2.98, 10.04)	5.0
Mussie A. et al	2014			4.40 (2.34, 8.27)	5.0
Geremew K. et al	2019			7.72 (2.90, 20.57)	4.1
Denberu B	2017		• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.09 (0.22, 5.35)	2.8
Biza N. et al	2018			2.90 (0.91, 9.21)	3.7
Subtotal (I-squared = 13.4%, p	= 0.329)		\diamond	4.88 (3.43, 6.93)	25.
Wanted pregnancy					
Addisu W. et al	2018			11.77 (3.51, 39.43)	3.6
Gezahegn T. et al	2010			0.44 (0.20, 0.95)	4.6
Subtotal (I-squared = 95.1%, p	= 0.000)			2.20 (0.09, 55.02)	8.3
Overall (I-squared = 85.6%, p :	= 0.000)		\diamond	1.92 (1.31, 2.80)	100
NOTE: Weights are from rando	m effects analysis				

Figure 10: Forest plot of odds ratio for the association of selected reproductive characteristics and pregnancy termination in Ethiopia, 2023

Table 1. Data extraction sheet of the studies

Authors name	Publication year	Study area	Region	Study design	Study setting	Study population	Sample size
Addisu W. et al	2018	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	423
Mahlet T. et al.	2017	Debre Markos	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	567
Fikreselassie T. et al.	2014	Bahr Dar	Amhara	Case-control	Institutional	Pregnant women	175
Gezahegn T. et al.	2010	Guraghe Zone	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	422
Bekele T. et al.	2017	Debre Markos	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	262
Getayeneh A. et al.	2016	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Community	Pregnant women	12378
Addisu T. et al.	2019	Hawassa	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	422
Amlaku M. et al.	2014	Amhara region referral hospitals	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	422
Birye D. et al.	2019	Gondar	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	648
Amanuel G. et al.	2004	Adigrat	Tigray	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Women with Gynecologic problem	7203
Endalew S. et al.	2021	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age	432
Worku A. et al.	2011	Arba Minch	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	845
Mesfn A. et al.	2021	Arba minch & Wolayita Sodo town	SNNP	Case control	Institutional	Reproductive age group	413
Bethelihem A. et al.	2015	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	429
Mussie A. et al.	2014	Tigray region health hospitals	Tigray	Case control	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	309
Geremew K. et al.	2019	Debre Berhan town health institutions	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	355
Amha A. et al.	2011	Hawassa University	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	493

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Girma G. et al.	2016	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Community	Youth women	6401
Kifle L. et al.	2017	Guraghe zone	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age	404
Arif H. et al.	2020	Harari	Harari	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	611
Biniyam B. et al.	2020	Dilla University	SNNPR	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	548
Denberu B. et al	2017	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa	Case control	Institutional	Youth women	330
Diriba G. et al.	2015	Jimma	Oromia	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	194
Girum M. et al.	2015	Gonji Kollela District	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age group	611
Murad M. et al.	2020	Harar	Harari	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Reproductive age group	835
Tekleab M. et al.	2007	Ethiopia	National data	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care service seekers	1075
Tadesse N. et al.	2020	Mizan Tepi University	SNNP	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	420
Tesfamichael G. et al.	2017	Gondar	Amhara	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age	154
Kidist A. et al	2022	Jimma, Bonga, and Mizan-Aman	SNNPR	Cross-sectional	Community	Insecurely housed women	124
Solomon W. et al	2006	Harer	Harari	Cross-sectional	Community	Reproductive age	1000
Biza N. et al.	2018	Semera	Afar	Cross-sectional	Institutional	University/College students	509
Abera et al.	2012	Mekelle	Tigray	Cross-sectional	Institutional	Abortion care seekers	260

BMJ Open

Page 34 of 35



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported			
5 TITLE						
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1			
ABSTRACT						
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	2			
INTRODUCTION	1					
2 Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.				
3 Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	3			
4 METHODS	1		5			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	4-5			
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.				
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	4			
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5			
22 Data collection 23 process 24	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5			
25 Data items 26	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	5			
27 28	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	5			
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.				
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	6			
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	6			
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	6			
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	6			
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	6			
ιφ	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	6			
1	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	6			
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	6			
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used topassess/centainty (ortconfidence) in the body of avidence/for a butcontem	6			

3 i

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

4 Section and 5 Topic	ltem #	Checklist item			
assessment					
RESULTS					
Study selection	16a	a Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included the review, ideally using a flow diagram.			
ΙΦ 11	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.			
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.			
4 Risk of bias in 15 studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.			
16 Results of 17 individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.			
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	7-9 &14		
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.			
21	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.			
3	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	7-9 & 14		
24 Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.			
²⁵ Certainty of ²⁶ evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	7-9		
DISCUSSION					
²⁸ Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.			
29 30	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.			
31	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	13		
32	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	111-13		
	TION				
Registration and	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	5		
δ	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	5		
37	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	5		
38 Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	14		
³⁹ Competing 10 interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	14		
Availability of data, code and dother materials	27 Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.		14		
++ 15 <i>From:</i> Page MJ, Mo	cKenzie	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 202	21;372:n71. doi:		

BMJ Open



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

.umation, visit. <u>http://www.</u> 10.1136/bmj.n71 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 36 of 35

BMJ Open