

http://dx.doi.org/10.52113/1/1/2023-127-140

Association between sociodemographic characteristics and contraception use in Al-Karkh district of Baghdad city

Tahreer Rehab Abd\_Almunaim <sup>1</sup>, Ruqaya Subhi Tawfeeq<sup>\*</sup>



# Abstract

High fertility rates in underdeveloped nations are connected to poverty and shorter lifespans, which creates economic and social problems. Contraception improves women's and children's health via family planning and fertility control. The aim of the study is to assess the Association between sociodemographic characteristics and contraception use in Al-Karkh district of Baghdad city. This study in Al-Karkh district of Baghdad, Iraq, used a descriptive crosssectional design to examine contraceptive use among married women of childbearing age attending primary health care centers. Conducted between September 2022 and February 2023, the study employed a multistage cluster sampling technique and a questionnaire adapted from a 2012 study. Data were collected through self-administered questionnaires, maintaining participant anonymity. The study included 500 married women in the Baghdad Al-Karkh district, analyzing their age, husband's age, education, and contraceptive use. The majority (60.6%) used contraceptive methods for family planning. A significant association was found between contraceptive use and participants' education level, marriage duration, and employment status. The number of pregnancies, the interval between deliveries, and the number of children also significantly correlated with contraceptive use. In conclusion, The study highlights the impact of socio-demographic factors on family planning and contraceptive use. Context-specific interventions addressing age, residency, education, and employment status disparities are necessary to improve contraceptive access, and reproductive health outcomes, and support informed family planning decisions, ultimately enhancing maternal and child health.

**Keywords:** Association, Sociodemographic, Characteristics, Contraception, Al-Karkh district, Baghdad city

\* Correspondence author: <sup>1</sup> College of Medicine, Al-Iragia University, Irag

Received 22 March 2023; revised 01 May 2023; accepted 24 May 2023, available online 08 June 2023. Copyright © 2023 Ruqaya Subhi Tawfeeq, et al. This is article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

### Introduction

The rapid population growth in developing countries presents significant economic and social challenges, as high fertility rates are linked to poor economic conditions and shorter life spans. Contraception offers numerous benefits and serves as an effective method for family planning and fertility management, contributing to improved women's and children's health [1]. Increased contraceptive use in poorer countries has led to a 40% reduction in maternal mortality over the past two decades [2].

However, millions of women worldwide are still at risk of unplanned pregnancies [3-5]. The global decline in fertility rates from the early 1970s to the late 2000s is primarily due to increased access to modern contraception methods [6]. Meeting the demand for contraception in developing countries could prevent millions of unwanted pregnancies and save lives [7-9]. In 2014, 44% of married women in the Arabian region used a modern form of contraception [10], but unmet demand for family planning remains high in many countries [11]. Socioeconomic and demographic factors influence contraceptive use, with women's employment status playing a particularly significant role [12, 13].

As employment provides women with greater independence and decision-making power, studies have found a strong correlation between women's employment and contraceptive use. High population growth strains resources in developing countries, hindering economic growth and threatening political stability. As a result, many nations are focusing on curbing population growth to improve living standards and quality of life. Organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO) and UNICEF [14, 15] promote family planning as a core healthcare service to help manage fertility rates and reduce family sizes. The aim of the study is to assess the Association between sociodemographic characteristics and contraception use in Al-Karkh district of Baghdad city.

### **Methods and Patients**

This study was conducted in Al-Karkh district of Baghdad city, the capital of Iraq. Baghdad has a high population density, covering an area of 204.2 km<sup>2</sup>, and its population in 2023 was estimated at 7,711,305, making it the country's largest city. Primary health care services in Iraq are provided through primary health care centers (PHCCs), which offer preventive, curative, and basic diagnostic services, covering the essential needs of the community and promoting health awareness. In Al-Karkh district, there are ten health sectors, with eight PHCCs included in this study. The target population included all married women of childbearing age (15-49 years) attending the PHCCs for vaccination, child health, and medical services in Al-Karkh district during the study period. Women who were

#### Ruqaya Subhi Tawfeeq, et al/ Muthanna Medical Journal 2023; 10(1):127-140

uncooperative or unmarried were excluded. The study employed a descriptive crosssectional design conducted between September 1st, 2022, and February 28th, 2023. A multistage cluster sampling technique was used to select a sample from the ten PHC sectors and their respective PHCCs. Administrators at each PHCC were contacted for information about the number of women attending the center and to obtain permission to conduct the study. Interviews took place in guiet locations, with a systematic random sampling technique based on the daily attendance of each PHCC. The questionnaire collected data on sociodemographic characteristics, such as participants' age, husband's age, marital status, duration of marriage, contraception use, residence, education level, and occupation. The questionnaire was adapted from a 2012 study on contraceptive use dynamics among married women attending primary health care centers in Mosul city, Iraq [16]. Data were collected using a self-administered questionnaire filled out by the researcher, with participant anonymity maintained. The researcher communicated with participants in Arabic, working five days a week for four hours a day over six months. Participants were given 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire in a calm environment. Data were coded, assigned a serial number, and entered into SPSS version 26 with the help of an academic supervisor and a consultant statistician. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and range. Pearson Chi-square test, Yate's correction, or Fisher Exact test was applied to assess the significance of differences in qualitative data, considering a P value of 0.05 or less as statistically significant.

### Results

This study enrolled 500 married women at bearing age in the Baghdad Al-Karkh district. The majority of them 237 (47.0%) age were between 30-39 years old, followed by 140 (28.0%) of participants age were between 25-29 years old, 77 (16.0%) aged between 40-49 years ol, and 46 (9.0%) were younger than 25 years old as shown in figure 1.

Ruqaya Subhi Tawfeeq, et al/ Muthanna Medical Journal 2023; 10(1):127-140



#### Figure 1.

The distribution of the participant according to age groups.

In the same manner, table 1 show that the majority of the women husbands were between 30-39 years old (242, 48.4%) followed by 120 (24.0%) were aged between 40 to 49 years old, 89 (17.8%) between 25-29 years old, 36 (7.2%) age more than 50 years old and only 13 (2.6%) of the participant's husbands age were below 25 years old as shown in table 1. About half of the participants (49.6%) were married 5-14 years ago, 152 (30.4%) were married less than 5 years, and 100 (20.0%) of the participants were married for more than 15 years. The vast majority of them 412 (82.4%) were not working and 350 (70.0%) of them were live in urban areas (Table 1). Regarding participant's education level, 221 (44.2%) of them had college e and higher education level, 203 (40.6%) had a secondary educational level, 60 (12.0%) had d primary school education level and 16 (3.2%) were illiterate also most of them from area (70%) as shown in table 1.

### Table 1.

Demographic characteristics of participants (N=500)

|                     |                              | Νο  | %    |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-----|------|
| husband age         | <25                          | 13  | 2.6  |
|                     | 25-29                        | 89  | 17.8 |
|                     | 30-39                        | 242 | 48.4 |
|                     | 40-49                        | 120 | 24.0 |
|                     | >50                          | 36  | 7.2  |
| Years since married | <5                           | 152 | 30.4 |
|                     | 5-≤14                        | 248 | 49.6 |
|                     | ≥15                          | 100 | 20.0 |
| Employment          | working                      | 88  | 17.6 |
|                     | not working                  | 412 | 82.4 |
| Education           | illiterate                   | 16  | 3.2  |
|                     | primary                      | 60  | 12.0 |
|                     | secondary                    | 203 | 40.6 |
|                     | collage and higher education | 221 | 44.2 |
| Residence           | urban                        | 350 | 70.0 |
|                     | rural                        | 150 | 30.0 |

About one-third 151 of the participants had 2 pregnancies, 97 (19.4%) had 3 pregnancies, 94 (18.8%) had 4 pregnancies, 84 (16.8%) had 5 or more pregnancies, 49 (9.8%) had 1 pregnancy and 25 (5.0%) didn't get pregnant at all (Table 2). The interval between the last deliveries was 2 years and above as mentioned by 261 (52.2%) of the participants, 1 to 2 years was mentioned by 114 (22.8%) of the participants, and less than 1 year mentioned by 52 (10.4%) of them respectively, while 46 (9.2%) of the participants mentioned that they had only one child and 29 (5.8%) didn't have children as shown in table 2. More than half of the participants 258 (51.6%) had 1-2 children, 170 (34.0%) had 3-4 children, 43 (8.6%) had more than 5 children and as mentioned above 29 (5.8%) didn't had children. About one-third 158 (31.6%) had a history of abortion and 47 (9.4%) had died child (Table 2).

### Table 2.

pregnancy and delivery various variables of the participants (N=500).

|                                |   |                     | No  | %    |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|-----|------|
| Number pregnancy               |   | Not pregnant at all | 25  | 5.0  |
|                                |   | 1                   | 49  | 9.8  |
|                                |   | 2                   | 151 | 30.2 |
|                                |   | 3                   | 97  | 19.4 |
|                                |   | 4                   | 94  | 18.8 |
|                                |   | ≥5                  | 84  | 16.8 |
| Interval between last          | 2 | <1                  | 52  | 10.4 |
| deliveries                     |   | 1≤2                 | 114 | 22.8 |
|                                |   | >2                  | 261 | 52.2 |
|                                |   | Have one baby only  | 46  | 9.2  |
|                                |   | Have no child       | 27  | 5.4  |
| Number living children         |   | No children         | 29  | 5.8  |
|                                |   | 1-2                 | 258 | 51.6 |
|                                |   | 3-4                 | 170 | 34.0 |
|                                |   | ≥5                  | 43  | 8.6  |
| History abortion<br>Died child |   | Yes                 | 158 | 31.6 |
|                                |   | No                  | 342 | 68.4 |
|                                |   | Yes                 | 47  | 9.4  |
|                                |   | No                  | 453 | 90.6 |
| Total                          |   |                     | 500 | 100  |

About two third of the participants women 303 (60.6%) mentioned that they are using contraceptive methods for family planning. While 116 (23.2%) of them reported that they are not using any kind of family planning method at all and the rest 81 (16.2%) reveals that they were using family planning method previously but not in the time being as shown in figure 2.



#### Figure 2.

The distribution of family planning contraception use among participants.

Table 3 shows that there was a significant association between using of family planning contraception methods with the level of participant's education, as we can see that highly educated participants had a high percentage of using family planning methods in comparison with the secondary and primary school education level whom mostly ex-users or not use family planning at all and this association was significant with a p-value of less thanv0.05 (Table 3). In the same manner, married duration was found to be related to the use of family planning, those married duration less than 5 years found to be not used contraceptive methods mostly compared to those married 5-14 years who mostly use contraceptive methods while old married women mostly found to be ex-users and this relation was statistically significant (P=0.044), also, working women found to use contraception at all (P=0.0001) as shown in table 6. While the age of the women, and their husband age and residency were found to be insignificantly associated with the use of the family planning method as the p-value was found to be more than 0.05 (Table 3).

#### Table 3.

The association of socio-demographic characteristics according to contraception use.

| Contraceptive use |                    |        |      |         |      | *P value |      |        |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------|------|---------|------|----------|------|--------|
|                   |                    | U      | se   | Not use |      | Ex use   |      |        |
|                   |                    | No=303 | %    | No=116  | %    | No=81    | %    |        |
| Age group         | <25                | 22     | 7.3  | 17      | 14.7 | 7        | 8.6  | 0.141  |
|                   | 25-29              | 91     | 30.0 | 27      | 23.3 | 22       | 27.2 |        |
|                   | 30-39              | 150    | 49.5 | 51      | 44.0 | 36       | 44.4 |        |
|                   | 40-49              | 40     | 13.2 | 21      | 18.1 | 16       | 19.8 |        |
| Husband age       | <25                | 7      | 2.3  | 6       | 5.2  | -        | -    | 0.470  |
|                   | 25-29              | 55     | 18.2 | 21      | 18.1 | 13       | 16.0 |        |
|                   | 30-39              | 152    | 50.2 | 53      | 45.7 | 37       | 45.7 |        |
|                   | 40-49              | 69     | 22.8 | 28      | 24.1 | 23       | 28.4 |        |
|                   | >50                | 20     | 6.6  | 8       | 6.9  | 8        | 9.9  |        |
| Residency         | Urban              | 219    | 72.3 | 79      | 68.1 | 52       | 64.2 | 0.325  |
|                   | Rural              | 84     | 27.7 | 37      | 31.9 | 29       | 35.8 |        |
| Education         | Illiterate         | 8      | 2.6  | 4       | 3.4  | 4        | 4.9  | 0.0001 |
|                   | Primary            | 29     | 9.6  | 17      | 14.7 | 14       | 17.3 |        |
|                   | Secondary          | 78     | 25.7 | 75      | 64.7 | 50       | 61.7 |        |
|                   | Collage and higher | 188    | 62.0 | 20      | 17.2 | 13       | 16.0 |        |
|                   | education          |        |      |         |      |          |      |        |
| Years of married  | <5                 | 86     | 28.4 | 46      | 39.7 | 20       | 24.7 | 0.044  |
|                   | 5-14               | 160    | 52.8 | 50      | 43.1 | 38       | 46.9 |        |
|                   | >=15               | 57     | 18.8 | 20      | 17.2 | 23       | 28.4 |        |
| Employment        | working            | 76     | 25.1 | 5       | 4.3  | 7        | 8.6  | 0.0001 |
|                   | not working        | 227    | 74.9 | 111     | 95.7 | 74       | 91.4 |        |
| *Chi-square test  |                    |        |      |         |      |          |      |        |

Table 4 shows there was a significant association between number of pregnancy and the use of family planning method as that not pregnant at all was significantly associated with the not used of contraception compare to 2 and above pregnancies that associated with the use and ex uses of contraceptive methods and this association was found to be statistically significant as p-value was 0.0001 as shown in table 4. In the same manner, the interval between the last 2 deliveries was found to be statistically associated with contraceptive use, that participants with one baby only and those with no child associated with not using contraception compared to participants with more than 1 delivery usually associated with the use of contraception while those with more than 2 deliveries associated with ex use of contraception (P=0.0001) as shown in table 4. Also, the number of children associated with the use of contraception, showed that participants with no children were associated with the not use of contraception compared with those with more than 1 child associated with the use of contraception, and ex uses of contraception as p-value was less than 0.05, also the knowledge of the participants about the other benefit of contraception use that protection against sexually transmitted disease associated with the use of contraception (P=0.032) as shown in table 7. History of abortion and dead child was found to be not associated with the use of contraception as the p-value was more than 0.05 (Table 4).

### Table 4.

The association of contraception use with the pregnancy and delivery-related variables.

|                                   |  | Contraceptive use |         |         |      |        | *P value |        |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------|---------|---------|------|--------|----------|--------|
|                                   |  | Use               |         | Not use |      | Ex use |          | · ۲    |
|                                   |  | No=303            | %       | No=116  | %    | No=81  | %        |        |
| Number                            | Not pregnant at all                              | 3                 | 1.0     | 22      | 19.0 | -      | -        | 0.0001 |
| pregnancy                         | 1  | 28                | 9.2     | 14      | 12.1 | 7      | 8.6      |        |
|                                   | 2  | 105               | 34.7    | 30      | 25.9 | 16     | 19.8     |        |
|                                   | 3  | 66                | 21.8    | 13      | 11.2 | 18     | 22.2     |        |
|                                   | 4  | 54                | 17.8    | 19      | 16.4 | 21     | 25.9     |        |
|                                   | ≥5   | 47                | 15.5    | 18      | 15.5 | 19     | 23.5     |        |
| Interval between                  | <1   | 46                | 15.2    | 3       | 2.6  | 3      | 3.7      | 0.0001 |
| last 2 deliveries                 | 1-2  | 88                | 29.0    | 16      | 13.8 | 10     | 12.3     |        |
|                                   | >2   | 139               | 45.9    | 61      | 52.6 | 61     | 75.3     |        |
|                                   | have one baby only                               | 27                | 8.9     | 12      | 10.3 | 7      | 8.6      |        |
|                                   | have no child                                    | 3                 | 1.0     | 24      | 20.7 | -      | -        |        |
| Number living                     | no children                                      | 5                 | 1.7     | 24      | 20.7 | -      | -        | 0.0001 |
| children                          | 1-2  | 162               | 53.5    | 59      | 50.9 | 37     | 45.7     |        |
|                                   | 3-4  | 114               | 37.6    | 23      | 19.8 | 33     | 40.7     |        |
|                                   | ≥5   | 22                | 7.3     | 10      | 8.6  | 11     | 13.6     |        |
| History abortion                  | yes  | 93                | 30.7    | 42      | 36.2 | 23     | 28.4     | 0.441  |
|                                   | no   | 210               | 69.3    | 74      | 63.8 | 58     | 71.6     |        |
| died child                        | yes  | 30                | 9.9     | 8       | 6.9  | 9      | 11.1     | 0.543  |
|                                   | no   | 273               | 90.1    | 108     | 93.1 | 72     | 88.9     |        |
| Knowledge other benefit of family | Improvement of<br>health                         | 93                | 30.7    | 26      | 22.4 | 23     | 28.4     | 0.032  |
| planning                          | Protection against cancer                        | 7                 | 2.3     | 3       | 2.6  | 1      | 1.2      |        |
|                                   | Prevention of<br>sexually<br>transmitted disease | 30                | 9.9     | 3       | 2.6  | 3      | 3.7      |        |
|                                   | No idea  | 173               | 57.1    | 84      | 72.4 | 54     | 66.7     |        |
|                                   |  |                   | *Chi so | luare   |      |        |          |        |

### Table 5.

The association of the socio-demographic features with the reason for family planning use.

|   |                    | Reason for using current method |             |            |            |        |  |  |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|--------|--|--|
|   | Economic           | Physician                       | Do not want | For child  |            |        |  |  |
|   |                    | N=34 (%)                        | advice      | to have    | spacing    |        |  |  |
|   |                    |                                 | N=28        | children   | N=95 (%)   |        |  |  |
|   |                    |                                 |             | N=146 (%)  |            |        |  |  |
| Age   | <25                | 6 (17.6%)                       | 4 (14.3%)   | 2 (1.4%)   | 10 (10.5%) | 0.0001 |  |  |
|   | 25-29              | 12 (35.5%)                      | 2 (7.1%)    | 20 (13.7%) | 57 (60.0%) |        |  |  |
|   | 30-39              | 15 (44.1%)                      | 18 (64.3%)  | 89 (61.0%) | 28 (29.5%) |        |  |  |
|   | 40-49              | 1 (2.9%)                        | 4 (14.3%)   | 35 (24.0%) | -          |        |  |  |
| Husband age   | <25                | 1 (2.9%)                        | 2 (7.1%)    | 1 (0.7%)   | 3 (3.2%)   | 0.0001 |  |  |
| -   | 25-29              | 12 (35.3%)                      | 2 (7.1%)    | 6 (4.1%)   | 35 (36.8%) |        |  |  |
|   | 30-39              | 16 (47.1%)                      | 14 (50.0%)  | 68 (46.6%) | 54 (56.8%) |        |  |  |
|   | 40-49              | 4 (11.8%)                       | 9 (32.1%)   | 53 (36.3%) | 3 (3.2%)   |        |  |  |
|   | >50                | 1 (2.9%)                        | 1 (3.6%)    | 18 (12.3%) | -          |        |  |  |
| Residency   | urban              | 20 (58.8%)                      | 11 (39.3%)  | 113        | 75 (78.9%) | 0.0001 |  |  |
|   |                    |                                 |             | (77.4%)    |            |        |  |  |
|   | rural              | 14 (41.2%)                      | 17 (60.7%)  | 33 (22.6%) | 20 (21.1%) |        |  |  |
| education   | illiterate         | 1 (2.9%)                        | 2 (7.1%)    | 3 (2.1%)   | 2 (2.1%)   | 0.0001 |  |  |
|   | primary            | 2 (5.9%)                        | 6 (21.4%)   | 15 (10.3%) | 6 (6.3%)   |        |  |  |
|   | secondary          | 15 (44.1%)                      | 13 (46.4%)  | 34 (23.3%) | 16 (16.8%) |        |  |  |
|   | collage and higher | 16 (47.1%)                      | 7 (25.0%)   | 94 (64.4%) | 71 (74.7%) |        |  |  |
| Years of married  | <5                 | 16 (47.1%)                      | 3 (10.7%)   | 12 (8.2%)  | 55 (57.9%) | 0.0001 |  |  |
|   | 5-14               | 17 (50.0%)                      | 11 (39.3%)  | 93 (63.7%) | 39 (41.1%) |        |  |  |
|   | >=15               | 1 (2.9%)                        | 14 (50.0%)  | 41 (28.1%) | 1 (1.1%)   |        |  |  |
| Employment  | working            | 2 (5.9%)                        | 3 (10.7%)   | 47 (32.2%) | 24 (25.3%) | 0.003  |  |  |
|   | not working        | 32 (94.1%)                      | 25 (89.3%)  | 99 (67.8%) | 71 (74.7%) |        |  |  |
| *Significant difference between different percentages using Pearson Chi-square test ( $\gamma^2$ -test) at 0.05 level |                    |                                 |             |            |            |        |  |  |

# Discussion

The current study highlights the influence of age, education, marriage duration, and urban residence on contraceptive use. Women aged 30-39 were the largest group using contraceptives, possibly due to factors like completed childbearing, higher education, or income [17]. Women under 25 had lower contraceptive use rates, potentially due to lack of knowledge, access, or cultural barriers [18]. These findings align with studies by Akinloye et al, 2022 in Nigeria and Kundu et al, 2022 in Bangladesh [17, 19]. Education level played a significant role, with the majority of participants (84.8%) having at least secondary education, suggesting increased awareness of family planning methods. This is consistent with a study by Ontiri et al, 2019 in Kenya that found higher LARC uptake with increasing education levels [20].

Marriage duration also impacted contraceptive use, with women married for longer durations more likely to use contraceptives, possibly due to factors like smaller desired family size, increased contraceptive knowledge over time, or health concerns [21]. This finding aligns

#### Ruqaya Subhi Tawfeeq, et al/ Muthanna Medical Journal 2023; 10(1):127-140

with a study by Sait et al, 2021 in Oman. Lastly, the majority of participants (70%) were from urban areas, which may contribute to better access to health services, including contraception. This is consistent with a study by Seran et al, 2020 in Indonesia, which found higher contraceptive use among urban women, particularly those aged 40-44 [22]. The current study found that women with college and higher education had the highest proportion of contraceptive use (62.0%), while illiterate women had the lowest (2.6%). This aligns with a study by Sámano et al., 2019 in Mexico, which showed that lower education levels were associated with increased unintended pregnancy rates [18].

Additionally, women married for over 15 years had higher contraceptive use (28.4%) than those married for less than 5 years (24.7%). Employment status also played a role, with working women showing higher contraceptive use (25.1%) compared to non-working women (74.9%). This may be due to increased access to information and resources for family planning among working women. However, a study by aldabbagh et al, 2020 in Iraq found no relationship between socio-demographic factors and contraceptive use [23]. In contrast, a study by handady et al, 2015 in Sudan found significant associations between education, gender, number of children, availability and accessibility of contraceptives, distance from the center, spouse support for family planning, and contraceptive practice [24]. The current study found significant associations (P<0.05) between various factors and reasons for family planning use, including age, husband's age, residency, education level, years of marriage, and employment status.

Participants aged 25-29 and 30-39 primarily used family planning for child spacing, while those below 25 used it for economic reasons. Similarly, those with husbands aged 30-39 and above used family planning for child spacing, while those with younger husbands used it for economic reasons [25]. Urban participants primarily used family planning for child spacing, while rural participants used it for economic reasons. This aligns with a study by Pliskin et al, 2022, which found that rural communities have poorer access to reproductive health services compared to urban areas [26, 27]. A study by Ouma et al, 2015 in Uganda supported this finding, revealing low contraceptive use in rural areas and a high unmet need for family planning [28]. Participants married for less than five years primarily used family planning for child spacing (57.9%), while those married for 5-14 years and more than 15 years used it for economic reasons (50.0%). This is in line with a study by Götmark et al, 2020, which suggested that reduced family size may result from trade-offs between the number and quality of children as economies and nations grow and develop [29].

# Conclusion

In conclusion, this study underscores the importance of socio-demographic factors such as age, husband's age, residency, education level, years of marriage, and employment status in influencing family planning decisions and contraceptive use. The complex relationships between these factors highlight the need for context-specific interventions to improve contraceptive access and knowledge, ultimately enhancing family planning and reproductive health outcomes. Targeted interventions should consider the unique challenges faced by different age groups, urban and rural populations, and individuals with varying levels of education and employment status. By addressing these disparities and promoting access to comprehensive reproductive health services, policymakers, and healthcare providers can better support individuals and families in making informed decisions about family planning and contribute to improved maternal and child health outcomes.

# **Ethical Approval**

Not required.

# **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare that he has no competing interests.

### Funding

None

# **Study registration**

Not required.

# References

- Tsikouras P, Galazios G, Anthoulaki X, et al. Family Planning Laboratory Review of Factors Affecting the Choice of Contraceptive Methods in Three Teenagers Populations' in Thrace, Greece. Arch Obstet Gynecol. 2020; 1:13-22.
- Passah MC. Influence of sociodemographic factors on the utilization of contraceptive methods among the married women of Jowai Town, West Jaintia Hills District, Meghalaya. The Oriental Anthropologist. 2020;20(1):181-93.
- Kantorová V, Wheldon MC, Ueffing P, Dasgupta AN. Estimating progress towards meeting women's contraceptive needs in 185 countries: A Bayesian hierarchical modelling study. PLoS medicine. 2020;17(2):e1003026.

- Chandra S, Vijayakumar SD. Laparoscopic ovarian electrocauterization in polycystic ovarian syndrome: outcome and influencing factors. American Journal of BioMedicine. 2023; 11(1):10-21.
- 5. Xu H, Zong XN, Yu R. Blurred vision and diplopia in full term vaginal delivery women. American Journal of BioMedicine 2021;10(1):6-12.
- 6. United Nations: Department of Economic and Social Affairs: Population Division. World population prospects 2019: Data booklet. New York, NY: United Nations; 2019.
- 7. Abdelaziz W, Nofal Z, Al-Neyazy S. Factors affecting contraceptive use among currently married women in Iraq in 2018. Journal of Biosocial Science. 2022; 10:1-4.
- Abed ZK, Al-Wasiti ER, Abdulmajeed BA, Khiro NK. Relationship of follicle stimulating hormone receptor Gene Thr307Ala polymorphism with polycystic ovary syndrome in Iraqi women. American Journal of BioMedicine 2021;9(2):142-153.
- Menning M, Schindler P. Family Planning, Birth Control, and Contraception. InFamily Medicine: Principles and Practice 2022 Jan 20 (pp. 1439-1447). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- 10. Peterson HB. Sterilization. Obstetrics & Gynecology. 2008;111(1):189-203.
- Sung S, Abramovitz A. Tubal Ligation. In: StatPearls. StatPearls Publishing, Treasure Island (FL); 2022. PMID: 31751063.
- 12. March CM. Female tubal sterilization: traditional and research methods. In The Handbook of Contraception 2016 (pp. 215-246). Humana Press, Cham.
- Wekere FC, Enyindah CE, Udofia EA. Permanent method of postpartum contraception (Bilateral tubal ligation): Experience at the Rivers State University Teaching Hospital. Age.;25(29):7.
- 14. Endicott S, Jorgensen E, Hur H, Lockrow EG. 34: The evolution of sterilization techniques. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology. 2018;218(2):S965.
- March CM. Female Tubal Sterilization. In the Handbook of Contraception 2020 (pp. 193-238). Humana, Cham.
- Al-Sammak NI, Al-Jawadi AA. Contraceptive use dynamics among married women attending primary health care centers in Mosul city, Iraq: A cross-sectional study. Middle East J Fam Med. 2012;10(1):29-34.
- Akinloye O, Adediji I, Samuel TA, Popoola O, Iranloye BO. Contraceptive Use among Women Assessing Family Planning Services in Different Levels of Health Care Facilities: A Decades Retrospective Review. J Comm Med and Pub Health Rep. 2022; 3(05).
- Sámano R, Martínez-Rojano H, Chico-Barba G, et al. Sociodemographic factors associated with the knowledge and use of birth control methods in adolescents before and after pregnancy. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2019;16(6):1022.
- Kundu S, Kundu S, Rahman M, et al. Prevalence and determinants of contraceptive method use among Bangladeshi women of reproductive age: a multilevel multinomial analysis. BMC Public Health. 2022;22(1):1-1.

- 20. Ontiri S, Ndirangu G, Kabue M, Biesma R, Stekelenburg J, Ouma C. Long-acting reversible contraception uptake and associated factors among women of reproductive age in rural Kenya. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2019;16(9):1543.
- Sait M, Aljarbou A, Almannie R, Binsaleh S. Knowledge, attitudes, and perception patterns of contraception methods: Cross-sectional study among Saudi males. Urology Annals. 2021;13(3):243.
- 22. Seran AA, Laksono AD, Prahastuti Sujoso AD, Ibrahim I, Marasabessy NB, Roharia N, et al. Does Contraception Used Better In Urban Areas?: An Analysis Of The 2017 Idhs (Indonesia Demographic And Health Survey). Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy. 2020;11(11).
- 23. Aldabbagh RO, Al-Qazaz HK. Knowledge and practice of contraception use among females of child-bearing age in Mosul, Iraq. International journal of women's health. 2020; 2:107-13.
- Handady SO, Naseralla K, Sakin HH, Alawad AA. Knowledge, attitude and practice of family planning among married women attending primary health center in Sudan. Int J Public Heal Res. 2015;3(5):243-7.
- 25. Barrow A. A survey on prevalence and knowledge of family planning among women of childbearing age in the provincial settings of the gambia: a descriptive cross-sectional study. Advances in preventive medicine. 2020;2020:1-2.
- 26. Pliskin E, Manlove J, Welti K. Rural and urban women have differing sexual and reproductive health experiences. ChildTrends. 2022.
- 27. Rahnama P, Hidarnia A, Amin Shokravi F, Kazemnejad A, Ghazanfari Z, Montazeri A. Withdrawal users' experiences of and attitudes to contraceptive methods: a study from Eastern district of Tehran, Iran. BMC Public Health. 2010;10:1-9.
- Ouma S, Turyasima M, Acca H, Nabbale F, Obita KO, Rama M, et al. Obstacles to family planning use among rural women in atiak health center iv, amuru district, northern uganda. East afr med j. 2015;92(8):394-400.
- 29. Götmark F, Andersson M. Human fertility in relation to education, economy, religion, contraception, and family planning programs. BMC Public Health. 2020;20(1):1-7.