

# BMJ Open

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 (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Factors associated with the awareness of vaginal fistula among women of reproductive age: Findings from the 2018 Nigerian Demographic Health Survey

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040078
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-May-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Morhason-Bello, Imran; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences Kareem, Yusuf; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Institute of Advanced Medical Research and Training Abdus-Salam, Rukiyat; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences Bello, Oluwasomidoyin; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences Lawal, Olatunji; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences Akinlusi, Fatimat; Lagos State University College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Abegunde, Linda; Obafemi Awolowo University, Cooperative Information Network (COPINE), National Space Research and Development Agency Ojengbade, Oladosu; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Centre for Population and Reproductive Health
Keywords:	OBSTETRICS, Urinary tract infections < UROLOGY, Urinary incontinences < UROLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



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 [licence](#).

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 [Creative Commons](#) 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.

1  
2  
3 **Factors associated with the awareness of vaginal fistula among women of reproductive age:**  
4 **Findings from the 2018 Nigerian Demographic Health Survey**  
5  
6  
7

8 Imran O. Morhason-Bello<sup>1,2,5,6</sup>, Yusuf Olushola Kareem<sup>2</sup>, Rukiyat A. Abdus-Salam<sup>1</sup>,  
9 Oluwasomidoyin O. Bello<sup>1</sup>, Olatunji O. Lawal<sup>1</sup>, Fatimat Motunrayo Akinlusi<sup>3</sup>, Linda O.  
10 Abegunde<sup>4</sup>, Oladosu O. Ojengbede<sup>5</sup>  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 **Affiliations:**  
16

- 17 1. Female Pelvic Medicine and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Obstetrics and  
18 Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, University College Hospital/University of Ibadan,  
19 Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria  
20  
21 2. Institute of Advanced Medical Research and Training, College of Medicine, University of  
22 Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria  
23  
24 3. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Lagos State University College of Medicine/ Lagos  
25 State University Teaching Hospital, Lagos  
26  
27 4. Cooperative Information Network (COPINE), National Space Research and Development  
28 Agency, OAU Campus, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria  
29  
30 5. Centre for Population and Reproductive Health, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan, Oyo  
31 State Nigeria  
32  
33 6. Corresponding author – [imranmorhasonbello@gmail.com](mailto:imranmorhasonbello@gmail.com)  
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  
60

**ABSTRACT**

**Introduction:** Involuntary leakage of urine and or stool (vaginal fistula) after childbirth remains a public health challenge in Africa and Southeast Asia. To our knowledge, there is no previous national data that examined the awareness of vaginal fistula among women in Nigeria.

**Aim:** To determine the prevalence of awareness of urinary/faecal incontinence, and the associated risk factors among women (18-49 years) with no previous experience of incontinence.

**Methods:** We used a cross-sectional study, the 2018 Nigerian Demographic Health Survey, to analyse awareness of vaginal fistula among women with no previous experience of leakage of urine or stool. The primary explanatory variable was childbirth experience, and other variables were demographics, access to information and reproductive or sexual history. The descriptive, univariate and multivariable models were presented.

**Results:** Of 26,585 women interviewed, 50 (0.2%) who had experienced fistula were excluded from the risk factor analysis. The mean age of women with childbirth experience was  $32.8 \pm 8.6$  years while that of women without childbirth experience was  $20.3 \pm 6.2$  years. There were significant differences in sociodemographic, access to information and reproductive or sexual history factors between those with and without childbirth experience. The prevalence of vaginal fistula awareness was 52.0%. Factors associated with the awareness include: childbirth experience; being 20-24 years and above; having at least secondary education; wealth quintiles, ethnicity, regional location, religion, access to radio, TV and newspaper; age up to 17 years at first sex; history of previous termination of pregnancy and use of contraception.

**Conclusion:** A significant number of young women with no childbirth experience had low level of awareness. We recommended vaginal fistula awareness programs that will target younger women prior to childbirth as this may positively impact on the incidence of vaginal fistula and the inclusion of other useful questions to improve the quality of information that would be collected in future surveys.

**Keyword(s):** Vaginal fistula, awareness, urine or faecal incontinence, women, NDHS, Nigeria

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- The study used a nationally representative large dataset of 26535 women of reproductive age (15-49years) to investigate factors associated with the awareness of fistula. It is possibly the largest data set analysed.
- This study provided an insight into the level of awareness of vaginal fistula, particularly, among women within the age range of highest risk.
- Given that the DHS has thankfully included relevant questions on awareness of incontinence of urine and stool in its data set, we identified that some useful information that could help to better under the context of awareness or knowledge are missing.
- This analysis relied on a secondary data with the possible attendant challenges of such data.
- The number of women who had experienced vaginal fistula were small (N=50) and do not allow for rigorous statistical approach except for descriptive summaries

### INTRODUCTION

Urinary or fecal incontinence among women is a devastating medical morbidity that is mostly caused by prolonged obstructed labour<sup>1</sup>. The delay in relieving the obstructed labour is usually due to lack of access to essential maternity services<sup>1</sup>. According to Thaddeus and Maine (1991), the three delay models used to describe obstetric obstacles leading to maternal death are: (i) delay in seeking appropriate medical help for an obstetric emergency; (ii) delay in reaching an appropriate obstetric facility; and (iii) delay in receiving adequate care at the facility. Recently, the three delay models were modified and recategorized into four levels<sup>2</sup>. The new addition was delay in identifying the warning sign as the first level. These delays also contribute to the occurrence of severe morbidities including vaginal fistula – leading to urinary or fecal incontinence<sup>3</sup>. Aside neglected labour, vaginal fistula could also occur from complications of

1  
2  
3 gynaecological surgeries, caesarean sections, obstetric procedures, radiotherapy, gynaecological  
4  
5 cancer and sexual assault<sup>4,5</sup>.

6  
7  
8 Although the exact global estimates of urinary (vesico-vaginal fistula) and or feecal (recto-vaginal  
9  
10 fistula) incontinence burden is unknown, estimates by the World Health Organisation (WHO)  
11  
12 showed that more than two million women are currently living with the disorder and between  
13  
14 80,000 to 100,000 new cases are detected every year, largely in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and  
15  
16 Southeast Asia<sup>6-8</sup>. Nigeria and Ethiopia have the highest burden of obstetric fistula in SSA<sup>6</sup>.  
17  
18 According to the 2008 Nigerian Demographic Health Survey (NDHS), the prevalence of urinary  
19  
20 incontinence was 0.4%, with highest prevalence in the Northern regions compared to the  
21  
22 Southern regions<sup>9</sup>. Evidence abounds that the risk of vaginal fistula is common in settings with  
23  
24 lack or inadequate qualitative emergency obstetric care, healthcare manpower challenges and  
25  
26 poor investment in maternity services<sup>1,10</sup>. Beyond the medical factors, socio-cultural issues such  
27  
28 as early marriage, harmful cultural practices like female genital mutilation and unsupervised  
29  
30 childbirth at home; poor policy implementation of girl child education and misconceptions about  
31  
32 childbirth practices are other drivers responsible for the huge burden of obstetric fistula in SSA  
33  
34 and Southeast Asia<sup>1,10</sup>.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Despite the huge burden of obstetric fistula in SSA, studies addressing the awareness of obstetric  
44  
45 fistula among women are limited, particularly in Nigeria<sup>11</sup>. The prevalence of awareness was 20-  
46  
47 61% in Ghana, Uganda, Ethiopia and Tanzania<sup>12-15</sup>. Generally, there are more studies that  
48  
49 reported poor awareness level of vaginal fistula compared to those that reported high level of  
50  
51 awareness among women. It is important to evaluate the level of awareness of women who are  
52  
53 at risk of developing involuntary leakage of urine and or faeces, especially, in Nigeria, where the  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 burden is high. Adequate information on the risk factors associated with vaginal fistula would  
4  
5 help women to take appropriate decision to prevent difficult labour, the commonest cause of  
6  
7 vaginal fistula. Furthermore, findings from this analysis will assist policy makers and public health  
8  
9 programmers to understand the level of awareness of vaginal fistula and the contributory factors.  
10  
11 This study aimed to determine the prevalence of, and the factors that could contribute to the  
12  
13 awareness of vaginal fistula among women of reproductive age in Nigeria.  
14  
15  
16  
17

## 18 **METHODS**

### 19 ***Study design and data***

20  
21  
22 The study utilized data from the 2018 NDHS. Nigeria is divided into six geopolitical regions, which  
23  
24 consists of 36 states and a federal capital territory (FCT). Each state and FCT is subdivided into  
25  
26 local government areas (LGAs). The LGAs were further divided into localities to make up census  
27  
28 enumeration areas (EAs). The NDHS adopted a two-stage stratified cluster sampling technique;  
29  
30 the states and FCT were stratified into urban and rural areas. The first stage involved 1400 EAs  
31  
32 that were selected with probability proportional to EA size across the states. While in the second  
33  
34 stage; 30 households were selected in every EAs using equal probability sampling. Further details  
35  
36 of sampling design, method and implementation can be found in the 2018 NDHS report <sup>16</sup>.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 ***Patient and public involvement statement***

46  
47  
48 Participants were not directly involved in the planning of the Nigeria demographic health survey.  
49  
50 Information was disseminated to the general public including the participants as part of the  
51  
52 protocol for a demographic health survey.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57



## Data management

### *Outcome variables*

The data on vaginal fistula were extracted from the women's questionnaire. The fistula module in the NDHS sought information on the awareness of vagina fistula from all women of reproductive age 15-49, and information on the knowledge about the cause, health seeking behaviour including access and effective treatment were sought from only those with a complaint of fistula. Out of the 14 item questions in the fistula section, the first question asked if a woman had ever experienced a constant leakage of urine or stool from vagina during the day or night, which we defined as vaginal fistula (Supplementary Box 1). The fifty women that had experienced vaginal fistula were excluded from the analysis on vaginal fistula awareness. The question on ever heard of leakage of urine or stool per vaginam (vaginal fistula) was used as the primary outcome for this study, and as a measure of level of awareness among participants.

### *Explanatory variables*

The explanatory variables in this analysis were categorized into 3 groups: demographic; access to information; and reproductive and sexual history characteristics. The demographic variables included in the model were: age groups (15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49) years; region (North Central, North East, North West, South East, South South, South West); place of residence (urban, rural); ethnicity (Fulani, Hausa, Igbo, Yoruba, other ethnic minorities); religion (Catholic, other Christians, Muslims, Traditional, others); highest educational level (no education, primary, secondary, higher) occupation (not currently working, working); and wealth quintiles (poorer, poor, middle, richer, richest).

1  
2  
3 Information related to access to media included: frequency of reading newspaper or magazine  
4  
5 (not at all, less than once a week, at least once a week); frequency of listening to radio (not at all,  
6  
7 less than once a week, at least once a week); frequency of watching television (not at all, less  
8  
9 than once a week, at least once a week); own a mobile phone (no, yes); and use of internet  
10  
11 (never, in the last 12 months, before last 12 months). Other related access to information were  
12  
13 knowledge and use of family planning: knowledge of contraceptive method (knows no method,  
14  
15 knows only folkloric method, knows only traditional method, knows modern methods); current  
16  
17 use of contraceptive method (no method, folkloric method, traditional method, modern  
18  
19 method); heard family planning on radio last few months (no, yes); heard family planning on  
20  
21 television last few months (no, yes); heard family planning on newspaper and magazine last few  
22  
23 months (no, yes); and heard family planning by text messages on mobile phone last few months  
24  
25 (no, yes).

26  
27  
28 The variables that were considered under reproductive and sexual history characteristics  
29  
30 included: childbirth experience (no, yes); currently pregnant (no or unsure, yes), and age at first  
31  
32 sex (not had sex, <15years, 15-17years, 18-25years, >25years).

### 33 34 35 **Data analysis**

36  
37  
38 The main primary response in this analysis was ever had a childbirth experience. The percentage  
39  
40 distribution and the test of association on the background characteristics between women who  
41  
42 had no previous childbirth experience and at least a childbirth was presented, since obstetric  
43  
44 fistula is associated with childbirth. The mean and standard deviation were presented for  
45  
46 continuous variables or median and interquartile range (IQR) if the Shapiro-Wilk test for  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 normality has a p-value<0.05. The prevalence of fistula awareness and univariate analysis were  
4  
5 presented. The outcome variable, ever heard of fistula was a binary response (no, yes).

6  
7  
8 Four different logistic regression model were fitted. In the first model we used childbirth  
9  
10 experience and age of women *a priori*. In the second model, we adjusted for other reproductive  
11  
12 and sexual history. In the third model we adjusted for demographic characteristics, and in the  
13  
14 final model we adjusted for variables related to access to information. A pairwise correlation  
15  
16 matrix and variance inflation factor (VIF > 5), were used to investigate collinearity between the  
17  
18 outcome measure and dependent variables<sup>17</sup>. None of the dependent variables was excluded  
19  
20 due to collinearity. Analyses were performed with Stata 15.0 software, at 0.05 level of  
21  
22 significance. We also presented a descriptive summary of women who had previously  
23  
24 experienced fistula A geospatial visual representation showing the prevalence of fistula  
25  
26 awareness across states in Nigeria was generated using the ArcGIS software (version 10.4).

## 33 34 **RESULTS**

35  
36 There were 26,585 women who responded to the questions in the fistula module. Only 50 (0.2%)  
37  
38 women reported ever experienced fistula and most said it occurred after a difficult delivery  
39  
40 (82.5% [33/40]) and livebirth (70.0% [35/50]). Two (4.0%) respondents reported developing  
41  
42 fistula after sexual assault. The reported median duration from the time of injury to leakage of  
43  
44 urine or stool was a day with a range of 1.0 to 5.0 days. The median age of respondents who had  
45  
46 experienced vaginal fistula was 16.0 (15.0 to 20.0) years (Table 1). Only 41 (82%) out of 50  
47  
48 women had sought treatment for their fistula. Of the 41 treated, 27 (66%) reportedly had surgical  
49  
50 repair.  
51  
52  
53  
54

### 55 56 **Table 1 (Insert)**

**Table 1: Characteristics of women (15-49 year) that had experienced Fistula in the 2018 NDHS Data**

Variable	Frequency (%)
<b>Age at onset of vaginal fistula symptom</b> (Median, Q1-Q3)	16(15-20)
<15	12/50(24.0%)
15-19	23/50(46.0%)
20-24	10/50(20.0%)
>24	5/50(10.0%)
<b>Time problem occur</b>	
After the delivery of a live baby	35/50(70.0%)
After a stillbirth	5/50(10.0%)
Neither	10/50(20.0%)
<b>Risk factor for vaginal fistula</b>	
After normal labour/delivery <sup>a</sup>	7/40(17.5%)
After very difficult labour/delivery <sup>a</sup>	33/40(82.5%)
Following sexual assault <sup>b</sup>	2/10(20%)
Others <sup>b</sup>	3/10(30%)
<b>Onset of vaginal fistula<sup>c</sup></b> (Median, Q1-Q3)	1(1-5)
0	7/45(15.5%)
1-2	20/45(44.4%)
3-4	4/45(9.7%)
5-6	4/45(9.7%)
>=7	10/45(22.2%)
<b>Previous vaginal fistula treatment</b>	
No	9/50(18%)
Yes	41/50(82%)
<b>Cadre of health worker that offered treatment for vaginal fistula<sup>d</sup></b>	
Doctor	34/41(82.9%)
Nurse/midwife	2/41(4.9%)
Community/Village health worker	2/41(4.9%)
Other	3/41(7.3%)
<b>Had had surgical fistula repair<sup>d</sup></b>	
No	14/41(34.2%)
Yes	27/41(65.8%)
<b>Outcome of vaginal fistula repair<sup>d</sup></b>	
Yes, stopped completely	37/41(90.2%)
Not, stopped but reduced	3/41(7.3%)
Not stopped at all	1/41(2.4%)

<sup>a</sup> asked from participants who experienced fistula from delivery complication (n=40)

<sup>b</sup> asked from participants whose fistula experience were not pregnancy related, there were 5 missing responses (n=10)

<sup>c</sup> asked from participants whose fistula experience were from delivery complication or not, there were 5 missing responses (n=45)

<sup>d</sup> ask from participants who sought treatment for fistula (n=41)

1  
2  
3 The background characteristics of participants that answered the question on vaginal fistula  
4 awareness were presented according to their childbirth experience (Table 2). The mean age of  
5 women with at least one previous childbirth experience was higher than those with no childbirth  
6 experience (32.8±8.6 years vs 20.3±6.2 years;  $p<0.001$ ). There were significant differences in the  
7 selected demographics, access to information and reproductive/sexual history variables between  
8 participants with at least one previous childbirth and those with no childbirth experience  
9 ( $p<0.001$ ). For example, there were more adolescents (15-19years) who had not experienced  
10 childbirth compared to those with a previous childbirth experience (60.4% vs 4.0%;  $p<0.001$ ).  
11 Although majority of participants were from the Northwest region, there were higher  
12 proportions of those from Northwest among women with a previous childbirth than those with  
13 no childbirth (27.5% vs 20.0%;  $p<0.001$ ). There were more participants with at least secondary  
14 education (60.0%) among women with no childbirth experience, while those that had childbirth  
15 experience were mostly with no formal education (43.7%). There were higher proportion of  
16 women that were not currently working (53.8% vs 28.1%;  $p<0.001$ ) and from richer/richest  
17 quintiles (50.8% vs 35.4%;  $p<0.001$ ) among those with no childbirth compared to women that  
18 had had a previous childbirth.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Women with no childbirth had lower proportion of those that have never read newspaper (77.6%  
43 vs 88.2%;  $p<0.001$ ), listened to radio (43.3% vs 47.4%;  $p<0.001$ ), watched television (38.5% vs  
44 55.9%;  $p<0.001$ ), owned mobile phone (45.6% vs 47.0%;  $p<0.001$ ) and used internet (72.1% vs  
45 90.1%;  $p<0.001$ ) compared to those with women who had had a childbirth. However, there were  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

p<0.001). Women with previous childbirth had higher proportion of those that were currently pregnant (11.4% vs 6.0%; p<0.001) and ever terminated a pregnancy (14.3% vs 3.5%; p<0.001) relative to those with no previous childbirth. However, there were more women among those with no childbirth that had their first sexual exposure before 15 years of age compared to those with no childbirth (21.3% vs 4.1%; p<0.001).

**Table 2 (Insert)**

**Table 2: The background characteristics of women of reproductive age in Nigeria**

Variables	No childbirth experience N=7933	At least a childbirth experience N=18602	Total N=26535	p-value
	n(% column)	n(% column)	n(% column)	
<b>Demographic</b>				
<b>Age (year)</b>				
Mean (SD)	20.3(6.2)	32.8(8.6)	29.1(9.8)	<0.001
<b>Age group (years)</b>				
15-19	4789(60.4%)	742(4.0%)	5531(20.8%)	<0.001
20-24	1700(21.4%)	2705(14.5%)	4405(16.6%)	
25-29	760(9.6%)	3690(19.8%)	3690(19.8%)	
30-34	318(4.0%)	3343(18.0%)	3343(18.0%)	
35-39	177(2.2%)	3129(16.8%)	3129(16.8%)	
40-44	105(1.3%)	2550(13.7%)	2550(13.7%)	
45-49	84(1.1%)	2443(13.1%)	2443(13.1%)	
<b>Region</b>				
North Central	1537(19.4%)	3412(18.3%)	4949(18.7%)	<0.001
North East	1274(16.1%)	3740(20.1%)	5014(18.9%)	
North West	1588(20.0%)	5115(27.5%)	6703(27.5%)	
South East	1359(17.1%)	2073(11.1%)	2073(11.1%)	
South South	1011(12.7%)	2074(11.2%)	2074(11.2%)	
South West	1164(14.7%)	2188(11.8%)	2188(11.7%)	
<b>Place of residence</b>				
Urban	3885(49.0%)	6745(36.3%)	10630(40.1%)	<0.001
Rural	4048(51.0%)	11857(63.7%)	15905(59.9%)	
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Fulani	372(4.7%)	1586(8.5%)	1958(7.4%)	<0.001
Hausa	1674(21.1%)	5411(29.1%)	7085(26.7%)	
Igbo	1649(20.8%)	2525(13.6%)	4174(15.7%)	
Yoruba	1140(14.4%)	2133(11.5%)	3273(12.3%)	
Others ethnic minorities	3098(39.1%)	6947(37.3%)	10045(37.8%)	

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  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<b>Religion</b>				<0.001
Catholic	1042(13.1%)	1747(9.4%)	2789(10.5%)	
Other Christians	3507(44.2%)	6417(34.5%)	9924(37.4%)	
Islam	3336(42.1%)	10275(55.2%)	1361151.3%)	
Traditional	23(0.3%)	73(0.4%)	96(0.4%)	
Others	25(0.3%)	90(0.5%)	115(0.4%)	
<b>Highest education level</b>				<0.001
No education	1290(16.2%)	8127(43.7%)	9417(35.5%)	
Primary	698(8.8%)	3271(17.6%)	3969(15.0%)	
Secondary	4758(60.0%)	5600(30.1%)	10358(39.0%)	
Higher	1187(15.0%)	1604(8.6%)	2791(10.5%)	
<b>Occupation</b>				<0.001
Not currently working	4272(53.8%)	5225(28.1%)	9497(35.8%)	
Working	3661(46.2%)	13377(71.9%)	17038(64.2%)	
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>				<0.001
Poorest	968(12.2%)	4150(22.3%)	5118(19.3%)	
Poorer	1297(16.4%)	4104(22.1%)	5401(20.4%)	
Middle	1640(20.7%)	3838(20.6%)	5478(20.6%)	
Richer	1957(24.7%)	3542(19.4%)	5499(20.7%)	
Richest	2071(26.1%)	2968(16.0%)	5039(19.0%)	
<b>Access to information</b>				
<b>Frequency of reading newspaper or magazine</b>				<0.001
Not at all	6158(77.6%)	16409(88.2%)	22567(85.1%)	
Less than once a week	1197(15.1%)	1528(8.2%)	2725(10.3%)	
At least once a week	578(7.3%)	665(3.6%)	1243(4.7%)	
<b>Frequency of listening to radio</b>				<0.001
Not at all	3438(43.3%)	8822(47.4%)	12260(46.2%)	
Less than once a week	2188(27.6%)	4629(24.9%)	6817(25.7%)	
At least once a week	2307(29.1%)	5151(27.7%)	7458(28.1%)	
<b>Frequency of watching TV</b>				<0.001
Not at all	3059(38.5%)	10391(55.9%)	13450(50.7%)	
Less than once a week	1776(22.4%)	3405(18.3%)	5181(19.5%)	
At least once a week	3098(39.1%)	4806(25.8%)	7904(29.8%)	
<b>Owns a mobile phone</b>				0.032
No	3617(45.6%)	8749(47.0%)	12366(46.6%)	
Yes	4316(54.4%)	9853(53.0%)	14169(53.4%)	
<b>Use of Internet</b>				<0.001
Never	5724(72.1%)	16763(90.1%)	22487(84.74%)	
In the last 12 months	2045(25.8%)	1614(8.7%)	3659(13.8%)	
Before last 12 months	164(2.1%)	225(1.2%)	225(1.2%)	
<b>Current use of contraceptive method</b>				<0.001
No method	7412(93.4%)	15778(84.8%)	23190(87.4%)	
Folkloric method	7(0.1%)	90(0.5%)	97(0.4%)	
Traditional method	104(1.3%)	597(3.2%)	701(2.6%)	
Modern method	410(5.2%)	2137(11.5%)	2547(9.6%)	
<b>Reproductive/Sexual history</b>				
<b>Currently pregnant</b>				<0.001

No or unsure	7454(94.0%)	16477(88.6%)	23931(90.2%)	
Yes	479(6.0%)	2125(11.4%)	2604(9.8%)	
<b>Ever had a terminated pregnancy</b>				<0.001
No	7652(96.5%)	15939(85.7%)	23591(88.9%)	
Yes	281(3.5%)	2663(14.3%)	2944(11.1%)	
<b>Age at first sex</b>				<0.001
Not had sex	4481(56.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4481(16.9%)	
<15years	323(4.1%)	3961(21.3%)	4284(16.2%)	
15-17years	1399(17.6%)	8375(45.1%)	9774(36.9%)	
18-25years	1630(20.5%)	5963(32.1%)	7593(28.6%)	
>25years	100(1.3%)	280(1.5%)	380(1.4%)	

**Statistically significant variables at  $p < 0.05$  are shown in bold**

The overall prevalence of awareness of vaginal fistula among the participants was 52.0% (13,066/26,535) (Table 3). There was a linear trend between the prevalence of awareness of fistula and age group of participants. The prevalence of awareness of fistula was highest among women aged 45-49 years (55.8%) compared to other age groups. Generally, the prevalence of awareness of fistula was higher in the northern regions than the southern regions (Figure 1). Women living in the Northwest had the highest proportion of those that had ever heard of fistula (80.2%). Participants from rural communities (59.0%) had higher proportion of awareness of fistula than those from urban communities (43.4%). There were more women that had heard of fistula among Muslims (64.5%) than other religious groups. The prevalence of awareness of fistula was highest among women with no formal education (67.7%) followed by those with tertiary education (54.0%). The awareness of fistula was highest among women in the poorest wealth quintiles and lowest among those in the richer wealth quintiles (41.9%). Women who read newspaper at least once a week (53.5%), never listened to radio (55.2%), never watched television (61.4%), never owned a mobile phone (57.5%) and never used internet (53.5%) had the highest proportions of those that had ever heard of fistula. The awareness of fistula was



1  
2  
3 highest among women with history of termination of pregnancy (61.8%), currently pregnant  
4  
5 (60.5%), had a previous childbirth (56.6%), and never used a contraceptive method (53.7%).  
6  
7

8 In the unadjusted analyses (table 3), the odds of ever heard of fistula by participants was  
9  
10 associated with demographic factors. Specifically, the odds of awareness of fistula was higher  
11  
12 among women aged 20-24 years and above compared to those whose age was 15-19 years.  
13  
14

15 Women living in the Northeast and Northwest had higher odds of ever reporting to have had  
16  
17 heard of fistula than those from Northcentral region. However, women in all the three Southern  
18  
19 regions of Nigeria had lower odds of awareness of fistula relative to those in the Northern region.  
20  
21

22 The odds of being aware of fistula was 1.87 times (95% CI, 1.68-2.09) among women living in the  
23  
24 rural communities compared to those in the urban communities. There was a higher odd of  
25  
26 awareness of fistula among participants from Islamic religion (OR=2.85; 95% CI, 2.42-3.37)  
27  
28 compared to those from Catholic faith group. However, participants who professed traditional  
29  
30 and other religions had lower odds of being aware of fistula relative to those from Catholic faith  
31  
32 group. The odds of awareness of fistula was lower among the participants that had primary,  
33  
34 secondary and tertiary education compared to those with no formal education. There was an  
35  
36 inverse relationship between the odds of reporting awareness of fistula and wealth quintiles of  
37  
38 participants. For example, women from richer (OR=0.37; 95%CI, 0.27-0.41) and richest (OR=0.37;  
39  
40 95%CI, 0.31-0.44) wealth quintiles had the lowest odds of being aware of fistula compared to  
41  
42 those with no education.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 The odds of ever heard of fistula by the participants was associated with access to information  
50  
51 factors: Generally, there was an inverse relationship between the odds of ever being aware of  
52  
53 fistula and the frequency of reading newspaper/magazine, listening to radio, watching television,  
54  
55  
56  
57

frequency of using internet and ownership of mobile phone. For example, women who reported reading newspaper at least once a week (OR=0.64; 95%CI, 0.57-0.83) were associated with lower odds of being aware of fistula compared to those that had never read newspaper. Concerning the reproductive/sexual history factors, women that had a child were associated with 1.87 (95%CI, 1.73-2.02) odds of been aware of fistula relative to those with no previous childbirth. Higher odds of ever heard of fistula was associated being currently pregnant (OR=1.47; 95%CI, 1.33-1.63) and history of ever terminated pregnancy (OR=1.57, 95%CI, 1.42-1.75) relative to those who were not currently pregnant and never terminated pregnancy, respectively. Women that reported having used any form of contraception were associated with the lower odds of ever been aware of fistula compared to those with those with no history of contraceptive use.

**Table 3 (Insert)**

**Table 3: Prevalence and bivariate analysis between explanatory variables and ever heard of fistula among women of reproductive age**

Variable	Ever heard of fistula		
	Prevalence (%)	Crude OR (95%CI)	p value
<b>Demographic</b>			
<b>Age group (years)</b>			
15-19	41.5	Reference	
20-24	53.8	1.64(1.49-1.81)	<0.001
25-29	55.5	1.76(1.60-1.93)	<0.001
30-34	54.5	1.69(1.52-1.88)	<0.001
35-39	55.1	1.73(1.54-1.94)	<0.001
40-44	54.1	1.66(1.48-1.86)	<0.001
45-49	55.8	1.78(1.59-1.99)	<0.001
<b>Region</b>			
North Central	46.6	Reference	
North East	61.3	1.81(1.56-2.12)	<0.001
North West	80.6	4.76(4.06-5.59)	<0.001
South East	27.8	0.44(0.37-0.53)	<0.001
South South	35.9	0.64(0.55-0.76)	<0.001
South West	22.2	0.33(0.28-0.39)	<0.001
<b>Place of residence</b>			
Urban	43.4	Reference	

1				
2				
3	Rural	59.0	1.87(1.68-2.09)	<0.001
4				
5				
6	<b>Ethnicity</b>			
7	Fulani	63.7	Reference	
8	Hausa	79.2	2.17(1.71-2.77)	<0.001
9	Igbo	30.1	0.25(0.19-0.31)	<0.001
10	Yoruba	22.5	0.16(0.13-0.21)	<0.001
11	Others ethnic minorities	47.4	0.51(0.41-0.64)	<0.001
12				
13	<b>Religion</b>			
14	Catholic	38.8	Reference	
15	Other Christians	36.7	0.91(0.77-1.07)	0.264
16	Islam	64.5	2.85(2.42-3.37)	<0.001
17	Traditional	29.5	0.66(0.47-0.92)	0.015
18	Others	3.7	0.06(0.02-0.20)	<0.001
19				
20	<b>Highest education level</b>			
21	No education	67.7	Reference	
22	Primary	47.0	0.42(0.54-5.09)	<0.001
23	Secondary	38.6	0.30(0.27-0.33)	<0.001
24	Higher	54.0	0.56(0.48-0.64)	<0.001
25	<b>Currently working</b>			
26	No	52.5	Reference	
27	Yes	51.6	0.97(0.89-1.04)	0.376
28				
29	<b>Wealth quintiles</b>			
30	Poorest	68.4	Reference	
31	Poorer	60.1	0.70(0.60-0.81)	<0.001
32	Middle	48.5	0.44(0.37-0.51)	<0.001
33	Richer	41.9	0.33(0.27-0.41)	<0.001
34	Richest	44.1	0.37(0.31-0.44)	<0.001
35				
36	<b>Access to Information</b>			
37	<b>Frequency of reading newspaper or magazine</b>			
38				
39	Not at all	53.2	Reference	
40	Less than once a week	42.1	0.64(0.57-0.72)	<0.001
41	At least once a week	53.5	1.01(0.87-1.19)	0.875
42	<b>Frequency of listening to radio</b>			
43				
44	Not at all	55.2	Reference	
45	Less than once a week	48.2	0.75(0.68-0.83)	<0.001
46	At least once a week	50.3	0.82(0.75-0.91)	<0.001
47	<b>Frequency of watching TV</b>			
48				
49	Not at all	61.4	Reference	
50	Less than once a week	42.3	0.46(0.41-0.51)	<0.001
51	At least once a week	43.4	0.48(0.42-0.55)	<0.001
52	<b>Own a mobile phone</b>			
53	No	57.5	Reference	
54	Yes	47.4	0.67(0.61-0.72)	<0.001
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

<b>Use of Internet</b>				
Never	53.5	Reference		
In the last 12 months	45.6	0.73(0.65-0.82)	<0.001	
Before last 12 months	37.0	0.51(0.40-0.64)	<0.001	
<b>Reproductive/Sexual history</b>				
<b>Ever had a child</b>				
No	41.1	Reference		
Yes	56.6	1.87(1.73-2.02)	<0.001	
<b>Age at first sex</b>				
Not had sex	39.4	Reference		
<15years	64.1	2.75(2.41-3.15)	<0.001	
15-17years	58.1	2.13(1.90-2.40)	<0.001	
18-25years	45.3	1.28(1.15-1.42)	<0.001	
≥25years	44.1	1.21(0.94-1.56)	0.131	
<b>Currently pregnant</b>				
No or unsure	51.0	Reference		
Yes	60.5	1.47(1.33-1.63)	<0.001	
<b>Ever had a terminated pregnancy</b>				
No	50.7	Reference		
Yes	61.8	1.57(1.42-1.75)	<0.001	
<b>Current use of contraceptive method</b>				
No method	53.7	Reference		
Folkloric method	30.1	0.38(0.16-0.89)	0.026	
Traditional method	31.3	0.39(0.32-0.48)	<0.001	
Modern method	43.7	0.67(0.59-0.75)	<0.001	

*Statistically significant variables at  $p < 0.05$  are shown in bold*

### **Figure 1 (Insert)**

The results of adjusted analyses were presented in the multivariable logistic regression in table 4. The first model included childbirth experience and age of respondents: women who had had a previous childbirth experience had a higher odds (Adjusted odds ratio (AOR)=1.81; 95%CI, 1.63 to 2.01) of awareness of fistula. Only women whose ages were between 20-24 years and 25-29 years had higher odds of reporting having heard of fistula compared to women that were less than 15 to 19 years. The second model adjusted for the reproductive and sexual history, all variables including the model 1 variables (which were kept apriori), were statistically significant

1  
2  
3 except the women whose age at first sex were greater than 25years. The odds of awareness of  
4  
5 fistula was higher among women who had their first sexual exposure at less than 15 years (AOR  
6  
7 1.59; 95%CI, 1.32 - 1.90) and between 15 to 17years (AOR=1.30; 95%CI, 1.11 - 1.52) compared to  
8  
9 those who had no previous sexual exposure. However, a lower odds was observed among women  
10  
11 aged 18-25 years (AOR=0.81; 95%CI, 0.70 - 0.95) compared to women who have never had sex.  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 The third model included the demographic characteristics: women that were living in the  
17  
18 southern part of Nigeria were associated with the lower odds of fistula awareness while women  
19  
20 in the Northwest (AOR=3.56; 95%CI, 2.84 - 4.47) and Northeast (AOR=1.82; 95%CI 1.53 - 2.17)  
21  
22 regions had higher odds compared with women in the Northcentral region. Similarly, women  
23  
24 from the Yoruba (AOR=0.47; 95%CI, 0.35 - 0.64) and Igbo (AOR=0.67; 95%CI, 0.46 -0.98) ethnic  
25  
26 groups have a lower odds of fistula awareness. Women with secondary (AOR=1.24; 95%CI, 1.09  
27  
28 - 1.41) and tertiary education (AOR=2.38; 95%CI, 2.00 - 2.83) had a higher odds of fistula  
29  
30 awareness. However, women from the poorer and middle wealth quintiles had the lower odds  
31  
32 of been aware of fistula compared with women in the poorest wealth quintiles. The variables  
33  
34 related with access to information that were significantly associated with the higher odds of  
35  
36 fistula awareness included: the ownership of a mobile phone (AOR=1.16; 95%CI, 1.05 - 1.27),  
37  
38 report of using the internet in the last 12 months (AOR=1.57; 95%CI, 1.33 - 1.86) and the history  
39  
40 of reading newspaper or magazine at least once a week (AOR=1.29; 95%CI, 1.07-1.57) and  
41  
42 listening to radio less than once a week (AOR=1.23; 95%CI, 1.09-1.38) relative to women without  
43  
44 the history of these factors.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 **Table 4 (Insert)**  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 4: Multivariable logistic regression models of factors associated with the awareness of fistula among women of reproductive age**

Characteristics	Model 1 OR (95% CI)	Model 2 AOR (95% CI)	Model 3 AOR (95% CI)	Model 4 AOR (95% CI)
<b>Had a childbirth</b>				
Yes(vs No)	<b>1.81(1.63-2.01)</b>	<b>1.45(1.30-1.62)</b>	1.05(0.92-1.20)	<b>1.14(1.01-1.30)</b>
<b>Age(years)</b>				
15-19	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
20-24	<b>1.25(1.12-1.39)</b>	<b>1.38(1.22-1.56)</b>	<b>1.47(1.28-1.69)</b>	<b>1.36(1.18-1.56)</b>
25-29	<b>1.17(1.05-1.31)</b>	<b>1.41(1.24-1.59)</b>	<b>1.64(1.43-1.89)</b>	<b>1.53(1.33-1.76)</b>
30-34	1.08(0.95-1.22)	<b>1.32(1.14-1.53)</b>	<b>1.62(1.37-1.91)</b>	<b>1.54(1.30-1.81)</b>
35-39	1.08(0.94-1.24)	<b>1.37(1.18-1.59)</b>	<b>1.91(1.61-2.26)</b>	<b>1.81(1.53-2.14)</b>
40-44	1.02(0.89-1.17)	<b>1.27(1.09-1.49)</b>	<b>1.80(1.50-2.16)</b>	<b>1.71(1.43-2.06)</b>
45-49	1.09(0.95-1.25)	<b>1.31(1.13-1.51)</b>	<b>2.11(1.78-2.50)</b>	<b>2.04(1.72-2.41)</b>
<b>Age at first sex</b>				
Not had sex		1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
<15years		<b>1.58(1.32-1.90)</b>	<b>1.32(1.09-1.59)</b>	<b>1.27(1.05-1.53)</b>
15-17years		<b>1.30(1.11-1.52)</b>	<b>1.30(1.10-1.53)</b>	<b>1.25(1.06-1.47)</b>
18-25years		<b>0.81(0.70-0.95)</b>	<b>1.19(1.00-1.42)</b>	1.14(0.96-1.35)
≥25years		0.78(0.59-1.03)	1.02(0.74-1.41)	0.95(0.69-1.32)
<b>Currently pregnant</b>				
Yes (vs No)		<b>1.18(1.07-1.30)</b>	1.02(0.92-1.14)	1.04(0.93-1.16)
<b>Had terminated pregnancy</b>				
Yes (vs No)		<b>1.37(1.22-1.52)</b>	<b>1.17(1.05-1.31)</b>	<b>1.17(1.04-1.31)</b>
<b>Use of contraceptive</b>				
No method		1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Only folkoric method		<b>0.30(0.13-0.72)</b>	0.58(0.30-1.11)	0.58(0.31-2.20)
Only traditional method		<b>0.40(0.32-0.50)</b>	<b>0.73(0.58-0.91)</b>	<b>0.70(0.56-0.88)</b>
Modern method		<b>0.64(0.57-0.73)</b>	<b>0.83(0.73-0.94)</b>	<b>0.81(0.71-0.92)</b>
<b>Region</b>				
North Central			1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
North East			<b>1.82(1.53-2.17)</b>	<b>1.84(1.55-2.20)</b>
North West			<b>3.56(2.84-4.47)</b>	<b>3.57(2.85-4.48)</b>
South East			<b>0.45(0.33-0.61)</b>	<b>0.42(0.31-0.58)</b>
South South			<b>0.56(0.47-0.67)</b>	<b>0.53(0.44-0.63)</b>
South West			<b>0.40(0.32-0.49)</b>	<b>0.37(0.30-0.45)</b>
<b>Place of residence</b>				
Rural (vs Urban)			1.08(0.94-1.23)	1.11(0.97-1.27)
<b>Educational status</b>				
No education			1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Primary			1.03(0.90-1.18)	1.02(0.89-1.18)
Secondary			<b>1.24(1.09-1.41)</b>	<b>1.14(1.00-1.30)</b>
Higher			<b>2.38(2.00-2.83)</b>	<b>1.74(1.45-2.08)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Fulani			1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Hausa			<b>1.66(1.33-2.09)</b>	<b>1.67(1.33-2.09)</b>

1			
2			
3	Igbo	<b>0.67(0.46-0.98)</b>	<b>0.67(0.46-0.97)</b>
4	Yoruba	<b>0.47(0.35-0.64)</b>	<b>0.47(0.34-0.64)</b>
5	Others	0.83(0.64-1.06)	0.84(0.65-1.08)
6	<b>Religion</b>		
7	Catholic	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
8	Other Christian	<b>0.82(0.70-0.95)</b>	<b>0.83(0.71-0.97)</b>
9	Islam	<b>0.77(0.63-0.95)</b>	<b>0.78(0.63-0.96)</b>
10	Traditionalist	<b>0.22(0.12-0.43)</b>	<b>0.24(0.12-0.46)</b>
11	Others	<b>0.05(0.02-0.18)</b>	<b>0.05(0.01-0.16)</b>
12	<b>Currently working</b>		
13	Yes (vs No)	<b>1.39(1.26-1.54)</b>	<b>1.35(1.22-1.49)</b>
14	<b>Wealth quintiles</b>		
15	Poorest	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
16	Poorer	<b>0.82(0.71-0.95)</b>	<b>0.81(0.70-0.93)</b>
17	Middle	<b>0.79(0.67-0.95)</b>	<b>0.76(0.63-0.91)</b>
18	Richer	0.89(0.74-1.06)	<b>0.80(0.66-0.96)</b>
19	Richest	1.22(0.99-1.49)	0.99(0.80-1.22)
20	<b>Read newspaper or magazine</b>		
21	Not at all		1.0 (Reference)
22	Less than once a week		0.93(0.82-1.06)
23	At least once a week		<b>1.29(1.07-1.57)</b>
24	<b>Listen to radio</b>		
25	Not at all		1.0 (Reference)
26	Less than once a week		<b>1.23(1.09-1.38)</b>
27	At least once a week		<b>1.23(1.10-1.38)</b>
28	<b>Watch TV</b>		
29	Not at all		1.0 (Reference)
30	Less than once a week		0.92(0.81-1.04)
31	At least once a week		1.05(0.91-1.22)
32	<b>Own a mobile phone</b>		
33	Yes (vs No)		<b>1.16(1.05-1.27)</b>
34	<b>Use of Internet</b>		
35	Never		1.0 (Reference)
36	Last 12 months		<b>1.57(1.33-1.86)</b>
37	before last 12 months		1.01(0.78-1.30)

**Statistically significant variables at  $p < 0.05$  are shown in bold**

## DISCUSSION

This study is probably the first largest nationally representative sample of women in SSA that investigated the level of awareness of vaginal fistula among women of reproductive age. The finding showed that only about half (52%) of Nigerian women interviewed had ever heard of

1  
2  
3 vaginal fistula. There was a high fistula awareness among young adults and those with previous  
4  
5  
6 childbirth experience. In addition, participants living in the North and rural communities had  
7  
8 higher prevalence of awareness of fistula than women in the Southern region and urban settings  
9  
10 in Nigeria. The awareness of vaginal fistula was associated with childbirth experience, 20-24 years  
11  
12 and above, reported age at first sexual intercourse of up to 17 years, history of ever terminated  
13  
14 a pregnancy, use of modern or traditional contraception, place of residence, having at least  
15  
16 secondary education, ethnicity, wealth quintile and access to the source of information  
17  
18 dissemination (radio, television and newspaper or magazine). The association between childbirth  
19  
20 and vaginal fistula awareness strengthens the role of antenatal care education, counseling and  
21  
22 health promotion in the prevention and prompt of obstructed labour and vaginal treatment.  
23  
24 Other sources of information dissemination will be useful in educating other groups of women  
25  
26 especially the adolescents on positive reproductive health information and behaviours.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Although the awareness level about vaginal fistula in this study has increased compared to the  
35  
36 2008 NDHS report of 30.7%, it is still a source of concern, particularly, among young population  
37  
38 relative to older adults in Nigeria<sup>9</sup>. The observed modest increase in the prevalence of vaginal  
39  
40 fistula awareness in the 2018 NDHS might be due to the increased priority and investment in  
41  
42 obstetric fistula prevention and treatment by the Government of Nigeria and development  
43  
44 partners in the last decade <sup>18</sup>. Vaginal fistula is more common among young people, who are  
45  
46 usually at risk of obstructed labour due to inadequate pelvis. Pregnant adolescents often have  
47  
48 difficulties in accessing timely obstetric emergency services should they develop obstructed  
49  
50 labour. The reported prevalence of awareness of fistula from previous studies were mixed,  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 majority were in the range of 20-46% while a few others reported a higher figure than 52% found  
4  
5 in this study. For example, two studies in Northern Ghana among 390 prenatal women (18-49  
6  
7 years) and 1982 (17-60 years) women in the community found that the awareness of fistula was  
8  
9 28.8% and 45.8%, respectively <sup>12,19</sup>. However, a study (2010) in Mtwara region of Tanzania  
10  
11 showed that 61.1% out of 334 women aged 18-49 years were aware of vaginal fistula <sup>15</sup>. Higher  
12  
13 prevalence (81%) of fistula awareness was recorded in an Eritrean study after the  
14  
15 implementation of health education and community mobilization programme among women;  
16  
17 this study however, included those living with fistula<sup>20</sup>.

22  
23 Some of the risk factors associated with awareness of vaginal fistula in this study had been  
24  
25 previously reported elsewhere<sup>13,21</sup>. Expectedly, high awareness level of vaginal fistula which was  
26  
27 found to be significantly associated with education status, age older than 20 years, wealth  
28  
29 quintiles and access to information dissemination platforms in this study, had also been  
30  
31 previously reported<sup>11-14,19</sup>. The high awareness level among women in the Northern region  
32  
33 relative to the southern part of Nigeria and Hausa/Fulani than other ethnic groups could be due  
34  
35 to the high burden of vaginal fistula and information diffusion from the high concentration of  
36  
37 interventions on obstetric fistula in North and among Hausa/Fulanis. Surprisingly, women living  
38  
39 in the rural communities were more likely to be aware of vaginal fistula compared to those in  
40  
41 urban setting. This observation is against the general belief that were often associated with  
42  
43 better healthcare awareness among people in the urban setting. It is plausible that women living  
44  
45 in rural setting might have experienced more cases of childbirth related complications including  
46  
47 obstetric fistula than those in urban setting.

1  
2  
3 The level of awareness of vaginal fistula might not necessarily translates to adequate knowledge  
4 that can help women to make appropriate decision on the prevention and access to care. There  
5  
6 are some studies that had reported significant proportion of misconceptions on the causes or risk  
7  
8 factors for vaginal fistula even among those that claimed to be aware of fistula<sup>13,21,22</sup>. In a  
9  
10 qualitative study in Malawi, Changole et al interviewed women who were said to be aware of  
11  
12 vaginal fistula on probable causes<sup>21</sup>. The authors reported that majority of these women  
13  
14 associated vaginal fistula with sexually transmitted infection, witchcraft, husband's infidelity and  
15  
16 laziness to push during labour<sup>21</sup>. There were two other qualitative studies from Ethiopia that also  
17  
18 showed that women including those suffering from incontinence had misconception on the  
19  
20 probable risk factors for vaginal fistula<sup>22,23</sup>.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Another limitation of the data on awareness is the inability to disaggregate the information on  
29  
30 the subtle differences between urinary and feecal incontinence because the question was not  
31  
32 asked separately. Other limitations include the use of secondary data and lack of information  
33  
34 that may help to describe causes or risk factors of vaginal fistula.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 It would be beneficial if other useful information to assess the knowledge of women on urinary  
41  
42 and feecal incontinence is collected during the 2018 NDHS survey. It is difficult to appreciate the  
43  
44 impact of awareness level of vaginal fistula from the 2018 Nigerian NDHS data because of lack of  
45  
46 other necessary information. For example, there are no questions on the sources of information  
47  
48 and causes or risk factors as well the preventive methods of vaginal fistula. It is imperative that  
49  
50 future national survey consider some of the following questions with response options for  
51  
52 participant to select: *Where did you first learn or hear about involuntary leakage of urine or stool*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *after childbirth in a woman?; What did you think is/are responsible for the involuntary leakage*  
4 *of urine or stool after childbirth in a woman?; and what are the ways of preventing the occurrence*  
5 *of involuntary leakage of urine or stool after childbirth in a woman?.* We believe that these  
6 suggested questions will add to the quality of information that will be collected to profile the  
7 public knowledge on vaginal fistula. This information will better guide the policy makers,  
8 programme planners and experts, to design a well-informed strategy for the control of vaginal  
9 fistula in the country.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 In conclusion, the study showed that a large number of women, particularly, young women with  
22 no childbirth experience and from the Southern region of Nigeria had low level of awareness of  
23 vaginal fistula. It is recommended that more public health awareness on vaginal fistula should be  
24 incorporated in reproductive health messages, especially among women of reproductive age. We  
25 also advocate that other critical questions should be included in the future national survey to  
26 help policy makers and programme planner better execute public health intervention for the  
27 control of vaginal fistula that is still ravaging Nigeria.

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 ***Figure 1: Prevalence of Vaginal fistula awareness by states among women of reproductive age***

#### 40 41 42 **Acknowledgement**

43  
44  
45 We are grateful to DHS Program for providing access to the data.

#### 46 47 48 **Contributions**

49  
50  
51 (I) Conception and design: Morhason-Bello IO and Yusuf Kareem (II) Data analysis: Yusuf Kareem  
52 and Imran Morhason-Bello (III) Spatial Data Analysis: Linda Abegunde; (IV) Data interpretation:  
53  
54

1  
2  
3 Imran Morhason-Bello, Yusuf Kareem, Rukiyat Abdus-Salam, Oluwasomidoyin Bello, Olatunji  
4  
5 Lawal, Fatimah Akinlusi, Linda Abegunde and Oladosu Ojengbede; (V) Manuscript writing: All  
6  
7 authors; (VI) Final approval of manuscript: All authors.  
8  
9

### 10 11 **Funding**

12  
13  
14 This research received no grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-  
15  
16 profit sectors  
17  
18

### 19 20 **Competing interests**

21  
22  
23 The authors declared no competing interest  
24  
25

### 26 27 **Ethics approval**

28  
29 Ethical approval is not needed, the study used secondary data from the Nigeria Demography  
30  
31 Health Surveys (DHS). The DHS program maintain strict standards for protecting the privacy of  
32  
33 respondents and the survey survey protocols are reviewed by the ICF and Institutional Review  
34  
35 Board (IRB) in each country to ensure that the survey complies with the regulations for the  
36  
37 protection of human subjects.  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 43 **Data sharing statement**

44  
45 No additional data are available.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


## REFERENCES

1. Lufumpa E, Doos L, Lindenmeyer A. Barriers and facilitators to preventive interventions for the development of obstetric fistulas among women in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2018; **18**(1): 155.
2. Thaddeus S, Maine D. Too far to walk: maternal mortality in context. *News/ Womens Glob Netw Reprod Rights* 1991; (36): 22-4.
3. MacDonald T, Jackson S, Charles M-C, et al. The fourth delay and community-driven solutions to reduce maternal mortality in rural Haiti: a community-based action research study. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2018; **18**(1): 254.
4. Swain D, Parida SP, Jena SK, Das M, Das H. Obstetric fistula: A challenge to public health. *Indian J Public Health* 2019; **63**(1): 73-8.
5. El-Azab AS, Abolella HA, Farouk M. Update on vesicovaginal fistula: A systematic review. *Arab J Urol* 2019; **17**(1): 61-8.
6. Tuncalp O, Tripathi V, Landry E, Stanton CK, Ahmed S. Measuring the incidence and prevalence of obstetric fistula: approaches, needs and recommendations. *Bull World Health Organ* 2015; **93**(1): 60-2.
7. Stanton C, Holtz SA, Ahmed S. Challenges in measuring obstetric fistula. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2007; **99 Suppl 1**: S4-9.
8. Jokhio AH, Rizvi RM, Rizvi J, MacArthur C. Prevalence of obstetric fistula: a population-based study in rural Pakistan. *Bjog* 2014; **121**(8): 1039-46.
9. National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ICF. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2008. Abuja, Nigeria, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NPC and ICF. . 2009.
10. Wall LL. Obstetric vesicovaginal fistula as an international public-health problem. *Lancet* 2006; **368**(9542): 1201-9.
11. Basheer SA, Pumpaibool, T. . Knowledge, attitude and maternal health care utilization among married women of reproductive age towards vesicovaginal fistula in Kebbi state, Nigeria. *J Health Res* 2015; **29**(2): 93-100.
12. Azanu WK, Dassah ET, Agbeno EK, Ofori AA, Opare-Addo HS. Knowledge of obstetric fistula among prenatal clinic attendees and midwives in Mfantiman municipality, Ghana. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2020; **148 Suppl 1**: 16-21.
13. Kasamba N, Kaye DK, Mbalinda SN. Community awareness about risk factors, presentation and prevention and obstetric fistula in Nabitovu village, Iganga district, Uganda. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2013; **13**: 229.
14. Banke-Thomas AO, Kouraogo SF, Siribie A, Taddese HB, Mueller JE. Knowledge of obstetric fistula prevention amongst young women in urban and rural Burkina Faso: a cross-sectional study. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**(12): e85921.
15. Kazaura MR, Kamazima RS, Mangi EJ. Perceived causes of obstetric fistulae from rural southern Tanzania. *Afr Health Sci* 2011; **11**(3): 377-82.
16. National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ICF. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2018. Abuja, Nigeria, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NPC and ICF. 2019.
17. Joshi H. Multicollinearity Diagnostic in Statistical Modelling and Remedies to deal with it using SAS. *Pharm Users Softw Exch* 2012; **1**: 1-34.
18. Amodu OC, Salami BO, Richter MS. Obstetric fistula policy in Nigeria: a critical discourse analysis. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2018; **18**(1): 269.

- 1  
2  
3 19. Saeed M, Alhassan, A., Opare-Asamoah, K., Kuubiere, C. . A survey on obstetric fistula awareness  
4 in Northern Ghana. *Eur J Exp Biol* 2014; **4**: 178-82.  
5 20. Johnson KA, Turan JM, Hailemariam L, Mengsteab E, Jena D, Polan ML. The role of counseling for  
6 obstetric fistula patients: lessons learned from Eritrea. *Patient Educ Couns* 2010; **80**(2): 262-5.  
7 21. Changole J, Kafulafula U, Sundby J, Thorsen V. Community perceptions of obstetric fistula in  
8 Malawi. *Cult Health Sex* 2019; **21**(5): 605-17.  
9 22. Animut M, Mamo A, Abebe L, Berhe MA, Asfaw S, Birhanu Z. "The sun keeps rising but darkness  
10 surrounds us": a qualitative exploration of the lived experiences of women with obstetric fistula in  
11 Ethiopia. *BMC Womens Health* 2019; **19**(1): 37.  
12 23. Gebresilase YT. A qualitative study of the experience of obstetric fistula survivors in Addis Ababa,  
13 Ethiopia. *Int J Womens Health* 2014; **6**: 1033-43.  
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  
60

For peer review only

Figure 1: Prevalence of Vaginal fistula awareness by states among women of reproductive age



only



**Box 1: Fistula Module questions asked in the 2018 NDHS data**

S/N	Questions	Denominator
1.	Sometimes a woman can have a problem of constant leakage of urine or stool from her vagina during the day and night. This problem usually occurs after a difficult childbirth but may also occur after a sexual assault or after pelvic surgery. Have you ever experienced a constant leakage of urine or stool from your vagina during the day and night?	No=26535 Yes=50 N=26585
2.	<b>Have you ever heard of this problem?</b>	Yes=13469 No=13066 N=26535
3.	Did this problem start after you delivered a baby or had a stillbirth	50
4.	Did this problem start after a normal labor and delivery, or after a very difficult labor and delivery?	40
5.	What do you think caused this problem?	10
6.	How many days after (cause of problem from 3 or 5) did this leakage start?	45
7.	How old were you when you experienced this problem?	50
8.	Have you sought treatment for this condition?	50
9.	Why have you not sought treatment?	Nil
10.	From whom did you last seek treatment?	41
11.	Did you have an operation to fix the problem?	41
12.	Did the treatment stop the leakage completely? IF NO: did the treatment reduce the leakage?	41
13.	Are there any (other) women in your household who suffer from obstetric fistula?	Nil
14.	How many (other) women in your household suffer from obstetric fistula?	No observation

**Questions 1, 3-14** were answered by participants that had experienced vaginal fistula; **Question 2** was answered by all women



## Adapted checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies (STROBE)

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	5
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6-7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	5-7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6-7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	6-7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	

Continued on next page

<b>Results</b>			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	8-11
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	19-20 19-20
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	21
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	23
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	21-22
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	24
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	25

# BMJ Open

## Factors associated with the awareness of vaginal fistula among women of reproductive age: Findings from the 2018 Nigerian Demographic Health Cross-sectional Survey

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040078.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Aug-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Morhason-Bello, Imran; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences Kareem, Yusuf; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Institute of Advanced Medical Research and Training Abdus-Salam, Rukiyat; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences Bello, Oluwasomidoyin; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences Lawal, Olatunji; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences Akinlusi, Fatimat; Lagos State University College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Abegunde, Linda; Obafemi Awolowo University, Cooperative Information Network (COPINE), National Space Research and Development Agency Ojengbede, Oladosu; University of Ibadan College of Medicine, Centre for Population and Reproductive Health
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Global health, Public health
Keywords:	OBSTETRICS, Urinary tract infections < UROLOGY, Urinary incontinences < UROLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



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 [licence](#).

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 [Creative Commons](#) 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.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **Factors associated with the awareness of vaginal fistula among women of reproductive age:**  
6 **Findings from the 2018 Nigerian Demographic Health Cross-sectional Survey**  
7  
8  
9

10 Imran O. Morhason-Bello<sup>1,2,5,6</sup>, Yusuf Olushola Kareem<sup>2</sup>, Rukiyat A. Abdus-Salam<sup>1</sup>,  
11 Oluwasomidoyin O. Bello<sup>1</sup>, Olatunji O. Lawal<sup>1</sup>, Fatimat Motunrayo Akinlusi<sup>3</sup>, Linda O.  
12 Abegunde<sup>4</sup>, Oladosu O. Ojengbede<sup>5</sup>  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 **Affiliations:**  
18

- 19 1. Female Pelvic Medicine and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Obstetrics and  
20 Gynaecology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, University College Hospital/University of Ibadan,  
21 Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria  
22  
23 2. Institute of Advanced Medical Research and Training, College of Medicine, University of  
24 Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria  
25  
26 3. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Lagos State University College of Medicine/ Lagos  
27 State University Teaching Hospital, Lagos  
28  
29 4. Cooperative Information Network (COPINE), National Space Research and Development  
30 Agency, OAU Campus, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria  
31  
32 5. Centre for Population and Reproductive Health, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan, Oyo  
33 State Nigeria  
34  
35 6. Corresponding author – [imranmorhasonbello@gmail.com](mailto:imranmorhasonbello@gmail.com)  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**ABSTRACT**

**Introduction:** Involuntary leakage of urine and or stool per vaginam (vaginal fistula) after childbirth remains a public health challenge in Africa and Southeast Asia. To our knowledge, there is no previous national data that examined the awareness of vaginal fistula among women in Nigeria.

**Aim:** To determine the prevalence of awareness of urinary/faecal incontinence due to vaginal fistula, and the associated risk factors among women with no previous experience of incontinence.

**Methods:** We used a cross-sectional study, the 2018 NDHS, to analyse awareness of vaginal fistula among women with no previous leakage of urine or stool. The primary outcome was childbirth experience, and other variables were demographics, access to information and reproductive or sexual history. The descriptive, univariate and multivariable models were presented.

**Results:** Of 26,585 women interviewed, 50 (0.2%) who had experienced fistula were excluded from the risk factor analysis. The mean age of women with childbirth experience was 32.8±8.6 years while that of women without childbirth experience was 20.3±6.2 years. The prevalence of vaginal fistula awareness was 52.0%. Factors associated with the awareness include: childbirth experience (Adjusted odds ratio (AOR)=1.14; 95% CI, 1.01 – 1.30); age of 20-24 years (AOR=1.36; 95%CI, 1.18 – 1.56) and older; currently working (AOR=1.35; 95%CI, 1.22 – 1.49); ownership of a mobile phone (AOR=1.16; 95%CI, 1.05-1.27). Other associated factors include: having at least secondary education; wealth quintiles, ethnicity, regional location, religion, access to radio, newspaper and internet; age up to 17 years at first sex; history of previous termination of pregnancy and use of contraception.

**Conclusion:** A significant number of young women with no childbirth experience had low level of awareness. We recommend vaginal fistula awareness programs that will target women at risk of vaginal fistula and the inclusion of other useful questions to improve the quality of information in future surveys.

**Keyword(s):** Vaginal fistula, awareness, urine or faecal incontinence, women, NDHS, Nigeria

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- The study used a nationally representative large dataset of 26535 women of reproductive age (15-49years) to investigate factors associated with the awareness of fistula. It is possibly the largest data set analysed.
- This study provided an insight into the level of awareness of vaginal fistula, particularly, among women within the age range of highest risk.
- Given that the DHS has thankfully included relevant questions on awareness of incontinence of urine and stool in its data set, we identified that some useful information that could help to better under the context of awareness or knowledge are missing.
- This analysis relied on a secondary data with the possible attendant challenges of such data.
- The number of women who had experienced vaginal fistula were small (N=50) and do not allow for rigorous statistical approach except for descriptive summaries

### INTRODUCTION

Urinary or fecal incontinence among women is a devastating medical morbidity that is mostly caused by prolonged obstructed labour<sup>1</sup>. The delay in relieving the obstructed labour is usually due to lack of access to essential maternity services<sup>1</sup>. According to Thaddeus and Maine (1991), the three delay models used to describe obstetric obstacles leading to maternal death are: (i) delay in decision to seek appropriate medical help for an obstetric emergency; (ii) delay in reaching an appropriate obstetric facility; and (iii) delay in receiving adequate care at the facility. Indeed, Thaddeus and Maine identified recognition of danger signs as the initial step to accessing health care by women with obstetric complication, it was not established as a definite phase in the model until recently when the delay models were modified and recategorized into four levels

1  
2  
3 2. The new addition was delay in identifying the warning sign as the first level. These delays also  
4  
5 contribute to the occurrence of severe morbidities including vaginal fistula – leading to urinary  
6  
7 or feecal incontinence <sup>3</sup>. Aside neglected labour, vaginal fistula could also occur from  
8  
9 complications of gynaecological surgeries, caesarean sections, obstetric procedures,  
10  
11 radiotherapy, gynaecological cancer and sexual assault<sup>4,5</sup>.  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 Although the exact global estimates of urinary (vesico-vaginal fistula) and or feecal (recto-vaginal  
17  
18 fistula) incontinence burden is unknown, estimates by the World Health Organisation (WHO)  
19  
20 showed that more than two million women are currently living with the disorder and between  
21  
22 80,000 to 100,000 new cases are detected every year, largely in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and  
23  
24 Southeast Asia<sup>6-8</sup>. Nigeria and Ethiopia have the highest burden of obstetric fistula in SSA<sup>6</sup>.  
25  
26 According to the 2008 Nigerian Demographic Health Survey (NDHS), the prevalence of urinary  
27  
28 incontinence was 0.4%, with highest prevalence in the Northern regions compared to the  
29  
30 Southern regions<sup>9</sup>. Evidence abound that the risk of vaginal fistula is common in settings with  
31  
32 lack or inadequate qualitative emergency obstetric care, healthcare manpower challenges and  
33  
34 poor investment in maternity services <sup>1,10</sup>. Beyond the medical factors, socio-cultural issues such  
35  
36 as early marriage, harmful cultural practices like female genital mutilation and unsupervised  
37  
38 childbirth at home; poor policy implementation of girl child education and misconceptions about  
39  
40 childbirth practices are other drivers responsible for the huge burden of obstetric fistula in SSA  
41  
42 and Southeast Asia <sup>1,10</sup>.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Despite the huge burden of obstetric fistula in SSA, studies addressing the awareness of obstetric  
52  
53 fistula among women are limited, particularly in Nigeria<sup>11</sup>. The prevalence of awareness was 20-  
54  
55 61% in Ghana, Uganda, Ethiopia and Tanzania <sup>12-15</sup>. Generally, there are more studies that  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 reported poor awareness level of vaginal fistula compared to those that reported high level of  
4  
5 awareness among women. It is important to evaluate the level of awareness of women who are  
6  
7 at risk of developing involuntary leakage of urine and or faeces, especially, in Nigeria, where the  
8  
9 burden is high. Adequate information on the risk factors associated with vaginal fistula would  
10  
11 help women to take appropriate decision to prevent difficult labour, the commonest cause of  
12  
13 vaginal fistula. Furthermore, findings from this analysis will assist policy makers and public health  
14  
15 programmers to understand the level of awareness of vaginal fistula and the contributory factors.  
16  
17 This study aimed to determine the prevalence of, and the factors that could contribute to the  
18  
19 awareness of vaginal fistula among women of reproductive age in Nigeria.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **METHODS**

### 27 ***Study design and data***

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 The study utilized data from the 2018 NDHS. Nigeria is divided into six geopolitical regions, which  
33  
34 consists of 36 states and a federal capital territory (FCT). Each state and FCT is subdivided into  
35  
36 local government areas (LGAs). The LGAs were further divided into localities to make up census  
37  
38 enumeration areas (EAs). The NDHS adopted a two-stage stratified cluster sampling technique;  
39  
40 the states and FCT were stratified into urban and rural areas. The first stage involved 1400 EAs  
41  
42 that were selected with probability proportional to EA size across the states. While in the second  
43  
44 stage; 30 households were selected in every EAs using equal probability sampling. Further details  
45  
46 of sampling design, method and implementation can be found in the 2018 NDHS report <sup>16</sup>.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 ***Patient and public involvement statement***

1  
2  
3 Participants were not directly involved in the planning of the Nigeria demographic health survey.  
4  
5 Information was disseminated to the general public including the participants as part of the  
6  
7 protocol for a demographic health survey.  
8  
9

## 10 11 **Data management**

### 12 13 *Outcome variables*

14  
15  
16 The data on vaginal fistula were extracted from the women's questionnaire. The fistula module  
17  
18 in the NDHS sought information on the awareness of vagina fistula from all women of  
19  
20 reproductive age 15-49, and information on the knowledge about the cause, health seeking  
21  
22 behaviour including access and effective treatment were sought from only those with a  
23  
24 complaint of fistula. Out of the 14 item questions in the fistula section, the first question asked if  
25  
26 a woman had ever experienced a constant leakage of urine or stool from vagina during the day  
27  
28 or night, which we defined as vaginal fistula (Supplementary Box 1). The fifty women that had  
29  
30 experienced vaginal fistula were excluded from the analysis on vaginal fistula awareness. The  
31  
32 question on ever heard of leakage of urine or stool per vaginam (vaginal fistula) was used as the  
33  
34 primary outcome for this study, and as a measure of level of awareness among participants.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 44 *Explanatory variables*

45  
46 The explanatory variables in this analysis were categorized into 3 groups: demographic; access to  
47  
48 information; and reproductive and sexual history characteristics. The demographic variables  
49  
50 included in the model were: age groups (15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49) years;  
51  
52 region (North Central, North East, North West, South East, South South, South West); place of  
53  
54 residence (urban, rural); ethnicity (Fulani, Hausa, Igbo, Yoruba, other ethnic minorities); religion  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Catholic, other Christians, Muslims, Traditional, others); highest educational level (no education,  
4 primary, secondary, higher) occupation (not currently working, working); and wealth quintiles  
5  
6 (poorer, poor, middle, richer, richest).  
7  
8  
9

10 Information related to access to media included: frequency of reading newspaper or magazine  
11 (not at all, less than once a week, at least once a week); frequency of listening to radio (not at all,  
12 less than once a week, at least once a week); frequency of watching television (not at all, less  
13 than once a week, at least once a week); own a mobile phone (no, yes); and use of internet  
14 (never, in the last 12 months, before last 12 months). Other related access to information were  
15 knowledge and use of family planning: knowledge of contraceptive method (knows no method,  
16 knows only folkloric method, knows only traditional method, knows modern methods); current  
17 use of contraceptive method (no method, folkloric method, traditional method, modern  
18 method); heard family planning on radio last few months (no, yes); heard family planning on  
19 television last few months (no, yes); heard family planning on newspaper and magazine last few  
20 months (no, yes); and heard family planning by text messages on mobile phone last few months  
21 (no, yes).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 The variables that were considered under reproductive and sexual history characteristics  
41 included: childbirth experience (no, yes); currently pregnant (no or unsure, yes), and age at first  
42 sex (not had sex, <15years, 15-17years, 18-25years, >25years).  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 **Data analysis**

48  
49 The main primary response in this analysis was ever had a childbirth experience. The percentage  
50 distribution and a chi-squared test of association on the background characteristics between  
51 women who had no previous childbirth experience and at least a childbirth was presented, since  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 obstetric fistula is associated with childbirth. The mean and standard deviation were presented  
4  
5 for continuous variables or median and interquartile range (IQR) if the Shapiro-Wilk test for  
6  
7 normality has a p-value<0.05. The prevalence of fistula awareness and univariate analysis were  
8  
9 presented. The outcome variable, ever heard of fistula was a binary response (no, yes).

10  
11  
12 Four different logistic regression model were fitted. In the first model we used childbirth  
13  
14 experience and age of women *a priori*. In the second model, we adjusted for other reproductive  
15  
16 and sexual history. In the third model we adjusted for demographic characteristics, and in the  
17  
18 final model we adjusted for variables related to access to information. A pairwise correlation  
19  
20 matrix and variance inflation factor (VIF > 5), were used to investigate collinearity between the  
21  
22 outcome measure and dependent variables<sup>17</sup>. None of the dependent variables was excluded  
23  
24 due to collinearity. Analyses were performed with Stata 15.0 software, at 0.05 level of  
25  
26 significance. We also presented a descriptive summary of women who had previously  
27  
28 experienced fistula. A geospatial visual representation showing the prevalence of fistula  
29  
30 awareness across states in Nigeria was generated using the ArcGIS software (version 10.4).

## 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 **RESULTS**

40  
41 There were 26,585 women who responded to the questions in the fistula module. Only 50 (0.2%)  
42  
43 women reported ever having vaginal fistula and most said it occurred after a difficult delivery  
44  
45 (82.5% [33/40]) and livebirth (70.0% [35/50]). Two (4.0%) of the 50 women with history of  
46  
47 vaginal fistula reported that their fistula was due to sexual assault. The median duration from  
48  
49 the time of injury to leakage of urine or stool was a day with a range of 1.0 to 5.0 days. The  
50  
51 median age of respondents who had experienced vaginal fistula was 16.0 (15.0 to 20.0) years  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(Table 1). Only 41 (82%) out of 50 women had sought treatment for their fistula. Of the 41 treated, 27 (66%) reportedly had surgical repair.

**Table 1 (Insert)**

**Table 1: Characteristics of women (15-49 year) that had experienced Fistula in the 2018 NDHS Data**

Variable	Frequency (%)
<b>Age at onset of vaginal fistula symptom (Median, Q1-Q3)</b>	16(15-20)
<15	12/50(24.0%)
15-19	23/50(46.0%)
20-24	10/50(20.0%)
>24	5/50(10.0%)
<b>Time problem occur</b>	
After the delivery of a live baby	35/50(70.0%)
After a stillbirth	5/50(10.0%)
Neither	10/50(20.0%)
<b>Risk factor for vaginal fistula</b>	
After normal labour/delivery <sup>a</sup>	7/40(17.5%)
After very difficult labour/delivery <sup>a</sup>	33/40(82.5%)
Following sexual assault <sup>b</sup>	2/10(20%)
Others <sup>b</sup>	3/10(30%)
<b>Onset of vaginal fistula<sup>c</sup> (Median, Q1-Q3)</b>	1(1-5)
0	7/45(15.5%)
1-2	20/45(44.4%)
3-4	4/45(9.7%)
5-6	4/45(9.7%)
>=7	10/45(22.2%)
<b>Previous vaginal fistula treatment</b>	
No	9/50(18%)
Yes	41/50(82%)
<b>Cadre of health worker that offered treatment for vaginal fistula<sup>d</sup></b>	
Doctor	34/41(82.9%)
Nurse/midwife	2/41(4.9%)
Community/Village health worker	2/41(4.9%)
Other	3/41(7.3%)
<b>Had had surgical fistula repair<sup>d</sup></b>	
No	14/41(34.2%)
Yes	27/41(65.8%)
<b>Outcome of vaginal fistula repair<sup>d</sup></b>	
Yes, stopped completely	37/41(90.2%)
Not, stopped but reduced	3/41(7.3%)
Not stopped at all	1/41(2.4%)

<sup>a</sup> asked from participants who experienced fistula from delivery complication (n=40)

<sup>b</sup> asked from participants whose fistula experience were not pregnancy related, there were 5 missing responses (n=10)

<sup>c</sup> asked from participants whose fistula experience were from delivery complication or not, there were 5 missing responses (n=45)

<sup>d</sup> ask from participants who sought treatment for fistula (n=41)

The background characteristics of participants that answered the question on vaginal fistula awareness were presented according to their childbirth experience (Table 2). The mean age of women with at least one previous childbirth experience was higher than those with no childbirth experience (32.8±8.6 years vs 20.3±6.2 years; p<0.001). There were significant differences in all the selected demographics, access to information and reproductive/sexual history variables between participants with at least one previous childbirth and those with no childbirth experience (p<0.001). For example, there were more adolescents (15-19years) who had not experienced childbirth compared to those with a previous childbirth experience (60.4% vs 4.0%; p<0.001). On access to information, women that owned a mobile phone were higher among women with no childbirth experience compared to those with previous childbirth (54.4% vs 53.0%; p=0.032). Regarding the reproductive and sexual history, there were more women with previous history of termination of pregnancy among those with previous childbirth relative to women with no childbirth experience (14.3% vs 3.5%; p<0.001).

### **Table 2 (Insert)**

**Table 2: The background characteristics of women of reproductive age in Nigeria**

Variables	No childbirth experience N=7933	At least a childbirth experience N=18602	Total N=26535	p-value
	n(% column)	n(% column)	n(% column)	
<b>Demographic</b>				
<b>Age (year)</b>				
Mean (SD)	20.3(6.2)	32.8(8.6)	29.1(9.8)	<0.001

<b>Age group (years)</b>				<0.001
15-19	4789(60.4%)	742(4.0%)	5531(20.8%)	
20-24	1700(21.4%)	2705(14.5%)	4405(16.6%)	
25-29	760(9.6%)	3690(19.8%)	3690(19.8%)	
30-34	318(4.0%)	3343(18.0%)	3343(18.0%)	
35-39	177(2.2%)	3129(16.8%)	3129(16.8%)	
40-44	105(1.3%)	2550(13.7%)	2550(13.7%)	
45-49	84(1.1%)	2443(13.1%)	2443(13.1%)	
<b>Region</b>				<0.001
North Central	1537(19.4%)	3412(18.3%)	4949(18.7%)	
North East	1274(16.1%)	3740(20.1%)	5014(18.9%)	
North West	1588(20.0%)	5115(27.5%)	6703(27.5%)	
South East	1359(17.1%)	2073(11.1%)	2073(11.1%)	
South South	1011(12.7%)	2074(11.2%)	2074(11.2%)	
South West	1164(14.7%)	2188(11.8%)	2188(11.7%)	
<b>Place of residence</b>				
Urban	3885(49.0%)	6745(36.3%)	10630(40.1%)	
Rural	4048(51.0%)	11857(63.7%)	15905(59.9%)	
<b>Ethnicity</b>				<0.001
Fulani	372(4.7%)	1586(8.5%)	1958(7.4%)	
Hausa	1674(21.1%)	5411(29.1%)	7085(26.7%)	
Igbo	1649(20.8%)	2525(13.6%)	4174(15.7%)	
Yoruba	1140(14.4%)	2133(11.5%)	3273(12.3%)	
Others ethnic minorities	3098(39.1%)	6947(37.3%)	10045(37.8%)	
<b>Religion</b>				<0.001
Catholic	1042(13.1%)	1747(9.4%)	2789(10.5%)	
Other Christians	3507(44.2%)	6417(34.5%)	9924(37.4%)	
Islam	3336(42.1%)	10275(55.2%)	136115(51.3%)	
Traditional	23(0.3%)	73(0.4%)	96(0.4%)	
Others	25(0.3%)	90(0.5%)	115(0.4%)	
<b>Highest education level</b>				<0.001
No education	1290(16.2%)	8127(43.7%)	9417(35.5%)	
Primary	698(8.8%)	3271(17.6%)	3969(15.0%)	
Secondary	4758(60.0%)	5600(30.1%)	10358(39.0%)	
Higher	1187(15.0%)	1604(8.6%)	2791(10.5%)	
<b>Occupation</b>				<0.001
Not currently working	4272(53.8%)	5225(28.1%)	9497(35.8%)	
Working	3661(46.2%)	13377(71.9%)	17038(64.2%)	
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>				<0.001
Poorest	968(12.2%)	4150(22.3%)	5118(19.3%)	
Poorer	1297(16.4%)	4104(22.1%)	5401(20.4%)	
Middle	1640(20.7%)	3838(20.6%)	5478(20.6%)	
Richer	1957(24.7%)	3542(19.4%)	5499(20.7%)	
Richest	2071(26.1%)	2968(16.0%)	5039(19.0%)	
<b>Access to information</b>				
<b>Frequency of reading newspaper or magazine</b>				<0.001
Not at all	6158(77.6%)	16409(88.2%)	22567(85.1%)	

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

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

Less than once a week	1197(15.1%)	1528(8.2%)	2725(10.3%)	
At least once a week	578(7.3%)	665(3.6%)	1243(4.7%)	
<b>Frequency of listening to radio</b>				<0.001
Not at all	3438(43.3%)	8822(47.4%)	12260(46.2%)	
Less than once a week	2188(27.6%)	4629(24.9%)	6817(25.7%)	
At least once a week	2307(29.1%)	5151(27.7%)	7458(28.1%)	
<b>Frequency of watching TV</b>				<0.001
Not at all	3059(38.5%)	10391(55.9%)	13450(50.7%)	
Less than once a week	1776(22.4%)	3405(18.3%)	5181(19.5%)	
At least once a week	3098(39.1%)	4806(25.8%)	7904(29.8%)	
<b>Owns a mobile phone</b>				0.032
No	3617(45.6%)	8749(47.0%)	12366(46.6%)	
Yes	4316(54.4%)	9853(53.0%)	14169(53.4%)	
<b>Use of Internet</b>				<0.001
Never	5724(72.1%)	16763(90.1%)	22487(84.74%)	
In the last 12 months	2045(25.8%)	1614(8.7%)	3659(13.8%)	
Before last 12 months	164(2.1%)	225(1.2%)	225(1.2%)	
<b>Current use of contraceptive method</b>				<0.001
No method	7412(93.4%)	15778(84.8%)	23190(87.4%)	
Folkloric method	7(0.1%)	90(0.5%)	97(0.4%)	
Traditional method	104(1.3%)	597(3.2%)	701(2.6%)	
Modern method	410(5.2%)	2137(11.5%)	2547(9.6%)	
<b>Reproductive/Sexual history</b>				
<b>Currently pregnant</b>				<0.001
No or unsure	7454(94.0%)	16477(88.6%)	23931(90.2%)	
Yes	479(6.0%)	2125(11.4%)	2604(9.8%)	
<b>Ever had a terminated pregnancy</b>				<0.001
No	7652(96.5%)	15939(85.7%)	23591(88.9%)	
Yes	281(3.5%)	2663(14.3%)	2944(11.1%)	
<b>Age at first sex</b>				<0.001
Not had sex	4481(56.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4481(16.9%)	
<15years	323(4.1%)	3961(21.3%)	4284(16.2%)	
15-17years	1399(17.6%)	8375(45.1%)	9774(36.9%)	
18-25years	1630(20.5%)	5963(32.1%)	7593(28.6%)	
>25years	100(1.3%)	280(1.5%)	380(1.4%)	

The overall prevalence of awareness of vaginal fistula among the participants was 52.0% (13,066/26,535) (Table 3). There was a linear trend between the prevalence of awareness of fistula and age group of participants. The prevalence of awareness of fistula was highest among women aged 45-49 years (55.8%) compared to other age groups. Generally, the prevalence of awareness of fistula was higher in the northern regions than the southern regions (Figure 1). The



1  
2  
3 awareness of fistula was highest among women in the Northwest (80.2%), those living in the rural  
4  
5 communities (59.0%), who are Muslims (64.5%), with no formal education (67.7%) and from the  
6  
7 poorest wealth quintiles (68.4%).  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Women who read newspaper at least once a week (53.5%), never listened to radio (55.2%), never  
13  
14 watched television (61.4%), never owned a mobile phone (57.5%) and never used internet  
15  
16 (53.5%) had the highest proportions of those that had ever heard of fistula. The awareness of  
17  
18 fistula was highest among women with history of termination of pregnancy (61.8%), currently  
19  
20 pregnant (60.5%), had a previous childbirth (56.6%), and never used a contraceptive method  
21  
22 (53.7%).  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 In the unadjusted analyses (table 3), the odds of ever heard of fistula by the participants was  
29  
30 associated with demographic factors. Specifically, the odds of awareness of fistula was higher  
31  
32 among women aged 20-24 years and older compared to those whose age was 15-19 years.  
33  
34 Women living in the Northeast and Northwest had higher odds of ever reporting to have heard  
35  
36 of fistula than those from Northcentral region. However, women in all the three Southern regions  
37  
38 of Nigeria had lower odds of awareness of fistula relative to those in the Northern region. The  
39  
40 odds of being aware of fistula was 1.87 times (95% CI, 1.68-2.09) among women living in the rural  
41  
42 communities compared to those in the urban communities. There was a higher odds of  
43  
44 awareness of fistula among participants from Islamic religion (OR=2.85; 95% CI, 2.42-3.37)  
45  
46 compared to those from Catholic faith group. However, the participants who professed  
47  
48 traditional and other religions had a lower odds of being aware of fistula relative to those from  
49  
50 the Catholic faith group. The odds of awareness of fistula was lower among the participants that  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 had primary, secondary and tertiary education compared to those with no formal education.  
4  
5  
6 There was an inverse relationship between the odds of reporting awareness of fistula and wealth  
7  
8 quintiles of participants. For example, women from richer (OR=0.33; 95%CI, 0.27-0.41) and  
9  
10 richest (OR=0.37; 95%CI, 0.31-0.44) wealth quintiles had the lowest odds of being aware of fistula  
11  
12 compared to those in the poorest wealth quintile.  
13  
14

15 The odds of ever heard of fistula by the participants was associated with access to information  
16  
17 factors. Generally, there was an inverse relationship between the odds of ever being aware of  
18  
19 fistula and the frequency of reading newspaper/magazine, listening to radio, watching television,  
20  
21 frequency of using internet and ownership of mobile phone. For example, women who reported  
22  
23 reading newspaper at least once a week (OR=0.64; 95%CI, 0.57-0.83) were associated with lower  
24  
25 odds of being aware of fistula compared to those that had never read newspaper. Concerning  
26  
27 the reproductive/sexual history factors, women that had at least a child had 1.87 (95%CI, 1.73-  
28  
29 2.02) odds of been aware of fistula relative to women with no previous childbirth. There were  
30  
31 higher odds of been aware of fistula among women that were currently pregnant (OR=1.47;  
32  
33 95%CI, 1.33-1.63) relative to those who were not currently pregnant. There was also a higher  
34  
35 odds of fistula awareness among women with history of previous termination of pregnancy  
36  
37 (OR=1.57, 95%CI, 1.42-1.75) compared to those with no such experience. Women that reported  
38  
39 history of contraceptive use were associated with the lower odds of ever been aware of fistula  
40  
41 compared to those with those with no history of contraceptive use.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 **Table 3 (Insert)**

51  
52 **Table 3: Prevalence and bivariate analysis between explanatory variables and ever heard of**  
53 **fistula among women of reproductive age**  
54

Variable	Ever heard of fistula
----------	-----------------------

	Prevalence (%; 95% CI)	Crude OR (95%CI)	p value
<b>Demographic</b>			
<b>Age group (years)</b>			
15-19	41.5 (39.5-43.5)	Reference	
20-24	53.8 (51.8-55.8)	1.64(1.49-1.81)	<0.001
25-29	55.5 (53.6-57.4)	1.76(1.60-1.93)	<0.001
30-34	54.5 (52.2-56.9)	1.69(1.52-1.88)	<0.001
35-39	55.1 (52.3-57.8)	1.73(1.54-1.94)	<0.001
40-44	54.1 (51.6-56.5)	1.66(1.48-1.86)	<0.001
45-49	55.8 (53.3-58.3)	1.78(1.59-1.99)	<0.001
<b>Region</b>			
North Central	46.6 (44.1-49.1)	Reference	
North East	61.3 (58.5-64.0)	1.81(1.56-2.12)	<0.001
North West	80.6 (78.6-82.5)	4.76(4.06-5.59)	<0.001
South East	27.8 (24.8-30.9)	0.44(0.37-0.53)	<0.001
South South	35.9 (33.0-39.0)	0.64(0.55-0.76)	<0.001
South West	22.2 (19.9-24.7)	0.33(0.28-0.39)	<0.001
<b>Place of residence</b>			
Urban	43.4 (41.3-45.6)	Reference	
Rural	59.0 (57.5-60.5)	1.87(1.68-2.09)	<0.001
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
Fulani	63.7 (58.6-68.5)	Reference	
Hausa	79.2 (77.2-81.2)	2.17(1.71-2.77)	<0.001
Igbo	30.1 (27.6-32.8)	0.25(0.19-0.31)	<0.001
Yoruba	22.5 (19.9-25.2)	0.16(0.13-0.21)	<0.001
Others ethnic minorities	47.4 (45.5-49.2)	0.51(0.41-0.64)	<0.001
<b>Religion</b>			
Catholic	38.8 (35.6-42.1)	Reference	
Other Christians	36.7 (34.7-38.7)	0.91(0.77-1.07)	0.264
Islam	64.5 (62.2-66.6)	2.85(2.42-3.37)	<0.001
Traditional	29.5 (23.6-36.2)	0.66(0.47-0.92)	0.015
Others	3.7 (1.2-11.0)	0.06(0.02-0.20)	<0.001
<b>Highest education level</b>			
No education	67.7 (65.8-69.6)	Reference	
Primary	47.0 (44.4-49.7)	0.42(0.54-5.09)	<0.001
Secondary	38.6 (36.8-40.3)	0.30(0.27-0.33)	<0.001
Higher	54.0 (51.2-56.8)	0.56(0.48-0.64)	<0.001
<b>Currently working</b>			
No	52.5 (50.6-54.4)	Reference	
Yes	51.6 (50.2-53.1)	0.97(0.89-1.04)	0.376
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>			
Poorest	68.4 (65.5-71.1)	Reference	
Poorer	60.1 (57.6-62.6)	0.70(0.60-0.81)	<0.001
Middle	48.5 (46.1-50.9)	0.44(0.37-0.51)	<0.001
Richer	41.9 (38.4-45.4)	0.33(0.27-0.41)	<0.001
Richest	44.1 (41.3-46.9)	0.37(0.31-0.44)	<0.001
<b>Access to Information</b>			

**Frequency of reading newspaper or magazine**

Not at all	53.2 (51.7-54.7)	Reference	
Less than once a week	42.1 (39.5-44.7)	0.64(0.57-0.72)	<0.001
At least once a week	53.5 (49.7-57.2)	1.01(0.87-1.19)	0.875

**Frequency of listening to radio**

Not at all	55.2 (53.3-57.1)	Reference	
Less than once a week	48.2 (46.3-50.1)	0.75(0.68-0.83)	<0.001
At least once a week	50.3 (48.2-52.4)	0.82(0.75-0.91)	<0.001

**Frequency of watching TV**

Not at all	61.4 (59.7-63.1)	Reference	
Less than once a week	42.3 (40.0-44.5)	0.46(0.41-0.51)	<0.001
At least once a week	43.4 (40.8-45.9)	0.48(0.42-0.55)	<0.001

**Own a mobile phone**

No	57.5 (55.8-59.2)	Reference	
Yes	47.4 (45.7-49.0)	0.67(0.61-0.72)	<0.001

**Use of Internet**

Never	53.5 (51.9-55.0)	Reference	
In the last 12 months	45.6 (43.1-48.1)	0.73(0.65-0.82)	<0.001
Before last 12 months	37.0 (31.8-42.4)	0.51(0.40-0.64)	<0.001

**Reproductive/Sexual history**

**Ever had a child**

No	41.1 (39.4-42.9)	Reference	
Yes	56.6 (55.1-58.1)	1.87(1.73-2.02)	<0.001

**Age at first sex**

Not had sex	39.4 (36.8-41.9)	Reference	
<15years	64.1 (61.8-66.3)	2.75(2.41-3.15)	<0.001
15-17years	58.1 (56.2-59.9)	2.13(1.90-2.40)	<0.001
18-25years	45.3 (43.5-47.1)	1.28(1.15-1.42)	<0.001
≥25years	44.1 (37.9-50.4)	1.21(0.94-1.56)	0.131

**Currently pregnant**

No or unsure	51.0 (49.6-52.4)	Reference	
Yes	60.5 (58.0-62.8)	1.47(1.33-1.63)	<0.001

**Ever had a terminated pregnancy**

No	50.7 (49.3-52.1)	Reference	
Yes	61.8 (59.4-64.1)	1.57(1.42-1.75)	<0.001

**Current use of contraceptive method**

No method	53.7 (52.4-55.0)	Reference	
Folkloric method	30.1 (15.7-51.2)	0.38(0.16-0.89)	0.026
Traditional method	31.3 (26.9-36.0)	0.39(0.32-0.48)	<0.001
Modern method	43.7 (40.7-46.7)	0.67(0.59-0.75)	<0.001

**Figure 1 (Insert)**

1  
2  
3 The results of the adjusted analyses were presented in the multivariable logistic regression in  
4 table 4. The first model included childbirth experience and age of respondents: women who had  
5 had a previous childbirth experience had a higher odds (odds ratio (OR)=1.81; 95%CI, 1.63 to  
6 2.01) of awareness of fistula. Only women whose ages were between 20-24 years and 25-29 years  
7 had higher odds of reporting having heard of fistula compared to women that were less than 15  
8 to 19 years. The second model adjusted for the reproductive and sexual history, all variables  
9 including the model 1 variables (which were kept apriori), were statistically significant except  
10 among women that reported that their age at first sex was 25 years and older . The odds of  
11 awareness of fistula was higher among women who had their first sexual exposure at less than  
12 15 years (Adjusted odds ratio (AOR)=1.58; 95%CI, 1.32 - 1.90) and between 15 to 17years  
13 (AOR=1.30; 95%CI, 1.11 - 1.52) compared to those who had no previous sexual exposure.  
14 However, a lower odds was observed among women aged 18-25 years (AOR=0.81; 95%CI, 0.70 -  
15 0.95) compared to women who have never had sex.

16  
17  
18 The third model included the demographic characteristics: women that were living in the  
19 southern part of Nigeria were associated with a lower odds of fistula awareness while women in  
20 the Northwest (AOR=3.56; 95%CI, 2.84 - 4.47) and Northeast (AOR=1.82; 95%CI 1.53 - 2.17)  
21 regions had higher odds compared with women in the Northcentral region. Similarly, women  
22 from the Yoruba (AOR=0.47; 95%CI, 0.35 - 0.64) and Igbo (AOR=0.67; 95%CI, 0.46 -0.98) ethnic  
23 groups had a lower odds of fistula awareness. Women with secondary (AOR=1.24; 95%CI, 1.09 -  
24 1.41) and tertiary education (AOR=2.38; 95%CI, 2.00 - 2.83) had a higher odds of fistula  
25 awareness. However, women from the poorer and middle wealth quintiles had the lower odds  
26 of been aware of fistula compared with women in the poorest wealth quintiles. The variables

related with access to information that were significantly associated with the higher odds of fistula awareness included: the ownership of a mobile phone (AOR=1.16; 95%CI, 1.05 - 1.27), report of using the internet in the last 12 months (AOR=1.57; 95%CI, 1.33 - 1.86) and the history of reading newspaper or magazine at least once a week (AOR=1.29; 95%CI, 1.07-1.57) and listening to radio less than once a week (AOR=1.23; 95%CI, 1.09-1.38) relative to women without the history of these factors.

**Table 4 (Insert)**

**Table 4: Multivariable logistic regression models of factors associated with the awareness of fistula among women of reproductive age**

Characteristics	Model 1 OR (95% CI)	Model 2 AOR (95% CI)	Model 3 AOR (95% CI)	Model 4 AOR (95% CI)
<b>Had a childbirth</b>				
Yes(vs No)	<b>1.81(1.63-2.01)</b>	<b>1.45(1.30-1.62)</b>	1.05(0.92-1.20)	<b>1.14(1.01-1.30)</b>
<b>Age(years)</b>				
15-19	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
20-24	<b>1.25(1.12-1.39)</b>	<b>1.38(1.22-1.56)</b>	<b>1.47(1.28-1.69)</b>	<b>1.36(1.18-1.56)</b>
25-29	<b>1.17(1.05-1.31)</b>	<b>1.41(1.24-1.59)</b>	<b>1.64(1.43-1.89)</b>	<b>1.53(1.33-1.76)</b>
30-34	1.08(0.95-1.22)	<b>1.32(1.14-1.53)</b>	<b>1.62(1.37-1.91)</b>	<b>1.54(1.30-1.81)</b>
35-39	1.08(0.94-1.24)	<b>1.37(1.18-1.59)</b>	<b>1.91(1.61-2.26)</b>	<b>1.81(1.53-2.14)</b>
40-44	1.02(0.89-1.17)	<b>1.27(1.09-1.49)</b>	<b>1.80(1.50-2.16)</b>	<b>1.71(1.43-2.06)</b>
45-49	1.09(0.95-1.25)	<b>1.31(1.13-1.51)</b>	<b>2.11(1.78-2.50)</b>	<b>2.04(1.72-2.41)</b>
<b>Age at first sex</b>				
Not had sex		1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
<15years		<b>1.58(1.32-1.90)</b>	<b>1.32(1.09-1.59)</b>	<b>1.27(1.05-1.53)</b>
15-17years		<b>1.30(1.11-1.52)</b>	<b>1.30(1.10-1.53)</b>	<b>1.25(1.06-1.47)</b>
18-25years		<b>0.81(0.70-0.95)</b>	<b>1.19(1.00-1.42)</b>	1.14(0.96-1.35)
≥25years		0.78(0.59-1.03)	1.02(0.74-1.41)	0.95(0.69-1.32)
<b>Currently pregnant</b>				
Yes (vs No)		<b>1.18(1.07-1.30)</b>	1.02(0.92-1.14)	1.04(0.93-1.16)
<b>Had terminated pregnancy</b>				
Yes (vs No)		<b>1.37(1.22-1.52)</b>	<b>1.17(1.05-1.31)</b>	<b>1.17(1.04-1.31)</b>
<b>Use of contraceptive</b>				
No method		1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Only folkoric method		<b>0.30(0.13-0.72)</b>	0.58(0.30-1.11)	0.58(0.31-2.20)
Only traditional method		<b>0.40(0.32-0.50)</b>	<b>0.73(0.58-0.91)</b>	<b>0.70(0.56-0.88)</b>
Modern method		<b>0.64(0.57-0.73)</b>	<b>0.83(0.73-0.94)</b>	<b>0.81(0.71-0.92)</b>
<b>Region</b>				

1			
2			
3	North Central	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
4	North East	<b>1.82(1.53-2.17)</b>	<b>1.84(1.55-2.20)</b>
5	North West	<b>3.56(2.84-4.47)</b>	<b>3.57(2.85-4.48)</b>
6	South East	<b>0.45(0.33-0.61)</b>	<b>0.42(0.31-0.58)</b>
7	South South	<b>0.56(0.47-0.67)</b>	<b>0.53(0.44-0.63)</b>
8	South West	<b>0.40(0.32-0.49)</b>	<b>0.37(0.30-0.45)</b>
9			
10	<b>Place of residence</b>		
11	Rural (vs Urban)	1.08(0.94-1.23)	1.11(0.97-1.27)
12	<b>Educational status</b>		
13	No education	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
14	Primary	1.03(0.90-1.18)	1.02(0.89-1.18)
15	Secondary	<b>1.24(1.09-1.41)</b>	<b>1.14(1.00-1.30)</b>
16	Higher	<b>2.38(2.00-2.83)</b>	<b>1.74(1.45-2.08)</b>
17			
18	<b>Ethnicity</b>		
19	Fulani	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
20	Hausa	<b>1.66(1.33-2.09)</b>	<b>1.67(1.33-2.09)</b>
21	Igbo	<b>0.67(0.46-0.98)</b>	<b>0.67(0.46-0.97)</b>
22	Yoruba	<b>0.47(0.35-0.64)</b>	<b>0.47(0.34-0.64)</b>
23	Others	0.83(0.64-1.06)	0.84(0.65-1.08)
24			
25	<b>Religion</b>		
26	Catholic	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
27	Other Christian	<b>0.82(0.70-0.95)</b>	<b>0.83(0.71-0.97)</b>
28	Islam	<b>0.77(0.63-0.95)</b>	<b>0.78(0.63-0.96)</b>
29	Traditionalist	<b>0.22(0.12-0.43)</b>	<b>0.24(0.12-0.46)</b>
30	Others	<b>0.05(0.02-0.18)</b>	<b>0.05(0.01-0.16)</b>
31			
32	<b>Currently working</b>		
33	Yes (vs No)	<b>1.39(1.26-1.54)</b>	<b>1.35(1.22-1.49)</b>
34			
35	<b>Wealth quintiles</b>		
36	Poorest	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
37	Poorer	<b>0.82(0.71-0.95)</b>	<b>0.81(0.70-0.93)</b>
38	Middle	<b>0.79(0.67-0.95)</b>	<b>0.76(0.63-0.91)</b>
39	Richer	0.89(0.74-1.06)	<b>0.80(0.66-0.96)</b>
40	Richest	1.22(0.99-1.49)	0.99(0.80-1.22)
41			
42	<b>Read newspaper or magazine</b>		
43	Not at all		1.0 (Reference)
44	Less than once a week		0.93(0.82-1.06)
45	Atleast once a week		<b>1.29(1.07-1.57)</b>
46			
47	<b>Listen to radio</b>		
48	Not at all		1.0 (Reference)
49	Less than once a week		<b>1.23(1.09-1.38)</b>
50	Atleast once a week		<b>1.23(1.10-1.38)</b>
51			
52	<b>Watch TV</b>		
53	Not at all		1.0 (Reference)
54	Less than once a week		0.92(0.81-1.04)
55	Atleast once a week		1.05(0.91-1.22)
56			
57	<b>Own a mobile phone</b>		
58	Yes (vs No)		<b>1.16(1.05-1.27)</b>
59			
60	<b>Use of Internet</b>		

Never	1.0 (Reference)
Last 12 months	<b>1.57(1.33-1.86)</b>
before last 12 months	1.01(0.78-1.30)

*Statistically significant variables at  $p < 0.05$  are shown in bold*

## DISCUSSION

This study is probably the first largest nationally representative sample of women in SSA that investigated the level of awareness of vaginal fistula among women of reproductive age. The finding showed that only about half (52%) of Nigerian women interviewed had ever heard of vaginal fistula. There was a high fistula awareness among young adults and those with previous childbirth experience in this study. In addition, participants living in the North and rural communities had higher prevalence of awareness of fistula than women in the Southern region and urban settings in Nigeria. The awareness of vaginal fistula was associated with the following factors: history of childbirth experience, aged 20-24 years and older, reported age at first sexual intercourse of up to 17 years, history of ever terminated a pregnancy, use of modern or traditional contraception, place of residence, having at least secondary education, ethnicity, wealth quintile and access to the source of information dissemination (radio, television and newspaper or magazine). The association between the history of previous childbirth and vaginal fistula awareness strengthens the role of antenatal care education, counseling and health promotion in the prevention and prompt treatment of obstructed labour and vaginal fistula<sup>18</sup>. Other sources of information dissemination will be useful in educating other groups of women especially the adolescents on positive reproductive health information and behaviours.



1  
2  
3 Although the awareness level about the vaginal fistula in this study has increased compared to  
4  
5 the 2008 NDHS report of 30.7%, it is still a source of concern, particularly, among young  
6  
7 population relative to older adults in Nigeria<sup>9</sup>. The observed increase in the prevalence of vaginal  
8  
9 fistula awareness in the 2018 NDHS might be due to the increased priority and investment in  
10  
11 obstetric fistula prevention and treatment by the Government of Nigeria and development  
12  
13 partners in the last decade <sup>19</sup>. Vaginal fistula is more common among young people, who are  
14  
15 usually at risk of obstructed labour due to inadequate pelvis. Pregnant adolescents often have  
16  
17 difficulties in accessing timely obstetric emergency services should they develop obstructed  
18  
19 labour. The reported prevalence of awareness of fistula from previous studies were mixed,  
20  
21 majority were in the range of 20-46% while a few others reported a higher figure than 52% found  
22  
23 in this study. For example, two studies in Northern Ghana among 390 prenatal women (18-49  
24  
25 years) and 1982 (17-60 years) women in the community found that the awareness of fistula was  
26  
27 28.8% and 45.8%, respectively <sup>12,20</sup>. However, a study (2010) in Mtwara region of Tanzania  
28  
29 showed that 61.1% out of 334 women aged 18-49 years were aware of vaginal fistula <sup>15</sup>. Higher  
30  
31 prevalence (81%) of fistula awareness was recorded in an Eritrean study after the  
32  
33 implementation of health education and community mobilization programme among women;  
34  
35 this study however, included those living with fistula<sup>21</sup>.

36  
37  
38 Some of the risk factors associated with awareness of vaginal fistula in this study had been  
39  
40 previously reported elsewhere<sup>13,22</sup>. The high level of awareness of vaginal fistula which was  
41  
42 found to be significantly associated with the educational status, age older than 20 years, wealth  
43  
44 quintiles and access to information dissemination platforms in this study, had also been  
45  
46 previously reported<sup>11-14,20</sup>. The high awareness level among women in the Northern region  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 relative to the southern part of Nigeria and Hausa/Fulani than other ethnic groups could be due  
4  
5 to the high burden of vaginal fistula and information diffusion from the high concentration of  
6  
7 interventions on obstetric fistula in North and among Hausa/Fulanis. Surprisingly, women living  
8  
9 in the rural communities were more likely to be aware of vaginal fistula compared to those in  
10  
11 urban setting. This observation is against the general belief that women in the urban settings  
12  
13 tend to have better awareness about health related issues than their colleague in the rural setting  
14  
15 . It is plausible that women living in rural setting might have experienced more cases of childbirth  
16  
17 related complications including obstetric fistula than those in urban setting.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 The level of awareness of vaginal fistula might not necessarily translates to adequate knowledge  
24  
25 that can help women to make appropriate decision on the prevention and access to care. There  
26  
27 are some studies that had reported significant proportion of misconceptions on the causes or risk  
28  
29 factors for vaginal fistula even among those that claimed to be aware of fistula<sup>13,22,23</sup>. In a  
30  
31 qualitative study in Malawi, Changole et al interviewed women who were said to be aware of  
32  
33 vaginal fistula on probable causes<sup>22</sup>. The authors reported that majority of these women  
34  
35 associated vaginal fistula with sexually transmitted infection, witchcraft, husband's infidelity and  
36  
37 laziness to push during labour<sup>22</sup>. There were two other qualitative studies from Ethiopia that also  
38  
39 showed that women including those suffering from incontinence had misconception on the  
40  
41 probable risk factors for vaginal fistula<sup>23,24</sup>.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Another limitation of the data on awareness is the inability to disaggregate the information on  
49  
50 the subtle differences between urinary and fecal incontinence because the question was not  
51  
52 asked separately. Other limitations include the use of secondary data and lack of information  
53  
54 that may help to describe causes or risk factors of vaginal fistula.  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4 It would have been beneficial if other useful information to assess the knowledge of women on  
5  
6 urinary and feecal incontinence were collected during the 2018 NDHS . It is difficult to appreciate  
7  
8 the impact of the awareness level of vaginal fistula from the 2018 Nigerian NDHS data because  
9  
10 of lack of other necessary information. For example, there are no questions on the sources of  
11  
12 information and risk factors as well the preventive methods of vaginal fistula. It is imperative that  
13  
14 future national survey consider some of the following questions with response options for  
15  
16 participant to select: *Where did you first learn or hear about involuntary leakage of urine or stool*  
17  
18 *after childbirth in a woman?; What did you think is/are responsible for the involuntary leakage*  
19  
20 *of urine or stool after childbirth in a woman?; and what are the ways of preventing the occurrence*  
21  
22 *of involuntary leakage of urine or stool after childbirth in a woman?.* We believe that these  
23  
24 suggested questions will add to the quality of information that will be collected to profile the  
25  
26 public knowledge on vaginal fistula. This information will better guide the policy makers,  
27  
28 programme planners and experts, to design a well-informed strategy for the control of vaginal  
29  
30 fistula in the country.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 In conclusion, the study showed that a large number of women, particularly, young women with  
40  
41 no childbirth experience and from the Southern region of Nigeria had low level of awareness of  
42  
43 vaginal fistula. It is recommended that more public health awareness on vaginal fistula should be  
44  
45 incorporated in reproductive health messages, especially among women of reproductive age. We  
46  
47 also advocate that other critical questions should be included in the future national survey to  
48  
49 help policy makers and programme planner better execute public health intervention for the  
50  
51 control of vaginal fistula that is still ravaging Nigeria.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Figure 1: Prevalence of Vaginal fistula awareness by states among women of reproductive age**  
4  
5

6 **Acknowledgement**  
7

8  
9 We are grateful to DHS Program for providing access to the data.  
10

11  
12 **Contributions**  
13

14  
15 (I) Conception and design: Morhason-Bello IO and Yusuf Kareem (II) Data analysis: Yusuf Kareem  
16 and Imran Morhason-Bello (III) Spatial Data Analysis: Linda Abegunde; (IV) Data interpretation:  
17 Imran Morhason-Bello, Yusuf Kareem, Rukiyat Abdus-Salam, Oluwasomidoyin Bello, Olatunji  
18 Lawal, Fatimah Akinlusi, Linda Abegunde and Oladosu Ojengbede; (V) Manuscript writing: All  
19 authors; (VI) Final approval of manuscript: All authors.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 **Funding**  
29

30  
31 This research received no grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-  
32 profit sectors  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 **Competing interests**  
38

39  
40 The authors declared no competing interest  
41  
42

43 **Ethics approval**  
44

45  
46 Ethical approval is not needed, the study used secondary data from the Nigeria Demography  
47 Health Surveys (DHS). The DHS program maintain strict standards for protecting the privacy of  
48 respondents and the survey protocols are reviewed by the ICF and Institutional Review Board  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 (IRB) in each country to ensure that the survey complies with the regulations for the protection  
4  
5  
6 of human subjects.

### 7 8 9 **Data availability**

10  
11 The data supporting this article is available at:

12  
13  
14 [https://dhsprogram.com/data/dataset/Nigeria\\_Standard-DHS\\_2018.cfm](https://dhsprogram.com/data/dataset/Nigeria_Standard-DHS_2018.cfm), which can be


15  
16  
17 downloaded after request from the DHS website.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 **REFERENCES**

- 33  
34  
35 1. Lufumpa E, Doos L, Lindenmeyer A. Barriers and facilitators to preventive interventions for the  
36 development of obstetric fistulas among women in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. *BMC*  
37 *Pregnancy Childbirth* 2018; **18**(1): 155.  
38 2. Thaddeus S, Maine D. Too far to walk: maternal mortality in context. *News/ Womens Glob Netw*  
39 *Reprod Rights* 1991; (36): 22-4.  
40 3. MacDonald T, Jackson S, Charles M-C, et al. The fourth delay and community-driven solutions to  
41 reduce maternal mortality in rural Haiti: a community-based action research study. *BMC Pregnancy and*  
42 *Childbirth* 2018; **18**(1): 254.  
43 4. Swain D, Parida SP, Jena SK, Das M, Das H. Obstetric fistula: A challenge to public health. *Indian J*  
44 *Public Health* 2019; **63**(1): 73-8.  
45 5. El-Azab AS, Abolella HA, Farouk M. Update on vesicovaginal fistula: A systematic review. *Arab J*  
46 *Urol* 2019; **17**(1): 61-8.  
47 6. Tuncalp O, Tripathi V, Landry E, Stanton CK, Ahmed S. Measuring the incidence and prevalence of  
48 obstetric fistula: approaches, needs and recommendations. *Bull World Health Organ* 2015; **93**(1): 60-2.  
49 7. Stanton C, Holtz SA, Ahmed S. Challenges in measuring obstetric fistula. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*  
50 2007; **99 Suppl 1**: S4-9.  
51 8. Jokhio AH, Rizvi RM, Rizvi J, MacArthur C. Prevalence of obstetric fistula: a population-based study  
52 in rural Pakistan. *Bjog* 2014; **121**(8): 1039-46.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 9. National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ICF. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey
- 5 2008. Abuja, Nigeria, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NPC and ICF. . 2009.
- 6 10. Wall LL. Obstetric vesicovaginal fistula as an international public-health problem. *Lancet* 2006;
- 7 **368**(9542): 1201-9.
- 8 11. Basheer SA, Pumpaibool, T. . Knowledge, attitude and maternal health care utilization among
- 9 married women of reproductive age towards vesicovaginal fistula in Kebbi state, Nigeria. *J Health Res*
- 10 2015; **29**(2): 93-100.
- 11 12. Azanu WK, Dassah ET, Agbeno EK, Ofori AA, Opare-Addo HS. Knowledge of obstetric fistula among
- 12 prenatal clinic attendees and midwives in Mfantsiman municipality, Ghana. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2020;
- 13 **148 Suppl 1**: 16-21.
- 14 13. Kasamba N, Kaye DK, Mbalinda SN. Community awareness about risk factors, presentation and
- 15 prevention and obstetric fistula in Nabitovu village, Iganga district, Uganda. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*
- 16 2013; **13**: 229.
- 17 14. Banke-Thomas AO, Kouraogo SF, Siribie A, Taddese HB, Mueller JE. Knowledge of obstetric fistula
- 18 prevention amongst young women in urban and rural Burkina Faso: a cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*
- 19 2013; **8**(12): e85921.
- 20 15. Kazaura MR, Kamazima RS, Mangi EJ. Perceived causes of obstetric fistulae from rural southern
- 21 Tanzania. *Afr Health Sci* 2011; **11**(3): 377-82.
- 22 16. National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ICF. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey
- 23 2018. Abuja, Nigeria, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NPC and ICF. 2019.
- 24 17. Joshi H. Multicollinearity Diagnostic in Statistical Modelling and Remedies to deal with it using
- 25 SAS. *Pharm Users Softw Exch* 2012; **1**: 1-34.
- 26 18. Boene H, Mocumbi S, Hogberg U, et al. Obstetric fistula in southern Mozambique: a qualitative
- 27 study on women's experiences of care pregnancy, delivery and post-partum. *Reprod Health* 2020; **17**(1):
- 28 21.
- 29 19. Amodu OC, Salami BO, Richter MS. Obstetric fistula policy in Nigeria: a critical discourse analysis.
- 30 *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2018; **18**(1): 269.
- 31 20. Saeed M, Alhassan, A., Opare-Asamoah, K., Kuubiere, C. . A survey on obstetric fistula awareness
- 32 in Northern Ghana. *Eur J Exp Biol* 2014; **4**: 178-82.
- 33 21. Johnson KA, Turan JM, Hailemariam L, Mengsteab E, Jena D, Polan ML. The role of counseling for
- 34 obstetric fistula patients: lessons learned from Eritrea. *Patient Educ Couns* 2010; **80**(2): 262-5.
- 35 22. Changole J, Kafulafula U, Sundby J, Thorsen V. Community perceptions of obstetric fistula in
- 36 Malawi. *Cult Health Sex* 2019; **21**(5): 605-17.
- 37 23. Animut M, Mamo A, Abebe L, Berhe MA, Asfaw S, Birhanu Z. "The sun keeps rising but darkness
- 38 surrounds us": a qualitative exploration of the lived experiences of women with obstetric fistula in
- 39 Ethiopia. *BMC Womens Health* 2019; **19**(1): 37.
- 40 24. Gebresilase YT. A qualitative study of the experience of obstetric fistula survivors in Addis Ababa,
- 41 Ethiopia. *Int J Womens Health* 2014; **6**: 1033-43.
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

**Figure 1: Prevalence of Vaginal fistula awareness by states among women of reproductive age**



only



**Box 1: Fistula Module questions asked in the 2018 NDHS data**

S/N	Questions	Denominator
1.	Sometimes a woman can have a problem of constant leakage of urine or stool from her vagina during the day and night. This problem usually occurs after a difficult childbirth but may also occur after a sexual assault or after pelvic surgery. Have you ever experienced a constant leakage of urine or stool from your vagina during the day and night?	No=26535 Yes=50 N=26585
2.	<b>Have you ever heard of this problem?</b>	Yes=13469 No=13066 N=26535
3.	Did this problem start after you delivered a baby or had a stillbirth	50
4.	Did this problem start after a normal labor and delivery, or after a very difficult labor and delivery?	40
5.	What do you think caused this problem?	10
6.	How many days after (cause of problem from 3 or 5) did this leakage start?	45
7.	How old were you when you experienced this problem?	50
8.	Have you sought treatment for this condition?	50
9.	Why have you not sought treatment?	Nil
10.	From whom did you last seek treatment?	41
11.	Did you have an operation to fix the problem?	41
12.	Did the treatment stop the leakage completely? IF NO: did the treatment reduce the leakage?	41
13.	Are there any (other) women in your household who suffer from obstetric fistula?	Nil
14.	How many (other) women in your household suffer from obstetric fistula?	No observation

**Questions 1, 3-14** were answered by participants that had experienced vaginal fistula; **Question 2** was answered by all women



## Adapted checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies (STROBE)

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	5
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6-7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	5-7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6-7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	6-7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	

Continued on next page

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  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60**Results**

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	8-11
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	19-20 19-20
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	

**Discussion**

Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	21
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	23
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	21-22
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	24

**Other information**

Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	25
---------	----	---	----