

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Developing and validating the Nepalese Abuse Assessment Screen (N-AAS) for identifying domestic violence among pregnant women in Nepal

Short title: Nepalese Abuse Assessment Screen (N-AAS) for identifying domestic violence in
pregnant women

Pratibha Manandhar^{1,2,*}, Pratibha Chalise^{1,3}, Poonam Rishal^{1,2}, Jacquelyn Campbell⁴, Lena
Henriksen⁵, Jennifer J. Infanti¹, Sunil Kumar Joshi², Mirjam Lukasse⁶, Kunta Devi Pun³, Berit
Schei^{1,7}, Katarina Swahnberg⁸, on behalf of the ADVANCE 2 study team[^]

¹Department of Public Health and Nursing, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Norwegian
University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

²Department of Community Medicine, Kathmandu Medical College Public Limited (KMC),
Kathmandu, Nepal

³Department of Nursing and Midwifery, Kathmandu University School of Medical Sciences
(KUSMS), Dhulikhel, Nepal

23 ⁴School of Nursing, Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing, Baltimore, USA

24

25 ⁵Department of Nursing and Health Promotion, Faculty of Health Sciences, Oslo Metropolitan

26 University, Oslo, Norway

27

28 ⁶Center for Women's, Family and Child Health, Faculty of Health and Social Sciences,

29 University of South-Eastern Norway, Kongsberg, Norway

30

31 ⁷Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Women and Children's Centre, St. Olavs University

32 Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

33

34 ⁸Department of Health and Caring Sciences, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Linnaeus

35 University, Kalmar, Sweden

36

37 *Corresponding author:

38 E-mail: pratibhamanandhar@gmail.com (PM)

39

40 ^Membership of the ADVANCE 2 research team is provided in the Acknowledgments.

41 **Abstract**

42 This study culturally adapted and validated a Nepalese version of the Abuse Assessment
43 Screen (AAS) tool for identifying domestic violence among pregnant women in Nepal, creating
44 the Nepalese Abuse Assessment Screen (N-AAS). International and national topic experts
45 reviewed the initial N-AAS version using the Delphi method, and pregnant women participated
46 in cognitive interviews, providing feedback on the N-AAS as user experts. Subsequent pre-
47 testing of a comprehensive questionnaire, which included the translated version of the N-AAS,
48 occurred in two tertiary care hospitals using an electronic format known as Color-Coded Audio
49 Computer-Assisted Self-Interview (C-ACASI). We assessed the content validity index,
50 compared the concurrent validity of the N-AAS with the gold standard interview, estimated the
51 prevalence of domestic violence from two hospitals, and calculated the Kappa coefficient. The
52 reliability of the entire questionnaire was also evaluated through a test-retest analysis, with
53 content validity rated as “good to excellent” by topic and user experts and high test-retest
54 reliability (91.2–98.9%), indicating consistency across questionnaires completed at two different
55 time points, with 12% of participants reporting any form of violence. The N-AAS demonstrated
56 $\geq 91.7\%$ specificity for all forms of abuse, accurately identifying non-abuse cases. In addition,
57 moderate to excellent sensitivity was observed for emotional abuse (52.5%) and physical abuse
58 since marriage (50%), while sensitivity for physical abuse in the past 12 months was 100%.
59 Thus, the N-AAS demonstrated reliable test-retest results with a good Kappa coefficient and
60 specificity, as well as showing excellent sensitivity for detecting recent physical abuse and
61 moderate sensitivity for detecting emotional abuse and physical abuse since marriage. Because
62 cultural context often leads women to normalize and tolerate abuse from spouses and family

63 members and women are thus reluctant to report abuse, the results imply that the N-AAS can
64 serve as a valuable screening tool for domestic abuse in antenatal care settings in Nepal.

65

66 **Introduction**

67 Domestic violence (DV) is a global concern that encompasses various forms of harm
68 inflicted within familial relationships. The Nepal Ministry of Law and Justice has defined DV as
69 “any physical, mental, sexual, or economic harm perpetrated by one person on another with
70 whom he or she has a family relationship, including acts of reprimand or emotional harm”[1].
71 DV during pregnancy, including intimate partner violence (IPV), is a serious concern that can
72 result in maternal death and morbidity, either directly or indirectly [2], and it is associated with
73 adverse maternal health and pregnancy outcomes, such as placental abruption, miscarriage, ante-
74 partum hemorrhage, and inadequate weight gain, as well as poor perinatal outcomes, such as low
75 birth weight and preterm delivery [3-5].

76 Prevalence studies of DV and IPV against pregnant women from around the world show
77 a wide range of reported figures. According to a multi-country study on women’s health and
78 domestic violence against women conducted by the World Health Organization (WHO), physical
79 violence during pregnancy by a male intimate partner affects between 1% and 28% of women
80 globally [6]. Variability is even more pronounced when considering developing versus
81 industrialized countries, with prevalence rates of violence of female partners during pregnancy
82 ranging from 3.8–31.7% in developing countries compared 3.4–11% in industrialized countries
83 [7]. A more recent review of 80 individual studies from different countries revealed prevalence
84 rates of IPV during pregnancy ranging from 1.5–66.9% in low- and middle-income countries
85 (LMICs) [8]. Moreover, psychological violence emerged as the most prevalent form of violence
86 during the perinatal period, with rates ranging from 1% in Sweden to 81% in South Africa, while
87 physical violence prevalence ranged from 0.4% in Sweden to 60.6% in Uganda [8]. In the two
88 hospital locations where we conducted the current study, prior research by our study team

89 demonstrated that 21% of pregnant women attending routine antenatal care (ANC) reported
90 experiencing all forms of DV [9]. Another study among pregnant women attending ANC in a
91 hospital in eastern Nepal found that 3.5% of women reported physical DV during their current
92 pregnancy [10].

93 The significant variability in reported IPV and DV prevalence can be attributed to
94 several factors, including differences in measurement instruments, varying definitions of
95 violence, and diverse cultural contexts. Additionally, the sensitive nature of this topic can impact
96 how participants respond to surveys. Therefore, it is imperative to develop and validate culturally
97 and contextually relevant measurement instruments to provide a more accurate understanding of
98 the complex dynamics surrounding violence during pregnancy.

99 Preventing and reducing the harms of DV requires the involvement of the health sector,
100 multi-sectoral organizations, awareness campaigns, and economic empowerment, with ANC
101 services being particularly important because most women attend them during their reproductive
102 lives [10]. In 2016, 84% of women who gave birth in the previous five years in Nepal reported
103 attending at least one ANC visit during their pregnancies, an increase of 25% from 2011, and
104 69% of Nepalese women attended four or more ANC visits throughout their pregnancies [11].

105 Several studies have introduced tools, instruments, or questionnaires for detecting
106 pregnancy-related DV in Nepal [10, 12, 13]. The Abuse Assessment Screen (AAS), originally
107 developed in the United States [14], has been validated in different countries, including Turkey,
108 Greece, and Spain, demonstrating its effectiveness as a simple tool [15-17]. However, formal
109 validation of the AAS is still lacking in LMICs, including Nepal. Therefore, the objective of this
110 study was to develop, to adapt culturally, and to validate a linguistically relevant version of the

111 AAS specifically for routine clinical use in Nepal. This version is called the Nepalese Abuse
112 Assessment Screen (N-AAS), whose test-retest reliability we also endeavored to analyze.

113

114

115 **Materials and methods**

116 This validation study was carried out over one year, from December 2021 to November
117 2022, with the main steps outlined in Fig 1.

118 **Fig 1. Step-by-step process of developing and validating the Nepalese Abuse Assessment**
119 **Screen (N-AAS).**

120

121

122 **Step 1: Adapting the original AAS and generating the N-AAS**

123 The AAS is an effective and short tool for detecting DV during pregnancy in clinical practice,
124 and it has demonstrated effectiveness in identifying DV among pregnant women in developed
125 countries [18] and in developing countries [19-21]. In our study team’s previous prevalence and
126 qualitative studies, conducted at the same sites as the present study, the AAS was used as a data
127 collection tool [10, 22]. However, we did not include the “body mapping” component in these
128 studies due to cultural sensitivity and social taboos. In addition, the AAS question about “fear in
129 the family” was identified as inconsistent with the Nepalese context, where “fear” can be
130 interpreted as a sign of respect for family members. Therefore, these two components were
131 excluded from the initial version of the N-AAS.

132 Furthermore, the qualitative study [22] revealed that demanding physical labor and food
133 denial were perceived as forms of physical and emotional mistreatment by pregnant women's
134 family members. Based on these findings, two new questions were added to the original AAS,
135 specifically targeting these pregnancy- and culturally specific types of emotional violence [10,
136 22], resulting in the N-AAS.

137 A few additional adjustments were made to enhance the clarity and focus of the initial
138 version of the N-AAS: we revised the first question to concentrate on DV and IPV by asking
139 about experiences since marriage or living with a partner, rather than encompassing lifetime
140 abuse. In addition, we separated the original AAS question on emotional and physical abuse into
141 distinct questions to assess better these specific forms of abuse. We also expanded the answer
142 choices to include mother-in-law, father-in-law, and other family members, while excluding the
143 option for stranger. More detailed information regarding these modifications can be found in
144 Table 1.

145 **Table 1. Comparison between the original Abuse Assessment Screen (AAS) and the Modified Nepalese Version (N-AAS),**

146 **Validated in the Study.**

Original Abuse Assessment Screen (AAS)		Nepalese Abuse Assessment Screen (N-AAS)	
Question	Answer option(s)	Question	Answer option(s)
1. Have you ever been emotionally or physically abused by your partner or someone important to you?	Yes/No If YES, who? (Circle all that apply): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Stranger Other Multiple Total # of times:	1. Since you've been married or living with a partner, have you been emotionally abused by someone in the family? <i>(Examples: Emotional abuse includes such acts as saying or doing something to humiliate you intentionally in front of others, the use of abusive words directed at you, threatening to hurt or harm you and your child/children, insulting you, deliberately making you feel bad about yourself, prohibiting you from visiting your mother's home, etc.)</i>	Yes/No If YES, by whom? (Choose one or more options): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Mother-in-law Father-in-law Other family member How many times? Once or twice Several times (3–5 times) Many times (more than 5 times)
		2. Since you've been married or living with a partner, have you been physically abused by someone in the family? <i>(Examples: slapped, burned on purpose, kicked, dragged, or otherwise intentionally hurt, had your hair pulled, spat on, struck with objects, or otherwise intentionally hurt)</i>	Yes/No If YES, by whom? (Choose one or more options): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Mother-in-law Father-in-law Other family member How many times? Once or twice Several times (3–5 times) Many times (more than 5 times)
2. Within the last year, have you ever been hit, slapped, kicked, or otherwise physically hurt by someone?	Yes/No If YES, who? (Circle all that apply): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend	3. Within the last year, have you been hit, slapped, kicked, had your hair pulled, spat on, struck with an object, or otherwise physically hurt by someone in the family?	Yes/No If YES, by whom? (Choose one or more options): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Mother-in-law

	Stranger Other Multiple Total # of times:		Father-in-law Other family member How many times? Once or twice Several times (3–5 times) Many times (more than 5 times)
3. Since you've been pregnant, have you been slapped, kicked, or otherwise physically hurt by someone?	Yes/No If YES, who? (Circle all that apply): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Stranger Other Multiple <i>Supplementary body mapping exercise: The person being assessed is provided with a blank body outline or a diagram of the human body. They are asked to mark the area of injury on the body map.</i>	4. Since you've been pregnant, have you been hit, slapped, kicked, had your hair pulled, spat on, struck with an object, or otherwise physically hurt by someone in the family?	Yes/No If YES, by whom? (Choose one or more options): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Mother-in-law Father-in-law Other family member How many times? Once or twice Several times (3–5 times) Many times (more than 5 times)
		5. Since you've been pregnant, have you been forced by someone in the family to do heavy physical work despite feeling unwell or exhausted? <i>(Examples: forced heavy physical work includes activities such as being made to carry a 20 liter of water jar or load of hay, forced to sit for a long period of time while washing clothes, lift sacks of rice, prolonged walking, etc.)</i>	Yes/No If YES, by whom? (Choose one or more options) Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Mother-in-law Father-in-law Other family member How many times? Once or twice Several times (3–5 times) Many times (more than 5 times)
		6. Since you've been pregnant, has someone in the family given you insufficient or no food to eat despite the availability of food and money in the household? <i>(Examples: not providing nutritious food such as eggs, fish, meat, fruits or hiding those foods)</i>	Yes/No If YES, by whom? (Choose one or more options): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Mother-in-law

			<p>Father-in-law Other family member</p> <p>How many times? Once or twice Several times (3–5 times) Many times (more than 5 times)</p>
4. Within the last year, has anyone forced you to have sexual activities?	<p>Yes/No</p> <p>If YES, who? (Circle all that apply): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Stranger Other Multiple</p> <p>Total # of times:</p>	<p>7. Within the last year, has anyone in the family forced you to have sexual activities without your consent?</p> <p><i>(Examples: physically forced you to have sexual intercourse or attempting to try when you did not want to, touching or trying to touch your private parts, using sexual slurs, forcing you with threats or in any other way to perform sexual acts you did not want to, or otherwise coercing you into reproductive acts?)</i></p>	<p>Yes/No</p> <p>If YES, by whom? (Choose one or more options): Husband Ex-husband Boyfriend Mother-in-law Father-in-law Other family member</p> <p>How many times? Once or twice Several times (3–5 times) Many times (more than 5 times)</p>
5. Are you afraid of your partner or anyone listed above?	Yes/No		

148

149

150 **Study questionnaire**

151 In this study, the N-AAS was validated as a component (Section D) of a comprehensive
152 questionnaire designed to assess various aspects of a safe pregnancy. The comprehensive
153 questionnaire, developed for our study team's subsequent research phase, a randomized
154 controlled trial, comprised eight sections and 110 questions in total. The sections included:
155 Section A: Recent pregnancy, Section B: Participant and family information, Section C: Food
156 access, Section D: Abuse in family relationships (assessed with the N-AAS), Section E: Support
157 seeking and other coping strategies, Section F: Attitudes towards family behaviors and norms,
158 Section G: Self-reported general health status, and Section H: Safety promoting strategies.

159

160

161 **Step 2: Translation to Nepali and quality control**

162 The 110-item questionnaire was translated from English into Nepali by a professional
163 translator and psychologist fluent in both languages. Back translation of the abuse questions
164 (only the N-AAS) was performed by a native English and Nepali speaker.

165

166

167 **Step 3: Delphi rounds with topic experts to evaluate content validity**

168 To evaluate the content validity of the N-AAS, the following steps were conducted
169 iteratively using the Delphi method [23] from December 2021 to April 2022. Initially, the study
170 team selected a review panel consisting of nine international and nine national topic experts,
171 including nurses, psychologists, researchers, clinicians, and members of scientific networks from
172 various organizations. To gather their input, a N-AAS review form was prepared and sent to the
173 experts, who were asked to assess the individual items based on their relevance,
174 understandability, and whether the items were sensitive using a five-point Likert scale. A score
175 of 0 indicated the item was irrelevant, non-understandable, and highly sensitive, whereas a score
176 of 4 indicated the item was highly relevant, easily understandable and non-sensitive. The experts
177 provided scores for each item and shared qualitative comments, which were carefully considered
178 to refine the domains and their respective items. In addition, the content validity index (CVI),
179 analyzed in step 5, was calculated based on their assessments.

180

181

182 **Step 4: Content validity and cognitive interviews with user experts**

183 The user expert group consisted of 18 pregnant women aged 18 years and older, in their
184 12-20 weeks of gestation. This was a convenience sample recruited from two tertiary care
185 hospitals in Bagmati province during the women's ANC visits in May and June 2022. Twelve
186 women had experienced DV, while six women did not.

187 The user experts also evaluated and rated the N-AAS items based on their relevance,
188 understandability, and sensitivity. The CVI was then calculated based on their assessments,
189 following the same process as the topic experts. Additionally, these participants took part in

190 cognitive interviews using a think-aloud technique [24]. This approach aimed to assess whether
191 the content of the N-AAS items accurately and meaningfully reflected the experiences of the
192 interviewees. The primary focus of the interviews was to evaluate the women’s comprehension,
193 judgment, recall and response to the questions based on their personal experiences. Throughout
194 the interviews, the first and second authors posed probing questions to encourage reflections, and
195 field notes were taken.

196

197

198 **Step 5: Analysis**

199 Next, in an analysis phase, the N-AAS items were evaluated using the CVI from both
200 topic and user experts. Item-level content validity index (I-CVI) scores were calculated. The
201 scale-level content validity index/average (S-CVI/Ave) and scale-level content validity
202 index/universal acceptance (S-CVI/UA) were determined, using the same approach for all
203 experts. The content validity of the N-AAS was assessed in terms of relevance,
204 understandability, and sensitivity [25]. The specific CVI scores obtained from this analysis are
205 presented in the results section.

206

207

208 **Step 6: Color-Coded Audio Computer-Assisted Self-Interview (C-** 209 **ACASI)**

210 The 110-item questionnaire, which included the N-AAS, was converted into an electronic
211 data collection format known as C-ACASI [26]. This study used two versions of the
212 questionnaire. Initially, the questionnaire only offered a listening option. However, after a first
213 performance assessment, the team decided to enhance the questionnaire by incorporating both
214 reading and listening options.

215

216

217 **Step 7: Clinical pre-testing**

218 **Test-retest**

219 Clinical pre-testing was conducted at the study team's two collaborating hospitals,
220 referred to as Hospital 1 and Hospital 2, from June to November 2022. Hospital 1 covers both
221 urban and rural areas, while most participants from Hospital 2 are from urban areas. During the
222 pre-testing period, a total of 7437 pregnant women attended ANC, of which 1180 were eligible
223 participants (12-20 weeks of pregnancy, aged ≥ 18 years), with 768 participants from Hospital 1
224 and 412 participants from Hospital 2.

225 Pregnant women attending the Outpatient Department (OPD) of Obstetrics and
226 Gynecology departments at the hospitals were referred to the data collection site by the nursing
227 staff after their registration. At the data collection site, pregnant women were provided with
228 invitations to participate in the study and received detailed explanations about it. Either a
229 Research Assistant (RA) or the first or second author provided comprehensive explanations
230 about the questionnaire, including the C-ACASI format and the use of electronic tablets to
231 administer the study questionnaire. To establish a relationship with the participants, some general

232 questions unrelated to the study were asked, such as about hobbies and favorite foods.
233 Participants were assured of confidentiality and informed that some questions in the C-ACASI
234 might be complex, sensitive, and of a personal nature. Participants were encouraged to ask for
235 clarification if any questions were unclear, and the functioning of the ‘back’ and ‘next’ buttons
236 on the C-ACASI was explained and demonstrated. Participants’ unique code numbers, mobile
237 numbers and addresses were recorded in a logbook, which was stored securely in a locked
238 cupboard when not in use. Basic information such as height, weight, last menstrual period date
239 and hemoglobin levels were entered into the tablet by research staff prior to handing it over to
240 the participant to complete the questionnaire. Upon completion, participants were thanked and
241 informed that they would receive calls for a retest in two to eight weeks’ time. Participants were
242 provided with booklets on safe pregnancy, nutrition, family planning, and non-communicable
243 diseases.

244 When participants returned for the retest, they were given a brief overview of the study’s
245 procedures again and reminded of their right to interrupt the process at any time. Upon giving
246 consent, they were provided with a tablet to complete the questionnaire for the second time.
247 Several reasons were given for not enrolling in the study, including medical issues, a busy OPD
248 schedule, inability to return for follow-up, language challenges, and a lack of interest due to time
249 constraints. A total of 488 participants were enrolled (235 from Hospital 1 and 253 from Hospital
250 2). The Time 1 questionnaire (test) was completed by 467 participants (221 from Hospital 1 and
251 246 from Hospital 2), while the remaining participants (n=21) discontinued during the C-ACASI
252 process (see Fig 2 for recruitment and sample details).

253 **Fig 2. Recruitment and samples from two hospitals for clinical pre-testing (Hospital 1 and**
254 **Hospital 2).**

255

256

257 At the second time point, the retaking of the questionnaire (retest), which was held two to
258 eight weeks after the initial test, some women chose not to participate again, and some again
259 withdrew during the C-ACASI process. A total of 340 participants (72.8%) completed the retest.
260 Reasons for not participating in the retest included being unreachable by mobile, agreeing but
261 not showing up, pregnancy termination, miscarriage, switching hospitals, being out of the valley
262 and a family member's illness.

263

264

265 **Gold standard interviews**

266 To assess the measurement precision of the N-AAS, a total of 121 participants (39 from
267 Hospital 1 and 82 from Hospital 2) were invited to participate in a short, structured interview
268 known as the 'gold standard interview' [27]. An interview, involving face-to-face interactions, is
269 considered the most accurate method (therefore, the 'gold standard') to provide results closest to
270 the truth in this study.

271 Participants who answered positively to at least one of the seven N-AAS questions were
272 invited for the interviews at a ratio of 3:1 compared to those who answered negatively. Two
273 weeks after completing the initial questionnaire, a RA contacted the participants. The first and
274 second authors were blinded to the participants' DV status. Some of these women completed the
275 interviews on a special visit for the purpose, others while attending their routine follow-up visits
276 two to eight weeks after completing the initial questionnaire, while others did not answer the
277 RA's phone call but made a surprise visit to the hospitals for the interviews (S1 Fig). The

278 interviews were conducted in a private room and audio recorded. On average, DV-negative cases
279 took around seven minutes to complete the interview, while DV-positive cases took 20-40
280 minutes.

281 **S1 Fig. Recruitment process and samples for gold standard interviews from two hospitals**
282 **(Hospital 1 and Hospital 2).**

283

284

285 **Ethical considerations**

286 Prior to collecting data, formal ethical approvals were obtained from The Nepal Health
287 Research Council, Nepal (Ref: 2395) and The Regional Committee for Medical and Health
288 Research Ethics of Central Norway (REK) (Ref: 178092). The study comprised a two-step
289 consent process. First, verbal agreement for participation was obtained, which involved
290 explaining the study objective to the participants and asking if they were willing to receive
291 further and more detailed information. The second step was obtaining electronic consent in the
292 C-ACASI. The authors also acquired informed consent for recording the gold standard
293 interviews. Participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they had
294 the right to withdraw from the study at any point without any impact on their future ANC.

295

296

297 **Step 8: Data management and analysis**

298 SPSS version 26 was used to analyze the data. The association between the interview
299 sample and the entire sample from the two hospitals was examined using the chi-square test and
300 Fisher's exact in bivariate analysis, with a p-value of ≤ 0.05 considered statistically significant.
301 The concurrent validity items i.e., prevalence, sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative
302 predictive values, and likelihood ratios were assessed [28], compared with the gold standard
303 interview [29]. Cohen's kappa test of concordance was used to establish reliability [30]. The
304 110-item questionnaire was assessed in percentages for test-retest reliability after administering
305 the same questionnaire twice over two to eight weeks.

306

307

308 **Step 9: Final adaptations and back translation**

309 Upon reflecting on the results of the clinical pretesting, the study team made a few final
310 modifications to the N-AAS items, such as expanding the introduction to the N-AAS questions
311 and adding illustrative examples in several questions to clarify the different types and forms of
312 violence.

313 The final version of the Nepali language N-AAS was back-translated to English by a
314 fluent speaker of both languages. The study team then compared the two English versions. The
315 team's two PhD students (first and second authors) along with their supervisors evaluated the
316 forward and backward translations to ascertain whether the true meaning had been captured.

317

318

319 **Results**

320 **Content validity**

321 Based on the I-CVI calculations, the scores obtained for the N-AAS were good (0.92–0.96) in
322 terms of relevance and understandability for I-CVI, S-CVI/Ave, and S-CVI/U. In terms of
323 sensitivity, where lowest scores are good levels, the score obtained for the N-AAS was 0.6,
324 which is satisfactory. The range of CVI obtained good scores for relevance (0.57–0.98),
325 understandability (0.57–1), and sensitivity (0–0.14) in the Delphi round with topic experts and
326 among the user expert group (Table 2).

327 **Table 2. Content Validity Assessment: Delphi and User Expert Group Item Scale Values.**

	Relevance			Understandability				Sensitivity			
	IE	NE	UE	IE	NE	NE	UE	IE	NE	NE	UE
					Delphi 1	Delphi 2			Delphi 1	Delphi 2	
I-CVI	0.96	0.94	0.98	0.92	0.90	0.96	1	0.61	0.77	0.66	0.14
S-CVI/Ave	0.96	0.94	0.98	0.92	0.90	0.96	1	0.66	0.77	0.60	0.14
S-CVI/UA	0.70	0.57	0.85	0.57	0.57	0.85	1	0	0	0	0

328 Notes: IE, International Experts (N=9); NE, National Experts (N=9); UE, User Experts (N=18);
329 I-CVI, Item-Level Content Validity Index; S-CVI/Ave=Scale-Level Content Validity
330 Index/Average; S-CVI/UA, Scale-Level Content Validity Index/Universal Agreement.

331

332

333

334 The qualitative feedback obtained from the international topic experts highlighted
335 important considerations, such as asking questions with care and respect and assisting women
336 who may be experiencing emotional distress, including shame, worry, anxiety, and other
337 distressing emotions. The experts also emphasized the importance of employing trained
338 interviewers to ensure more accurate answers. In response to recommendations from the national
339 experts, culturally adapted examples of abuse, such as hair pulling, spitting on, and forcing to lift
340 heavy sacks of rice and hay, were added to the N-AAS (Table 1).

341 The user experts, pregnant women in the study setting, emphasized the understandability,
342 relevance, acceptability, feasibility, and cultural appropriateness of the N-AAS questions, and
343 they noted that healthcare settings can provide a safe space for individuals who have experienced
344 violence to disclose their experiences [31]. However, they underscored that participants in
345 studies about DV must be assured that their responses to questionnaires will be published only in
346 a manner that guarantees their anonymity.

347

348

349 **Background characteristics**

350 Table 3 shows the background characteristics of the participants in the clinical pre-testing
351 phase of validation, showing the differences in total participants (n=461) vs. interview
352 participants (n=121) and in Hospital 1 (n=221) vs. Hospital 2 (n=246). The largest proportion
353 (44%) of study participants were aged 25 to 29 years, with no difference between the two
354 samples (p=0.72) and two hospitals (p=0.155). In addition, most (62%) participants were of
355 Brahmin/Chhetri (upper caste) ethnic group, with a similar distribution in the total and interview
356 samples (p=0.24). However, in Hospital 1, the largest proportion of participants were from the
357 Janajati (Indigenous) ethnic group (43.4%), whereas in Hospital 2, most (65%) were from the
358 Brahmin/Chhetri group (p<0.001). Participants' civil status was equally distributed in both
359 samples (p=0.14), but not equally distributed in both hospitals (p=0.019). Further, there was no
360 significant difference in the distribution of the samples in both categories according to their
361 independent income (p=0.286, p=0.399) with the majority of participants not having an
362 independent income in either hospital, type of family (p=0.67, p= 0.577), with just over half in

363 both hospitals living in “joint” families, and approximately half in each hospital experiencing
 364 their first pregnancy (p=0.64, O= 0.853).

365

366

367 **Table 3. Background Characteristics Comparing the Interview and Total Sample and**
 368 **Comparing Participating Hospitals.**

		Total sample N=467	Interview sample n=121	p-value	Hospital 1 n=221	Hospital 2 n=246	p-value
		n (%)	n (%)		n (%)	n (%)	
Age (years)	< 20	19 (4)	6(5)	0.72	12(5.4)	7(2.8)	0.155
	20–24	126 (27)	28(23.1)		66(29.9)	60(24.4)	
	25–29	205 (44)	57(47.1)		88(39.8)	117(47.6)	
	30–34	101 (22)	25(20.7)		50(22.6)	51(20.7)	
	35 or more	15 (3)	5(4.1)		5(2.3)	11(4.5)	
Ethnicity	Janajati ^a	159 (34)	32(26.4)	0.24	96(43.4)	63(25.6)	<0.001
	Brahmin/Ch hetri ^b	252 (54)	75(62.0)		92(41.6)	160(65)	
	Dalit ^c	20 (4)	7(5.8)		15(6.8)	5(2)	
	Madhesi ^d	6 (1.2)	1(0.8)		0	6(2.4)	
	Muslim ^e	2 (0.42)	0		0	2(0.8)	
	Others ^f	28 (6)	6(5)		18(8.1)	10(4.1)	
Settlement	Rural	121 (26)	22(18.2)	0.02	106(48)	15(6.1)	<0.001
	Urban	346(74)	99(81.8)		115(52)	231(93.9)	
Education	Illiterate	20(4)	4(3.3)	0.76	6(2.7)	14(5.7)	0.036
	Informal education	28(6)	8(6.6)		12(5.4)	16(6.5)	
	Upto class 8	59(13)	19(15.7)		29(13.1)	30(12.2)	
	Class 9–12	197(41)	50(41.3)		108(48.9)	89(36.2)	
	>12	163(36)	40(33.1)		66(29.9)	97(39.4)	
Independent income	Yes	121 (25.9)	46(38.1)	0.286	89(40.3)	109(44.3)	0.399
	No	346 (74.1)	152(43.9)		132(59.7)	137(55.7)	
Type of family	Nuclear	212(45)	57(47.1)	0.67	97(43.9)	115(46.7)	0.577
	Joint	255 (55)	64(52.9)		124(56.1)	131(53.3)	
Civil status	Married, living with husband	431(92)	110 (90.9)	0.14	211(95.5)	220(89.4)	0.019
	Married, not living with husband	36(8)	11(9.1)		10(4.6)	26(10.3)	

Primi gravida	Yes	227(48.6)	61(50.4)	0.64	106(48)	121(49.2)	0.853
	No	240(51.4)	60(49.6)		115(52)	125(50.8)	

369 ^aJanajati-Indigenous groups with varying degrees of opportunity and access to social mobility,
370 including some with little or no social mobility.

371 ^bBrahmin/Chhetri (Upper castes)-Brahmin are traditionally the most privileged groups in the
372 social hierarchy.

373 ^cDalit-The most oppressed social class

374 ^dMadhesi-Groups residing/originating from the Terai region.

375 ^e Muslim-Group from Muslim religion

376 ^f Others- Groups other than the abovementioned categories

377

378

379 **Prevalence of violence**

380 Any form of violence was reported by 12% of participants with almost similar
381 proportions in both study sites (12.7% and 11.4%). Among all types of violence, emotional abuse
382 was most prevalent (10.1%) and food deprivation was least prevalent (0.6%) (Table 4).

383

384

385 **Table 4. Prevalence of Abuse.**

N-AAS items		N=467	Hospital 1 n=221 (47%)	Hospital 2 n=246 (53%)
		N (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Emotional abuse	Since you've been married or living with a partner as married, have you been emotionally abused by someone in the family?	47(10.1)	21(9.5)	26(10.6)
Physical abuse (since marriage)	Since you've been married or living with a partner as married, have you been physically abused by someone in the family?	14(3)	6(2.7)	8(3.3)
Physical abuse (past 12 months)	Within the last year, have you been hit, slapped, kicked, spat on, or struck with an object; had your hair pulled; or otherwise physically abused by someone in the family?	12(2.6)	2(0.9)	10(4.1)

Physical abuse (since pregnancy)	Since you've been pregnant, have you been hit, slapped, kicked, spat on, or struck with an object; had your hair pulled; or otherwise physically abused by someone in the family?	7(1.5)	3(1.4)	4(1.6)
Forced to do heavy work	Since you've been pregnant, have you been forced by someone in the family to perform heavy physical work despite feeling unwell or exhausted?	9(1.9)	4(1.8)	5(2)
Food deprivation	Since you've been pregnant, has someone in the family given you insufficient or no food to eat despite food being available in the house?	3(0.6)	1(0.5)	2(0.8)
Sexual abuse (past 12 months)	Within the last year, has anyone in the family forced you into sexual activity without your consent?	9(1.9)	2(0.9)	7(2.8)
Yes, to any type of abuse		56(12)	28(12.7)	28(11.4)

386
387

388 Concurrent validity

389 The N-AAS demonstrated a high range of specificity (91.7–100%) across all types of
390 abuse in both listening-only and listening and reading versions, where the sensitivity of the
391 former in identifying emotional abuse was 34.4% and the latter 52.5%. Regarding physical
392 abuse, the N-AAS showed a sensitivity of 50% for abuse since marriage and 100% for abuse
393 within the last 12 months (see Table 5 for detailed results).

394

395

396 **Table 5. Concurrent Validity Analysis of the Seven N-AAS Abuse Items Compared to**
397 **Interview Gold Standard.**

	EA	PA since marriage	PA at 12m	PA since pregnant	FHW	FD	SA 12m	EA+FD+ FHW	PA ^{+a}
N-AAS listening only version^b, n=68 (% and likelihood ratio)									
Sensitivity	34.4	33.3	20	0	28.6	33.3	14.3	37.5	64.3
Specificity	91.7	98.4	100	95.5	98.4	100	98.4	91.7	94.4
Pre-test probability	47.1	8.8	7.4	2.9	10.3	4.4	10.3	47.1	11.6

(prevalence)									
Positive predictive value	78.6	66.7	100	0	66.7	100	50	80	60
Negative predictive value	61.1	93.8	94	96.9	92.3	97	90.9	62.3	95.3
Likelihood ratio	7.31	6.715	5.4	0.183	6.01	6.605	2.099	8.78	26.21
N-AAS listening and reading version^c, n=53 (% and likelihood ratio)									
Sensitivity	52.5	50	100	0	25	0	20	55	85.7
Specificity	84.6	89.4	97.9	98.1	97.8	100	93.6	84.6	91.3
Pre-test probability (prevalence)	75.5	11.3	9.4	1.9	15.1	9.4	9.6	75.7	13.2
Positive predictive value	91.3	37.5	83.3	0	66.7	0	25	91.7	60
Negative predictive value	36.7	93.3	100	98.1	88	90.6	91.7	37.9	97.7
Likelihood ratio	6.03	4.80	27.71	0.03	4.46	0	0.88	6.78	18.41

398 EA, Emotional abuse; PA, Physical abuse; FHW, Forced to do heavy work; FD, Food
399 deprivation; SA, sexual abuse.

400 ^aPA+, Physical abuse since marriage + Physical abuse past 12 months (12m) + Physical abuse
401 since pregnant.

402 ^bThe first version of the C-ACASI, consisting of listening questions only.

403 ^cThe second version of the C-ACASI, including both listening and reading options.

404

405

406 **Test-retest reliability**

407 The test-retest reliability measure for the N-AAS ranged from 91.2–98.9%, with the
408 highest percentage obtained for sexual violence (98.9%) and the lowest for emotional abuse
409 (91.2%). The Kappa coefficient was calculated for the N-AAS, showing the highest agreement
410 for sexual abuse (0.74) and the lowest for physical abuse since pregnancy (-0.00) (S1 Table).

411

412

413 **S1 Table. Test–Retest Reliability of N-AAS Items (with Kappa Coefficient).**

414 The test-retest reliability of the entire comprehensive questionnaire was also measured (S2

415 Table), and the test-retest reliability range was 0.27–99.4% for Section A, 81.8–100% for Section

416 B, 81%–97.2% for Section C, 91.2–98.9% for Section D, 83.3–95.8% for Section E, 87.3–97.8%
417 for Section F, 80.7–97.2% for Section G, and 45.8–100% for Section H.

418

419

420 **S2 Table. Test-Retest Reliability of Comprehensive Questionnaire (with Kappa**
421 **Coefficient).**

422

423

424 **Discussion**

425 The current study addresses gaps in the validation of tools for screening DV among
426 pregnant women in LMICs. Through a comprehensive validation process, the N-AAS tool was
427 developed as a culturally adapted simple screening tool with seven relevant questions for the
428 Nepalese context.

429

430

431 **Content validity**

432 Content validity is an as essential aspect of evaluating the appropriateness and
433 representativeness of an assessment tool for the construct of interest [32, 33]. In this study, the
434 content validity of the N-AAS was assessed through a rigorous iterative process involving input
435 from a team of experts who provided feedback on the relevance, understandability, and
436 sensitivity of the N-AAS items.

437 Overall, regarding the cultural adaptation of the N-AAS, the CVI demonstrated good
438 scores, indicating the experts' agreement on the relevance, understandability, and sensitivity of
439 the questions. These findings align with similar observations from the validation of the AAS in
440 Turkey [15], reinforcing the validity and potential broader utility of the N-AAS in cultures other
441 than the US.

442 The insights from the user experts in our study emphasize the need to prioritize the
443 creation of user-friendly and culturally appropriate tools within healthcare contexts, as they
444 enable the identification and support of people experiencing DV. The N-AAS questions were
445 reported as straightforward, reasonably sensitive, and easy to answer, making them suitable for
446 inclusion in routine antenatal care services.

447 The questionnaire was administered using tablet computers and a digital technology
448 called C-ACASI [26], an approach proven effective for collecting data on sensitive topics within
449 ANC settings with limited privacy. Participants' privacy was maintained, and the majority
450 remained engaged throughout the study, indicating a satisfactory level of comfort with the
451 questionnaire. The use of electronic data collection methods, such as C-ACASI, offers several
452 advantages in busy outpatient departments, where time is limited. It provides a confidential data
453 collection tool that accommodates individuals with minimal or no literacy, particularly relevant
454 in a country with a female literacy rate of around 67% [11]. Previous studies have also
455 highlighted the effectiveness of C-ACASI in ensuring high-yield and private responses to
456 sensitive questions [10].

457 The modifications made to the listening and reading versions of the questionnaire
458 simplified and expedited the data collection process, saving time and improving participant
459 comprehension. By incorporating user feedback and leveraging digital technology, the N-AAS

460 demonstrated practicality and ensured participant comfort, privacy, and inclusivity. Further, the
461 utilization of C-ACASI not only improved the data collection process but also expanded the
462 accessibility of the questionnaire to include a wider range of participants.

463

464

465 **Concurrent validity**

466 The current investigation revealed the N-AAS had high specificity, positive predictive
467 value, and adequate to high negative predictive value, demonstrating its overall satisfactory level
468 of measurement accuracy. Sensitivity was higher in the reading and listening version than in the
469 listening version only, which could be attributed to added clarity for participants who could read
470 but who may have misheard or misunderstood while listening only. In addition, completing the
471 questionnaire may be less burdensome for participants in the hearing and listening version
472 because it took less time to complete, which may explain the difference in results shown in Table
473 5.

474 Another study conducted in Nepal [34] highlighted that cultural factors often lead women
475 to accept violence from their husbands. To encourage disclosure and improve relevance and
476 understanding, we incorporated culturally relevant examples of physical abuse and being forced
477 to do heavy work into the N-AAS. However, disclosures in response to these questions were
478 limited, with few instances of physical abuse and food deprivation reported, and the low
479 disclosure rates observed in the study could potentially be attributed to the success of recent
480 public health initiatives. For instance, increased ANC visits have allowed family members,
481 alongside pregnant women, to receive health information from qualified specialists, and similar

482 initiatives emphasize the importance of pregnant women consuming nutritious meals and of
483 raising awareness about their vulnerability during pregnancy [35].

484 In the C-ACASI listening version, we observed lower sensitivity than the gold standard
485 interview, where some women initially denied experiencing DV in the C-ACASI questionnaire
486 but disclosed instances of DV during the interviews. This inconsistency suggests a potential
487 weakness in the C-ACASI format for DV inquiry and may signal a lack awareness,
488 understanding, or recognition of abuse among participants. This observation aligns with a
489 qualitative study [32] on South Asian women’s DV experiences, indicating that societal
490 pressures often discourage them from disclosing or revealing DV due to fear of family
491 embarrassment. It is possible that some participants are unfamiliar with the term “domestic
492 violence,” which may explain the discrepancy in responses observed in our study. Furthermore,
493 such factors as low confidence, distrust of ethnic or social outsiders, loyalty to family, and a
494 desire to protect family privacy and honor could have contributed to the reluctance to disclose
495 DV. However, our study revealed false negative cases with low sensitivity in the C-ACASI
496 listening version, underscoring the need for awareness-raising programs and interventions to
497 combat DV, fostering greater consciousness and reducing general societal acceptance of DV.

498 Studies validating DV screening tools and instruments are an important contribution to
499 addressing the complex issue, and they are crucial to developing innovative interventions that
500 involve collaboration among legal, judicial, law enforcement, social services, and medical
501 systems, followed by comprehensive evaluations [36]. In addition, qualitative research plays a
502 role in gaining valuable insights into potential strategies for increasing screening rates and
503 developing successful intervention programs, particularly from the perspective of the women

504 themselves [37]. As such, our study, by validating a DV screening instrument, contributes to
505 these ongoing efforts.

506

507

508 **Prevalence**

509 The reported prevalence rates of DV among pregnant women in this study appeared low,
510 with 12% for any type of abuse, compared to our prior study which documented a prevalence of
511 21% [10]. This disparity can primarily be attributed to the limitations imposed by our sample
512 size in the current study. To address this limitation and obtain a more comprehensive
513 understanding of DV prevalence, especially in terms of specific characteristics such as the type
514 of perpetrator, we are currently conducting a larger scale randomized controlled trial (RCT) at
515 the same study sites.

516 Additionally, another significant factor that may explain the low reported prevalence of
517 DV in this study is the persistence of a patriarchal system in Nepal [22], which may discourage
518 the reporting of DV and normalize violence perpetrated by intimate partners [38].

519

520 **Test-retest reliability**

521 The test-retest reliability of the N-AAS was found to be high, indicating that the
522 questions produced consistent results when administered at two different time points. The Kappa
523 coefficient measures agreement between observations, the findings of which highlight the

524 simplicity and effectiveness of the N-AAS as a tool for assessing DV prevalence among pregnant
525 women in Nepal.

526 In a validation study of the AAS conducted in Turkey [15], the reliability coefficient was
527 reported as KR20=0.801, whereas the Greek version of the scale yielded a reliability coefficient
528 of 0.80 [39]. Therefore, the comparability of the N-AAS result with other studies supports it as a
529 robust and consistent tool for measuring DV among pregnant women.

530

531

532 **Contributions to knowledge**

533 This study contributes to the research methodology and evidence-base regarding
534 validated tools for addressing DV in LMIC contexts. One significant contribution is the
535 enhanced understanding of the cultural meanings and nuances of violence, where the inclusion of
536 culturally specific forms of violence in the tool, such as food deprivation despite the availability
537 of food in the house, represents a step towards improving the recognition and understanding of
538 DV in a cultural context. Although the positive response rate to this question was low, it
539 underscores the importance of further testing these questions in our larger clinical study.

540 Identifying DV in pregnancy is just one aspect of broader efforts aimed at combating all
541 types of violence against women. Additional measures are needed to shift societal norms, raise
542 awareness, provide education, and train healthcare providers to inquire about DV experiences.
543 Various health promotion programs should be implemented from the national level to break the
544 silence surrounding the disclosure of DV experiences. Continued and further preventive work in

545 this field is important to ensure the safety and well-being of individual women who have
546 experienced DV.

547

548

549 **Strengths and limitations**

550 This study represents a pioneering validation of a clinical screening tool for DV in Nepal,
551 the development of which and similar screening tools is crucial for obtaining better estimates of
552 the prevalence of DV during pregnancy in LMIC settings. The implementation of the tool was
553 feasible and required participant convenience, particularly regular ANC visits rather than
554 extensive resources. The positive reception of the study invitation among the women, despite the
555 topic's sensitive and taboo nature in the cultural context, promotes the acceptability of our
556 approach. By prioritizing the perspectives of individual women, our research adopts a woman-
557 centered approach that acknowledges the significance of their voices, particularly in societies
558 wherein they may be marginalized or excluded. Nevertheless, the study has limitations that must
559 be acknowledged so future research can aim to overcome them and expand the scope and
560 inclusivity of studies on DV during pregnancy in Nepal.

561 First, the study was conducted in two largely urban hospitals, which may inaccurately
562 reflect the prevalence of DV during pregnancy in all regions of Nepal; thus, further research is
563 needed to encompass a wider range of healthcare settings and diverse geographic locations.
564 Additionally, the small sample size precludes a focus on sub-group analysis, perpetrator type,
565 with low prevalence. Second, linguistic barriers prevented several potential participants from
566 participating in the study. Although Nepali is the official working language at the federal level,

567 some individuals may have trouble understanding it, and this limitation may have led to the
568 exclusion of individuals who could have provided valuable insights from their experiences of
569 potential DV encounters. Thus, efforts should be made in future studies to address language
570 barriers and ensure inclusivity. Finally, the study did not include participants with physical
571 disabilities, such as poor vision and hearing, and the absence of sign language interpretation in
572 the study materials may have hindered these individuals' participation. As such, future research
573 should consider accessibility measures to enable the inclusion of individuals with disabilities, as
574 they may belong to vulnerable groups that could provide valuable perspectives on DV
575 experiences.

576

577

578 **Conclusion**

579 The N-AAS exhibited strong test-retest reliability, concurrent validity, specificity,
580 positive predictive value, negative predictive value, likelihood ratio, and Kappa coefficient,
581 where excellent sensitivity ratings were observed for physical abuse within the last 12 months
582 and emotional and physical abuse since marriage produced moderate sensitivity ratings.
583 Furthermore, sexual abuse, heavy work during pregnancy, physical abuse during pregnancy, and
584 food deprivation warrant further investigation with a larger sample size, and participants should
585 be assured that their responses will be published in a manner guaranteeing their anonymity.

586

587

588 **Acknowledgements**

589 We are grateful to all participating pregnant women, the staff, and our research assistants
590 at the antenatal clinics of Hospital 1 and Hospital 2, as well as to Prabin Raj Shakya for
591 programming the C-ACASI.

592 The ADVANCE 2 research team includes the following people: *Norway*–Principal
593 Investigator Professor Berit Schei, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU);
594 Associate Professor Jennifer J. Infanti, NTNU; Professor Eva Skovlund, NTNU; Associate
595 Professor Melanie Rae Simpson, NTNU; Co-principal Investigator Professor Mirjam Lukasse,
596 University of South-Eastern Norway; Professor Lena Henriksen, Oslo Metropolitan University;
597 *Sweden*–Professor Katarina Swahnberg, Linnæus University; *USA*–Professor Jacquelyn
598 Campbell, John Hopkins University School of Nursing; *Nepal*–Principal Investigator Professor
599 Sunil K. Joshi, Kathmandu Medical College (KMC); post-doctoral researcher Poonam Rishal,
600 KMC; site principal investigators at Dhulikhel, Professors Rajendra Koju and Kunta Devi Pun;
601 PhD candidates Pratibha Chalise and Pratibha Manandhar; and research assistants Kritika
602 Shrestha, Usha Thapa, Nani Maiya Basi, Asma Pun, and Shanta Banjara.

603

604

605 **Ethics approval**

606 The study was approved by the Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research
607 Ethics Mid-Norway (178092) and by the ethics committees of the participating hospitals, as well
608 as the Nepal Health Research Council (2395).

609

610

611 **Consent for publication**

612 Not applicable.

613

614

615 **Availability of data and materials**

616 All data and materials used in this study are available on request to corresponding author.

617

618

619 **Competing interests**

620 No competing interests to disclose.

621

622

623 **Funding**

624 This project is funded by a grant from the Research Council of Norway (FRIPRO
625 program), project/grant number 301525, Addressing Domestic Violence in Antenatal Care
626 Environments 2 (2020–2025). The funder had no role in designing and planning the study and
627 will have no role in analyzing and interpreting the results.

628

629

630 **Author contributions**

631 Conceptualization, all authors; Data curation, PM, PC; Formal analysis, PM, PC; Funding
632 acquisition, BS, JJI; Investigation, PM, PC; Methodology, PM, PC, JJI, BS, KS; Project
633 administration, SKJ, KDP, JJI, KS; Supervision, PR, LH, JJI, SKJ, ML, KDP, KS; Writing—
634 original draft, PM; Writing—review & editing, all authors. All authors have read and agreed to
635 the final version of the manuscript.

636

637

638 **References**

- 639 1. Ministry of Law and Justice. Domestic violence (offence and punishment) act, 2066.
640 [Internet]. Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of Nepal, Nepal Law Commission;
641 c2009 [cited 2023 Jun 27]. Available from: [https://www.lawcommission.gov.np/en/wp-](https://www.lawcommission.gov.np/en/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/domestic-violence-crime-and-punishment-act-2066-2009.pdf)
642 [content/uploads/2018/10/domestic-violence-crime-and-punishment-act-2066-2009.pdf](https://www.lawcommission.gov.np/en/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/domestic-violence-crime-and-punishment-act-2066-2009.pdf).
- 643 2. UN Millennium Project. Taking action: achieving gender equality *and* empowering
644 women. [Internet]. Earthscan London; c2005 [cited on 2023 May 6]. Available from:
645 [http://content-ext.undp.org/aplaws_publications/1844034/Taking%20Action-](http://content-ext.undp.org/aplaws_publications/1844034/Taking%20Action-%20Achieving%20Gender%20Equality%20and%20Empowering%20Women.pdf)
646 [%20Achieving%20Gender%20Equality%20and%20Empowering%20Women.pdf](http://content-ext.undp.org/aplaws_publications/1844034/Taking%20Action-%20Achieving%20Gender%20Equality%20and%20Empowering%20Women.pdf).
- 647 3. Tjaden PG, Thoennes N. Prevalence, incidence and consequences of violence against
648 women: findings from the national violence against women survey. [Internet]. U.S.

- 649 Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Centers
650 for Disease Control and Prevention; c1998 [cited on 2023 May 8]. Available from:
651 <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED434980>.
- 652 4. Gazmararian JA, Petersen R, Spitz AM, Goodwin MM, Saltzman LE, Marks JS.
653 Violence and reproductive health: current knowledge and future research directions.
654 Matern Child Health J. 2000;4(2):79-84.
- 655 5. Stewart DE. Incidence of postpartum abuse in women with a history of abuse during
656 pregnancy. CMAJ. 1994;151(11):1601-04.
- 657 6. World Health Organization. Multi-country study on women's health and domestic
658 violence against women: initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's
659 responses. [Internet]. World Health Organization; c2005 [cited on 2023 May 9].
660 Available from: [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/43309/924159358X](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/43309/924159358X_eng.pdf)
661 [eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/43309/924159358X_eng.pdf).
- 662 7. Campbell J, Garcia-Moreno C, Sharps P. Abuse during pregnancy in industrialized and
663 developing countries. Violence Against Women. 2004;10(7):770-89. Available from:
664 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1077801204265551>.
- 665 8. Mojahed A, Alaidarous N, Kopp M, Pogarell A, Thiel F, Garthus-Niegel S. Prevalence of
666 intimate partner violence among intimate partners during the perinatal period: A narrative
667 literature review. Front Psychiatry. 2021;12. doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2021.601236.
- 668 9. Rishal P, Pun KD, Darj E, Joshi SK, Bjørngaard JH, Swahnberg K, et al. Prevalence and
669 associated factors of domestic violence among pregnant women attending routine
670 antenatal care in Nepal. Scand J Public Health. 2018;46(8):785-93.

- 671 10. Sapkota D, Anderson D, Saito A, Baird K. Domestic and family violence and its
672 association with mental health among pregnant women attending antenatal care in a
673 tertiary hospital of Eastern Nepal. *J Nepal Health Res Counc.* 2021;19(1):115-21.
674 doi.org/10.33314/jnhrc.v19i1.2508.
- 675 11. Ministry of Health and Population (MOHP). New ERA, and ICF International Inc. Nepal
676 Demographic and Health Survey 2016. [Internet]. Ministry of Health and Population,
677 New ERA, and ICF International; c2017 [cited on 2023 April 28]. Available from:
678 <https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-fr336-dhs-final-reports.cfm>.
- 679 12. Bhatta NS, Assanangkornchai S, Rajbhandari I. Does husband's alcohol consumption
680 increase the risk of domestic violence during the pregnancy and postpartum periods in
681 Nepalese women? *BMC Pub Health.* 2021;21(5):1-9. doi:10./1186/s12889-020-10021-y.
- 682 13. Singh JK, Evans-Lacko S, Acharya D, Kadel R, Gautam S. Intimate partner violence
683 during pregnancy and use of antenatal care among rural women in southern Terai of
684 Nepal. *Women Birth.* 2018;31(2): 96-102.
- 685 14. McFarlane J, Parker B, Soeken K. Assessing for abuse during pregnancy: severity and
686 frequency of injuries and associated entry into prenatal care. *JAMA.*1992;267(23):3176-
687 178.
- 688 15. Berkiten AE, Özdilek R, Özdemir S, Baydemir C. Violence in pregnancy: scale validity
689 and reliability study in Turkey. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergis.*
690 2022;8(1):44-53.
- 691 16. Antoniou E, Ioannidi-Kapolou E, Daglas M, Vivilaki V, Karamitros D, Dafermos V, et
692 al. Abuse assessment screen (AAS) questionnaire: the Greek validation. *Clin Exp Obstet*
693 *Gynecol.* 2010;37(4):313-16.

- 694 17. Escribà-Agüir, V, Ruiz-Perez I, Artazcoz L, Martin-Baena D, Royo-Marques MBS, et al.
695 Validity and reliability of the Spanish version of the “abuse assessment screen” among
696 pregnant women. *Public Health Nurs.* 2016;33(3):264-72.
- 697 18. Pearce CW, Hawkins JW, Kearney M, Peyton C, Dwyer J, Haggerty LA, et al.
698 Translation of domestic violence instruments for use in research. *Violence Against*
699 *Women.* 2003;9(7):859-78.
- 700 19. Weiss SJ, Ernst AA, Cham E, Nick TG. Development of a screen for ongoing intimate
701 partner violence. *Violence and victs.* 2003;18(2):131-41.
- 702 20. Norton LB, Peipert JF, Zierler S, Lima B, Hume L. Battering in pregnancy: an
703 assessment of two screening methods. *J Obstet Gynaecol.* 1995;85(3):321-25.
- 704 21. Reichenheim ME, Moraes CL. Comparison between the abuse assessment screen and the
705 revised conflict tactics scales for measuring physical violence during pregnancy. *J*
706 *Epidemiol Community Health.* 2004;58(6):523-527. doi: 10.1136/jech.2003.011.
- 707 22. Pun KD, Infanti JJ, Koju R, Schei B, Darj Elisabeth, ADVANCE Study Group.
708 Community perceptions on domestic violence against pregnant women in Nepal: a
709 qualitative study. *Glob Health Action.* 2016;9(1):31964.
- 710 23. Linstone HA, Turoff M. General applications. In: Linstone HA, Turoff M, editors. *The*
711 *Delphi method: techniques and applications.* 1st ed. New Jersey: Addison-Wesley
712 Publishing Company; 1975.
- 713 24. Willis GB. The practice of cross-cultural cognitive interviewing. *Public Opin Q.* May
714 2015;79(S1):359-95.
- 715 25. Polit DF, Beck CT. The content validity index: are you sure you know what's being
716 reported? Critique and recommendations. *Res Nurs Health.* Oct. 2006;29(5):489-97.

- 717 26. Bhatnagar T, Brown J, Saravanamurthy PS, Kumar RM, Detels R. Color-coded audio
718 computer-assisted self-interviews (C-ACASI) for poorly educated men and women in a
719 semi-rural area of south India: “good, scary and thrilling.” *AIDS Behav.* July
720 2013;17(6):2260-68.
- 721 27. Swahnberg IK, Wijma B. The NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ) validation of new
722 measures of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and abuse in the health care system
723 among women. *Eur J Public Health.* 2003;13(4):361-66.
- 724 28. Jaeschke R, Guyatte GH, Sackett DL. Users’ guides to the medical literature: iii. how to
725 use an article about a diagnostic test b. What are the results and will they help me in
726 caring for my patients? *JAMA.*1994;271(9):703-07.
- 727 29. Zhou XH, Obuchowski NA, McClish DK. Comparing the accuracy of two diagnostic
728 tests. In: Zhou XH, Obuchowski NA, McClish DK, editors. *Statistical methods in*
729 *diagnostic medicine.* 1st ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 2009. p. 165.
- 730 30. Bowling, A. Health-related quality of life: conceptual meaning, use and measurement. In:
731 Bowling, A, editor. *Measuring disease: a review of disease-specific quality of life*
732 *measurement scales.*2nd ed. Buckingham: Open University Press; 2001. p. 23-68.
- 733 31. World Health Organization. Responding to intimate partner violence and sexual violence
734 against women: WHO clinical and policy guidelines. [Internet]. WHO; c2013 [cited on
735 2023 May 6]. Available from:
736 https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/85240/9789241548595_eng.pdf.
- 737 32. Delgado-Rico E, Carretero-Dios H, Ruch W. Content validity evidences in test
738 development: An applied perspective. *Int J Clin Health Psychol España.* 2012;12(3):449-
739 60.

- 740 33. Almanasreh E, Moles R, Chen TF. Evaluation of methods used for estimating content
741 validity. *Res Social and Adm Pharm*. 2019;15(2):214-21.
- 742 34. Sharma S. Domestic violence in Nepali society: root cause and consequences – a research
743 report. [Internet]. Social Inclusion Research Fund (SRIF/SNV); c2007 [cited on 2023
744 May 9]. Available from:
745 [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje\)\)/reference/referencespapers.aspx?re](https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje))/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=1442918)
746 [ferenceid=1442918](https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje))/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=1442918).
- 747 35. Ministry of Health and Population (MOHP), New Era, ICF International Inc. Nepal
748 Demographic and Health Survey 2022: key indicators reports. [Internet]. MOHP; c2022
749 [cited on 2023 April 23]. Available from:
750 [https://mohp.gov.np/uploads/Resources/Nepal%20Demographic%20and%20Health%20S](https://mohp.gov.np/uploads/Resources/Nepal%20Demographic%20and%20Health%20Survey%202022%20Key%20Indicators%20Report.pdf)
751 [urvey%202022%20Key%20Indicators%20Report.pdf](https://mohp.gov.np/uploads/Resources/Nepal%20Demographic%20and%20Health%20Survey%202022%20Key%20Indicators%20Report.pdf).
- 752 36. Gill A. Voicing the silent fear: South Asian women’s experiences of domestic violence.
753 *Howard J*. 2004;43(5):465-83.
- 754 37. Cole TB, Flanagin A. What can we do about violence? *JAMA*. 1999;282(5):481-83.
- 755 38. Gazmararian JA, Petersen R, Spitz AM, Goodwin MM, Saltzman LE, Marks JS.
756 Violence and reproductive health: current knowledge and future research directions.
757 *Matern Child Health J*. 2000;4(2):79-84. doi:10.1023/a:1009514119423.
- 758 39. Paudel GS. Domestic violence against women in Nepal. *Gender Technol Dev*.
759 2007;11(2):199-233. doi: 10.1177/097185240701100204.




Figure 1





Figure 2



S1 Fig